U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 89—PART 7

OCTOBER 21, 1943, TO NOVEMBER 22, 1943
(PAGES 8609 TO 9842)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
JUL 31 '

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as in the white light of Thy searching we pause at the day's threshold to examine our hearts and minds, we confess with contrition that selfishness has poisoned our relationships with men, and indifference our relationship with Thee. As servants of the Nation's life, save us from the dangers that lurk in a warped judgment, a confused reckoning, and a narrowed outlook. Deliver us from the shrunken imagination of an embittered mind which sees nothing beyond this war and the hope for the winning of it but a gloating triumph over our foes. Keep us from any national and international plans which would be blasphemies against the universal vision of the kingdom of God.

Upon all who here labor with true purpose of heart for the purification of public life, for the removal of all that betrays and denies democracy, for the spread of the gospel of good will, let Thy blessings rest. Bring us to a golden tomorrow for all Thy children when the shared plenty of the good earth shall wash the slums of the world into vague, unhappy memories. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 20, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 445 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY AND OFFICE

A letter from the Director of the War Relocation Authority, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Authority for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; and also a letter from the Administrative Officer, Office of Defense Transportation, submitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the Office for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO—RESOLUTION OF PUERTO RICO FARMERS ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of the Puerto Rico Farmers' Association, San Juan, P. R., transmitting a resolution adopted by the twentieth annual convention of that association, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico in accordance with the recommendations communicated to Congress in a recent message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 192, declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States. The resolution is commonly called the post-war peace resolution. I ask unanimous consent that I may file a written report on the resolution at any time during the day (Rept. No. 478).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the resolution reported by the Senator from Texas will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may have intended to do so, but I think he should also announce that the committee voted to ask that the resolution be given consideration next Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his suggestion. The committee reported the resolution favorably by a vote of 20 to 2, and it was agreed with the leadership and among the members of the committee that the Senate proceed on next Monday to give consideration to the resolution.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 20, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation;

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; and

S. 1350. An act to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1468. A bill to extend the time for allowing credit under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for amounts paid into State unemployment funds for the years 1936 to 1941, inclusive; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1469. A bill to provide for the issuance of a lapel button to men who are deferred under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, by reason of physical disqualification; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1470. A bill to provide for mandatory loans to small business concerns upon termination of their war contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Mr. ANDREWS (by request) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that there should be created appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and that the participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes is essential to its success.

2. That our own national interest and that of the world can be best served by participation in the establishment and maintenance of an association of free sovereign nations implemented with whatever force is necessary, in that no peace can be lasting and secure for nations that are not fully prepared to maintain peace.

3. That the United States should immediately take the initiative in calling a conference of representatives of the United Nations which shall undertake, among others, the following objectives:

(a) To assist in coordinating and utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis to a victorious peace.

(b) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent self-governments can be established.

(c) To administer relief and assistance in the economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(d) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations pending the consummation of a final treaty of peace.

(e) To provide for the creation and maintenance of a United Nations military force, established on a pro rata plan as to personnel, expense, and equipment, adequate to suppress any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

(f) To provide machinery for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to the organization and its member nations which seek no territorial aggrandizement.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 196), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas it is alleged that the people of the United States are apprehensive and disturbed by the directives, rules, and regulations administered by the various Federal governmental bureaus and agencies in the executive department; and

Whereas it is alleged that these rules and regulations have the effect of law; and

Whereas it is alleged that these bureaus and agencies have the power, or assume the power, to punish the violations of their rules and regulations by fine or imprisonment, or both; and

Whereas it is alleged that these bureaus and agencies claim to derive their authority to punish violators of these rules and regulations by fine or imprisonment from various Executive orders; and

Whereas it is alleged that during 1933 and subsequent years, during and including 1942, there have been more than 3,500 Executive orders issued by the President, and during and including the same years there have been approximately 4,800 laws enacted by the Congress and signed by the President; and

Whereas it is alleged that the Government of the United States has gone far in its departure from a government by legislative enactment by Congress to a government by Executive order; and

Whereas it is generally believed this alleged departure from constitutional government has created confusion, waste, and inefficiency in administration of governmental affairs and resentment amongst our people and has retarded the war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be hereby directed to determine the source of constitutional or legislative authority upon which these Executive orders are based, the validity of same, what effect their enforcement has had upon our national economy and our constitutional democracy, and report to the Senate the result of such labors as the committee finds may be helpful in preserving to the Congress its constitutional authority and place in the legislative process.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PERSONAL REPORT BY SENATOR MEAD OF OBSERVATIONS ON THE FIGHTING FRONTS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "A Personal Report of My Observations," delivered by Senator MEAD on October 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNPRECEDENTED POTATO HARVEST IN MAINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him today on the steps at the east front of the Capitol to a group of potato pickers from Kentucky, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARMER AND R. E. A. MEET THE CHALLENGE — ADDRESS BY EUGENE CASEY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Farmer and R. E. A. Meet the Challenge," delivered by Eugene Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, at the Georgia State-wide meeting of R. E. A. cooperatives, Atlanta, Ga., October 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Connally Resolution," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post, October 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF LOCAL AIR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

[Mr. VAN NUYS, on behalf of Mr. MCCARRAN, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A National System of Local Air Service Is America's Great Transportation Need," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD AND THE WAR—EDITORIAL FROM LEXINGTON (KY.) HERALD

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The World and the War," published in the Lexington Herald of October 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 466.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an address on the question of transportation, delivered yesterday by the Vice President before a meeting sponsored by various civic and labor groups in Dallas, Tex., at the Sunset High School auditorium. The address was broadcast over a Nation-wide hook-up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that the address referred to by him be printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Out of our natural and industrial wealth we are producing the sinews of war, the purchase price of victory. We are meeting the challenge of war. We have yet to measure and meet the challenge of peace. Whether we shall preserve the essentials of our American life and build an abundance in which all men may share depends primarily and fundamentally upon the wisdom with which we organize and administer our resources. There is one simple key to the kind of domestic peace we must have. It is the full use of our physical and human resources to produce for a better standard of living. There must be no hidden strings, no unwarranted restraints on the freedom to use our productive facilities. But abundant production has only one destination, and that is abundant consumption. We must be as vigilant in maintaining the free flow of goods between producer and consumer as we are in maintaining the free flow of capital and invention in productive enterprise. It is for this reason that I discuss today the vital role of public transportation.

The history of transportation has been a continuing battle against monopoly controls. From the Granger laws of the 1870's to the present time, the people of the South and the West have fought in State and Federal legislatures and in the courts to harness the railroads to serve the public interests. The battle has been without permanent victory; financial interests, through court appeals, legislative rules of rate-making, corporate manipulations and conspiracies, have continued to exact their tolls. The early victories of the Sherman Antitrust Act have not been vigorously followed up, and new

restraints have appeared with the outlawing of the old.

The financial exploitation of our railroads, which has placed an unbearable burden on the people, is without parallel in our American life. It is the source and center of the railroads' difficulties and of many of the Nation's ills. The plundering of the Erie, the New Haven, and other eastern railroads has been equaled only by the looting of certain western railroads, the greatest of which was the Milwaukee. How these plunderers could have escaped the consequences of their evil acts is incomprehensible. They or their successors rule the railroad empire today as they did in the heyday of their financial manipulations. They are even strengthening their grip. So I say to you that the people's battle has not been won; that the battle is on, and that it will never cease until these evils are uprooted altogether.

Public transport is again being brought under monopoly control. Competition has already been effectively eliminated in the making of transportation rates. The evil consequences are everywhere apparent—

"Excessive transportation rates burden agriculture and industry and trade.

"Noncompetitive rates deprive agriculture and industry of the benefits of more efficient and cheaper forms of transportation.

"Discriminatory rates are keeping the South and the West in a colonial status.

"Newer forms of transportation are being brought under monopoly control.

"Monopolistic conditions already present in transportation are fostering monopolies in industry."

These are serious charges. Let us examine them in the light of the known facts.

The people, not only of Texas but of the entire South and West, have experienced the effects of excessive transportation charges—the high cost of the necessities of life and the inability to market the products of their labor. You recall years of plenty when it was impossible to move crops to market because the prices would not bear the cost of transportation. Your grapefruit has rotted on the ground, as have peaches in Colorado and Utah, potatoes in Minnesota and Wisconsin, and other farm products elsewhere. All other elements which affect the farmers' costs go up and down with changing conditions, but the high-rate barrier remains the same.

The empire of the West and South which has produced so much of the wealth of the Nation has been drained dry by the tolls of monopolies, the most important of which is transportation. Consider what happened to the consumer's dollar spent for representative agricultural products in a typical year. Of every dollar paid by consumers for Texas onions, 28 cents went for transportation and 12 cents went to the farmers. In like manner, out of every dollar spent for Texas cabbage, 36 cents went for transportation charges and 14 cents were paid to the farmers. The growers of Georgia and Carolina peaches received only 31 cents in each dollar paid by purchasers; the railroads and other transportation companies received 22 cents. When Dallas consumers bought Idaho potatoes they paid 32 cents of each dollar to the growers and 27 cents for transportation; and of each dollar spent in Dallas chain stores for Pacific iceberg lettuce, 14 cents went to the growers at the packing house and 26 cents were required to pay for transportation. What is true of onions, cabbage, and peaches is also true of virtually everything the farmer grows. These disproportionate and high rates have limited consumption and have penalized the farmer for producing abundantly.

Who makes these excessive rates? There is a widespread misconception that the Government or, more particularly, the Interstate Commerce Commission prescribed each and every rate for public transportation. This is not the fact. In reality, the actual transportation charges, with few exceptions, are made by private rate bureaus and conferences of the carriers. In no year during the past 10 years did the Interstate Commerce Commission review as many as 1 percent of the tariffs filed with it; that is, more than 99 percent of the tariffs filed became effective without action by the Commission.

The private rate-making machinery of the railroads is highly organized along geographic lines into three principal territories—eastern, southern, and western. Approximately 15 railroad associations and conferences determine the freight rates of the country. This private rate-making machinery, which surpasses in size and complexity that of the Interstate Commerce Commission, has arrogated to itself that control over rates which Congress sought to vest in a public agency. With few exceptions, these private rate bureaus determine what transportation rates shall be filed with the Commission, and successfully block at their inception virtually all rate reductions that threaten carrier profits. Although competition in rate making is the national legislative policy, it is, in fact, as dead as the dodo.

These rate bureaus are not even democratically organized with respect to their own membership. Many of the decisions with respect to what rates shall be charged in the Southwest have to be referred for final decision to Chicago. One of the important bureaus—the Trans-Continental Freight Bureau—is controlled by the nine railroads reaching the Pacific, and fixes the transcontinental rail rates for the entire country. Though these conferences and bureaus make pious declarations to the effect that individual railroads have the right to quote rates independently, the fact is that this right has long since become an empty fiction. Instead of responding to the recent exposé of their cartel methods by the Department of Justice by conforming to the law of competition which all business must observe, the railroads have rushed to Congress seeking special legislation to permit them to continue their illegal private rate-making practices which have been so costly to the entire Nation.

The second charge is that the elimination of competition between competing forms of transportation has deprived the Nation of the benefits of newer and cheaper forms of transport. In an attempt to develop cheaper transportation, the farmers and the businessmen have joined forces in promoting a national system of highways and waterways, and under the vigorous leadership of President Roosevelt, we have completed a vast network of highways and waterways. More recently public funds have been directed to the development of airways and airports. Public patronage has been responsive to the inherent advantages of these newer forms of transport, particularly to the low-cost appeal of highways and waterways. But the early promise of cheap transportation by highway and by waterway has been largely nullified. Under the slogan of "Equality of Regulation," Congress was persuaded to adopt legislation which placed waterways and highways under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The consequences of this legislation were foreseen. On February 16, 1940, the then Secretary of War, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate in opposition to certain provisions of the Transportation Act of 1940. In that letter, we stated:

"Farmers and other shippers should not be required to pay rates based on transportation costs of properties improvidently built, wastefully operated, or partially obsolete. The advocacy of thorough regulation of the minimum rates of motor and water carriers by a centralized agency appears to represent an attempt to use Government power to bring competing transportation agencies into a cartel, and in this manner, to share traffic and adjust rates in such a way as to earn a return upon all transportation capital of these agencies."

These fears were realized. Private rate bureaus were developed by motor and water carriers; indeed, these private rate bureaus have been encouraged both by the requirement that carriers publish tariffs and by the minimum rate orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Once competing forms of transportation were organized into private rate conferences, agreements and conspiracies were easily promoted. Through conspiracies between motor and rail carrier conferences, motor-carrier rates have been raised to the level of the rail rates. The activities of water-carrier rate conferences have resulted in relating water-carrier to rail rates. In thus eliminating all competition in rates, the public is deprived of the savings from cheap highway and water transport.

If the public has any illusions on this score, they can be readily dissipated by a reading of the recent decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts whereby the farmers and shippers of the Middle West are virtually compelled to use expensive rail instead of cheap barge transportation for the eastward movement of grain.

Not satisfied with eliminating competition in surface transportation, the railroads have even extended their control to the airways to prevent any competition from the carriage of air cargo. Through an exclusive contract between Railway Express Agency (which is owned by the railroads of the country) and the domestic airlines, air express rates have been maintained far above the competitive level, and the movement of cargo by air has been effectively retarded. Despite the assertion of aviation authorities that cargo planes can be operated at 8 to 10 cents per ton mile, air express rates are artificially held at 80 cents per ton mile. This rate is five to seven times the rail express rates.

The coming of the air age can bring to the people of this country new industries, new outlets for goods, and greater freedom of movement. But if monopoly interests are successful in keeping air rates high, we shall be barred from this new frontier, and our Nation's development will suffer.

The third charge is that discriminatory rates have helped keep the South and the West in a colonial status.

The people of the West and South have long fought against discriminatory freight rates. They have asked and are asking pointed questions about the transportation practices and the governmental policies which permit such inequalities to persist. They have watched with deep concern the loss of local industries. They have been profoundly discouraged by the futility of their attempts to attract industrial capital. They have watched the continuing drift of the younger generation to regions promising greater opportunities. They have witnessed a reduction of their purchasing power and the loss of their homes and their farms. Despite the abundance with which Providence had blessed the land, they could not produce sufficient income to cover their costs. They have witnessed a deterioration in the services supplied by the State and local governments, the closing of schools, the neglect of public health and housing, and the delay of sanitation projects. They have become increasingly dependent upon Federal funds for carrying on essential government services. During the war, many of these communities are witnessing what local industry can mean in terms of larger incomes and higher living standards for the whole community, but they are aware that with the coming of peace the old trend of industry to seek productive centers with favorable freight

rates will deprive them of this temporary prosperity.

As those most immediately victimized by these conditions, the people of the South and West have a right to demand that the public transportation industries and their Government take steps necessary to secure for them that equality of opportunity which is the foundation of economic and political democracy and the first step toward freedom from want in the midst of plenty.

The Southern Governors' appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1937 highlighted some of these discriminations.

Studies of various governmental agencies have fully supported the charge of discrimination. Packing houses in Chicago have been able to ship fresh beef to Birmingham, Ala., at a lower rate than packers located at Fort Worth, Tex.; this difference is equal to 50 percent of the available profit margin. Manufacturers of milk bottles at Santa Anna, Tex., had to absorb freight equal to one-third of their net profit margin in order to sell in the St. Louis market in competition with producers at Elmira, N. Y. The freight rate on tractors from Pueblo, Colo., to Baton Rouge has been substantially higher than the rate from Cleveland to Baton Rouge. From typewriters to laundry soap to paint in nearly every class of manufactured goods the South and the West must pay unequal freight rates in comparison with the North and the East. These disadvantages have been major factors in stifling the industrial development of the South and the West and thus have undermined our whole national economy.

No time need be spent on the specious arguments by which those who benefit from these discriminations have sought to justify their continuance. It is true that only a small proportion of the traffic moving from the South and West to the Northeast consists of manufactured products. This will always be the condition so long as these discriminations continue. For years we were told that higher rates were necessary in the South and West because of higher transportation costs. Now the investigations of the Interstate Commerce Commission's staff reveal that costs are lower in the South than in the Northeast, and that even in the West they are only slightly above the level of costs in eastern territory. Cost differentials may no longer be advanced in defense of rate discriminations.

How has it been possible to maintain those rate discriminations over the years? The answer is found in the private rate-making machinery of the railroads. Railroads with established industries on their lines have naturally opposed any rate adjustments which would in any way detract from the preferred position of the industries which create a large volume of traffic. Individually, these railroads would have been powerless to prevent a readjustment of rates, but organized into bureaus they present a united front against any change in the existing situation.

Consider the so-called western agreement, which was recently exposed by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in testimony before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. Thirty-five railroads operating west of the Mississippi River adhered to the western agreement. The basic purpose of this agreement was to "avoid practices which will dissipate railroad earnings in the western district." Under this agreement there was created a czar, the powerful western commissioner, responsible to no public authority. Under him rail rates were made with the sole objective of preserving the net earnings of the railroads as a whole within the western district. To this end services were restricted in the name of eliminating wastes, technological developments were delayed, and all competition was stifled. The effects of their acts upon agriculture and industry are not even considered. The spirit of this agreement was truly, "The public be damned." I hope the Justice Department exposé of this agreement in May of this year has really knocked the agreement out, but I still have my fingers crossed.

But this is not the whole story. If in any particular instance the railroads or their bureaus failed to cooperate, the matter was referred by the western commissioner to a committee of directors for action. This committee of directors held its meetings at 40 Wall Street, New York City, the headquarters of its most powerful members. Thus, the transportation policies for the West were made in Wall Street. Is it surprising under all these circumstances that rate discriminations against the South and the West have been perpetuated and that the industrial development of these regions has been retarded?

The American people should know that the western agreement and the private rate-bureau machinery of the entire country function for the purpose of making the public pay a return upon an obsolete railroad capitalization. The origins of the financial control go back into the early financing of the railroads, one of the blackest pages of American financial history. Although the period of high finance in railroads occurred prior to the establishment of Government control over railroad securities, its consequences linger on, not only in the huge capitalization of the railroads of more than $24,000,000,000, but also in the unbalanced capital structure which consists of bonded indebtedness to the extent of 50 or 60 percent. If the railroads are to be able to serve the public, they must set their financial house in order so that their rates may move in harmony with other prices and not forever constitute a barrier to full production in business and agriculture.

The fourth charge is that the railroads plot to seize control of the newer forms of transportation.

Those who guide the destinies of the railroads and seek to preserve their financial position are not content with the cartel controls which they now exercise over all domestic transportation. They propose to solidify and make permanent their empire through the enactment of legislation designed to permit the creation of a permanent monopoly of public transportation under the control of the railroads. The plot has been sugar-coated to deceive the people. In the name of efficiency and economy, and under the slogan "Preserve the free enterprise system," it is proposed that Congress permit the creation of integrated transportation systems each of which would control and operate all rail, motor, water, and air transportation facilities throughout large geographic areas. If the railroads are able to establish such regional monopolies controlling air, water, and highway rates they will be in position to hand out favors or penalties to every community in the United States. They can determine the location of industry and population. Under such a system they could freeze ancient injustices and stifle new opportunities. If they should unhappily persuade Congress to set up such a series of regional transportation monopolies, I am convinced the public would arise in its wrath and insist on public ownership of all transportation. In my opinion transportation methods have not yet reached that state of static perfection which lends itself either to monopoly control or Government ownership. Therefore, I hope Congress will be on guard to fight the transportation monopoly whenever this Wall Street inspired creature lifts its ugly head in Washington.

The people of Texas are particularly aware of the charge that monopoly control of transportation breeds monopoly in other industries.

Among Texas' great treasures is the untold wealth of oil which lies beneath your land. The independent oil men of Texas know what the fight against monopoly means. They know that nearly all the great oil fields of this country were discovered and brought to life by small independent producers and wildcatters willing to risk their labor, their meager resources, and their hopes. They also know that the giants in the industry have employed price wars to drive them from the market, and that they have used conservation measures as a competitive screen to conceal their attempts at domination of the industry. By their control of railroads and pipe lines, the oil trusts have sought since the 1870's to fasten their grip on the oil resources of the Nation.

It is an irony of history that the first pipe lines were built by independent producers attempting to escape the domination of the railroads by the oil monopoly. But the people, not only of Texas but of the Nation, know what happened to the pipe lines. Instead of having equal access to the pipe-line facilities, they discovered that it was the major oil companies who owned and operated this vital artery. To the independent producer pipe lines have become common carriers in name only, not in fact.

Control of pipe lines by the major oil companies strangles the industry. This device is used by monopolistic interests to maintain their grip on the crude-oil resources of the Nation. As long as they own the lines and are able to discriminate against the independents, and can arrange supply, refining, and distribution to suit themselves, the great oil companies can hold down the independent producer and make the public pay the cost. Only through determined action by the people to break this stranglehold can any relief be obtained.

In the light of these facts the people of the West and South are asking insistently—what are we going to do about it? Are the policies and the practices of the past going to be perpetuated? Is there no relief from high transportation costs and discriminatory rates which have reduced the West and the South to a colonial status? Is competition in transportation at an end? Are the newer forms of transportation to be made subservient to the old? Are the American people to be victimized by the scheme for integrated transportation systems? Are they to pay tribute to maintain an obsolete railroad capital structure? Is Washington once more to become a way-station for Wall Street?

The day of accounting has come. Destructive practices in transportation and suppressive governmental policies under which monopoly thrives must now yield to the needs of the common man. These practices and policies must be reversed. The double talk in legislation which has permitted these conditions to exist must give way to clear and understandable provisions which protect the public. Private rate bureaus and rate-making conferences through which railroad bankers and railroad managers have been able to exact from the people unconscionable rates for rendering an indispensable service must be stripped of their power and their activities confined to legitimate practices in the public interest. A clean-cut declaration of legislative policy must insure to the newer forms of transportation an opportunity to develop without suppression. Competition must be restored. This does not mean chaotic competition as some would have you believe. These are regulated industries, and the Interstate Commerce Commission should protect the public interest in transportation in accordance with the direction of Congress. We can cry out against the existing evils in transportation, but this is futile unless we do something about it. The industry has failed to offer anything constructive and, therefore, the people must look to their duly elected Representatives in Congress. Our greatest need is to recast our transportation laws to insure the utmost development of each form

of transportation. Thereby present and prospective monopolistic controls will be broken; regional rate discriminations will disappear; and transportation will then truly serve the public interest. In this struggle for economic freedom, Congress will not fail the people.

If and when Congress does its duty, the people of the West and South will have more industry. Their children will find opportunity at home. The output of the entire Nation will increase as the surplus labor of the South and West becomes more skilled in the full utilization of southern and western natural resources for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, with reference to the request of the Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say that I am glad he has offered the address of the Vice President for printing in the RECORD. It is a very excellent and illuminating address, and I desire to commend the Vice President for delivering it.

A subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee of which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is chairman, and the Senator from Tennessee, and I are members, has held hearings practically for 3 solid weeks, and has listened to testimony exposing monopolistic practices in transportation. Over a long period of years there have been various measures introduced in the Senate to curb monopolies not only in transportation but in the financing of railroad securities by private contract, by private bankers, and by private consultation instead of by competitive bidding. Not only in the matter of rates is there monopoly but there is also monopoly, to a large extent, in the financing of railroad securities, to the detriment of the public, to the detriment of the railroads, and to the detriment of labor. There are measures now pending in the Interstate Commerce Committee designed to compel competitive bidding by the various financial houses and bankers in the sale, purchase, and distribution of railroad securities.

The Federal Securities Commission have not taken any action, so far as I know, on the question of competitive bidding for railroad securities, but they have taken action with regard to other corporations, and they have saved, in the aggregate, millions of dollars to the general public and to the corporations that have been financed.

I have taken these few minutes to call the attention of the Senate not only to the address delivered by the Vice President, but to ask Senators to read the hearings before the subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee where the sworn testimony revealed sustains the charges made by the Vice President of the United States. At a later date we expect to hold hearings before a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee on the question of compelling railroads to offer their securities by competitive bidding, instead of going to favored groups, members of which are on the board of directors of the railroads, so they sit on both sides of the fence. They buy from the railroads and sell for the railroads securities to companies upon whose boards of directors they also sit, thus occupying a position of trust on both sides. I think the record will substantiate the charge that it costs the railroads considerably more money to sell securities in that way than in cases where competitive bidding has been permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has made his statement, because I find myself very much in accord with his views, and with the views so splendidly expressed by the Vice President in his address.

The Senate has a very definite responsibility in this matter. We not only have a responsibility from the standpoint of the enactment of the legislation under which these conditions have arisen and under which they exist, but we also have a responsibility in the matter of the confirmation of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission. No man can sit as a member of one of those commissions except by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and speaking as one Member of this body and one member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, I wish to say that I shall certainly scan and scrutinize very closely further nominations which may come to the Senate, and which will have to come to the Senate, for membership on the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission, particularly in the light of the facts to which the Senator from Minnesota has called attention, and about which the Vice President spoke in his address yesterday.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think that on another occasion mention should be made of the public service rendered to the people of the United States by the New York Daily Times for printing this address. We sat in the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and took testimony, sworn testimony, for 3 solid weeks, and I did not see any report of that tremendously important hearing, or the facts which were brought out in the hearing, in any newspaper, although newspapermen were present. I do not blame the newspapermen; I am sure they recorded the evidence, but the newspapers evidently did not undertake to print it.

Mr. President, this is something of which the public should be aware; this is information which many of us have known of for years, but it has been impossible to get it to the public because of the suppression of this kind of news.

Mr. HILL. I think the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has rendered a public service this morning in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and, so far as he could, to the attention of the whole country.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, some correspondence which I have had with the Interstate Commerce Commission on the question of competitive bidding for railway securities. I ask that it be printed in connection with my remarks earlier in the day.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 6, 1943.*

Hon. J. HADEN ALLDREDGE, *Chairman,*
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ALLDREDGE: On June 23, 1943, I addressed a letter to you, as Chairman of the Commission, in regard to the application before your Commission to grant Kuhn, Loeb & Co. permission to buy $28,000,000 Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit bonds without competition. In that letter I called to your attention that, "Railroads in recent years have made important savings by inviting competition for their securities in numerous instances."

I made the suggestion at that time that the course to be followed in the public interest would be to sell that issue under competitive bids. This policy was not adopted by your Commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission now has before it final proof indicating that its Finance Division literally let the Pennsylvania Railroad privately negotiate the sale of $28,483,000 Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit bonds to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. at a price which seems to yield to the bankers an ultimate unnecessary $10,000,000 on that deal.

I base that statement on the fact that verification can easily be made by comparing the P., O. & D. transaction with the Pennsylvania Railroad's present proposal now before Division Four for approval, that is, to sell $12,929,000 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington bonds to the Equitable Life Assurance Society. The P., B. & W. and the P., O. & D. are both leased lines of the Pennsylvania. The two bond issues are virtually identical in character. Both are rated "A" by Moody's Investors' Service. Yet the P., B. & W. financing properly calls for a 35-year 3-percent bond at par, whereas the P., O. & D. financing improvidently called for a 25-year 3¾-percent bond at par, later raised only a quarter of a point by Division Four. Had the terms now proposed for the P., B. & W. issue obtained in the recent P., O. & D. financing, the Pennsylvania Railroad would, on this account alone, have been able to save $10,435,000 over the life of the P., O. & D. bonds.

The terms of the P., B. & W. sale ought finally to convince the Commission that Division Four's order providing for a small advance in the price paid by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., for the P., O. & D. issue was ridiculously inadequate and that Division Four did the public interest a grave disservice in avoiding the much better minimum bid available to the Pennsylvania from independent bankers for the P., O. & D. issue.

In approving the P., O. & D. sale and thus giving the odor of sanctity to the 10 Pennsylvania Railroad directors who sat on both sides of the deal, it now appears that the Commission must realize that it short-changed the Pennsylvania by more than $10,000,000.

The Commission must also realize that, if it persists in giving its sanction to improvident transactions like the P., O. & D. sale, arranged through private negotiations which exclude offers from competitors, its guardianship of the railroads and its "fostering care" of the public will eventually become a travesty. Not only that, but the railroads themselves will be gutted like herrings, and railroad stockholders, railroad labor, and the general public must take the leavings.

The attached memorandum will show how the $10,435,000 loss to the Pennsylvania Railroad is calculated.

Yours very truly,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

Cost of money to Pennsylvania Railroad on P., O. & D. 3¾'s of 1968 (percent)	3.73455
Cost of money to Pennsylvania Railroad on P., B. & W. 3's of 1978 (percent)	3.00000
Net difference in cost of money (percent)	0.73455
Savings to the Pennsylvania on the P., B. & W.'s over and above what it received for the P., O. & D.'s, after making allowance for the operation of the sinking fund, average annually	$78,259
An annuity of this sum invested at 3 percent for 35 years would amount to	$4,731,000
Had the Pennsylvania been able to sell 35-year 3's at par rather than 25-year 3¾'s at 100¼ on the P., O. & D., the net difference in cost of money would have been as above (percent)	0.73455
On this basis, savings to the Pennsylvania over the life of a 35-year issue of 3's rather than 3¾'s, after making allowance for the operation of the sinking fund, average annually	$172,582
An annuity of this sum invested at 3 percent for 35 years would amount to	$10,434,630

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, October 11, 1943.

Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SHIPSTEAD: This will acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated October 6, 1943, respecting the recent refunding of $28,483,000, principal amount of Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit Railroad Co. first and refunding mortgage 4½-percent bonds, series A, by the issue of a like principal amount of series D bonds, and the proposed refunding of $12,929,000 principal amount of Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. general mortgage 4½-percent bonds, series D, by the issue of a like principal amount of 3-percent bonds, series E.

While there is a spread of three-fourths of 1 percent between the coupon rates of the two issues, this spread does not yield the bankers an ultimate unnecessary $10,000,000 on the Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit Railroad Co. issue. As stated in the report and order of July 26, 1943, by division 4, "The series D bonds have been offered to the public at 101¾ and accrued interest * * *. We conclude that we should authorize the applicant to sell the bonds at not less than 100¼ percent of par and accrued interest." The spread or total payment to the bankers was therefore 1½ percent of $28,483,000, or $427,245, and not $10,434,630, as stated in the memorandum attached to your letter, nor would it purchase an annuity of that amount 35 years later, even at compound interest.

Furthermore, by issuing a 3¾-percent bond having a 25-year maturity in lieu of 35 years, the carrier escaped the necessity of paying interest for 10 years at a cost of "3.73455" per annum, or $10,637,118.77 at simple interest.

A brief glance at the financial pages of the daily newspapers will show that the price of securities bearing the same coupon rate will often vary considerably from week to week. Therefore, a comparison of money costs of the issues by the two Pennsylvania subsidiaries offered several weeks apart does not necessarily indicate that the Pennsylvania, Ohio and Detroit series-D bonds could have been sold at par at the time offered if they bore a 3-percent coupon. To the contrary, a contemporaneous offer of 102 by independent bankers, made at the hearing and later modified after more mature consideration, indicated their belief that the then current cost of money was approximately 3.62745 per annum and not the 3 percent now currently offered by a single investor for the proposed Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington issue.

Your attention is invited to the fact that neither of these issues was sold at competitive bidding nor is it probable that competitive bids by investment bankers could duplicate the price offered by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, as it is improbable that these bonds could have been diposed of to the general public profitably at current money rates.

The calculations shown upon the memorandum attached while arithmetically correct, do not meet the facts of either case but are derived from purely arbitrary assumptions taken in part from each issue and consequently applicable to neither.

Very respectfully yours,
J. HADEN ALLDREDGE,
Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 18, 1943.*

Hon. J. HADEN ALLDREDGE,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ALLDREDGE: The analysis in your letter dated October 11, 1943, of my comparison of the recent $28,483,000 Pennsylvania, Ohio & Detroit financing with the proposed $12,929,000 Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington financing indicates that the Commission's financial technicians either are incompetent or have deliberately misinformed you.

There never has been a more outrageous misrepresentation than the statement that the Pennsylvania Railroad, "by issuing a 3¾ percent bond having a 25-year maturity in lieu of 35 years" in the P., O. & D. refunding, "escaped the necessity of paying interest for 10 years at a cost of '3.73455' per annum, or $10,637,118.77 at simple interest."

With a 35-year maturity on the P., O. & D. bonds, the Pennsylvania would have the assurance of not having to pay more than 3¾-percent interest for th full 35 years. As matters now stand, the Pennsylvania has this assurance for only 25 years, at the end of which time (unless, of course, the bonds are again refunded in the interim) provision will have to be made for renewal of the loan at whatever interest rates then prevail. Such refinancing will, of course involve additional expense to the railroad.

Since neither the P., O. & D. nor the P., B. & W. bonds were sold at competitive bidding, the inference that the Pennsylvania would not have received a bid of par for 35-year 3's in either case is unwarranted. In the P., O. & D. case independent bankers offered the Pennsylvania a minimum guaranty substantially better than the price proposed by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the traditional Pennsylvania bankers, on the condition that the financing be opened to competitive bidding. The Commission saw fit to let the transaction go through without competitive bidding, so that no effort was ever made to determine the maximum price that investment bankers, insurance companies, or any other bidders would have paid. If competitive bidding had been utilized in the P., B. & W. case, there would have been nothing to prevent the Equitable Life Assurance Society from bidding what it actually has, by private negotiation, agreed to pay the Pennsylvania for the bonds, unless you believe that it would have boycotted a competitive sale.

Going back to my original computation of the approximately $10,435,000 savings which the Pennsylvania could have made had it obtained in the P., O. & D. financing the terms now proposed for the P., B. & W. bonds, I believe that you will agree that:

	Percent
The cost of money to the Pennsylvania R. R. on the P., O. & D. 3¾'s of 1968 is	3.73455
The cost of money to the Pennsylvania R. R. on the P., B. & W. 3's of 1978 is	3.00000
The net difference in cost of money is	.73455

You will also agree, I am confident, that the Pennsylvania could have gotten a 35-year maturity on the P., O & D. bonds and, inasmuch as the Commission chose not to require competitive bidding and, therefore, failed to ascertain the maximum price available for the P., O. & D. bonds, perhaps you will also do me the courtesy of conceding that the issue might have been sold as 3's at par, as the P., B. & W. issue has now been sold, even without competition. On this assumption, I think you will agree that the savings to the Pennsylvania over the life of the issue, after making allowance for operation of the sinking fund, would average annually $172,582.

If there is any question as to my choice of a 3 percent rate at which an annuity of this amount might be invested, I should like to say that I believe this rate is conservative, since the Pennsylvania could obviously get at least such a return by investing in its own obligations, most of which are selling to yield substantially more. The General 4¼ percent bonds of 1981, for instance, are now selling at a price which yields the investor approximately 4.02 percent. Proceeding on this basis, I believe you will then agree that the savings to the Pennsylvania would be an annuity of $172,582 invested at 3 percent for 35 years, or $10,434,630.

There is, of course, an alternate method of calculating the possible savings, which many people would prefer to use. That is—

If the Pennsylvania Railroad had sold the P. O. & D.'s as 35-year 3¾-percent bonds on a 3 percents basis, it would have received per $100 of principal amount of bonds	$116.18
As compared with what it actually received	100.25
Or a difference, per $100 of principal amount, of	15.93
Which on the entire issue of $28,483,000 would have been equal to	4,537,342
This sum, invested at 3 percent compound interest for 35 years, would at the end of that period amount to	12,767,427

In the interests of conservatism, however, I am willing to abide by the $10,434,630 savings which I originally calculated.

Where I referred to this $10,434,630 in my letter of October 6, 1943, as an ultimate profit to bankers, I should have said to investors, including most—if not all—of the financial institutions having officers and directors who also sit on the Pennsylvania board. These institutions, as you know from the hearings held last summer by your Commission, were substantial purchasers of the P. O. & D. bonds.

I have been shocked by the frivolous and evasive nature of the Commission's analysis of my previous letter, and hope that you will charge those who prepared it with a new sense of their responsibility for the protection of the public interest, for which purpose Congress provides the Commission with an appropriation of more than $9,000,000 a year.

Yours very truly,
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Overton
Andrews	George	Pepper
Bailey	Gerry	Radcliffe
Ball	Gillette	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	McNary	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Walsh
Connally	Millikin	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wherry
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Wiley
Eastland	O'Daniel	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is absent on official business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent from the city, visiting his son, who is in the armed forces.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to correct a misstatement in the press of my home State, and I wish to read two paragraphs having to do with the bill which was before the Senate yesterday. The headline over the first column on the first page of the Baltimore Sun of this morning reads: "Bill for aid in education pigeonholed—Foes force amendment hitting at South's color line, 40–37—$300,000,000 measure then sent to Senate Committee, 53–26."

The two paragraphs in question read as follows, in a 2-column account of what purports to state what happened:

Both Maryland Senators voted for the motion to pigeonhole the bill, despite a warning from the majority leader, Senator BARKLEY (Kentucky), that its adoption would end "for a long while" any further consideration of Federal aid to educational proposals.

The next paragraph reads:

Both also voted for the antidiscrimination amendment which was denounced by Senators GEORGE, BARKLEY, OVERTON, PEPPER, and THOMAS, as deliberately intended to "kill" the bill. Senator THOMAS called it "trickery."

The fact is that both my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and I myself voted against and not for the antidiscrimination amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator did not identify the Senator THOMAS referred to in the article.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was Senator THOMAS of Utah. As I was stating, my colleague and I both voted against the antidiscrimination amendment and not for it, as is stated in the sixth paragraph on the front page of this morning's newspaper in its 2-column account of what happened. Therefore, we are labeled in this account as having been parties to trickery.

Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Congress for a long time, and I certainly have my shortcomings and my faults, many of which I recognize, and there must be many I do not, but I think my colleagues will at least accord me the consideration of saying that trickery is not one of those faults. I have been candid and forthright in either opposing or supporting any measure, and I resent this unwarranted, palpable, and, in my opinion, inexcusable error.

My answers on the roll calls were very audible. I do not vote in a soft tone of voice. The votes were verified in a clearly audible voice thereafter by the reading clerk of the Senate, and the votes were analyzed in this very article, so that the writer must have had the roll calls in his possession.

It is most unfortunate that men in public life should be represented to their constituents, first, as having voted differently from the way in which they did vote, and then have the implied label of "trickery" applied to them, when, by their votes, they opposed the very trickery pointed out in the article, if such trickery existed.

I regret that we cannot have more accuracy in the columns of the news. I have long suffered as a result of such inaccuracy. On various occasions when I have been present in the Senate and paired I have been represented to the people as not having been present to make a recorded vote. The fact that I was paired has often not been stated. Those I have mentioned are only several of many long-continued oversights and misrepresentations in the news by this same writer. I certainly hope there will be no more of them.

(By unanimous consent it was ordered that the following remarks by Mr. TYDINGS made by him on Monday, October 25, and appearing in the daily RECORD of that date be transposed to this point in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on last Thursday I called the attention of the Senate to an error in the press referring to my vote on the so-called antidiscrimination amendment to the education bill, then pending. That error not only misstated my position but drew an inference that I was actuated by trickery. I now wish to say to the Senate that on the following day the newspaper in which the error and improper inference appeared very generously, on the front page and in the same column, made a very factual and complete correction of that error which I felt reflected greatly on me.

On reading my remarks of Thursday, when I called the error to the attention of the Senate, addressing them to Mr. Ward, who was the author of the article, I see that perhaps my remarks might be interpreted as saying that Mr. Ward is addicted to perpetual error or perpetual carelessness. I have no intention of making any errors of my own while trying to correct those of Mr. Ward. Therefore, I issued a statement to cover that phase of the matter and to thank the Baltimore Sun for its very generous correction.

I ask that the first correction, together with my following statement, may be printed in the RECORD, and I further ask that in the permanent RECORD all three statements may appear in series.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun]

CORRECTION

In a dispatch from the Washington Bureau of The Sun, published in The Sun yesterday, it was incorrectly stated that Senator MILLARD TYDINGS and Senator GEORGE RADCLIFFE voted in favor of the so-called antidiscrimination amendment to the $300,000,000 Federal aid to education bill.

This amendment prohibited discrimination between whites and Negroes in the expenditure of Federal and State appropriations for education. Proponents of the bill, in the course of the debate in the Senate, declared that the amendment was deliberately intended to defeat the bill.

Both Senator TYDINGS and Senator RADCLIFFE voted against the antidiscrimination amendment, not for it.

The Sun regrets the error.

The complete text of remarks made by Senator TYDINGS in the Senate, in connection with the error, appears on page 10.

CORRECTION BY TYDINGS—SENATOR SAYS HIS REMARKS ON ERROR IN SUN WERE UNFAIR TO WRITER

WASHINGTON, October 22.—Senator TYDINGS today gave The Sun a copy of a statement which he said he would put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, together with a request for notation in the Senate's permanent RECORD.

The statement follows:

"I appreciate the very generous correction made by The Sun of the error in stating my position and motive on the Langer amendment to the educational bill. The correction was in keeping with the high standard for which The Sun is preeminent in the country.

CORRECTS OWN STATEMENTS

"Today Mr. Paul W. Ward came to my office and was generous enough to say the error was his and was thoroughly unintentional. I am sure, after talking with him, it was one of those mistakes we all make at times in our respective fields.

"I was naturally aggravated by the mistake, even though unintentional. But, I feel I would not be fair, in view of the generous correction by The Sun, made with Mr. Ward's full approval, if I did not at the same time also say that my remarks, uttered in the heat of the moment concerning Mr. Ward's error, were in other respects unfair to him to whatever extent they may have implied he was not a careful newspaperman or was addicted to perpetual error in reporting the news.

"Innuendos of that character may be drawn from what I said and I feel, in fairness to Mr. Ward, that I should be equally as outspoken in correcting my own statements as The Sun and Mr. Ward have been in correcting the statement referred to."

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I did not take part in the debate on the so-called school bill. However, I had made up my mind to support the bill if no amendments were added overturning the school system in my State. Such an amendment was offered and adopted and therefore I was compelled to vote for the motion to send the bill back to committee.

There were other objections to the bill, but inasmuch as I have a uniform record of having voted for all educational measures since I have been in the Congress I had determined, as before stated, to vote for the bill as it was reported by the committee.

Mr. President, I am wholeheartedly in favor of giving the colored youth of our country the best education possible just as I am in favor of giving the white youth of our country the best educational facilities; but not together in States where, I believe, it is better to educate them separately. My own State provides for separate education, and we are making wonderful strides in educating both races with a minimum of trouble.

THE MILITARY SITUATION TODAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity again to bring to the attention of the Senate the meeting to be held this afternoon in the auditorium of the Library of Congress, at which time General Marshall and members of his staff will present to the Members of the Senate a picture of the military situation as it is today. The meeting will start at 2 o'clock p. m., and is for Senators only.

Mr. BARKLEY. The meeting is to be held in the so-called Coolidge Auditorium?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the Coolidge Auditorium in the Library of Congress.

CONSTANCE EAGER

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the order entered a few minutes ago, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 466, Senate bill 1225. The clerk will state the bill.

The bill (S. 1225) granting a pension to Constance Eager was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Constance Eager, widow of John M. Eager, late surgeon, United States Public Health Service, who died August 17, 1916, from disease contracted in line of duty, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

NORTH SLOUGH, COOS COUNTY, OREG.

The bill (H. R. 3145) to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF INTERESTS IN LANDS FROM CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1372) to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 16, after the word "Interior", to add a colon and the following additional proviso: "*And provided further*, That before the said rules and regulations are promulgated they must be submitted to and approved by both the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to create the war shipping field service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution go over unless some member of the Committee on Commerce is prepared to make an explanation of it. There are two or three questions I should like to ask. In the absence of an explanation I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

PROCLAMATION OF FEBRUARY 11, 1944, AS EDISON DAY

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating February 11, 1944, as Thomas Alva Edison Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on said date and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

WILLIAM A. HAAG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1077) for the relief of William A. Haag, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 2, line 5, after the word "injury", to insert "alleged to have been"; in line 6, after "1939", to insert "while pulling down an overhead fire door on an elevator shaft"; and in line 9, after "Kansas", to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of William A. Haag, of Leavenworth, Kans.; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed with the Commission, within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, by or on behalf of the said William A. Haag for compensation or other benefits under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for disability due to an injury alleged to have been sustained by him on December 8, 1939, while pulling down an overhead fire door on an elevator shaft, in the performance of his duties as a storekeeper at the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans.: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUTHER THOMAS EDENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1288) for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,500" and insert "$3,500"; and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Luther Thomas Edens the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of his claim against the United States arising out of the death of his minor daughter, Clara Edens, and personal injury to his minor daughter, Bettie Edens, resulting from an accident involving a United States Army truck on Highway No. 17, at Scotts Hill, N. C., on April 22, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAFAEL TORRES

The bill (H. R. 2152) for the relief of Rafael Torres, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY J. LEIBERSCHAL

The bill (H. R. 1907) for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. FRANK HOLEHAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 962) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, the Buffalo Insurance Co., and the Miller Insurance Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments. On page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "(1)"; in line 6, after the words "sum of", to insert "$3,190.21"; and on page 2, line 1, after the word "damage", to strike out "and (2) to the Buffalo Insurance Co., the sum of $479.91, and to the Miller Insurance Co., the sum of $307.26, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for reimbursement of amounts paid to the said Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, as insurers of property damaged as a result of such crash" and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $3,190.21, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for damage to certain property owned by them, which resulted when a United States Navy airplane crashed into such property on November 25, 1942, and for loss of rent from such property as a result of such damage: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan."

CONVEYANCE OF MAYAGUEZ BARRACKS MILITARY RESERVATION, P. R.

The bill (S. 1373) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be and he is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for educational purposes a certain building and lot consisting of the Mayaguez Military Barracks and 1.74 acres of land, more or less, located in the municipality of Mayaguez, P. R.: *Provided*, That when said land and improvements shall cease to be used for the purpose aforesaid, the same shall revert to the United States Government.

SHORTAGE OF RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 185) to investigate the causes of, and means of relieving, the shortage of railroad cars for the transportation of grains in the Northwestern States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution? If one is not forthcoming I shall ask that the resolution be passed over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask the Senator who, as I understand, made objection, if he will withhold his objection so I may explain the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked for an explanation of the resolution, Mr. President, and said that if one is not forthcoming I shall ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. The chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], is not in the Chamber at this time, but before he left he asked me to explain the purpose of the resolution if any objection were made.

Mr. President, the resolution was submitted by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] by reason of a severe shortage of railroad equipment for the movement of grain from the northwestern section of the country. Undoubtedly there is such a shortage. Undoubtedly there has been much trouble in moving the present grain crop. The committee reported the resolution favorably. The purpose of the resolution is to provide for study and investigation of the general condition of stringency which exists in connection with transportation equipment at this time. The resolution simply authorizes a study and investigation to be made by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate. It calls for the appropriation of no money. The committee thinks the investigation is desirable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that an investigation of the purpose of the resolution has been made by the Senate standing Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. REED. Yes, Mr. President; that is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And that the resolution does not provide for the expenditure of any money?

Mr. REED. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 185), submitted by Mr. LANGER on the 4th instant, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, with amendments. On page 1, line 5, after the word "railroad", to strike out "cars for the transportation of wheat, flax, and other grains in the Northwestern States", and insert "equipment for transportation purposes"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "hearings", to insert "and"; and on page 2, line 4, after the word "Congress", to strike out, "to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee", and insert "as it deems advisable", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the causes of the existing shortage of railroad equipment for transportation purposes, and (2) means of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings and to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress as it deems advisable.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3309) to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes as amended was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, while I personally am in favor of the bill, at the request of another Member of Congress I ask that it go over for one call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EXEMPTIONS FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY

The bill (H. R. 3338) relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CREDITS AGAINST THE VICTORY TAX

The bill (H. R. 3381) relating to credits against the Victory tax, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should perhaps offer one word of explanation of the bill. It does not shift the burden of taxation under the Victory tax from one taxpayer to another, and does not in fact affect the burden. It merely requires the taxpayer to take automatically the credits allowed under the Victory tax. Most taxpayers take it anyway, nearly all of them being entitled to take it. The sole purpose of the bill, which has passed the House without opposition, and which was unanimously reported by the Senate Finance Committee, is to simplify the tax returns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3381) relating to credits against the Victory tax was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYEE OF ALLOWANCES ON DEATH OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN

The bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am not opposed to the bill, but desire some member of the Military Affairs Committee, if present, to give an explanation in order to determine whether the provisions of the bill conform with the naval law on the subject. I do not find any report on the bill. Let me inquire whether a report has been filed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A report has been filed, Report No. 477.

Mr. WALSH. Then, Mr. President, I shall not object now, but shall read the report and save my rights to move to have the bill reconsidered if I find that the report indicates that the provisions of the bill are not in conformity with naval law on the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not object?

Mr. WALSH. I do not object.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct" (41 Stat. 367), approved December 17, 1919, as amended and supplemented (42 Stat. 1385; 45 Stat. 249; 55 Stat. 796; 10 U. S. C. 903, 903a), be, and the same is hereby further amended by inserting at the end of section 903 the following: "*And provided further*, That if there be no widow, child, or previously designated dependent relative, the Secretary of War shall cause the amount herein provided to be paid to any grandchild, parent, brother or sister, or grandparent shown to have been dependent upon such officer or enlisted man prior to his death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein, such gratuity shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated."

SEC. 2. Nothing herein shall be construed to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments made prior to the date of the approval of this act, but no gratuity payment shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 865) suspending for the duration of the war the limitations upon the compensation of certain retired personnel employed by the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I regret that the majority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has been compelled to leave the floor, but I see present the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I should like to have his attention for a moment. Earlier in the day the so-called post-war collaboration resolution was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I understand that the committee has voted to have the resolution taken up by the Senate on Monday. Is that action of the committee binding on the Senate?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I do not think the inquiry is addressed to me, but the able senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, announced that the committee had authorized that the resolution be brought forward for consideration in the Senate on Monday next, and that he would move to bring it up and to have it made the unfinished business.

Mr. HATCH. I did not understand the announcement. It was my impression that it related to procedure in the committee, and that the Senator would move to take up the resolution on Monday. I wish to say I have no desire to delay consideration of the resolution by the Senate; in fact, some of us have been urging for some months that consideration be given by the Senate to the resolution.

However, I rose to suggest to both the majority and minority floor leaders and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas, that some weeks ago in the Committee on the Judiciary, I made a motion that the anti-poll-tax bill be considered by the whole committee as a body sitting somewhat in the nature of a court; that the committee inquire into the matter, and invite to appear before it representatives of those who favor the legislation and those who oppose it, suggesting that they obtain the best legal representation they could, and that the constitutionality of the proposed law be fully argued. I am quite sure there would be no delay in proceeding with the hearings on Monday next, and perhaps on Tuesday. Has the Senator any suggestion about that matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; Mr. President; the Senator from Texas took note of that situation, but he felt his primary responsibility as chairman of the committee was to move to take up the resolution on Monday. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico did not understand what I said. I said that the committee, in conjunction with the majority leader, had agreed. I said that on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I did not understand the statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am quite sure the Senator did not understand it. I said that the full committee, in conjunction with the majority leader, in conference with him, had agreed that we would undertake to take it up next Monday. Of course, I presupposed I should have to make a motion to proceed to consider the resolution and thereby make it the unfinished business. I did not assume that the committee could determine that matter, because that is the function of the full Senate. I meant no hardboiled, reactionary, arbitrary course at all. I simply meant that the committee desired to take up the resolution next Monday.

Let me say to the Senator that I very much regret any conflict with hearings scheduled before the Committee on the Judiciary; but I am not the only member of the committee, and we shall have to let the committee proceed in its own way.

Mr. HATCH. As I have said, Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the consideration of the resolution; but I know, speaking frankly, that I made the motion in the Judiciary Committee. I immediately received letters and telegrams from persons all over the United States to the effect that the filibuster had already started, and that I had started the filibuster by asking that the constitutionality of the measure be argued before the committee. I answered those telegrams and letters by assuring the persons who had sent them that there was no intention of a filibuster, that there was a serious doubt in the minds of many Members of the Senate as to whether the proposed legislation would be constitutional, that the Committee on the Judiciary had taken this means of endeavoring to determine as best it could whether the measure was constitutional, and that I, for one, was going to vote after that hearing on the basis of the determination which might be made.

I should very much regret to see the hearing postponed now. I make that observation at this time in order that the majority floor leader and the minority floor leader may consider the question. I think we are first obligated to proceed with the Judiciary Committee hearing, which has been set for weeks.

I should like to have the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Let me ask whether he thinks we should postpone the hearing?

Mr. VAN NUYS. No, Mr. President; I do not think it is possible to postpone the hearing; but we could quit at 12:30, at least, so that we could all be on the floor of the Senate by 12:30, if that would be satisfactory to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, Mr. President, my idea was that we should continue to hear the argument of the attorneys until they finish, and not break into their arguments, if we could make arrangements so as not to do so. I have been in hope that such a program could be worked out. I think that would be the orderly and the better way to proceed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It would be a more satisfactory way to proceed, I grant; because I do not believe we could postpone the hearing, inasmuch as the lawyers are coming from a considerable distance, as we know, and have made all their arrangements and reservations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has suggested some conflict. I should say that the one matter is before the committee, and the other will be before the Senate. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I feel compelled to give precedence to proceedings in the Senate over proceedings in the committee, however much I should like to be present at the hearings.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senate has taken definite action by way of determining that the resolution is to be argued on Monday.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not know whom the Senator expects to answer his question, but I may say that the Senator from Texas just explained that the Senate has not taken any action, and that on Monday he would move to have the Senate take up the resolution, inasmuch as the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, with the consent of the majority floor leader, agreed to present the motion, and to request that the resolution be taken up on Monday.

Mr. WILEY. Inasmuch as we have a conflict on important matters, it seems to me we should decide today. Why not have the Senate vote on the question of whether the second matter could not be postponed until Tuesday? I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I personally know that the matter of poll-tax legislation has been receiving the attention of the entire country, and that for some 2 weeks the date for the hearing has been definite and certain. We have asked some very distinguished legal talent from various places in the country to be present, and to argue the various angles of the case. Certainly the other matter is one of accommodation, and in my opinion it should go over until Tuesday. I think the Senate should take action now, and should have the matter definitely decided.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know that my judgment in the matter will carry very much weight. I think the Senate has the right to make its own record and determine what matter to bring up on Monday, irrespective of what may be before any committee.

I have long recognized the authority of the Senate to conduct its own affairs. Matters before committees should always follow the precedent established by Members of the Senate in choosing some measure as the unfinished business.

I have no interest in whether the resolution comes up Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or the week following. I am prepared to meet the situation on Monday. If the business of the Senate must conform to committee hearings, if the Committee on the Judiciary should have a hearing on Monday, some other committee on Tuesday, and another committee on Wednesday, it would simply mean that we would never have business transacted on the floor of the Senate. It is an absurd proposition. The Senate carries on its own business. The Senate brings up business for consideration, debate, and final disposition. The committees, with regard to business before them, must regulate their affairs to meet the best judgment of those who control the policy and procedure of the Senate. I do not know any reason why it should be stated that there is a conflict between the motion to be made by the distinguished Senator from Texas on Monday, and what might be before the Judiciary Committee on Monday and Tuesday.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate has completed the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The call of the calendar has been completed.

Mr. WILEY subsequently, during the consideration of executive business, said: Mr. President, I should like to find out what the parliamentary situation is. I heard what the distinguished minority leader [Mr. McNARY] said. As I understand, on Monday, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will make a motion that Senate Resolution 192 be taken up for consideration. Is the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] to give notice at that time that he will ask that the resolution go over until Tuesday? What is the situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that both Senators have indicated their intentions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has just entered the Chamber.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had stepped out of the Chamber to telephone.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not know that the Senator was out of the Chamber.

I have moved, as in legislative session, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 192, with a view, of course, not to proceed with it at this time, but that it be made the unfinished business, to be taken up on Monday.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall not object to making the resolution the unfinished business. We have been urging that this resolution or a similar resolution be considered. I realize that the Senate itself must determine the question and that ordinarily the matter of a committee meeting, which I mentioned a while ago, should not take precedence. However, the meeting which I mentioned is a rather extraordinary occasion. I shall not object to making the resolution the unfinished business, but I hope the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the leaders will get together and try to arrange that we may have time to hear the gentlemen who have been invited to appear before the Judiciary Committee on Monday. I realize that it is a rather extraordinary request.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Texas cannot tell with any exactitude when we are likely to have a vote on the resolution, if it should come up next Monday, but will the resolution probably come to a vote next week?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas rather thinks that we should reach a vote next week, although certain Senators have indicated that they desire to debate the question. The Senator knows that when it comes to debate, no power on earth knows how long a Senator may speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the Senator's considered judgment that the vote should come toward the end of the week?

Mr. CONNALLY. Toward the end of the week, I think surely we should get through with it by Friday.

Mr. TYDINGS. Many of us are in and out of the Chamber on other matters. The resolution is of such importance that I believe that if Senators knew in advance they would try to arrange to be present. That is my purpose in asking the question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas has the right to make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution on Monday. I understand that he is merely giving notice now——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am making the motion now to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, so as to make it the unfinished business, with the view of having it go over until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Is it desired to have the Senate pass on the motion now, or does the Senator simply wish to enter the motion, to be considered the first thing on Monday?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Oregon prefers that course, I will accede to it.

Mr. McNARY. I have no suggestion to make.

Mr. CONNALLY. I prefer to make the motion now so that the resolution may be made the unfinished business, with the view of adjourning until Monday, when we will take it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the motion as in legislative session? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 192.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of

the resolution (S. Res. 192), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 878, Calendar No. 349. The bill is important, because many widows are desperately in need of money.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 878) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1942," and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, for some reason this bill has been passed over on the call of the calendar. I do not know how many times it has been passed over.

Mr. LANGER. It has been passed over only once.

Mr. HILL. It must have been passed over, because it is listed on the calendar ahead of the point at which the call of the calendar was commenced today. I do not know why it was passed over. Does the Senator know who objected?

Mr. LANGER. It was passed over because the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was not present. Later he returned and said that he had no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] objected to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator would not be willing to renew his request on Monday. It is planned to adjourn shortly until Monday. The Senator could make his request on Monday. I do not see the chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. DOWNEY] in the Chamber.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] asked me to take care of the matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am very sure that the objection which I voiced some time before the recess still stands. I do not feel that the lower-paid Federal employees receive the benefits which they should receive under the terms of the bill. There is too much of an increase in retirement for the higher-paid employees. Therefore I do not think the bill accomplishes the purpose sought.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Leo H. Thebaud, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from June 21, 1942;

Capt. Bertram J. Rodgers, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy for temporary service, while serving on the staff of the Supreme Allied Commander, Southeast Asia, to rank from the 14th day of October 1943;

Capt. Stanley D. Jupp, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy for temporary service, while serving as commandant, Naval Operating Base, Auckland, New Zealand, to rank from the 13th day of October 1943;

Several naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of law; and

Several meritorious noncommissioned officers and sundry citizens, to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 21, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

Lincoln MacVeagh, of Rhode Island, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt and also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in Egypt.

Hiram Bingham, Jr., of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 21, 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Preston Delano, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant surgeons

Arthur B. Gravatt, Jr.
Martin G. Van der Schouw
Avery B. Wight
Harry F. White, Jr.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

William H. Errgong
William L. Hewitt
C. Dudley Miller
John W. O'Donnell
Jack C. Haldeman
Robert H. English
John J. Davies

To be temporary surgeons

William J. Brown
Wendell A. Preston
Charles F. Blankenship
James A. Smith

To be temporary sanitary engineer

Charles C. Spencer

To be temporary senior surgeons

Michael J. Pescor
Ralph B. Snavely

To be temporary medical directors

Edgar W. Norris
Fred T. Foard

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Leslie Fahrner, Keosauqua.
Edith M. Wehrle, Middletown.
Kathleen A. Elbert, Whittemore.

MAINE

Fred Elsmore Glew, Fort Fairfield.
Merle R. Pitman, Lovell.
Milton Edes, Sangerville.

MISSISSIPPI

Shelby O. Taylor, Union.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

William F. Keating, Hill.

NORTH CAROLINA

James Henry Hill, Hickory.
Pearl E. Linville, Oak Ridge.
Arthur E. Briscoe, Union Mills.

TEXAS

David F. Stamps, Dime Box.
Gorden S. Barker, Sulphur Bluff.
Vaughn M. Price, Three Rivers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. G. Kearnie Keegan, D. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Longview, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, Thou who art from everlasting to everlasting, Thou the only true and living God, Thou who didst lead our forefathers in the founding of this great Nation, to Thee we raise our voices in ceaseless praise. For every blessing upon our land we express our humble gratitude, realizing full well, that our actions merit them not, but they come as a gift of Thy Holy Grace.

We invoke Thy richest blessings upon our President. Sustain and guide him, we pray. Grant unto each Member of this House of Representatives, divine wisdom that they might discern that which is best in Thy sight for all our people. Help them never to lose sight of the individual's need in this day of collective action, for in the atoning death of Thine own Son, Thou didst place the individual on the pedestal of preeminence in Thy plans for man's future progress.

Forgive our national sins, O God, and lead us soon in the walk of peace with all mankind, we humbly beg in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton.

INTERCHANGEABLE USE OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, while the United States is at war and for 6 months thereafter, the Postmaster General may, when the interest of the Service requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency may assign any post-office employee to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office employee without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

With the following committee amendments:

That the Postmaster General may, in an emergency, when the interest of the Service requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency, when the interest of the Service requires, may temporarily assign any post-office clerk or city delivery carrier to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office clerk or city delivery carrier without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN HANSON, FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, most Virginians and most Americans are under the false impression that George Washington was the first President of the United States; but a Scandinavian was the first President of the United States, John Hanson, of Maryland. John Hanson has been sleeping in American history too long, Mr. Speaker, and I am introducing a bill today, or a resolution, calling upon the President to proclaim November 15, John Hanson's birthday, as John Hanson Day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution of the Governors' Conference Committee on Mining for the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a copy of a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FARRINGTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address by General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, on the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, October 19, 1943, at St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Butte (Mont.) Standard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address made by Judge John J. Freschi, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Investigate the Lend-Lease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter relative to the very excellent care that has been given a patient at the Gallinger Hospital over a long period of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

REPEAL OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph. Amendments are in order to the first paragraph.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the first section which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. After reading the gentleman's amendment the Chair advises the gentleman that it is an amendment to the second section which has not been read. The Chair will entertain the amendment after section 2 has been read.

Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan proposes to strike out two sections, just when would it be in order to offer the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Chair will entertain the amendment following the reading of section 2.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. We were unable to hear the conversation which took place between the Chairman and the gentleman from Michigan. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment is to strike out section 1 or section 2?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It is to strike out section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is to strike out section 2 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Sections 2 and 3.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to section 1 the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. With the exception of those coming under subsections (b), (d), (e), and (f) of section 4, Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155; 144 Stat. 812; 45 Stat. 1009; 46 Stat. 854; 47 Stat. 656; 8 U. S. C. 204), all Chinese persons entering the United States annually as immigrants shall be allocated to the quota for China computed under the provisions of section 11 of the said act. A preference up to 75 percent of the quota shall be given to Chinese born and resident in China.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT: Page 3, line 19, after the word "for", strike out "China" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the Chinese."

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, this is purely a corrective amendment to make the section read as all thought it did read. The word "China" should be "the Chinese" because this is a quota granted not to China but to the Chinese.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT of Michigan: Page 3, after line 13, strike out all of section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I spoke at length on this matter yesterday and do not intend to take the time of the Committee to reiterate.

If this amendment is adopted, and the amendment which I intend subsequently to offer to strike out section 3, it will leave the bill with section 1 only. Section 1 repeals the Chinese exclusion laws which have had the effect of stigmatizing the Chinese as against all other Asiatics and, in my judgment, have been unfair to them, but it will not disturb any part of our basic immigration structure. It will give the Chinese the same immigration status as other Asiatics. It will not give them any preference but it will end the present discrimination. We ought to stop there.

Two arguments have been made for the passage of this bill: First, we would cement our friendly relations with China if we put the Chinese on a quota basis at this time. The argument all the way through has been that we did not treat the Chinese as equals. Mr. Chairman, even if we pass this entire bill, we still will not be treating the Chinese as equals, so far as the white race is concerned. The Japanese have been propagandizing the Chinese that we do not treat them on a basis of equality with the whites, and that has been the basis for this legislation, but it does not accomplish that end, and therefore you leave the Japanese in the same situation, as far as propaganda is concerned, as they were before, and, in addition, you create one further problem that you do not have today: That immediately when you pass this bill you put the Chinese in a superior position, if you please, to all the other Asiatics, including our own nationals, the Filipinos.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, stated yesterday that we could disregard all other Asiatics except China because none of the rest were sovereign nations. Thus, we have the specious argument that because the Philippines is not an independent sovereignty we can safely legislate here today to discriminate against its people. No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot subscribe to that kind of reasoning. We are taking our immigration structure apart under the guise of war legislation to do a thing which will be appreciated by no nation and resented by many. It will not mislead anyone, even the Chinese whom it is intended to mislead, and go down in history as one more master stroke of meaningless diplomacy at the expense of a very important part of our immigration system.

It was stated on the floor here yesterday, and correctly so, that the Japs were propagandizing the Filipinos along the same lines as they have been the Chinese. When we pass this bill giving the Chinese preference over the Filipinos, what do you expect as far as propaganda is concerned? Do you expect the Filipinos will not learn of the unfairness of our action?

I just want to say one thing further. There has been all this talk about what we owe to China and what we should do for them. Why not be truthful with China? They are an understanding people. Truth is always appreciated, even in time of war. Why not tell them that the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law putting them on a quota basis is not the only immigration problem that we are confronted with and it is not the only one we are going to be confronted with from now until the end of the war and thereafter. Why not tell them that we consider this an economic and social problem that ought to be considered along with the rest of our immigration problems after the war? Let us do as we are endeavoring to do at present. Those in charge of our Government today say they are doing their utmost to give the Chinese all the material aid they need.

What is China going to expect after this war and what are we going to have to do for China? There is no question in the mind of any Member in this House but that we are going to be called upon to aid China in her program of rehabilitation after the war is won because China's problems are not going to be solved with the winning of the war. We are then going to be called upon to help feed the starving people of China. We should give China the actual and material aid to the best of our ability and not offer gestures or a few crumbs as this bill proposes to do. This legislation will do nothing but multiply the many headaches we already have.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman might acquaint the committee with the fact that the Immigration Committee reported out a bill embodying all of section 1 and the gentleman from Louisiana offered the motion in committee several weeks ago to report out a bill embodying that part, repealing all of the Chinese exclusion laws proper but not repealing the oriental laws.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman is correct. That bill had the unanimous support of our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. Chairman, of course the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would take away the very im-

portant part of the bill. May I say to the gentleman, and for the information of the House, bearing out what many Members said here yesterday regarding Japanese propaganda, that last night at 11 o'clock the radio of Tokyo in a broadcast beamed all over the Orient quoted the minority report on this bill.

We are not putting China in any favored position by this section as regard the other Asiatics. We are merely putting China on an equality with the other nations of the world. We cannot deal with the other Asiatics now in reference to immigration if we wanted to. They are not independent. India is not an independent country. There is also the problem of Filipino independence and the problem of their immigration to this country. I have no doubt that they will be put on an equality basis or a quota basis when their independence is given to them.

Let me say something else about Japanese propaganda. One week ago in a radio broadcast beamed to the Philippines the Japanese said to the Filipinos in celebration of their independence last week:

> You and America have been talking about this for the Chinese and the Filipinos, but we are giving it to you here today.

They are a Japanese mandate today. We cannot deal with them until we give them independence and rescue and retake the islands. All this does, again, is to put China on an equality with the other nations of the world. You say we favor China? I do not know of any country in the world, if we are going to favor anybody, that should be favored, or a better country to favor, than China.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the last speaker indicates that it does not make any difference what we in the United States do, Japan is going to distort it so as to take advantage of it. You cannot blame Japan for putting out all over the Philippine Islands the story that we are about to do some great favor to China which in comparison will be detrimental to the Philippines. Whatever we in Congress might do will be broadcast by Japan to her own advantage. This bill proposes to do something favorable to China and Japan knows that the Filipinos will be displeased because they are denied the great favor granted to China.

When we pass this bill we give China two quotas. That is something that no other nation on the face of the earth has been favored with. That cannot be disputed. I dare say that the office of the Secretary of State will agree that I am correct in making that statement. Under this bill you give China two quotas while right alongside of China are the Filipinos who have been a part of our country for 45 years, are denied this privilege, and what is more, under the present law the Filipinos are given only a half quota. They can get 50, and when we give them their independence they will then be compelled to relinquish that 50. It is not right to give the right of citizenship to Chinese and deny it to Filipinos. This legislation is simply the result of extreme sentimentality. Too much sentiment and too little practical intelligence.

Here is another thing we are trying to do here today. We are trying to do China a little favor, and while we are doing it we are tearing down a great structure that took us a generation to build up. If you want to do China a favor, do them the favor by helping them get munitions of war. If you are in earnest in your claim that you desire to erase the stigma, if any, that China faces from the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act, then pass section 1 of this bill. Take out of this bill all those provisions with reference to the Chinese exclusion laws. There were several Chinese exclusion laws passed back about 60 years ago. Let us take them all out by passing section 1, and let it go at that. Why, in order to do China this favor, do you have to go further than section 1? Why do you have to tear down this immigration structure that has been a magnificent piece of legislation and has been tremendously successful? I only wish that some of you who seem so anxious to lay down the immigration bars had been here when we were establishing these principles of government that saved our Nation from the floods of immigrants that were coming to our country in the early part of this century. You cannot throw away sound principles of government under an urge to do something from the urge of sentiment.

Our great Nation, the greatest Nation in the world, was a pioneer in immigration. We built up a model law. We gave to the world the principle that each sovereign nation has the right to determine who can come to dwell within its boundaries. Now you are going to tear this structure down piecemeal by trying to give China a little sop. There are 350,000,000 people in China, and you are going to give 75 of them an opportunity to enter this country. This is only a sop and is an insult to this great nation. Why do you not repeal those provisions against which they complain and stop at that? When you have done that you have done a good day's work. You have done what the State Department will approve. If you pass this proposed legislation, it is not going to meet the approval of the State Department. You will be imposing a burden upon the State Department, for it will be compelled to pacify the other nations of the world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry, but I cannot yield. I know what the gentleman wants to ask me. I can anticipate him by asking him, Why did you not ask the State Department before your committee? No one from the State Department testified before your committee. In years gone by we never legislated in this body on matters of immigration without giving the profoundest respect to the opinion of the State Department. I have that respect for the State Department yet. I know that this sort of legislation will not be approved by those in the State Department who administer the immigration laws.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. JENKINS. I am sorry to decline to yield, for I know the gentleman cannot correct any statement that I have made, because the State Department did not testify before his committee.

Mr. MASON. We did have representatives of the State Department before our committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Some representative of the State Department might have been in the room, but he did not give testimony. I do not want to have my statement about these matters broken into. The record shows that I am right, and I insist that we should know what the attitude of the State Department is, and it should be in the record. I am sure, to my own satisfaction, what it is, for I know from past experience.

Let us not make a mistake about this now. We can do what China wants and what we ought to do. In fact, we should have done this in 1924. We can do this by passing this section 1 and by striking out sections 2 and 3. When you go into passing section 2 and section 3 you do something which you ought not to do, because you try to unmake and remake this great structure that has been made so carefully and so cautiously. You do not do anybody any good, but you are going to cast a lot of extra burdens on the State Department. How are they going to reconcile this with the Philippines and with India and with Great Britain? I tell you it cannot be done. Let us not make that mistake.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill in its present form may bring on some bitter controversy in the courts. Let me illustrate. Heretofore our restrictive immigration laws have made no mention of nationalities or peoples by name. For instance, nobody is admitted or rejected because he is or is not a Briton or an Irishman or a Swede or a Chinaman. They are admitted for citizenship if they are white or if they are of African decent or if they are decendants from parents in the Western Hemisphere. This bill amends the very basic section of the immigration laws by adding the word Chinese. It makes Chinese admissible. In order to be classified as the others admissible are classified the word "oriental" would be the proper word. For instance what is an Englishman? Does it not include any person of any color or race just so he was born in England? Is not a Chinese person born in America of Chinese parents also born in America a full-fledged American? Is not a boy born in America of Italian parents living in America an American? Therefore, let us suppose that a man living in England born there of Chinese parents who were living there and were born there wanted to come to the United States for citizenship he would not be admitted. Why? Because he was not a white man, according to our immigration laws. He is an Englishman but still he cannot be admitted. Under our law Great Britain,

of which England is a part, has an enormous quota of 65,000. Englishmen or citizens of British provinces are eligible to this quota if they do not come within the excludible class. A Chinese Englishman is not now eligible. The question is: Will he be eligible when this bill passes taking the Chinese out of the excludible class. I know that one section of this new bill seeks to limit 75 percent of those Chinese who will come within the 105 quota to Chinese born and now living in China. But what about the remaining 25 percent, or, rather, will not the granting of eligibility to all Chinese everywhere in the whole world result in these Chinese who are citizens of England and other countries and who have never been in China demanding to be admitted under the quota of the country in which they live? If we make all Chinese eligible do we not make the Chinaman born and living in England as eligible as any other person born in England. I should not wonder if from some situation such as I have described much litigation will result. I am sure much bad feeling might result.

I repeat, we should do what we started out to do, and we should refrain from bringing on some involvements that may result disastrously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can reach an agreement as to limiting debate on this section. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, I do not think an hour is enough time.

Mr. GOSSETT. That gives 5 minutes to everyone who has indicated he wants to speak on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be an impression among some of the Members that this legislation would dispense with or would be a so-called entering wedge to relax our immigration laws. This is incorrect. I am not in favor of relaxing our present laws with respect to immigration. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is one of the distinguished and influential Members of this House. He is a former member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. His work on the committee was outstanding and his interest on behalf of restricted immigration on the floor of this House is most effective. Like my good friend from Ohio, I am also for restricted immigration. As a matter of fact, I have introduced a bill now pending before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that would cut the quotas 50 percent for the next 10 years. The minimum of this in each case would be 100. I agree that immediately following this war the question of immigration is going to be a most important and tremendous one. That problem will have to be handled with extreme care and prudence to see that, after all, the best interests of America are properly safeguarded.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not have the time or I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. He also believes in restriction of immigration and I have always respected his advice as well as his opinion on matters affecting this and other questions. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has suggested this legislation would create two quotas. He explains we already have a quota of 100 and that this would make 200 in all. The quota of 100 to which he refers applies only to white people born in China and does not apply in any way to the Chinese. I thought sure the gentleman from Ohio understood that. Mr. Chairman, I think the question of "opening the gates" should be cleared up. Whether you are in favor or opposed to this legislation, it ought to be understood that this measure puts the Chinese under the quota law and wipes out the only place in our law where a race or people are restricted by name. In 1917 by Presidential order restriction by name was stricken out as to the Japanese. We did that much for the Japanese. I think, too, it might be interesting, Mr. Chairman to examine some figures on this subject. There are now 77,500 Chinese in this country. There were 34,000 here 80 years ago, so there has not been much of an increase in Chinese population in America. There are 450,000,000 people in China and about 70,000,000 in Japan, but we have 126,947 Japanese in this country, according to 1940 census figures, and 91,858 are aliens.

Mr. Chairman, attention ought to be called again to the fact that if this legislation is passed it will permit not more than 105 Chinese to come into this country for permanent residence during the period of 1 year, and of that number 75 percent must come from China, so that the other 25 percent will include Chinese that are here lawfully but temporarily and Chinese who might now reside in other countries. Chinese who are citizens of other countries cannot now enter this country as citizens of such countries. It ought to be observed this small group should and will be pretty carefully examined to see that we have the best type of Chinese who may want to enter this country for permanent residence. Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to call attention to some comparative figures. Under our present law quotas are available from other countries in rather large numbers, although some of them do not avail themselves of the use of such quotas. For example, Germany has an annual quota of 27,370; Great Britain, 65,721; Italy, 5,802; Czechoslovakia, 2,874; Turkey, 226; Spain, 252; Soviet Republic, 2,712; Rumania, 377; Greece, 307. The total from all countries is 153,724, although, as I have said before, not all countries avail themselves of these quotas. The matter of 105 for the Chinese is comparatively small if it really means, as the Chinese claim it does, the cementing of a little firmer friendship and a little closer tie in the present crisis. I think the House may be interested in knowing the manner in which quotas are allocated to the various countries. I shall include a table at the end of my statement showing these allocations.

Considerable has been said this afternoon about our aid to China. I want to concur with other Members who have suggested that the thing that China needs more than anything else is war materials. I am in favor of giving her everything we can in that respect because the more guns and ships and planes and other war materials we can spare to China will do more good than anything else to help save the lives of American boys, but if this legislation will be of further assistance in building the morale of the people of China it is one more thing we can do to assist her. Of course the fact remains that we did not begin to help China quite soon enough. I would call your attention to the fact that during a period of 4 years before Pearl Harbor on numerous occasions I spoke on the floor of this House demanding that we curtail and stop shipments of the huge amounts of scrap steel and iron and other munitions that were going to Japan. During those 4 years we shipped more scrap and iron to Japan than any other country in the world. Even as late as June 1941 I spoke on the floor of this House calling attention to the fact that we had shipped 800,000 barrels of high octane gas to Japan during a short period before that date. I protested to the State Department and suggested then that if we were the friends of the Chinese people the very least we could do would be to curtail these shipments and not permit them to go on in increased amounts. Of course that is "water under the bridge." We were not in the war and there were a lot of problems to be considered. We are now in a terrible, cruel war. We are fighting a most ruthless enemy. If legislation permitting 105 Chinese to come into this country annually for permanent residence will help in anywise in the prosecution of this war and save and protect the lives of American soldiers to any extent whatever I believe there will be no objection to it by the American people.

Annual immigration quotas allotted under the national origin provision of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended

(NOTE.—Quotas are available only for aliens who are eligible to citizenship in the United States and admissible under the immigration laws of the United States.)

COUNTRY OR AREA AND QUOTA	
Afghanistan	100
Albania	100
Andorra	100
Arabian Peninsula (except Muscat, Aden Settlement and Protectorate, and Saudi Arabia)	100
Australia (including Tasmania, Papua, and all islands appertaining to Australia)	100
Belgium	1,304
Bhutan	100

Bulgaria	100
Cameroons [1]	100
Do.[2]	100
China	100
Czechoslovakia	2,874
Danzig, Free City of	100
Denmark	1,181
Egypt	100
Estonia	116
Ethiopia (Abyssinia)	100
Finland	569
France	3,086
Germany	27,370
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	65,721
Greece	307
Hungary	869
Iceland	100
India	100
Iran (Persia)	100
Ireland (Eire)	17,853
Iraq	100
Italy	5,802
Japan	100
Latvia	236
Liberia	100
Liechtenstein	100
Lithuania	386
Luxemburg	100
Monaco	100
Morocco (French and Spanish zones and Tangier)	100
Muscat (Oman)	100
Nauru [1]	100
Nepal	100
Netherlands	3,153
New Guinea, Territory of (including appertaining islands—Australian mandate)	100
New Zealand	100
Norway	2,377
Palestine (with Trans-Jordan)	100
Philippine Islands	50
Poland	6,524
Portugal	440
Ruanda and Urundi (Belgian mandate)	100
Rumania	377
Samoa, Western (mandate of New Zealand)	100
San Marino	100
Saudi Arabia	100
South Africa, Union of	100
South-West Africa (mandate of the Union of South Africa)	100
Spain	252
Sweden	3,314
Switzerland	1,707
Syria and the Lebanon [2]	123
Tanganyika Territory [1]	100
Thailand (Siam)	100
Togoland [1]	100
Do.[2]	100
Turkey	226
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,712
Yap and other Pacific islands (under Japanese mandate)	100
Yugoslavia	845
Total	153,774

[1] British mandate.
[2] French mandate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The statement has been made that since propaganda is based upon distortion we cannot do anything about it legislatively. To the extent that propaganda is based on distortion of course we cannot, but if propaganda is based upon truth, if it is based upon discrimination, based upon an unfairness, like it is here, we can remove the reason for the propaganda by removing the discrimination, and that is what we are about to do today.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. In a moment. If I understand this amendment, we will in effect say to the Chinese, "We will not exclude you because you are Chinese, but we will exclude you because you are orientals." What weasel words, what an insult to a people! I would far rather vote against this entire act, I would far rather have Congress go on record as saying to the Chinese people, "We do not consider you equals at all" than to be guilty of this double-dealing. The gentleman would remove the discrimination against them, because of the fact they are Chinese nationals and still retain it because they are orientals. Let us not deal like that with our allies and our friends of the last 100 years.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I rise to call the attention of the House to a point of view of this bill that does not seem to have been touched on in the arguments so far. I want to remind Members of a treaty we made with the Chinese, called the Burlingame Treaty of 1868, the preamble of which reads as follows:

> The United States of America and the Empire of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance and also the free migration and immigration of their citizens and subjects respectively, from one country to the other, for the purpose of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residence.

Implicit in these words was the conception that the Chinese could come to the United States freely and could become citizens.

The treaties of 1844 and 1855 between China and this country had said nothing about the rights of our resident Chinese, who were actually being naturalized in a few States. Not until the amendment of the naturalization law after the Civil War specifically to include "persons of African nativity" was the phrase "free white persons" definitely construed to exclude Chinese from naturalization. When the movement for the naturalization of Negroes got under way there was some activity looking to the extension of the naturalization laws to include Chinese.

In 1876 a joint special committee of Congress was appointed to study the Chinese question. The chairman of the committee, Senator Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, was very favorable to the Chinese and against the conclusion of the committee, but because of his illness and later death, he could not be very active. Senator Edwin R. Meade, of New York, was present only a few days, and Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, resigned, so the friends of China did not continue on that particular committee.

The following year an even less careful California report was drawn without calling any Chinese witnesses. Twenty thousand copies of this hostile document were distributed.

On this background, and without any impartial study of the problem the Chinese Commissioners were sent to China to negotiate a modification of the Burlingame treaty. This was effected in the treaty concluded November 17, 1880, providing that our Government "may regulate, not prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers."

Disregarding the terms of this treaty there followed the Chinese exclusion laws and related anti-Chinese legislation.

The first act was that of May 6, 1882, as amended July 5, 1884. It suspended the coming of Chinese laborers for 10 years and made certain other provisions, including the requirement for certificates of residence.

Although the new treaty was allegedly the justification for this act, it did, in fact, just what the treaty forbade, prohibited rather than regulated the coming of Chinese laborers.

September 13, 1888, a new act was passed, apparently to embarrass the administration, forbidding the return of resident laborers who had gone to China to return with certificates. After violating the statute by the earlier laws, the good faith of this country was jeopardized by this act.

May 5, 1892, there was a further suspension of 10 years, and on March 29, 1902, the suspension was made permanent. The bill was expanded to prohibit the entry of other than laborers and to tighten up the requirements for certificates of residence.

These anti-Chinese laws discriminate on the grounds of race; they are in violation of our war aims, and serve the ends of the Axis.

It seems to me that we here on Capitol Hill should do our utmost to have the United States of America keep its treaties. If we have not kept faith, and it is clear that we have not done so in this instance, let us act to renew that faith that no one can say of us that we hold any treaty of no more account than a scrap of paper.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I know a few things about the Chinese. I have lived with them. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, we are considering a most important policy in dealing with the Chinese immigration today. We are dealing with a policy that undermines civilization. We are dealing with the kind of a policy that undermined the Roman civilization. I know something about the Chinese. As a boy of 12, I was immigrated from the State of Iowa to the State of Idaho, and at the point where I landed, where my father was a railroad station agent, there were nothing but Chinese inhabitants. I think there were 200 Chinese coolies employed in the immediate environs of the little town where I landed. It was simply a station along the railroad line. I saw the Chinese. I know something of the Chinese mentality. I wonder how much these people here who want to open the gates to Chinese immigration know of the perils that the Chinese immigration raised in California in the early days, and all the troubles that the people had to maintain themselves against being displaced wholly and bodily

by the Chinese coolies, exploited by a few whites. It was the exploitation of cheap Asiatic people by the people of Rome that drove out the best fighting class in the world, their own Roman nationals, the people who had conquered the world. They were displaced by the importation of Asiatics and immigrants from Egypt, and when the barbarians came down upon Rome, where were the fighting men? They had been gone for hundreds of years, and Rome fell a victim to the invasion of the barbarians.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman comes from California and knows something about the Chinese. I yield for a question.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman compare the fighting Chinese at the present day with the weak Romans that fell then?

Mr. WHITE. I think the gentleman knows the preponderance of population in the great Empire of China. I think he knows also that the little country of Japan, off the coast of China, has been able to come in there and subdue them.

We have heard a great deal about arousing the yellow peril. We are doing everything we can do today both in China and Japan to arouse the yellow peril, that we may have to contend with in the years to come.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the gentleman did not mean to impart the information that Japan had subdued China. I think the gentleman meant they were trying to.

Mr. WHITE. What happened to poor helpless China when the gunboats of Japan moved right in under the nose of the International Settlement at Shanghai and destroyed the Chinese end of that island? What happened there? What defense could they put up? What defense can they put up today? A few fighting men have been trained by some Germans who were withdrawn from there, and they made a pitiful spectacle, with all their vast hordes of manpower against the little country of Japan.

We want to help China in its own country, but we do not want to colonize the Pacific coast. In dealing with this bill you are opening the doors, if you please, to coolie labor. How do we know that these quotas will not be raised? How can we discriminate against the Chinese in favor of other European nationals when immigration quotas are raised?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the gentleman read the statement of Admiral Yarnell in the hearings of this bill?

Mr. WHITE. I have done better than read the statement of Admiral Yarnell. I was reading the newspapers at the time of the big fight to protect the Pacific coast from the immigration of these ignorant coolies that worked for a dollar a day. They did not even get a dollar a day.

When I was a boy the six companies flooded this country with Chinese. The only reason we do not have a worse Chinese problem today is because they did not bring in any women. The Chinese were all bachelors. They were all single, who were brought into this country to labor and naturally they died off after the Exclusion Act went into effect. There were enough Chinese on the Pacific coast to have colonized that country and taken it over from the white people completely. San Francisco today would be a Chinese city if you had not enforced this law that we are now trying to repeal.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not understand the gentleman's answer. Has he read Admiral Yarnell's testimony?

Mr. WHITE. I have not. I know something about the problem from first-hand information. I know the habits of the Chinese. They are inveterate opium smokers most of the day. They brought that hideous opium habit to this country. These Chinese coolies provide a means of spreading it out among our boys and girls. If you stop to think about what you are doing here in dealing with this Chinese question, you will not repeal this law. Under the prevailing Chinese practice, when you went out to hire Chinese labor you went to the company. You did not deal with the individual. The company furnished you 10 or 20 or 30, and a bookman with them. You had to give then an order through this bookman and pay the company for their labor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman is familiar with what country brought the opium habit to China?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I know something about that, too. I know we are out today with our men to support the empire that sent their warships in to strike down the Chinese defense, and make them take their opium. We are companions in arms today with the people that forced opium into China when the Chinese Government had prohibited its importation in order that a few capitalists might make some money out of it. I know that hideous story. I believe we should think about what we are doing today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. As I understand the gentleman, the facts upon which he is basing his argument were derived 50 years ago, when he was a boy of 12. Is that right?

Mr. WHITE. Well, I lived there until I reached manhood, and I know something of the Chinese mentality and Chinese habits. There is no melting pot in America that can change their habits or change their mentality. It is a process of slow breeding and slow education. If there are any people who have refused to accept our standards and our education, it is the Chinese.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman concedes, does he not, that he has made some progress in the last 50 years? Does he not feel that the Chinese people have likewise made some progress in that period of time?

Mr. WHITE. When I go into the gentleman's State of Wisconsin to buy some cattle I try to look around and get cattle that are bred-up over a period of a good many centuries. If I want a horse I go there and get a horse of a breed that has been improved by breeding over a long period of time.

I do not think we can take the Chinese with their habits and mentalities in this year and time into our great American melting pot and in 10 years or a hundred years bring them up to our standards of civilization. It is impossible. We may be placed in the same position as the sentimentalists were in the South after the Civil War who wanted to do something grand for civilization. You have got a long, tough job to bring them up, and you still have race riots and other racial problems confronting you.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only a matter of bringing 105 Chinese into this country; that number would not do a great deal of harm, but you open the gates when you drive this entering wedge and then you make some changes in our immigration laws. You may have cause to regret the things that you are doing, the things that the people in California and the people of the west coast went through some 50 years ago.

How many of you Members know anything of the devious ways of the "wily Chinese"? The younger people of the west coast have grown up since these problems have passed. Do you know that under the operations of the six companies handling Chinese coolie labor, practically all of their food was imported from China, and that the Chinese were not permitted to buy food supplies in our stores—and if any of the gang who cooked and ate in common broke this rule and bought anything from an American store, that the Chinese company deducted the exact amount of that purchase from their pay at the end of the month? I know this to be a fact, because that rule was enforced on the Chinese gangs that worked in our community. Do you know that Chinese labor was contracted in gangs by the six companies who supplied an interpreter and a book man to direct their operations in our country, and the railroads paid the contractor $1.10 per day—the 10 cents went to the six companies and $1 to the man with which to pay for his food and clothing—and out of which he could save up to send money back to China. Most Chinese are inveterate gamblers and opium smokers—the fan-tan games were run by the company, and the coolie losses were taken out of their pay with the result that most of the coolies were never free of debt. Talk about peonage and American standards of living! I wish you could have gone with me as a boy into these Chinese hovels, built by digging a shallow pit in the forest, and laid up with logs and a dirt roof, heated by a little funnel of a sheetiron stove, with its tiers of bunks around the side and across the end that had only a hard

straw mat for a bed—with an opium can and the inevitable opium pipe for the use of its occupants. The scene of these coolies lying on their hard beds smoking opium through their water-filled bamboo pipes, I will admit, was fascinating. Let me tell you the country along the lines of our early day transcontinental railroads are strewn with the relics of these old Chinese huts where Chinese coolies lived and smoked opium, and worked 10 and 12 hours for $1 per day.

I have no animosity against the Chinese. We children loved the Chinese cooks and laundrymen who lavished Chinese "goodies" on us on Chinese New Year's—and even remembered our own Christmas.

Let us help the Chinese—but help them in their own country!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, on February 18 last this House collectively lost its heart to Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. It is my hope that we will pass the legislation that is before us, thereby expressing our admiration for China, a great nation which has sacrificed so much for the common cause.

I would like to quote from the address of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek:

> The traditional friendship between your country and mine has a history of 160 years. I feel, and I believe that I am not the only one who feels this way, that there are a great many similarities between your people and mine, and that these similarities are the basis of our friendship.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that China and the United States are economically complementary, and I believe that our economic history and China's economic future will show points of great similarity. We all recall that it was out of the internacine war in which our fathers on both sides of the aisle so heroically fought for their ideals; it was, as I say, from the Civil War that the American industrial revolution was born. It was not until 1866 that the first railroad spanned the United States. This first great move to open communication between the distant points of our great continent ushered in the development that has made us the most powerful Nation in the world.

Our ally, China, will undoubtely follow the same course of economic effort. Her old civilization has been slow to accept modern methods, but I believe that when the war is past and peace again comes to what I hope and believe will be a united China, our western methods will be accepted and China will commence her industrial revolution.

I should like for a moment to digress and consider what will be the position in our own country following the war. For my part, I believe that only through an economy of plenty and full production can this country continue to give jobs and employment to those now employed and offer employment to our returning soldiers and sailors. Such a policy naturally has certain dangers. With our great ability to produce both agricultural and manufactured products, surpluses may result. I, for one, will take my chance of financing our surplus materials outside of our country to those that may need them, as compared to risking underemployment and bread lines as a result of restricted production.

If we are to have surpluses, China, which has been so devastated by 5 or 6 years of war will certainly welcome them. What is more, China will make a great demand upon us for many years to come for all sorts of finished materials—tools, transportation, machinery, and hundreds of other items that she is now incapable of producing herself.

One of the first and principal requirements of China will be transportation facilities. Transportation not only by railroad, but by road and air. Secondly, China will have great demand for all types of agricultural machinery. As regards agriculture, the farmers of the United States need have no fear that China will compete with American agricultural products. From the point of view of food China is greatly undernourished and it will be many years before her 450,000,000 people will be in a position to feed themselves adequately. In other words, it will, from the cold, selfish point of view be of great advantage to American workmen and farmers to take part in China's forthcoming industrial revolution.

So far, I have only spoken of the things that we are to provide China. The Chinese are a race known throughout the world for their willingness and desire to fairly settle their financial obligations; it is worth our while to consider for a moment how they can accomplish this.

There are and always have been certain items—tea and other agricultural products—which we have taken in great quantity from China, the sale of which has provided the dollars to buy those things China needed from us. Moreover, China is one of the world's leading producers of tin for which metal there will always be a great demand in the United States. Further, in tungsten and antimony China dominates the world market, and these two materials will become increasingly used in American manufacturing processes as we turn from steel to the lighter and tougher metals which can be made by their admixture.

I cannot help but believe that when the vast country of China is scientifically explored many other natural resources will be found. Practically all are present today but in limited quantities; limited probably by lack of proper development.

Contemporary China, beneficiary of an ancient culture, is readjusting the economic life of her country. In seeking help and assistance I think that she will turn to us. I admit that there will always be competition in world trade, but I believe the Chinese had rather deal with Americans as a people than with many other nations with whom they have come in contact. Many other nations have had imperialistic ideas. The Chinese know that we will come to them as good merchants, willing to sell and willing to buy, and willing to lend our methods and arts that they may more quickly start their industrial rebirth.

When I say that our attitude toward China has been nonimperialistic, I give my reasons.

Who was it that forgave the Boxer indemnity? The United States.

Did any other countries? No.

Who waived the extraterritorial provision?

Did other countries? No.

Did the United States? Yes.

I think that China appreciates that we Americans have no ulterior motive.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Exclusion Act which has been used by our common enemy to cause misunderstanding between our two great nations will be repealed. I hope that we Americans can take our part in assisting the Chinese to restore their nation, that American workmen will provide the machinery and the tools which will be later operated by Chinese hands.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that practically every responsible organization on the west coast is in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated on a previous occasion, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 3070, a bill to repeal the so-called Chinese Exclusion Act.

I have heretofore given what seemed to me to be sound reasons for this stand.

Today I feel even more strongly that this act should be repealed, and I shall state additional, and I believe compelling, reasons for my convictions; they are:

First, the Chinese people, ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed, and practically unarmed as they are, have for years withstood the onslaught of the Japanese hordes. They are today one of our most important allies, holding the line, fighting a defensive and delaying action while we slowly, but surely, gather our strength for the final blow that will overwhelm both Hirohito and Hitler.

The second reason, based not on sentiment but on sanity, is that China will emerge from this war as one of the four major powers. She will be a sovereign and independent nation, enjoying all the sovereign rights of other independent nations. If we persist in maintaining a policy of exclusion, what is to hinder China, and who could criticize her, if she in retaliation exercised her sovereign right to exclude our nationals from China?

I feel that it is outrageous to put the appeal on this basis, but since our opponents are taking the hard-boiled attitude I feel that I am justified in calling their attention to the position that China would be justified in taking, a position which would work as great an economic hardship on us as it would on her.

At this point I want to reiterate my firm conviction that the Chinese are a great people. They have developed a civilization that is shot through with

cultural elements that would be tremendously beneficial to our western civilization; they have demonstrated that as a nation they possess qualities that are closely akin to the qualities that we as a nation prize most—a love of liberty—a love so intense that they are willing to sacrifice blood and treasure immeasurably to sustain that principle.

In addition to this, they are a reliable people; they possess traits of character that are entirely consonant with our own ideals; they are honest; they have on innumerable occasions demonstrated that they are loyal. They are good citizens in every sense of the word, and those born here and endowed with citizenship rights by reason of birth have demonstrated that they are sound, sane, and patriotic American citizens.

Personally, I have found that the Chinese with whom I have come in contact are splendid individuals worthy of confidence in all matters.

I have always felt that Chinese exclusion was a mistake. It has deprived us of a type of citizenship that would have been a real contribution to our body politic.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will promptly rectify this erroneous discrimination against a great people who, if permitted to enter on equal terms with other nations into our American body politic, will make a distinct and tremendously valuable contribution to freedom as conceived by democracy.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object if the gentleman will limit his request to the pending amendment.

Mr. GOSSETT. My request is limited to the present amendment and any amendment to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, was at one time a member of the Immigration Committee, and while a member I am sure I had the reputation of being rather strict and rather opposed to allowing people to come into the United States, and I have been criticized somewhat by some of my very liberal friends for that. I still feel that a strict policy of limiting immigration to the number that we can absorb is a sound policy for the United States. But I recognize that times do change, even though the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] did suggest that we should go back 82 years and legislate on the basis of conditions as they existed at that time.

We are now engaged in what we call an all-out global war. Our enemies are putting all they have into this war. We can do no less. They are smart enough to use psychological and political, as well as mechanical, weapons. Certainly if this Congress can, by the exercise of common sense and a little elementary statesmanship, save a single soldier's life, it is our solemn duty to do it. If we can, by legislation or by diplomacy, save the lives of American boys, then you and I are guilty of the deaths of those whose lives would be sacrificed if we do not take such action as we can to save their lives. If we simply raise a political hullabaloo and drag up conditions that existed 82 years ago and use them as an excuse to let American boys lose their lives, then we are not playing the game as good Americans. I do not think there is a Member of this House who is not more interested in keeping our allies fighting, in winning this war as quickly as possible, in saving American lives, than in his pet theories and assuring his own reelection, but I do think that there are too many Members who have never realized the far-reaching implications of this bill and the grave danger of contributing to the continuation of the war if we vote against it.

There is not a practical man or woman in this House today who does not know that this bill is of practical importance to China and of nothing but political importance to the United States. Of course, we know that we can drag up a political hullabaloo and say that we are afraid to open the doors to China, when you know and I know that 105 Chinese a year are not going to hurt the United States. Even the most active enemies of this legislation have admitted that it will not hurt this country, that it will not interefere with labor, that it will not interfere with the development of this Nation, that as a matter of fact, it will have no practical effect at all. You know, as I know, that it will have no practical effect on the United States, that it is purely political as far as the United States is concerned. In China, however, it will have vast practical effects. Last night I had the pleasure of visiting with a friend whom I had known as a boy in Waco, Tex., many years ago. This friend has been in China for the last 12 years. He just flew back this week. He has been flying over the Himalayas taking supplies into that heroic nation for the past 18 months. He tells me that there is no one thing America can do today that will have as much practical effect toward keeping China in this war as to pass this legislation. Oh, I know those who do not want this bill passed tell us we are doing a great deal for China, but those who come from China, Mr. Chairman, like my friend who was there last week, tell me that with all of our bragging we are not bringing as much goods into China today as they are getting through the Japanese lines by smuggling; in other words, the Japs are bringing more supplies into free China than we are.

I fear that the opponents of this bill, in spite of their touching concern for China, in spite of their criticism of the bill for not going far enough, in spite of their repeated assurance that "China will understand and remain loyal to the United States," I fear that these self-professed friends of China want to give China about the same amount of moral support that we have been giving in the way of material aid. From a material standpoint we have given money and credit, but we have provided no way whereby the credit in the New York bank can be converted into gasoline and medicine in Chungking.

Do not think that you can expect the support of the Chinese people, do not think that Chiang Kai-shek and his government can continue to rely on the support of their people for the friendly policy of the Chinese Government with the United States unless we can give them some kind of results. You as practical men should know that if you are to expect the support of your electorate you have got to show some results now and then. The Chinese Government has got to show some results now and then or its people are not going to follow it blindly forever in a policy that simply says, "Oh, yes; the United States is your great friend." Let the United States exhibit its friendliness to China. We cannot do it today by delivering airplanes; we cannot do it by delivering gasoline; we cannot do it by putting soldiers in China because we cannot get them there; but you and I can today deliver tangible evidence of American good will by passing this bill. In so doing we will help in a small way to keep a most vital ally fighting until we can take more material steps to show China that she does well to look on America as a friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I taught school in China for a year after the last war, at Changsha, the place where they have whipped the Japs 4 times since 1939. I do not claim that a year in China makes me an expert on China any more than a year in this country would make a Chinese an expert on America, but I cannot sit here in silence and hear things said about the Chinese through ignorance that simply are not true. The Chinese were a civilized people when your ancestors and mine were wearing skins for clothes and fighting with clubs. They have a pride of race similar to the pride of race that you and I have; they have a pride of color. They look upon mixed marriages the same way white people look on mixed marriages. They have a dignity, a humanity, a democratic spirit which is simply magnificent. When we talk about permitting 105 Chinese to come in here as if we could stand that much damage to our culture and our blood stream, we are taking a pretty stupid and bigoted viewpoint, because the sort of Chinese that will come in under that quota of 105, who must pass educational, financial, and moral tests, will be a contribution to American life, not a detriment. They will not provide much dilution to our blood stream, because they do not go in for intermarriage between races, and I am not criticizing them for that viewpoint. Their total effect on American life will be good, not bad.

We have all heard about "face," how important "face" is in China—"face," pride, dignity. Although the Chinese

have their own standards of "face," we have the same thing in this country. If the situation were reversed and we were doing more for a certain nation than any other nation, and they treated us with contempt we would "lose face." I have heard Congressmen on this floor complain of the lack of appreciation by the British and the Russians of our part in the war effort. Why is it important to be appreciated? Is appreciation worth anything? We know it is when we want to be on the receiving end. We are not expecting any patient in dollars for what we are doing, but we do want so much to be appreciated. The Chinese are human, too. "Face" is not just oriental. It is universal.

You say this is only a gesture. Gestures are important. Shaking your fist is a gesture, but an important one. Shaking hands is a gesture, but an important one. This is an important gesture to a people to whom we owe much and for whom we are in a position to do so little from a military standpoint at such a crucial time. No other nation is so important to us right now, has been for some time in the past, and probably will be for some years to come, as China, from a military standpoint. There is no other nation on our side in this war for whom we are doing comparatively so little. Let us take the Chinese at their word; let us take the word of the people who know something about China and realize that this gesture is important.

I sat as assistant secretary of the American delegation at the Conference on Pacific and Far Eastern Affairs in 1921 and 1922 here in Washington, when we became a party to an international treaty, the Nine Power Pacific Treaty, and undertook obligations toward China which we have not yet fulfilled and which we are not now, right at this moment, in a position to fulfill. Let us at least do this one thing, this gesture which is important to a dignified, great people, civilized long before we were, to show them not that they are in a favored position but that they are no longer in an unfavored position.

If the precedent we are creating here is that we will remove discriminations against any nation on this planet that is fighting our battles for us at a time when we cannot do much about it, who are a race of great people, a civilized people, a fine people, all right, let us create that precedent; it is an excellent precedent to create. It will not only help the Chinese, but will help us.

We have had unusual relations with China. Burlingame, our Minister to China, turned around and became the Chinese Minister to the United States. We returned the Boxer indemnity money. China has accepted our educational system. Those who say there has not been any change in China in the past 50 years or in the past 20 years since American education has spread through China, simply do not know the facts. We have had unique relationships with these people who are of unique importance to us. If this war or its aftermath develops into a race struggle there will be about half a billion more people on the side of the colored races than on our side. In such a crisis the fact that the most numerous colored race on earth has had unique relations of friendship with the United States, that single fact, may prove the salvation of the white race. We may be helping our own race more than we think when we make this gesture, and establish this precedent today, by passing this bill without amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, as one who knows the Chinese, I want to add my endorsement to their splendid qualities. It so happens that I come from a city in which is located the second largest concentration of Chinese people in this country. From an intimate association with them, I know them to have wonderful qualities, I know them to be fine neighbors, I know them to be honest, upstanding, trustworthy. I regard them as highly desirable residents. But, with all of these commendable qualities, I also know that the Chinese are unusually intelligent, very keen, and discerning. Certainly, they are not gullible or easily fooled. So I rise to inquire, Why this law?

Is there anyone among us so guileless as to believe that we are going to placate the Chinese and further intensify their friendship for us, these Chinese people who number more than 375,000,000, by merely changing our laws so as to permit an insignificant 76 of them to each year enter this country? Seventy-six out of 375,000,000! If the Chinese are going to be fooled by that kind of a gesture, if they are going to be swayed in their sentiment of friendship toward us by that kind of an idle device, then, indeed, the Chinese are no longer the proud, sensitive, and intelligent race I have always believed them to be. I think too much of the Chinese people with whom I grew up not to resent the unhappy implications which this loosely drawn and ill-considered legislation gives rise to.

The repeal of the provisions of the Exclusion Act, which has been on our statute books for a half century, and, though on our statute books for all of those years, has not interfered with the friendship of the Chinese for the Americans or the Americans for the Chinese, will not and cannot result in that which its well-intentioned proponents assure us is bound to follow. Why change the act for such a silly, inconsequential, ridiculous reason as the one which has been advanced? Seventy-six immigrants a year out of a population of 375,000,000 Chinese nationals; the very mention of these disproportionate figures is to add insult to injury. And the proponents of this idle gesture assure us it will promote friendship.

All I can say is that when the cry of "it will help win the war" is raised, it does not take much to stampede this, which was once known as the world's greatest deliberative body. Even to the most obtuse, a quota of seventy-six is as much an exclusion act as is the Exclusion Act itself.

Even though it is but an idle gesture insofar as the Chinese are concerned, its enactment is bound to have most unfortunate repercussions down in Manila. It is going to, in all probability, cost us a lot of friends down that way, in the Philippine Islands, where every friend saved is an enemy we will not have to fight.

Are there any among us that have forgotten that the Philippine Independence Act provides that from the date of its enactment to the date on which they assume their full independence, but 50 Filipinos shall be permitted to enter this country, and that all of these by the very act itself have been declared ineligible for American citizenship? Have we forgotten that that same Independence Act provides that after independence matures and the Philippine Commonwealth becomes an independent nation, all Filipinos shall be deemed ineligible for American citizenship, and that no Filipino shall be permitted to enter the United States for permanent residence. The race of the little brown men of Manila will, after the Chinese Exclusion Act is repealed, be the only race on earth that will remain under the stigma of ineligibility to American citizenship.

But the walls of this ancient Chamber continue to rock with ear-dinning assertions that this 50-year-old Chinese coolie Exclusion Act has become a dangerous Japanese propaganda weapon. My God, Mr. Chairman, what kind of a propaganda weapon are we placing in the hands of the Japanese by the repeal of this Chinese Exclusion Act? Already I can hear them chanting over the radio that the United States holds them, the Filipinos, in such contempt that we have by our laws declared theirs to be the only race so inferior and so degraded as to be unfit to enter the United States, even on the quota basis.

You can bring in a silly, foolish bill calling for repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act—an idle gesture, at best—and accomplish nothing with it insofar as the Chinese are concerned. But that repealer can become—this as certainly as night follows the day—a source of tremendous danger to the future relationships of the United States and the Filipino people. So when you think of this friendly gesture as but a passing expression of good will, let me impress upon you that that gesture may work our undoing in a section of the world where we need friends more than we have ever needed them before.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman as the time has been fixed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How much time is there left on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman knows that the time was limited to 1 hour. Twenty minutes have been consumed, leaving 40 minutes on this

amendment and all amendments thereto. The Chair may say that there are a sufficient number of Members on the list to give 5 minutes to those on the list and no more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday when our friend and colleague from Minnesota was on the floor, I requested the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, to yield to me, because I wanted to ask him some questions. He did not deem it advisable to yield at that time and in looking over the RECORD it is stated that his remarks will appear at some future time in the Appendix. Therefore I have not had the opportunty of reviewing what he had to say.

One of the questions I wished to submit at that time pertained to what he had to say about the enormous undeveloped or potential market there is in China. We hear discussed the matter of bringing in people from China who can perform work in competition with American people who wish to work. Little has been said about the goods that might come from China in payment of services and the goods we might send to China for the purpose of industrializing that great republic. So I wanted to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, how does he propose to finance the potential market to which he refers as existing in China? If he wishes to answer that question now I yield at this time.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman's question, How will the Chinese pay for the materials they get from us?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. Fortunately, the situation in that regard is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the point I was trying to make yesterday. After the last war we sent considerable amounts of goods to Europe and in most cases we had to lend them the money to pay for those goods. In the case of China, her economy does not compete with ours, so far as her products and commodities are concerned. They complement ours. She has tungsten, tung oil, bristles, silk, antimony, and a great many other things which she can use to pay us for the things that she needs from us. Therefore, there is a great deal less conflict between our economy and China's than there is between ours and many nations of South America, for example.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On that basis would it not be true, as far as the gentleman has explained it now, that the market we would have out of China in the future would simply be the market we have at the present time as covered by the present imports from China? What additional market did the gentleman add to the proposition in that explanation?

Mr. JUDD. As the Chinese become more industrialized, and that is the only way people have ever been able to raise substantially their standard of living, they will have more purchasing power and there will be a greater interchange of goods and a greater amount of commerce and exchange of tourists and visitors back and fourth. Unquestionably her purchasing power will increase. Therefore, she can buy more from us. The fact that so many fortunes for Americans and Britons have been made in China in the past would seem to me to be strong evidence in favor of the statement that it is in our own economic interest to develop this good will and trade.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, we may say that there is an unlimited market all throughout the world as well as here in the United States. In my opinion, we have merely scratched the surface here in the United States among our own people. I think our own people could consume three times the volume of goods and services we are consuming at the present time or ever did consume before, when we once work out a way of financing it. But as we proceed to develop the rest of the world industrially, which many of these new concepts now appear to cover, all the time the proponents are asking us to do the financing for that development, I ask the gentleman: Who is to buy the bonds that must be sold in this country for the purpose of financing the industrial development of these new areas of the world? Our people will have to learn the art of foreign investment and accept low tariffs, otherwise these new concepts will have to be largely abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I imagine the particular thing that urged me to ask for this time was to take my position in favor of the unamended and undisturbed adoption of this bill, which I regard as just as helpful to our people as anything we can do in this great struggle for freedom and the salvation of our own country.

It does not make any difference whether the number who will be permitted to come in under this bill is 76 or 105 or more; the thing is that I apprehend from what I have seen of the people of China and from what I have read about them that they have a spiritual appointment as well as a physical possession. We cannot continue to permit this discrimination, and it has been a discrimination, the reasons for which I would not undertake to give, and I shall not say anything with respect to the wisdom or the unwisdom of those things that are past. I really cannot imagine why it was ever done, but probably there was a reason for it. But I cannot imagine at this time, when we have come to realize that no man can live to himself and no nation can live to itself, and that we must create and cultivate throughout the world a spirit of brotherhood, the good-neighbor doctrine, and good will as among peoples, that we should permit this discrimination to obtain longer between us and the great people of China.

We are going to need China through this war and after this war is over. Their position is such that if we want to consider it from the standpoint of our own welfare, that we will need China to keep the peace throughout the centuries to come and to prevent a recurrence of this awful debacle into which we have found ourselves thrown at this time.

This is a gesture, and it is no more than a gesture, but it is a friendly handshake that knits together the hearts and the souls of two great peoples. I hope for our own good and for the good of the world and the peace of the world that this bill will be adopted without any kind of amendment or apologetic gesture of any sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said on this floor for the purpose of minimizing the importance of this resolution. It has been characterized as psychological warfare. Maybe it is, but Japan is using psychological warfare against us in order to win the friendship, the good will, and the cooperation of the Chinese people.

Two percent of the population of Japan has accepted the Christian faith, undoubtedly as a result of the missionaries sent to that country by the Christian churches in years gone by. Japan has been shrewd enough to use that 2 percent of her population, Japanese Christian workers, and has sent them among the Filipino people and also among the Chinese people in order to win over those peoples to the Japanese cause. They are telling the Filipinos and the Chinese they can have freedom of religion, they can have independence of government. We all know that the Filipino people are a devout people and have been for 400 years. What is more, Japan is giving just a little bit more to the Chinese people than some of her own rulers have given them, and let me say to you that they have succeeded in China with the Chinese people to a degree greater than we want to believe. Their success with a policy of pacification has achieved much, perhaps has added greatly to their aggression with the bayonet. The promise of a full stomach in a nation and a country that has known universal impoverishment for centuries does go a long way to win over a people to the propaganda that Japan is using against the United States. We can remove an affront to a friendly nation and a peace-loving people by adopting this resolution.

We need the help of the Chinese people. They need ours. This may be a gesture but it is a friendly gesture. It is a step in the right direction. They are our allies. Let us encourage them today with what we do in this Chamber in order to stiffen their morale and encourage them to resist, and in that way aid the Allied cause.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass. I have no fear of its consequences on the American people.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I am in full agreement with what the gentleman from Michigan has said. I wonder if he would

not go a step further with me and say that when it comes to writing the peace a woman should be represented on the peace commission. I should like to nominate for that particular office Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, who is not only a credit to her own country, but one of the world's outstanding personalities, honored by people all over the world.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the American people would agree to that suggestion and I would approve of it. I thank the distinguished Member from Wisconsin and my friend for his contribution.

May I say to you that the objective of Japan is not only to destroy us as a military power in the southwest Pacific but to unite one-half of the population of this world in a race war against us, the white people. She is using the age-old prejudice of race and color to attain that objective. Let us do what we can to counteract it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]. It ought to be adopted.

I believe when we pass the first section of the bill we will have eliminated that part of the law to which the Chinese object.

I was very much surprised to hear the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] rise on the floor here and advance as an argument the fact that Japan was propagandizing against the minority report. Of course Japan wants the door left ajar for her to get her nose in after the war. Where is this propaganda coming from? Not from the Chinese, but from Japan, whose Black Dragon Society has been propagandizing the United States for the last quarter of a century, to wipe out what they claim is a discrimination against them.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and other gentlemen who have spoken here, that I was in the House when the present immigration law was passed, and some of the very men who are now clamoring to break down our immigration laws were here at that time opposing the passage of any law at all that would restrict immigration in any way.

If you pass this bill with sections 2 and 3 in it, when this war is over you will have given Japan an argument for breaking down our immigration laws, so that she can flood the district of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], so that she can flood the States of Washington, Oregon, and California with Japanese immigrants.

I am not disturbed about what Tokyo says about Members of this House. I am sure Tokyo does not think any less of us than we think of Tokyo.

I heard Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, who some of these propagandists are trying to besmirch, when she spoke here. She is undoubtedly the greatest Christian leader that China has seen in 1,900 years. She did not ask us to change our immigration laws. She asked us for help, for materials, for munitions of war, for food, for manpower with which to fight Japan. You will not offend China if you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan. You will not offend anyone who has any rights in the matter.

You will offend Japan, because Japan wants those two last sections as a wedge to propagandize her way into breaking down the immigration laws that keep her out of this country after this war.

I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I consider this a very important bill in reference to this war, and I also consider it a just bill. I think it does justice to a great people, and I use the word "great" advisedly. The Chinese people have proven that they are great both in peace and in war. The Committee on Foreign Affairs last year held a hearing upon a resolution to grant financial aid to China. At that time there appeared before the committee the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, and all of them paid tribute to the part China is playing in the present war. Mr. Jones in his statement as Secretary of Commerce said that China, in her dealings with the United States and in the loans that we had made to her, had always been prompt in payment and meticulously honest and usually paid the loan before it was due. That China was one country with whom we had dealings that had never defaulted on any promise that she had ever made. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, Chinese people have demonstrated that they have within them a spirit and a soul and a determination to live and die for their country and for what they believe to be right. No country ever fought more valiantly. I venture the assertion that when this war is over, with the long sufferings and sacrifices made by the Chinese people during the 6 years, when they have been fighting, fighting practically with their bare hands against an army, a well mechanized army, a cruel army, that she will have written for herself in her heroic conduct and her fight against Japan a name that will live in history throughout the centuries to come. This bill does simple justice to a great country who is our ally, who is heroically fighting, and who has saved and will save the lives of thousands of young Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I think support of this bill could be justified on the ground of doing justice to a valiant ally whose fighting in this war may well be the balance of power between victory and defeat for the forces of Christian civilization. But I think we can well place justification for our support solely upon the basis of a war measure. We realize that the basis of the campaign for power on the part of the Axis countries has been to divide and conquer; to use Quislings for the purpose of bringing to their support groups of people within the nations they expect to take over. They are trying to do that in China today, as has been well pointed out here. This action on our part will, in my judgment, do as much as anything we could possibly do to stop the effectiveness of the Quisling movement on the part of Japan, an Axis partner, in bringing to their support a part of the Chinese people in the occupied territory.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] raised the question about the State Department and the fact that no appearance by a representative of that Department was made before the committee. Surely the gentleman has not forgotten that the President of the United States sent a message to Congress advocating the passage of this act. He speaks not only for the State Department but for all other departments in the executive branch of the Government.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] says that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek did not ask us for this legislation. The gentleman is very much mistaken. She may not have referred to it in her speech to this body, and to have done so would have been in poor taste, because it is a matter of legislation. But I am told by members of the committee who talked with her that she earnestly urged it and pointed out the value of it to her and her husband and to those who are of like mind in China, in their efforts to keep the Japanese from using Quislings there for the purpose of destroying Chiang Kai-shek's government.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that all she asked for was the wiping out of the Chinese Exclusion Act?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is not my understanding of it. She did ask for the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, and, for putting China on the same basis as the other peoples of the world.

Now, who is using the quota now? Last year there was only one nation that used 100 percent of the quota and that was Spain. Would you rather have them come here than the good people of China? Other countries that used as much as 50 percent were, Greece 99 percent; Portugal 59 percent; Turkey 56 percent. Only 6½ percent of the quotas of all countries who are authorized to have quotas under this law used their quotas during the last 12 months.

Like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], I believe in restrictive immigration. I would support legislation to reduce the quotas, but let us help our boys over there by passing this act which

those best informed regarding the situation believe will greatly assist our ally China and thus save the lives of many of our soldiers and sailors.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement regarding the quota situation:

THE QUOTA SITUATION TODAY

The quota situation today is in sharp contrast to that of earlier years. According to the State Department only 6.4 percent of the total yearly quota was used in the fiscal year which has just ended (June 30, 1943); in the 1920's between 95 and 98 percent of the total quota was almost invariably used up. In the fiscal year 1943 only one quota, the quota for Spain, was exhausted; in the 1920's all, or almost all, of the important European quotas used to be exhausted as soon as the immigration law permitted—that is, by the tenth month of the fiscal year (May)—and the registered demand against them was so large that applicants might have to wait several years for their turn to get a quota immigration visa. In the early 1930's, due to the depression and the strict enforcement of the L. P. C. clause ("likely to become a public charge" clause) of the 1917 immigration act by our consuls because of it, there was a drastic reduction of immigration similar to the one which war and the disruption of transportation facilities have now effected and a low was reached in the fiscal year 1933 when only 5.2 percent of the total yearly quota was used During the second half of that decade, however, immigration was beginning to resume normal proportions—38 percent of the quota was issued in 1939—when war forced the curve downward again—as stated above, to 6.4 percent last fiscal year.

In 1943 no country, except Spain, used up the quota assigned to it. Of the other countries, Greece came nearest to doing so; all but three numbers of its quota were used. In this connection the following table which furnishes information on this point for all the important European quotas may be of interest:

Status of certain European quotas as of June 30, 1943

Country	Yearly quota	Quota numbers issued in 1943 to—			Total issued	Unused balance	Percent of quota issued
		First preference relatives	Second preference relatives	Non-preference immigrants			
Belgium	1,304	3	5	127	135	1,169	10.3
Czechoslovakia	2,874	15	0	395	410	2,464	14.2
Denmark	1,181	8	2	114	124	1,057	10.5
Finland	569	10	1	104	115	454	22.1
France	3,086	7	5	354	366	2,720	11.8
Germany	27,370	26	82	1,422	1,530	25,840	5.6
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	65,721	93	41	1,731	1,865	63,856	2.8
Greece	307	57	2	245	304	3	99.0
Hungary	869	7	1	175	183	686	21.0
Ireland	17,853	5	0	207	212	17,641	1.2
Italy	5,802	12	0	195	207	5,595	3.5
Netherlands	3,153	7	2	203	212	2,941	6.6
Norway	2,377	19	1	92	112	2,265	4.7
Poland	6,524	89	24	1,697	1,780	4,744	27.2
Portugal	440	27	32	204	263	177	59.8
Russia (U. S. S. R.)	2,712	25	8	436	469	2,243	17.2
Spain	252	26	16	210	252	0	100.0
Sweden	3,314	12	0	93	105	3,209	3.0
Switzerland	1,707	3	0	107	110	1,597	6.4
Syria and Lebanon	123	5	1	41	47	76	38.2
Turkey	226	13	1	114	128	98	56.6
Yugoslavia	845	12	1	91	104	741	12.3

The present quota situation, as was pointed out above, is very different from that in the 1920's and, to a less extent, from that in the years just preceding the current World War. As the following shows, all the countries included in the previous table used up their quota in 1928 and, with the exception of Ireland, in 1929; a considerable number of them did so also in 1938 and 1939.

Quota situation in 1943 compared with that in certain earlier years

Country	Percentage of yearly quotas used in fiscal years ending June 30—				
	1928 [1]	1929 [1]	1938	1939	1943 [2]
Belgium	100	100	22	29	10
Czechoslovakia	100	100	99	100	14
Denmark	100	100	27	26	11
Finland	100	100	88	83	22
France	100	100	25	33	12
Germany	100	100	71	100	6
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	100	100	5	5	3
Greece	100	100	100	100	99
Hungary	100	100	100	100	21
Ireland	100	87	8	8	1
Italy	100	100	61	75	4
Netherlands	100	100	12	38	7
Norway	100	100	24	19	5
Poland	100	100	84	100	27
Portugal	100	100	78	84	60
Russia (U. S. S. R.)	100	100	42	95	17
Spain	100	100	100	99	100
Sweden	100	100	11	11	3
Switzerland	100	100	25	46	6
Syria and Lebanon	100	100	100	100	38
Turkey	100	100	100	100	57
Yugoslavia	100	100	100	100	12

[1] The quotas in 1928 and 1929 differed from those of later years; the so-called national origins quotas went into effect on July 1, 1929.

[2] To conform with the statistics for the earlier years, decimal figures have been dropped from the 1943 percentages

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it has been said by several who, as near as I can find out, have never been in China but have had some contact with Chinese immigrants of the coolie class who were brought to the west coast by ourselves many years ago, that the Chinese do not care about this giving them an immigration quota on a basis of equality with our other allies; that all they want is the removal of the discrimination in the old exclusion acts; that they do not want to be treated as equals with human beings, but only want to be treated on a basis of equality with the other peoples against whom we have discriminated in Asia for so long.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman speaks about the Chinese that certain Members have spoken of as having had contacts as "coolie laborers who came in a long time ago." The Exclusion Act was devised for the very purpose of excluding coolie labor and in that regard it was successful. They are the very ones who in the nature of things could not have been the ones with whom the previous speakers had their contacts.

Mr. JUDD. But as far as Chinese becoming citizens is concerned, or their coming in under a quota, the law applies to Chinese indiscriminately except for the limited classifications of ministers and professors, and a few others.

Mr. GEARHART. As implied by the question, the Chinese coolies he refers to are the Chinese I have grown up with and gone to school and played with and helped to learn the English language. The coolies at that time were excluded because we did not want the Chinese coolie labor in this country to enter into competition with American labor.

Mr. JUDD. I think that perhaps the original exclusion acts were as good as could be developed at the time. But they are outmoded now by the quota method. We used to give quinine for treatment of pneumonia; it was the best we had. But now we have sulfadiazine and sulfapyridine. We do not insist on continuing to use quinine, just because it once was the best we had. We have far better drugs now and therefore we use them. Even so, we want to use the quota method now as the way to regulate Chinese immigration.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that the exclusion acts in their practical operation merely excluded Chinese coolie laborers?

Mr. JUDD. No; the present Immigration Act excludes all persons who are not eligible for citizenship; that is, all persons whose skins are not red, white, or black.

Mr. GEARHART. Under its terms students, ministers, businessmen and persons within some other named classification could be admitted, this in spite of the provisions excluding coolie laborers.

Mr. JUDD. For temporary residence only.

Mr. GEARHART. Of course. The point I wanted to make is that, in effect, only coolie laborers are excluded by the exclusion law. I do not think we are in disagreement.

Mr. JUDD. No Chinese of whatever class or occupation can be admitted for permanent residence on the same basis as persons of the three approved colors.

Mr. Chairman, on the matter of whether this bill means anything more than a sop to the Chinese, I want to read a statement by the great Catholic Bishop of China, Paul Yu-pin, because, as he said, the time has come for plain, candid speaking. This is from the Commonweal of July 2, 1943, reporting an interview with him shortly after the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization decided last June to take no action on this bill. I have time only for some excerpts:

The recent vote of your congressional Committee on Immigration comes as a deadly blow to all we had hoped for.

And what had they hoped for?

We do not wish to have you open your country to a flood of Chinese immigrants. That is your own problem, for you to solve precisely as you wish. It is an internal problem. But we do object to being branded not only as inferior to you but as inferior to all the other nations and races in the world.

No matter how friendly any of us may personally be toward you, we cannot vouch for the thoughts in our countrymen's hearts. They will think the Atlantic Charter is a sham.

Certainly China will keep in the fight until Japan is defeated. In this defeat you, of course, will play a great part. But if your attitude of superiority continues, if the Far East becomes convinced that the United States has forfeited her moral right to leadership, and is fixed in her determination to look down upon the colored races, I can foresee only a prospect which makes me tremble at its horrors.

In that case the next war would almost inevitably be a war between races, and that would mean a war in which not only armies are pitted against each other, armies and industries, but a war in which child is against child, woman against woman, grandfather against grandfather. In such a war there would not even be talk of mercy and decency. It would literally be to the death, and we would not hear of unconditional surrender, but of annihilation. What Christian can envisage such things without being tempted to despair?

Several gentlemen have spoken of the race problem and suggested that in discussing this legislation we are raising it. But we are not raising it now. We raised it by our own laws beginning 60 years ago, and Japan has been raising it constantly in China. This is rather the way to put it down. You cannot dispose of a cancer by turning your head in the other direction or by covering it up with a poultice.

Recently we have had race riots in our country, and every thoughtful person must be concerned about the possibility of a great race war such as Japan has been trying so desperately to whip up. We could not win a race war, even though we won all the battles. The colored peoples are two-thirds of the world's population, and they can outwork and undereat and outlast the white man.

Fortunately, this is not a war between races, and will not become one unless we make it so. If it were, China would be fighting with Japan against us, not with us against Japan. This is still a war between those who believe in human freedom and those who believe in human slavery. We must keep it so. There cannot be a great war between the white and colored races in the next 10 years, or the next 100 years, or the next 300 years, if we keep ourselves—the white people—and the Chinese, the largest and strongest of the colored peoples, on the same side—the side of freedom and democracy. What more important business has Congress than this?

I must beg you as earnestly as I can to believe that granting a quota to the Chinese and making them eligible for citizenship does mean very much, indeed, to them. If it will do them or us any good at all, this bill ought to be passed in toto, because certainly it cannot do us any harm.

Therefore I hope the amendment to strike out section 2 will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, briefly, I hope this amendment will be defeated and I hope that all other amendments that are offered that are germane to the bill will be defeated and that we will pass the bill as the committee reported it.

I expressed my views yesterday when I said that this bill should pass, not only because it is for the best interest of our country; to cement a friendship between our country and China that has existed for a hundred years, but it should pass because it enables us to express our sentiments.

Sometimes interest and sentiment go along together in the consideration of a bill, but when sentiment and interest conflict, we must follow the pathway of interest. But this is a bill where we can follow the pathway of interest to our country and express our sentiment and at the same time extend justice by treating the people of this great country, China, and it is going to be greater in the future with the equality to which they are entitled, and with the equality which I am sure we want to give them—to treat the people of China as equals.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does the gentleman not think that the pending amendment should be defeated?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is just what I stated; I have urged the defeat of the pending amendment and all other amendments and that the bill pass in the form of the bill as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENNETT of Michigan) there were—ayes 21, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703), is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" before the word "descendants", changing the colon after the word "Hemisphere" to a comma, and adding the following: "and Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Page 4, after line 4, add a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That, beginning with the end of hostilities of the present war, no immigrant (as defined in sec. 203, title 8, U. S. C.) shall be admitted into the United States during any calendar year until the number of unemployed persons, including United States war veterans, within the United States, is less than 1,000,000, such number of unemployed persons to be based upon statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor."

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in rising in support of my amendment, I first wish to say that I have a very high regard for the Chinese, that they are a great people, that we are their friends, and we want them to be our friends. I wish to add, however, that there is no better way for America to show her friendship for China than is exemplified by the heroic boys fighting on China soil, some of whom are making the supreme sacrifice. A few days ago a fine young man from my home town, a member of General Chennault's forces, was killed in action in China.

Mr. Chairman, I have presented in this amendment the American Legion amendment. The American Legion at its Omaha convention a few days ago passed a resolution nearly identical with the amendment which I have just offered. You have heard my amendment read, and now I read to you the resolution by the American Legion, as follows:

Be it resolved by the American Legion, in convention assembled in Omaha, Nebr., September 21–23, 1943, That all immigration be barred from the United States from the date of the end of hostilities of the present war until unemployment has dropped to less than 1,000,000.

You will note, therefore, that my amendment, in line with the position of the American Legion, undertakes to stop all quota immigration from the end of hostilities of the present war until the number of unemployed persons, including United States war veterans, is less than 1,000,000. You will note that the figure, 1,000,000, was the same as included in the American Legion resolution. I am informed by those in a position to know that this amendment, if carried, would amount to a ban on all immigration. I have made my fight

throughout the years to protect the American worker and the American veteran from the influx of aliens. This is the objective of the American Legion, and it is where I stand.

I wish to remark, also, in passing that the Veterans of Foreign Wars have passed a strong resolution on the question of immigration at its national encampment in New York city a few days ago and I shall obtain leave and make a letter from the V. F. W. a part of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is in no way antagonistic to the Chinese nor to any race or nationality. It is simply an amendment in behalf of the American worker and the American soldier. It will fully satisfy China. It will not antagonize the Koreans and other Asiatics. It is the only thing that has been offered that will absolutely be fair to every race and every nationality on the face of the globe. It seems to me that it is the only solution to this question. We know that after this war there will be a mad scramble of people from other nations to come here. They came here following the First World War. In 1918, the number of immigrants was 110,618; in 1919, we had 141,132 immigrants; in 1920, the number jumped up to 430,001; and in 1921, we had 805,228 immigrants coming here. Think of it. Nearly 1,000,000 in 1 year. The thing got so bad that Congress had to take further restrictive measures. Right now we have pending in this Congress a resolution which, if passed, might bring literally millions to our shores. I cannot believe the American people want that done. If my amendment should be passed, then there would be no possibility of these great throngs coming from Europe and elsewhere. I, therefore, submit this amendment, Mr. Chairman, which, frankly, will have the effect of shutting out immigration. By its passage, we can be assured that American jobs after the war will go to American workers, including the millions of American soldiers who will be returning from the battle fronts of the world and who will have a right to expect to receive these American jobs.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., October 14, 1943.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At its national encampment which convened in New York City during the period September 28, 29, and 30, 1943, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States went on record as opposing any legislation which would result in a let-down in the immigration or exclusion laws of our country. To this end the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas pressure is being exerted by certain selfish interests for the lifting of immigration restrictions as a means of obtaining an abundance of cheap labor, giving the excuse that wartime conditions necessitate unrestricted importation of labor; and

"Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has consistently opposed unrestricted immigration or influx of aliens who are not potentially good American citizens, and has with equal consistency demanded the deportation of aliens who have manifested traits of character or tendencies which make them unworthy of American citizenship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Forty-fourth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, To hereby go on record in opposition to any let-down in United States immigration or exclusion laws, under any guise whatsoever."

In view of the above the Veterans of Foreign Wars respectfully calls upon all Members of the House of Representatives to oppose any pending legislation which will in any way increase immigration quotas or eliminate present immigration restrictions.

Very sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington

IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES FROM 1820 THROUGH 1940, BY YEARS AND DECADES

(No official records were made of the influx of foreign population to this country prior to 1820. Although the number of immigrants arriving in the United States from the close of the Revolutionary War up to 1820 is not accurately known, it is estimated by good authorities as 250,000. For 1820 to 1867 the following figures are for alien passengers arriving; for 1868 to 1903, for immigrants arriving; for 1904 to 1906, for aliens admitted; and beginning with 1907 for immigrant aliens admitted.)

YEAR AND NUMBER	
1820	8,385
1821	9,127
1822	6,911
1823	6,354
1824	7,912
1825	10,199
1826	10,837
1827	18,875
1828	27,382
1829	22,520
1830	23,322
1831	22,633
1832 [1]	60,482
1833	58,640
1834	65,365
1835	45,374
1836	76,242
1837	79,340
1838	38,914
1839	68,069
1840	84,066
1841	80,289
1842	104,565
1843 [1]	52,496
1844	78,615
1845	114,371
1846	154,416
1847	234,968
1848	226,527
1849	297,024
1850 [2]	369,980
1851	379,466
1852	371,603
1853	368,645
1854	427,833
1855	200,877
1856	200,436
1857	251,306
1858	123,126
1859	121,282
1860	153,640
1861	91,918
1862	91,985
1863	176,282
1864	193,418
1865	248,120
1866	318,568
1867	315,722
1868 [1]	138,840
1869	352,768
1870	387,203
1871	321,350
1872	404,806
1873	459,803
1874	313,339
1875	227,498
1876	169,986
1877	141,857
1878	138,469
1879	177,826
1880	457,257
1881	669,431
1882	788,992
1883	603,322
1884	518,592
1885	395,346
1886	334,203
1887	490,109
1888	546,889
1889	444,427
1890	455,302
1891	560,319
1892	579,663
1893	439,730
1894	285,631
1895	258,536
1896	343,267
1897	230,832
1898	229,299
1899	311,715
1900	448,572
1901	487,918
1902	648,743
1903	857,046
1904	812,870
1905	1,026,499
1906	1,100,735
1907	1,285,349
1908	782,870
1909	751,786
1910	1,041,570
1911	878,587
1912	838,172
1913	1,197,892
1914	1,218,480
1915	323,700
1916	298,823
1917	295,403
1918	110,618
1919	141,132
1920	430,001
1921	805,228
1922	309,556
1923	522,919
1924	706,896
1925	294,314
1926	304,488
1927	335,175
1928	307,255
1929	279,678
1930	241,700
1931	97,139
1932	35,576
1933	23,068
1934	29,470
1935	34,956
1936	36,329
1937	50,244
1938	67,895
1939	82,998
1940	70,756
1941	51,776
1942	28,781
1943	23,725
Total	38,290,443

[1] 1832 covers 15 months ended Dec. 31; 1843 covers 9 months ended Sept. 30; [2] 1850 covers 15 months ended Dec. 31; 1868 covers 6 months ended June 30. Other periods cover 12 months, 1820 to 1831, and 1844 to 1849 ended Sept. 30; 1833 to 1842, and 1851 to 1867 ended Dec. 31; and 1869 to 1940 ended June 30.

PERIOD AND NUMBER	
1820 to 1830	151,824
1831 to 1840	599,125
1841 to 1850	1,713,251
1851 to 1860	2,598,214
1861 to 1870	2,314,824
1871 to 1880	2,812,191
1881 to 1890	5,246,613
1891 to 1900	3,687,564
1901 to 1910	8,795,386
1911 to 1920	5,735,811
1921 to 1930	4,107,209
1931 to 1940	528,431

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane. Does the gentleman from Louisiana wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I concede that the point of order is well taken but I had hoped that the gentleman would let this Congress pass on this question

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

SAVE FACE

Mr. Chairman, the term "save face" has been bandied around this Chamber a great deal within the last few days. It is an expression which comes from the Orient and refers to a large extent to embarrassment and loss of prestige. There are those who suggest that we so arrange our laws as to permit China to save face and that by rearranging our immigration laws, we may throw out to a war-weary land a gesture of good will and friendship. There are those in this body who seem to feel that this action on our part will give new hope and confidence to the teeming hundreds of millions of Chinese people and will also go far to discharge our obligation to a land ravaged, pillaged, burned, and raped.

I do not share this feeling, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe such a gesture will be even the starting point of the help, aid, and comfort which we should give to the people of China. Instead of telling these people that we will permit them to bring 105 of their nationals each year into this country provided they can run the gamut of the Jap Fleet and dodge the terror of the Jap Air Force which had invaded and completely surrounds this unhappy country, instead of making this idle boast and empty gesture, I would give them substantial aid.

Gen. Claire Chennault, who was the organizer of the Flying Tigers, and who has an intimate acquaintance throughout China, once said, "I know of no place where so much can be done with so little as in China." This is a most significant statement from a great officer and a man truly interested in the liberation of China. It gives us our indication into that type of aid which Gen. Chiang Kai-shek needs and has a right to expect from us.

When Pearl Harbor descended like a black cloud upon us, and in one fleeting moment we were engulfed completely into the vortex of this great war, the Chinese people had already been fighting for over 5 years. They had been, like us, the subject of unwanted and unprovoked attack; they had been invaded, their coastal cities sacked and burned by Jap soldiers, and their rivers channeled by Jap gunboats. Great stretches of fertile countryside, running back hundreds of miles from the coast, had been conquered by a ruthless Jap war machine and subjected to frightful scenes of barbarism unequaled in the annals of history.

At the critical time, when it appeared that China could no longer carry on, we came to her side. We sent our gallant officers and airmen into China to give them encouragement and to aid in the training of their own soldiers. For a time it looked that we were going to go far toward giving substantial aid, which this afflicted people had a right to expect from us, who came as a new entry into the struggle. In this we have dismally failed.

Although we have been in this war about 2 years, China has seen only a few of our airplanes and almost no other equipment. The original boasts of succor have been almost forgotten by the world in the realization of our present failure to give material aid. If we are really interested in our ally in the far Orient, we should begin to give real help. Our help should not go merely in the form of a repealed statute, which will not kill a single Jap nor recover a single mile of conquered territory from the heel of the enemy. It should be in the form of more airplanes, more guns, ammunition, tanks, and military equipment. It should be in the form of more trained soldiers and skilled pilots who can map out the strategy and build up the organization to drive the foe into the sea. We should bend every effort toward opening the Burma Road, placing the sinews of war into the willing hands of a China that wants to fight to be free.

Just a little of this material aid will go a long way toward reviving the drooping spirits of our Chinese allies. It will offset, as no other action on our part can do, the Japanese propaganda against us. I hope this House by its action will encourage the executive department of Government to give all-time aid of a material nature to China.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3070 to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 314, reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 149]

Andrews	Graham	Mott
Bates, Ky.	Hare	O'Connor
Chapman	Hartley	Plumley
Clark	Hendricks	Smith, Maine
Cullen	Izac	Steagall
Dies	Jackson	Taylor
Dirksen	Lewis, Colo.	Troutman
Ditter	McGehee	Wene
Domengeaux	McLean	Wilson
Douglas	McMurray	Winter
Fogarty	Merrow	
Furlong	Morrison, La.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Moved by Mr. BENNETT of Michigan that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization with instructions to report it back forthwith with an amendment striking out all of section 2 thereof.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 308), and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 307, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXAMINERS AND OTHER PERSONNEL BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 325 be, rereferred to the Committee on Accounts from the Committee on Rules. I have taken this matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and he is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

KITTY HAWK DAY IN NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, December 17 will mark the fortieth anniversary of the first heavier-than-air ship to ever fly, which event occurred on the coast of North Carolina at Kill Devils Hill, Dare County, N. C.

Each year, Mr. Speaker, there is held a commemoration of this event. So outstanding have been these affairs, particularly this year since aviation has played such a great part in our national defense, and its birth having occurred in North Carolina, that the Governor of North Carolina has set aside December 17 as Kitty Hawk Day and has issued a proclamation that the State so observe the day and has appointed a commission to see that proper exercises commemorating the event are carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the proclamation of the Governor of North Carolina and the names of the committee he has appointed to carry out the celebration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, October 8, 1943.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HERBERT: Throughout the Nation, particularly in aviation circles, there has been manifested much interest in the suitable observance of the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk. This event occurs on December 17, 1943. You may recall that some time ago I wrote you about this event.

In deference to this sentiment and by reason of the great significance of the anniversary this year, I have issued a proclamation declaring December 17, 1943, as Kitty Hawk Day, copy of the proclamation being herewith enclosed. Also I have named a Statewide committee to plan for this event and have taken the liberty of naming you as chairman of the committee. I sincerely hope that you can serve.

I would suggest a meeting of the committee at some reasonably early date in the Governor's office at Raleigh, the date to be suitable to your convenience. If you will write to me suggesting some suitable dates, I will be glad to have the call for the meeting issued from my office on your behalf.

I enclose herewith copy of press release which gives the names and addresses of the committee as appointed by me.

Cordially yours,

J. M. BROUGHTON.

[Enclosures.]

In connection with the proclamation setting aside December 17, 1943, the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight in history, as Kitty Hawk Day, Governor Broughton today announced the appointment of a committee to plan for the appropriate observance of this event, such anniversary ceremony to be held at Kitty Hawk at noon on the anniversary date. The committee as appointed by the Governor is as follows:

Herbert C. Bonner, Washington, chairman; Josephus Daniels, Raleigh; Judge Richard D. Dixon, Edenton; H. W. Kendall, Greensboro; James B. Ficklen, Greenville; Stratton Poyner, Winston-Salem; R. Bruce Etheridge, Manteo; Herbert Peele, Elizabeth City; Miles Clark, Elizabeth City; Dr. William Parker, Elizabeth City; Dick Brown, Charlotte; Bill Sharpe, Burlington; Josh L. Horne, Jr., Rocky Mount; Robert L. Thompson, High Point; Miss Gertrude Carraway, New Bern.

The Governor also announced that he would ask the recently appointed aeronautics commission of the State to cooperate with the Kitty Hawk committee in planning this event. The aeronautics commission is composed of the following:

Roy Rowe, Burgaw; E. C. Brooks, Jr., Durham; Lee H. Smith, Burlington; Ben E. Douglas, Charlotte; William C. Olson, Raleigh.

The Governor stated that a special committee of citizens of Manteo would be later named to look after local arrangements for this event.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

Forty years ago, amidst the sand dunes at Kitty Hawk, N. C., two brothers, then obscure but since made famous, began experiments for the purpose of testing and confirming their conviction that machines heavier than air could be made to fly. In this seemingly fantastic endeavor, which was met with scepticism and even ridicule, they devoted many long hours and days of effort, experiment, and frustration. Ultimately their efforts were crowned with success, and on December 17, 1903, the world was electrified at the announcement that for the first time in history a heavier-than-air machine had on that day been successfully flown at Kitty Hawk. Thus the airplane was born. Its creators were the immortal Wright brothers, Wilbur and Orville; and its place of birth was Kitty Hawk, N. C.

The fortieth anniversary of this epochal event, December 17, 1943, will come in the midst of the greatest war in history—a war in which the airplane will be the decisive implement of victory for democracy, decency, and righteousness in the epochal struggle against aggression, brutality, and slavery.

Before this global war and its tragic consequences had thrown a shadow over the face of the earth the airplane was already revolutionizing the transportation and communications of the world. This swift messenger of peace and friendliness as between nations, this harbinger of a new world of trade and good will, had already served to bring the world closer together. In the miracle of this winged swiftness the farthest nations of the earth had been brought closer together in understanding and in commercial relationship. After the carnage of war is over and when victory is crowned, the airplane, immeasurably stimulated in its production and perfection, will prove the indispensable agency for rebuilding a disordered and mutilated world.

Under these circumstances, it is altogether fitting that the anniversary date of this world-changing event should be appropriately observed at the place of its occurrence.

Now, therefore, I, J. Melville Broughton, Governor of the State of North Carolina, do hereby designate Friday, December 17, 1943, as Kitty Hawk Day, and do hereby call upon all citizens of North Carolina, and insofar as I may be privileged to do so all citizens of an America grateful for the achievement of the Wright brothers, to give suitable observance to this deeply significant event, and further do call upon all who are vitally connected with the airplane industry in America and upon representatives of the Army and Navy and governmental agencies to designate and delegate official representatives to attend a suitable observance of this event which will be held at Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1943, when and where appropriate tribute can be paid to the memory of Wilbur Wright, now deceased, and to Orville Wright, the surviving member of this world-famous partnership endeavor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and cause the Great Seal of the State of North Carolina to be affixed at Raleigh, the capital, this the 6th day of October A. D. 1943.

[SEAL] J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON,
Governor.

Attest:

ALLSTON STUBBS,
Private Secretary.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, October 18, 1943.

Mr. ORVILLE WRIGHT,
Dayton, Ohio.

MY DEAR MR. WRIGHT: As you may have noted already, we have planned here in North Carolina to make suitable observance of the anniversary of the first flight. Since this the fortieth anniversary occurs in the midst of a war in which aviation will be the determining factor, it has occurred to us that the observance should be attended by more than the usual planning and preparation. By proclamation, copy of which is enclosed, I have officially designated December 17, 1943, as Kitty Hawk Day.

I have named a committee to plan a suitable event at Kitty Hawk and have appointed as chairman of the committee Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina Representative in Congress from our First Congressional District.

We are extending invitations to many leading figures in the field of aviation. First of all, however, we are exceedingly anxious to have you present for this significant event.

On behalf of the committee and of the State of North Carolina, I am writing to extend you an invitation to attend the ceremonies which will be held at Kitty Hawk at noon on December 17, and to make such remarks as you may deem appropriate for this occasion.

With greatest respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. M. BROUGHTON,
Governor of North Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 763.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the Chinese exclusion bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein resolutions adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, also certain statistics with reference to immigration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my comments pertaining to the ac-

tivities of the Navy Department, and to include therein some statistical studies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] if he can tell us the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Nothing is scheduled for Monday.

On Tuesday the fathers' draft bill, on which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has just obtained permission to have until midnight tonight to file a report, will come up, in the event that a rule is reported on the bill, as I hope it will be. I believe we should dispose of this bill as quickly as possible.

After that, nothing is scheduled for the remainder of next week, with the exception, of course, of any matter that may be taken up by unanimous consent. However, the only bill scheduled for next week is that bill from the Committee on Military Affairs on Tuesday. If the rule is not reported out in time for the bill to be considered on Tuesday, as I hope it will be, it will come up on Wednesday, if it is reported out for consideration then, but I would prefer Tuesday.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. May I ask what the plan is in regard to calling up the legislation, in which many of us are interested, to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. McCORMACK. No rule has yet been reported out on that bill. Has the committee report on the bill been filed yet?

Mr. PACE. I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of the report's having been filed yet. I cannot see how it can be brought up until after election day. There are elections November 2 in two or three States and several communities. Some Members are interested in these elections. It is only proper and fitting that we should have regard for the fact that they are interested in them. These Members should have the opportunity of expressing their opinions on the coming elections in their States and in their communities.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman says there are several States that will have important elections on November 2. Two of my objectors on the Consent Calendar happen to live in those States, one in New York and one in New Jersey. They are wondering if the call of the Consent Calendar scheduled for November 1 could be deferred for a few days.

Mr. McCORMACK. I intended to ask unanimous consent for that next week, but I think this is an appropriate time to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar a week from next Monday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I make this statement for the benefit of the Members of the House and for the information of the floor leader as well? The House Committee on Military Affairs will be in session in about 5 minutes for the purpose of further considering a bill relating to the termination of war contracts. This has developed into one of the most important propositions ever to come before our committee. I do not suppose we would be able to get that bill to the floor of the House in time next week, but if we do not we will certainly have it here by the week following.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall give it as early consideration after it is reported as I can.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the vice president of the John B. Stetson Co., an industry of my district, together with my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a eulogy by the late Dr. Glenn Frank, former president of the University of Wisconsin, of Dr. Stephen Moulton Babcock, the one-hundredth anniversary of whose birth is tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Greeley Daily Tribune, of Greeley, Colo., of October 18, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the legislative business and after special orders heretofore made on that day I be permitted to proceed for 30 minutes on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the milk question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning the problem of butter and include an article by one of the citizens of my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an interesting article on the seventh annual observance of Pulaski Day which took place in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee today and include certain quotations from magazines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article recently published in the Jersey Journal by Helen L. Manning on juvenile delinquency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONRONEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REGULATION OF THE INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, shortly after the reconvening of the present session of Congress, the gentleman from New York, Congressman HANCOCK, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] introduced similar bills, H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270, to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and Otcober 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business.

This legislation is of great importance, not only to every insurance company in the United States but to every holder of an insurance policy. I am sure that most of my colleagues know that I have the honor to represent the First Congressional District of Connecticut. Within that district is the city of Hartford—the capital city of Connecticut. Hartford is often referred to as the "Insurance center of the world." In Hartford are located the home offices of many of the larger fire- and life-insurance companies. For that reason I am particularly interested in this proposed legislation.

In addition to representing thousands of men and women who are engaged in the insurance business, I might also add that for several years I have been engaged in the general business of insurance, although I have never been directly employed by any insurance company. I have always been proud of my association with the insurance business. I know many of the men who direct our insurance companies and I do not believe that a finer group of loyal, patriotic, law-abiding citizens could be found in any business anywhere in the world.

The fire-insurance business in the United States has grown tremendously in the last 90 years. Those who founded our first fire-insurance companies learned a lot as they went along with the business. The first fire-insurance companies were rather loosely organized—they had no record of past experience. In the early days, a few men got together, pooled their resources and formed a fire-insurance company. If, at the end of the year, the premium income was substantially larger than the amount paid out in losses, they declared themselves a dividend and hoped that next year would prove just as successful. But, as time went on and they gained experience, they evolved a sound method of setting up reserves. They found sound methods of determining adequate premiums. From such small beginning has grown some of the largest and soundest institutions in the world.

I am not at all surprised that there are some who want to bring all insurance under control of the Federal Government. What a vast bureau would be required to regulate the business of insurance companies of all kinds. The Social Security set-up would be a small department in comparison to the administrative staff necessary for this anticipated bureau. The argument has already been advanced that insurance companies have grown to such size that it is beyond the ability of the several States to control it. Probably no business has been subject to the same degree of State regulation as fire insurance. Every phase of fire insurance has been exhaustively studied, carefully experimented with and eventually subjected to detail regulation.

The regulation had its inception over 90 years ago when New Hampshire established a board of insurance commissioners, followed by Massachusetts the next year, and by Rhode Island 3 years later. By 1890, when the Sherman Act became law, 18 States had established independent insurance departments. At the present time and for many years past, every State has had an insurance department.

A few months ago the Department of Justice obtained an indictment in the northern district of Georgia against 198 insurance corporations and 27 individuals, charging them with a conspiracy to fix noncompetitive rates on fire insurance in violation of the antitrust laws. The defendants filed a demurrer which was sustained by District Judge Underwood on August 5, 1943. An appeal from this decision to the Supreme Court has been taken by the Government, and is now pending. The passage of the bills to which I have referred has no effect on the indictment already obtained. The Department of Justice can try these cases either before or after this proposed legislation has been enacted into law.

Last Tuesday, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] inserted in the RECORD as part of his remarks, an editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer in which it is claimed that insurance companies in 5 States charged $52,000,000 to policyholders and only returned eighteen million in losses. If the author of that editorial would only take the trouble to look up the facts, he would find that fire-insurance companies in the States he mentioned actually retained about 3½ percent of the premium income and not 40 percent.

It has been said that life-insurance companies are not interested in this matter. That statement is far from the truth, as I know of my own knowledge. True, life-insurance companies do not operate rating bureaus—they don't need them—but the life-insurance companies know that if the States are denied the right to continue the control of fire-insurance companies, they are next on the list.

The scurrilous story now being circulated about a $700,000 slush fund to bring about enactment of this legislation does not impress me. I don't believe a word of that story. If those who circulate it have one iota of proof, why don't they turn it over to the Department of Justice?

This matter should be of interest to every Member of Congress. The speedy passage of the proposed legislation may well be the turning point in the threat towards centralizing all power in Washington. If the bright young men in the Justice Department wanted to bring insurance under control of the Federal Government and consider it commerce under the Sherman Act, why did they not come to Congress for legislation? I wish every Member of this House would read the argument presented by the lawyers in the Justice Department during hearings before Judge Underwood in Atlanta, Ga. These Government lawyers argued in the brief that fire insurance is commerce and thus commerce subject to the Sherman Act, but cited no judicial authority so holding. Instead, they attacked the Supreme Court for holding uniformally over the past 75 years that fire insurance is not commerce. They pictured the Supreme Court as having handed down dictum based upon a misconception, having failed to comprehend; having followed the path of least resistance. In short, the Government asked the court to decide that fire insurance is commerce and thus to sustain the indictment on the theory that the Supreme Court has wrongly decided the other way. So say the bright young men about the opinions of some of the finest Justices who ever sat on our Supreme Court. That crowd has no more respect for the decisions of those learned Justices than they have for an act of Congress.

If, by some strange freak of fate the Supreme Court should sustain the contention of the Department of Justice, conditions in the insurance companies would certainly be chaotic. Strong companies would be ruined before Congress could act. There is no emergency now. We can study this matter calmly and unhurriedly, and thus save a great business from ruin. We would have a situation where certain States would require fire-insurance companies to establish rating bureaus while, under the contention of the Federal Government, those who participated in the creation of such rating bureaus would be violating Federal law. State regulation is based upon principles so diametrically opposed to the Sherman Act that it is inconceivable that State regulation and the Sherman Act could both be applicable at the present time.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not true that if the insurance companies were put on a competitive basis, the diminution of business would affect the weaker companies and they would go out of business, and subject the risks under their jurisdiction to a loss?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very definitely so. I hope to come to that question very shortly.

For the States, on the one hand, it is encouraging the restriction of competition of fire insurance through State regulation, while on the other hand the Federal Government would be demanding restricted competition in fire insurance through the Sherman Act. The State regulation on such theory would be an unconstitutional nullification of Federal statute.

Over a period of 75 years the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that neither fire insurance nor the business of fire insurance is commerce. In 1868 the Supreme Court held this squarely in the leading case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (75 U. S. 168), as follows:

> Issuing a policy of insurance is not a transaction of commerce. The policies are simple contracts of indemnity against loss by fire, entered into between the corporations and the assured, for a consideration paid by the latter. These contracts are not articles of commerce in any proper meaning of the word. They are not subjects of trade and barter offered in the market as something having an existence and value independent of the parties to them. They are not commodities to be shipped or forwarded from one State to another, and then put up for sale. They are like other personal contracts between parties which are completed by their signature and the transfer of the consideration. Such contracts are not interstate transactions, though the parties may be domiciled in different States. They are, then, local transactions, and are governed by the local law. They do not constitute a part of the commerce between States.

The decision of Paul against Virginia has been repeatedly and consistently followed by the Supreme Court and has never been questioned. In 1895, the Supreme Court reaffirmed its view of insurance in *Hooper* v. *California* (155 U. S. 648) stating:

> The business of insurance is not commerce. The contract of insurance is not an instrumentality of commerce.

In 1900 the Supreme Court again so ruled in *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Cravens* (178 U. S. 389):

> That the business of fire insurance is not interstate commerce is decided in *Paul* v. *Virginia; Liverpool Insurance Co.* v. *Massachusetts; Philadelphia Fire Association* v. *New York*. That the business of marine insurance is not, is decided in *Hooper* v. *California*. In the latter case, it is said that the contention that it is "involves an erroneous conception of what constitutes interstate commerce."

Strenuous efforts were made in *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Deer Lodge County* (231 U. S. 495), to secure a reversal of Paul against Virginia. Dean Pound, of the Harvard Law School, on behalf of the insurance companies, presented every conceivable argument for reversal. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court refused to adopt any of these arguments for overruling its holding that insurance is not commerce and, in reaffirming Paul against Virginia, and succeeding cases, stated:

> If we consider these cases numerically, the deliberation of their reasoning, and the time they cover, they constitute a formidable body of authority and strongly invoke the sanction of the rule of stare decisis. This we especially emphasize, for all of the cases concerned, as the case at bar does, the validity of State legislation, and under varying circumstances the same principle was applied in all of them. For over 45 years they have been the legal justification for such legislation. To reverse the cases, therefore, would require us to promulgate a new rule of constitutional inhibition upon the States and which would compel a change of their policy and a readjustment of their laws. Such result necessarily urges against a change of decision.

I could cite case after case in which the Supreme Court reiterated the reasoning expressed in the decisions that I have just read. In addition to decisions of the Supreme Court, Congress has stated, and repeatedly acted on the assumption that insurance is not commerce within the meaning of the Sherman Act. Indeed, in 1920, on the one occasion that Congress was induced to pass on the question of whether a phase of insurance was subject to the antitrust laws, Congress declared that it was not. Congressional recognition that insurance is not commerce is further found in the long history of attempt to obtain congressional regulation of insurance. Congress has consistently refused to regulate insurance and has expressed the belief that it lacks the constitutional power so to legislate.

In 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt in his message to Congress dealt with the question of regulating interstate insurance transactions. Consideration of this portion of his message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. The report of the Judiciary Committee stated:

> The question as to the power of Congress to regulate and control insurance corporations created by the States has been squarely and fully presented to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Court has many times held that insurance is not commerce, and that Congress has no power to regulate insurance corporations or their business. The views of the Supreme Court have practically met the approval of the bar and businessmen of the United States as being in accordance with law and common sense.
>
> If there was any doubt upon the subject, it has been dispelled by the argument made for Federal control. All at once it is voiced throughout the Nation that a way out of the difficulty has been discovered, and the happy thought is suggested that Congress can declare insurance to be commerce, and that on account of the great interests involved the Supreme Court will reverse itself and the law of the Nation and hold the legislation constitutional. The suggestion is not very complimentary to the Supreme Court that, on account of great interests involved, that tribunal would reverse its decisions for a century, absolutely wipe out and destroy the police powers of the States that have so many times been upheld by that Court.

As a sidelight upon consideration in Congress of regulatory statutes relating to insurance, it is to be noted that the 1940 platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties contained planks upholding State—as distinguished from Federal—regulation of insurance. The Democratic platform contained the provision—

> We favor strict supervision of all forms of the insurance business by the several States for the protection of policyholders and the public—

While the Republican platform contained the provision—

> We condemn the New Deal attempts to destroy the confidence of our people in private insurance institutions. We favor a continuance of regulation of insurance by the several States.

The most widely accepted solution to the rate problem was found in statutes which require or permit fire-insurance companies to be members of rating bureaus and to adhere to rates promulgated by those bureaus. These rating bureaus are organizations set up and maintained by fire-insurance companies to establish for their members uniform fire-insurance rates on all properties within their jurisdiction. A rating bureau has a staff of trained experts to study hazards of risks and loss experiences of its members; establish schedules for classes of risks; and apply those schedules to individual risks to arrive at a rate for each individual risk.

In the States which specifically provide by statute that insurance companies may or must be members of rating bureaus, the usual requirement is that the bureau rates must be filed with the State insurance commission. It is further provided that the members must maintain the bureau rates unless they file advance notice of a deviation or variation from a bureau rate with the bureau and the commission. This new rate must be uniform, and applicable to all risks of essentially the same hazard in the class for which the variation is made. In some States it does not become effective until approved by the State commission, and in some the deviation must be made effective for not less than a year.

If a rating bureau were not maintained by groups of fire-insurance companies, who would pay for the services rendered by these bureaus? Certainly no one company could operate them without increasing premiums tremendously. The theory of rating bureaus and of cooperative action and accord by the fire-insurance companies in arriving at procedure for rating or actual ratings stem from the fundamental theory of insurance itself. Insurance is cooperative. It is a device by which men share the burden of loss by fire. The guiding principle is that each person who is insured shall contribute to the burden for the payment of losses and expenses, automatically, in accordance with the hazard on the risk. No one company is large enough to determine from a single experience rating, with a degree of accuracy which can be secured by a combination and agreement between the companies who pool their experience and agree upon rating procedure.

Aside from this, even if one company could do a scientific job, the experience would be prohibitive or would result in rates that would burden the public. Therefore the States have not only encouraged it, but, in many instances, required coordinated action between companies in the most scientific rating procedure possible. Of course, none is perfect. Such a procedure is necessary for companies because not only by statutes but from business prudence, no company will carry all of a large risk.

For example, in a plant where the policy is several million dollars, while it may be written in one company, that company will, generally speaking, carry only a small part of the risk. It is automatically reinsured by that company in many companies. Obviously, in order to protect the business and the original writing company, this reinsurance must be automatic. Obviously also the company will not undertake to write automatic reinsurance unless they know in advance that the rate charged for the particular risk to be written is a proper one and that the details of the policy are standard details. In short, all the companies involved as reinsurers must particularly know the details and provisions of the policy and rates in advance.

If this were not true, there could be no insurance of very large risks. The rating procedure outlined is advantageous to the policyholder because he gets the resources of many companies for the payment of a possible loss. This procedure has been material in the reduction of rates over the last 30 years, Nation-wide, of over 40 percent. Not only may the individual policyholder secure rate reduction but a city or municipality may also by adopting standards of fire prevention such as water system, alarm system, and the like, secure a reduction for the entire community.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not a fact that at times the rate on insurance of all nature is reduced during the term of insurance as a result of these rating bureaus?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very definitely so. Not only the premium rate for a specific policy but the rate for the whole community can be reduced if the community makes certain changes suggested by underwriters employed by bureaus created by the fire-insurance companies. For instance, a small town may put in an alarm system, or install hydrants which will bring about a reduction to every policyholder in the community.

Mr. ROWE. A restudy of the rates by the rating bureau is with the objective in mind of reducing the cost of the cooperative plan of sustaining that loss?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Definitely so.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. COMPTON. Is it not true that if this bill were to pass, confusion would reign throughout the country in the fire-insurance business? And is it not true that probably these people who offer this suggestion have not thought through to a conclusion what confusion might obtain?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure they have not. I referred to the fact that last Tuesday our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] spoke on this subject. Any man with even limited experience in the insurance business could answer every contention made. There was no argument presented in Atlanta by Government lawyers except that the Supreme Court for the last 75 years did not know what they were talking about; that they were old fogies and they did not understand it. They did not comprehend; but that these bright young fellows knew all about it.

Mr. COMPTON. Is it not true that this thing was offered so that in this confusing time of war another one of these enormous New Deal agencies could be set up to further destroy State rights—what few State rights we have left?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Some fear so, but I am more concerned about the gentleman's original contention that if, by some strange freak of fate, the Supreme Court should sustain the Department of Justice there would be chaos and confusion worse confounded. The insurance companies would be compelled to set up rating bureaus under the laws of the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, for example, and if they did so, under the opinion of the present Department of Justice, they would be violating the antitrust laws.

Mr. COMPTON. But the point I made is that in their zeal to set up another agency in Washington to look after all of the States of the Nation they have overlooked this terrific confusion.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think they have overlooked it, all right.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. On the question of rates, I understand that during the last 30 years the average rates of the fire-insurance companies have been reduced 40 percent.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is correct information.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. My mind is open on this question, although some very fine friends of mine, whose opinions I respect deeply, and whose opinions will receive very profound consideration from me, favor the bill.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut for the very fine presentation he has made containing valuable information that will be of interest to every Member.

My purpose in asking the gentleman to yield is to make the observation and to express the hope that we should continue to support all bills on their merits rather than talking about New Deal objectives or purposes. Let us decide these questions on a broad, high plane and determine them on their merits.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], will agree with me that no matter how it is decided, it is of great importance to our people and to the business interests of this country to find a correct answer to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from Connecticut says that the bill was introduced for one purpose only, that purpose is to immune insurance companies from prosecution under the antitrust laws of the Federal Government. Is that true?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is not what I said. This legislation does not give them any immunity that they have not had for the last hundred years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then why do we need all of these bills if they have had that immunity for the last hundred years? Why do we want to put through these bills?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman from Texas may not have been here for all of the last half hour. There is only one bill. The same proposal has been made by four different Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I have been here listening to everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I tried to make myself clear that while I felt that no court could sustain the position taken by the Department of Justice, nevertheless we do not know what some court may decide, and that is why I want to make a study of this whole thing and come to a proper conclusion before anything like that happens.

Why should any agency of the Government try to write a law, when the Congress itself has refused to say on many occasions that insurance is commerce under the Sherman Act, and the Supreme Court of the United States has said, 27 times, over a period of 75 years, that insurance is not commerce under the Sherman-Clayton Act, and as recently as August 5, Judge Underwood in his decision said that if this dictum was going to be upset it would have to be by some other court than his.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then the reason for introducing these bills is due to the fact that insurance companies are afraid that the Supreme Court might render an opinion adverse to them in the case that is now pending?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There is always a possibility that a court may rule that way, but the insurance companies certainly have an obligation to protect their policyholders and that is why I believe it is necessary to study this matter now. The only thing the insurance companies are afraid of is that the laws written by Congress will be ignored.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman who is an author of the proposal under discussion, my colleague, Mr. HANCOCK.

Mr. HANCOCK. It has been the settled law in this country for 90 years that the control over fire insurance and all other forms of insurance belongs to the State. Now through this criminal suit the Department of Justice is attempting to change that law and to change a policy followed by the courts since insurance was first discovered as an institution, and we feel that if that policy, if that law, is to be changed, it is the business of the Congress to do it, and not the Department of Justice.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Another important fact is, I think, it would be a misconception of the purpose of the bills to say they seek to establish immunities which the insurance companies do not now have; but to retain the rights they presently have.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is my contention; to retain those rights.

Let no one shed crocodile tears for the little policyholder in this discussion. If the present successful system of operating under State control is destroyed, it will be the little fellow who will suffer, not the big fellow.

There cannot be any monopoly in the fire-insurance business as now operated in the United States. Anyone can start a new company at any time. Just think of the chaos that would result if every company issued a different policy form with hundreds of variations. Some may say, Why not wait and see what the Supreme Court will do? Unfortunately, for the sake of its policyholders, the insurance companies cannot take the chance.

As my time draws to a close, may I emphasize that the passage of H. R. 3269, or any of its companion bills, will not give to any fire-insurance company any privilege it has not possessed since its inception. This proposed legislation does not restrict the operation of the antitrust law.

THE A. A. A. AND COTTON LOANS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of Congress to something which has been done for the cotton farmer by the Congress but from which he is not receiving the full benefits intended on account of dereliction of duty on the part of the A. A. A., certainly insofar as my district in South Carolina is concerned.

Through appropriations and legislation, directly and indirectly, Congress has developed a plan which permits a farmer who does not want to sell his cotton to put that cotton in loan to the Government and receive 90 percent of the parity price. And the Commodity Credit Corporation, which directs the program, has arranged elaborate regulations for approval of warehouse facilities for the cotton to see that it is safe and does not deteriorate.

Now, it develops that in South Carolina few approved warehouses are available. Many warehouses are not interested in cotton storage because of the rates. The Office of Price Administration has approved a 20-percent increase in rates in two Western States, and I believe has increased rates in another area by 12 percent. But no increase has been allowed in the ceiling in South Carolina.

But an increase in storage rates is not my primary interest. A reasonable return to warehousemen is, of course, desirable; but any increase at all would be borne by the cotton producers. The real fault lies in the failure to inform farmers of the private storage plan.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, through State and county offices, administers the storage program in the field and sets up a county committee elected by farmers, with the county agent acting in an ex officio capacity. Despite the fact that educational work is part of the A. A. A. program, somewhere down the line from the A. A. A. in Washington or from the State office to the farmer the information about the storage of loan cotton got lost. And farmers tell me they do not know where to turn. Not 1 in 50 have ever been informed that there is a private storage plan or how it works. I can come to no other conclusion but that the A. A. A. has deliberately failed to inform the county committees and the cotton farmers about the storage program in order to reduce the amount of cotton placed in Government loan. It is too late now to appreciably remedy the situation in regard to the 1943 crop as most of the crop has been forced on the market, but this neglect on the part of the A. A. A. should not be allowed to happen again.

Many farmers have no approved warehouses in their own community, and rather than pay hauling charges elsewhere they simply sell at what price they can get. As a direct result of this practice farmers in my congressional district have lost thousands of dollars this year.

In this connection, here is a statement from a well-informed farmer in Chesterfield County, S. C., in my district:

> It cost a good bit more money to make this crop than it cost to make the 1942 crop, and we are not going to get as much per pound for cotton this year as we got last year. * * * The farmers have been selling cotton here for about $10 per bale less than the Government loan because we have no warehouse near to put the cotton in.

Finally he says:

> I believe if you men up there will think the matter over you will see that the farmer is not being treated right.

Mr. Speaker, to me the last part of that sentence is a masterpiece of understatement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly about one war industry which holds no cost-plus contracts, in which the workers are not drawing high wages, in which the workweek is limited only by the strength of the worker, which awards no banners for excellence, and without which the war would be lost in a matter of days. That industry is the farm.

Consumers in cities do not, I am convinced, have any conception of what farming is like, nor how the farmer is at the mercy of the elements and his fellow men. They do not know what a small share the farmer gets of the cost to them of processed goods and even of raw farm products. They simply have no idea of the pitiful figure the cotton farmer gets from the sale of a cotton shirt, for instance.

We who represent farm States lost our fight here to fix farm parity prices at what we considered a fair level. No one would expect a manufacturing plant to speed up to record production, paying wartime labor and costs, and sell its products at peacetime levels. Yet that is what the farmer is asked to do. Labor and other costs have gone up for the farmer just as they have for every other business, and the armed services and defense plants have taken sorely needed labor from the fields. The farmer's living costs have gone up 34 percent while the living costs of urban residents has climbed only 22. Yet many of these factors have been given no consideration in fixing the price which the farmer may receive for his products. By all that is fair, parity on short cotton should be about 26 cents a pound instead of 5 or 6 cents lower. Parity on long cotton should be increased in proportion.

If we are to feed and clothe ourselves and the world there must be a new understanding of the farmers' problems and a realization that he is not seeking special privileges when he asks a just judgment on his pleas for assistance in his uncertain and poorly paid toil. Now, all he wants is an even break and he has not received it by a long shot.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the special orders heretofore made and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. ROGERS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by Raymond M. Smethurst. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect it will cost $120.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, in one to include an article on General Pulaski which appeared in the Chicago American, and in the other to include a resolution adopted by the United Spanish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] had a special order for tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that it may be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CITRUS FRUIT PRICES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a statement concerning the citrus price ceiling plan for 1943–44 by the National Citrus Industry Committee, and also to include therein a copy of H. R. 2542, a bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the imperativeness of action by O. P. A. upon representations made to it recently by the National Citrus Industry Committee. This committee was in conferences with O. P. A. and War Food Administration officials on and before October 1. Price levels and a suggested system of operation were worked out and presented. Unless action is promptly taken, we may anticipate during the present season losses to citrus growers, unwarranted prices to consumers, and generally disturbed, upset, and chaotic marketing conditions.

This committee suggested an increase of price schedule presented by W. F. A. of 1 cent per pound at the retail level on oranges and ½ cent per pound on grapefruit and lemons. They urged immediate clearance with W. F. A., O. P. A., and higher authority, if necessary, to the revised price schedule and the plan of operation as presented by W. F. A. It was concluded by the committee that a maximum average price for all areas and seasons of 10.7 cents per pound for oranges to consumer is reasonable and not out of line. This price, it was concluded, was far less, comparatively, than prices set on other fruits, vegetables, and food in general.

It is apparent that the main difficulty which has confronted the citrus growers of our country, particularly during the war period, is the excessive amount which goes to middlemen. The price received by the grower has been not excessive; in fact, in some instances, it has been less than the actual cost of production. The handlers are allowed a mark-up of 9½ percent, and then the next handler—and usually there are at least two in-betweens—an additional mark-up of 21 percent. In other words, the grower will deliver his fruit to the first broker who will buy it and add a 9½ percent mark-up. Then he delivers on to the next handler or broker, and this one is allowed an additional 21 percent mark-up. His mark-up, however, is 21 percent of not what was paid to the grower for the fruit alone, but to all costs incident to the time the fruit reached this man. He gets his 21 percent on all costs, including transportation theretofore piled on the box of fruit. He adds his and then transfers it on to the retailer. The retailer, I believe, is allowed a mark-up of 30 percent or better. These two in-betweens have been getting a total of 30½ percent; the retailer about 30 percent; the transportation facilities, drayage, storage, and so forth, probably on the average of 20 to 30 percent.

You will see this leaves a very small amount for the man who actually runs the production risk and puts out the actual cost of production.

Great risks are involved in the production of citrus fruits—adverse weather and season conditions, added expense for fertilizer, added expense for labor, crates, hauling, and every item entering into production and delivery of the fruit to the transportation platform. Some method could and should be worked out by O. P. A. to eliminate a large portion of the in-between charges between producer and consumer. These costs and charges have been pyramided through the operations of O. P. A.

This war is being fought, we believe, with the great purpose of security and protection for the American people and their homes. It is not to be taken as an opportunity for the making of large profits and excessive moneys.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have listened very carefully to what the gentleman said. The gentleman has given the subject a great deal of study. Has the gentleman given thought to the matter of the wide divergence to which he made reference between the basic price of the commodity and the actual retail price?

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman means the price received by the producer and the retail price?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. When I referred to the basic price I mean the price received by the producer. For instance, when I was recently home I went out in the country and purchased some eggs at the rate of 30 cents a dozen. That was only a few weeks ago. Eggs in Washington are today selling for 65 cents a dozen. It occurred to me and I am sure it has occurred to the gentleman from Florida that this is too wide a divergence between the basic producer's price and the final retail price.

Mr. GREEN. Undoubtedly the gentleman is correct; and that reminds me of a housewife telling me right here in the District of Columbia one day this week of having to pay $1.20 a dozen for oranges—a dime apiece. That orange to the man who produced it probably did not bring more than 1 cent or maybe less. Oranges are graded according to size and the full crate is sold by the producer for say $1.50 to $3 per crate.

Our O. P. A. officials naturally are probably doing the best they can but they do not have the production experience; in other words if we are experienced in one particular field our knowledge and efforts may go in that channel. What we need in O. P. A. is some actual producers who have had experience with these problems of production against the hazards of weather, against the adverse market conditions, increased fertilizer costs, increased labor costs, yes, up 50, 75, and in some instances 100 percent. We need men in O. P. A. who have had that experience, men who know the producer's problems. If we can make that change in O. P. A. it is my belief, my considered belief, that the price to the consumer will not have to be raised, that there is plenty of space in between, to where the retailer will still be enabled to retail at his same price and the consumer not have to pay more, but with the producer receiving more out of this middle bracket of profit. That is what should be done.

Consumption in our country of many staple commodities is increasing. The demand for our foodstuffs here and abroad among our allies and our armed forces has increased. On the other hand, our production of food commodities has gained in some instances very, very little, and in some instances there has been an actual falling off. In north and central Florida, Irish potato plantings may decrease, because it is apparent that a ceiling price will be placed so low that the producers will not be able financially to bear the risks. A ceiling price that will not pay them for production.

These are the things which are essential and the things which I believe the Congress must consider because they, in my opinion, are imperative.

MILK CEILING PRICES

I have had numerous conferences with O. P. A. and W. F. A. officials over the past many months; in fact, since the beginning of its operations. Conference after conference has been held with O. P. A. officials and our Florida dairymen and members of the Florida congressional delegation. We have plead for increased producer's ceiling prices for milk in order that our dairymen may continue in operation and supply this necessary food. Their feed, labor, machinery, and all operating costs have been pyramided. O. P. A. has consistently and persistently declined and refused to permit an increase in the producer's ceiling costs sufficiently to enable our dairymen to operate. Numbers of most valuable pure-bred herds have been sold and slaughtered for beef on account of this maladministration by O. P. A. And a peculiar thing—milk from outside the State may be shipped in and sold, I am told, at a price much higher than that which is allowed the producers in the State to produce milk within the State.

VEGETABLE CEILING PRICES

Our Florida vegetable growers and our congressional delegation have had numerous conferences with O. P. A. officials

concerning ceiling and support prices for winter vegetables, including early Irish potatoes. The vegetable price ceilings for the approaching season apparently may be slightly more favorable to the growers; however, under these now ceilings many of our growers will not be able to operate. We have had numerous conferences between our citrus growers and in some instances congressional delegation members, and O. P. A. and W. F. A. officials in an effort to enable our people to continue to produce and market citrus fruits. We are struggling now with these Federal agencies in an effort to get some favorable declaration, working agreement, and system promulgated in order to enable the present citrus crop to go on to the market. From these months and months of experience in direct effort in trying to aid in war food production, I am convinced that in O. P. A. we need and must have the actual food producers represented.

It is my belief that O. P. A. is overstaffed with men from the merchandising and handling industries, and understaffed with men and women who are actually experienced in food production. These merchants, brokers, and handlers of food in O. P. A. cannot, through training and experience which they have not had, be familiar with the problems of production. They perhaps are doing the best they can from the point of view which they understand to hold down prices and to prevent inflation, but we need men in O. P. A. who have had actual production experience in dairies, in groves, in vegetable fields, and in other food-commodity production, to meet and solve the problems facing the producer. If we could have some food-production experienced men in O. P. A. to work with the merchants and brokers who are now in there, they could bring together and fuse their joint understandings of the problems and we could then, I am certain, have producer price ceilings and retail price ceilings which would stimulate food production and at the same time, not pyramid actual food cost to the consumer.

While I did not vote for the establishment of the O. P. A., I must confess that it has been instrumental in holding down the actual cost of living. For the first 44 months of World War No. 1, I am told, the cost of living advanced about 40 percent. I am also told that during the first 44 months of World War No. 2, the cost of living advanced in America only about 24 percent. This indicates a splendid accomplishment insofar as cost of living is concerned. Yet, my friends, it is not fair to the consuming public, the dairymen in Florida, the Irish potato and vegetable producers in Florida, the citrus and other food producers in my State and in your State, for the operations of O. P. A. ceilings to bring about the confiscation of their herds, crops, groves, and other food-producing possibilities. These high-handed and unwise operations of O. P. A. in many instances are actually reducing, in my opinion, the amount of food produced in our country. We now need food and more food. The citrus growers, vegetable growers, hog and cattle producers, and other food producers of our Nation now need encouragement rather than handicaps, red tape, and destructive methods applied against them.

For your detailed information concerning the National Citrus Industry Committee's recommendations, I call your attention to the following citrus price-ceiling plan for 1943–44:

CITRUS PRICE CEILING PLAN FOR 1943–44

The citrus industry is fully represented in Washington this week by growers, shippers, and canners from all major producing regions. On Friday, October 1, handlers joined with the growers and shippers, at the request of Government officials, for the purpose of discussing mechanics of a price-ceiling program.

Because we seek your continued counsel and assistance, it is necessary to review briefly the status of citrus-fruit price ceilings.

The industry representatives called here by War Food Administration on Monday, September 27, were presented with a price plan by the organization. After thorough discussion, that plan has been accepted by the industry in principle. At the request of War Food Administration, minor modifications have been suggested for the purpose of improving the workability of the proposal. It is not our purpose to occupy your time with such operating details, which we feel sure will be adjusted by mutual agreement. One important item, on which we request your support, is an increase of 1 cent per pound at the consumer level on all orange (including tangerines, temples, and kings) schedules and one-half cent per pound on all grapefruit and lemon schedules recommended by War Food Administration. We have made this request to War Food Administration based upon facts which are summarized as follows:

1. The schedule given the industry fails to recognize an allowance for grade differentials which always exist in perishable farm products. The principle of grade differentials has been recognized by the Office of Price Administration for many commodities, including citrus fruits. Without such a differential it is impossible for producers to receive the required minimum price objective for their crop because some grades will inevitably sell below the average. Congress intended that price-ceiling schedules should include grade classifications.

2. The schedule for oranges at the retail level is based upon the weighted average retail price as of September 15, 1942. Included in such average price are prices reflecting both lower and higher prices. For example, the average price in the largest consumer market, namely, New York City, was 10.7 cents per pound compared to the average for all areas of 9.7 cents per pound. On the other hand, the average prices in other markets were as low as 8 cents per pound, exclusive of the markets in the producing areas. If the maximum price is set at the average price during a period when the normal factors of supply and demand operated, this will eliminate the possibility of obtaining such a level because the below-average prices will continue with the offsetting factor of above-average prices. It is our studied opinion that a maximum average price for all areas and seasons of 10.7 cents for oranges to consumer will result in an actual average of price to consumers of not to exceed 9.7 cents, which completely meets the executive mandates and price-law objectives.

3 Citrus prices at the irreducible minimums requested by the industry are reasonable compared to the prices of other commodities and services. Most other domestically produced perishables have enjoyed a complete season of unrestricted prices. This has permitted an unfair competitive situation between citrus fruits and other fruits and vegetables. Higher returns for other crops has permitted them to take labor and supplies away from citrus producers and handlers, even though citrus fruits were classified among the essential foods. The schedule of prices recommended by the industry will not result in average returns to producers above parity, yet prices for a few other important food items in relation to parity prices as of July 15, 1943, published by the Department of Agriculture, are as follows:

	Actual prices	Parity price
Cattle, per 100 pounds	$12.60	$8.94
Lambs, per 100 pounds	$13.30	$9.70
Eggs, per dozen ..... cents	26.3	32.3
Butterfat per pound ..... do	49.2	40.5

A further comparison of fruit and vegetable prices with citrus as of July 1943, which is a normally high-priced season for citrus and a relatively lower price season for deciduous fruits and vegetables shows percent increase in prices from a 5-year July average during the period 1937 to 1941, inclusive, as follows:

Prices received by farmers

Commodity	Unit	July average, 1937–41	July price, 1943	Percent increase
Apples	Bushel	$0.97	$2.55	263
Cabbage	Ton	14.94	37.80	253
Cantaloups	60-pound crate	1.03	3.50	340
Celery	½ crate	1.30	4.30	331
Cucumbers	48-pound bushel	.67	2.45	366
Tomatoes	53-pound bushel	.95	3.75	395
Watermelons	1,000 melons	90.00	382.00	424
Oranges	Fresh, box	1.47	2.89	197
Lemons	do	2.02	3.25	161

A further comparison of prices is with apples. Current published information indicates retail prices of from 10 cents to 11 cents per pound. Official data of the Department of Agriculture shows that during the past 9 years beginning 1934 and for the first 8 months of 1943, the average retail price of apples in leading cities of the United States has been 5.1 cents per pound compared to a retail price of 8.3 cents per pound for citrus fruits. The published price for citrus is on a per-dozen basis, and has been converted to a per-pound basis by using an average weight of 80 pounds per box for all areas and 20 dozen per box.

During the above period the retail price of oranges has been 63 percent above apples. Therefore assuming a national average apple price of 10½ cents per pound the average retail price of oranges should be 17.1 cents per pound to maintain the proper historical relationship. The retail prices for both commodities have been reflected in comparable returns to producers.

The comparisons here made with other commodities are not for the purpose of reflecting against the prices of other items, which in most instances are fair and reasonable based upon increased costs, but to point out the unfair competitive situation of citrus

fruits. We ask only for a fair relationship compared to the past and call to your attention the high costs and hazards of producing citrus fruits.

At the present time and for several years there has been in effect marketing agreements and order programs in California, Arizona, and Florida under the authority of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. The objective of these marketing orders was to establish and maintain parity prices on citrus.

Section 3 (d) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 approved January 30, 1942, provides:

"(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of such act."

The citrus industry contends that any price ceiling which does not reflect at least parity on citrus is illegal and contrary to the intention of Congress when it enacted section 3 (d) above. Parity is one of the legal minima to which our growers are entitled under any price ceiling program.

As heretofore mentioned we request an increase of 1 cent per pound in the retail price schedules for all oranges and ½ cent for grapefruit and lemons over the schedule, presented by the War Food Administration. It is our thought that a part, perhaps one-half of the increase would accrue to producers and the additional amount would suffice to cover shrinkage and other natural losses in the handling of citrus fruits, thus permitting all factors in the business a fair return for their services. We have requested the War Food Administration to prepare new schedules which should be made available to you.

The second phase of any price ceiling plan, after the level of prices has been determined, is the method of application.

The existing regulations has failed to protect producer and consumer and has encouraged new factors to enter the trade. It has increased the total spread between producers and consumers and has resulted in a breakdown of basic practices in the industry, which have protected both producers and consumers and which we believe have placed citrus fruits among the best merchandized products. The failure of the present plan is recognized by the War Food Administration and we believe by the Office of Price Administration. Both agencies have expressed a desire to develop an improved system of price regulation. We are mystified that the flagrant errors have not been corrected long before now.

The proposed plan of operation suggested by War Food Administration is to establish per pound consumer prices by seasons in various consumer areas, and to protect retail merchants by establishing maximum prices per box on sales to retail outlets. While the industry generally feels that a single national price, at the consumer level only, is the least obnoxious pricing method of citrus we have acceded to the general plan of War Food Administration, with the price changes mentioned above and with the right to suggest minor changes which will improve detailed operations. The trade factors present at the Office of Price Administration conference on October 1 with the exception of three wholesale trade representatives likewise approve the basic plan.

Because of the feeling in O. P. A. that the intermediate trade must be fully and adequately protected, we have further agreed, in an honest effort to be helpful, that if the pricing plan to retailers and to consumer results in great malpractices and distribution that the price may be established at a point beyond the retailer. However, such pricing must first give complete protection to growers against other factors taking an undue portion of the consumer price.

During the past week we have not received from O. P. A. any agreement either as to the price level or system of operation. This must be had promptly, and if there is controversy between War Food Administration and O. P. A., the difference must be settled by Mr. Vinson so that changes can be made at a very early date to avoid further losses to growers, unwarranted prices to consumers, and chaotic marketing conditions.

In summary we believe that any pricing plan on citrus fruits, which is a perishable commodity, is fraught with difficulties and inequalities, but that the plan of War Food Administration, carrying prices to the consumer and retailer, is the least objectionable plan yet devised by Government authorities. It simplifies the pricing system, establishes a uniform price at the consumer level, compared to the multiple and almost indeterminate prices now. It makes possible a more normal spread in distribution costs. It gives growers the possibility of obtaining the legal minimum prices required by law and reduces the consumer price.

We ask your help on the following:

1. Increase the price schedule presented by War Food Administration by 1 cent per pound at the retail level on oranges and ½ cent per pound on grapefruit and lemons.

2. Obtain immediate clearance with War Food Administration, O. P. A., and higher authority if necessary to the revised price schedule and to the plan of operation as presented by War Food Administration. An honest effort to establish a more workable and a fairer plan should result in final determination during this week. The industry is here ready to speak and make decision.

For your past assistance and continued interest we express the sincere appreciation of the citrus industry.

NATIONAL CITRUS INDUSTRY COMMITTEE.

MED-FLY CLAIMS SHOULD BE PAID

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of citrus, I believe I should call to the attention of my colleagues the justification and merit for the Congress at this time to pass legislation for the reimbursement of losses sustained by Florida growers during the eradication in Florida of the Mediterranean fruitfly in 1929–30. Florida properties were destroyed and extensive losses sustained during the eradication of this pest. The destruction of fruits, vegetables, and the injury to groves was carried on by the Bureau of Entomology, United States Department of Agriculture. This destruction was done in order to eliminate the Mediterranean fruitfly, which, it was said, existed, and to prevent the spread of this pest to other fruit and vegetable producing States of the Union. Florida's property was destroyed as a protection to property in other States. It was destroyed through the instrumentality of the Federal Government. These damages should be paid to Florida growers by the Federal Government. Exhaustive surveys, studies, and hearings have been had upon the subject. A special congressional investigating committee, a joint committee of Senators and Congressmen, has investigated these claims and found them to be valid, and this committee has recommended enactment of legislation for payment

I have introduced H. R. 2542 to carry out the recommendations of this special congressional investigation committee. I commend this bill to you for immediate consideration and passage by the Congress:

H. R. 2542

A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida

Whereas a very serious emergency arose by reason of an outbreak of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida in 1929 which threatened the fruit and vegetable industry of the Nation; and

Whereas it was the general consensus of opinion of the Government experts that the only safe way to meet the situation was the eradication of the pest in the shortest possible time; and

Whereas to accomplish this result orders were promulgated under authority and direction of the Federal Government for the destruction of all fruits and vegetables considered as possible hosts to the fly within an established area (comprising 22 counties) designated as the "area of infestation," and other drastic measures were taken to aid in the eradication program, all of which resulted in severe loss and damage to the growers of fruits and vegetables in said area; and

Whereas the joint special committee of the Senate and House of Representatives appointed under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 40, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, after full investigation has recommended in its report that Congress compensate those who suffered losses under certain circumstances for the losses and damages sustained as the direct result of the eradication campaign: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to designate an officer or employee of the Treasury Department as Commissioner, whose duty it shall be to investigate and take proof of all claims for damages growing out of the Mediterranean fruitfly-eradication campaign. The Secretary of the Treasury shall fix the duties and compensation of the Commissioner. The Secretary of the Treasury shall also employ and fix the compensation and duties of such number of employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, but such compensation of such employees shall correspond as far as may be practicable to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Commissioner may accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as he may deem necessary; and may make such expenditures, including expenditures for necessary offices, for travel and subsistence expenses, and for printing and binding as are necessary for the efficient execution of his duties under this act. All expenses incurred by the Commissioner in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be allowed and paid by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor duly approved by the Commissioner.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner is authorized and directed to determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay in accordance with the certifications of the Commissioner, the amount of indemnity determined as due each person for losses and damages sustained as the result of the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication campaign conducted in the State of Florida during the years 1929 and 1930. The formula to be used by the Commissioner for the determination of the losses and damages of claimants for fruit, vegetable, and field crops shall be substantially as follows: For oranges, $1.10 per box; grapefruit, limes,

lemons, and kumquats, $1 per box; peaches, $1.45 per bushel; avocados, $2.12 per bushel; persimmons, $5 per bushel; grapes, $2.10 per bushel; guavas and other noncitrus fruits, $1 per bushel; cowpeas, $5.50 per acre, or where gathered, $1.25 per bushel; beans, $1.44 per bushel; peppers, 92 cents per bushel; tomatoes, $3.18 per bushel; miscellaneous vegetables, fruits, field crops, and plants not mentioned above shall be at the average net price in Florida for the period as shown by the reports of the United States Department of Agriculture for the years in question. In determining the quantity of vegetables destroyed, the Commissioner shall take into consideration whether same were produced on irrigated or nonirrigated land, the average production per acre of each, and the percentage of the crop that had been marketed prior to the destruction of the plants and vines in the gardens and fields. Where any fruit or vegetable had been gathered and was in the process of being marketed, the actual cost of gathering and hauling, where paid by the grower, shall also be included. When such costs were paid by a purchaser or packing-house operator, a separate claim shall be filed by such purchaser or packing-house operator for the actual cost of gathering or hauling. Each grower of citrus fruit shall also be entitled to recover the actual cost to him of picking and burying citrus drops and splits, not to exceed $5 per acre in zone 1, $7.50 per acre in zone 2, and $6.50 per acre in zone 3 of the area of infestation.

Damages to fruit trees resulting from the use of poisonous bait spray shall be determined in conformity with table 8, page 17, House Document No. 290, Seventy-sixth Congress, being a report prepared by the Mediterranean Fruitfly Board appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the act of Congress of May 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 436). Damages for the destruction of commercial plants and shrubs ordered destroyed during the eradication campaign shall be determined and fixed by the Commissioner after taking into account the true market value to the seller of the property destroyed. It is hereby declared to be the express intention of Congress that persons who suffered losses and sustained damages of the kind and character described in this act shall receive full compensation, as provided for herein, for the losses sustained and damages suffered, but that losses of no other kind or character shall be considered by the Commissioner.

SEC. 3. All books, papers, documents, reports, and other records of the Department of Agriculture which relate to the campaign conducted during the years 1929 and 1930 in the State of Florida for the extermination and eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in such State (including the books, papers, documents, reports, and other records of the Mediterranean Fruitfly Board created by the act entitled "An act to provide for an investigation of the Mediterranean fruitfly by the Department of Agriculture," approved May 23, 1938) shall be available for examination and inspection by the Commissioner or his duly authorized agents and representatives.

SEC. 4. No payment under the provisions of this act shall be made unless an application therefor is filed with the Commissioner, by or on behalf of the person entitled to payment, within 6 months after the date the Secretary of the Treasury designates a person as Commissioner under the provisions of the first section of this act. Any such application shall set forth the amount and kind of losses or damages claimed and shall be supported by such documents or other information as the Commissioners shall require. All claims filed with the Mediterranean Fruitfly Board created under the act of May 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 436) shall be delivered to the Commissioner by the Secretary of Agriculture, and claims filed by growers with Florida Growers Reimbursement Committee may also be filed with the Commissioner, and each such claim shall constitute an application for reimbursement where no other application is filed: *Provided*, That the Commissioner may require claimants to furnish such additional information as the Commissioner may deem necessary. All claims filed by growers with Florida Growers Reimbursement Committee shall be made available to the Commissioner upon request in considering any claim filed by any claimant under this act. If any claimant has died, become incompetent, or is otherwise unable to file a claim, such claim may be filed by the heirs, representatives, administrators, executors, successors, or assigns of any such person, and payments of indemnity may be made to such heirs, representatives, administrators, executors, successors, or assigns of any such person, and further administration upon the estate of any person who has died shall be avoided where that is possible: *Provided*, That no person who makes a claim under this act by virtue of having acquired and succeeded to the rights of the original claimant through purchase and assignment from said claimant of any claim shall receive more than the amount actually paid for such claim and assignment.

SEC. 5. When the Commissioner has determined the amount due on any claim filed with him, and the person or persons entitled thereto, the same shall be certified by him to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, and the payment of such amount shall constitute full and final release and discharge of such claim against the United States. The determination of the Commissioner as to the amount due and payable and the person or persons entitled thereto shall be final.

SEC. 6. The sum of $10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying claims approved hereunder and expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That of the sum hereby appropriated, $350,000 shall be available only for the payment of claims designated and described in the paragraph entitled "Other Losses" on page 32 of House Document No. 290, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, 1939. Indemnity paid to any claimant under the provisions of this act shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process.

SEC. 7. The Commissioner shall establish his principal office at some central place convenient to claimants within the affected Florida citrus area where claims may be filed and may conduct hearings and investigations at any point within the Florida citrus area as he may deem necessary to establish the validity of any claim, and no person shall be denied an opportunity to be heard prior to the determination and certification of the amount due such claimant.

SEC. 8. The Commissioner shall provide for proof of claims under oath, prescribed blanks and forms to be used by claimants, and prescribe such rules and regulations not inconsistent herewith as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. The word "person" and "claimant" as used in this act shall include any individual, two or more persons having a joint common interest, company, partnership, county, or municipal or private corporation.

SEC. 10. Any person or group of persons, individually or collectively, who charge or collect or attempt to charge or collect, either directly or indirectly, any fee or other compensation, in excess of 5 percent of the amount of the claim actually paid under this act, for assisting in any manner any person in obtaining the benefits of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 11. It shall be unlawful for any person or claimant to swear falsely as to any claim, or to attempt by fraud to collect any claim under the provisions of this act, and any person or claimant violating any provision of this section, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 12. The Commissioner shall submit a report to the Congress covering his activities under this act within 1 year from the date of his designation, together with such information, data, and recommendations for any further legislation in connection with payments of indemnity for losses and damages resulting from the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication campaign in the State of Florida as he may deem advisable.

SEC. 13. All power and authority of the Commissioner under the provisions of this act shall cease upon the expiration of 1 year after the date the Secretary of the Treasury designates a person as Commissioner under the provisions of the first section of this act.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, a front-page news item appeared in last Tuesday's Daily Oklahoman naming me as 1 of 50 individuals in Oklahoma whose State income-tax return had been requested for scrutiny by the Tulsa County, Okla., grand jury upon the order of a district judge of that city. I wish to make a few observations.

I would have been only too happy to have shown the county attorney, Mr. Dixie Gilmer, all the copies of my tax returns had he even suggested a disposition to look them over. I mean all of my tax returns—from the first one I filed up to and including 1943. He knows as well as I know that I have never been an agent or recipient of a commission or fee or any other kind of remuneration, directly or indirectly, for the sale of textbooks.

I wish to say further to Mr. Gilmer and his cohorts and confederates that when he chose to smear my name he went just one name too far. I shall demand proof not only from him but from all who are responsible for bringing my name into this political maligning. When innocent people are made a party to an investigation that stinks of having been designed by men who think they are mighty, in my opinion it should be brought to the attention of the Department of Justice that the citizens of Oklahoma may know where such Gestapo scheming was born and who was present at the birth. I shall continue the fight to see that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. They should be as willing to bare their breasts to an investigation as any person they are attempting to destroy.

When I have further information upon the subject, I may call on the Department of Justice, or offer a resolution, asking for a thorough investigation of what happened preceding the calling and during the deliberations of this grand jury, when and where they met,

and who were parties thereto. It is a sad day in America when any court of justice can be prostituted by politicians for their own selfish purpose. The press has heralded the name of Dixie Gilmer as a potential candidate for judge of the Criminal Court of Appeals, and it might be of interest to know who took the young gentleman upon the mountain and showed him all the world before him. Those responsible surely would not feel too badly at seeing their names front-paged throughout the country.

The man who started the textbook investigations in Oklahoma was then a high public official. He appointed the judge who called the Tulsa County Grand Jury. His tax return has been listed for investigation by order of the same judge. This smacks of camouflage and the laying of a smoke screen of fair play. This former high official also contracted with and appointed the attorney who filed a civil suit in the Federal court on behalf of the State of Oklahoma against a number of persons alleging them to be illegally involved in the State buying textbooks for the public schools of Oklahoma. I was not included in this suit. According to the press this attorney, appointed by the former high official, has appeared before the grand jury and consorted with the county attorney. Do such manipulations show fair play? I have a hunch what it is all about and believe it can be developed. I am not familiar with the textbook controversy other than by newspaper reports, but I know well I had nothing to do with it.

I think Mr. Gilmer and his coterie will live to regret the day he brought my name into this investigation. I do not like it and am going to do something about it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a couple of letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very splendid and powerful address recently made by the Honorable Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, in New York City, an address that everybody should read and analyze. This will cost $120, according to estimate of the Public Printer, but because of the unusual contribution made by Mr. Welles in this address, I am asking unanimous consent that it be included as a part of my remarks notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore made, I may address the House for 15 minutes. Next Wednesday being Navy Day, it is my intention to make some remarks on the heroism of the officers and men of the United States Navy during this war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. MAAS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) until November 8, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), pursuant to previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

869. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380); to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

870. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting copies of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, covering regular operations of the Office of Civilian Defense and its protective property program; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

871. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the Office of War Information covering the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

872. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the Arkansas River and tributaries, Conway County, levee districts Nos. 1, 2, 6, and 8, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 14 and November 12, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

873. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 9, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and a review of report on, the Missouri River and tributaries at Kansas City, Mo., and Kans., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and requested by a resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate adopted on April 29, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 342); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 30, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 308. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 307; without amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 2580. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3507. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Ute Indians, or any

of the tribes or bands of Utes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3508. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to erect headstones over the graves of wives of soldiers who served in the Spanish-American War, World War No. 1, and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3509. A bill to provide for mandatory loans to small business concerns upon termination of their war contracts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3510. A bill amending Public Law No. 625 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution designating November 15 of each year as John Hanson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day and urging that it be properly observed throughout the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. Res. 329. Resolution to make a special order of business, H. R. 3055, a bill to repeal Public Law No. 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. McCORD introduced a bill (H. R. 3511) for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc., which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3120. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Jones Grill, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3121. Also, petition of C. R. Rouse, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 39 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3122. Also, petition of R. C. Power, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 23 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3123. Also, petition of C. Ellis, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 88 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3124. Also, petition of Robert B. McRaven, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 33 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3125. Also, petition of Rose L. Scholle and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3126. Also, petition of Walter Bartman and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3127. Also, petition of Jacob L. Scholbe and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3128. Also, petition of Mrs. S. Kuhlmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3129. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles J. Liss and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3130. Also, petition of C. Elmer Kelle and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3131. Also, petition of A. Kimerle and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3132. Also, petition of August S. Preusch and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3133. Also, petition of Miss E. Glennon and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3134. Also, petition of C. Scott and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3135. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by Thomas Kennedy and other citizens of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3136. Also (by request), petition signed by Edward J. Glick and other citizens of the State of New York, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3137. Also (by request), petition signed by William A. FitzGibbon and other residents of New York and New Jersey, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3138. Also (by request), petition signed by Gustav A. Tappert and other residents in Westchester County, N. Y., opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3139. Also (by request), petition signed by William A. Loock, Sr., and other residents in New York and Connecticut, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3140. Also (by request), petition signed by James Donald Benson and other residents in New York and Connecticut, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3141. Also (by request), petition signed by Edwin T. Harman and other residents in the State of New York, opposing enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3142. Also (by request), petition signed by Daniel F. MacNamara and other residents in the State of New York, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3143. Also (by request), petition signed by William K. Smith and other residents in the State of New York, opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3144. Also (by request), petition signed by Loring Pratt and other residents of Mamaroneck, N. Y., opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3145. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Fred's Museum Tavern of Elgin and 21 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3146. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by sundry residents of Westchester County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3147. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution adopted by the Chicago Board of Underwriters, representing over 6,000 insurance brokers and agents in Cook County, endorsing Senate bill 1362 and House bills 3269 and 3270; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3148. Also, resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of Clay County, Ill., on October 9, 1943, urging the immediate repeal of the Victory tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3149. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted by sundry citizens of Lithuanian birth or extraction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3150. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of Richmond, Mich., expressing interest in House Resolution 117, which seeks to aid the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the author of peace and the lover of concord, whose mercy is broader than the measure of man's mind: We confess that we have made Thy love too narrow by false standards of our own. By all the tragic mistakes of the centuries past Thou art reminding us that no nation liveth to itself or aileth by itself. Through all the broken dreams of humanity Thy spirit is urging us to the high road which leads to the glorious goal of man's oneness. More and more we comprehend that history is but Thy story, telling us how the truth of cooperation has fought the falsehood of strife and competition all down the ages, and how slowly and painfully cooperation has won, dragging civilization behind it. Above the flickering lamps of our own hearthstones, above the broken lights of our own little systems, may a glory from the bending skies shine upon us and upon all this darkened earth, making clear the way ahead. Without confusion, joining all men of good will, may we follow the gleam to the blessed plains of perpetual peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 21, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced

that on October 21, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1113. An act to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942;

S. 1170. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; and

S. 1350. An act to establish the grades of commissioned warrant officer and warrant officer in the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CANCELATION OF DRAINAGE CHARGES AGAINST LANDS WITHIN UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES

Letters from the Chief, Budget and Accounts Division, Department of Commerce, the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense, and the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; and also letters from the Director of the Office of War Information and the Archivist of the United States, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ended September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the War Manpower Commission, National Youth Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

MEMORIAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY presented the memorial of O. A. Dart, of Lamont, and sundry other citizens, all in the State of Wyoming, remonstrating against the enactment of any and all prohibition measures, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present petitions for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 400 signers of the petitions, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	1
Kansas	29
Maine	41
Maryland	27
Massachusetts	1
Minnesota	46
Pennsylvania	199
Texas	38
Wisconsin	18
Total	400

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also present petitions for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 5,113 signers of the petitions, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	550
California	66
Florida	20
Illinois	919
Maine	105
Maryland	27
Massachusetts	1
Michigan	77
Minnesota	1,198
Missouri	34
Ohio	1,264
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	361
Washington	122
West Virginia	10
Honolulu, T. H.	355
Total	5,113

FREE TRANSPORTATION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF NEW BRITAIN, CONN.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter including a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of New Britain, and signed by W. G. Gibney, Frank W. Chase, H. L. Connor, J. J. Storey, Kenneth A. Larson, John J. Borselle, and H. E. Scheuy, city clerk.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE,
New Britain, Conn., October 22, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is called to the following resolution accepted and adopted by the common council at its meeting held Wednesday evening, October 20, 1943, approved October 22, 1943, by George A. Quigley, mayor.

No. 61.

To His Honor, the Mayor and Common Council of the City of New Britain:

The undersigned recommend that the following be accepted and adopted:

"Be it resolved by the Common Council of the City of New Britain, That it is the sense of this body that members of the armed forces of the United States should receive free transportation to and from their homes while on leave or furlough; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk to the Senators from Connecticut, the Representative from this district, and the Representative at large."

W. G. GIBNEY,
FRANK W. CHASE,
H. L. CONNOR,
J. J. STOREY,
KENNETH A. LARSON,
JOHN J. BORSELLE.

Attest:

H. E. SCHEUY,
City Clerk.

APPOINTMENT OF OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS IN THE NAVY—PETITION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by Harold Wagner, Jr., and about 40 other residents of Brattleboro, Vt., requesting the President to require those in charge of making naval appointments to fulfill the law by utilizing the professional skills of osteopathic physicians and surgeons. I request that the petition be printed in the RECORD without the names attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the names attached, as follows:

Whereas twice during the past year Congress has enacted laws (Public Law 763, 77th Cong.; Public Law 92, 78th Cong.) approving and indicating the necessity of commissioning osteopathic graduates as medical officers in the Navy;

Whereas in spite of these laws, and in the face of a mounting shortage of medical personnel to serve the armed forces, no osteopathic appointments have been made, and all applications refused; and

Therefore we, the undersigned citizens of the United States, do request that President Roosevelt require those in charge of making naval appointments to fulfill the law by utilizing the professional skills of osteopathic physicians and surgeons.

ANTI-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA IN PUERTO RICO—RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution passed by the American Legion, Department of Puerto Rico. I particularly ask that Senators observe this carefully, because the American Legion states that there is a great deal of anti-American activity in Puerto Rico at the present time.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the loyalty of our people toward our American citizenship is essential for the

preservation of our American form of government; and

Whereas there exists in our island a strong wave of anti-American propaganda tending to undermine the confidence of our people in the great principles of liberty and justice embodied in the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas this anti-American propaganda is hurting the united effort of the people of Puerto Rico toward the prosecution of the war and the final victory of our armed forces; and

Whereas to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism is part of the preamble of our organization: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Department of Puerto Rico of the American Legion, at its monthly meeting held today, October 3, 1943, To request from the Congress of the United States, through the national executive committee of the American Legion, that the activities of the Dies committee be made extensive to Puerto Rico, in order to investigate the sources of the anti-American propaganda presently being carried out in our island at a moment when our Nation is involved in a horrible and cruel war in defense of our democratic form of government, for the preservation of which hundreds of thousands of lives of American citizens have been sacrificed on the field of battle.

DAIRY PRODUCTION IN NORTH DAKOTA—PETITION OF MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the body of a petition signed by about 19 farmers who are milk producers in the Devils Lake area, Ramsey Cauny, N. Dak.

I call attention particularly to the following paragraph:

The average cow in this area in producing 6,500 pounds of milk requires at least 16½ bushels of barley at 97 cents or $16, 33½ bushels oats at 65 cents or a total of $21.77, 4½ tons of hay at $7 per ton or a total of $32, with a minimum amount of protein supplement (100 pounds) at a cost of $3. This makes a total of $72.77 for cost of feed only.

I call attention also to the paragraph at the top of page 2, headed "Cost of feeds."

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned milk producers in the Devils Lake area, Ramsey County, State of North Dakota, representing the milk producing and dairy industry in this area, do hereby call the following to the attention of Office of Price Administration, Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator; War Food Administration, Marvin Jones, Administrator; North Dakota State War Board, John Kasper, chairman; American Dairy Association, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Senator Gerald P. Nye, Hon. Senator William Langer, Hon. Representative William Lemke, Hon. Representative Usher L. Burdick, all of Washington, D. C., representing and interested in the welfare of the dairy industry, the situation relative to the dairy production and the industry in this area.

1. We feel that we are not getting a satisfactory return for the whole milk or butterfat produced and sold, in proportion to other agricultural commodities. For that reason we ask that the price of dairy commodities, including whole milk and butterfat be increased.

2. We are definitely opposed to increasing the return for the sale of dairy products, namely, whole milk and butterfat, in the form of subsidies, or the so-called dairy feed price adjustment payments. We are opposed to this type of increased income for the sale of the above commodities because we feel that the buying public can well afford to pay a price that will give us cost of production and a fair and reasonable return. We ask that such return come from the sale price of our product rather than load the burden of subsidies on the American Federal taxpayers in years to come, of which many will be men in uniform today. They are serving their country today.

To substantiate our local situation may we point out the cost of maintaining the average cow in this area, and also the returns from such cow today in contrast with a year ago? From records available the average cow in our area supplying whole milk produces 6,500 pounds of milk in one year, with a butterfat content of 220 pounds.

1943 costs: The average milk cow in this area producing 6,500 pounds of milk requires at least 16½ bushels of barley at 97 cents, or $16; 33½ bushels of oats at 65 cents, or a total of $21.77; 4½ tons of hay at $7 per ton, or a total of $32, with a minimum amount of protein supplement (100 pounds) at a cost of $3. This makes a total of $72.77 for cost of feed only.

The present going wage demanded by those working on dairy farms is $130 per month, including board. Assuming that 1 man can take care of 20 cows and the offspring, the average cost of taking care of 1 cow for 1 year is $78, charging all of the labor against the cow and nothing against the offspring. This perhaps may not be fair, but discounting this figure by one-fourth it would still leave a labor cost of $58.50 per cow per year.

The difference between $78 and $58.50, or $19.50, can well be chargeable against the cow or herd because of the variation in cost of labor covering the various seasons of the year will more than account for this. And during the summer months, or growing season, the man's time is utilized in making hay and growing a crop for the herd.

There is also another point that must be taken into consideration if this labor item should happen to look out of line, there is the labor involved and feed involved and other expenses in maintaining a dairy herd, for it takes from 3 to 5 years to develop a cow to be retained in the herd. This must be done or it would be impossible to maintain our dairy herds. Seventy-two dollars and seventy-seven cents, total cost of feed, plus $78, cost of labor, equals $150.77, cost of feed and labor per cow per year only to say nothing about compensation for management, cost of maintaining buildings, water supply, milking equipment, interest, taxes, veterinary fees, and outright losses, due to disease, accidents, and other factors.

1943 income per cow: The average cow is producing 6,500 pounds of milk per year. The present average return is $2.38 per 100 pounds of milk averaging 3½ percent butterfat, or a total of $154.70; $154.70 minus $150.77 leaves $3.93 per cow per year to take care of such items of cost as compensation for management, maintaining buildings, water supply, milking equipment, interest, taxes, veterinary fees, and outright loss of individual cows.

The same picture 1 year ago—1942—was as follows:

Cost of feeds: The same quantity of feed used, or 16½ bushels of barley, at 45 cents per bushel, total $7.43; 33½ bushels oats, at 27 cents per bushel, total $9.05; 4½ tons of hay, at $3.50 per ton, total $16; a minimum of 100 pounds protein supplement per cow, $2.75, or a total feed cost of $35.23 per cow per year.

Dairymen 1 year ago obtained labor for $75 per month, including board, or a cost of $45 for labor per cow per year. Total cost for labor and feed per cow 1 year ago was approximately $80.23.

Production per cow in 1942, same as in 1943. Average price received was $2.135 per 100 pounds of milk with 3.5 percent butterfat content, or a total return per cow of $138.45, or a total of $55.12 income per cow for the year, over and above cost of feed and labor, for such expenses as compensation for management, maintaining buildings, water supply, milking equipment, interest, taxes, veterinary fees, and outright losses due to death, etc. There is a lot of difference between $55.12 per cow income in 1942 and $3.93 per cow income in 1943, over and above cost of feed and labor.

Because of price ceilings on our product being out of line with the cost of labor and feed, we seek for an increase in price so that we can stay in the business of supplying the much-needed wholesome, healthful food. Prices of milk should be such that there would be an equal competition for feed. The prices for milk and dairy products are not competitive for the use of feed as compared with prices of hogs, beef cattle, and poultry.

We therefore ask that the present price structure for milk and milk products be increased so that it would be on an equal competitive basis. It is inadvisable to reduce the return to producers of livestock and poultry. The only practical alternative is to increase the return for milk and butterfat.

In July Dairy Situation, U. S. D. A., the following statement is made:

"Unless price ceilings are increased, however, dairy product feed price ratios during the last 3 or 4 months of 1943 will be less favorable for dairy farmers than either a year earlier or the long-time average."

That is true.

The undersigned, a committee representing the milk producers in the Devils Lake area, ask that this request be given serious consideration. We have, after two meetings, arrived at the costs mentioned above as being the average cost for the 2 years mentioned, and certainly the contrast between the 2 years is too great for we, as milk producers, to continue in the dairy business at the present price of our product. We acknowledge, however, that the average return per 100 pounds of milk has increased some; as a matter of fact, only about twenty-four and five-tenths per 100 pounds here locally. Adding the recently announced subsidy or dairy feed price adjustment payment, of which we are opposed, the return still falls way short of a fair and reasonable return. May we also point out that the milk production for this area has already been reduced 25 percent, and other dairymen will discontinue if prices are not increased? We definitely have a milk shortage right at the present date. The outlook offers no improvement unless our income is increased.

This resolution signed and dated this 20th day of October 1943 in the city of Devils Lake, Ramsey County, N. Dak.

PETITION FROM KANSAS TO REDUCE THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from A. V. Lundgren, president of the Kansas State Federation of Labor, a paper entitled "Petition To Reduce the Cost of Living," signed by 438 members of the A. F. of L. in cooperation with other unions and other citizen organizations throughout the State. This petition was addressed to the members of the Kansas Delegation in Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the petition may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached. I am not in accord with all the provisions of the petition, but it has

good points in it and should have fair consideration by the Senate.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned citizens of Topeka Kans., call upon Congress to give full support to the price-control and roll-back program, as an essential element of the war program.

We call for the roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures:

1. Subsidies "on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers."
2. Grade labeling.
3. Dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level.
4. Continued rent control.
5. A strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control—given adequate funds for enforcement—with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors.

This petition is circulated by the Kansas State Federation of Labor in cooperation with all other unions and with other citizens' organizations.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending Senate Resolution 192, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table, and that copies thereof may be distributed to the desks of Senators in due course. The amendment is offered on my own behalf and on behalf of other Senators whose names appear in connection with the amendment.

The amendment submitted by Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. FERGUSON), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate Resolution 192, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in explanation of the amendment.

The issue in this debate is not what can be passed by the Senate, but what the Senate should declare as the part of this Nation in world affairs after the war.

Nothing is to be gained by the adoption of a resolution which offers the appearance of agreement in the Senate, when no real agreement has been formulated.

The important thing is not what the Senate now does, but whether the Senate is willing to tell the world that we will not again forsake our allies and destroy the hope of mankind in taking our full and fair share in the building of a peaceful and a better world.

The people have a right to the truth about our sentiments and we have a duty to hold nothing back which, in the remote future, might again forfeit the victory which we shall win at the cost of so much blood and treasure.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the procedure now being followed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is called for.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my statement may be printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement of Mr. PEPPER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate, if it is to be the final arbiter of American foreign policy, must be willing to lay down now at least the broad principles by which this Nation shall be governed in post-war affairs. The President and our allies cannot shape their policy, cannot determine what they will do, without their knowing what the Senate of the United States will do. It is the Nation's duty, nay, an opportunity paid for with the blood of the flower of our youth, to lead the world to peace and a measure of prosperity. And it is the Senate's duty to lead the Nation toward a clear-cut declaration of that high character.

Neither the Nation nor the Senate can discharge those obligations by halting and equivocating and the use of words of double or doubtful meaning unworthy of the challenge which confronts us.

Whether we realize it or not, this is historic ground upon which we are treading, and nations will note as much what we do not say and our timidity in saying it, as what we say. Never did the world more earnestly pray for that bold, righteous leadership from us than now.

The amendment we propose, therefore, makes us say what we say with clearness and positiveness and draws at least the general outline of what we are willing, indeed, what we must do, if we do not again dishonor our debt to our dead.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff; without amendment (Rept. No. 479);

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 480); and

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener; without amendment (Rept. No. 481).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny; with amendments (Rept. No. 482);

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 483); and

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman; without amendment (Rept. No. 484).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira; without amendment (Rept. No. 485); and

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia; without amendment (Rept. No. 486).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugene W. Randall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1472. A bill for the relief of William B. Scott; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1473. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1474. A bill to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a south central district in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 1475. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise Reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 1476, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGISTRATION OF CARTEL AGREEMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for the registration of all cartel agreements. This measure harmonizes with some suggestions and recommendations which have been made in the past by the Temporary National Economic Committee, and in some degree more recently by the National Patent Planning Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at length in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1476) to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce, and to safeguard the security of the United States, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) "Foreign contract" includes any contract, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, written or unwritten, now in force or hereinafter entered into (1) in which a domestic company or its affiliate participates, and which (A) concerns trade, transactions, or commerce between the United States and any foreign country, or (B) restricts or limits the right of any domestic person to engage in trade, transactions, or commerce outside the United States; or (2) in which a foreign company or its affiliate participates and which (A) concerns trade, transactions, or commerce within the United States, or (B) concerns trade, transactions, or commerce between the United States and any foreign country, or (C) restricts or limits the right of any domestic person to engage in trade, transactions, or commerce outside the United States.

(b) "Domestic company" includes any corporation, business trust, joint-stock company, partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, unincorporated association, or company, incorporated or organized under the

laws of the United States or any of its States, Territories, or possessions, or domiciled or residing in the United States.

(c) "Foreign company" includes any corporation, business trust, joint stock company, partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, unincorporated association, or company, incorporated or organized under the laws of a foreign state, and any alien not domiciled or residing in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions.

(d) "Domestic person" includes any citizen of the United States, any alien domiciled or residing in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions, and any corporation, business trust, joint stock company, partnership, limited partnership, syndicate, unincorporated association, or company, incorporated or organized under the laws of the United States or any of its States, Territories, or possessions, or domiciled or residing in the United States.

(e) "Affiliate" of a domestic or foreign company includes the agent, subsidiary, or parent of such domestic or foreign company, and also includes any domestic or foreign company controlled by or under common control with such domestic or foreign company.

(f) "Trade, transactions, or commerce" also includes "manufacture."

(g) "United States" also includes "Territories and possessions" of the United States.

(h) "Commodity" includes goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, and any article of commerce of any nature whatsoever.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of each domestic company and of each foreign company doing business in the United States to register with the Attorney General a copy of any foreign contract (or if unwritten a copy of the terms thereof) in which it or its affiliate participates and which contains in form or substance any of the following terms, conditions, or provisions:

(a) A restriction, limitation, or prohibition upon the amount, types, or kinds of commodities, or processes which any party to the contract, or any nonparty, shall be permitted or authorized to produce, manufacture, sell, use, lease, or purchase;

(b) An agreement as to the prices to be paid or to be charged for any amount, type, or kind of commodity or process bought from or sold to any third party;

(c) An allocation, division, or apportionment between parties to the contract, or between a party and any nonparty, of any territory or markets in which any operations or activities of any business shall be conducted;

(d) An agreement to form or to use, for the purpose of conducting joint operations or a joint venture, any corporation, partnership, unincorporated association, company, or legal person or entity;

(e) A license, cross-license or sublicense in or under any United States or foreign patent or patent application, or any United States or foreign registered trade-mark or trade-mark application; or an agreement to grant in the future any such license, cross-license, or sublicense; or an agreement not to sue for the infringement of any patent or registered trade-mark;

(f) Any assignment of (or of any interest in) any United States or foreign patent or patent application, or any United States or foreign registered trade-mark or trade-mark application;

Provided, however, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any foreign contract which is solely a contract of insurance, contract for personal services, bill of lading, or forwarding agreement, bill of exchange, promissory note or other evidence of indebtedness, letter of credit, check or draft, a charter party for a vessel, or a contract or deed, when the interest transferred is not in excess of $50,000 for the sale, lease, or mortgage of real property.

SEC. 3. (a) Any existing foreign contract which is required to be registered shall be registered with the Attorney General within 6 months after the effective date of this act; and any foreign contract required to be registered which is hereafter entered into shall, within 60 days thereafter, be registered;

(b) Foreign contracts registered under this act shall be public records and open to public examination and inspection at such reasonable hours, under such regulation, as the Attorney General may prescribe, except that, upon the petition of any party to a foreign contract, the Attorney General shall determine whether public disclosure will result in the disclosure of a trade secret and shall withdraw from public disclosure all or any part of such foreign contract as may be necessary in order to prevent the disclosure of a trade secret.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General shall have power:

(a) To permit a summary of any foreign contract or any class of foreign contracts to be filed in lieu of the full contract, provided such summary makes full disclosure of the terms and provisions of such contract;

(b) To extend the time for registration of any foreign contract or any class of foreign contracts whenever he finds extension justified by special circumstances;

(c) To make, prescribe, amend, or rescind any rules, regulations, and forms necessary to carry out the provisions and policy of this act.

SEC. 5. Whenever a foreign or domestic company shall violate any of the provisions of this act, such violation shall be deemed to be also that of such persons who are individual directors, officers, partners, or agents of such company and who shall have authorized, ordered, or done any of the acts constituting in whole or in part such violation; or, when such violation arises out of the failure to register a foreign contract, shall have knowingly failed to have the foreign contract registered when such action lies within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 6. (a) If any foreign or domestic company violates this act, or any rule or regulation promulgated hereunder, by failing to file any foreign contract, as herein provided, then such company shall be subject to a civil penalty of $250 for the first day of such violation, and $25 for each succeeding day thereafter until the contract shall have been filed. The Attorney General may institute, in the name of the United States, a suit to recover the civil penalty provided for in this section, but no such suit shall be instituted more than 1 year subsequent to the discovery by the Attorney General of the fact of such violation.

(b) Any foreign or domestic company or person violating this act, or any rule or regulation promulgated hereunder, by willfully failing to file any foreign contract, as herein provided, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

(c) The willful making of any false or fraudulent statement or registration under this act, or under any rule or regulation promulgated hereunder, shall be a violation of section 35 (a) of the Criminal Code, as amended (18 U. S. C. sec. 80).

(d) In the event of any failure to comply with the provisions of this act or any rule or regulation promulgated hereunder, the Attorney General may institute a suit, in any district court of the United States (or in any other United States court of original jurisdiction in the territories or possessions of the United States outside continental United States), for a mandatory injunction to compel full compliance therewith.

SEC. 7. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to prevent or interfere with the enforcement of the provisions of the antitrust acts or the acts to regulate commerce, nor shall anything contained in the act be construed to alter, modify or repeal the said antitrust acts or the acts to regulate commerce, or any part or parts thereof. The registration of any foreign contract as required by this act shall not confer any immunity from the enforcement of the provisions of the antitrust acts or the acts to regulate commerce.

SEC. 8. The Attorney General shall, from time to time, make a report to the Congress concerning the foreign contracts registered under this act.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Foreign Contracts Act."

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution which I ask to have referred to the Finance Committee. I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement which I submit with respect to amendment of the Social Security Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Social Security Board be requested to create a Special Advisory Council to investigate the extension of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System to include persons in the armed forces, and also the extension of unemployment allowances after termination of military service;

That the Special Advisory Council be composed of citizens who are recognized as possessing substantial experience in dealing with problems of this nature, including reasonable representation from veterans' organizations;

That the report of the Special Advisory Council be transmitted to Congress by the Social Security Board together with its recommendations.

The statement presented by Mr. VANDENBERG is as follows:

There is one point at which it seems clear that the Social Security Act should be promptly amended as a matter of elementary fair play to persons in the armed forces. In respect to old age and survivors insurance, if these persons were in covered occupations before the war, they obviously are at a relative disadvantage—compared with those who have remained in civil life—when they return to civilian employment when the war is over. They have lost all of their intervening social security credits simply because their armed service was not a covered occupation. This ought to be corrected and the Government should meet the pay-roll taxes involved.

Similarly, persons in the armed forces will be at a post-war disadvantage in respect to unemployment insurance.

I know that several Senators have been studying these problems. Chairman Altmeyer made a very able and comprehensive report to some of us last week. But I am impressed with the fact that the subject is so technical that it will be difficult to handle without expert and considered advice. In 1935, in a similar difficulty when we were struggling with the problem of social-security reserves, we were greatly helped by the creation of a temporary advisory council. I am proposing the same course in the present instance.

INQUIRY INTO ADMINISTRATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 197), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry appointed by the chairman of such committee to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act is authorized, for the purposes of such inquiry, to employ clerical and other assistants and to expend during the Seventy-eighth Congress not in excess of $15,000, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, which shall be in addition to any other funds available for expenditure by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any subcommittee thereof.

PROTECTION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Dr. A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, in which he calls attention to the fact that, responsive to a number of inquiries and requests from Members of the House and Senate, a document has been prepared concerning the protection of the social security rights of individuals in the military service. He has enclosed a copy of this statement to the chairman of the Finance Committee, and I ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks in the RECORD, for the benefit of the Members of the House and the Senate who are interested in this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

General nature of plan: There are two methods that could be utilized in extending the protection of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to persons in the armed forces. One is the moratorium plan whereby all preexisting rights under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, possessed by persons entering the armed forces, would be frozen at the time they entered the armed forces. The other method is simply to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system to include service in the armed forces.

The moratorium plan has three disadvantages. One is that a large proportion of persons entering the armed forces have no previous existing benefit rights to be frozen. The second is that there is no increase in the benefit rights as occurs in the case of periods of insured employment. If these men had not been in the armed forces during the war, but had continued at their regular jobs or gone into war industry in most cases they would have been building up their benefit rights. The third is that it is more difficult to understand because it would be necessary to explain in each individual case that the period of military service would be blocked out in computing an individual's average wage (upon which benefits are paid) and in determining eligibility for benefits, both of which are related to the period of time elapsing from the date the Federal system originally went into effect (or from the date the individual became 21 years of age, whichever is the later).

It seems preferable, therefore, to treat service in the armed forces as though it were insured employment and to credit to the serviceman's social security account the wages received during his military service.

Amount of wages to be credited: In selecting the amount of wages to be credited to the serviceman's social security account consideration must be given to equity to the serviceman, and to administrative factors. The actual amount of pay received by the serviceman might be credited under the program plus an arbitrary amount such as $60 or $75 per month to represent the value of the subsistence which he receives. Crediting the actual pay, however, may involve substantial administrative difficulties. Two other simpler possibilities are either the highest pay during military service, or pay at time of discharge—plus some amount in lieu of subsistence. Another even more simple possibility is to provide some flat sum for all persons in the service, such as $160 per month, as is provided in the military service amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. It should be noted that the crediting of any amount less than $250 per month (the maximum under the present insurance program) may reduce the amount of any benefit slightly for those few persons who had higher earnings and were covered under the insurance system before entering military service.

Contributions by servicemen. Since the old-age and survivors insurance program is a contributory program, it is suggested that the legislation affording military service credit provide that contributions be paid just as they are in private employment. This should add to the assurance that any benefits derived from military service are being provided through a contributory program. In private employment, the employer may pay the individual's contributions for him. Analogously, provision can be made that the Federal Government should pay the serviceman's contributions.

Duplicate benefits. An important question to be decided is the relationship of regular veterans' benefits to benefits which would be payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. It is desirable not only to eliminate gaps, but also overlaps in providing protection against economic loss. In other countries having a social insurance system adjustments are usually made to prevent the payment of duplicate benefits for the same hazard. In Great Britain, for example, social security benefits usually are not payable if the person is eligible for veterans' benefits. In Germany the social insurance benefit may be reduced to one-third when veterans' benefits are payable.

In this country the problem of adjustment of duplicate benefits payable for the same hazards under the Social Security Act and other laws has not yet been faced or solved. If the social security law had been passed first it is probable that the various other laws Federal, State, and local, providing protection against economic loss due to the same hazards would have taken into account the basic protection provided under the Social Security Act. That is to say, the benefits provided under such other laws would have been made supplementary to the extent necessary to a more desirable degree of protection. However, as it is, in this country benefits are paid under veterans' legislation, under workmen's compensation laws, and, under other Federal, State, and local government retirement plans without any adjustment for the fact that we now have a basic social security law. The result is that frequently the benefits provided are in excess of the economic loss sustained.

In the case of workmen's compensation the duplication of benefit payments occurs only in the case of death, since disability benefits are not yet provided under the basic social security law. But in the case of death, while each type of law calculates benefits as a percentage of the wage loss sustained with a maximum to prevent payment of more than the wage loss, the payment of the given percentage under several laws results many times in a payment in excess of 100 percent of the wage loss sustained. If veterans benefits are intended to cover a proportion of the economic loss, the same result occurs in the case of death as under workmen's compensation.

Duplicate benefits can also occur in the case of persons who are entitled to old-age retirement benefits under both the old-age and survivors insurance system and under some other Federal, State, or local government retirement plan. While this duplication is reduced somewhat by the fact that all old-age retirement benefits are generally related to the actual period of service, this duplication is by no means eliminated in its entirety, since the benefits provided under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system have very little relationship to the actual actuarial value of the contributions that have been made by or on behalf of each individual who is insured. This is particularly true in the early years of the operation of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. Of course, if in the present instance the Government bears the cost of the employee's contributions as well as the employer's contributions, this is all the more true.

In this respect social insurance differs from private insurance. A comparison of the actuarial value of contributions and the actuarial value of benefits payable in the early years of the old-age and survivors insurance system will be found in table 5 of the report of the Senate Finance Committee on the Social Security Act amendments of 1939 (S. Rept. No. 734, 76th Cong., 1st sess.). That table indicates, for example, that a person who receives under the old-age and survivors insurance system $27.50 a month makes contributions which would purchase an annuity of only 41 cents a month. However, eventually, as this table indicates, the employees' contributions will cover approximately one-half of the actuarial cost of the benefits for the high-paid employee.

The Federal Government would of course have no power to require our State or local governments to make adjustments in benefits to take account of the basic benefits provided under the Social Security Act. However, it would appear that the Federal Government should make adjustments in the benfits provided under various Federal laws to cover economic loss in order to take account of the basic protection provided by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. This adjustment should, of course, be made in such a manner as to eliminate any gaps in the protection and to prevent any reduction in combined protection below a reasonable level. In the case of the various special Federal old-age retirement plans which relate the amount of benefits to length of service, while the problem of duplication exists, it is not quite so great, although its solution is more difficult. Therefore, any adjustment should start with Federal employee noncontributory plans where benefits are paid that are not related to the length of service; such as veterans' benefits and benefits payable under the United States Employees Compensation Act, the District of Columbia Work-

men's Compensation Act, the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Compensation Act, and various noncontributory retirement plans for officers of the armed forces.

If the benefits provided under the old-age and survivors insurance system, standing alone, and the benefits provided under these other Federal noncontributory plans, standing alone, were considered completely adequate, it would probably be logical and reasonable to provide that benefits should be payable under only one law. Thus, one method would be to provide that no benefits shall be payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system if benefits are payable under some other Federal law to cover the same hazard. This method is incorporated in bill S. 281. Its defect is that the benefit payable under some other Federal law may not be adequate and also not be as great as the benefit payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. Moreover, it would seem to be inequitable to pay the noncontributory benefit and withhold all of the "insurance" benefit toward which some contribution had been made by or on behalf of the insured.

Another method is to provide that there shall be subtracted from the benefits payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system benefits payable under some other Federal law. This would make certain that a person would always receive an amount equal to the higher of the two benefits. However, again we could not be sure that even the higher of the two benefits was completely adequate. Moreover this method also would not recognize that a person insured under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system probably should receive some additional protection because of the contributions that he has made under that system.

A third method would be to provide that the full old-age and survivors insurance system benefits shall be paid in any case and that the benefits provided under any other Federal law shall be reduced by only one-half of the amount of the old-age and survivors insurance benefits or one-half of the amount of the benefits provided under the other law, whichever amount is the lesser. An alternative way of accomplishing the same result as achieved under the last-mentioned method would be to make an equivalent adjustment in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system benefits but pay the full benefits provided under the other Federal law. While this alternative would accomplish the same result and might be considered more acceptable, it is not so logical if the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system is recognized as the basic social-security system and all other governmental systems are considered supplemental thereto.

It should be recognized that even this third method does not bring about a fundamental readjustment of benefits under the various systems to take into account their relationship to each other. Therefore, this method does not make certain that the total combined benefits is adequate in all cases. However, it does make certain that in all cases where protection is provided under more than one system, the beneficiary receives more in total benefits than he would receive under any one system.

There are a number of other methods which would adjust, in part at least, the duplication of benefits occurring under the several Federal laws, but it is doubted whether they would be considered as understandable as any of the three mentioned above.

In deciding on the adjustment to be made an important detail relates to the treatment of survivors who are already receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits or would have been receiving such benefits if credit for military service had been granted in the past. For the survivors of persons already killed in service retroactive credit might be granted and benefits adjusted so that all survivors of persons killed in service will receive benefits according to the same plan. Some of the alternatives for adjusting benefits would result in reduced benefit amounts for a small number of persons already receiving, or eligible, for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Therefore, consideration should be given to whether to apply the adjustment provisions only with respect to future deaths in order not to reduce benefits already payable, or to apply the adjustment with respect to all deaths in the military service since 1940.

Disqualification: It is assumed that since old-age and survivors benefits are payable under a contributory insurance program there will be no disqualification from receipt of any credit under the old-age and survivors insurance program if the discharge is not under honorable conditions.

Effective date of plan: Among the various dates which may be considered in determining the effective date of the plan are the following: September 8, 1939, at which time the emergency was proclaimed by the President; August 31, 1940, when the National Guard was called into active service; and September 16, 1940, when the Selective Training and Service Act was approved. As calendar quarters constitute the time unit with respect to wage credits under the old-age and survivors insurance system, the wage credits to be provided might begin with a calendar quarter, such as July 1, 1940, or October 1, 1940.

Terminal date of plan: The providing of wage credits for servicemen under the old-age and survivors insurance program might be terminated at the end of the war or at the end of a reasonable period thereafter. It is impossible to determine now the length of time it will take for demobilization after the termination of hostilities. Moreover, it does not seem necessary that a terminal date be specified in the initial legislative enactment. If termination of the plan is desired at the end of the war the appropriate date can be inserted at that time by amendment. However, there is no fundamental reason why the crediting of wages under the old-age and survivors insurance program for military service need be discontinued at all, since movement of individuals in and out of the armed forces will continue, although on a reduced scale.

(By unanimous consent it was ordered that the following statement submitted by Mr. MAYBANK on Tuesday, October 26, and appearing in the daily RECORD of that date be transposed to this point in the permanent RECORD.)

DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOBILIZATION UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES—STATEMENT BY ARTHUR J. ALTMEYER

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by Mr. A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, relative to policy questions involved in the development of a national system of demobilization unemployment allowances after termination of military service. I feel certain that every Member of this body is deeply interested in protecting to the full the servicemen's compensation rates and all benefits for those in the armed services.

Mr. President, this statement supplements the statement by Mr. Altmeyer which was placed in the daily RECORD of October 25 by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I request unanimous consent that the statement I submit today appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following the statement submitted by the Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement submitted by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

POLICY QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF DEMOBILIZATION UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES AFTER TERMINATION OF MILITARY SERVICE

GENERAL NATURE OF PLAN

The first fundamental policy question is whether the allowances shall be in accordance with a uniform national pattern or in accordance with the varying patterns developed under the 51 State, Territorial, and District unemployment compensation laws. Since the payments are to be made as a result of Federal military service, it is assumed that a uniform national pattern is desired so that benefits shall be calculated in the same manner, regardless of where the ex-serviceman makes application or where he lives.

AMOUNT, CHARACTER, AND DURATION OF BENEFITS

Another fundamental question is whether the amount of allowance should be a flat amount and for a fixed period of time, or whether it should be related to the amount of the serviceman's base pay or the length of his service. It is assumed that a flat allowance is desired regardless of the amount of base pay or length of service. A $12-a-week or a $15-a-week allowance for a specified number of weeks of unemployment during the 12 months immediately succeeding the period for which a mustering-out payment would be made might be considered reasonable for a person without dependents. It should be noted that only 3 State unemployment compensation laws pay benefits uniformly for more than 20 weeks, and most States pay for a considerably shorter period. Payment for a maximum of 26 weeks during a 12-month period or payment for all weeks of unemployment during a 12-month period might be considered. This 12-month period would be required in many cases for a serviceman to develop new benefit rights under a State unemployment compensation law.

Another fundamental question is whether the amount of the allowance should be varied in accordance with the number of dependents. While only the District of Columbia unemployment compensation law provides dependents' allowances, it is assumed that it is desirable to take account of dependents, especially since provision is made for dependents' allowances for persons while in service. However, a secondary question is whether the amounts allowed for dependents should be the same as (or be related to) the allotments and allowances now being provided or whether a separate schedule of dependents' allowances should be established. Either approach would be feasible administratively; however, if the dependents' allowances are to be related to the allotments and allowances now being received several questions would have to be decided. To mention only the more important, Is it desired to pay to dependents only the allowances or both the allotments and allowances in addition to the unemployment allowance that the man himself would receive? Is it desired to pay to class B dependents? Is it desired to consider a working wife to be a dependent? Is it desired to fix a maximum amount on dependents' allowances?

If a separate schedule of dependents' allowances is established the amount of the basic allowance may largely determine the number of dependents who may be taken into account because of the desirability of establishing a maximum allowance. For example, if the basic weekly allowance were made $12, a dependent's allowance of $6 a week for each dependent, up to a maximum of two or three dependents, might be considered reasonable. If the basic weekly allowance were made $15,

a dependent's allowance of $7.50 a week for each dependent, up to a maximum of two dependents, would be considered.

All but two State unemployment compensation laws provide for compensation for partial unemployment—that is, when a person works so little in a week that he earns less than his weekly benefit amount. It is assumed that allowances should be paid to ex-servicemen for partial unemployment on a basis which would encourage them to accept part-time work. Such a formula might exempt the first $3 or $6 of weekly earnings in making deductions for earnings from the total weekly allowance.

Another question is whether allowances should be paid on a daily or weekly basis. All but one State law provides for compensating for unemployment in units of a week, although the method of paying on a daily basis has certain advantages.

PAYMENT DURING DISABILITY

Another fundamental question is whether unemployment allowances should be paid regardless of whether the unemployment is due to lack of work or physical disability. There are six possibilities:

(a) Pay unemployment allowances regardless of whether the unemployment is due to lack of work or physical disability;

(b) Pay no unemployment allowances if the person is physically unable to work;

(c) Pay unemployment allowances if the beginning of the period of unemployment was due to lack of work, even though after the period started the person became physically disabled;

(d) Pay unemployment allowances if the beginning of the period of unemployment was due to lack of work, even though after the period started the person became physically disabled, except when the individual fails to accept suitable work offered to him through the employment office;

(e) Pay unemployment allowances if the beginning of the period of unemployment was due to lack of work, even though after the period started the person became physically disabled, so long as he would have been held to be "available for work" under the State unemployment compensation law of the State in which he is residing.

(f) Pay unemployment allowances if the beginning of the period of unemployment was due to lack of work, so long as the extent of any period of unavailability within a week is not such as to preclude a finding under Federal regulations that he was available for work "for the week." As indicated in (e), this is in accordance with the present practice of some States.

At the present time one State is paying disability benefits. Other States administer their laws in the manner indicated in (b), (e), or (f). Alternatives (c) and (d) are intermediate suggestions. In part, the decision as to whether to pay allowances during periods of disability will depend upon the decision as to the effective date of the program, since administrative considerations must be weighed with respect to any inclusion of disability benefits. There can be no doubt as to the social desirability of providing the ex-servicemen and their families protection during periods of sickness and disability. With an appropriate allowance of time to get ready it would not be impossible to administer disability benefits. It would be comparatively simple if disability benefits are payable only for disability occurring within periods of unemployment. If benefits are payable for disability regardless of whether it occurs within a period of unemployment, the administrative task is more difficult and of a different character, since it would be necessary to have Nation-wide facilities to determine the fact of disability in individual cases. On the other hand, payment of benefits for disability occurring within periods of unemployment and failure to pay benefits for disability not occurring within periods of unemployment will cause some anomalies and may be difficult to understand.

DISQUALIFICATION PROVISIONS

Another fundamental question is whether there shall be uniform provisions relative to disqualification for the receipt of benefits or whether the disqualification provisions in the various State, Territorial, and District unemployment compensation laws shall be applicable. The most important of the disqualifying conditions in these various unemployment compensation laws relate to discharge for misconduct, voluntary quitting, or unreasonable refusal to accept suitable employment. The laws vary in defining the type of discharge, quit, or refusal which disqualifies and in the extent of the attendant disqualification. It is assumed that specific and uniform disqualification provisions are desired. It is also assumed that refusal or failure without good cause to attend a training course as directed shall be one of the causes for disqualification.

A related question is whether the interpretations of the disqualification provisions and other provisions of the law shall be in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by a Federal authority or whether they shall be in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the various State unemployment insurance agencies. There is considerable variation between the States in their interpretation of identical language. It is assumed that the provisions should be interpreted in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Federal agency.

RELATION TO EXISTING STATE LEGISLATION

Final decisions as to what the allowances should be, what the disqualification conditions should be, and who should be responsible for interpretations are dependent to a considerable extent upon the relationship envisaged between the ex-servicemen's unemployment allowances and the regular unemployment insurance benefits payable under the various State, Territorial, and District unemployment compensation laws. All but three States have enacted legislation to freeze any unemployment benefit rights which persons entering the armed forces may have possessed at the time of such entrance. It is estimated that probably 50 percent of the persons entering the armed forces had benefit rights in varying degrees under some State law. Twenty of the States which provide for freezing the benefit rights of persons entering the armed forces have included a proviso to the effect that the benefits frozen shall not be payable until unemployment allowances payable under a Federal law to such persons are exhausted. Six additional States provide that the frozen benefits payable for a given week shall be reduced by the amount of the Federal benefits. There is likewise a general provision which is found in most State laws to the effect that benefits are not payable for any period for which unemployment benefits are payable under an unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States. Therefore, it is doubtful whether a Federal statute could be drawn to supplement for each week the benefits otherwise payable under State unemployment insurance laws which would not require amendment of the majority of existing State laws in order to make certain that ex-servicemen actually could receive combined State and Federal benefits up to the desired amount.

The States could be compelled to amend their laws to pay the frozen benefits through the insertion of sanctions in the Social Security Act relative to Federal grants for the administration of State unemployment insurance laws and the approval of State unemployment insurance laws which is necessary in order that employers may qualify for the 90 percent offset against the 3 percent Federal unemployment tax. However, this would undoubtedly be resented by the States. Even if the States were compelled to pay these frozen benefits, the determination of the respective State and Federal obligation in individual cases would be complicated.

ADMINISTRATION

Even though the States were not required to pay the frozen benefits first or were not required to share any financial responsibility for the payment of allowances to ex-servicemen, it would still be possible to utilize the State unemployment insurance agencies for the administration of Federal unemployment allowances. However, it is assumed that in order to assure administrative flexibility and adaptation to changing circumstances it is desired to make it optional with the Federal agency as to whether the allowances will be paid directly by the specific Federal agency designated to administer the law or by other cooperating Federal or State agencies.

In any event, it seems that there should be a specific requirement that applicants for allowances shall register at an office of the United States Employment Service. That Service is now being operated by the War Manpower Commission, but is being utilized by the State unemployment insurance agencies. The United States Employment Service is required by the Wagner-Peyser Act (48 Stat. 113) to "maintain a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans." Prior to January 1, 1942, the United States Employment Service consisted of 51 separate services maintained by the various unemployment insurance agencies, although almost 100 percent financed by grants from the Federal Government. On that date all of the State agencies, at the request of the President, consented to the transfer of the employment offices to the Federal Government for direct operation by the Federal Government. In consenting to this transfer practically all of the Governors and other State officials specified that they considered this transfer temporary and justified only because of the war emergency.

Regardless of whether the employment offices are returned to the States or directly operated by the Federal Government, it should be possible to administer this program simply, and in practically all cases to have local offices pay allowances without referral to either State or Federal central offices, since the schedule of allowances would be uniform and the ex-serviceman's discharge papers would contain all the information necessary to process the individual's claim.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF PLAN

Finally, there is the question of when such a program should become effective. Already thousands of individuals have been discharged from the service and it is possible that there may be some demobilization of the armed forces before complete victory over both Germany and Japan. Consequently, the effective date should be determined in relation to possible military developments and possible demobilization plans. One alternative is to begin payment of allowances upon a specified date; another upon occurrence of a specific event, such as an armistice or a substantial demobilization; another is to provide that the President shall determine the date by proclamation, taking due account of certain factors specified in the law.

TERMINAL DATE OF PLAN

It is also necessary to decide for how long a period after the termination of hostilities the program will be in effect. The period for which such a program should be in effect

depends in large part upon the length of time it takes to demobilize the armed forces and the economic conditions prevailing during the post-war period. It is possible, in view of the fact that our forces are distributed all over the world, that it may take some time for demobilization to be nearly complete. Provision could be made for the program to operate for a specified time after the termination of hostilities, say 3 years. If the Congress should decide later on that this was not long enough to permit individuals to take advantage of the provisions of the law because of a slower process of demobilization, the Congress would have sufficient time and opportunity to amend the law to extend the duration of the program, or if experience should so indicate, to shorten the duration of the program.

PURCHASE OF OLD SHIPS BY MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren, has been appearing before a House committee calling attention to the waste and misuse of Government funds, I wish to insert in the RECORD material which was recently received by me from the Comptroller General's office concerning the purchase of old ships by the Maritime Commission.

The extent to which the United States Treasury is being raided with the consent of the Maritime Commission is almost unbelievable. I shall submit today only a very few examples. I expect to submit others from time to time in the hope that sometime the conscience of this Congress may be awakened to such an extent that honesty and competency in Government will be demanded, and that those responsible for such performances may be brought to justice.

Today let me call the attention of this body to the purchase of five ships from the Waterman Steamship Co. under date of July 15, 1943, only 3 months ago. It should be recalled that over a year ago the Comptroller General laid before the Congress a report on the dealings of the Maritime Commission with the Waterman Steamship Corporation. This report has been frequently referred to by persons concerned with honest administration of our maritime affairs. Nothing has been done about it. Now the Commission and the steamship corporation, apparently emboldened by the indifference of the Congress, continue their plundering of the American taxpayer.

The five vessels purchased on July 15 of this year are the *West Kyska*, *Lafayette*, *Kofresi*, *Gateway City*, and *Arizpa*.

The *West Kyska* was built in 1918 for the United States Shipping Board. It is an 8,480-ton vessel which cost $2,006,807.48 25 years ago. In September 1931 it was sold to the Waterman Steamship Co. for $76,320. It was repurchased on July 15 of this year for $560,000, although it was valued by the United States Maritime Commission itself, under General Order No. 24, at only $50,170.

The *Lafayette* was built in 1919 for the United States Shipping Board at a cost of $1,768,163.16. It was sold in 1932 to Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. for $52,025. It was acquired in July 1943 from the Waterman Steamship Co. for $676,000, although it was valued on the books of the Maritime Commission for only $44,200.

The *Kofresi* was built for the United States Shipping Board in 1919 at a cost of $1,881,600.18. In 1931 it was sold to the Waterman Steamship Co. for $70,425. Twelve years later, July 15, 1943, it was repurchased from the Waterman Steamship Co. for $686,700, although valued under the United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24 at only $35,492.

The *Gateway City* was built in 1920 for the United States Shipping Board at a cost of $1,428,627.24. This, too, was sold to the Waterman Steamship Co. in September 1931 for $79,236. At the time of its purchase on July 15, 1943, it was valued under the Maritime Commission order at $35,715. Yet this same Commission paid the Waterman Co. $686,900 for this ship.

The *Arizpa*, which was built for the United States Shipping Board in 1920, originally cost $1,529,223.33. This was sold to the Waterman Co. in September 1931 for $79,236. On July 15, 1943, the Commission bought it back from the Waterman Co. for $686,900, although its valuation was placed at $38,230.

These five ships, upon which the Maritime Commission itself had placed a value of $203,807, were purchased by the Commission for $3,296,500 or over 16 times the legal valuation placed thereon by the Commission.

I submit, also, the report covering two ships purchased from the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corporation, which is owned by the Waterman Steamship Corporation.

These two ships, the *Pan Gulf* and the *Panama City*, were valued under the Commission's General Order No. 24 at $97,759. The Commission bought these ships on September 14, 1943, only 5 weeks ago, for $1,089,000, or 11 times the value which the Commission itself had placed upon them.

I submit the reports on these two ships that they may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

I want everyone to understand, Mr. President, that these reports which I have submitted are the official reports of the Comptroller General's office. They are indicative of the manner in which United States tax money is being squandered today. Yet the administration comes before Congress and asks for $10,000,000,000 in new taxes.

When will the conscience of the Congress be awakened to the point where it will take steps to stop this wholesale robbery? I doubt if in all the history of the world one can find an instance of the plundering of a nation such as is going on under our very eyes today while the Congress and the people seem to take it for granted. I do not put the blame for such a shameless condition on the Executive Department alone. Congress is equally to blame.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORPORATION—VESSELS TRANSFERRED TO THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION UNDER SECTION 510, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

"WEST KYSKA"

Year built, 1918.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 8,480.
Construction cost, $2,006,807.48.
Sold to Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date sold, September 1931.
Sales price, $76,320.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $560,000.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $50,170.
Scrap value, $31,560.
Remarks: Operated under mail contract, Merchant Marine Act, 1928, and under Red Sea charter in 1941.

"LAFAYETTE"

Original and subsequent name, *Dryden*.
Year built, 1919.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 11,240.
Construction cost, $1,768,163.16.
Sold to Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.
Date sold, April 1932.
Sales price, $52,025.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date acquired, July 15, 1943.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $676,000.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $44,200.
Scrap value, $34,780.
Remarks: Acquired by Waterman Steamship Corporation in 1939. Operated under Red Sea charter in 1941, reported book value as of December 31, 1941, $76,346.06.

"KOFRESI"

Original and subsequent name, *Kenowis*.
Year built, 1919.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 7,999.
Construction cost, $1,881,600.18.
Sold to Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date sold, September 1931.
Sales price, $70,425.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date acquired, July 15, 1943.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $686,700.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $35,492.
Scrap value, $31,616.
Remarks: Operated under mail contract Merchant Marine Act, 1928.

"GATEWAY CITY"

Year built, 1920.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 8,804.
Construction cost, $1,428,627.24.
Sold to Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date sold, September 1931.
Sales price, $79,236.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date acquired, July 15, 1943.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $686,900.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $35,715.

Scrap value, $29,165.
Remarks: Operated under mail contract, Merchant Marine Act, 1928, and under Red Sea charter in 1941.

"ARIZPA"

Year built, 1920.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 8,804.
Construction cost, $1,529,223.33.
Sold to Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date sold, September 1931.
Sales price, $79,236.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Waterman Steamship Corporation.
Date acquired, July 15, 1943.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $686,900.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $38,230.
Scrap value, $29,165.
Remarks: Operated under mail contract, Merchant Marine Act, 1928.

PAN-ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP CORPORATION—VESSELS TRANSFERRED TO THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION UNDER SECTION 510, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

"PAN GULF"

Original and subsequent name, *West Bridge—Ossa.*
Year built, 1918.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 8,594.
Construction cost, $2,249,620.43.
Sold to Sudden & Christenson.
Date sold, March 26, 1929.
Sales price, $57,000.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Pan-Atlantic Steamship Co.
Date acquired, September 14, 1943.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $541,000.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $56,240.
Scrap value, $31,000.

"PANAMA CITY"

Original and subsequent names, *Exbrook—Barbara Oates.*
Year built, 1920.
Built for United States Shipping Board.
Dead-weight tons, 7,667.
Construction cost, $1,660,776.73.
Sold to Export Steamship Co.
Date sold, September 9, 1925.
Sales price, $57,502.50.
Present owner, United States Maritime Commission.
Purchased from Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corporation.
Date acquired, September 14, 1943.
Acquisition cost under section 510, $548,000.
Value under United States Maritime Commission General Order No. 24, $41,519.
Scrap value, $26,300.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] inserted material in the RECORD with regard to the transactions of the Maritime Commission pertaining to the exchange which took place between the Commission and the Waterman Steamship Corporation with reference to some new ships and some old ships.

Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, has written to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, a letter setting out fully the facts with regard to the transactions referred to, together with an opinion of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, regarding the legality and the propriety of those transactions. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Chairman of the Maritime Commission to the Senator from North Carolina, together with the opinion of the Comptroller General, be printed in the RECORD following the material previously inserted by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I never object to anything presented by the very distinguished Senator, but did the request of the Senator from Vermont refer to the body of the RECORD or to the Appendix?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, but my recollection is that he asked that the matter be placed in the body of the RECORD. If so, I should like to have this follow that.

Mr. McNARY. Whichever it may be?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; whichever it may be.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, October 25, 1943.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: This letter is in response to your communication of today, requesting that you be furnished with the particulars concerning the acquisition by the Maritime Commission of five old vessels from Waterman Steamship Corporation in July 1943, and of two old vessels from Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corporation, an affiliate of Waterman Steamship Corporation, in September 1943. These two transactions were the subject of criticism by Senator AIKEN in conferences with the press held by him, as reported in the newspapers on Saturday.

None of the reports of the press conferences made reference to the most important fact concerning these transactions, namely, that these vessels were not purchased for cash, but the acquisition figures represented trade-in allowances (sec. 510, Merchant Marine Act, 1936) which were applied against the purchase by the companies concerned of at least an equivalent amount of new tonnage purchased at wartime prices.

You will recall that representatives of the Commission discussed with your committee the general problem of allowances made for old vessels traded in to the Commission in connection with the acquisition of new tonnage, with particular reference to the trade-in of some thirty-odd old ore carriers as part of the program for selling 16 new ore carriers to shipping concerns on the Great Lakes. It was explained to your committee that it was hopeless to expect to sell new tonnage at war costs, in the absence of some incentive to the owner by way of trade-in allowances for its old tonnage, and that section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, was enacted for that very purpose.

You will also recall that we submitted to the Comptroller General the situation which existed in the case of the Great Lakes ore carriers, and you were later informed that the Comptroller General had rendered an opinion fully sustaining the Commission's views as to the legality and propriety of allowing current market values for the old vessels as an inducement for the disposal by the Commission of the new ore carriers at current war costs. It will be noted that the Comptroller General indicates that for the purposes of section 510, the Commission is not required to adopt either scrap values or depreciated costs as the applicable trade-in allowances under that section. The so-called values mentioned by Senator AIKEN, as reported in the press, are not much more than scrap prices.

A copy of the Comptroller General's opinion is forwarded herewith for your information.

Waterman Steamship Corporation and its affiliate are acquiring new vessels without the aid of any construction subsidy whatsoever. They are paying for the new vessels the entire war costs to the Commission, less the trade-in allowances for the old vessels.

The new vessels are of the modified C-2 design, and it may be conservatively estimated that the difference between 1938-39 costs of these new vessels and their actual war cost is in excess of $800,000 per vessel. Present costs are, as you know, far in excess of pre-war costs, due to war conditions, particularly the excessive amount of overtime incurred in speeding up construction and other increased costs arising out of labor and material shortages. As a matter of fact, if we were to sell our new vessels at prewar costs, Waterman and its affiliate could afford to give us the old vessels for nothing, rather than accept the allowances, ranging between $560,000 and $687,000 actually granted. Notwithstanding the fact that the Comptroller General's opinion would permit the Commission to allow the full market values for the old vessels, we have applied the principle laid down in that opinion in such manner as not to make an allowance for the old tonnage over and above the lowest possible estimate of pre-war value which would be in excess of a similarly conservative estimate of the increased construction cost of the new tonnage which we are selling.

In short, through the medium of transactions such as is illustrated by the ore-carrier arrangements and the arrangements made in these two cases, we are disposing of new tonnage without the granting of any subsidy, at prices which we could hardly hope to obtain after the war. At the same time, we are assuring that at least a substantial amount of old tonnage which ought to be no part of our post-war American merchant marine will be, as provided in section 510, permanently sterilized after having served its useful purposes during the period of the emergency.

If your committee desires to make further inquiries into these matters, we will be glad to render all possible assistance.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 17, 1943.

CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL LAND: I have your letter of January 28, 1943, as follows:

"PROPOSED SALES BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION OF 16 ORE CARRIERS CONSTRUCTED FOR THE ACCOUNT OF THE COMMISSION TO PRIVATE OPERATORS ON THE GREAT LAKES, AND TURN-IN BY SUCH OPERATORS TO THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN OLD VESSELS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 510 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

"INTRODUCTORY

"The Commission was requested on August 25, 1941, by John D. Biggers, Director of Production, Office of Production Management, to arrange for the construction of 25 new ore carriers in order to take care of the transportation requirements involved in meeting the ore quota set up by the O. P. M. Upon analysis, it was decided that the O. P. M. requirements could best be met by the conversion of 7 old vessels, not previously utilized in the ore trade, for ore-carrying purposes, and by the construction of 16 new ore carriers. This program the Commission undertook to carry out.

"As these new ore carriers constituted all of the Commission's program for the Great Lakes ore trade, it was considered advisable to explore the possibilities of selling these vessels upon their completion to private operators in that trade. In its consideration of this problem, the Commission necessarily had to take into account certain controlling factors, as follows:

"(a) Under normal conditions an overtonnaged situation existed between the period from 1931 to 1940 in the Great Lakes ore trade,[1] and the same condition will undoubtedly prevail upon the termination of the emergency.

"(b) The new tonnage would aggravate the difficulties caused by there being more vessels than the trade could normally keep in operation unless at least an equivalent amount of old tonnage were withdrawn, effective as of the termination of the emergency.

"(c) Accordingly, any program for placing new vessels in the hands of private operators, or, for that matter, operating them for Government account, necessarily involves peacetime sterilization of a certain amount of old tonnage. If private operators, therefore, were to take over the new tonnage, assurances as to the retirement of the old tonnage upon the termination of the emergency would have to be given. Section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, contains statutory assurance for such eventual retirement and therefore affords an appropriate medium to effect the same.

"(d) The new vessels, even on the estimates of cost arrived at in 1941, represent a very large capital investment by the private operators in view of the long-range competitive position of the old tonnage. (As the old vessels were employed in fresh-water trades, the probability exists of their continued use up to about 60 years in the aggregate, even though these vessels may now, on the average, be 35 years old.)

"(e) Due to the shortage of turbine propulsion machinery, it was necessary to furnish the vessels with reciprocating engines, and such vessels would be inferior, with regard to speed and operating expenses, to certain new tonnage constructed for private account within the last few years. This long-range inferiority under post-war competition would seem to require, after the termination of the emergency, either conversion to turbine propulsion or permanent acceptance of other handicaps.

"Proposal: After a number of conferences, the Commission, on September 5, 1941, indicated that it would consider with favor proposals of the Great Lakes operators to acquire the new ore carriers in connection with the turn in of the old carriers under section 510 of the act, subject to the requirements of the statute, on the following general basis:

"1. The Commission would consider an allowance of credit under the provisions of section 510 in the amount of $63.75 per gross ton of ore-carrying capacity, subject to the conditions (a) that the tonnage turned in by any company would not exceed the tonnage of the new vessels purchased by that company by more than approximately 10 percent, (b) that the vessels shall have been used generally in the ore trade since September 1939, and (c) that they shall be in class and have outstanding certificates of inspection issued by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

"2. The Commission to charter back the obsolete vessels so traded in, for an annual charter hire of $2.50 per ton of ore-carrying capacity, the charter to run from the date of delivery of the replacement tonnage but with an option in favor of the operator to extend the charter for the duration of the emergency and providing for cancelation on 60 days' notice.

"3. The plans and specifications for the new vessel to be satisfactory to the Commission, but details to be left in the hands of the private operator, providing that the vessel is of modern type and that the specifications will not unduly delay construction.

"4. The Commission to lend, under the provisions of section 509, not more than 75 percent of the cost of the new vessel, at a rate of 3½ percent per annum, payable in 20 years, with provision for accelerated installments if a certificate of necessity is granted to the operator under section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"5. The Commission to recommend issuance of certificates of necessity to the proper governmental agency.

"Action taken by the Commission: Following the general outline of the program made on September 5, 1941, it was left to the operators to submit applications along the lines thereof. As such applications were not promptly forthcoming due to the rapidly increasing costs of construction and as no fixed price bids could be obtained, the Commission, on October 9, 1941, authorized the construction of 16 bulk ore carrier vessels under the provisions of Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, approved May 2, 1941, upon a negotiated basis as provided by that act. On October 11, 1941, the Commission authorized the award of a contract to the American Shipbuilding Corporation for six of these vessels, and on October 14, 1941, it awarded a contract to the Great Lakes Engineering Works for the remaining 10 vessels.

"These contracts were on an adjusted price basis, the basic price being $1,972,000 in the case of the American Shipbuilding Corporation, and $1,955,000 in the case of the Great Lakes Engineering Works. (The most recent estimates made by the Commission based upon adjustments to October 1942, indicate a probable cost of $2,170,000 per ship.)

"Due to the high cost of the new vessels, no proposals were received from the various operators for a considerable number of months. In June 1942 one of the operators having expressed an interest in the plan, the Commission authorized the Chief Examiner as follows:

"'At a meeting on June 5, 1942, the Commission considered your memorandum of June 1, 1942, on the above subject, and authorized you to proceed with negotiations looking toward placing under private ownership the ore carriers being constructed by the Commission in accordance with the terms of the letter from Chairman Land to the president of the Lake Carriers' Association dated September 5, 1941. It is understood that your recommendation on specific proposals will be submitted to the Commission for approval.'

"Upon resumption of the negotiations, an informal agreement was reached with 9 private operators, whereby they would purchase 16 new ore carriers aggregating 245,000 tons of cargo-carrying capacity, to be purchased under section 509, and would turn in, under section 510, 39 old vessels aggregating approximately 254,621 tons of cargo-carrying capacity.

"The arrangements were substantially similar to those previously outlined except that the operators insisted that, if the new vessels, after making adjustments provided for in the contracts, cost more than $2,250,000 each, either the Commission or the operator might elect to cancel the agreement.

"Accordingly, nine applications were filed, similar in general terms, the first of which, namely, that of Wilson Transit Co., of Cleveland, was presented to the Commission for consideration. As any action taken by the Commission on this application would necessarily constitute a precedent in the handling of the other applications, long and careful consideration was given by the Commission to this application and the memorandum from the chief examiner in connection therewith. At a meeting of the Commission on January 14, 1943, the Commission decided that it would take favorable action on the proposal, but that final approval would be withheld for the purpose of obtaining the views of the Comptroller General with regard to certain phases of the application, as more fully explained hereinafter.

"Since most of the details with regard to the transaction are set forth in full in the memorandum from the chief examiner, a copy of the same is attached as an exhibit hereto. Accordingly, this memorandum will merely summarize the pertinent features of the memorandum and supplement the same in certain particulars.

"NEW VESSELS

"Design known as L6–S–B1: Length overall, 621 feet; molded breadth, 60 feet; extreme summer draft, 24 feet; cargo dead weight, 15,130–15,422 long tons; I. H. P. normal, 2,500; speed, 12 miles per hour.

Reciprocating steam-engine propulsion; cost about $2,250,000 ($146 per dead-weight ton, comparable to $155.10 per ton of cargo-carrying capacity.)

"VALUE OF NEW VESSELS

"The cost per ton on the basis of the original contract is estimated to be approximately $130 per dead-weight ton. Due to adjustments based on increased cost of materials and labor and overtime expenses incurred for the purpose of insuring early delivery, it is estimated that the new vessel would cost about $146 per dead-weight ton, or about $155.10 per ton of cargo-carrying capacity.

"These figures compare with—

"(a) Pittsburgh Steamship Corporation—construction of three vessels completed in 1942—14 miles per hour, turbine-propelled vessels at about $125 per ton of cargo carrying capacity;

"(b) 1938 construction of two similar type turbine vessels at approximately $104 per ton of cargo-carrying capacity.

"Due to economies in operation and greater speed, the present trend is toward turbine propulsion. Accordingly, either the new vessels will have to be converted to turbine propulsion or will have to be considered partially obsolescent because of the marked disadvantage from the point of view of speed and operating expense as compared with the turbine vessels.

"Estimates furnished to the Commission indicate that the new vessels could be expected to earn, before depreciation and Federal taxes, about $126,000 per ship per year, as compared to estimated earnings of the turbine vessels completed in 1942 of $242,000. Translating these figures in terms of percentage of annual earnings to construction cost, such earnings should amount to about 6 percent in the case of the Maritime Commission new vessels and about 11 percent for the 1942 turbine vessels. It is apparent from the foregoing that the acquisition of these new vessels, privately operated at present construction cost to the Commission, would be of doubtful profitableness unless compensated for by other advantages.

"VALUE OF OLD VESSELS

"The old vessels which are being traded in have an average age of approximately 35 years. Due to their being operated in fresh water, they are not subject to rapid rates of depreciation, and have been allowed, for income-tax purposes, depreciation rates based on useful life up to 60 years. Furthermore, since the vessels are laid up for from 3 to 4

[1] There is appended hereto a table submitted by the Great Lakes Ore Carriers Association, showing the amount of available ore-carrying capacity and the amount of ore-carrying capacity actually employed for the period 1931 to 1940.

months during each winter season, opportunity is afforded for maintenance work which tends to keep them usable over long periods of time.

"Accordingly, considering that the vessels have remaining useful lives of 20 to 25 years on the average, variations in age are not of great significance, and an over-all valuation per ton of ore-carrying capacity is not considered by the Commission to be inappropriate.

"In the memorandum of the chief examiner it is stated that there are no comparable contemporaneous sales. However, since the preparation of this memorandum there has been disclosed in the files of the War Shipping Administration a record of a sale between private parties in December 1942 of the vessel *J. R. Sensibar*, which is a Great Lakes bulk carrier, self-unloading, gross 7,179 tons, dead-weight tonnage 9,500 tons. The purchase price of this vessel amounted to $616,000, of which $500,000 represented cash and $116,000 consisted of the assumption of a mortgage obligation. This sale indicates a current market price of $64.84 per dead-weight ton, or approximately $70 per ton of carrying capacity, as compared with the proposed turn-in value of $63.75 per carrying ton. On the other hand, early 1942 purchases of five lake vessels previously used as automobile carriers and their conversion to ore carriers cost in the aggregate $43 per ton for emergency use. It must be noted, however, in this connection that these vessels were only put into such operating condition as would enable them to take care of the emergency. Large additional costs would be required to place these vessels in a condition comparable to the trade-in vessels.

"Furthermore, it must be recognized that the valuation of $63.75 is in excess of normal values of lake vessels of comparable age and type, but this is equally true of the construction cost of new vessels.

"STATUTES INVOLVED

"No question appears to be involved with respect to the authority of the Commission to contract to sell these vessels prior to their completion, under the provisions of section 509, at the full construction cost thereof, and to lend financial assistance by way of mortgage loans of not in excess of 75 percent of such full construction cost. The only question which does arise is in connection with the determination by the Commission of the amount of trade-in allowance, which is governed by the following provisions of section 510 of the act:

"'(d) The allowance for an obsolete vessel shall be the fair and reasonable value of such vessel as determined by the Commission. In making such determination the Commission shall consider: (1) The scrap value of the obsolete vessel both in American and in foreign markets, (2) the depreciated value based on a 20-year life, and (3) the market value thereof for operation in the world trade or in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States. If the owner of the obsolete vessel uses such vessel during the period of construction of the new vessel, the allowance shall be reduced by an amount representing the fair value of such use.'

"It might appear that literally the Commission was merely required to give consideration to the factors set forth in the above quotation; nevertheless the congressional understanding was that the Commission would fix a valuation within a range set by these standards, according to which standard appeared most appropriate under all the circumstances. In this connection, I quote from my statement which appears in the course of the hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives on H. R. 5130, which I made on March 29, 1939. (The statement appears on page 2 of the public hearings:)

"'The allowance suggested by the Commission and stated in the bill would be the fair and reasonable value of the old vessel, as determined by the Commission after consideration of the following factors: (1) The scrap value of the obsolete vessel both in American and in foreign markets; (2) the depreciated value based on a 20-year life; and (3) the market value thereof for operation in the world trade, or in the foreign or domestic trade of the United States.

"'The Commission, after consideration of the age of the vessel, its physical condition, and world and United States market conditions, would assign whichever value it found to be most appropriate to the circumstances, limited, however, to the categories specified in the bill.'

"It should be particularly noted that there is no language in section 510 which provides for the elimination of enhancement in values of trade-in vessels arising from emergency conditions, parallel to the provisions of section 902, although the last-mentioned section was then part of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Such omission must be considered intentional on the part of Congress since the value for trade-in purposes under section 510 must be determined as of the time the new construction is committed for. It would be unreasonable to apply the theory of disregarding enhancement in value of the old tonnage when the same factors affect the cost of new construction. From a dollar-and-cents point of view, the conditions causing the so-called enhancement might operate to a greater extent in connection with new tonnage than with respect to the old, because of the much larger amount involved in the cast of newly constructed vessels.

"Considering solely the market value as established by the sale of the *Sensibar* and by the other tests set forth in the memorandum of the chief examiner, it would seem that the Commission could establish a trade-in allowance based on the market value thereof for operation in the world trade or in the foreign domestic trade of the United States. The problem arises, however, whether the Commission can make such market value a criterion for the allowance under section 510 (d) to the exclusion of the tests based on scrap value and depreciated value based on a 20-year life.

"It is considered that, applied to vessels used in fresh-water operation, a test based on a depreciated life of 20 years seems to have no practical application.

"As to the scrap value test, it will be recalled that when section 510 was originally enacted, the vessels acquired thereunder had to be immobilized by the Commission, except that they could be operated in a period of emergency and subject to the restrictions of the act in trade routes exclusively serving the foreign trade of the United States.

"On May 14, 1940, Congress, by Public Law 74, suspended section 510 (g) (restricting the use of vessels in the laid-up fleet of the Maritime Commission) until the proclamation issued by the President on November 3, 1939, under section 1 (a) of the Neutrality Act of 1939, shall have been revoked. Accordingly, during the emergency, such immobilization provisions are not operative, with the consequence that the weight now to be given to the scrap values is greatly lessened.

"It is believed by the Commission that the future prospects that the new vessels costing about $36,000,000 in the aggregate could not be disposed of under normal conditions without serious sacrifices justifies the Commission in allowing the full market value for the old vessels, and that therefore the transaction should be carried out notwithstanding the fact that, sooner or later, the old vessels will have to be immobilized and probably sold for scrap. But the ultimate loss involved in scrapping the old vessels is believed to be a less serious loss than that involved in postponing until after the war the disposition of the new ore carriers.

"REQUEST FOR VIEWS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"It is recognized that the determination of allowance under section 510 is primarily one for the Commission. The Commission might not, under ordinary circumstances, allow the full market value of $63.75, but it is prepared to do so in this case because of the circumstances outlined above, and it proposes in the light of the foregoing practical considerations and the legislative history to give no weight to the scrap value or values resulting from a 20-year life.

"The Commission is firmly of the opinion that the transaction is within its statutory powers and in the best interests of the United States, and that legislative sanction therefor is not necessary.

"The Commission, however, thinks that it would be advisable, in view of the magnitude and importance of the transaction, that, before consummation thereof, your views be solicited as to whether or not your office would be compelled to interpose any objection to the carrying out of the transaction along the lines set forth in this memorandum.

"As the first new vessel will be completed within the next month or so, a very prompt expression of your views would be appreciated, in order that the required arrangements for the employment or disposition of these vessels may be made in sufficient time."

The authority granted the United States Maritime Commission under section 510 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to make an allowance of credit on an obsolete vessel toward the purchase price of a new vessel was intended to provide an incentive—other than by way of subsidy—to shipowners to replace older vessels with efficient craft of modern design. (See p. 2 of H. Rept. No. 824 on H. R. 6746, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) It would seem therefore, that section 510 (d) and the extent to which the terms thereof limit the amount of an allowance which may be made should be construed in the light of such purpose.

It is stated in your letter that $63.75 per gross ton of ore-carrying capacity, the proposed allowance of credit on obsolete vessels in connection with the sale of these new ore carriers, represents the "full market value" of such vessels and that such amount is in excess of their "normal values." Presumably, the term "normal values" refers to values determined in accordance with the formula contained in section 902 (a) of said act as construed by my decision of November 28, 1942, B-30613, 22 Comptroller General 497. However, section 902 (a) contemplates only an emergent state of affairs wherein it becomes necessary and lawful for the Government to take a private vessel with or without the consent of the owner; section 510 (d) contemplates a situation—whether in times of national emergency or not—wherein the mutual consent of the Government and of the private owner to the terms of the exchange and sale transaction is necessary to its consummation.

It has been pointed out that the allowance of credit was intended as an "incentive" to owners of obsolete vessels to cooperate with the Government in modernizing the merchant marine. It would seem apparent, therefore, that if the construction cost of the new vessel, which the private operator must assume under the contract of purchase, is abnormally high—that is, if it is an inopportune time generally to buy or build a new vessel from the standpoint of normal prices or costs—private owners will be reluctant to enter into a deal involving the assumption of such costs unless the increased costs are taken into consideration in the allowance of credit on their old vessel in such way as to offset—to some extent at least—the disad-

vantage of purchasing a new vessel at such time. In other words, it would seem to be obvious that unless the offer of credit to the shipowner is sufficiently attractive in amount to induce him to contract for the purchase of the new vessel, the program which said section 510 contemplates cannot be carried out.

Eligibility of a vessel to be classified as "obsolete" under this section is limited by the definition contained in subsection (a) to vessels not less than 17 years old. However, as pointed out in your letter, a vessel might well be obsolete within the meaning of this section and yet have remaining 20 or 25 years of useful economic life. It would seem highly improbable that an allowance of credit for such vessel based upon its scrap value would provide much, if any, incentive to a shipowner to buy a new vessel under present conditions. Nor would the depreciated value based on a 20-year life of the vessel seem any more relevant in fixing an acceptable allowance.

The circumstances attending a particular sale or series of sales are so varied in nature—having regard to the condition of the obsolete vessel and the uses to which it is being or may be put—that the conclusion would seem inescapable in listing three separate standards of valuation in section 510 (d) Congress intended only that in determining the fair and reasonable value of a vessel as a basis of a credit allowance, each standard be given due consideration with a view to selecting that standard which under all the facts and circumstances of the particular case provides the most appropriate guide to such fair and reasonable value. The legislative history—particularly your statement before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives during the hearings on H. R. 5130 (76th Cong., 1st sess), quoted in pertinent part in your letter—would appear to support that construction.

Accordingly, if it be administratively determined that the program to which your submission refers should be handled by selling the new vessels and accepting in part payment thereof old vessels turned in under authority of section 510 (d), and since it is stated that $63.75 per gross ton of ore-carrying capacity represents the present fair market value of vessels of the type and class which the Commission intends to accept in connection with the sale of the new ore carriers, and since from the circumstances described in your letter the present market value of such vessels would appear to be the appropriate standard for consideration in fixing the allowance of credit therefor, this office would not be required to object to such allowances of credit on obsolete vessels in connection with the involved transactions.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

THE LATE COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last year the Senate passed a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army. The joint resolution was passed so late that the House of Representatives did not take action. I reintroduced the joint resolution on January 7 of this year. So far the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate has taken no action on it.

When the Senate passed the joint resolution last year it honored not only the memory of William Mitchell, or "Billy," as everyone called him, but it honored itself. Why the Senate Committee on Military Affairs should delay some 10 months in reporting the joint resolution I do not know.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to issue posthumously to the late William Mitchell, late a colonel, United States Army, a commission as a major general, United States Army, as of the date of his death in 1936.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized and requested to amend the records of the War Department so as to carry the said William Mitchell as a major general, United States Army, at the time of his death in 1936.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD an article under date of October 10 from the Beacon Journal, of Akron, Ohio, on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED POSTHUMOUS AWARD SEEN MORALE-BOOSTER FOR YANK PILOTS—EFFORT TO VINDICATE BILLY MITCHELL REVIVED IN CONGRESS

Pigeon-holed among dusty records of a congressional Military Affairs Committee in Washington is a bill which, if passed, would give more hope to the young American officers fighting this war in the skies than anything since the semiseparate United States Air Force was created 2 years ago.

It is a joint House and Senate resolution, more than a year old, which would bestow posthumously the rank of major general on William L. Billy Mitchell, outspoken and critical prophet of air power who was stripped of rank after making predictions that since have come true and are blasting the United Nations road to victory.

Pressing for congressional action on the measure, which would pay belated tribute to the officer whose pleas for great United States air power and warnings of danger in the Pacific were heard more than once in Akron, the Beacon Journal found that the sponsors of the resolution believe the moral effect of its adoption would be great.

Members of both Houses of Congress, the Beacon Journal Washington bureau learned Saturday, are entertaining the idea of passing this measure before the next birthday of Billy Mitchell, who died in 1936 after vainly trying for two decades to impress upon his country the power of air attack. He would have been 64 on December 29.

Passage of the measure would be a birthday present for the Nation and assurance to America's fighting airmen that the country is fully awake to the value of air power—and will never again lag behind in that field.

Since the War Department has expressed its approval, the measure could be passed easily if Members of Congress give it their attention. It was passed in the Senate during the last Congress after being introduced by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, Mitchell's home State, but died in adjournment. The White House has indicated its belief that Mitchell got a bad break, and Secretary of War Stimson has made known that the War Department has no objections.

"I shall be glad to join in a move to get the Mitchell bill passed by his next birthday and I believe a majority of Congress backs me," Senator WILEY told the Beacon Journal Washington bureau Saturday.

In December 1932—years after he had criticized Army and Navy air operations and was punished for pointing out wrongs that since have been righted—Mitchell told an Akron audience that the Nation that is powerful in the air can rule the world.

AIR MIGHT FORESEEN

Speaking to the State convention of National Aeronautical Association chapters at the Mayflower Hotel he said: "An air force not only can attack both an army and navy, but can fly directly to the vital centers of the opposing state and, if properly equipped, organized, and led, can neutralize these centers in comparatively short time."

Previously, during a visit to Akron airport in 1931, the far-sighted Mitchell declared: "Within a few years most of the overseas passenger traffic between this and other countries will be by airship. Airships will transplant naval vessels in warfare."

Mitchell was a good friend of B. F. "Shorty" Fulton, former Akron airport manager now a major in the United States air forces.

FORESAW NAZI TACTICS

Mitchell, commander of United States air forces in the last war, who was demoted from brigadier general to colonel for criticism of the Army, Navy, and Washington bureaucracy, resigned after his court martial but continued his criticism.

He also made many recommendations, which included the entire pattern of air conquest that Germany used to conquer Europe two decades later. Other recommendations in the early twenties were: Parachute troops, air troop transports, aerial torpedoes, arming of fighting planes with semiautomatic cannon and bulletproof gasoline tanks for planes.

He strongly advocated wide use of heavy bombers. He also advocated just as strongly the use of Zeppelins—claiming that we could beat Japan if necessary with 50 of them—and that is the only major air weapon he recommended that is not in use, this country preferring heavy bombers to the more cumbersome lighter-than-air craft.

News of Mitchell's death in 1936 brought praise for his career from industrial officials and others here who had known him.

The proposal in Congress simply authorizes the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell, a commission as major general, United States Army, and instructs the Secretary of War to amend the records accordingly. It doesn't cost a penny but is worth a lot more than any amount of money to a nation engaged in a struggle that Mitchell warned about and for which he demanded more adequate preparation.

Mitchell did not fight in vain. When Gen. H. H. "Happy" Arnold testified for him during the famous court martial of 1925, the young colonel of that day calmly said that more than 500 men had met their death in obsolete planes.

The impetuous Mitchell was convicted, but such facts as his were bound to have their effect. No separate air force—Billy Mitchell's pet idea—will result in this war, because the Nation is in the middle of it, but a semiseparate air forces is created and the smartest young officers of the army are now doing what Bill dreamed, filling the skies with fastest and best armored bombers and fighters.

Mitchell was a prophet without honor for years, but his greatness is now generally recognized. He preached the lesson of the role of air power and most of his compeers did not listen but Arnold and other younger officers listened and they are doing the job today.

General Mitchell was a man who would not be quieted because he saw that he spoke to deaf ears. When he was told to pipe down

he said in louder tones than ever: "What I have said about the conditions of our national defense hurts the bureaucrats in Washington. It ought to hurt them. Because it is true." He said, "Our pilots are flying in flaming coffins."

The court martial was lenient with Mitchell. Because of his brilliant World War record he was stripped of rank with forfeiture of command, pay, and allowance for 5 years. This was for telling what turned out to be the burning truth.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this article particularly calls attention to the fact that, on December 29 next, Billy Mitchell, the great prophet of the air, would have been 64 years of age if he had lived. It is my hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], whom I observe now on the floor of the Senate, will see that Senate Joint Resolution 10 is reported in the very near future, because I am informed that the House is now willing and ready to take action, and I should like to see the Senate take action first, thereby showing that the Senate was not behind in honoring this great hero. I believe that it would be a wonderful thing if, by December 29 next, this joint resolution could become law, and we could honor the memory of this great American, who demonstrated clearly the importance of air power, and who was a generation ahead of the rest of the world in his knowledge.

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. PELLEY REGARDING ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON THE RAILROAD QUESTION, AND REPLY BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of the address delivered by the Vice President at Dallas, Tex., a few days ago, with reference to the railroad question, it has been suggested to me that I offer for the RECORD a statement issued by John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, on October 21, 1943, stating the position of the railroads.

Mr. President, I might say that I have not had occasion to read the entire speech of the Vice President on this question, but from what I read in the newspaper accounts, I must say that with some of the statements the Vice President made I agree, particularly with reference to his statement regarding Wall Street control of the railroads. Many of the other questions covered in his speech were highly controversial, the correct answers to which I have not fully formed in my mind, and I do not think any other Member of the Senate has, for that matter. However, I think it is a good thing the discussion has been brought about. It is good for the country, and therefore I offer Mr. Pelley's statement for the RECORD.

In the same connection I offer a statement by the Vice President in reply to Mr. Pelley's statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. PELLEY

The Vice President of the United States, in the savage and unwarranted attack upon the transportation agencies of the country made at Dallas last night, has echoed old and discredited statements which have been answered time after time by spokesmen of Government and industry.

He repeats assertions made by employees of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in a public hearing before a Senate committee, but he does not refer to the fact that these assertions were conclusively refuted by responsible public officials and private citizens concerned with transportation. The truth is that the conference method of considering rates has long been in use and has had the approval of both shippers and public regulating authorities, and that every conclusion reached is subject to review by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Speaking for the railroads, they are willing and anxious that their rate-publishing agencies should be subject to Commission control, under regulations that will be practicable and fair.

Mr. WALLACE devoted much time to alleged discrimination against the South and West in the matter of rate adjustments. All such questions are again before the Interstate Commerce Commission in a comprehensive proceeding involving all the issues. That body, which enjoys the confidence of the country to a very high degree, can certainly be trusted to do justice to all sections.

Mr. WALLACE would have the public believe that railroad freight rates are unreasonably high. As a matter of fact, they are the lowest in the world. The average revenue for hauling a ton of freight one mile is less than one cent, and less than at any time in the past 25 years.

The Vice President repeats with the usual inaccuracies the oft-told story of the contract between the air lines and the Railway Express Agency, which performs for them the necessary ground services. This contract has lately been reviewed, revised, and approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, after certain provisions as to rate levels had been eliminated, but even before revision the contract had no effect upon air-line express rates. This is obvious from the fact that the original contract provision limited air rates to twice railroad express rates, whereas Mr. WALLACE states that these air rates are 80 cents per ton-mile, which is five or six times the measure of rail express rates. The truth is that the air rates are fixed by the air lines and the express contract has had no effect whatever upon them.

It is true that Mr. WALLACE, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, opposed the regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of motor and water rates, a reform approved by Congress in response to the overwhelming sentiment of the country. It is difficult to reconcile such a position with his statements in this speech that the Commission may be depended on to prevent ruinous and undesirable competition.

Mr. WALLACE devotes a considerable amount of time to the so-called western agreement, formerly in effect on certain western railroads. Those who are interested in this question should read the statement on this subject recently put into the record of the Senate hearings by W. Averell Harriman, our war Ambassador to Russia, who had much to do with the adoption of this agreement some 20 years ago.

The address by the Vice President is filled with statements that, by implication at least, reflect upon the competency, if not the integrity, of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That body needs no defense at my hands. Its more than 50 years of honorable service speaks for itself. It is strong in the confidence of the country.

In his references to Wall Street control of the railroads, Mr. WALLACE is merely rattling the dry bones of ancient prejudices.

STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE

It is imperative that the people understand the true nature of our national transportation problem. It is unfortunate that Mr. Pelley, speaking for the Association of American Railroads, failed to meet the serious issues presented in my speech at Dallas of last Wednesday. He says nothing of the illegal status of the railroad rate-bureau conspiracies under the controlling decisions of the Supreme Court. He accuses me of a savage and unwarranted attack because I sought to warn the people of the newest conspiracy of those who control the railroads to take advantage of our concentration on winning the war to extend their control to all competing forms of transportation and establish regional transportation monopolies.

Mr. Pelley acknowledges by implication the rate discriminations long endured by the South and West, and only remarks that all of those issues are now before the Interstate Commerce Commission. He makes no mention of the exhaustive and authoritative reports of the board of investigation and research and the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to these territorial rate discriminations. He says nothing of the role which the railroad rate bureaus have played in maintaining these regional rate discriminations.

He does not deny the existence of the western commissioner. He only refers vaguely to Mr. Harriman's apology for the western agreement, which, on close reading, merely serves to emphasize the power exercised by the committee of directors, at 40 Wall Street, over rail transportation in the South and West. From Mr. Harriman's letter it appears that the plan really did work out as intended—to stifle all competition among the western railroads. The sudden abandonment of the western agreement when its existence was brought to light by the Department of Justice is sufficient comment on the railroads' own views as to the legality of their organization.

Mr. Pelley would have the people believe that Wall Street bankers no longer control the railroads. The recent private sale of railroad bonds to private banking houses, which have long controlled and exploited the railroads, where admitted savings could be obtained through competitive bidding for such securities, is convincing evidence that these bankers rule the railroad empire today as they have in the past. The increased cost of such private financing is reflected in the rates charged the public. Only when the grip of investment bankers of the railroad corporations has been broken will sound financial policies be established which will insure that railroad financing will not contain hidden profits for financial groups which must be paid by the public through higher rates.

His attempt to explain away the monopolistic contracts of the Railway Express Agency with the domestic air lines will not bear analysis. For 4 years these contracts existed until some of their monopolistic provisions were recently eliminated under pressure from the Civil Aeronautics Board. During these years Railway Express Agency and the air lines maintained rates which discouraged the development of all air cargo. Mr. Pelley's statement that the Railway Express contracts had no effect upon air express rates deliberately ignores the fact that the mere existence of these contracts with their provisions for the distribution of available cargo was a most effective device to suppress competition among the air lines to develop their express business.

Contrary to Mr. Pelley, my address did not reflect upon the competence or the integ-

rity of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but so long as the American Association of Railroads and other transportation organizations display such callous disregard for the public interest as has characterized their past conduct, it will be difficult for any public officials charged with responsibility for regulating this industry to retain the confidence of the people.

I know of no basis for Mr. Pelley's sweeping statement that American rail rates are the lowest in the world. The evidence is that through rate conspiracies the railroads have raised the whole level of transportation rates by all forms of public carriage.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, perhaps no problem facing our people has caused more concern on the home front than gasoline rationing. This is only natural when we consider that our whole national economy has been built around the automobile; that mass transportation lines were abandoned and curtailed as the number of cars increased; that many sections of our country are wholly dependent upon motor vehicles; and that in the confusion over petroleum supplies and rationing too little attention was given to the ultimate effect of curtailments and rationing.

For nearly 2 years we have witnessed a barrage of claims and counterclaims over petroleum supplies and transportation facilities; we have seen rationing regulations changed with great frequency; and we have been in the midst of interagency feuds over responsibility.

Recently 94 motor clubs in the Atlantic Seaboard States have formed the Eastern Petroleum Consumers Council. They have tendered their combined experience and facilities to Government and industry in a desire to help stabilize the petroleum problem. The council makes sound and reasonable suggestions for future handling of all-important gasoline supplies and rationing. It is high time for Government and industry to consider the consumer and work with such groups.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD the text of a joint letter sent to Federal officials by the Eastern Petroleum Consumers Council.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASTERN PETROLEUM CONSUMERS COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., October 21, 1943.

TEXT OF JOINT LETTER SENT TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION DIRECTOR BYRNES, WAR PRODUCTION CHAIRMAN NELSON, PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATOR ICKES, DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION DIRECTOR EASTMAN, AND O. P. A. ADMINISTRATOR BROWN BY EASTERN PETROLEUM CONSUMERS COUNCIL

As we near the end of our second war year, we believe the time has come when a consumer organization of gasoline users in the Eastern States can be helpful to government and industry in meeting the manifold problems involved in petroleum supplies and rationing. With this in mind, we have formed the Eastern Petroleum Consumers Council. It is composed of 94 motor clubs, representing 250,000 members and their families.

Broadly speaking, the council will endeavor to dispel misunderstanding pertaining to petroleum supplies and rationing, help to eliminate the malpractices in the rationing system evident in black market, counterfeit, stolen, and overissuance of coupons, and will insist on an equitable distribution of the maximum quantities of petroleum that can be made available to civilians, without interfering with war uses.

In offering the assistance of the council to government and industry, we believe that it can be made much more effective if the consumer experience of motor clubs is utilized through representation in government and industry circles. We are not unmindful of the difficulties involved in petroleum production, distribution, allocation, and rationing. We also appreciate that the eastern supply has been constantly increased in the face of handicaps involving materials, manpower, and a variety of other conditions; that there were no precedents for curtailments and rationing to be used as yardsticks in assuring complete equity, and that any system of rationing touching the habits of millions of people will always be difficult to administer.

However, we now have the experience of 2 eventful years. It has been a trying period for all car owners in determining whether to retain their vehicles or place them on the market. On the one hand, they have been encouraged to keep their cars and are told that a minimum of 20,000,000 automobiles must be kept in use to prevent a breakdown in transportation. On the other hand, gasoline allowances have often been below the minimum necessary to maintain automobile efficiency and even necessary family driving has been eyed with suspicion. We subscribe wholeheartedly to the conclusion of the special Senate Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages to the effect that "* * * much of the hardship of any rationing plan can be removed by letting the public know in advance what it must expect and what it must do. * * *"

In formulating its program, the council has in mind another conclusion of the special Senate committee. In discussing the inadequate information on the number of coupons outstanding and the problem of black markets, the report said "* * * the committee feels, however, that the soundest approach to this problem must be premised upon an understanding that public opinion is the chief weapon against black markets. To mobilize public opinion people must have confidence in the information received from the administrative agencies, and must at least understand some of the reasons for the regulations * * *."

We recognize that much of the difficulty and confusion in the past have been due to conflict in Federal authority. It would seem from official statements from Washington that authority has now been more clearly defined. Thus, to bring about better public appreciation of the problem, it is desirable to have all statements emanating from Washington provide full facts and not piecemeal facts, as they relate to petroleum supplies and their effect on transportation and on rationing. We believe that the council and its component units can be extremely helpful in interpreting facts and the reasoning behind programs and policies if we have the full confidence of all agencies concerned with the problem.

Thus the purpose of this letter is not to review the conditions confronting motorists over the last 24 months nor to deal with the mistakes made, some of which were inevitable, in attempting to meet the wartime supply and rationing situation. Instead, we desire to offer the complete cooperation of the council to government and industry and make some very definite suggestions which we believe will be helpful from the standpoint of the future.

These suggestions are:

1. Petroleum supplies should be so adjusted as to permit equalization of A coupons throughout the country. The current 15-miles-per-gallon yardstick should be reviewed in the light of automotive experience and the fact that as cars get older mileage per gallon is decreased. A stabilized minimum and reasonable wartime allowance for all car owners, without constant fluctuations in coupon values and temporary expedients such as pleasure bans and attempts to arbitrarily dictate necessity driving for families will do more than anything else to wipe out black markets and assure public support.

2. Adequacy of mass transportation in urban and suburban areas should be decided upon a basis of a complete analysis of facilities, rather than the mere fact that electric railway or bus lines are operating. Facilities overcrowded far beyond capacity should not be the basis for denying supplemental rations.

3. Federal officials should discontinue questioning the patriotism of A-card holders in the form of constant criticism to the effect that they are wasting gasoline for pleasure purposes when they are consuming their limited allotments for necessary driving and often for purposes for which they would be entitled to supplementary rations.

4. Regulations relating to rationing should be so planned as to avoid last-minute repeals and amendments which have been a constant source of confusion. The Senate Oil Committee says: "Regulations affecting the use of automobiles and gasoline rationing should be carefully thought out before they are issued, so that the first impact on the public will be an incentive to cooperation."

5. The motoring public should be given the facts by Government and industry as to what steps are being taken to supplement domestic production of petroleum with imports; what effect proposed increases in crude prices will have on supplies and why they are necessary; what effect, if any, the lag in imports has on the demand for crude price increases; what is being done to encourage the exploration for new oil pools and what may be expected in the way of quality of gasoline and adequate refinery facilities.

6. The public should be fully informed as to whether production of any new cars is anticipated during the war years. If none are to be manufactured, this fact will encourage a greater degree of car conservation. The War Production Board should certainly be in position now to indicate its planning as regards wartime automobile replacement facilities or whether they are out for the duration. It is not sound to reason that secrecy is necessary to prevent owners from storing their cars for future use and thus place an added drain on mass transportation. The present low mileage limitation, and those which seem in sight, even with more gasoline, will assure operation of most cars for years to come.

This letter is being addressed jointly to the Federal agencies concerned with petroleum supplies and rationing and your cooperation with the council is earnestly solicited.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. GOTTLIEB,
Chairman.

CORRESPONDENCE INCIDENT TO RESIGNATION OF PRENTISS M. BROWN AS PRICE ADMINISTRATOR

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the letter of resignation submitted by Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown to the President and the President's reply, which appear in the Appendix.]

RATIONING IS DOING ITS JOB—ARTICLE BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Rationing Is Doing Its Job," written by Chester Bowles, General Manager of the Office of Price Administration, and published in the New York Times Magazine for October 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF S. 637 ON TEACHERS' SALARIES IN COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Mr. Paul Sifton, of Washington, D. C., and a telegram from Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, relating to teachers' salaries in Colorado, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHICH WAY, AMERICA—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Which Way, America," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon at the University of Kansas Debate Institute on October 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY AND DISAPPEARING STATES—ADDRESS BY ALFRED E. CLARK

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Bureaucracy and Disappearing States," delivered by Alfred E. Clark on September 2, 1943, before the annual meeting of the Oregon State Bar, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALES TAX AND SUBSIDIES—ADDRESS BY MAURICE LYNCH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Sales Tax and Subsidy," delivered by Maurice Lynch, financial secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, at the regular meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, October 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAYING POLITICS—EDITORIAL FROM RALEIGH NEWS AND OBSERVER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Playing Politics," published in the Raleigh News and Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Legislative Sabotage," published in the Washington Post of October 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW WORLD

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial with regard to the freedom of the press, published in the New World of October 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PHASES OF THE WAR—COMMENT BY HELEN ESSARY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comment on phases of the war by Helen Essary in her column, Dear Washington, published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS, BY LEWIS HANEY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "Some questions of readers answered," by Lewis Haney, from the Washington Times-Herald of October 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the rule the unfinished business would not come before the Senate automatically until 2 o'clock, but I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 192, which was made the unfinished business on last Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to be proposed by me to Senate Resolution 192 and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After line 9, it is proposed to add a new section, to read as follows:

SEC. 2. As herein used the term "complete victory" shall mean that our enemies have been overcome, their forces disarmed and without further control over their former productivity in arms, ammunition, and implements of war;

"Comrades-in-arms" shall be deemed to refer to those nations which shall have engaged with the United States in actual combat against our enemies;

"In securing" shall mean in bringing about and making secure;

"Just" means righteous or equitable in effect;

"Honorable" means directed to a proper end;

"Peace" shall mean an agreement designed to result in a state of tranquillity to be enjoyed by political society, marked internally within the several nations by the good order which prevails among their peoples, and externally by a good understanding with all other nations. Such an agreement shall include provision (1) that no signatory nation shall seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise, (2) that no territorial changes shall be permitted which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, (3) that all peoples shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they shall live, particularly to the end that self-government may be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived thereof, (4) that they will grant to all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished, access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity, (5) that they will undertake fullest collaboration among all nations in the economic field to the end that all may enjoy improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

"Constitutional processes" shall mean the course of procedure prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, particularly including regard for the powers of Congress stated in article I, section 8, and the limitations upon as well as the power granted to the President under article II, section 2 thereof;

"Join" means unite in effort;

"Free" means enjoying political independence;

"Sovereign" means exercising the usual powers of self-government and of declaring peace and war without outside control;

"Nation" means body of inhabitants of a country united under a single independent government;

"Establishment" means creation and regulation;

"Maintenance" means supporting and keeping in a state of efficiency;

"International authority" means a form of government possessing capacity to act in a particular field;

"Power" means capacity for action;

"Prevent" means to keep from happening;

"Aggression" means a breach of the agreement for peace, as above defined, by any nation signatory thereto, as well as the first act by any other nation of injury leading to a war;

"Preserve" means keep from destruction;

"Of the world" means all nations of the world;

"Senate resolution" means a declaration having no legislative effect, of the largest number of Senators who agree thereto, present and voting at the time of the adoption of such resolution, but no such resolution shall be binding upon the Senators voting therefor nor upon the membership of any succeeding Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is Webster's Unabridged Dictionary offered as an exhibit or appendix to the pending resolution? [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut is pending and it will be printed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Millikin
Andrews	Ferguson	Murdock
Bailey	George	Murray
Ball	Gillette	Nye
Bankhead	Guffey	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hawkes	Overton
Brewster	Hayden	Pepper
Brooks	Hill	Radcliffe
Buck	Holman	Reed
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Butler	Kilgore	Robertson
Capper	Langer	Russell
Caraway	Lodge	Scrugham
Chavez	McClellan	Shipstead
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Smith
Connally	McKellar	Stewart
Danaher	McNary	Taft
Davis	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Downey	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Mead	Thomas, Utah

Tunnell	Wagner	Wiley
Tydings	Wheeler	Willis
Vandenberg	Wherry	Wilson
Van Nuys	White	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, or does he desire first to proceed for a while?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am asking the Senator from Texas to yield to me in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. The Senator from Connecticut has just offered an amendment to the pending resolution, an amendment which would make certain and specific the language and the meaning of words in the pending resolution. I desire to ask the Senator from Connecticut if he is ready and prepared to vote for the resolution having the meaning given by the definitions which he has offered in his amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield in order that I may make reply?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that if the amendment I have offered shall prevail, I will vote for the resolution as thus amended.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has recommended to the Senate the passage of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Though brief in its words, it is the result of many weeks of the most careful and deliberate consideration of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the full committee. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman. I desire to express my deep personal gratitude to members of the subcommittee for their patience, for their industry, and for the able manner in which they performed their duty as members of the subcommittee.

Before the committee for its consideration were resolutions as follows:

1. Senate Resolution 22, by Mr. WILEY: Inviting the President to join with the Senate in creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council.

2. Senate Resolution 76, by Mr. PEPPER: Authorizing the appointment of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations to be known as the Committee on Reoccupation and Reconstruction.

3. Senate Resolution 91, by Mr. GILLETTE: Approving the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter.

4. Senate Resolution 99, by Mr. THOMAS of Utah: Favoring the calling of a conference to formulate a program of international economic cooperation.

5. Senate Resolution 114, by Mr. BALL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HATCH: Favoring organization of the United Nations to maintain peace.

6. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, by Mr. KILGORE: Requesting the President to invite foreign governments to participate in an international constitutional convention to draft a constitution providing for an international government.

7. Senate Resolution 135, by Mr. PEPPER: Relating to membership of the United States in the United Nations in order to implement the Atlantic Charter.

8. Senate Joint Resolution 56, by Mr. THOMAS of Utah: Relating to the participation of the United States in the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

9. Senate Joint Resolution 60, by Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Establishing a committee to provide for the formation of a Pan-American Legislative Union.

10. Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, by Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. WHITE: Relating to America's post-war plan.

11. House Concurrent Resolution 25, by Mr. FULBRIGHT: Declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace.

12. Joint Resolution 84, by Mr. WILSON: Requesting the President to invite friendly nations to enter upon consultations with delegates of the United States with a view to the promotion of permanent international peace.

These various resolutions presented many approaches to the outstanding objective of world peace. The Committee on Foreign Relations, after long and careful study, concluded that the pending resolution most nearly interprets the sentiments of the people of the United States and that of the United States Senate than any other proposal submitted. It therefore recommends that the Senate pass the resolution without amendment or modification.

The ideal of international peace has long attracted the dreams and efforts of statesmen and thinkers. It has thrilled the imagination of men for more than a century. A great French scholar, Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1713) proposed a plan for universal peace. The great German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1795) advanced a plan for the same objective. The distinguished Englishman, Jeremy Bentham (1786–89) proposed his conception of a workable plan for international peace. None of these proposals met with any concrete adoption. They did, however, leave an impress on the intellect and thought of public men and scholars through succeeding generations. The League to Enforce Peace sponsored by ex-President Taft was another example. There were others.

The attainment of international peace is the logical culmination of the development of governmental and judicial processes. The primary step toward peace was begun in the establishment of agencies to settle disputes between individuals respecting personal property or personal rights within a political unit. The next step was the assumption of authority over feudal barons by the crown, or national authority, in the matter of differences between feudal lords, theretofore settled by wars between their private armies.

Possibly the most significant step in the evolution of peace was crystallized in the Constitution of the United States. Conflicts between States had rendered continuance under the Articles of Confederation intolerable. The Constitution federated the States into a Union and established the Congress to legislate for the control of the States in their relation to each other and provided a Supreme Court with authority to adjudicate disputes between the States.

In 1914 the First World War broke upon Europe in all its fury and savagery. For almost 3 years the United States was able to maintain its neutrality. However, because of repeated aggressions against American rights and the lives of American citizens, our country was reluctantly compelled to draw the sword in defense of its own safety and dignity. It is unnecessary here to catalog the sacrifices, the misery, and the tragedies that the war brought upon the humanity of the world. Millions of lives were sacrificed. Oceans of blood were loosed upon fair lands. Billions of dollars of wealth were poured into rivers of ruin and waste. The gallant and the brave were mutilated and wounded and killed in this cruel and barbaric conflict. The people of the United States and of the

world suffering the horrors and miseries of that war began to fashion in their minds and hearts a desire for the establishment by international action of some agency or machinery for the settlement of the causes of war through peaceful and amicable means and therefore to prevent the recurrence of another world tragedy. The League of Nations was established by the Treaty of Versailles. The United States did not become a party to that treaty because the United States Senate failed to ratify the compact.

It is frequently said that the League of Nations was a failure. That is an unjust charge. It is granted that it was not a complete success. However, it did serve a useful purpose. Even its weaknesses and its failures have contributed to the public thought and the attitude of nations and of political leaders. It has served an additional purpose. It has demonstrated where the pitfalls may lie, and where any international organization for peace must be strengthened or buttressed. It was a new departure in international life. It was an experiment in a virgin field. It could not be expected to attain perfection. It did not spring full-panoplied with wisdom, with courage and with instrumentalities for achieving all of the ends which many hoped for and expected. The history of the League ought to lighten the pathway along which nations may travel in the years to come. Great civilized nations are now engulfed in another world war, more far-flung and involving the expenditure of greater resources and calling for more momentous sacrifices than any struggle that has ever shaken the foundations of the earth. Twice within a quarter of a century, the United States, without being guilty of aggression, without any ambitions for the lands of our neighbors, and innocent of any violation of international law, has been dragged into two world struggles that have sorrowed thousands of homes, have orphaned many thousands of children, and have wasted the national wealth, have injured our commerce and internal economy and have forced staggering sacrifices upon all of our people.

Again the people of the United States hunger for peace. Again they dream of the establishment of international authority to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That ambition cannot be achieved by the United States alone. It requires the cooperation of other strong and powerful nations. The United States cannot write a pattern of its own and expect all other nations to accept it in detail. The Senate of the United States cannot blueprint in advance the action of the nations whose influence, power, and arms must secure the desired results. The most that the Senate may accomplish at this time is to express to the peoples of the world and to lay before the people of the United States the attitude of the Senate with respect to this commanding problem. The Constitution of the United States provides:

> He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

This solemn injunction places upon the Senate the high responsibility of advising the President, who must initiate treaties with respect thereto. Of course, the Senate may not ratify treaties not yet made. The present Senate may not bind the action of a future Senate. The present Senate, however, under its solemn duty may advise the President as to its sentiments and intentions with respect to any treaty which may be negotiated.

It is under this constitutional sanction that the Senate is asked by the passage of this resolution to express to the President the attitude of the Senate of the United States.

The resolution has been attacked as being general in its terms. It is broad in its terms for the reason that it is advanced as a framework within which the makers of the treaty may provide the detailed structure and the particular delimitations and affirmative provisions that may be necessary to accomplish the desired ends.

The primary condition upon which the peace of the future may be based is the necessity that the present war shall end in victory. It is therefore provided, "Resolved that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved." After victory shall be achieved, the next logical step is the securing of an honorable peace. Therefore it is provided, "That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace." When these pressing and imperative achievements shall have been accomplished the resolution then looks to the establishment and maintenance of international authority to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world. It is therefore provided, "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The last paragraph just quoted has been assailed because of its employment of the word "sovereign" nation. Certainly a nation would have to possess the elements of sovereignty and ability to perform its obligations and commitments under an international treaty. To the extent of the commitment assumed, the nation would, of course, be deprived of its liberty of action. It would not have, however, to surrender anything of its sovereignty. Sovereignty implies the right and the power in a nation to make its own choices and decisions. But when it assumes a treaty obligation voluntarily, it must fulfill its obligation. This is not an impairment of its sovereignty but is rather a demonstration of its sovereignty. The resolution is not suggestive of any alliance. It provides, "Join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority."

It thus gives the widest latitude to nations that may become initially, or later, members of any organization or authority which may be created.

It has been suggested that instead of the words "international authority," the words "international organization" should be used. The word "authority" was chosen because of its breadth and comprehensiveness. It includes the employment of all existing international agencies, such as the Court at the Hague, or any other existing international organizations, as well as the creation of any new organizations.

We should not abandon what may be useful in arbitration, conciliation, the Pan American Union, the deliberations of the World Court, or the Kellogg Pact.

I was glad to see in this morning's press a statement by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in which he suggested the utilization of the League of Nations. It indicates agreement with the general belief that the maintenance of international authority comprehends the employment of any useful agencies already in existence, and authorizes the organization and creation of any further agency or organization which might be employed, and that to confine the language to the creation of a new organization would not comprehend those very laudable purposes.

It has been suggested that the words, "with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world" should designate the particular kind of power with which international authority may be invested. The word "power"—meaning a grant of authority—was chosen with the deliberate intent to include all forms of power necessary to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. "Power" is a term clear in its implications and any designation of particular forms of power would exclude those forms not named.

When World War No. 1 ended in victory, we hoped thereafter to live in peace with the powers of the earth. We had hoped that our heroes had not died in vain. Our great leader and Commander-in-Chief, Woodrow Wilson, with an exalted dream of peace and a noble conception of freedom from the misery of war, undertook to lead the world into the pathways of peace. We had hoped that the constructive initiative and the intelligent energies of the modern world would be devoted to the creation of useful things for the enjoyment of the peoples of the earth. We had hoped that the genius of scientists would no longer be devoted to the manufacture of arms and murderous weapons of warfare. The United States, during the score of years following World War No. 1, made generous exertions toward peace and disarmament and arbitration. These hopes and dreams came crashing about us in ruins in 1939. The dastardly designs of megalomaniacal conquerors and the flame of the cannon's mouth shriveled them into ashes.

Today, our Nation is involved in a war that belts the globe. For 10 years Hitler was secretly arming and marching and drilling a mighty army. He planned the conquest of Europe. He hoped to master the Mediterranean and the lands which it washed. With his fantastic ambition to surpass Napoleon, he planned to subjugate Russia and extend his realm into Asia. He was to combine Napoleon and Alexander the Great and Caesar and Genghis Khan into the world's greatest military master.

His ultimate ambition was to leap across the South Atlantic from Africa and challenge the independence of South America and the Monroe Doctrine.

Six thousand miles westward the crafty and treacherous Japanese for 20 years had been preparing for the hour they could strike the United States. For 5 long bloody years Japan had harried with torch and sword the territories of unoffending China. Savage and destructive war had been waged against that peaceful people. The world will long remember the dastardly and treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor. Our soldiers and sailors were murdered without a hint of warning. While their diplomatic emissaries were standing at the door of the White House pretending to be messengers of peace, they drove the dagger of the assassin into our armed forces. With Oriental beguilement, they sought to becalm and then betray us while they planned with fiendish deviltry the barbaric attack on Pearl Harbor. We promptly declared war on Japan. Germany and Italy quickly declared war upon us, and we declared war upon them.

In this heroic struggle to save the life of free government and to preserve the liberties of the world, we fight with the United Nations as comrades-in-arms. We are fighting side by side in the cause of "collective security." If in war, concert of action is necessary, why should not we together with the United Nations and other free nations act in concert in time of peace to provide collective security to avert the horrors and miseries of brutal and unjustified aggression? Tyrants and dictators may easily make war. Their edict alone is required to declare and make war. In democratic nations constitutional requirements demand something more—the action of the people through their representatives. There is no adequate curb against the ambitions and aggressions of despots and conquerors except the joint action of peaceful nations.

We have tried "isolation"—and I say that without any desire of offense. It did not bring peace or security. Dictators planned their conquests upon the hope of "divide and conquer." Alone through cooperative action can their mad schemes be arrested. Isolation has failed. Let us try collective security.

The Senate of the United States will express the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen. It does not follow that the status quo in every particular will be preserved. The constitution of such a body could provide the necessary elasticity to meet the needs of the future. It will not be an easy task. Difficulties will be encountered. Obstacles will face us. But we need not despair. We have faced great national and international problems before. American genius and leadership and statesmanship will not be deterred by hardships and struggles. They are rather a challenge to the highest and noblest traits of national character. It will not be perfect. What human agency reaches such a goal? The Constitution of the United States has been amended, and may be amended again. The British Constitution and the structure of other powers have yielded to change. They have responded to the need of changing times. The sublime objective of world peace is worth the effort. The experiment commands our highest hopes and best aspirations.

The United States is so powerful, with such a tremendous striking power upon the sea and upon the land, that it is invincible against any single power on the globe. It is equally powerful in world councils. We gave freedom to the Philippines. We withdrew our Army from Cuba and granted it independence. The world knows that we cherish no scheme of conquest and no ambition for military rule. The hour has struck for America to instill those principles into world policy.

From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venomous head. [Applause.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the minority side of the Foreign Relations Committee I wish to make a brief statement following the statement made by the able Senator from Texas. I shall appreciate it if I may be permitted to make my statement without interruption, although, of course, I shall be glad to submit myself to the Senate at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I support this resolution for four reasons:

First. It is obvious that effective post-war collaboration between the United States and her allies must continue beyond our victory at arms if we are to defeat permanently not only our military enemies but also the tyrannies and the aggressions for which they stand; and if our war sacrifices are to win a better world not only for ourselves but for a happier and a safer civilization. We must organize for peace and for the power to preserve it, and for the quest of justice through effective international law. In my opinion, that is what this resolution means. I am willing and glad to say so.

Second. It is equally obvious that this post-war cooperation need not and should not impair the essential sovereignty and independence of our own free Republic; that we best serve the world—as well as our own traditional destiny—by preserving the identity and the essential self-determination of our own America as a continuing lighthouse of benign liberty and as a strong, component, prosperous partner in our future relations with other free and sovereign nations. I am willing and glad to say so.

Third. In determining our specific, cooperative course in these subsequent critical events—in other words, in ultimately implementing these great aspirations—it again is obvious that the United States must and should proceed by the due constitutional process which is our own peculiar and particular and utterly precious, democratic inheritance. We owe it to candor to make this necessity and this intention plain to our own people, and to the world, which especially needs to understand. I am willing and glad to say so.

Fourth. In stating our objectives, the resolution has avoided crystal-gazing details in respect to happenings and attitudes which are yet to reveal the actual circumstances which we shall confront at the peace table and in the post-war world and which will be the controlling factors in the ultimate decisions. Here and now we assert our faith and purpose. But we withhold our blueprints until we are at grips with the realities of tomorrow and the disclosure of the intentions of others. I am willing and glad to approve such sanity and prudence.

Having thus stated my four cardinal reasons for supporting the pending resolution, perhaps it were wiser if I took my seat. But the solemnity of this step, and the vast range of controversial discussion which has preceded it, urge me to a few, brief, additional comments.

Mr. President, it is important to understand the source of the pending resolution. The subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to which this whole problem of peace relationships was originally referred commenced its meetings on March 31, 1943. The subcommittee, like the full committee, proceeded under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. For the record, because the identification will become important a little later, I should like to have it appear that the subcommittee consisted of the following Senators: CONNALLY, GEORGE, BARKLEY, THOMAS of Utah, GILLETTE, LA FOLLETTE, WHITE, and the Senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The subcommittee was in weekly session almost constantly in this interim during which History was writing with a rushing pen. It was privileged intimately to interview many of the most responsible spokesmen for our own and the Allied Governments. It was in constant and sympathetic contact with our own State Department. It had access to much confidential information which, for military and diplomatic reasons, could not be more widely disclosed even in the Congress itself. It was declining to move in the dark, and meanwhile it was seeking light.

There have been impatient complaints, Mr. President, from time to time that the subcommittee was stubbornly suppressing the many resolutions before it, representing many divergent points of view, simply because it was grimly committed to a do-nothing and say-nothing policy of blindly entrenched nonaction. Again for the record, I want to assert that nothing could have been further from the truth. In my 15 years' experience in this body I have never known any committee that more constantly or more conscientiously kept to its critical task. Let it be known that we were constantly warned to take extreme precaution and care lest we disunite the war effort by premature attempts to unite the peace effort. Let it also be known that the subcommittee was an absolute unit—regardless of either partisan or

foreign policy predilections—an absolute unit throughout the spring and summer and well into the fall in believing that the war effort, both at home and abroad, could have been greviously jeopardized, beyond any possible compensatory advantage, if the Senate took the wrong kind of action at the wrong time. This is still true. If we were mistaken, it was an error in which we were constantly supported by the best lights and the best advice available to us.

The only dissenting vote in the subcommittee when it took this final action was that of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who was, unfortunately, absent because of serious illness during the last month of our proceedings, and who voted not on the merits of the committee's report but because his belief in the inadvisability of any Senate action continues down to this good hour. At his request I quote from a current telegram from him:

> With all due respect to other members of the committee, I think a great mistake is being made by the committee in its present efforts to commit the United States to a future course in world relationship when the committee and the people of the United States are still in the dark as to the peace-table demands and the post-war policies of the other United Nations.

I am glad to thus serve the request of the Senator from Wisconsin. Frankly, there is still much to be said for his point of view. It reemphasizes what I have said about the long deliberations of the subcommittee. We were not stalling, Mr. President. We were using the best united and composite judgment which we could dedicate to our country's welfare. If we were guilty of anything, we were guilty of looking before leaping—which is still a worthy motive when the trustees of a nation deal with its life and fate.

Recent intervening events convinced all the balance of the subcommittee that if the world really needs a general declaration of the present Senate's belief in an American purpose to play its full and appropriate part in the post-war world and in programs to consolidate the fruits of victory for keeps, we could now undertake to declare these general purposes, short of any detailed specifications, which must, I repeat, await the disclosure of tomorrow's realities. The usefulness of the effort, Mr. President, now confronts its acid test. The answer will be written in the nature and in the trend of this debate, and in the character of the decision which concludes it. If we were to try to do too much, we might wind up doing worse than too little.

For whatever it may be worth, Mr. President, I recommend the adoption of the resolution without change. I shall oppose any change, even in aspects which my personal judgment might approve, because if we start to rewrite the resolution on the Senate floor we may finish with a hybrid which the Senate might disown. It could be easy, under such circumstance, not only to harm the post-war peace, but also to prejudice the war and our victorious momentum.

Now, what is it we propose to say and do?

We are asserting the firm American purpose: First, conclusively to win this war against all our enemies; second, effectively to cooperate with our comrades in arms to secure a just and honorable peace; and then, third, acting under constitutional order to join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve peace in the world.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a forthright, unequivocal expression of American intent and purpose to see this war through to a victorious finish, and then to see the peace through to the equally victorious finish of tyranny and aggression. If the world is waiting to know America's post-war intentions, there stands the straightforward answer so far as the Senate is concerned.

I do not know of any other Allied parliament that has said as much. I do not know of any sound and realistic reason why anybody—at home or abroad—should ask us at this time to say more.

To attempt to say more—to enter the speculative realm of prophetic methods—would be to deal with the imponderables of the future. We cannot know the precise pattern of things to come; and the pattern will have much to do with ultimate methods. We do not know the peace plans and the peace purposes of our allies—except, of course, that we know Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin have given their people ample reassurances from time to time that they intend faithfully to look out for their own national interests. They will have quite as much to say about it as will we. This business is not our monopoly. Our State Department is only now entering upon its very first, preliminary conversations with one of our great major allies which will have infinitely much to say about the post-war world. These foreign attitudes are dreadfully important. I confess I cannot ignore the warning given us by Henry J. Taylor, one of our greatest war correspondents, who, after years abroad, reports to us, in his great contemporary book, that—

> If our leaders were less vain they would see that, whereas the world resents the German idea of world influence as being repugnant to all free men, our own Government's idea of excessive internationalism is also unacceptable.

In my very earnest opinion, Mr. President, it would be recklessly improvident for us to proceed at this juncture beyond the assertion of these general objectives which only unfolding destiny can implement—objectives upon which we hope a chastened world may unite. It would not only be improvident, I believe it would be disingenuous because it might invite international reliance upon specifications which our people might insist upon changing in the light of subsequent realities. It would be not only improvident and disingenuous, but I believe it might threaten the validity of our general pledge which, otherwise, will, in my judgment, be faithfully kept when the American people see that this pledge is wisely implemented, from time to time, as the realities of tomorrow disclose their own necessities. It would not only be improvident, disingenuous, and dangerous from a domestic point of view but it could easily create immediate dissension that would split apart our allied unity before the war is won if, in our impatient zeal for details, we should trespass upon delicate situations which—whether we like it or not—must await negotiation for settlement. If we open the door to details, it may never be closed until infinite damage has been done. So far as I am concerned, our first job is to win the war and get our boys back home.

There are those who will disagree with this analysis. I respect their opinions. I do not ask them to embrace mine. I simply state my own deep conviction—born of the long work of the subcommittee to which I have referred—that it is the course of wisdom to stop, for the time being, where this resolution stops; thus to assert—I hope by a powerful vote—that this Nation intends to see this crusade through to its final triumph whether in war or peace; and to let unfolding realities, when we know them, dictate the ultimate ways and means.

This does not mean that we should not be constantly studying and planning and consulting in respect to all possible post-war contingencies. There cannot be too intensive preparation for the show-down days. But it does mean that blueprint commitments should be the end result only when the show-down days arrive. Otherwise, we have the cart before the horse.

Even the war map is changing every day. Yesterday's enemy is today's ally. I hope to God this last statement never has to be written in reverse. But it seems deadly clear to me that we must await the ultimate event before we presume to deal specifically with it. Our wise pledge, at the moment, is the general pledge which the pending resolution contemplates. For myself, I am prepared to take that pledge for keeps.

We are now said to be one world. We are indeed a physically foreshortened universe in which America cannot live unto herself alone. But we are still a world in flux in which the integration of the universe is as yet utterly remote. We still have primary responsibilities to our own United States which we shall desert at our peril. We cannot resolve these responsibilities by resoluting in the dark. There is no resoluting being done abroad. The desirable, the essential objective is clear. The desirable, the practical procedure is not. Therefore, I submit, Mr. President, that while the studying and the planning and the exploration should intensively go on, the Senate's immediate responsibility is discharged to the maximum of both wisdom and prudence when we define the objective, leaving the procedure to a time when we know whereof we speak. After all, this is only our first word of advice. It need not be the last.

It is not without its admonition at this point to quote a distinguished citizen who

is most pronounced in his advocacy of international unity and who spoke recently at St. Louis, as follows:

> In my opinion, we are not yet at the blueprint stage. The ultimate blue print will be what we can work out with our allies in mutual accommodation. But first we must discover a common ground on which we can begin to build.

Mr. President, I think it is a God's blessing upon the work of the Foreign Relations Committee that it has found a common ground which could win such overwhelming approval, and which in turn, if it shall win kindred Senate approval, will be infinitely more informative around the earth in respect to our post-war intention than can any possible parsing of a sentence in the resolution itself.

Let this be added: The Senate and the House are rightly jealous of their own prerogatives. We assert these prerogatives in the pending resolution—precisely as did the House in the Fulbright resolution—when we declare that America's ultimate commitments shall scrupulously pursue due constitutional process. Those who thus defend their own constitutional prerogatives should be equally scrupulous in recognizing the constitutional prerogative of the Executive in respect to the initial negotiation of international engagements. I fervently believe it is of the highest concern that the Senate and the Executive should work in closest possible cooperation in the evolution of the formulas of peace so that we may avoid the sterile deadlocks of 25 years ago. But I equally believe that we must respect each other's constitutional rights; and that we in the Senate are not the ones who should speak first in respect to any detailed blueprints for the peace. We are entitled to "advise" the Executive in respect to the boundaries of our peace purposes. Beyond that, we would be—certainly at the present moment—somewhat trespassing.

It has been said, Mr. President, that this resolution is vague—that it can be subjected to varying interpretations respecting the peace methods it envisions. That is true. But that is a source of strength rather than of weakness for the moment. It can fit itself into whatever channel our best judgments dictate when we confront the actual post-war situation to which our precepts shall be applied. It is not a strait jacket which otherwise might burst asunder. By remaining general instead of attempting now to become specific it also remains both honest and practical. But there is nothing vague about its pledge. We promise to join in establishing and maintaining international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve peace in the world. If that pledge is not good, Mr. President, then any multiplication of details would be a mere multiplication of deceit.

I do not undertake to say how it shall be done. There are many different ways. I would not even undertake at this time a public prophecy as to the proper formula. I shall most respectfully decline to indulge in any present discussion of method. At best, in the absence of a prescience which is denied to mortal minds, it would be mere confusing speculation so far as Senate responsibilities are concerned. In my view, we have done our full Senate duty at this point in World War No. 2 when we specifically recognize the need for international collaboration in the subsequent peace as well as in the present war, to end tyranny for keeps and to protect the world's peace; and when we solemnly assert the purpose of the United States faithfully to cooperate with its comrades in arms to achieve this benediction.

Mr. President, I want to quote just one cogent editorial comment at this point. It is from the New York World-Telegram:

> The Senate subcommittee resolution for post-war international collaboration should be passed by more than a two-thirds majority and in time to strengthen Secretary of State Hull's hand at the Moscow conference. It is not perfect. But it is probably the best compromise to get the largest vote on the major commitment, which is what counts.
>
> One objection raised is that it is very general. That is its virtue. To try to fix details of post-war organization, when the world situation is in rapid flux is an academic rather than practical pastime. Anyway, that is beyond the Senate's function. Details must be left to the foreign negotiating agency of government which is the Executive.

It is very easy to put a microscope upon each word in this resolution and then to use it as a text for critical inquiry. That is a trait which it has in common with all generalizations. Such a process, applied to other resolutions that have been offered on this subject, will disclose even greater infirmity—if it be an infirmity—upon this score. They are shot through with speculation. The more they attempt to approximate partial details the wider becomes the zone of argument. This is one of the persuasive reasons which moved the subcommittee in clinging to the greatest simplicity in this initial statement.

Now, Mr. President, I come to another phase. The opinion of the Senate is of no value; it would be a sham and a delusion, except as it reflects the reliable opinion of the country. America still belongs to her people. They are not yet wholly at the mercy of their overlords. The people have spoken, in very recent months, through several different official and semiofficial media, although they have never spoken as a whole upon their post-war convictions.

They spoke, for example, in the so-called Fulbright resolution, overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives. The Fulbright resolution went no further in its details than the pending resolution does; indeed, I do not think it went as far. Yet it was widely greeted as an adequate and an appropriate expression of American aspirations and intentions.

They spoke through the resolutions adopted by the advisory council of the Republican Party at Mackinac. To be sure, that was a partisan group. But I do not refer to it in a partisan sense. Partisan divisions among us should stop at the water's edge. I refer to it only because it included, among others, the elected Governors of States representing some two-thirds of our population. When that council spoke, it spoke substantially in the spirit and within the limitations of the pending resolution.

Another great sector of our people spoke—and most significantly—through the action of the American Legion a few weeks ago, and the kindred pronouncement of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The servicemen of World War No. 2 have a supreme priority in their right of consultation regarding the liquidation of this conflict to which they give their lives. Perhaps the veterans of World War No. 1—who went through these same bloody vicissitudes 25 years ago—may not be an unreliable criterion as to these service viewpoints. These veterans in very recent conventions approved our post-war association with other nations, implemented with the power to preserve peace. Their action was, in essence, the same as that here recommended for Senate action. Indeed, our phrase about cooperation between "free and sovereign nations" is a direct quotation from the Legion resolutions. The V. F. W. was even more direct and vehement upon this point. It said:

> We are unalterably opposed to any peace plan that would bring the United States into a world government or superstate.

I pause at this point, Mr. President, to say that, in my opinion, this reference to sovereignty is indispensable to a correct assessment of the American point of view. If this is so, it were better that we be frank about it. Under metaphysical examination, the definition of sovereignty may invite wide latitudes. I agree, for example, that the exercise of sovereignty includes the right voluntarily to part with some of its elements by due constitutional process. Obviously the sovereign may, upon occasion, voluntarily part with certain elements of literal sovereignty in return for compensatory advantages. Certainly sovereigns do not cease to be sovereigns when they mutually and voluntarily cooperate for their collective good—any more than we lost our sovereignty by joining the United Nations in this war. But this, again, is a detail which presently begs the question. Even the New York Times observed editorially a few days ago that "as long as such agreements do not delegate to an international body coercive powers to be applied to the United States, a theoretical debate on sovereignty is indeed beside the point." But, of course, it would not be theoretical, and it would be straight on a very deadly point, if an expression of our sovereignty were to be denied to us in a general prospectus of this nature.

"Sovereignty," in its general sense, is an over-all symbol, like the flag. It bespeaks the maintenance of the identity, the integrity, and the essential self-determination of the free and independent United States. It denies our disappearance in any world government of a world state. It does not deny, it does not hamper, our legitimate and effectual cooperation with other free and sovereign

nations in post-war relationships which shall seek a conclusive end to aggression, to tyranny, to international piracy, and to the repetition of world wars because these things can serve the best welfare of our sovereignty. But it has a distinct and positive implication which, in my humble opinion, is an irrevocable part of the average American mind and heart which it would be sheer folly and futility to ignore. The American people will internationally cooperate. They will never internationally surrender.

But let me come back to my theme. The pending resolution is the common denominator of all these official and semiofficial contemporary pronouncements on American foreign policy. To the same end, let me remind the Senate that the subcommittee which drew this resolution was composed of five Democrats and two Republicans. It was composed of men who profoundly differed in their pre-Pearl Harbor views. The resolution is the common denominator of their views. Each would have written it differently in some aspect. For example, my own deep interest is in the pursuit of international justice through the establishment of international law on effective foundations. It is the committee's view that this objective is inherent in the resolution's broad language to do whatever is necessary to preserve the peace of the world. It is inevitably included within the boundaries of "international authority to preserve the peace of the world" along with other instrumentalities. I could write a strong resolution dealing with this one instrumentality alone. Other members of the committee could similarly identify their favorite themes. But the important thing at this preliminary stage of the proceedings is to contemplate the eligibility of all useful instrumentalities; and each member of the subcommittee, abjuring personal preferences, subscribes to the composite whole of the pending resolution as the best and wisest present statement of prospective national policy. I repeat that it is the common denominator.

Do not misunderstand me, I do not for an instant deny that many American groups have urged that we go further. But, by that very token, they must approve if and when we go this far. Other groups, with deeply patriotic conviction, object that we should go this far. We must search for the point at which the most minds meet. When we stand at such a point, we stand on solid ground. It is foolish and futile to stand on any other. Here is the solid ground:

> The United States, acting through its constitutional processes, will join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, that is solid ground. Let us keep to it and carry on. On this ground the United Nations can begin to build a better world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rise to ask the Senator a question, not with any desire of being in conflict with the views which he has expressed, or those expressed by the chairman of the committee, because I find myself in practical accord with everything which has been said as to objectives and purposes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know that is so.

Mr. HATCH. I was impressed with what the Senator said about his deep interest in organized justice throughout the world and the establishment of necessary machinery to accomplish and provide for organized justice throughout the world. I correctly understood the Senator, did I not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator did; and I might remind the Senator that long ago I was supporting a world court.

Mr. HATCH. As I recall, on one occasion, the Senator did vote for adherence to the World Court. Perhaps on another occasion he did not. I am not sure about that. I am not making any point about it.

In the words of this resolution are embraced the necessary authority, and the necessary advice to the Chief Executive in negotiating treaties and agreements, namely that there shall be set up whatever machinery may be necessary to bring about the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations. That is the way the Senator interprets the committee's resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan states again that he interprets the committee resolution as embracing any useful instrumentality for the promotion of peace, through force or justice, which may subsequently commend itself to the Government of the United States and the constitutional voice of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. With that advice to the Executive, he would be perfectly justified in negotiating an arrangement or an association with other nations to bring about such a condition.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have made my statement to the Senator, and I rest upon the statement.

Mr. HATCH. I am not trying to embarrass the Senator at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not embarrassing me in the slightest. The able Senator from New Mexico, whose interest in this problem I deeply appreciate and respect, has a different approach to this subject today than I have, although we have a common objective.

Mr. HATCH. I am not so sure that we are in disagreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan happens to believe that any emphasis today upon any sort of specifications or details would seriously impair the chances for fundamentally doing the thing which is fundamentally essential, namely, to assert, by eloquent majority, an aspect and an attitude which no one can misunderstand as being the aspect and attitude of willingness to consider whatever instrumentality it develops in the future may be essential to the preservation of peace. I decline to go behind that generality at the moment, because to go behind the generality would defeat the entire purpose which I believe we are undertaking to serve.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I am not at all certain that we are in disagreement, because I now construe what the Senator has said in the resolution and what he says on the floor today as announcing his willingness to support whatever agency may be set up to settle disputes and differences among nations peacefully and without resort to war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have done nothing of the sort, Mr. President. I have asserted my attitude toward that objective, I reserve the right to pass upon the details, when submitted under the Constitution to the United States Senate. As I see it, I can make no commitment beyond that, in my own good conscience.

Mr. HATCH. I am sorry if I misunderstood the Senator, but I thought he made it very definite and clear. I commend the Senator for the statement which he made, which I understood as he interpreted it. Mr. President, so far as reserving the right to pass upon the details is concerned, we are talking now only about advice. Nothing we can do here today, or at any other time, can take away from any Senator his constitutional right to ratify, or consent, which is just as much a part of his obligation as to advise. We cannot relieve ourselves of those obligations.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question or two.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan, first——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator sounds as though he were starting on a serial catalog and at the moment had reached only No. 1. I want it perfectly well understood that I am not going to submit myself to an interrogatory regarding my detailed feelings about where, when, and how the proposed pledge shall be implemented. With that observation I cheerfully yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I desire merely to exchange observations with the Senator from Michigan. If he makes no more commitments in that respect than he has with respect to the future in connection with the pending resolution I am sure that we can get along very well. I have no purpose whatever, Mr. President, in subjecting the Senator from Michigan to a serial interrogatory. I should like to have him answer a few questions with reference to the facts to which he made some adversion in the course of his very interesting and especially illuminating address. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan, for example, whether or

not he has consulted, or whether or not his committee has consulted, with the President of the United States at any time during the formulation of its thinking as reflected by the resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to answer for the other members of the committee. I can answer for myself. I have not consulted the President. I believe that the last time I was in any kind of consultation at the White House was in April 1933. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is easy to see how far afield the White House can go in view of the protracted absence from it of the Senator from Michigan. [Laughter.]

But may I ask the Senator further whether or not, to his knowledge, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has been consulted by the President during the past 3 years?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to answer in respect to anyone except myself. I am not sure that the President himself should have been expected to consult with us. If the Senator would broaden his question to include the Secretary of State, whom I suppose is an appropriate representative of the administration upon foreign matters, my answer would be totally different. We have been in almost constant consultation with the Secretary of State.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator has very carefully stated, and properly so, I believe, that we should jealously guard the constitutional prerogatives of all branches of the Government, including that of the Chief Executive. He has stated that he does not wish to intrude upon the Chief Executive's prerogatives in the field of negotiations. I wonder whether or not there are any commitments in which the Chief Executive has already engaged, or whether there are any negotiations which he has conducted of which the committee has been acquainted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to give the Senator any light upon the question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I believe it is the time of the Senator from Michigan, but if I have the floor I am happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not understand the implications of the Senator's question. The Senator from Michigan is certainly familiar with the conference which is now taking place.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I assumed the Senator from Connecticut meant something else. I assumed he was inquiring whether any subterranean conspiracy had been taking place.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut was not referring to any subterranean conspiracy.

Mr. DANAHER. No.

Mr. HATCH. I was referring to conferences such as the food conference, and the one now taking place in Moscow, and another conference called for next month. The Senator is familiar with the studies which the executive branch is rightfully conducting under the Constitution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that the executive branch should quite properly conduct negotiations. I should like to know whether or not the results of the negotiations have been communicated to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me further to respond, I had forgotten for the moment the negotiations regarding the Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the draft of agreement in respect to it. Inasmuch as that is entirely a public matter I assumed the Senator was not asking about it.

Mr. DANAHER. No; I had in mind whether the results of the conferences at Quebec and at Casablanca have been communicated to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have already answered the question so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DANAHER. That is, the information has been received through the Secretary of State? Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Through the Secretary of State we have had whatever information the Executive thought we were entitled to receive.

Mr. DANAHER. Is the Senator in position properly to say whether or not the general purport and intendments of the resolution, within the Senator's explanation and understanding of it, conform to the views of the Secretary of State?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should not undertake to say so. The Secretary will have to speak for himself. I have spoken only for myself.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator feel that properly he may say whether or not, so far as he knows, the views of the Secretary of State are reflected in the resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I make the same answer.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator only one other question. In the course of the committee's deliberations it must have come to the committee's notice that a few months ago Mr. Churchill advised the British Parliament to make no commitments, either to bind the present Government or the sitting Members of Parliament, with reference to any post-war matters. Was that subject considered by the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator asking me whether Mr. Churchill's speech was considered?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was not.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator recall that within the month, to substantially similar end, Mr. Anthony Eden addressed Parliament with similar advice, reflecting the views of the Prime Minister as communicated to Parliament on March 10, 1943?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am willing to accept the Senator as my expert on the subject.

Mr. DANAHER. Was there no consideration in the committee given to the subject?

Mr. VANDENBERG. None whatever.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Michigan struck a common chord with the junior Senator from Florida when he spoke of the advocacy of the World Court, and I know that he has been a diligent laborer in the cause of international justice. I understood from the Senator's remarks that he felt the language of the subcommittee's resolution, namely, "the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," was sufficiently broad to cover our advocacy of the establishment of a world court. Did I correctly understand the Senator in that regard?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct. That is also the view of the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] who joined with me in my attitude in the subcommittee.

Mr. PEPPER. Assuming the language to be sufficiently broad to constitute ground for that inference as the sentiment of the Senate, if there were no background upon which the language were predicated would the able Senator still answer as he has answered, taking into consideration the historical background that the Senate has, I believe, twice specifically refused to agree to a treaty or an international agreement setting up a world court, and proposing that the United States participate in it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senate can do nothing except to express its own attitude. It cannot even bind the next Senate, which is the one which will probably have to deal specifically with the question. It certainly is not bound by the ancient history of other Senates. I think it stands by itself on the basis of the attitude of this Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the able Senator still think so, in view of the Senate having twice repudiated the suggestion, once the proposal of a Democratic President and once the proposal of a Republican President, that we join the World Court?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to interject to say that the Senate has not twice refused. When the matter of the World Court and the establishment of the Court of International Justice first came before the Senate, it was approved with but one material reservation. The Senate did not reject it at that time, but did insist upon a reservation which was subsequently not accepted by the other powers signatory.

Mr. PEPPER. But, of course, the able Senator has in mind that of the forty-odd nations, I believe, who were signatory powers to the pact setting up the World Court, when the United States made a reservation, only five nations in 1926 agreed to the reservation the United

States had made, and that it was 2 years before the Executive in office said anything more about the World Court.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator is talking about the attitude of the United States Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senate did not twice reject the World Court. The Senate approved the World Court with a reservation. What the other powers did has nothing to do with the attitude of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in my recollection that two Presidents, one Republican and one Democrat, submitted the World Court proposal to the Senate?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. And that all the Senate ever did, by way of acquiescence in the recommendation of either a Republican President or a Democratic President that we join the World Court, was to agree to it with reservations, which reservations were not agreed to by the other signatory powers.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not talking about what other powers did. The Senator was addressing himself to the attitude of the Senate, and, in view of the attitude of the Senate heretofore, seeking to draw the inference that now we might well write into the resolution something about the World Court.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to ask the able Senator, from his full knowledge of judicial subjects, by reason of his own great judicial background, am I essentially correct in saying that what actually happened in the Senate was that a Republican President and a Democratic President proposed to the Senate that we adhere to a World Court and that what the Senate at last did was to agree with reservations, which reservations, in turn, were never agreed to by more than five of the signatory powers to the World Court. Is that a fair statement of the history of the proposal before the Senate?

Mr. GEORGE. When the World Court proposal was submitted to the Senate first it was by a Republican President; it was approved by the Senate; but with reservations which we thought should be acceptable. As to how many of the other signatory powers objected to those reservations I am not able to answer.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of what the able Senator suggests, I was wondering how the able Senator from Michigan would construe this language. Does it carry the implication or the assurance that we agree to the World Court as proposed by a Republican and a Democratic President or that we agree to it as eventually agreed to by the Senate with the reservations the Senate made, or do we agree to it in some other language? What would the able Senator understand to be the import of the language of the resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator is addressing the Senator from Michigan, the answer would be the first commitment is not the specification to which the Senator refers; it is a general assertion of a general purpose, and I repeat that I decline to go behind the general assertion of a general purpose.

If there is any historical background which is to be consulted, perhaps, the world might consult the fact that we have been a full-time partner in the Hague Court since the turn of the century, which might be an exhibit in point, if exhibits are to be consulted; but, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, exhibits are not to be consulted, and so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, the Senate of the United States confronts an opportunity to say to the world that it intends, insofar as it can possibly do so, ultimately to implement the peace with international authority to make the peace permanent and successful, and that it proposes to proceed in that direction, but it makes no specific commitment of any nature either by way of precedent or by way of present promise or by way of future commitment.

Mr. PEPPER. But would not the able Senator have to say, in all fairness, that it does not even make a specific commitment to the World Court?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have answered the Senator as far as I intend to go in a discussion of details. I think it is a forthright, square, honest disclosure, and an amazing one, in view of the great divisions which have rested upon the Senate and upon the country heretofore—a disclosure of a purpose to undertake to see to it that the victories of this war shall be translated into a permanent victory of peace; and I think the Senator ought to consider we have gone a very long way in the direction to which he is so devotedly wedded when we do so.

Mr. PEPPER. But the thing I am uncertain about in my own mind is, What does the resolution say about the World Court? Does it favor it or does it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have answered the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has emphasized the breadth of the different means which might be included within the general terms of the resolution to reach the ends of the resolution. I should like to ask the Senator if there is not one condition to which all such means must conform. Is it not true that only those means are authorized which, after they are adopted, leave the United States a free and sovereign nation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct within a practical definition of the term.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It seems to me that after the proposed action is taken the United States will either be a sovereign nation, or it will not be a sovereign nation. Of course, it may yield some part of its sovereignty and remain a sovereign nation. We speak of the sovereign States of this country, but it seems to me that they are not sovereign States. In my opinion that is merely a term, for today the States only use a part of the national sovereignty assigned to them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator and I are in complete agreement as to what the word means in this instance.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I note that the resolution advocated by the Senator refers to an agreement with "free and sovereign nations," but there is nothing in the resolution to indicate that we are asking or insisting that all the United Nations join in the agreement. Will the Senator explain why the resolution does not say that all the United Nations shall be within the agreement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They are all inherently in under the language of the resolution.

Mr. BURTON. There is nothing that includes them all. Is the agreement to be made with several, two or three, or four or five, or with all?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator is applying one interpretation, and I can apply mine. The resolution will include any instrumentality which, in the judgment of a future Senate, will contribute in the general direction we have asserted. There is no intent or purpose to count anybody out or to count anybody in or to identify one over. I repeat, it is a general prospectus.

Mr. BURTON. Does not the Senator think the resolution might well have said all the United Nations must be included?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the resolution might have said several different things it does not say and which I should like to have in it, and so would the Senator from Texas, and so would the Senator from Ohio; but here is the consensus of opinion of Senators who heretofore have widely differed upon the subject and who now recommended a general precept to America and the world which I think the Senator from Ohio ought to applaud.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will retain it for a moment. The Senator from Ohio, with whose general objectives I am in agreement, indicated it must include all United Nations. Suppose some of them did not want to belong?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I refer the Senator to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose some nation did not want to belong. The language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to include not only the United Nations but any other nation that may qualify for admission and express its desire to be admitted, provided, of course, the treaty which sets up this organization makes provision for that sort of thing.

Mr. BURTON. According to the Senator from Texas, of course, we cannot compel all the United Nations to come in, but we can invite all to come in, and indicate in the statement of our purposes that we want them all in.

Mr. CONNALLY. Every free and sovereign nation is invited in.

Mr. BURTON. The resolution does not say so.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have no agreement as yet. Somebody else has got to be consulted besides the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator who has the floor yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to say that I think the debate and the questions which are being raised are serving a very useful purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope so.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to have the questions answered. The Senator from Ohio just propounded a very pertinent question. It may be quite true, as the Senator from Texas has explained, that the language of the resolution is sufficiently broad to include or admit to association and membership all of the present United Nations. That may be entirely true, but the resolution itself does not say so, although the Senator from Texas has now on the floor so interpreted it. That is important in this respect, if in no other, not so much as to those who are included, but is the Senate of the United States saying by inference that some nations are being excluded? That is the important thing. I am very glad the Senator from Texas is making that clear, and we can now understand that under the terms of the resolution and his interpretation of it all the United Nations would be entitled to associate themselves in this joint authority if they so desired.

Mr. CONNALLY. If they complied with whatever is provided in the treaty. Let me say to both the Senators, and to all Senators, that I liken the resolution to an authorization. It is an authorization. The appropriation will have to come later.

Mr. HATCH. In that I do not think we are in disagreement. We realize that it is not possible to make a detailed blue print. We have never tried to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. Let us see what the resolution provides. We are talking about the United Nations. We are not separating from the United Nations, because the United Nations, and every one of them, will have a representative at the peace conference, where the treaty, or whatever it may be, will be made, will be created, will be constructed. Do not Senators know that every United Nation which desires will try to so influence the treaty as to make it eligible to cooperate? Unless a nation desires to cooperate, we cannot force it to do so. So the language of the resolution is employed with intention and with design. It is broad. We do not restrict it to the United Nations, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] made a very splendid contribution to that very problem during the consideration in the committee, by pointing out that there are 27 nations on the earth now which are not numbered among the United Nations, yet which would be possibly eligible in some treaty arrangement creating the new instrumentality. So that I do not think there is any question on earth that, while we should not exclude them, we should not even create the impression on the other nations that we are not going to let anyone else join except those included among the United Nations. It is just as important to cultivate the good will of the neutral nations, not involved in the war, as it is to create the idea that we are not excluding any nation.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is now making the exact point which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] had in mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did it by inadvertence, if I did.

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure the Senator from Texas would be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said that I was in agreement with the objective of the Senator from Ohio, but I do not approach the solution from his particular angle, in this instance.

Mr. HATCH. The point is that "free and sovereign nations," which is the language of the resolution, are the ones with whom this joint authority is to be exercised.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. As the Senator from Ohio pointed out, five free and sovereign nations, or four, or even three, would meet the test of the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator keep in mind that the peace treaty, which will create the agency, or supposedly will, will be cooperated in by all the United Nations? Will they not all have a voice in the peace treaty?

Mr. HATCH. I do have in mind what the Senator from Texas refers to, but I also have something else in mind. I know that the resolution is going to be interpreted by every nation in the world, and it is going to be interpreted, not according to the viewpoint of the Senator from Texas, perhaps, or of the Senator from New Mexico, or of the Senator from Ohio. The nations are going to look at the cold language.

I now wish to conclude my thought. I think it is very necessary that we let the nations of the world know that we are not raising barriers against any of them. I have in mind those nations which are represented by exiled governments today. I have in mind the conquered nations that have been allies of ours, but, because of the conqueror's heel under which they live today, are not free and sovereign nations.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the able Senator from Texas leaves the floor, I wish to ask him a question or two, if I may attract his attention.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Florida always attracts the attention of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. The able Senator is aware of the fact that even we who are members of the committee did not have the opportunity of intimate consultation with the subcommittee which the members of the subcommittee had with one another.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the Senator proceeds further, let me say that the subcommittee was open to any Senator who desired to appear, whether he was a member of the subcommittee or not, and a number of Senators did appear before us. If the Senator from Florida did not come, it was not because we did not want him. We did want him.

Mr. PEPPER. I did have the opportunity, which was very graciously extended, but what I desired to ask was what the subcommittee meant by certain of the phrases in the resolution when they were drafted.

Mr. CONNALLY. We meant just what Mr. Webster and the other lexicographers all mean.

Mr. PEPPER. Perhaps the Senator can, by his own translation, bring out a part of what Mr. Webster and the other lexicographers meant. The resolution reads:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority.

How many free and sovereign nations would constitute an eligible group, I should like to have the Senator say.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should say the number who may be named in the peace treaty establishing the agency. I do not know how many that will be.

Mr. PEPPER. Would that language be broad enough to cover our entering into, say, a four-power pact to accomplish what the resolution says; that is, "the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world"?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot probe into the minds of those who are going to make the peace treaty, but I cannot imagine that would be the case. It was not the case in 1919. So far as I am personally concerned, if that is what the Senator wants to know, I think, of course, that the nations which are now allied together and really carrying on the war will have, as they should have, great influence in inaugurating whatever international agency shall be created. I have no doubt that the treaty will provide for the admission of every free and independent nation, but if the people who are suffering, the people who are having their sons killed, and the people who are pouring out their wealth and making the sacrifices do not take the leadership in creating such an agency, it probably will not be created, and, if created, will not be worth much.

Mr. PEPPER. My reason for asking the question was that a great many people are troubled as to what the subcommittee had in mind, whether this language might be satisfied by a compact of two or three or four nations forming an organization to do the things which the resolution contemplates, whether that kind of an instrumentality was in mind, or whether the subcommittee envisioned something like the League of Nations, which is universal in its scope,

and which has in mind all nations, it may be hoped, coming together and forming an international organization which will embrace the peoples of the world. Some have been troubled that the resolution in saying "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations," without saying "United Nations," without such universality of scope or number, might indicate that the Senate is agreeable to some kind of a power compact, which we think would be unfortunate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; let me take the Senator's own statement. He says we must mention the United Nations. The term "United Nations" is broader than a league of two or three or four nations under the language we use when we say "free and sovereign nations." The language we use is "free and sovereign nations." That means them all.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Mexico will pardon me, I will answer the question of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The resolution does not say "all free."

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to answer his question? If not, I will take my seat.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, I will, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I have tried to explain, this is broad and comprehensive language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

Mr. CONNALLY. I pause in respect to the Chair. What does the Chair desire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires that the Senator suspend until there can be order in the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am afraid the Senator from Texas might as well take his seat if that is the case. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, as I attempted to say, we are not undertaking to make the treaty. We are not undertaking to delineate just how this agency shall be created. We are simply saying that within this broad authorization, within this broad compass, we look with favor upon the establishment of a new organization, if necessary, or upon the utilization of all existing agencies with power to prevent aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world.

We cannot commit Senators. The Senator from Florida spoke as if we are now pledging that we shall vote for some particular kind of an instrumentality. We cannot commit any Senator.

The Senator speaks of people having fears. I have not heard of anyone having any fears on this point except from what the Senator from Florida says. No one has complained to me about fears, but if there are any fears, when there is submitted a treaty providing for a league of two, or three, or four nations, the answer will be given here. The Senate does not have to approve the treaty. The Senate can reject it. It does not have to ratify the treaty. The resolution does not commit any Senator. We do not deprive any Senator of the discretion, and the wisdom, and the courage, or whatever it takes for him to discharge his duty as he then sees it.

Mr. President, if I had the intellectual, astronomical ability simply to look across the earth and see the leading powers among all the nations that are going to sit in on the peace treaty, and if I could place the microscope of intellectual inspection upon them to examine into what they are going to do, even then I could not tell the Senate what those nations will do when they get together and argue and construct the treaty and the instrumentality about which we are speaking.

So, Mr. President, that is all the Senator from Texas can say on the subject.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow another question. I understood that the whole reason for the resolution was that the Senate was availing itself of its constitutional right, perhaps its constitutional duty, to advise?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. We are not now purporting to bind subsequent Senates. I thought we were effectively proposing to speak for this Senate, so that we would discharge our present and personal obligations, for we will simply state what this particular Senate, in the exercise of its right to advise, says about the matter. I thought, therefore, that this Senate could surely find some language which would indicate whether we want simply three or four nations to join in a power pact as free and sovereign nations, or whether the thing we are striving for is universality, or something at least as broad, for a nucleus, as the United Nations, and then accept such other nations as might from time to time join in the organization.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of two or three or four nations. I do not know how we can make the language any more comprehensive or any broader than to use the language "with free and sovereign nations." All free and sovereign nations are eligible. We would not want to admit on an equality with the United States a nation which was a satellite nation, we will say, a nation which was a mere dependency of some stronger power, which was dominated by it; but a sovereign and free nation, which can act in its own judgment and in its own discretion, is eligible under the terms of the resolution. The particular eligibility, of course, will have to be determined by the structure of the agency when it is created. I cannot tell what that is going to be.

Mr. PEPPER. I can understand what might be meant by "sovereign," because it might apply to governments in exile. But does the word "free" include France, for example, or Poland?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is a cultured gentleman. He was schooled at Harvard. I do not know whether he ever went to Groton, but he is from Harvard. If he does not know what "free" means I cannot tell him, and I decline to be interrogated on a fundamental question of what the word "free" means.

Mr. PEPPER. The important thing is what the subcommittee means by it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the subcommittee means what it says. The subcommittee means exactly what it says in the language of the resolution. If the Senator from Florida cannot tell what the word "free" means, I cannot tell him.

Mr. PEPPER. Would it include France, I ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator knows more about France than I do, and can answer his own question. He knows.

Mr. PEPPER. It is strange that it is so clear, Mr. President, to the chairman of the committee, and yet he is not willing to tell the Senate whether or not he has in mind the exiled governments.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it seems to me that the debate is degenerating into a heckling of the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I am not here to be heckled and brow-beaten. Anyone knows that when France is free, when this war is won and France is liberated, and she assumes again in her own right the powers of government, and becomes a free and a sovereign nation, under the terms of this resolution, so far as we can now see, she will be eligible. If that does not answer the Senator from Florida I cannot answer.

Mr. PEPPER. That answer makes it very clear, Mr. President, that the Senator from Texas contemplates the postponement of this authority until after the war is over, and that nothing should be organized prior to that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator want to admit France while she is under the dictation of Hitler? Does he want France to come in now? Does he want to create this international agency tomorrow, and day after tomorrow admit France under the leadership of Laval and with Hitler's bayonets sticking him in the ribs? Does he want that nation to become a party to this so-called league to enforce peace?

Mr. PEPPER. There are effective measures——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not asking the Senator that. I am asking him if he is in favor of France, under these circumstances, becoming a party.

Mr. PEPPER. The Government of France in exile, yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. In exile! [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely rise to say that I regret that the Senator from Texas has just said that the debate has degenerated into a heckling of him and the Senator from Michigan. I have participated in some of the questions which have been asked. I want to say to the Senator from Texas that I have had no desire at all to heckle the Senator, or the Senator from Michigan.

I thought, Mr. President, that the resolution was vague in its terms. I have thought it was an obligation of the Senate of the United States to know what it was voting for and what it was being asked to agree to. I know of no better source from which to obtain information than the chairman of the committee

which reported the measure. The very fact that it is vague and indefinite has been demonstrated by the answers to questions which have been made already, and the positive declaration of the Senator from Michigan that it is a vague resolution. He so stated in his prepared remarks.

Mr. President, the questions asked with respect to the language "free and sovereign nations" were not idle questions. The Senator from Texas himself has supplied the resolution with a word which does not appear in it, for in his explanation made to us he said, not once but many times, "all free and sovereign nations."

Mr. CONNALLY. Wait a minute. The Senator must not misquote me. I said "all free and sovereign nations that could meet the eligibility requirements as prescribed in the treaty that sets up the agency." Is that not what I said?

Mr. HATCH. I agree with the Senator. I have no point to make with respect to that. The point I make is that the Senator introduced the word "all" in his explanation on the floor. That word certainly does not appear in the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. The word "or"?

Mr. HATCH. The word "all." A-l-l.

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean to say all nations which are eligible.

Mr. HATCH. Anyway, that word now has been supplied by the able chairman of the committee. All free and sovereign nations which meet the test of the resolution, I take it, are entitled to join the association. I am not mincing words, and I am not quibbling; but under the terms of the resolution, under the test applied, both Germany and Japan are qualified for admission.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to speak a little later on the general tenor of the pending proposal, but I desire now to make a few statements with reference to the colloquy which has been carried on as to the language and the meaning of the words "free and sovereign nations." There can be no difference of opinion among legal authorities as to the definition of the words "free and sovereign people," and I think I may be permitted to anticipate what may be presented here—although I hope not—as an amendatory proposal, because it was presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Some of the eminent Senators, with the laudable purpose of broadening, as they asserted to us——

Mr. HATCH. Or clarifying.

Mr. GILLETTE. Well, I will use both words—broadening and clarifying—suggested that the language be changed to "a union or an organization of United Nations" and stop there.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. We did announce our agreement to make the language broader than the term "United Nations," and to include all other nations that might qualify. There was no dispute among us as to that.

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no. I have before me the proposal which was presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Senators—11 Senators were supposed to be behind it, I think, but it was presented by 2 of them, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the distinguished Senator who sits at my left, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is speaking of the draft of Tuesday, not the corrected draft of Thursday, which was the final draft of our amendment, and which did read "the United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted."

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator is correct.

The proposal of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as a broadening proposal, was that the organization should be composed of the United Nations. When it was pointed out to the Senators in the Foreign Relations Committee that the language "United Nations" would shut out 27 sovereign nations throughout the world, many of whom were participating in the war effort, not with military force, but with economic assistance and material assistance—that Sweden, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, France, Egypt, Denmark, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, Colombia, Liberia, Thailand, Afghanistan, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Albania would be definitely excluded under that language—then the Senators amended their proposal in order to meet that statement, and said, "the United Nations"—and it may be presented on the floor of the Senate—"and such other nations as are admitted," in order to correct that difficulty, as the Senator has said.

A question was asked of the distinguished chairman of the committee a little while ago, by the very able junior Senator from Ohio, supplemented by questions by the Senator from New Mexico as to why it would not be preferable to limit it to the United Nations or to be assured that the United Nations would come in. Mr. President, what are the United Nations?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Simply in order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me inquire why cannot the language be so worded as to state that all the United Nations would be invited; and that would be a premise—all the United Nations which might be eligible to join.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. For fear the Senator may have misunderstood what was said, let me say that our purpose was, not to limit it, but to make sure that they are not excluded. There is a vast difference. I would not exclude the nations the Senator has mentioned. I would join with him in seeing that they are included.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. Perhaps I inadvertently gave the wrong impression, because I know that what the Senator had in mind was to see that they are not excluded.

Reference was made to governments in exile. Mr. President, there is only one organic law under which the so-called United Nations exist. That is executive agreement series 236, Cooperative War Effort Declaration by United Nations, Washington, January 1, 1942. These are governments, not nations, that join in the declaration, and are so specified in that organic document itself.

Mr. President, the governments signatory to that document are what? In the first place, they are the Commonwealths of the British Empire, that cannot be taken in under the full definition of "free and sovereign nations." But they are signatory. There are signatory to that declaration governments which are known as governments in exile, but which are recognized by this Nation as sovereignties, through the exchange of their representatives. Most of them are now located in Great Britain. Representatives have been exchanged between this Nation and them, and they are recognized. They are the following: The Kingdom of Belgium, the Czechoslovak Republic, the Kingdom of Greece, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Poland, and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, what other entities comprise the United Nations? India, which is not a commonwealth, has not the status of a commonwealth, is not a free and sovereign nation, but is signatory to the United Nations' declaration. Of course, it could not be a party to such a compact as is envisioned by Senators or by the members of the subcommittee, but it is signatory to the United Nations' declaration.

What other? The Grand Duchy of Luxemburg is signatory. What other? The Commonwealth of the Philippines is signatory. Its Government was invited to sign, and has signed, the United Nations' declaration.

When an attempt is made upon the part of any Senators to assume that we are excluding any free and sovereign nations, it is entirely without the reasonable construction of the language of the committee's resolution. Then when the Senators say they are going to start, as they did in the first place, with the United Nations, and make the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and India and the Commonwealth of the Philippines parties to it, and eliminate all others that do not belong to the United Nations, they have so restricted the application of the proposal as to make it somewhat bordering on the ridiculous.

Mr. BURTON rose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think the Senator from Ohio was first on his feet. I yield first to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator yield to me for

a moment. There is one question I wish to ask.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. The question is one which was prompted by the remarks the Senator made a moment ago, when I previously rose. I understood the Senator to say that the Dominions of the British Commonwealth of Nations would not be included under the words "free and sovereign nations."

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that could well be an interpretation.

Mr. BURTON. That is, that Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Eire would not be included within the words "free and sovereign nations," as included in the resolution of the committee; is that correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. As I understand the status of the commonwealths making up the British Empire, those that have been invested with commonwealth status have almost complete independence, but there are limitations. In the establishment of any post-war organization, of course, the question as to whether they could come in with independent status would depend on the proposal which was presented. The League of Nations was broadened, and it was stated that they could come in; but even that classification could not apply to India, to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, or to the Philippine Islands at the present time.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am respectfully inquiring for information with respect to the Senator's interpretation of the resolution of the committee, which says:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations—

And so forth. As I understand, the Senator would interpret that language as excluding the Dominion of Canada, the Union of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and Eire.

Mr. GILLETTE. I would not personally so interpret it; but I say that it could be so construed, because there is a specific limitation in the constituent situation of the commonwealths of the British Empire. The difficulty could be obviated in formulating the provisions under which the post-war authority might be created.

Mr. BURTON. Or it could be obviated by a change in the language of the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it would not. The treaty would govern.

Mr. GILLETTE. Many things could happen to the resolution if it were changed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In line with the Senator's interpretation, with respect to which the Senator from Ohio is inquiring, the Senator stated that it was his personal interpretation that the language "free and sovereign nations" as used in the resolution would not necessarily exclude the dominions mentioned.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is my own interpretation.

Mr. HATCH. Would the language used in the resolution include those dominions as free and sovereign nations?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will answer that question as I tried to answer it a moment ago. The members of the British Commonwealth of Nations occupy a peculiar status. It is something short of what we recognize as complete independence of action, such as is exercised by the United States or by any other free and sovereign nation. In setting up the machinery for membership in the League of Nations it was provided that they could come in, because they are almost complete entities, but not quite complete. The Senator knows that just as well as I do. There is a limitation which exists with respect to Canada and New Zealand which does not exist with respect to the United States. There could be an interpretation of the words "free and sovereign nations" in a future organization which would exclude them. Personally I do not believe it would be done. I do not believe that such an organization would obtain support if it were done.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Again I assure the Senator that there is no desire on my part to heckle. These are respectful questions.

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not think the Senator is heckling me.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wished to make the point clear. I believe this is a reasonable inference from what the Senator said. He has personally interpreted the resolution as not excluding those dominions.

Mr. GILLETTE. I personally so interpret it.

Mr. HATCH. Then, he personally interprets it as including them, because if they are not excluded, certainly they are included. They are not left in a state of flux.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is a fair statement.

Mr. HATCH. Then, according to the Senator's interpretation, they are included.

Mr. GILLETTE. According to my personal interpretation, yes. But, Mr. President, I repeat that these commonwealths are something short of the general conception of free and sovereign nations. In setting up the post-war machinery, such language might be interpreted so as to exclude the constituents which have been referred to as commonwealths making up the British Empire.

Let me refer again to the point which I tried to present, namely, that when the proposal was brought forward to use the United Nations as a nucleus, it meant bringing in governments which are not sovereign entities in any sense of the word, and could not be brought in under the interpretation of free and sovereign nations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. What has the Senator to say as to the eligibility of the Irish Free State for admission into this organization, under the language of the committee resolution? Would the Government of Eire be eligible?

Mr. GILLETTE. I should say that under the language of the proposal of the 11 Senators which was presented to the Foreign Relations Committee, in which the eloquent and able Senator joined, it would be definitely excluded.

Mr. PEPPER. I was making inquiry about the resolution of the committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. I believe that under the language of the committee resolution, it definitely could come in as a free and sovereign nation.

Mr. PEPPER. What is there in the language of the resolution of the committee that is broader than the language of the amendment presented to the committee by a group of Senators on Tuesday and Thursday? The language of the amendment is:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted—

We use the exact language, "free and sovereign nations," that is used in the committee resolution. Previous to that we refer to the United Nations. There is no broader language in the resolution of the committee than there is in the suggested amendment, is there?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator is now referring to the amended proposal.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. When Senators who sponsored the proposal were advised of its shortcomings, they tried to correct it; but again, they were starting with the nucleus of the United Nations. That is their starting point. They provide for the admission of additional states which would have been excluded under the terms of the original language. Again, I say we cannot start there, because that would bring in other signatories to the United Nations agreement which under no stretch of the imagination can be called free and sovereign States. The United Nations are merely an association of governments to prosecute a war.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has spoken of France, having regard to the future, when all such nations will be free and sovereign nations. Would it not be just as well to make the group with whom we fight the war successfully the nucleus of the group with whom we may fight the peace to a successful conclusion?

Mr. GILLETTE. It would be impossible to start with a nucleus of free and sovereign nations which are not all sovereign and free.

Mr. President, I do not wish to consume any additional time. As I have stated, I hope to discuss the resolution later, not at length, but in some of its other phases.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two further inquiries?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has worked diligently upon this resolution, and is as well informed about its contents as is any other member of the com-

mittee. Let me ask the Senator whether the words "international authority" were chosen in exclusion of the term "international organization"; or does the Senator understand the resolution to mean, when it uses the words "international authority," the same as though it had used the words "international organization"?

Mr. GILLETTE. In reply to the distinguished Senator, I think I can say without any impropriety that, as has been stated, the members of the subcommittee discussed this matter at great length day after day. The choice of words was discussed in great detail. There was the question of whether to use the words "international organization," "international agency," "international coalition," "international entity," or "international authority." After weighing all these words and the possibility of misinterpretation which might destroy the very thing we were trying to do, it was the opinion of the committee that the words "international authority" correctly represented what we were trying to do. The questions might be asked, What is meant by an organization? What is meant by a coalition? How far could it extend? What would be its constituent parts? What authority could it exercise?

We were trying to avoid just what we have now encountered. Able Senators rise on the floor of the Senate and ask—and very properly—"Why did you choose 'authority' instead of 'organization'? Why did you not choose 'organization' or 'agency'?" After weighing the words and studying their definitions, connotations, and implications, it seemed to us that the words "international authority" envisioned a body set up and empowered to seek the goal toward which we were driving.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Again the Senator has broadened and clarified his resolution by the introduction of a word which does not appear in the resolution, just as the Senator from Texas did when he inserted the word "all." The Senator has just now inserted the article "an" which to me makes a tremendous difference in the resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator explain?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. I appreciate the Senator's calling my attention to that. I know that the Senator from Texas, our distinguished chairman, will forgive me when I allude to the fact that the first draft of the so-called Connally resolution which came before the subcommittee carried the words "an international authority"—the establishment of an international authority—and the committee changed that by striking out the article "an" and adding the words "maintenance and establishment." That was because the article "an" is a limiting article.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish clearly to understand the Senator. He said the committee struck out the article "an" and added the words "maintenance and establishment." Were not the words "maintenance and establishment" in the original draft?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not as I recall.

Mr. HATCH. How did it then read?

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The word "establishment" was in the original resolution, but the words "and maintenance" were added.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct. As I recall the language, it advocated the establishment of an international authority. We struck out the article "an" and added the words "and maintenance." As I started to say, it was because "an" is a limiting article. It would limit the organizations to only one. It was within all logic that there would be, should be, and might be, a number of organizations working to this end which would be included in the word "authority."

Then we tried to construe "establishment." What does that mean? It means a setting up of a new organization—it could well be so considered—and it would exclude automatically some of the international labor commissions, and some of the international organizations now in existence which we wanted to retain. So we added the words "and maintenance," striking out the article "an," so that there could be several authorities or organizations working to the same end—establishment and maintenance—and it would not be exclusive. Again the able Senators, in their laudable zeal to broaden the language, make it exclusive, limit it, restrict it, by trying to put in the word "an," limiting it to one organization.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish the Senator to understand that I think he is doing what we are seeking to do. We are not especially trying to broaden the language of the resolution by the use of the article "an."

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. What we are now trying to find out is what was meant by dropping the article "an" and saying "international authority" alone. The Senator from Iowa has now explained. I want to know if I correctly understand him. I think that it is important that the entire Senate understand what is meant. When the Senator says the words "establishment and maintenance of international authority" are broad enough to cover all existing organizations he certainly is not restricting the term, but is broadening it. He would include in the words which I have just quoted, for instance, the present structure of the League of Nations. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. HATCH. May I say that one member of the committee just nodded his head "yes" when I asked the question?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am afraid the Senator is stepping too fast.

Mr. HATCH. I am seeking information. The Senator sees the drift of my question.

Mr. GILLETTE. Within my limited knowledge I shall try to give the Senator the information which he seeks. It was not to exclude the agencies which we wanted to preserve. It was not to assert that all of them would be continued. Does the Senator from New Mexico follow me in my statement?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I was interrupted, but the thought occurred to me that when the Senator said the language to which I have referred was not intended to exclude, then if it does not exclude them, it must include them. If it does not exclude the League of Nations, then it must include it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. HATCH. Then what becomes of the League of Nations?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think the Senator is clearly in error. Only by the insertion of the article "an" would other organizations be definitely excluded. By striking out the article and using the broadened authority, without the limiting article, we would make it possible, in setting up an international authority after the war, to include existing agencies. It does not mean that they are to be excluded. It does not mean they are all to form constituent parts of the organization.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Iowa is correct in his interpretation of the action of the subcommittee in the elimination of the article "an". If we had said that we would join with other nations in establishing and maintaining an organization, that would have connotated our purpose to limit our advice to the President, or whatever else the resolution may carry by implication or by direct expression, that some one organization should be set up and maintained; that would limit it to that particular organization, whether it were new, or whether there might be an adaptation of an organization already in existence. By the elimination of the article "an" we undoubtedly intended—and I think it was the unanimous view of the subcommittee—to make it possible to utilize all existing agencies which might be worked into the peace plan of the future, and, in addition to that, the creation of any new organization which might be found necessary. So the elimination of the article "an" undoubtedly broadened the scope of the meaning held out by the Senate, if the resolution shall be adopted, to include all those who are to write the treaty later on.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky, because he has clearly, and I hope to the advantage of the Senator from New Mexico, made the matter clear, which with my own limitations I was not equal to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Iowa has made the matter entirely clear, and that the Senator from Kentucky has contributed to

the explanation. Perhaps I am the one who is confused, but from the interpretation which has been given on the floor—and if I am wrong I should like to be corrected—I think under the advice of the pending resolution, for it is advice to the Executive, in negotiating a peace treaty he would be clearly within the terms of the advice if, the other nations agreeing, he used any existing agency or any agency to be created, and within that group could well be included the present organization of the League of Nations.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. President, I have said that at a future time I expect to speak somewhat further on this proposal, but since I am on my feet I will say what little I have to say in addition.

I believe that no one could add to the superb statement which was made by the chairman of the subcommittee, supplemented by the magnificent address of the senior Senator from Michigan. I wish to make clear, Mr. President, as one who was privileged to be a member of the subcommittee, that the resolution is not a statement which has been handed down from Mount Sinai, it is not sacrosanct; it is merely the work of eight earnest men who were trying, as has been stated by the Senators who have spoken, to meet the situation.

I do not desire to be understood as criticizing any of those who seek to amend it if they are deeply and seriously disturbed over the definition and application of that language. But I will say to them in all affection and kindness that the matter of jeopardizing what we are trying to accomplish by quibbling over language seems to me not to be justified.

As I sat here this morning, and listened to the superb statements which were made, this thought ran through my mind: The Master of Nazareth gave to the world what we know as the Lord's Prayer. One sentence of that petition kept going through my mind—"Give us this day our daily bread"; seven words—"Give us this day our daily bread." That single petition has one supreme goal, that is the recognition by man of the fact that there is not within him the source of the help he needs; that he has to petition an Almighty Power for the material sustenance and for the spiritual sustenance which are essential to him. No one can suggest that that is not the purpose of the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread"; it recognizes a source we must contact for the things we need for our living.

Now, Mr. President, in all kindness, would it not be rather futile and would it not be clouding the purpose of the petition if we should start to analyze it? Take the word "give." Oh, we should not use the word "give." "Give" presupposes bounty without any recompense, without any contribution on the part of the recipient. I move to strike out the word "give" and substitute the words "make it possible for us so to labor as to secure these results."

The second word, "us"—"Give us." Who does "us" mean? Does it mean, as in holy Willie's prayer, "me and my family"—

> "Lord remember me and mine,
> With mercy simple and divine."

Does it mean my family? Does it mean the State of Iowa? Does it mean the United States of America? I move to strike out "us," and substitute "United Nations" or "free and sovereign nations." Strike out "us" and insert "Give the United States of America its daily bread." "Give to us"—I move to strike that out entirely and substitute "Give the United Nations and such other free and sovereign nations as are subsequently admitted to association their daily bread." Then the prayer petitions for our daily bread. Daily. That could merely mean that we want it today; but we are going to want it tomorrow, we are going to want it in the future. I move to strike out the word "daily" or leave "daily" in and add "on each succeeding day."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might raise the question whether we meant a calendar day or a legislative day. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly. "Give us our daily bread." Bread is a very limited commodity. We understand it to be a loaf made from wheat. It does not include cake, it does not include meat. I move to strike out "bread" and substitute "everything essential for physical well-being and life and spiritual well-being and life." Would that not be ridiculous?

Why? Because in that language, however it might be changed, there is the goal of trying to reach out and to contact the source of power, infinite power, that does not appertain to a finite being, and seeking that help which every normal man and woman needs.

What is in the proposal before the Senate? It is an assertion before the world that the United States of America is abandoning the position which many of us have taken, and which a majority took in the past, that we were not going to participate, we were not going to cooperate with the other nations of the world in peace security. When we are approaching the time, God willing, when we need an organization of that kind, what should we try to do? We should endeavor to express the purpose in language which will notify the world that that is the goal toward which we are striving, the goal we are seeking. We tell you that we will cooperate with you in winning the war, we tell you that we will join with you in trying to formulate a peace, and we now tell you that we will unite with you in trying to secure that peace.

As I have said, the language contained in the resolution is not the last word. It could have been improved on; there was not a member of the Senate committee who was satisfied with the language. I had to abandon a position that I held tenuously—strenuously, rather——

Mr. HATCH. The Senator need not quibble about a word. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. No. Of course, the first word used very greatly changes the meaning, but I may say, Mr. President, that I substituted the proper word—strenuously—without assistance. I believe we ought to implement the Atlantic Charter, which at the present time stands unsupported. I submitted a resolution for that purpose. I am going to reoffer it in the hope that we can give the Charter some substance, something to stand on. But the resolution now before the Senate presents a goal that is definite. Perhaps Senators could offer something better; I am sure some of them could and, as I have said, I am not criticizing their attempts to do so, but I am warning of the danger that is involved in beclouding the goal we are trying to reach and beclouding the thinking of the world, in leaving it uncertain as to whether the United States will cooperate with it.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that, without striking out or changing words, we will in this case accept the version of the resolution presented to us, as we accept that of the petition to which I have alluded—"Give us this day our daily bread"—and that we will keep before us the goal and what we are trying to do, without quibbling over language.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to have something inserted in the RECORD, but I must again call attention to the fact that we are not quibbling about words. Words do have importance, and we should know what they mean. They are important, as the Senator from Iowa appreciates, as he indicated by so quickly changing from "tenuously" to "strenuously."

Awhile ago a question arose as to the vote on the adherence of the United States to the World Court. The executive clerk has furnished me the tabulation of the two votes which were taken, the first in 1926, when the Senate had before it the reservations mentioned by the Senator from Georgia, which were submitted, I believe, by the then Senator from Virginia, Mr. Swanson. I ask that the reservation be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the vote of the Senate taken at the time. At that time, with the reservations, the votes for adherence to the World Court numbered 76, the votes against numbered 17, and 3 did not vote. I think that is in accordance with what the Senator from Georgia stated this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESERVATION NO. 5, WITH RESERVATION CONCURRED IN IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AND REPORTED TO THE SENATE, JANUARY 27, 1926

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 67, pp. 2824, 2825, or Executive Journal, vol. 64, pt. I, pp. 557, 558)

The resolution, as modified, follows:

"Whereas the President, under date of February 24, 1923, transmitted a message to the Senate, accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of State, dated February 17, 1923, asking the favorable advice and consent of the Senate to the adherence on the part of the United States to the protocol of Decem-

ber 16, 1920, of signature of the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, set out in the said message of the President (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction contained therein), upon the conditions and understandings hereafter stated, to be made a part of the instrument of adherence: Therefore be it

"*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the adherence on the part of the United States to the said protocol of December 16, 1920, and the adjoined statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction contained in said statute), and that the signature of the United States be affixed to the said protocol, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and condition of this resolution, namely:

"1. That such adherence shall not be taken to involve any legal relation on the part of the United States to the League of Nations or the assumption of any obligations by the United States under the Treaty of Versailles.

"2. That the United States shall be permitted to participate through representatives designated for the purpose and upon an equality with the other states, members, respectively, of the council and assembly of the League of Nations, in any and all proceedings of either the council or the assembly for the election of judges or deputy judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice or for the filling of vacancies.

"3. That the United States will pay a fair share of the expenses of the court as determined and appropriated from time to time by the Congress of the United States.

"4. That the United States may at any time withdraw its adherence to the said protocol and that the statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice adjoined to the protocol shall not be amended without the consent of the United States.

"5. That the court shall not render any advisory opinion except publicly after due notice to all states adhering to the court and to all interested states and after public hearing or opportunity for hearing given to any state concerned; nor shall it, without the consent of the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest.

"The signature of the United States to the said protocol shall not be affixed until the powers signatory to such protocol shall have indicated, through an exchange of notes, their acceptance of the foregoing reservations and understandings as a part and a condition of adherence by the United States to the said protocol.

"*Resolved further*, As a part of this act of ratification that the United States approve the protocol and statute hereinabove mentioned, with the understanding that recourse to the Permanent Court of International Justice for the settlement of differences between the United States and any other state or states can be had only by agreement thereto through general or special treaties concluded between the parties in dispute; and

"*Resolved further*, That adherence to the said protocol and statute hereby approved shall not be so construed as to require the United States to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall adherence to the said protocol and statute be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions."

(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 67, p. 2825, or Executive Journal, vol. 64, pt. I, p. 558)

On motion by Mr. Moses, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the rule of the Senate governing the procedure in the matter of a resolution of ratification may be set aside, and that instead of the resolution as modified going over until tomorrow a vote thereon be taken immediately.

On the question, "Will the Senate advise and consent to Senate Resolution No. 5, as modified?"

Mr. Reed of Missouri demanded the yeas and nays.

Yeas: Messrs. Ashurst, Bayard, Bingham, Bratton, Broussard, Bruce, Butler, Cameron, Capper, Caraway, Copeland, Couzens, Cummins, Curtis, Ddle, Deneen, Edge, Edwards, Ernst, Ferris, Fess, Fletcher, George, Gerry, Gillett, Glass, Goff, Gooding, Hale, Harris, Harrison, Heflin, Howell, Jones of New Mexico, Jones of Washington, Kendrick, Keyes, King, Lenroot, McKellar, McKinley, McLean, McMaster, McNary, Mayfield, Means, Metcalf, Neely, Norbeck, Norris, Oddie, Overman, Pepper, Phipps, Pittman, Ransdell, Reed of Pennsylvania, Robinson of Arkansas, Sackett, Sheppard, Shortridge, Simmons, Smith, Smoot, Stanfield, Stephens, Swanson, Trammell, Tyson, Underwood, Wadsworth, Walsh, Warren, Weller, Wheeler, Willis—76.

Nays: Messrs. Blease, Borah, Brookhart, Fernald, Frazier, Harreld, Johnson, La Follette, Moses, Nye, Pine, Reed of Missouri, Robinson of Indiana, Schall, Shipstead, Watson, Williams—17.

Not voting: Messrs. Dill, du Pont, Greene—3.

So Senate Resolution No. 5, as modified, was agreed to, more than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in 1935 the question again arose, and I ask to have the resolution and vote printed in the RECORD. The question was, "Shall the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of adherence, as amended?" On this question the yeas were 52, the nays were 36, 6 not voting. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that, as he stated this morning, he was among those who voted for adherence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The resolution of adherence, as amended, follows:

Resolution of adherence offered by Mr. Robinson:

"Whereas the President, under date of December 10, 1930, transmitted to the Senate a communication, accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of State dated November 18, 1929, asking the favorable advice and consent of the Senate to adherence by the United States to the protocol of date December 16, 1920, of signature of the Statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, the protocol of revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice of date September 14, 1929, and the protocol of accession of the United States of America to the protocol of signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice of date September 14, 1929, all of which are set out in the said message of the President dated December 10, 1930: Therefore be it

"*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the adherence by the United States to the said three protocols, the one of date December 16, 1920, and the other two each of date September 14, 1929 (without accepting or agreeing to the optional clause for compulsory jurisdiction), with the clear understanding of the United States that the Permanent Court of International Justice shall not, over an objection by the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest."

[Amendment offered by Mr. VANDENBERG—agreed to January 24, 1935, without a record vote.]

"*Resolved further*, That adherence to the said protocols and statute hereby approved shall not be so construed as to require the United States to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall adherence to the said protocols and statute be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions."

[Reservation offered by Mr. THOMAS of Utah—agreed to January 29, 1935, without a record vote.]

"*Resolved further*, as a part of this act of ratification, That the United States approve the protocols and statute hereinabove mentioned with the understanding that recourse to the Permanent Court of International Justice for the settlement of differences between the United States and any other state or states can be had only by agreement thereto through general or special treaties concluded between the parties in dispute."

Mr. Lewis made the following statement:

"I am instructed to inform the Senate that a telegram has been placed in my hands to be read, the contents of which I shall recite. From Genoa, Italy, comes a cable to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BACHMAN] saying: 'Pair us for the World Court.' (Signed) McKELLAR and TYDINGS."

The question was,

"Shall the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of adherence, as amended?"

On this question Mr. JOHNSON demanded the yeas and nays, and the demand being supported by one-fifth of the Senators present, the roll was called and resulted in 52 Senators voting in the affirmative and 36 Senators voting in the negative, as follows:

Yeas: Adams, Ashurst, Austin, Bachman, Bailey, Bankhead, Barbour, Barkley, Bilbo, Black, Brown, Bulkley, Burke, Byrd, Byrnes, Capper, Caraway, Clark, Connally, Costigan, Couzens, Cutting, Dieterich, Duffy, Fletcher, George, Glass, Guffey, Hale, Harrison, Hatch, Hayden, Keyes, King, Logan, Lonergan, McNary, Maloney, Minton, Moore, Neely, O'Mahoney, Pittman, Pope, Radcliffe, Robinson, Sheppard, Thomas of Utah, Truman, Vandenberg, Van Nuys, and Wagner—52.

Nays: Bone, Borah, Bulow, Carey, Coolidge, Davis, Dickinson, Donahey, Frazier, Gerry, Gore, Hastings, Johnson, La Follette, Lewis, Long, McCarran, McGill, Metcalf, Murphy, Murray, Norbeck, Norris, Nye, Reynolds, Russell, Schall, Schwellenbach, Shipstead, Smith, Thomas of Oklahoma, Townsend, Trammell, Walsh, Wheeler, and White—36.

Not voting: Copeland, Gibson, McAdoo, Overton, Steiwer, and Tydings—6.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably, with an amendment, in

which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell;

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home;

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. BALL obtained the floor.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	McFarland
Andrews	Downey	McKellar
Bailey	Eastland	McNary
Ball	Ellender	Maloney
Bankhead	Ferguson	Maybank
Barkley	George	Mead
Bilbo	Gillette	Millikin
Brewster	Guffey	Murdock
Brooks	Hatch	Murray
Buck	Hawkes	Nye
Burton	Hayden	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler	Holman	Overton
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Chavez	Kilgore	Reed
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Revercomb
Connally	Lodge	Reynolds
Danaher	McClellan	Robertson
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Scrugham	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Shipstead	Tunnell	White
Smith	Tydings	Wiley
Stewart	Vandenberg	Willis
Taft	Van Nuys	Wilson
Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] took what seems to me to be a strong position when he said that the resolution purposely is general, and perhaps even vague. A case can be made for that point of view. However, earlier today the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] submitted and asked to have printed and to lie on the table an amendment to the pending resolution, an amendment which 13 Senators are supporting. We who support that amendment take a position different from that taken by other Senators. Our position is that the advice of the Senate to the Executive in the present situation can have value only to the extent that it is clear and specific to the greatest degree we can make it so.

The final paragraph of the pending resolution is as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Our amendment would change the language of the final paragraph to read as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, before discussing the specific questions involved in the resolution and our proposed amendment, I should like to comment for a moment on what we cannot help but regard as a studied attempt to rush the resolution through the Senate without a full attempt to explore by debate its implications or meaning.

The Foreign Relations Committee has had before it for from 6 to 8 months half a dozen or more resolutions dealing with the subject of the post-war foreign policy of the United States. For many months the resolutions remained in a subcommittee with little outward sign of action or consideration. Suddenly, a couple of weeks ago, the subcommittee, apparently reversing its previous position that the time was inopportune for consideration of the subject, reported to the full committee the resolution which is now before the Senate.

The full committee held three meetings, reported the pending resolution last Thursday, and immediately asked and obtained unanimous consent to make it the unfinished business of the Senate, bringing it up for debate today. It is rather an unusual procedure to report a measure of this importance and have it made the pending business on the same day. Why, after months of delay, this sudden haste?

In addition, there has been a deliberate attempt, through the press and otherwise, to create the impression that any extended debate of the subject, any effort to strengthen and clarify the resolution, such as we are proposing—and I might add that the amendment was offered in the committee, so we are not coming to the Senate with something with which we did not go before the committee—would be harmful both to national unity and to international collaboration. The implications contained in that suggestion are frightening to any true believer in the democratic process.

The issue before the Senate is what post-war foreign policy will best safeguard the security and peace of the United States. There can be no more important issue for this Nation now, next year, or for the next decade. Is our democracy so weak, is our faith in ourselves as Senators of the United States so faltering, is our faith in the people of America and their inherent common sense and justice so fragile that we dare not debate and fully explore this vital issue? I cannot believe it. If it be true, then our democratic republic truly is in grave danger today.

All of us recognize that the split personality of the United States Government in the field of foreign relations—the fact that the Executive conducts all negotiations, but that the result of such negotiations must be submitted to Congress, and particularly to the Senate, for approval and ratification—constitutes both a delicate and an extremely difficult problem for democracy to solve. But we cannot solve that problem simply by refusing to face it.

The Senator from Michigan said that in the pending resolution we are going further than any other parliamentary body has gone. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is no other great power which cannot make binding commitments in the foreign relations field without the approval of two-thirds of one of its legislative bodies. That puts us in a different position. The cabinet of the United Kingdom is a part of the parliament of the United Kingdom. It can speak with authority whenever it believes the time has come to speak on what that Government will undertake in the way of obligations to maintain peace. Chiang Kai-shek can speak with authority for China. Certainly Premier Stalin can speak with authority for what Russia will do. But can the President of the United States speak with any real authority as to what obligations the United States will undertake, as to the kind of institution or organization or authority in which it will participate, or how much power may be delegated to such authority? He cannot do so today. He can speak with that authority only if he has clear, strong advice from the Senate.

It seems to me that, both in the conference now being held in Moscow and in the later conference to be held by the

heads of the three nations, the question is bound to arise, What is the United States willing to undertake in the way of specific obligations to maintain peace in the post-war world, to guarantee security to all nations? That is the great issue before the Senate.

It has been suggested that words might be uttered in a full debate on this floor which would promote discord among the United Nations. In view of the things which have been said on this floor regarding lend-lease and in view of the somewhat garbled reports in the press on the secret sessions in which the five Senators reported on their trip around the world to the battle fronts, I doubt if anyone seriously advances that view today. If any criticism of our allies has been made, I for one, do not know what it is; and certainly so far as our group is concerned—the group of Senators proposing this amendment—there will be nothing of the kind. Every one of us has supported and will continue to support the strongest kind of national and international united effort, both in the war and in maintaining the peace to follow it.

On the other hand, if the purpose in seeking speedy action is deliberately to keep the position of the Senate on our post-war foreign policy so vague and general as to leave every individual Member free in his own conscience to advocate, support, or oppose whatever interpretation might suit him in the future, while at the same time conveying to the American people and to our allies the impression that a strong and clear position had been taken, then I submit that such a procedure contains far greater danger to the security of the United States and the future peace of the world than could possibly arise from the most acrimonious kind of debate in the Senate.

The pending resolution has legal significance only under article II of the Constitution, which provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The Senate is advising the Executive as to the kind of international arrangements to maintain world peace and to prevent a recurrence of the present war, that it at present believes would be best for this country, and which it presumably would be inclined to approve when presented in treaty form. Obviously, such advice has value only if it is reasonably clear and furnishes a true guide to the Executive as to the type of international commitments he may make on behalf of the United States with reasonable assurance that the Senate will approve. I am fearful that the pending resolution—and this is no reflection on its authors; I have the greatest respect for them—because of the varying interpretations of it which are possible and reasonable, is somewhat in the nature of a blank check of advice, but without any valid signature.

However, there is another obligation which I believe the Senate has, in addition to the legal one of advice under the Constitution, and that is the obligation of leadership in forming public opinion, which I look upon as a very real obligation in a democratic republic such as ours. The Senate has exercised that kind of leadership in the past, but, unfortunately, very often in a negative sense insofar as international obligations for the United States are concerned. It seems to me that only through the exercise of real leadership in forming public opinion can we in America resolve the difficult problem arising from the split responsibility on foreign policy in our Government, and develop a firm, continuing American foreign policy, and I might add only through the closest kind of cooperation and collaboration between the executive and the legislative branches in all major international negotiations. I think the recent negotiation of the relief and rehabilitation agreement and the part that a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations played in that negotiation constitute a very constructive step forward, and point the way toward a solution of the problem arising from the fact that we separate the powers of government, and that there is a division of responsibility on foreign policy.

That kind of leadership is needed in America today. In the final analysis it will be the composite attitude of the American people that decides how far the United States will go in international collaboration to maintain peace and stability in the post-war world. I think that today the American people are overwhelmingly convinced that the United States must participate with other nations in maintaining peace after this war. There has not been any argument over that since Pearl Harbor, for Pearl Harbor taught us all a bitter lesson about how greatly space and time have been annihilated by science and industry.

But there is far less crystalization of thinking in America on the political form such collaboration, participation, or cooperation—those are the words most commonly used—should take, and there are differences of opinion as to the extent of obligations we as a nation should assume in such collaboration, the differences ranging all the way from opposition to assuming any kind of obligation, to favoring a world union with common citizenship.

The pending resolution—and I think the same criticism applies to the resolution recently adopted by the House of Representatives—merely would place the Senate on record as having caught up to the will of the American people as it has existed for the past year and a half. In other words, we are now in favor of international collaboration to maintain peace. The resolution offers no leadership or guidance on the question of what form the collaboration should take, whether by means of alliances or organization, and is but little clearer in stating the extent of our cooperation, the specific fields of international relations in which we are willing to assume obligations. It does not answer, for instance, the question whether we are prepared now to pledge the joint use of our military forces to stop attempts at aggression.

Certainly that question is at the very heart of maintaining the future peace of the world, and is a specific question which almost inevitably will arise both in the current tripower discussions at Moscow and in any later meeting between Churchill, Stalin, and President Roosevelt. I cannot escape the conviction that such a resolution as the pending one, which must of necessity be rather broad in its phraseology, can have value only if it is debated fully, to such an extent that it will furnish a reliable guide to the Executive as to the present convictions of the Senate on this question, and also serve to help crystalize the thinking of the American people, and indicate clearly to them where their representatives in this body stand.

It should be made clear in the beginning that the United States Senate cannot and should not attempt here to outline the peace settlement which must be accepted by other nations—or else. It is not our task to say what must be negotiated and agreed upon by many nations. Our task is to state as clearly as we can the basic principles which we believe should guide American representatives in negotiating the settlement, the objectives behind which the influence of the United States should be thrown. I think sometimes we underestimate the influence of the United States in the world. The United States will not dictate the final settlements agreed upon, but our influence in shaping those settlements will be tremendously greater if our own policies and objectives are clear. Everyone knows that in a conference, business or political, the individual or group who know exactly what they want are most likely to be effective.

We recognize that the United States may not, and probably will not, obtain the acceptance by all other nations of all the major principles we espouse. I hope that there will not be a repetition of 1919, with the United States refusing to participate in an organization to maintain peace because all of its details do not suit us; that instead, if we are offered the chance of participating in an organization headed in the right direction—that of effective international collaboration to maintain peace and stability—we will go along, even though all of the arrangements may not suit us perfectly. International progress must be made through compromise of conflicting viewpoints, just as progress is made domestically. However, if we begin the whole process with a watered-down compromise which does little to clarify the American position either to our own people or our allies, our chances of coming out of any conferences with international arrangements acceptable to us seem to me very remote.

Against that background let us consider the pending resolution and our proposed amendment. That amendment would clarify Senate Resolution 192 in five respects.

First, the resolution reads:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment—

And so forth. We would change that to read:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted in the establishment—

And so forth. The name "United Nations" was coined, I believe, by the President of the United States. The Declaration of the United Nations was signed by 26 nations—I believe there are now 33 or 34—in Washington on January 1, 1942. The name "United Nations" has become a symbol throughout the world of the forces of freedom united to wage war to complete victory over the Nazi and Japanese tyranny. Incidentally, all of the United Nations have subscribed to the Atlantic Charter, pledging them to remain united to maintain a just peace.

The concept of the United Nations has tremendous psychological, moral, and even spiritual value in the world today. Why throw it overboard here in the Senate? Why not use it? The United Nations will win the war together. They must logically be the nucleus of any joint democratic effort to maintain peace in the future. "Join" used in the resolution is a present tense verb. Followed by the phrase "free and sovereign" nations, the only logical interpretation can be that in any current negotiations looking toward the establishment of joint international agencies to maintain the peace, many of the United Nations are to be left out. Greece, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Yugoslavia are not "free" nations today, and will not be free until the war in Europe is over.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] stated that in his opinion a broad definition of the term "free and sovereign" would exclude Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Iowa said that in his personal opinion they would not be excluded.

Mr. BALL. He said that the language might be so construed as to exclude them.

Mr. HATCH. He said that under the terms of the resolution they might be excluded.

Mr. BALL. It seems to me to be very important. Australian soldiers in the South Pacific are fighting alongside our own. Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders fight alongside our boys in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. Are not their nations to be represented in this set-up? I think we should make it very clear that they will be represented.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I can imagine that someone might make the argument, against the desire of the able Senator from Minnesota, that if nations such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and the other dominions were admitted into the international organization, that would give the British Empire more than one vote. The question of the number of votes which each of the constituent member states should have is a question which will arise and will be settled at the time the organization is formed. The same objection might be made to a small country having the same number of votes the United States is to have. According to the committee resolution, all free and sovereign nations are put in exactly the same category. I am sure the able Senator does not mean that that principle should be violated.

Mr. BALL. So far as I am concerned, I believe that the United Nations are united to win this war. They should remain united as the nucleus of an international organization to maintain peace. I hope that an organization will be created on a basis of democratic representation proportionate to the contribution of each nation to the support of such international agency. That seems to me to be the democratic way to do it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am certain the Senator from Minnesota would never wish to imply to our sister, the Dominion of Canada, that while we are willing to have her sons fight alongside ours, and while we will unite with her in time of war, we will refuse to join her in time of peace.

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what we are trying to get away from by the amendments which we propose.

Granted that governments in exile cannot speak with authority for peoples with whom they have been out of contact for two or three years, still it seems to me extremely unwise and harmful to allied unity to even appear to bar them from provisional adherence to any joint agreements made now looking toward the maintenance of peace in the post-war world. We have not heretofore done such a thing. In the relief and rehabilitation agreements all the United Nations, as well as approximately 10 other associated nations, are included. They are governments in exile, yes. Probably most of them will be overthrown when their countries are free; but now they speak in a way for those peoples who have borne the brunt of the conflict between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny.

The language of our proposal would make it clear that the United Nations should be the nucleus of a future peace organization, with participation open to all free and sovereign nations willing to assume the obligations, and duly admitted to membership.

Let me say here that I recognize that so far as the military power to maintain peace and order is concerned, at the end of this war, when we shall have defeated the Axis, that power will reside chiefly in Britain, Russia, and the United States. China will be a great psychological force in the Orient, but her military power is now, and probably will then be, slight as compared with that of the other three. Obviously any basic agreements should be made, first, among those three, with China also as a party; but certainly the smaller nations have something to contribute, and should then be drawn in, and the agreements should be gone over in the light of their suggestions. After all, it is the smaller nations which have the greatest stake of any in collective security and in really making it function. If we truly believe in democracy, the smaller nations are entitled to some voice in determining how the affairs of the world in which they must live shall be conducted.

Our second clarification concerns the word "authority." The resolution pending would favor the joining of nations "in the establishment and maintenance of international authority." We would substitute the words "the establishment and maintenance of an international organization."

"Authority" is one of those flexible, one might almost say rubber, words that has a variety of meanings. Without any article before it, the word might mean anything from an unwritten understanding among the great powers to a hard-and-fast military alliance. If the article "an" were before the word "international" I believe it then would imply an organized, clearly defined authority. As it stands, the term is so vague that no one can be sure what it does mean.

What we are discussing here is international collaboration to maintain peace. I know of only two effective methods of collaboration among nations. One is through alliances, either bilateral or multilateral. The other is through an organization of nations, with clearly defined authority in limited fields. All history demonstrates that alliances are unstable and unreliable. They tend inevitably toward imperialism and balance-of-power politics—a route that always in the past has led to war. They are in the power-politics, secret-diplomacy tradition.

On the other hand, an organization of nations, with clearly defined authority in specified fields, is the democratic, and by far the most hopeful, approach to the joint solution of international problems and maintenance of peace and stability in the world. In an organization, controversial issues and the motives and actions of all nations are out in the open, where world opinion can operate effectively to check those which are inimical to the peace and welfare of the world. In alliances the reverse is true. Secret diplomacy is the rule.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to ask the Senator a question in line with what he has just said. Doubtless the Senator will recall that today, by the explanation given by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the word "authority" has now been construed on the floor of the Senate to mean every existing agency or every agency organized in the future.

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think it has been so construed.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, Mr. President; it was so construed.

Mr. BALL. It has been construed that it might mean that.

Mr. HATCH. Well, that it might—including the League of Nations.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to ask the Senator if that word might equally well be construed to mean an offensive and defensive alliance among two, three, or four powers of the world, relying only upon military power and authority.

Mr. BALL. I do not think there is any question that such an interpretation is perfectly reasonable under the language of the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator then say that if the Senate were to adopt the resolution in its present form, the President of the United States would be perfectly justified in following the advice given in that language, by forming with other great powers a strictly power alliance, and nothing more?

Mr. BALL. I do not think there can be any question about that, and later I shall discuss that point more fully.

At this time I should like to read an article published in the New York Times of October 22, 1943. The article was written by Arthur Krock. In it he interprets the resolution. He is supposed to have rather good sources of information. I quote from Mr. Krock's article:

> The Connally resolution, which the Senate has agreed to bring up for consideration next Monday, urges that "the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority, with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." To continue the division of responsibility that now exists between the American and British Navies (air forces included, of course) into the provisional post-war period would be merely to establish that international authority and that "power," as specified in the resolution.
>
> The directive text that refers to "free and sovereign nations" would be met by the proposed invitation to Russia and China, and to others thereafter, to take an appropriate share in the naval policing establishment. And the qualification—

This interested me very much—

> "acting through its constitutional processes," is met by the fact that the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy at all times, and they are at all times subject to his orders. If he should choose to have these continue temporarily to issue through the Combined Chiefs of Staff, little doubt exists here that he has the right to do so under constitutional process.

That was an interpretation of the resolution which rather startled me, an interpretation of it as an authorization for the President now, without any further reference to Congress, to negotiate a military alliance with Great Britain, Russia, and China.

Mr. HATCH. To develop the point, if the Senator will further yield, let me inquire whether such an agreement would not come back to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. BALL. Absolutely no, under Mr. Krock's interpretation.

Mr. HATCH. That is what I mean.

Mr. BALL. I think there are a great many Senators who would give him an argument on that point.

Mr. President, if we attempt to do the job of maintaining the peace through a system of alliances, one member of the alliance might commit the other members to war by unilateral actions which the other members had no chance to oppose in advance. That, I think, is the fundamental weakness of the proposal which has been talked about so much lately of an Anglo-American hard-and-fast alliance. It would commit us to support with our forces all the commitments of the Government of the United Kingdom, but would give us no voice whatsoever in determining what those commitments should be.

The United States does not want any territory, nor does it want to exploit any peoples anywhere, for its own selfish benefit. All we seek in this world and in the post-war world is a fair break for all nations and peoples, ourselves included, and peace and security for ourselves and the world. With those objectives, where will American influence be most potent, where will the interests of the United States be best protected—in the open, above board deliberations of an international organization, or in the devious, secret diplomacy and power politics of a system of alliances? I think there can be only one answer to that question, and the answer is organization. Why not say so plainly in this resolution?

There is another reason for clarification on this point. My interpretation of the resolution as it stands is that it points most clearly in the direction of a multilateral military offensive and defensive alliance.

Others may dispute that interpretation, and have done so here on the floor, but I believe there can be no question that such an interpretation is clearly reasonable as the resolution stands and that the Executive, the President of the United States, whoever he may be, would be perfectly justified in so interpreting this resolution of advice from the Senate and in negotiating such an alliance or system of alliances. If that should happen, is there anyone in this Chamber who doubts what would be the fate of such an alliance if submitted to the Senate for ratification? It would not stand a chance. The American people, I believe, are ready to support our participation in a strong democratic organization of nations to maintain peace, but they would be overwhelmingly against our tying in with any group of nations in a power-politics alliance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the able Senator, in view of what he has just said about alliances and power politics, would care to comment on the remark of the able Senator from Alabama who said, if I recall correctly, in the committee on Tuesday of last week, that it would seem to him that under such a resolution as the subcommittee had reported, the Congress of Vienna might have been assembled and the organization there established might have been created?

Mr. BALL. I think that is a very possible interpretation of the meaning of the resolution. I do not think there can be any question in the mind of any Senator that the people of the United States and their representatives in the Senate would never approve the United States joining any system of power politics or alliances. Yet the President would be justified in negotiating such an arrangement to maintain peace. Under this resolution, are we not taking a dangerous chance in not clarifying our advice on that point?

If we mean organization when we say "authority"—and I believe the word "organization" is broad enough to cover the utilization of any existing organized agencies or the creation of new ones then, for heaven's sake, let us say so plainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I was merely going to say that I think the Senator disputes his own argument. He starts out with the proposition that the American people are against alliances, and then says that the President, under this resolution, could enter into an alliance. He could not do such a thing, of course; he would have to come to the Senate; and the proposal would have to be considered by the Senate. Anything which the President recommends must come to the Senate. Therefore, if you are against it, there is no need of being fearful of such a contingency. So, Mr. President, I wonder if we are not imagining too much when we assume that there could be a bilateral offensive and defensive alliance under this resolution? Assume that this resolution becomes the supreme law of the land, and that under it we could proceed to that sort of an arrangement, the first part of the resolution speaks about carrying on the war "against all our enemies"; the second part of the resolution uses the term "comrade-in-arms." There is surely more than one comrade in arms. There is no point to the language at all unless we are describing conditions that exist. "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations." How could anyone assume that when the term used is "free and sovereign nations," involving plurality, the United States is going to join with a single free and sovereign nation in bringing about an alliance?

This resolution has virtue or it has not virtue. It has virtue in that it will accomplish the major objectives which I know the Senator from Minnesota wants to accomplish. But do not let us in our argument, in attempting to narrow the resolution, get down to the place where we forget the English language.

Mr. BALL. I hope the Senator will expand his argument later in his own time. I do not think the Senator will argue with me the point that an alliance or a system of multilateral alliances would not be clearly within the meaning of this resolution. Certainly two of its strongest newspaper supporters, Arthur Krock and Walter Lippmann, whose book advocating alliances is a best seller in the United States, are supporting the resolution on that basis. I do not think the American people would ever approve alliances. If the Senator has read the newspapers, he knows that today there is a great deal of discussion of alliances and the possibility that an alliance of the three great military powers may be the only way to do this job.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If there was a power alliance of three great military powers, it would not be a bilateral alliance.

Mr. BALL. I did not say a bilateral alliance; I said a bilateral or multilateral alliance.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Incidentally, an offensive and defensive alliance between two powers is what one of the authors to whom the Senator has referred favors.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to ask the Senator if he can agree to the suggestion of the able Senator from Utah that the words "free and sovereign nations" mean the same group of nations as those with which we are making war for victory and peace mentioned in the first clause, the same group who are our comrades in arms and with whom we are going to secure a just and honorable peace, because, obviously, the nations that we are going to continue to fight until we win a just victory are the United Nations? They are the ones with whom we are now fighting, and the nations with whom we are going to fix a just and honorable peace for the United Nations. Yet our able friends have clearly stated that they did not use "free and sovereign nations" as synonymous with "United Nations."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will allow me, I should like to answer that. The only point which the Senator from Utah made was that in both expressions "comrades in arms" and "free and sovereign nations" there is a plurality. The expression of both those terms conveys the idea of duality. That is the only point I have made.

Mr. BALL. Returning to the question of alliances, I think they would clearly be within the meaning of the advice we give under this resolution; but I think they never would be ratified by the United States Senate, and it would be tragedy, indeed, if our advice to the Executive were to mislead rather than to advise him on this point.

The third and fourth points on which we seek to clarify the pending resolution and strengthen it is by the insertion, after the words "international authority", of the words "to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle disputes peacefully." The pending resolution is singularly silent on both these points. By the phrase "promote cooperation among nations" we merely seek to tie into this resolution the fact, which all of us recognize, that there are many problems, such as currency stabilization, air routes, control of food and other surpluses, development of undeveloped areas, and so forth, where a considerable degree of international cooperation and even of joint action will be necessary for any kind of satisfactory solution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Under that provision of the Senator's proposal would it be possible for the President of the United States to work out with Britain and other nations the pending proposal for an international bank, about which we hear so much, without referring it to the Congress?

Mr. BALL. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We would grant him authority to do that, would we not?

Mr. BALL. No; there is no grant of authority. The language is "to promote cooperation." That refers to individual nations acting voluntarily, of their own free will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the value of all that language if no authority is granted, and if the matter all has to come back to the Congress for final ratification?

Mr. BALL. The value of it is that we suggest that we are willing to join with other nations in cooperative discussion of these problems, which are international in nature, and to try to agree on a joint course of action, the adoption of which voluntarily, through its own governmental processes, will then be up to each individual nation.

Mr. PRESIDENT. I do not believe we or other nations are going to delegate to an international organization any authority to act independently in these fields, but certainly our set-up should include machinery for conference and discussion of possible joint courses of action, always subject to approval by individual nations.

The function of settling international disputes by peaceful means, in accordance with agreed-upon principles, clearly should be included in a declaration such as this if we are not to give the impression that our sole aim will be to preserve the status quo after the war by means of force. I have always assumed that procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes between nations which threaten war, and which they cannot settle amicably between themselves, is an essential corollary to outlawing of aggressive war. If we take away from nations the right to wage aggressive war to settle what they consider grievances, the least we can do is offer them a tribunal of justice where their cases can be heard and decided. I cannot help but feel the committee's failure to include such a clause was an oversight.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I dislike to disagree with my distinguished colleague, with whom I see so many things in common, but he has just stated that the failure of the committee to include machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations was undoubtedly an oversight on the part of the committee.

Mr. BALL. I said I could not help but feel it was. I should say that I hope it was.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator hopes it was; nevertheless, he will recall that that very point was brought to the attention of the committee, and it was urged upon the committee that, at least as a gesture, we should take some action to hold out hope to the peoples of the world that the United States stood for the setting up of machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations. It was called to the attention of the committee that that was not provided for in the resolution. It is not in it today. But we do have the explanation on the floor of the Senate by Senators that they think the terms of the resolution contemplate the setting up of machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations. I ask the Senator, and I ask the Senate, as I shall do repeatedly throughout the course of the debate. If that is what the resolution means, then why not say so?

Mr. BALL. I ask the same question.

Mr. President, our fifth clarifying change concerns the words "power" and "aggression." The pending resolution would advocate "international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." We would change it to "and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

We simply seek to make it clear that power includes joint use of military force to stop and suppress military aggression. Power is another broad, flexible word. Under any reasonable interpretation, I think it must include military force. But it is well to remember that it was on the very mild use of military force against a declared aggressor provided in article X of the Covenant that the League of Nations foundered. In view of that fact, it seems to us that it would be wise to make our intention in that respect clear beyond any shadow of a doubt.

I am more concerned about the failure to limit aggression to military aggression. There can be economic, ideological, or cultural aggression. Certainly we have no intention of delegating to any international authority power to prevent our Nation or any other nation from managing its own internal economy or from propagandizing the advantages of our free institutions.

There is one fundamental principle underlying all of these clarifying changes we propose. That principle is that the only way for us and the world to avoid these recurring wars of ever-growing magnitude and destruction is to establish and enforce jointly through democratic organization a few basic rules of conduct among nations. The two essen-

tial rules are that all nations must submit to international arbitration of one kind or another disputes that threaten to provoke war, and that no nation be permitted to wage aggressive war.

In actual practice few nations have ever been completely free to do as they pleased internationally because of external limiting factors, and most civilized nations have accepted the thesis that their complete sovereignty was limited by consideration of the effects their actions might have on the peace of the world. Yet this is a purely voluntary limitation, which some nations have chosen to throw aside, and twice in one generation the whole world has been plunged into war as a result. If we are to prevent that from happening again, this voluntary limitation on complete national sovereignty must be firmly written into international law, with adequate provision to enforce it against the minority of outlaw nations.

In other words, the concept of a world community consisting of some sixty-odd completely sovereign nations, each free to wage war as it pleases and limited only by its own conscience and force, must give way to a concept based on individual nations completely sovereign as to their internal affairs, but limited in their international acts by a few common rules which all have accepted and agreed to help enforce.

If we make that basic decision, and we are trying to make it clearly in the amendment we propose, then we and the world stand some chance of preventing another great world war. If we fail to make it, the odds are against preventing another world war.

Mr. President, in our armed services today there are some 11,000,000 men, the very flower of the young manhood of America. A few days ago Senators witnessed a moving picture of modern war which was exhibited at the Library of Congress Auditorium. They saw the crushed and mangled bodies of extremely young men. We have heard speeches made in the Senate with respect to lend-lease and the dollars we are pouring out. The greatest cost of war to a democracy lies in the lives of the best of its young men. Our death casualties in the war may not be so great proportionately as in other wars, for the methods used by our armies are saving many lives, but we recognize that many young men will come back crippled physically and some mentally.

A democratic republic such as ours cannot continue to exist unless there comes from the people continually a supply of leadership with intelligence, vision, and ability to cope with the complicated problems of the day. We must solve the problem of preventing another war, because all Senators know that our democratic institutions, the freedoms we are fighting today to preserve, will not survive the involvement of the United States in another great world war. We are asking our young men, some of them still in their teens, to face the horrible mechanical weapons of destructions used in modern war. There is no question about the courage with which they are facing that great test. But they and their parents, and the children which some of them have left at home, have a right to expect from us a clear answer to the question of what we propose to do.

How do we propose that the great influence and force of the United States shall be used in the future to prevent this horrible destruction from happening again? Is the best answer we can give to them that the United States shall "join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power"? What are we fighting against if it is not international authority with power? I dare say that if the nations opposed to us are successful in winning the war they will add to any rule they lay down the last phrase of the resolution "to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace," because after conquering the whole world they would wish to prevent aggression.

Mr. President, is the establishment of an international authority with power the best answer we can give to the boys who are offering their lives to defend freedom in the world? Is that the hope for future peace of the world which we from this great democracy, the cradle of freedom, liberty and justice, shall hold out to them?

Mr. President, I refer my colleagues on the other side of the Chamber to a great statement made in the midst of World War No. 1, not by the Senate, but by the President of the United States. He did not use vague general terms. He was not afraid to say openly that this country stood for a democratic organization, for organized justice in the world, and, after we had won the war, was ready to use its force to maintain peace, to stop the breaking of the peace by outlaw nations of the future. Let me read his statement to the Senate. It was made on July 4, 1918, and is as follows:

> These are the ends for which the associated peoples of the world are fighting, and which must be conceded them before there can be peace:
>
> First. The destruction of every arbitrary power anywhere that can separately, secretly, and of its single choice disturb the peace of the world. Or if it cannot be presently destroyed, at the least its reduction to virtual impotence.
>
> Second. The settlement of every question, whether of territory or sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.
>
> Third. The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct toward each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern the individual citizens of all modern states in their relations with one another, to the end that all promises and covenants may be sacredly observed, no private plots or conspiracies hatched, no selfish injuries wrought with impunity, and a mutual trust established upon the handsome foundation of a mutual respect for right.
>
> Fourth. The establishment of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of free nations will check every invasion of right and serve to make peace and justice the more secure by affording a definite tribunal of opinion to which all must submit, and by which every international adjustment that cannot be amicably agreed upon by the peoples directly concerned shall be sanctioned. These great objects can be put into a single sentence. What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.

Mr. President, I think that utterance made by President Wilson in the midst of the last war, was a magnificent statement of the principles which should govern the foreign policy of this democratic republic. Has our democracy so weakened, is our faith in democracy become so diluted that we do not dare speak up so clearly, so forthrightly today? Have not we the political courage—we know we cannot bind any future Senate—to say clearly what we think are the principles which America should espouse in the world order to see to it that such a catastrophe as the present war shall not happen again, that never again shall millions upon millions of young men be slaughtered in such a conflict as the present barbaric, uncivilized, modern war?

On July 25, 1910, under Republican President William Howard Taft, both Houses of Congress, controlled by the Republican Party, unanimously passed the following joint resolution:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

Mr. President, why have we become so much more cautious today in stating the principles for which we stand? Incidentally let me say that, according to Robert C. Albright's story in the Washington Post, the resolution I just read grew out of a speech by Theodore Roosevelt. More than 4 years before World War No. 1, he made a speech in which he said:

> It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves but to prevent, by force, if necessary, its being broken by others.
>
> The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power—of any police to enforce the decrees of the court.
>
> In any community of any size the authority of the courts rests upon actual or potential force; on the evidence of a police, or on the knowledge that the able-bodied men of the country are both ready and willing to see that the decrees of judicial and legislative bodies are put into effect.
>
> Each nation must keep well prepared to defend itself until the establishment of some form of police power, competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations. As

things stand now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be secured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions.

Mr. President, I should like to read, before I sit down, a letter from a boy from Floodwood, Minn., a fighter pilot in Sicily. The letter was published in the Rural Forum, a weekly newspaper.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. BALL. No; I yield merely for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I shall not make any point of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hatch	Reed
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Danaher	Millikin	Wagner
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson
Gillette	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, let me say to the majority leader that in 15 minutes or so I shall conclude the statement which I wish to make at this time. I may have something further to say later on other aspects of this subject.

Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate a very moving letter from a fighter pilot in Sicily, written back to his home town in Floodwood, Minn., and published in the weekly newspaper there.

For 2 years, at home and abroad, I have listened to the uniformed men of America discussing their Nation. I believe we finally know what we are fighting for, but I don't believe you do.

I intend to tell you what we think about every phase of the home front. You'll find me plain-spoken and direct; I expect to find you honest, clear-headed, and fair.

Most important of my subjects is that each of you, Nordic, Celt, or Slav; white, black, or yellow; wife, father, husband, child, or youth; each and every one of you as citizens of America control the destiny of the world now and while I and my comrades remain overseas. These are not brave and empty words. They are the truth which you must each recognize and act upon today, while there is yet time.

1918—YEAR OF PEACE

In 1918, the American people lost the First World War. There can be no shelving of blame to Woodrow Wilson, to Congress, or to the men at that shameful "peace" table. The men of the military returned to their homes and became ex-soldiers instead of citizens. All over the Nation was heard a sigh of relief, and men expressed only the desire to enjoy life and forget the world. In short, instead of following our war effort through to its logical conclusion at Geneva, we placed our individual desires first, cursed our children with blood and like simon-pure isolationists turned away from the difficult, the uncharted future.

In moments for action, private and public, man has ever been swamped by a multitude of plausible reasons for doing nothing at all. Most of our current public voices tend to exactly that today, and after the armistice will scream to the heavens for total inactivity of the public brain.

He does not think much of some of us.

We must get our damn fool heads out of our homes, our cities, our States, and our country and face the task of establishing a workable plan for world government. And if you don't realize that this is what we're fighting for you'd better get your head out in one hell of a Yankee hurry!

The worst "ism."

Do you know what clear-headed historians and political analysts of the last 30 years acknowledge to be the enemy that is upsetting our lives each 25 years and cursing our children with war and bloodshed? Do you know that it is as plain as day that the real and final enemy of the peace of our homes is not the Prussians, the Italians, or the Japanese?

Do you know that there can be no honest doubt that your and my enemy is merely an imaginary line with signs posted on it which say on this side the laws of Germany prevail, on the other those of France; here a bank runs on the British pound, there it is the franc; on the other side a loaf of bread is 10 cents, here it is 3. * * * Boundaries, borders, tariff walls, protective legislation, economic systems, protective diplomacy, propaganda, large armies, navies, the parry and thrust of people against people, all these are the practical evidences of our real enemy, the enemy which created Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito.

That enemy is nationalism.

The breath of the word "fatherland," main tool and war cry of rabble rousers and political climbers, nationalism is the type of human stupidity which makes a man say, "My country, right or wrong."

There is our dangerous and noble-seeming enemy.

The only way to stop it from sending our children to World War No. 3 is by limiting its power. The only way to do that practically is by establishing an interdependent world union. We want that.

This morning we were over enemy territory dive-bombing some German gun positions. I saw one of my buddies get hit by flak, dive into the hills and die in a hell of flame. I have flown with that boy for a year. His wife and I are great friends. Before we went overseas I saw his 3-months-old child. More than anyone else, I know the deep and horrible heartbreak his death is going to cause in that family.

I feel that we who are left are responsible for the future of his bereaved wife, his child, and all the other American families smashed to bits by the war.

In short, I want to know, by God, what kind of a deal you Americans at home are going to pass to that kid. Are you going to ride a "safe" and compromising bandwagon or in the words of George Washington, are you going to "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair."

Each of us overseas is daily risking his life so that you at home may vote for a wise peace, a world-government peace.

The marks on your ballot are literally made with our blood. See to it that that blood is not betrayed as it was in 1918. * * *

That's why I want you to grab your pen and ballot and straighten out the boys we hired to work in Washington and the state capital. They don't yet realize the kind of common sense American thinking we need in the world today.

I have often wondered what a changed concept of the world these boys who are fighting 25,000 feet or more in the air are going to bring back with them, and whether these imaginary lines are going to be quite so important to them. At this time I would not go so far as would the boy whose letter I have read. He is ready for world government now. I doubt if we are ready; but it seems to me that if we are to keep faith with the boys who are fighting and dying all over the world we must make the decision to set up in the international field a limited level of government which can create a minimum of international law that will have available to it on call the necessary force to make the law work in any kind of society. I think we owe our boys a clearer answer as to what we think the position of the United States should be and how we should use our influence to keep this terrible thing from happening again than is contained in the pending resolution. We are not trying to dictate to the rest of the world. We are merely saying where we stand. I think we can state it more clearly than it is stated in the pending resolution.

I wish to quote a statement which General Washington made to the Constitutional Convention. One morning when they were discussing the Constitution several said, "We do not dare to do this; we will have to compromise that; let us go halfway on it." Washington is recorded as having said:

It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.

I believe that the Senate of the world's greatest democracy has an obligation to try to lead the long-suffering peoples of the world more clearly and more forthrightly than we would be able to do by the adoption of the pending resolution in its present form.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read for the information of the Senate the amendment about which I gave notice this morning, to be offered by myself and other Senators. I also ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. PEPPER, for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. FERGUSON, proposes to strike out the

third paragraph of the resolution and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the body of the RECORD at this point a brief statement which was issued this morning by the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the nature of the request.

Mr. PEPPER. I asked unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point, without my reading it, a statement consisting of less than a page, which the proponents of the amendment issued at the time the amendment was presented.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement issued by Senator PEPPER, upon submission earlier in the proceedings of an amendment by himself and other Senators to Senate Resolution 192:

The issue in this debate is not what can be passed in the Senate, but what the Senate should declare as the part of this Nation in world affairs after the war.

Nothing is to be gained by the adoption of a resolution which offers the appearance of agreement in the Senate, when no real agreement has been formulated.

The important thing is not what the Senate now does, but whether the Senate is willing to tell the world that we will not again forsake our allies and destroy the hope of mankind in taking our full and fair share in the building of a peaceful and better world.

The people have a right to the truth about our sentiments and we have a duty to hold nothing back which, in the remote future, might again forfeit the victory which we shall win at the cost of so much blood and treasure.

The Senate, if it is to be the final arbiter of American foreign policy, must be willing to lay down now at least the broad principles by which this Nation shall be governed in post-war affairs. The President and our allies cannot shape their policy, cannot determine what they will do, without their knowing what the Senate of the United States will do. It is the Nation's duty, nay an opportunity paid for with the blood of the flower of our youth, to lead the world to peace and a measure of prosperity. And it is the Senate's duty to lead the Nation toward a clear-cut declaration of that high character.

Neither the Nation nor the Senate can discharge those obligations by halting and equivocating and the use of words of double or doubtful meaning unworthy of the challenge which confronts us.

Whether we realize it or not, this is historic ground upon which we are treading, and nations will note as much what we do not say and our timidity in saying it, as what we say. Never did the world more earnestly pray for that bold, righteous leadership from us than now.

The amendment we propose, therefore, makes us say what we say with clearness and positiveness and draws at least the general outline of what we are willing, indeed, what we must do, if we do not again dishonor our debt to our dead.

Mr. PEPPER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Eyes on the Senate," appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EYES ON THE SENATE

The Senate has an opportunity this week to make its voice heard around the world. What is more, it can make its voice ring down through the corridors of history, for the Senate is undertaking to tell mankind what will be the attitude of the United States toward the maintenance of peace when this greatest of all wars has been victoriously concluded. Senators who rise from their seats to discuss this issue may well be staggered by the responsibility that is theirs. Their words and votes will in large measure shape the fate of the Nation involving, as it does, the lives, welfare, and happiness of millions of citizens.

So it is of the utmost importance that the issue before the Senate be clearly understood and that the debate be directed to only those questions that are meaningful at this time. In our opinion the issue before the Senate is not isolationism. That issue was decided with repeal of the Neutrality Act and passage of the Lend-Lease Act. It expired as an active issue with the declaration of war and the creation of the United Nations to put down aggression throughout the world. Public sentiment now clearly demands that this Nation take its part in the world community after the war as a powerful factor for law, order, and peace. The Senate debate comes much too late to decide the issue of isolationism.

What is before the Senate is the question of this country's leadership in the establishment of a new world agency to implement the will of the United Nations after the war is over. Having already undertaken a world role of the greatest importance, we must now sincerely and forthrightly face the queries of our allies as to what we are willing to do to make our cooperation effective in the future. If the Senate evades that issue and gives the world only a weak gesture of good will, its resolution will amount to little more than a declaration of intention not to commit suicide.

Herein lies the grave weakness of the Connally resolution. It scarcely goes beyond the repudiation of isolationism. Or if it is intended to go further than that, its advocacy of an agreement between "free and sovereign nations" to establish and maintain "international authority, with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world" is so vague as to be negative in effect. Instead of putting the United States in a position of leadership in mobilizing international power behind law and order, it would timidly offer to dip a toe into the international pool, providing the water should get neither too hot nor too cold.

Fortunately, the Senate will have before it a reasonable alternative to the innocuous Connally resolution. The compromise amendment to be introduced by Senator PEPPER specifically proposes that we use our influence to make the United Nations the nucleus of "an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The advantages of this more specific and forthright language can scarcely be overemphasized. It proposes to build upon a foundation already in existence—the United Nations. It looks toward the creation of an "international organization" instead of an amorphous "authority" which might turn out to be only a new balance of power. It contemplates machinery for the settlement of international disputes and not merely the utilization of force by a concert of powers after war has become inevitable. Certainly that provision is vital; peace without routine means of adjusting differences and eliminating injustices could not possibly endure.

Use of military force by any international agency to keep the peace is a basic essential. That does not, however, imply an international army big enough to subdue the armed forces of any nation. The international organization would be dependent upon its constituent powers for the men, ships, planes, and tanks that might be necessary to put down aggression. We must rely upon the will of the nations to work together for peace. But unless that collective will can be centralized in a definite working organization capable of assigning to each nation its obligation in meeting an aggressive threat, the hope of avoiding another great war a generation hence will be very meager.

Senate leadership will emerge as a vital factor in the future course of the world only if it is willing to meet this issue. It cannot, of course, make a blueprint for the post-war world at this time. But it can go a long way toward putting the United States in a position for effective leadership in the making of such a blueprint. If the Senate fails in this, it will have fumbled one of the greatest opportunities any legislative body has had in modern times to use its influence for law, order, and peace in the world.

THE POLL TAX—LETTER FROM IRVING BRANT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I did not intend to propose it, but I think that I shall ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received dated October 24, 1943, from Mr. Irving Brant, who was formerly editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and now editorial writer for the Chicago Sun. He is author of the book entitled "Father of the Constitution," published in 1936, and other books on the subject of James Madison, as well as a book to be published on November 15, 1943, entitled "The Road to Peace and Freedom." Mr. Brant is leaving his newspaper work at the end of this month in order to complete his Life of Madison. He will live in Tennessee.

The letter of Mr. Brant pertains to what in his opinion the father of the Constitution would say on the subject of the power of Congress to abolish the poll-tax restriction in Federal elections.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire, What is the letter about?

Mr. PEPPER. The letter pertains to the opinion Mr. Brant entertains of what Mr. Madison's stand would be on the legality of Federal legislation affecting the poll tax.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does it have to do with this debate?

Mr. PEPPER. Nothing. I said that I wished to put it in the Appendix of the RECORD only.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is Mr. Brant's conception of what Madison would say?

Mr. PEPPER. It is what Mr. Madison would say if he could express his opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY. For the present, I object.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, if the Senator wants to make that the rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said that for the present I should object. If the Senator wants to renew his request later, I may change my opinion, but I do not have time to read the letter now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo H. Thebaud to be rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bertram J. Rodgers to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley D. Jupp to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTER—ST. MARYS, PA.

Mr. BARKLEY. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has asked, and in his behalf I present the request, that the nomination of Dennis H. Phelan to be postmaster at St. Marys, Pa., reported today by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, be submitted to the Senate for present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Pennsylvania spoke to me about the action of the committee, which was favorable and unanimous, and I have no objection to the present consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 25, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James W. Johnson, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York, in place of Joseph T. Higgins, resigned.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Office of Price Administration, vice Prentiss M. Brown.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John J. Haggerty, of Maryland, to be comptroller, Post Office Department, vice William L. A. Slattery.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Carl H. Jones, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of October 1942.

Capt. Samuel P. Ginder, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of December 1942.

Capt. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1943.

Capt. Cortlandt C. Baughman, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commandant, naval operating base, Londonderry, Ireland, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. Benjamin V. McCandlish, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Moroccan sea frontier, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. Campbell D. Edgar, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, transports, Amphibious Force, northwest African waters, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. George H. Mills, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Commander Fleet Airships, Atlantic, to rank from the 17th day of September 1943.

Capt. Byron McCandless, United States Navy, retired, to be a commodore in the Navy on the retired list for temporary service, while serving as commandant, Naval Repair Base, San Diego, Calif., to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

Capt. William M. Quigley, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander advanced bases, Solomon Islands, to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

Capt. Wallace B. Phillips, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander of the Rear Echelon, Fifth Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet, to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

Capt. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as a submarine task force commander, to rank from the 4th day of October 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Graves B. Erskine to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service, from the 19th day of September 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 25, 1943:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Leo H. Thebaud

To be commodores

Bertram J. Rodgers
Stanley D. Jupp

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

Harold B. Penne	Guy B. Mayo
Arthur K Bourret	Harry Feehan
Harold E. Allen	Richard Q. Lewis
Harry D. Pratt	Cleveland C. Barry
Arthur F. Wilson, Jr.	William E. Collier
Warren B Capron	Richard B. Smith
Luther A. Bookout	George E. Lawrence
Theodore D. Vreeland	Ralph E. Knight, Jr.
Raymond S. McFall	William A. Barry
Edward D. Miller, Jr.	Arthur E. Isensee
Edward H. Stauffer	John R. Gibney
Robert K. West	Charles H. Booth
Jack P. Stone	

POSTMASTER

PENNSYLVANIA

Dennis A. Phelan, St. Marys.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." Stay Thou our faith on the word of Thy Prophet, we beseech Thee, Almighty God. Whenever a flood of great sorrows is the work of evil, with all its perilous and uncontrolled waters which arise in a nation's experience, O Master, break through all mental delusions, strive with divided purposes and defeat mistaken ambitions. Bless Thou richly, dear Lord, our most honorable Speaker and the Congress; grant that all labors shall bear the mark

of unity and a wise consideration of our fellow countrymen.

God be merciful unto us and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth; Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase and God, even our own God, shall bless us; God shall bless us and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 21, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1225. An act granting a pension to Constance Eager;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; and

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit tomorrow morning until 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 330) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 763, amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

OCTOBER 21, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Roads.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE E. OUTLAND.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF OYSTERS FROM THE WATERS OF YORK RIVER AND QUEEN CREEK, VA.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2886) to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "season", insert ": *Provided*, That there shall be no appropriation hereunder for liquidation of damages to owners or others."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what this amendment does?

Mr. BLAND. I think it prevents any individual claim for oysters or things of that kind. The theory of the bill as originally presented was to acquire the oysters that were damaged, but I think this amendment was placed in the bill because of the fear that it might recognize an individual claim for oysters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This amendment will ban any individual claims against the Government?

Mr. BLAND. I was afraid it might interfere with the proposed plan. I submitted the matter to the Navy Department and they assured me that the amendment is in conformity with their plan. I would not say it would prohibit a man from at any time making a claim against the Government. It would be under this bill. Every individual has a right to make a claim if he wants to. I guess if he was my constituent I would probably put in a bill if I thought he made a good case. But this is a very serious situation which it is hoped will be worked out in this way, that the Navy has an arrangement whereby it will itself or through some organization it forms purchase the oysters that are now salable and are going to die, thus not approaching it as a proposal to save an individual or pay him damages but to save a supply of oysters badly needed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We have already passed the bill. What I am trying to get at is exactly what this amendment does.

Mr. BLAND. It is restrictive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a restrictive amendment?

Mr. BLAND. Entirely so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I recall when this bill was here before, but I do not understand what the gentleman is trying to do unless it is that he is trying to purchase these oysters at Government expense. If that is the purpose, why not go up in our country, and why are not our farmers saved from this loss they are sustaining day after day when the Government interferes with their production?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman asked me that question before, and I told him I would gladly go along with him if he could find some way. This is worked out by the Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our crops are ruined because they take all the men away. The farmers cannot harvest the crops. For example, the apples fall on the ground

and cannot be used, the grapes cannot be harvested, and all those things, but nobody pays our farmers. Is this because these are oysters and because they are south of the Potomac?

Mr. BLAND. No; not that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not that?

Mr. BLAND. They are south of the York River. I presume some of the men are there. The lands are lands from which under the laws of the State of Virginia oysters may not be removed, because they come in a contaminated area. They come in this contaminated area because the Navy established a Seabee camp there, and the waters of this area are polluted because of their proximity to this camp of 85,000 men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this in the area where the Government is purchasing this overflowed land up in New Jersey at a cost of some $2,000,000 to establish this camp, from the Hague interests?

Mr. BLAND. No. The testimony before our committee was that there was no other situation of this kind in the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suppose you will get it all anyway, so I do not see any use to object.

Mr. BLAND. No, I will not get it all, but I would like to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post of October 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include the text of a radio interview on the subject of aviation legislation by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Miami (Fla.) Chamber of Commerce, on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Green Bay Press-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Lorain Journal of October 22, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the same paper of different date, October 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a part of a broadcast by Mr. Philip Keyne Gordon on October 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and read a brief editorial appearing in one of my local newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. The editorial is as follows:

The farmers all got checks Saturday from the Government. There was no explanation of what the checks were for. The best explanation the bank here could give them was: "It must be corn money."

One of Mr. Morgenthau's secretaries must have forgotten to enclose the picture of F. D. R. and the reminder about the election in November 1944. Bill Bunting says he shook his envelope vigorously and no campaign literature (other than the check) fell out.

The farmers are trying to figure whether the payment was for corn they raised or for corn they didn't raise.

BEEF AND BEEF CATTLE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article entitled "City Woman Feeds Her Family," by Miss Rachael Reed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on silver, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the National Lawyers Guild protesting the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee in voting a subsidy ban.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SURPLUS MILITARY SUPPLIES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] be permitted to extend his remarks to include a copy of a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests to extend my remarks in the RECORD; in one to include an editorial; in another to include a newspaper article; and in the other to include a resolution adopted by A. F. of L. unions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a letter received from Mr. Boling, of the Feed Industry Council, and findings and recommendations of the council with respect to grain feed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Director of Economic Stabilization is reported to have on his desk at this moment an order which would in effect establish a price ceiling on live cattle. Such a price ceiling is absolutely unworkable and could not accomplish any beneficial results. It could only add to the multiplying difficulties of the producer. We are told that the purpose of ceilings is to protect the consumer. The consumer is protected by wholesale and retail ceilings. Those are the only ceilings that are effective, as far as the consumer is concerned. It, therefore, seems to me rather a strained procedure to establish an additional ceiling on the live animals and claim that it is for the benefit of the consumer. The consumer is interested in the ceiling on beef and not upon live cattle. But, if ceilings are established on the price of live cattle there will be one more deterrent factor to be overcome by any would-be cattle producer. I do not know how much more Government interference the producer is going to accept and remain a producer. He is confronted with enough difficulties already. He has suffered a 20 to 25 percent loss in the value of his cattle since the roll-back subsidy went into effect. This of itself is calculated to put thousands of cattle growers out of business, but at least the consumer was promised a lower price as a result. In this case, however, there is not even any promise of relief for the consumer—simply a new burden

on the producer which is certain in the long run to result in less beef. In behalf of the consumers of beef as well as of the producers of cattle, I urge Judge Vinson to prevent this useless gesture of bureaucracy at its worst.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include an article in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the regular business of the day and following the special orders already granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOPE was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

PRICE CEILINGS ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, following what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just said, I wish to call attention to the fact that the O. P. A. is getting ready to deal another blow to the beef-cattle producers of this country. A few weeks ago it put into effect a price roll-back and subsidy program which resulted in the packers getting the subsidy and the producer getting the roll-back. This program was put into effect against the advice and over the opposition of every element of the livestock industry. The ultimate effect of this roll-back program is going to be less meat at the time of the greatest demand in our history from our armed forces, our allies, and our domestic consumers.

Not satisfied with the damage already done, the O. P. A. is now planning to submit to the Stabilization Director a plan to put ceilings on live cattle. I am advised that there is not a single person connected with the livestock industry in any of its phases in this country who thinks that the plan will work. I think I am justified in saying that the Food Administrator does not believe it will work. It is being put into effect without any consultation with livestock producers and its ultimate effect will be a further decrease in the amount of meat available for war and civilian purposes.

RUBBER TO SWEDEN

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have not heard very much about crude rubber for a long time. All kinds of interesting things have been pushed in front of it. However, in the November Farm Journal appears the following:

RUBBER TO SWEDEN

The Toledo Times carried an article the first week in October, under the heading "Big rubber cargo arrives in Sweden." The article related that the motorship *Mindora* had arrived in neutral Sweden with 172 tons of crude rubber from the United States; that it was the first time since March 1942 that Sweden had received rubber from any source.

Is it true that we are exporting rubber at a time when we are being asked to conserve? And is there any chance that this rubber might be reshipped from neutral Sweden to Germany?

I think it would be a very good idea if we found out whether we are shipping crude rubber to Sweden.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution by the National Association of Assessing Officers and an address by the county auditor of Hamilton County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests: First, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. George M. Harrison, president of the railway clerks' organization, and the other is to extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address given by our colleague the gentleman from Indiana, GERALD W. LANDIS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be transferred to Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. ARTHUR GRUENNERT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DAVE E. SATTERFIELD 3D

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the House reads stories every day of the courage and determination of our American soldiers and sailors, but it is very seldom that those accounts of courage come close to home, and I want to briefly recite something that happened in the south Pacific in connection with the recent naval attack on Wake Island, during which a certain aviation officer of the Navy took off from a carrier, came in low, and strafed Wake Island, at which time he was hit by a Japanese bullet in the leg, that went through his knee and up into the groin and inflicted a very serious wound.

Further, Japanese bullets knocked out the hydrostatic system of his plane and punctured the gasoline tank. Finding himself under those difficulties, this man tied up his own wounds so he would not bleed to death, flying the disabled plane, and flew it for 45 minutes back to the deck of the carrier, where he landed it without a crash.

That boy was the son of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Church Federation of Los Angeles; also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include

therein a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of New Britain, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

COLORADO, ITS MOUNTAIN BEAUTY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, a thorough research has been made by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as well as by other Democratic members of the committee on the function and purpose of this committee.

It was found that this committee has definite functions to perform, namely, the subject included in the name of this committee. Because of the insistence of certain of the senior members on this committee, of the majority party, it has been allowed to become atrophied. Today we are attempting to inject new life into the activities of this committee and again we find that the same persons are working to block such movements. If they are successful, I see no occasion to continue this committee, and I think it would be appropriate that the balance of the members resign, because if we are accountable for a responsibility, we should accept that responsibility and not continue as a committee in name only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a number of newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROBLEMS OF THE CATTLE PRODUCERS

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great Corn Belt section and cattle-feeding country and have in my district many producers of cattle feeds and the finished product. As the cattle come from the ranges we finish them on corn.

Large production of grain was lost this past year because of bad handling of rationing by people who were not familiar with the industry. Had the machinery manufacturers been allowed to handle the program, men who know more about it than anyone else, we would have had much more production of grain in the Grain Belt.

O. P. A. now proposes to fix price ceilings on different grades of cattle. This I am sure is going to be disastrous to the production of meat in this country. There are no more patriotic people than the farmers, the food producers, and the cattle producers of the great West, Southwest, and Northwest. They know more about this subject than anyone else and should be consulted. The question should at least come before the House Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRICE CEILINGS ON CATTLE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the matter presented by many Members with reference to the approaching fixation of a live price ceiling on cattle is of great concern to me; it is of great concern to the country. It presents fairly the question of whether or not we are going to be called upon to exist upon red tape or red meat as the central basis of diet for the American people.

I think it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Agriculture call the O. P. A. heads before it and insist that they show cause and reason for this beyond the mere desire to harass and create greater confusion. There can be no reason for it. I know from more than 40 years' experience in the beef-cattle business that it will not work except to destroy an essential food commodity not only for the people of this Nation but our soldiers and our allies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that within the last 30 minutes five Members, notwithstanding that the price of cattle has reached the highest level it has ever reached in this country, namely, 16 cents per pound on the hoof, complain bitterly because it is contemplated that the Office of Price Administration will place the long-delayed ceiling on the price of cattle.

Mr. Speaker, in this country today we have 15,000,000 more head of cattle than ever before in history.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot, I only have a minute.

Notwithstanding this increased number of head, charges are made that we shall be short of meat. It is charged that the farmers who are feeders are holding their cattle off the market and doing so in order to obtain a still higher price. One of the Members stated that the placing of a price ceiling on cattle will not help the consumer. That statement appears ridiculous to me. I presume it would help the consumer if the price of meat were lowered after the price of cattle had been permitted to go higher and higher.

As to the farmers: I sympathize, of course, with them. The gentleman from Ohio complained that they received many checks from the Government and many did not know what the checks were for. Is it possible that the farmers complain because a letter did not accompany the checks urging that they be cashed, or can it be that they want the Government to send them cold cash instead of checks? I concede the statements as to the patriotism of the farmers, but it appears to me that their spokesmen are placing them in an extremely selfish position by continuously urging and demanding that they receive higher and higher prices for all of their products. This morning we hear complaints about a ceiling on cattle and for days we have heard complaints about the ceiling on hogs. Potato growers in featured advertisements oppose the ceiling on potatoes and we read of the demand of the dairymen for higher ceilings on their products.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether these farmer spokesmen have ever given the slightest thought to the consumer and, as our former colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, would say, in questioning appropriations, "Where will we get the money?" applies to the already overburdened consumer in meeting the increased cost of living and paying additional and higher taxes. Where will he get the money if prices go higher and additional taxes are imposed?

While we have raised a 10-percent greater crop this year than in 1942 and the indications are we will still further increase production in 1944, the professional farm leaders persist that we must not put any ceilings on farm products because it would eliminate the incentive to grow larger crops in 1944. Even with the prevailing prices there should be no fear of any shortage next year—leave it to the farmers—they will raise as large a crop as is possible in view of these high prices. Instead of higher prices the gentlemen would be doing the farmers a real service if they would urge them not to pay the doubled and trebled prices for additional acreage to the banks and insurance companies which the latter obtained for little or nothing through foreclosures in 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that from time to time I call attention to the consumer, especially the 22,000,000 whose earnings and incomes are below $1,000 a year, who have no lobbyists here because they are

unorganized. Theirs is truly an unfortunate condition in contrast to the farm blocs and other groups.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

CATTLE PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the cattle rancher from Chicago, I want to say there is nothing surer than a desperate meat shortage in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to a Member as the "gentleman from Chicago." The Chair has ruled heretofore that that is not a proper designation for a Member.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair so rules again.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at a livestock auction in southeastern Pennsylvania the other day, where normally the sale is over at 4 o'clock, it took until 4 o'clock to dispose of the pigs. Pigs that 6 months ago brought from $6 to $8 each so'd at from 60 cents to $2 each because of the corn situation. You have to become a criminal to buy corn on the market today. There is none in that country and, I repeat, nothing is surer than a desperate meat shortage.

This morning's papers came out again advertising the sale of another long and well-established Holstein herd in my district, consisting of 75 head of Holstein cows now in the hands of a rich man who finds it impossible to carry on. When the Morgenthau type and these other rich men cannot carry on in this industry, how in the name of God can the average farmer get along, and where is the meat coming from?

The best safeguard against inflation is a generous supply of consumer goods. By all means the administration should make it possible for the farmers to produce. Right now the hens would be laying more eggs and turkeys would gain weight much more rapidly if corn would be available. There is plenty of corn in the country, but the O. P. A. makes it impossible for it to flow into the channels of trade.

THE CATTLE SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, none of us need worry overmuch about the welfare of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who has just addressed us in opposition to the five Members who demanded a fair price for the farmer. I regret to refer to his appearance, I do it with reluctance, but may I say he gives every appearance of never having suffered, never having in any way suffered, because of a lack of meat, so he should not be unduly concerned because the farmers have now a chance of getting the cost of production. They will carry on just the same as they have in the past, ever feeding the people in the cities, of whom the gentleman is one.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, just told us of the incident of a Wisconsin couple who would not come to Washington to be received at the White House and there receive a medal awarded to a son who gave his life to the country because they wanted to save their money to buy War bonds and stamps. May I say that attitude is typical of all our people in the Middle West. Contrast it with the attitude of some folks here in Washington. This morning a member of the Committee on Printing advises us that in a certain Government bureau here the employees spent 8,000 man-hours looking at the film pictures of Mrs. Roosevelt on her last trip to the war front. Eight thousand hours! Eight thousand man-hours—all paid for by taxation—was that productive employment?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] in regard to the ceiling price on live cattle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an extract from an address made by Watson Thomson, on the subject of the Jews in Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the president of the Civil Service Commission on Federal employment in the State of South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Columbus Day speech made by a Legionnaire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DANGEROUS STATEMENTS OF WENDELL L. WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my sympathies to the Republican Members of this House.

A few nights ago Wendell L. Willkie, continuing his operations in the Republican "china shop," came to Washington and made some of the most offensive and dangerous statements to Allied unity that have ever been made by any man parading as a public figure.

The statements he made about our two chief allies were undoubtedly known to them within less than 2 hours.

It is fortunate that Cordell Hull is in Europe at this time for he can assure both Russia and Great Britain, and all the rest of our allies, that Wendell L. Willkie speaks only for himself when he makes such reckless statements as he made here the other night.

We care nothing about Mr. Willkie's slurring attacks on us southern Democrats or his offensive references to the white people of the South generally. The more he attacks us the stronger we get.

But when he comes here and makes statements, such as he made the other night, that were offensive to our principal allies and dangerous to Allied unity at this critical time, I say that I am glad we have a man like Cordell Hull in Europe to let the heads of those governments know that Mr. Willkie speaks for nobody but himself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TIRE RATIONING

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a letter from a soldier who has lost a leg in north Africa. He is back home and is trying to get to and from his job. All four tires on his 1936 model Ford are blown out. Under the present rules he cannot get any tires for his automobile. Our new O. P. A. Administrator, Mr. Chester Bowles, should give consideration to such cases, and take care of these servicemen immediately upon their return. When a serviceman who has served this country comes back here wanting a job, secures same, and drives several miles in order to perform same, he certainly is entitled to the tires needed for his transportation necessary to earning a livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to read his letter which is as follows:

OCTOBER 20, 1943.

Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: I am writing you to see if you could be of assistance to me in helping get some casings for my car. It is 1938 Ford, uses 600 x 16, and the casings are all blown out at this time. The local board here says there is no way they can give me tires as I have only an A book.

Mr. WICKERSHAM, I lost a leg in north Africa on November 12. I have an artificial leg but it is unhandy and hurts me considerable to do much walking. I am on a 60-day furlough, have 30 days yet. I am unassigned to any company at this time and am still a patient. I have been working at the farmers elevator in Hobart, and have to have some way to get to and from work. My father lives 6 miles northwest of Hobart, and I am staying at his place, and naturally I do want to do some going which I believe I am entitled to do.

As I have only been out of the hospital since September 22, Mr. WICKERSHAM, I realize that gasoline and tires are scarce, and don't think that the Government owes me anymore than anyone else, but do feel like I am entitled to necessary transportation, and cannot go at this time on casings I have. I have tried to do something in line of work of some kind ever since I got out of the hospital, and want to continue to try to do something. That is the reason I am calling on you to do what you can in this matter. Thanking you for whatever you can do to assist me in getting some tires, I am,

Yours truly,

CORP. FLOYD L. MCELREATH,
Borden General Hospital,
Chickasha, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WENDELL L. WILLKIE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say for the benefit of the Members of the House that the Republican Members, with the possible exception of half a dozen, concur most heartily in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I am surprised that JOHN would take Mr. Willkie seriously, this hybrid mongrel of Socialist, Democrat, Republican, new dealer, and world traveler, who in 49 days discovered the answers to all the questions in all the countries of the world. Mr. Willkie is a self-made man, and God how he loves his maker! No one listens to Mr. Willkie because all the hot air he spews forth is just some more campaign oratory. Only one other man can match him in colossal conceit and fast footwork.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

TAXES AND TAX SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2199) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I observe that these bills have all had the unanimous action of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but I would ask the chairman of the committee to explain these bills, four in number.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois says, the full District Committee has acted in unanimous accord in presenting these measures to the House. H. R. 2199 is a bill which would amend our present act relating to taxes and tax sales within the District of Columbia.

Under existing law, when taxes on real property in the District of Columbia are in arrears, the property is sold to the highest bidder and a tax-sale certificate issued to him. The purpose of the measure we present today is to provide means whereby this cloud upon the title may be removed by paying to the Collector of Taxes for the legal holder of the tax-sales certificate the amount for which the property was sold, exclusive of surplus, plus interest thereon for the first 2 years after the date of such certificate at the rate of 12 percent per annum and for 3 years thereafter at the rate of 6 percent per annum.

The bill also provides that, when the property is so redeemed, the Collector of Taxes shall notify the owner of record of such tax-sale certificate by registered mail at his last known address, and, if the owner of such tax-sale certificate fails to apply for that money within a period of 5 years, it accrues to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I observe that the Committee on the District of Columbia has been given every opportunity to bring up legislation as quickly as possible after it is reported out of the committee. The leadership on both sides of the aisle has cooperated to the fullest extent possible with the chairman and the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia in seeing that legislation reported out received prompt consideration. As a matter of fact, the leadership has enabled the legislation to be brought up where it was reported out unanimously without the committee's being compelled to wait until the regular District of Columbia day. Further, I think the business in order on District of Columbia day has been dispensed with as little delay during the last 2 or 3 years as during any similar period.

The leadership on both sides recognizes that while we are Members of Congress we are also members of the legislative body of the District of Columbia and that that is quite a serious trust. We want to see that the people of the District receive as prompt consideration in the passage of legislation as possible. We want the Congress and the legislative body of the District to convey to the people of the District of Columbia and the city of Washington that knowledge so that they may have confidence in the fact that Congress as a legislative body is legislating as quickly as possible.

The chairman of the committee and all of the members are aware of that fact. That condition will continue as long as I am leader, but I am very much concerned about the constant tendency and effort on the part of some individuals, and particularly one of your newspapers—and I speak frankly and impersonally—to bring about a misunderstanding between the people of the District and the Members of Congress. We should have confidence in one another and respect for one another. I think that instead of trying to bring misunderstandings that they should attempt to bring about a feeling of confidence and understanding. Certainly, the Congress during the past 3 years, and I am confining myself to that period only, has done everything in its power to convey to the people of the District of Columbia the fact that we recognize our trust, and are legislating just as quickly as is humanly possible, even not compelling the committee to wait until its regular District day, in order to get legislation through which relates to the District. I think it only fair to make these observations so that in the future, instead of trying to bring about a feeling of misunderstanding, that a feeling of confidence and understanding, which the action of the Members of Congress justifies, would be a better course to pursue.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the observations of the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts are well timed. I think, without any disparagement to the leadership either Democratic or Republican in the past years in this House, that the present leadership on both sides of the aisle has attempted in every possible way to cooperate with the House District Committee in the expeditious consideration of legislation. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the ranking minority member, joins me in that comment on the very pertinent remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the people of the District of Columbia and the Congress have not been able to get along as friendly as we all desire, I do not believe it can be charged to the District Committee of the House, because it seems to me they have at all times been endeavoring to smooth out any fancied difficulty. Of course there is one thing that we perhaps would miss, if all of our difficulties were wiped out. During my short stay here, I have been entertained as well as amused on several occasions by visiting at the homes of friends here in the District, and when neighbors came in, not being introduced as a Congressman, it has been my privilege to get the opinion of some of the neighbors of Congressmen and their lack of ability and their disregard of District interests. That is really very amusing and very instructive, and so I hope that no serious difficulties will continue, and that we will always be free to get the opinion the people have of us, having expressed that opinion when they did not know that we are around. It is so conducive to harmonious action.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, I am pleased to yield again.

Mr. McCORMACK. The observations of the gentleman from Michigan are correct. The District of Columbia Committee has done a wonderful job, and I am very glad that I agree with my friend from Michigan, whom I personally like. My observation was not made for the purpose of controversy, but in the hope that a better understanding would develop.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I concur in the remarks of the two gentlemen just preceding me, but I do call attention to the way this bill is drafted. The bill provides as follows:

That an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by inserting in section 3 thereof immediately preceding the word *"Provided"* where the same first appears in said section the following:

Would it not be preferable for the District Committee to bring in a bill drafted in accordance with the Ramseyer rule? It appears to me, that it is rather involved for a Member on the floor to digest quickly just what is desired in a measure such as this.

Does the gentleman object to offering an amendment to this bill embodying the suggestion which I have made, and which will require no additional work, but will clarify the matter?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, of course, not only I, but I am sure all Members of the House have a very genuine respect for the legislative ability of our distinguished colleague from Michigan, especially in view of the fact that for many years he has served as a member of the Rules Committee and he goes into the intricacies of bill drafting perhaps to a greater degree than some of the other Members of this body. I should like in this instance, to simply say to the gentleman that the measure in the first instance was proposed by the corporation counsel, acting in behalf of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia. It is my understanding, although I may be in error, that in the drafting of proposed legislation which is sent here and which clears through the office of the Speaker and has been sent to our committee, the legislative drafting service is called into consultation. I shall investigate that further to see if I have made a correct statement.

I feel that in connection with this bill, if the gentleman will be kind enough to allow its passage in the way it is presented, I can assure him on behalf of myself as an individual, and more particularly on behalf of the District Committee, that we will observe the suggestion which he has made, to a more marked degree in the future.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. This piece of legislation, as the gentleman knows, is highly technical in character, and is so construed, so as to protect the rights of the legal owner of the equity in the property. I notice on page 2, in line 6, there is a provision for the redemption of the certificate by paying to the collector of taxes for the legal holder of the certificate the amount for which it was sold at such sale, exclusive of surplus. Will the gentleman explain for the purpose of the record just what is meant by the words "exclusive of surplus," and what meaning is to be attached to that?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I might reply that an answer could be made in several ways. I will transfer the inquiry to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as he is a member of our subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee which had this legislation under careful study and consideration and reported it to the full committee. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois might desire to make answer.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that the record may be clear in the matter, as I understand it, in the District of Columbia, delinquent taxes are offered for sale to the highest bidder, are they not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is the present law.

Mr. KEEFE. Quite unlike the law in my State where they are purchased by the municipality, and they got rid of that idea of having a lot of people come in and bid for these tax certificates.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There has been a bad practice existing in the District, as the gentleman says.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, if such a sale is held and a desirable tax certificate is offered for sale, it might be that it will be bid above the actual amount of taxes due, in which case there would be a surplus. Is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. So that upon redemption, the owner of the property could actually redeem it by paying the exact amount of the taxes, without being compelled to pay the surplus created through the excessive bidding. Is that the way I understand the situation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I answered the gentleman frankly.

Mr. KEEFE. I will defer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to make that explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might confess that we have a very archaic tax-sale system in the District of Columbia. If there is any jurisdiction in the United States where there is no justification for a system whereby property is put on the block for open competitive bidding, this would be that one jurisdiction, because the District of Columbia in times of emergency, can obtain necessary funds from the Federal Treasury on a loan basis. But as the situation stands today, tax buyers from other sections of the country, notably New York, Philadelphia, and other cities, come down to Washington at the appropriate time and they purchase by bid the desirable properties and all the cats and dogs revert to the District of Columbia itself. Consequently, when they bid over and above the amount of the taxes, they are entitled, under existing law, to draw interest thereon, but certainly we do not want to penalize the owners of the property who can redeem property and make them pay an amount that carries a surplus over and above the actual amount of the tax. And it was that section that refers to the surplus as being over and above the amount of the tax that is in question.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. This proposed legislation further provides that the owner of the property may redeem the same by paying the amount of the tax, plus interest, to the collector of taxes "who shall, within a reasonable time thereafter, notify the owner of record of such tax sale certificate at his last known address," and so on.

Now in view of the fact that legislation of this character is very technically construed by the courts and every intendment is made in favor of the owner of the property, why has not the committee specifically provided that the collector's certificate specify the time or times given to the owners of the property or the owners of the tax certificate

that the owner of the property has the right to redeem the same by paying the collector the amount due plus the interest and state the amount that is available, and that he should surrender his certificate, because who is going to determine what is a reasonable time under the circumstances? Is it 5 days, 10 days, 20 days, 30 days, 60 days, or what?

May I ask if the gentleman from West Virginia would consider an amendment that would be specific in character, and requiring the collector to serve notice upon the owner of the tax certificate within 5 days; then there can be no question about it, and there should be no litigation arising as to that particular omission or failure on the part of the tax collector to serve notice within a time within which the holder of the tax certificate thought was, perhaps, unreasonable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin raises a pertinent suggestion and, as far as I am individually concerned, I think the proper procedure would be to have a certain limitation of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is an operating detail of the assessor's office, where that matter is taken care of, and insofar as possible they serve them expeditiously.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true, of course. However, if the gentleman from Wisconsin desires to offer an amendment, I personally would not object; in fact, I would endorse it. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to offer the amendment. May I inquire if the bill is subject to amendment at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not at this moment. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1898, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by inserting in section 3 thereof immediately preceding the word *"Provided"* where the same first appears in said section the following: *"Provided,* That no deed shall be issued unless application therefor be made within five years from the last day of sale, and if no such application be made then the owner of any property sold as aforesaid, or any other person having an interest therein at the time of redemption, may redeem the property by paying to the collector of taxes for the legal holder of the certificate the amount for which it was sold at such sale, exclusive of surplus, plus interest thereon for the first 2 years after the date of such certificate of sale at the rate hereinabove provided, and for 3 years thereafter at the rate of 6 percent per annum; that when the said property is redeemed as aforesaid, the collector of taxes shall, within a reasonable time thereafter notify the owner of record of such tax sale certificate at his last known address, by registered mail, of the redemption of such certificate; that within 5 years from the time that payment has been made to the collector of taxes to redeem such tax sale certificate, the owner thereof may apply for, and, upon the surrender of the certificate, shall receive from the District of Columbia the payment made as hereinbefore prescribed; that upon the failure of the owner of such tax sale certificate to apply within the period of 5 years, as hereinbefore prescribed, such money shall be forfeited to the District of Columbia, and be deposited by the collector of taxes in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the chairman of the committee that, while the amendment is in the process of preparation, we might proceed to the consideration of the next bill and then come back to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the bill will be laid aside for the moment.

There was no objection.

PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 1951 to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to make a brief statement explaining the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I should call attention to the fact that under the proposed bill we attempt to deal with three acts; we would amend section 3 of the present Parking Facilities Act so as to permit the District to establish off-street parking facilities on property that belongs to the District, but not acquired under the act, when such facilities will not impair the use of the property for the purpose for which the land was originally acquired.

The National Park and Planning Commission would approve any use of property for this purpose.

Section 2 would amend the Parking Act to authorize the Commissioners to delegate to the parking agency the operation of the parking facilities under the Municipal Center.

Section 3 would amend the present act so that moneys collected from the operation of the Municipal Center parking facilities would be used in a fund for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph lettered (b) of section 3 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The words 'such property' in this paragraph shall include, in addition to property acquired under this act, any other property, heretofore or hereafter acquired by the District, until needed for the purpose for which it was acquired, or if no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired, or upon which parking facilities may be established without impairing its use for the purpose for which it was acquired: *Provided,* That in each case the agency shall have made a determination that parking facilities thereon are necessary or expedient. Before establishing any parking facilities upon the property not acquired under authority of this act, the Commissioners shall request the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for its recommendations and it shall be the duty of said Commission to report thereon within 30 days of such request."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Commissioners are also authorized to delegate to the agency any or all of the powers vested in said Commissioners by sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Municipal Center,' approved June 6, 1940."

SEC. 3. Section 7 of said District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 is hereby amended by inserting, after the figures and abbreviation "(52 Stat. 192)," the words "and the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Municipal Center,' approved June 6, 1940."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin has his amendment ready, and I ask unanimous consent now to return to H. R. 2119, to amend the act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1893, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 2, line 11, after the word "within", strike out the words "a reasonable time" and insert "5 days."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARRYING OF CONCEALED WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2866) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who together with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE] went into this matter very thoroughly, make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it came to the attention of the committee through the instrumentality of the Attorney General that many times when people were apprehended on a charge of carrying concealed weapons where the weapons were actually disclosed, it became very difficult to obtain convictions.

This bill is an amendment to take care of this difficulty that has developed because of that situation in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. What effect will this bill have upon a person's carrying a shotgun or any kind of weapon that is not concealed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That matter was discussed in the committee. My inquiry concerning this language as it might apply to a person carrying a shotgun in a car in the District of Columbia indicated that it would have no application.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, my attention is directed to the fact that the Senate has passed a similar bill (S. 1151). In view of this fact I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932 (47 Stat. 651; D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 22, sec. 3204) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. No person shall within the District of Columbia carry either openly or concealed on or about his person, except in his dwelling house or place of business or on other land possessed by him, a pistol, without a license therefor issued as hereinafter provided, or any deadly or dangerous weapon capable of being so concealed."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed. A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 2866) were laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3313) to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes."

The specific purpose of this bill is to include any appliance moved over the highway on wheels or traction tread including streetcars, draft animals, and beasts of burden.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Any person operating a vehicle, who shall injure any person therewith, or who shall do substantial damage to property therewith and fail to stop and give assistance, together with his name, place of residence, including street and number, and the name and address of the owner of the vehicle so operated, to the person so injured, or to the owner of such property so damaged, or to the operator of such other vehicle, or to any bystander who shall request such information on behalf of the injured person, or, if such owner or operator is not present, then he shall report the information above required to a police station or to any police officer within the District immediately. In all cases of accidents resulting in injury to any person, the operator of the vehicle causing such injury shall also report the same to any police station or police officer within the District immediately.

"Any operator whose vehicle causes personal injury to an individual and who fails to conform to the above requirements shall, upon conviction of the first offense, be fined not more than $500, or shall be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and upon the conviction of his second or subsequent offense, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or shall be imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Any operator whose vehicle causes substantial damage to any other vehicle or property and fails to conform to the above requirements, shall, upon conviction of the first offense, be fined not more than $100, or be imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both; and for the second or any subsequent offense, be fined not more than $300, or be imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

"(b) No individual shall, while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor or narcotic drug, operate any vehicle in the District. Any individual violating any provision of this subdivision shall, upon conviction for the first offense, be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and upon conviction for the second or any subsequent offense be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Upon conviction of a violation of any provision of this paragraph involving the operator of a motor vehicle, the clerk of the court shall certify forthwith such conviction to the designated agent of the Commissioners, who shall thereupon revoke the operator's permit of such individual.

"(c) Any violation of any provision of law or regulation issued thereunder which is repealed or amended by this act, and any liability arising under such provisions or regulations may, if the violation occurred or the liability arose prior to such repeal or amendment, be prosecuted to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia went into this proposal which was sent to us by the District of Columbia Commissioners. It was believed that we should consider the matter of persons who, in the District of Columbia, flee from the scene of an accident or who drive cars under the influence of liquor, and just how far the application of the present law would affect those individuals, whether it would go to the operator of the car or to others.

We found that the operator of a street car could not, in the District of Columbia, be required to report an accident or identify himself to the individual involved even though there be substantial damage or personal injury. Neither can he be tried under the old act for operating a vehicle while under the influence of liquor. The bill brought to the House today from this committee would bring within the purview of the traffic regulations those who operate types of vehicles other than motorcars or streetcars.

It would apply to bicycles and to other mechanical means of transportation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, that completes the business for the District Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by the Honorable Fred Vinson, on the question of subsidies, and other excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES ONLY WAY TO KEEP DOWN COST OF LIVING AND PREVENT INFLATION, A VOTE AGAINST SUBSIDIES UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES IS A VOTE FOR UNBRIDLED INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House a few days ago reported a bill known as a bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation which brings up a fundamental question of policy for this Congress to consider and decide. That fundamental question of policy is whether or not we shall recognize and under certain conditions and situations pay subsidies of any kind or nature whatsoever.

We did not have a bill before us when the hearings were conducted before the Banking and Currency Committee, but at the conclusion of the hearings the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama, presented a bill which was reported favorably by the committee. Practically all of the members were in favor of extending the Commodity Credit Corporation. Some voted for reporting the bill with reservations. That is, they did not want to be bound to vote for section 3 of the bill as presented.

The main question to be considered is section 3 which purports to be in opposition to subsidies as they have been paid. The argument was freely made in the committee that we should not under any circumstances pay any part of anyone's grocery bill. That is a very well-worded phrase, a very appealing phrase and on first blush everyone will say that is exactly right, we should not pay anyone's grocery bill. Expanding upon that phrase, which was a very good one for the destructive purposes for which it was framed and coined, a campaign was conducted in that committee to outlaw all subsidies.

I am perfectly willing to vote directly on the question of subsidies. It is a question, in my opinion, whether or not we shall have subsidies at all or whether or not we shall have some subsidies. On careful analysis of this bill as reported you will discover that our friends on the Republican side who voted unanimously against what they call subsidies have not voted against all subsidies. They have voted against some subsidies and it is to that part of the bill I want to address my remarks today.

This bill is H. R. 3477, and if you will notice section 3 of that bill it is the one proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] which had for its purpose excluding all subsidies. It says in there that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not, neither shall any other governmental agency which is owned directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency, pay any subsidy or take any loss on any commodity. There shall not be any support prices, there shall not be any subsidies paid, there shall not be any losses taken by these agencies in any way, shape, form, or fashion. Up until there, of course, you would say, "Well, now, that is a direct declaration against subsidies." But may I invite your attention to the last proviso in that section 3. It says:

Provided further, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in any transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds.

The entire section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided,* That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further,* That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further,* That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.

Now, that is just marching up the hill and marching back down again. It says that we are against all subsidies and no losses to be paid, no support prices, but if it happens to be domestic vegetable oils, fats, and oil seed, it is perfectly all right for the Government, and the Congress is saying as a matter of policy, that subsidies should be paid in the case of vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state what would come under that phrase, "Vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds"?

Mr. PATMAN. They are something that I think should be subsidized, but they are entitled to no more consideration than anything else. It involves products produced in my district, such as cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans, and things like that if they are vegetable. The inconsistency, and what borders at least upon hypocrisy, is the fact that our so-called opponents of subsidies have said in there that they are against all subsidies, but if it is vegetable oils, fats, and oil seeds it is all right to subsidize, that they are in favor of that principle, but they are not if it is lard, if it is butter, if it is Cheddar cheese, or different things like that. They say as a matter of principle we are against that; we feel like it is paying somebody's grocery bill, and we are not going to be for it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does it not illustrate the inconsistency of the position when we would pay a subsidy on, for instance, oleomargarine, yet object to paying a subsidy for the production of butter?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I am glad the gentleman brings that up. Our friends say they are willing to subsidize oleomargarine, that is perfectly all right, and they ask you to recommend it and endorse it and say that you are for it. The sum of $60,000,000 was used last year for these different subsidies on vegetable fats and oils. As a matter of principle, if it is vegetable fats and oils, it is all right to subsidize, but if it is not vegetable, it is absolutely wrong because it would pay somebody's grocery bill.

Let us examine this question of subsidies, and I want to seriously insist that every Member of the House give this consideration without reference to politics, without reference to anything except whether or not it is in the interest of the country and the war effort. If you will do that I believe you will come to the conclusion it is not only justified but it is the only way that you can get adequate production and at the same time keep down the cost of living. It is the only way to do it. If you will remember the words of the Chief Executive, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he has told us time and again that if we have any other method to keep down the cost of living and to keep down inflation as an alternative, to suggest it, it is all right with him. But here is Congress—which I brand as an inflationary Congress—this is an inflationary Congress. We have demonstrated that as a Congress we are inflationary, that we are willing for prices to get out of control, that we are willing for the dollars to become worth dimes. We are not concerned about that. We are not as a Congress concerned about inflation, and we have demonstrated it.

We are doing that in the face of the fact that we are told that if we have another remedy to present it will be all right with him, but we have no alternative, we have no remedy, we propose nothing, we are just against something.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman and indirectly to the President that the Representative of the Seventh District of Wisconsin has been trying to do that for the last month, but he just cannot get it done.

Mr. PATMAN. What is the gentleman's alternative?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We have tried at least to get this feed in here without having all this bucket-shop operation.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies for feed?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. We do not need a subsidy if we can get it in here.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies for feed? The gentleman is either for it or against it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am making the point that the majority leader has taken it upon himself to try to get this feed in here at a cheaper price, and that the powers that be do not seem to want it in here.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has brought up a very interesting point. The dairyman's price has been frozen in order to hold down the cost of living. If you increase the salaries and wages 10 percent it will be $10,000,000,000 more, and that will add to the excess purchasing power already floating around. So the desire is to keep the cost of living down to this September 15, 1942, level. How are you going to do that and take care of the farmer and keep him in business and encourage him to produce unless you give him a subsidy? That is the only way on earth you can do it that I have found. If you will present any other way I will be for it, it makes no difference to me. But we cannot have that squeeze there on the dairyman. It either has to be taken care of by an increased price, which would cause a demand for increased wages and salaries, or you have to subsidize this extra cost of feed the gentleman has just mentioned. That is the only way I know of you can do it.

What is so sacred about the word "vegetable"? If you say a subsidy is so good and support prices so fair, that we can take losses on vegetable oils and fats,

why can you not conceive of other situations where it would be just as important? Are we not bordering on the ridiculous as well as the hypocritical when we put language like that in a bill which we say is intended to outlaw subsidies entirely?

Another reason is that the people who are for this provision are not against all subsidies. The people in New England have their transportation costs subsidized on fuel oil. That is as it should be. I would not change it if it were within my power to do it. I think it is all right, but it is a subsidy. So how can you say if you subsidize oils and fats that are not vegetable it is a subsidy and wrong, it is helping pay somebody's grocery bill, but on the other hand it is all right to help pay somebody's fuel bill, that is not wrong?

Then you take public housing, which we have all endorsed because we have to have public housing around these war plants, and we are subsidizing public housing, which is in effect helping pay the rent of the workers. We are letting them have these houses for a rental that is much less than it would cost normally. We are subsidizing it. So it is wrong to help pay anybody's grocery bill, if it is nonvegetable, it is wrong to help pay anything else, but it is all right to help pay your fuel bill, it is all right to help pay your rent bill; that is in the public interest and should be recognized and endorsed and sponsored and approved, and the Chief Executive has to carry it on.

It just does not make sense. Here we are as a Congress. There will be some doubt as to our intellectual honesty if we put such provisions as this in a bill stating that vegetables it is all right to subsidize and nonvegetables it is wrong, as a matter of principle, to subsidize; it is helping pay your grocery bill.

Take sugar. That is a case where a subsidy is absolutely justified. Nobody can contend otherwise. We produce only one-fifth of the sugar that is consumed in this country. Our sugar-beet and sugarcane growers cannot compete with imported sugar. Why should we increase the price of all sugar just to take care of one-fifth? There is only one way on earth to take care of that, and that is to give that one-fifth an extra price here in the United States. So, by putting 1 cent a pound on one-fifth of the sugar, we keep the price down at least 1 cent on the other four-fifths, all of it; is not that right? Does anyone say that is wrong? If you pass this bill, you stop that, because it is not vegetable, it is not vegetable oils or fats or oil seeds. You will stop the sugar subsidy.

Further, you take metals that are so vital for the defense of our country. Consider copper. When this war commenced we needed to increase the production of copper. The big copper companies were making plenty of money at 12 cents a pound; they were making more money than they knew what to do with. In order to increase the production of copper were we going to say, "Well, we have to induce these high-cost mines to get into production. It will cost 17 cents or 25 cents or 30 cents to bring them in, but we must have the copper and we are willing to pay for it; we have to have it." We did not do that, we did not increase the price of all copper to get that production. We froze the price at 12 cents on that production, but we told the high-cost miner, "You go out and, if it takes 5 cents more or 30 cents more, you get that copper and we will pay for it, but we will do it as a subsidy." We increased the copper production 10 percent.

Would it not have been silly, absolutely, for us to have paid from 5 to 30 cents more a pound on that 90 percent in order to get that extra 10 percent? Does anybody say that subsidy is wrong? No; that is all right. It is good principle; we endorse it; it is fine.

There are lots of things like that. I will show my colleagues where we can save lots of money, and it is necessary that we keep down the cost of this war. We have kept it down by subsidizing the high-cost producer in order to get production. Why increase everybody in price up to the top man? Is that the way to stop inflation or hold down the cost of production? No. That is the way to guarantee it. That is what you do if you pass this bill as you have it here.

A STEP TOWARD UNBRIDLED INFLATION

This is a bill to promote inflation. This is a bill to have unbridled inflation, to increase the cost of living, and to stop production, because you are not going to get farmers to produce where dollars are not worth anything; and if you equalize the difference in the cost of living by raising wages and salaries, it will be just like putting a match under a thermometer—the mercury will go out the top. That is what will happen. This is the longest step toward inflation I have ever known to be made in the Congress of the United States. It is a step toward unbridled inflation.

I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time a very interesting, informative, and timely address delivered by the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, before the Washington Board of Trade, on October 20, 1943, on the subject Weapons Against Inflation. It is in connection with the remarks I am making about subsidies and is as follows:

You businessmen, here and in the radio audience, do not need any lecture from me about the dangers of inflation. You believe, as I do, that the preservation of our free-enterprise system offers the best hope for a prosperous, growing, dynamic America in the period of healing and restoration which must come after the war drums have ceased to throb and the boys are back from the battlefields.

Inflation, I confidently assert, is the deadly enemy of private enterprise and of a free economy. Inflation always ends; and deflation always follows in its train. Deflation brings in its wake unemployment and hunger, bankruptcy and foreclosure. Labor, agriculture, and industry are equally its victims. The chaos and panic of deflation will inevitably unloose forces which eat away the foundations of the economic and social order.

In Kentucky we say that nobody can beat the horses. As to that I will not testify. But I am sure that nobody can beat inflation.

Up until May I should have been willing to go further and say that nobody wants inflation. In May I took over my present office and now I'm not so sure.

Just a few weeks ago I was talking to the leader of one of our most effective pressure groups, who was rather critical of our "hold the line" policy. I questioned him and he told me quite frankly that he thought a mild dose of inflation might be helpful to the country, and especially helpful to those whom he represented.

Sometimes, however, I am pessimistic enough to believe that this gentleman was not alone. Perhaps there are others who, though not quite candid enough to admit it, feel that a mild dose of inflation would be good for what ails them.

Such people may be all too numerous. However numerous, they are not our chief danger. The real threat to stabilization comes from sincere, earnest Americans who sincerely and earnestly support stabilization—for the other fellow. It is all too easy for each individual to stabilize the other fellow's wages, freeze the other fellow's prices, and raise the other fellow's taxes.

Mine is the unpleasant job of reminding all these groups, "Uncle Sam included you."

For it will do us little good and much harm to utter homilies against inflation in general, while we belie our professions with a series of petty concessions each day—acts of small appeasement, each unimportant in itself, but altogether spelling out inflation with the inevitability of a jigsaw puzzle.

If we will the end, then let us be brave enough to will the means. If you want us to stabilize, then we must have the tools to do the job.

Tonight I will discuss one of these tools which, in my judgment, we must have if we are to hold the line.

I come, then, right to the point and talk about subsidies.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives has reported out a bill which would prohibit the use of Federal funds by any Government agency to subsidize the production or distribution of food or to hold down prices to the housewife.

At the outset, I say to you solemnly that such a restriction would torpedo the stabilization policy as effectively as any U-boat ever torpedoed a Liberty ship.

Efforts have been made by some propagandists to give the word "subsidy" an evil smell. These specious pundits seek to create the impression that there is something un-American or sinister about subsidies. These reckless critics need an elementary course in American history. There is nothing new about subsidies—except the violence of the opposition to them.

Since the founding of this Republic, funds from the Federal Treasury—subsidies—have been used to achieve various objectives of national policy. The biggest subsidy of them all, the tariff, was enacted by our First Congress. Down through the years, this Nation has repeatedly used the resources of the Public Treasury to speed our national progress or to promote the general welfare.

The development of this great continent is due in no small part of the use of common resources—subsidies. Land grants to the railroads opened up the great West. The homestead laws allotted free land to the hardy pioneers who built an empire. These, too, were subsidies. As early as 1891 ocean-going mail was subsidized to the tune

of $20,000,000. Agriculture, transportation, and industries of most kinds have all at some stage of their growth received help from the Federal Treasury. They have been subsidized. And, at this good hour, some of the very newspapers which howl the loudest against subsidies for bread and meat have never refused the privilege of second-class mail at less than cost.

Subsidies or Federal aid, call it what you will, are as much a part of the American tradition as flapjacks or corn pone. Those who would have you believe that an odious stigma attaches to the word fail to understand the democratic spirit which demands that we pool common resources to meet a common crisis.

No one objects to the use of public funds for a laboratory to devise new weapons to conquer the enemy, or to stamp out some dread disease at home. We do not feel outraged when we read how subsidies developed our Nation—how they are used today to obtain copper, aluminum, coal, and oil for the war effort. Why then such a clamor against the use of subsidies to produce food for war? Perhaps it is because the alternatives have not been made clear.

There is only one real alternative—higher food prices. What will this mean? Higher wages. If these are granted, other costs will rise which will breed new demands for food and wage increases. The familiar spiral will be set in motion and inflation will be upon us.

Thus food prices must be kept down if we are to avoid inflation. It does not require an economic wizard to understand these simple facts.

Back in 1876 that distinguished Kentucky editor, Henry Watterson, was talking about the financial bugaboos of his day. He was discussing the Resumptionist "who wants to take a back somersault into a gold basin," and the "90-day Resumptionist," and the "Resumptionist who thinks the Radical Resumption Act a swindle." According to Marse Henry, the three are met by Mr. Toombs' old Georgia friend who wanted "to stamp out as much money as folks could spend," and when asked how it was to be redeemed, replied, "That's just what I'm coming to; I'm agin redemption."

From that date, Mr. Watterson expressed a prejudice, as it were, against repudiation. I have a similar prejudice against inflation and a passion for stabilization.

Let us examine briefly the fundamentals of the anti-inflation program. Congress, in the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, directed that the cost of living be stabilized as near as practicable at the levels of September 15, 1942. Nevertheless, by May 15 of this year, the cost of living had risen 6.2 percent above the levels prescribed by Congress. This was a serious situation which had prompted the President to promulgate his famous hold-the-line order. No prices or wages were to be increased except under strictly limited conditions and the agencies charged with the responsibility for holding down the cost of living were directed to take immediate steps to bring it back as near the level of September 15, 1942, as possible.

Although, as I have said, the cost of living last May was 6.2 percent above the prescribed level, not all items in the family budget showed increases of this amount. Rent, for example, had not increased during the 8-month period. House furnishings had increased by only nine-tenths of 1 percent, and clothing by 1.6 percent. A remarkably good job had been and is now being done in those fields.

The trouble was with food. Four-fifths of the increase in the cost of living which took place between September of 1942 and May of 1943 was due to failure to control effectively the prices for food. These prices rose by almost 13 percent during the 8-month period.

This was the major problem faced by your Government in the early summer of 1943. Food prices were 13 percent above the levels prescribed by Congress, which had directed the President to grant no more general wage increases on the grounds of higher living costs. This was a solemn pledge to American soldiers on the production line that living costs would be held down. It was also a covenant to the millions of white-collar workers, the clergymen, school teachers, firemen, the old-age pensioners, and—of vital concern—the dependents of our fighting men on foreign soil. The Government had obligated itself to protect these groups and all of us against rising living costs.

Acting upon the mandate from Congress and the orders of the Commander in Chief, prompt action was taken to regain the lost ground and redeem the pledge of the Congress that living costs would be held down. Here is where subsidies came into play. While it is possible to reduce some prices without subsidies, such action was not possible in the case of butter and meat. The prices received by the farmers and distributors did not permit of reductions without bringing their returns to tax unreasonably low levels. Accordingly, a subsidy is being paid by the Government to the processor to enable him to reduce the price of these products without loss to himself and without reducing the price paid to the farmer.

There were other specific programs undertaken in the early part of last summer to meet the crisis in the stabilization program. The O. P. A. undertook a major revision in its food price-control program. It established simple dollars-and-cents ceilings on most food items to replace the cumbersome regulations that had developed over a period of a year.

As a result of these and other measures, the rise in the cost of living was brought to an abrupt halt. For the first time since war began in Europe, the cost-of-living index began to decline. In June of this year, the index was 5.9 percent above the September level; in July a further decline to 5.1 percent above September 1942 was noted, and in August living costs dropped to 4.6 percent above the date set in the Stabilization Act of 1942.

Clearly, we had the high cost of living on the run. The upward trend had been arrested and some of the lost ground regained. And—mark this well—subsidies, as in the case of meat and butter, were responsible for a major portion of success of our victories on the stabilization front during the summer of 1943.

Now, just as success is within our grasp, we have pending before the House of Representatives a proposal which would knock our entire structure into a cocked hat. The Wolcott amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill would abruptly terminate at the end of this year all subsidies now in effect, with the notable exception of subsidies on peanuts and cottonseed and other domestic vegetable oils. Why these commodities were exempt from the prohibition is not explained on any rational ground. It is an obvious political concession by those who rest their case against subsidies on the high ground of principle.

There will be immediate consequences of a disastrous nature if this anti-subsidy bill becomes law. According to its terms, present programs for which funds are available must terminate not later than December 31, 1943.

Let me summarize for the housewife the immediate effect upon the new year's market basket:

Each loaf of bread will cost at least a penny more.

Each pound of butter will increase at least 5 cents.

Each quart of milk will advance at least 1 cent.

Each pound of bacon, cut of beef, pork chop, ham, and every ounce of hamburger or sausage will advance at least 10 percent.

Each can of vegetables will advance at least 25 percent.

Each pound of American cheese will advance at least 4 cents.

Each pound of sugar will go up 1 cent.

Each pound of potatoes will go up from 2 to 3 cents.

Prices will advance on prunes, raisins, onions, peanut butter, oranges, grapefruit, and other commodities upon which the agencies of Government have programs under way or contemplate transportation or other subsidies to obtain stable and uniform prices.

These will be the immediate results if Congress shackles the hands of the Executive in the battle against inflation. The cost of food, it is estimated, would immediately rise from 4 to 6 percent if the existing or immediately contemplated programs were terminated. But this is only the beginning.

Once the trend is on the upswing, other prices will be affected. No method has yet been discovered to isolate or quarantine a price increase. And the increases which this proposal would require would only be the spark which might start a sweeping fire of inflation.

The pending amendment would prohibit the War Food Administration from underwriting farm production for 1944. Never before in our history has there been such a need for maximum food production. Civilian demand is at the highest level and the requirements of our armed forces and our allies are tremendous. The American farmer has for the past 3 years or more achieved a miracle of production. In spite of the handicaps of manpower and some shortage of farm machinery, agricultural production has successively increased.

For 1944, the War Food Administration has planned even greater production. As an essential tool in achieving that production, American farmers have been given the assurance that their prices would be supported at levels which would remove the economic hazards in increasing production. Because of our desperate need for increased food supplies, the Government, in effect, extended to American agriculture an insurance policy. Farmers have been told that if they would increase production of crops and livestock, the Government would guarantee that their prices would not fall below a prescribed level.

This bill would prohibit the use of support prices because it would prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from assuming any losses if the market fell below the prices guaranteed.

Therefore, as I view it, this measure would make the Government impotent to underwrite the production of necessary food. If enacted, it would constitute a serious blow to our war effort.

The War Food Administration reports that the ultimate cost to the Government of discontinuing these programs would be several times greater than the losses incurred under present programs. At the same time, many price ceilings would be more difficult to enforce because the Government would be powerless to absorb transportation and other costs necessary to establish uniformity in the general price structure. Instead of making our ceilings simpler, we should be forced to make them complicated and unenforceable.

Those who assert that we can let food prices go up and at the same time hold wages at their present levels are living in a dream world. The National War Labor Board has done a tremendously effective job in stabilizing wage rates. However, it is quite clear that the Board's effectiveness will depend in a large measure upon our ability to hold down food prices.

Recently, for instance, the Board was faced with a demand for higher wages by shipyard workers. These employees contended that the Government had failed to control living costs, and demanded that the Board abandon the "Little Steel" formula.

The Board denied this request. In doing so, its language was highly significant: "The sound conclusion," said the Board's opinion, "is not that the policy should be abandoned but that it should be held on to, while giving particular attention to better control of the cost of food. That is precisely the policy that has been followed by the Government."

On June 29, 1943, the Board spoke plainly: "This increasing cost of food gravely affects the wage-stabilization program of the National War Labor Board. The Board believes that its established wage stabilization policy is effective. It believes that policy should be carried forward in full cooperation with the other agencies of Government responsible for the other factors of the over-all economic stabilization program. But the Board states with all the emphasis at its command that its wage-stabilization program calls for a prompt carrying forward of announced policies of the administration affecting the cost of food. In the considered opinion of the Board, this is essential to the success of national economic stabilization.

"Subsidies are among the instruments which have proved effective to control food prices. The War Labor Board unanimously supports the administration's intention to use those and all appropriate measures in its food-price policy."

There is little need, in the face of this warning, to point the moral or adorn the tail. Wages and prices must ultimately go up or go down together. In 1941 and 1942 we tried to control prices without controlling wages. The experiment did not succeed. That was one reason why Congress passed the Stabilization Act in October 1942.

Let us not attempt an equally futile effort to try controlling wages in the face of skyrocketing food prices.

Rather let us irrevocably resolve to stabilize every factor in our national economy. Only from such a resolute policy can we draw the strength to fight successfully against the ravaging fevers of inflation.

The evil effects of antisubsidy legislation would not, however, be confined to labor and agriculture. Every group, organized and unorganized, would also suffer from the cancer of inflation. Not the least of these would be American business.

With all sincerity I assert that those who would, by forbidding subsidies, manacle their Government in this great home-front struggle are assuming an awful and solemn responsibility. Most of them, I readily admit, are acting from the purest and most disinterested motives. But there are others, I sometimes suspect, who would make this great economic issue the football of partisan and pressure-group politics. These few, like mischievous children, are playing with fire in an ammunition dump piled high with superexplosives.

The opponents of subsidies have but a single argument. Higher production costs must somehow be paid, and it is better that they be paid directly and openly by increasing prices. Subsidies, these critics claim, only hide the increased burden, which must ultimately be paid in taxes.

Such an argument, of course, begs the question. It assumes that we can let food prices go up and yet hold down wages. It is predicated upon a repudiation of the solemn covenant embodied in the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942. Such a repudiation is unthinkable; and those who advocate it are living in blissful ignorance of the economic and other pressures which exist in a war economy.

Subsidies, then, are actually less costly than higher prices, and not only to the economy but to the taxpayer as well. The Government is spending $100,000,000,000 for war purposes. Higher prices not only cost consumers more; they cost the Government more. For instance, it is estimated that our present food subsidy program saves the Treasury $5 for every dollar paid out. Subsidies, by minimizing cost increases and by holding wages in line, save money for consumers and taxpayers alike.

To those who would play with fire we must throw out a challenge. I do not believe that any group in America will dare vote up the price of bread and meat, potatoes and milk, bacon and beans, butter and cheese, onions and oranges. It is hard to believe that any pressure group will dare assume responsibility for the devastating and disastrous consequences of such an act.

But this I do know. The executive department of your Government will fight to the last ditch to prevent the release of this inflationary cyclone.

I do not mean to tell you tonight that subsidies are the only weapon in our armory. We must continue to use with rigor and resolution the other weapons we already have—price control at all levels in the economic process, wage stabilization, and rationing. We must continue and increase our individual purchases of War bonds. We must pay off our debts. We must limit our purchases to those items which are absolutely essential.

We also need a further weapon—additional taxes. In framing a tax bill at present we must recognize its part in our battle against inflation and in our fundamental policy of distributing available food, clothing, and other goods on an equitable fashion. But this system is seriously threatened by the relentless pressure of too many loose and eager dollars. These dangerous dollars capture at illegal prices and without rationing points many of our civilian supplies. Supplies which are scarcely enough to go around. Then with prices of goods higher there is the clamor for wage increases, which, if granted, sets us off to the races.

Some for reasons incomprehensible or political doubt that we actually have more money to spend than there are goods and services to buy. I can tell you, however, that there is at present, on the basis of the current fiscal year, a minimum difference between spending money and available goods and services of at least sixteen to twenty billion dollars over and above all taxes, insurance premiums, savings accounts, debt repayments, and War bond purchases. This is entirely apart from the one hundred billions in demand and time deposits—accumulated and volatile purchasing power.

A large portion of these eager, restless dollars must be immobilized, siphoned off. That is why the administration has requested additional taxes yielding some ten and one-half billions more of revenue. A real tax program is vital to the stabilization program and also means that an additional portion of the war cost will be paid when we are most able to bear it. To increase taxes will, of course, mean some hardship. Only through taxes based on ability to pay can these hardships be held to a minimum. The administration program recognizes the problems of those whose lot is most difficult, and especially those whose incomes have not felt the impact of war prosperity. May I point out that the sacrifice of the taxpayer on the home front is not comparable to the sacrifice of the soldier on the war front? Take the case of the person earning two, three, or four thousand dollars a year who is taken into the armed forces. Not only does he brave the danger of disease and bullets, risking the loss of health, limb, or life, but he yields his civilian salary or wage for $50 per month, Army rations, and sometimes fox holes for shelter. Those who never return will lose the priceless privilege of complaining about high taxes.

Those of us on the home front who are still receiving civilian salaries and wages—in many instances increased salaries and wages—who are enjoying the American way of life, certainly should be willing to pay more taxes in order that our economy might be on an even keel when our absent ones return; pay more taxes in order that the fires of inflation will not consume our Government's allotment to the soldier's wife and children. In my opinion, our folks do not want luxurious baubles and second helpings of dessert while reading of Bataan, Dieppes, and Salernos which lie ahead.

So I repeat that no one weapon can win the war, either on the battle front or the home front. Just as we must coordinate land power, sea power, and air power, so must we coordinate all our home-front weapons for a single objective—victory, a speedy victory.

And in the last analysis no weapon of warfare is victorious without the fighting spirit of the common soldier. So on the home front our fight against inflation cannot succeed without the fighting spirit of the people.

Without your help we are licked. And if we are licked, you are licked. But if we all pitch in and win this fight against inflation, then the America of today and of the boundless, challenging future will win an enduring and glorious victory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

LABOR SHORTAGE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the subject of manpower problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial of the Dallas News should be read by everyone and especially by the Members of the present Congress, as well as Government officials who are interested in our manpower problems:

GALLUP ON LABOR SHORTAGE

The most revealing poll conducted by Gallup in recent months was that printed in the News Saturday showing that less than half of the people of the Nation believe there is a labor shortage. "Hence, the Government's headache," says Dr. Gallup.

An interesting and hardly less revealing part of the report is Dr. Gallup's own comment: "War Manpower officials apparently have failed to dramatize the labor shortage in such a way as to convince the public that the problem is acute." Reading this, one wonders if it is the position of Dr. Gallup that, though his poll accurately reflects what people think, it does not reflect the actual truth because the Government has not properly "dramatized" the situation for their education. Dr. Gallup does not exactly state this, but he leaves this impression with the reader. After all, Dr. Gallup's headquarters at Princeton are pretty close to the atmosphere of Washington.

Fact is, the people that were interrogated by Dr. Gallup's census takers told the simple truth from simple observation. There is no need of dramatizing facts to get the American people to understand them, certainly not in instances where the evidence is in open daylight and as broad as the land. If Dr. Gallup will look at cold data, he will find that the labor force in this country is working a little above the 40-hour week as a whole, while the labor forces of Great Britain, Russia, Germany, and other Allied and enemy countries are working 50 to 70 hours weekly.

If Congress would amend the present wage-and-hour law to eliminate the extra half-time bonus on the workweek up to 48 hours, so that there could be an increase in production with only proportional increases in wages, the labor situation would very largely be relieved.

Mr. Speaker, on the 3d day of March of this year, I introduced in this House H. R. 2071. Section (a) of this bill is, as follows:

(a) No employee of the United States or of any employer other than the United States shall be paid for any employment in excess of any number of hours under 48 in any workweek at a rate greater than the regular rate at which such employee is employed; but this paragraph shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Section C of this bill is as follows:

(c) All provisions of law are suspended which (1) limit the number of hours that any such employee may be employed during any workweek, or (2) require any contract or agreement to include any provision or stipulation limiting the number of hours that any such employee may be employed during any specified period of time.

This bill should be enacted immediately and without hesitation. It would standardize 48 hours as a workweek, and in so doing it would increase manpower one-seventh. This increase would be of material aid in solving our manpower shortage. With this one-seventh added to the manpower of the Nation, it would also help to prevent the breaking up of the homes of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, in that it would eliminate part of the necessity for drafting these pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

It has been said against this bill that many workers are already working in excess of the 40 hours per week now provided by law. My answer to that is that a very small percent of the total workers are working in excess of 40 hours per week, and those who are working in excess of 40 hours per week are paid, under the law, time and one-half of the base pay for such excess work.

This extra pay, in most instances, is now being paid by the Government. It comes from the funds, or money, raised by taxation, and it is creating an extra burden on the taxpayers, who are now being strained to the limit in the raising of funds to carry on our war effort, and who will necessarily have to suffer more as tax burdens grow. This extra expense of overtime pay is, in itself, aiding inflation, which we are supposed to be fighting to hold down.

If the workers could see the agony the Ways and Means Committee of the House are going through, as they are now laboring to devise a new tax bill to raise additional revenue which is necessary to carry on our war effort, these workers would immediately see the necessity of H. R. 2071. And in further answer to the statement that many workers are working in excess of 40 hours per week, there are many companies and contractors who refuse to work their employees over 40 hours per week by reason of the added expense of the time and one-half pay for such excess work. On the other hand, they are creating, in some instances, three shifts a day rather than two, in order that they will not have to pay the extra expense of time and a half for overtime pay; and if H. R. 2071 was enacted into law, it would eliminate some of these extra shifts, thereby further relieving our manpower shortage.

Under H. R. 2071, the worker would work 8 hours a day. In doing this he would be working one-seventh more than he works under the 40-hour-week law. Likewise, he would be receiving one-seventh more pay for his daily or weekly wages. Is this a sacrifice too great for the American worker, when America is fighting for her very existence; when America's debt is largely in excess of the combined debts of Russia, England, and France? When the American worker is drawing from one-third to twice the amount of any other worker in the world today? Do you not believe he is willing to make this small sacrifice, to help win this war and preserve our democratic way of life?

I am informed that Russia has no law limiting work hours to any specified time. I am also informed that the British workweek before Dunquerque was from 52 hours to 56 hours, but that after Dunquerque it jumped to 72 hours, while the American workweek, by law, remains at 40 hours unless extra pay is given.

The millions of our American soldiers who are fighting on every battle front are not limited to 40 hours per week. Those men in the foxholes, the swamps, the jungles, and the deserts are on the job 24 hours per day.

The American people cannot and will not get alarmed at our Government's cry of shortage of manpower as long as the 40-hour-week law remains on the statute books. They cannot hear the cry of "wolf" when the War Department, the Navy Department, the Labor Department, the War Production Board, and the War Manpower Commission all file opposition to establishing a standard 48-hour-week law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special permission heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] for 25 minutes.

SUBSIDIZED COMPETITION AND THE RURAL BANKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, slow death faces the small rural banks from Government-subsidized competition.

In these days of a high mortality rate in the ranks of small business the closing of a small rural bank goes unnoticed beyond a local news item, with perhaps a notice inserted in the local newspaper and paid for from the bank's own depleted assets. The effect on our national economy is infinitesimal, but it is a disaster of considerable local importance. Multiply this by the thousands of small rural banks in the country and you have a picture of the dire national catastrophe that threatens.

I refer in general to competition from 19 lending agencies operating under the Department of Agriculture, and in particular to the activities of Production Credit Associations of the Production Credit Corporations under the Farm Credit Administration in the Department of Agriculture. In deference to the administration's fondness for alphabetical epitome I list the 19 agencies alphabetically. They are:

Central Bank for Cooperatives.
Commodity Credit Corporation.
Disaster Loan Corporation.
Electric Home and Farm Authority.
Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Security.
Farm Credit Administration.
Farm Security Administration.
Federal Credit Unions.
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
Federal Land Banks.
Land Bank Commissioner Loans.
National Farm Loan Association.
Production Credit Associations.
Production Credit Corporations.
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
Rural Electrification Administration.

Not all of these agencies were created by acts of Congress, but by Executive orders and directives. Some, created by Congress as independent agencies, have been transferred to the Department of Agriculture by Executive order under President Roosevelt's reorganization plan of 1939. The result is that functions are controlled by appointive officials who are responsible to Congress only so far as the agency is dependent upon Congress for appropriations.

Charges of growing socialistic tendencies in the Department of Agriculture have stirred the interest of Congress. Committees have investigated the activities of certain agencies, and we recall the debate last spring on the agricultural appropriation bill in which the Farm Security Administration figured outstandingly. The Commodity Credit Corporation once narrowly escaped liquidation, and its existence is currently a matter of legislative consideration.

Mr. Speaker, many depression-created agencies of Government have long since served their purpose and, in the interest of a need for economy manifoldly enhanced by the terrific cost of a global war, should be liquidated. Some of the 19 agencies I have listed could well come within that category. And, although Congress has, through power on the purse strings, already curtailed activities of some of these agencies, the power must be exercised still more. Created for the commendable purpose of aiding through critical periods the financing of agricultural activities, the agencies have, I will agree, served a good purpose. We cannot say that future conditions will not again develop a need for them. But, what is to prevent their

being rendered dormant in the interest of economy until their functions may again be required? The answer is, only the selfish desire of bureaucrats to keep the agencies alive regardless of conditions, and the political advantage to be derived therefrom.

These agencies were created to supplement the small rural banks which have always played an important part in financing agricultural activities—not for the purpose of destroying private enterprise. The small banks and rural communities were grateful for the Government's assistance. But now, like Little Red Riding Hood, they find the solicitude of a kindly grandmother replaced by the greed of a ravenous wolf. The rural banks find themselves in a death struggle of competition with lending agencies subsidized by Government funds—faced with increasing competitive activities subsidized by taxpayers' money, including that of the banks and their patrons.

I cite the example of one county in my congressional district to show the growth of Government competition with local banks. In this particular county from January 2, 1943, through March 16, 1943, agencies of the Department of Agriculture made 70.40 percent of the total dollar value of rural chattel loans, as compared with only 26.47 percent made by five local banks. Of this total 66.51 percent represented loans made by a production credit association. Without question the same percentage prevails wherever production-credit associations operate. It is true throughout Indiana.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What type of collateral was given by those people who borrowed on that 66 percent? Was it collateral that commercial banks could have accepted?

Mr. SPRINGER. Some of the collateral offered by those prospective borrowers was practically nil. It would not have been accepted in any instance by any of the local banks, because there was no worth-while security presented. In other instances the collateral offered was entirely adequate and was such that any bank, engaged in a conservative banking business, would have accepted.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman approach the comparative interest rates somewhere in his discussion?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall refer to that later in the discussion, provided I have the time to do so.

Mr. Speaker, such competition is unfair to the banks, and to the taxpayers. Local banks must depend upon their own resources and profits to expand and protect their volume of business. They are faced at present with shortage of manpower, and increasing burdens heaped upon them by Government restrictions and regulations—to say nothing of the cooperation they are expected to give in War bond drives, rationing, and other war activities. Any advertising or solicitation of business that they carry on to survive must be paid for by the banks themselves, yet Government lending agencies have available unlimited propaganda material, including press handouts forced upon local newspapers. Rural banks cannot long survive this competition, and I am sure no one will deny the disaster that will follow if the backbone of our national economy—the small rural banks—should be put out of existence.

I will not take the time of the House to discuss each of these lending agencies—their values can best be left to the consideration of appropriate committees at the proper time. However, I do wish to bring to attention the activities of one in particular. I refer to the production credit system which includes one production credit corporation in each of the 12 farm credit districts, and 529 production credit associations.

Under the Farm Credit Act of 1933 there was created a revolving fund of $120,000,000 upon which the system was established. This fund was made up from certain unobligated balances of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, $40,000,000 from money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and $2,000,000 appropriated for administrative expenses in the establishment and supervision of the production credit corporations and production credit associations. As of December 31, 1942, total capitalization of the 529 production credit associations was $104,248,697. Of that amount $81,214,125 was class A stock owned by production credit corporations, $1,042,127 was class A stock owned by farmer members, and $21,992,445 was class B stock owned by farmer members. In other words, nearly 80 percent of the total capitalization is owned and controlled by a Government agency. Therefore, competition with local banks is 80 percent Government responsibility.

I feel that in passing legislation to establish this means of financing aid to agricultural production Congress was motivated by the sole desire to aid and supplement local financing institutions founded by resourceful citizens of thriving communities. I am certain that it was not the will of the people, nor the intention of Congress, that it should operate to destroy the very thing it was to supplement. But that will come to pass unless the unwarranted activities of production credit associations are curtailed.

Reports of active solicitation of loans by production credit associations persist despite denial by Government officials. In denial officials say that this sort of activity is hardly possible under gasoline rationing. But O. P. A. regulations have provisions under which individuals engaged in such solicitation might be considered eligible for supplemental gasoline—especially in view of the claims Government lending agencies are making for their continued existence. These agencies are not bashful about inventing essentiality to the war effort and even the post-war period.

The activities of production credit associations are really masterful innovations. They have, for instance, established victory clubs, such as victory pig clubs or victory calf clubs. The idea is that when a farmer is granted a loan for production purposes he pledges one hog, or one calf, to War bonds. I hardly believe that Government regulations permit local banks to place special stipulations in a loan.

I have in my possession evidence of the latest innovation of production credit associations in local bank competition. It is a form letter addressed to farmer-members. I will read it:

> We have four things to write about, three of which concern you, the fourth concerns this association.
>
> 1. If you are in a position to do so, it is your patriotic duty to support the third big War bond drive which is being conducted this month.

This letter is dated September 4, 1943.

> 2. We are not urging you to borrow money to buy War bonds, but if you care to do so, we can make short-term loans or advances for reasonable amounts for bond purchases. If you do not have an active loan, we can set up a loan for War bond purchases at our regular 4½ percent interest rate and no other charges.
>
> 3. If you now have a loan, we can approve releases of livestock sales for War bond purchases for reasonable amounts in keeping with your financial position.
>
> 4. Although we get no compensation of any kind for handling bonds, we are anxious to issue as many bonds as possible.

That is an interesting statement, in view of the offer to make loans for War bond purchases. The letter concludes—

> Many people forget that we have bonds to sell in all of our offices. When you are solicited for bond purchases, see that your bonds are to be issued by your production credit office. Our offices are supplied with series E bonds.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of competition that rural banks are objecting to in their struggle for existence. It is evidence of the unembarrassed activities by which emergency-created agencies seek to prolong their activities, and strengthen their position at the cost of private enterprise. It is an example of how these agencies seize upon the war emergency in an effort to justify their continued operations founded on taxpayers' money. Are they blind to the knowledge that such tactics will destroy the very thing that made them possible? Or, is it an unwitting collaboration in a general plan to destroy our national economy, and substitute an economy of the State?

Dr. C. W. Warburton, Deputy Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, has denied many of the reports of active loan solicitation by production credit associations. I intend to ask him for an explanation of this documentary evidence I have just submitted. I am interested in knowing just how such activities can be considered as a direct contribution to agricultural production by providing credit for farm and ranch operations. In my opinion the letter of the law is being seriously stretched, if not broken.

Many of these lending agencies are so constituted as to be almost beyond the

reach of Congress. But Congress has a responsibility to face, and must employ some method to control such activities that will destroy the rural banks of the Nation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I will gladly yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Permit me to make this very brief statement. I think the subject on which the gentleman has just talked is one of the most serious that we have in the country, and I am entirely sympathetic with his position. What was the attitude of the banks in the gentleman's area toward foreclosures during that period, we will say, the peak of the period, between 1929 and 1934? Were the banks in the gentleman's area foreclosing on the farmers in that area, and were the banks lending to farmers during that period? I recall that one of the lending institutions to which the gentleman has referred, and I think more than one, actually came into existence because of the unwillingness of the banks to enter that field.

Mr. SPRINGER. During that period to which the gentleman refers our banks were making loans, and they were making loans where there was adequate or even partially adequate security for the loans. May I observe that there were, in some instances, foreclosures, but during that period of time we were suffering a terrible hardship in our agricultural sections. That period has largely passed and now the banks have ample funds on hand to loan, and they are ready and willing to make loans but they are met with this unfair competition to which I have referred. In this unfair competition we find men going about personally soliciting loans, and we have instances such as that to which I have referred, where they circularize the people of entire communities, and in entire districts, in which they are advertising for loans at a reduced rate of interest, which is the most unfair competition imaginable against our rural banks. After all, those rural banks, and our local loan agencies, are the backbone of every community in this entire Nation. They have contributed largely to the building and development of every community in our several States.

I think that the gentleman has raised a good question and I am happy to advise him that in my district the banks are ready and willing to make loans. They want to go forward, they want to continue their business on a sound basis, but, as I have stated, in that particular area in which these production credit associations have been operating, over 70 percent of the chattel loans have been made by those Government lending agencies. Our banks and lending agencies, in the local communities, are entitled to some protection at the hands of their Government, instead of the unfair competition which the Government now offers. Our Government should not destroy private enterprise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. THOMASON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is indeed unfortunate, in view of the wishes of a vast majority of the people in this country who have spoken so decisively on the subject, that the executive branch of the Government should continue in its attempt to force upon the country its program of consumer subsidies and price roll-backs.

Major representative farm organizations, I think with only one exception, vigorously oppose such a program. Individual farmers almost without exception everywhere, oppose such a program. Livestock producers of cattle, sheep, and hogs, oppose such a program. Feeders and processors of livestock products almost without exception oppose such a program. A vast majority of the people's representatives in the Congress have consistently and persistently opposed such a program.

Notwithstanding all of this, and the overwhelming sentiment expressed by both Houses of the Congress just previous to the adjournment, an attempt is again being made to saddle this un-American program upon the country.

It is difficult for the people in my section of the United States to understand the motivating influence behind this proposal. If they believed such a program was a barrier against, or even an aid toward, controlling inflation, they would probably be willing to go along with such a scheme; but no one so far has been able to successfully explain why the dumping of millions and perhaps billions of dollars, that would be required to finance such a program out of the Public Treasury, into an already disrupted economy, would do anything other than add to the burden of inflation.

They cannot understand the logic or common sense of those who say that the Government should step in and pay a part of the food bill of an industrial worker who is receiving $10, $15, or $20 per day, or to the large salary groups, or to the industrialists who are making the greatest profits of all time.

When you relieve these millions of a part of their food bill, by paying it back to them through Government subsidies, you leave in their hands (to be expended if they can) the excess to spend for unrationed articles of food as well as luxuries and a dozen or more other things not affected by price control.

I was very much interested recently in checking through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 14, at the extension of remarks inserted therein by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] an able member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in which he suggests that this question of consumer subsidies is a partisan political issue. To quote briefly from his remarks:

> This brings up the question of subsidies as an issue between the two major parties, Democrats and Republicans. This is unfortunate. The Republicans on the committee—11—voted solidly against subsidies, and they were joined by the Progressive on the committee, the Honorable MERLIN HULL, and four Democrats, The Democrats on the committee voted 10 to 4 in favor of supporting the President's anti-inflation program to keep down the high cost of living

As far as I am personally concerned, I would be perfectly willing to make the subsidy program a political issue. The facts, however, as disclosed by the record during the time that this whole matter of consumer-subsidies has been considered by the Congress, in my humble judgment in no way warrants the charge made by our distinguished friend from Texas.

In June this year, when the House had under consideration H. R. 2869, which was a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered an amendment to the bill in the form of a new section which provided, among other things, the prevention of the use of Government funds to pay consumer subsidies.

The amendment was agreed to in the committee without a record vote. When the bill was reported back to the House a separate vote was demanded on the Wolcott amendment by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. And while a record vote was not taken, the following colloquy occurred, as will be disclosed at page 6548 of the RECORD for June 25, 1943:

> Mr. DINGELL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
>
> Mr. DINGELL. Is this the amendment that has to do with the elimination of the payment of any subsidies?
>
> The SPEAKER. This is the Wolcott amendment as amended.
>
> Mr. DINGELL. I should like to have an explanation of it.
>
> The SPEAKER. The Chair is not presumed to know the language of the amendment.
>
> The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.
>
> The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.
>
> The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
>
> Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.
>
> The yeas and nays were refused.
>
> Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.
>
> Tellers were refused.
>
> So the amendment was agreed to.
>
> The SPEAKER The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.
>
> The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.
>
> The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.
>
> Mr. WRIGHT and Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania demanded the yeas and nays.
>
> The yeas and nays were refused.
>
> The bill was passed.
>
> A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Does this record bear out the statement of my distinguished friend that the question of consumer subsidies is political? His party has a majority in the House. If it is only the Republicans that are opposing consumer subsidies, why could not he muster enough votes in his

own party to obtain a record vote. Let us further examine the charge of the distinguished gentleman, that the payment of subsidies is partisan political issue. It will be recalled that when the commodity credit bill, including the Wolcott amendment, was passed by both Houses of the Congress and sent to the President, it came back to the Congress vetoed, with rather sharp words from the Chief Executive on the question of consumer subsidies. He gave the membership a pretty severe lacing down for refusing to permit consumer subsidies, and when the bill came back upon a reconsideration f the passage of the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, on a roll-call vote, 228 Members of the House voted to override the veto, and only 154 Members voted to sustain, while a few votes were lacking sufficient to override the veto, a substantial majority did vote in the affirmative. Again may I remind the gentleman that his party is in the majority, and if it is a partisan political issue, how does the gentleman explain the fact that a very substantial majority of the membership voted to override instead of sustain the President's veto? I have not broken down or made a political analysis of the 228 Members who voted to override the veto, but since the gentleman has charged that those who oppose subsidies are Republican partisans, I was interested in checking his own State delegation for the purpose of ascertaining how they voted, all of whom are Democrats, and whose genuine party loyalty I am sure cannot be challenged by anyone. It is interesting to note that included in this distinguished list of Texas Democrats who voted to override the President's veto, and thus register their protest against consumer subsidies, such distinguished names appear as LUTHER A. JOHNSON, PAUL KILDAY, RICHARD KLEBERG, FRITZ LANHAM, BOB POAGE, Judge SUMNERS, MILTON WEST, and we might go on. In almost every solid South State, where only Democrats are sent to Congress, there will be found the names of distinguished Members of this House registering their votes against consumer subsidies.

Now, let us take my own State and take a look at the record. Mr. BOREN, Mr. DISNEY, and Mr. STEWART joined with me in their votes to override the President's veto and thus register their protest against the payment of consumer subsidies. Does my friend from Texas question their democracy or loyalty to their party? Bringing the matter down to date, according to the gentleman's own statement, when this matter was before the Banking and Currency Committee last week 11 Republicans, 4 Democrats, and 1 Progressive voted to kill consumer subsidies. It was this action on the part of the committee which caused him to charge that it was a partisan political matter. The vote in the committee according to his statement on the question of consumer subsidies, was 16 against to 10 for, I do not know, and am not interested, except to congratulate them, as to who the 4 Democratic members of his party were, who voted against consumer subsidies, suffice it to say that almost a third of the members on that committee belonging to the gentleman's party registered their disapproval of this un-American program.

No, Mr. Speaker; it is not a question of party politics, rather I believe it to be one of fundamental government philosophy. Each succeeding day reminds us more and more of the fact that the world is now, and has been for some time, involved in sweeping economic, social, and political changes, unleashed perhaps by the First World War, which together with tremendous advances through science and invention, brought about an apparent failure of our economic system to advance and keep pace with the welfare of the people. The difficulties have perhaps been augmented by the present all-out global war and we are confronted with tremendous and complicated economic problems. In the solution of these problems we are face to face with two clashing philosophies of government. One of these philosophies proposes the solution of these problems through a vast further turn toward complete centralization of authority in the Federal Government. Economic planning with strong coercion of individuals by and through Executive directives operating through a network of bureaus. The other philosophy, and the one to which I subscribe, proposes to accomplish the same end within the framework of a strong local, as well as Federal Government, and the development of understanding and voluntary cooperation among freemen. One of these philosophies insists on changes of what has always been considered fundamentals, and advocates abandoning or suspending the charter of government so to speak, while the other advocates a program in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution. One of these philosophies is represented by the New Deal. The other is simply traditional American principles. This new philosophy failed in its solution of our economic problems in time of peace. It saddled an unprecedented debt upon our country while the problems remained unsolved. Day by day now its failure to solve our increased economic problems brought on by the war, is more apparent. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this new philosophy for the solving of our economic ills was sure to fail, either in peace or at war because a republican form of government, a representative democracy so to speak, cannot exist under that sort of philosophy. I believe that all of the problems now confronting us can be solved, and that their solution can be brought about through the traditional American system, in the American way, in the spirit of the Constitution, and by and through the three separate and distinct branches of our government. This payment of consumer subsidies is fundamentally unsound, dishonest, and immoral, and I believe it will stimulate, rather than retard, inflation.

One of the leading newspapers in my State sums up this whole roll-back business editorially as follows:

The entire objective of the administration in attempting to impose consumer subsidies, disguised as farmer subsidies, has been and is to appease and favor the organized consumer vote in the East, while trying to make the farmer think he is being given something by the White House, and to make the public in general believe that if it were not necessary thus to subsidize the farmer, living costs would be very low indeed and the impacts of the war scarcely felt by anyone.

It is fourth-term hokum, of course, and the farmers have seen through it. In overwhelming majority, they oppose subsidies, since they are, in this case and among other reasons, designed to keep a measure of control over them, and to employ added bureaucratic fourth-term tub thumpers at public expense. Labor, momentarily, at least, was seemingly inclined to swallow the administration roll-back, subsidy, balogney in large chunks. But now comes an editorial in the influential workers' weekly, Labor, which under the heading "Roll-back looks like 'Gold brick'" has this to say about the subtle scheme, the consumers' subsidy masquerading as a farmers' subsidy and supposed to materially lower the cost of living.

"Workers who may have taken at face value an O. P. A. promise to roll back the cost of living by 2.3 percent are going to be sadly disappointed.

"Chester Bowles, O. P. A. general manager, said the cut-back would be achieved by reducing prices on apples, onions, potatoes, oranges, lard, shortening, and peanut butter.

"Labor research men analyzed his figures and the result was an eye opener. Boris Shishkin, A. F. of L. economist, concluded the announced reductions wouldn't roll back living costs more than 1 percent.

"Another economist made the jibe that the O. P. A. program 'rolls back the cost-of-living index faster than it rolls back the cost of living.'

"Even the New York Times branded the O. P. A. claim as a fake. It estimated benefits of the proclaimed program at even less than the laborites did—about one-half of 1 percent.

"Bowles was asked about these discrepancies and explained he relied on figures worked out by Richard V. Gilbert, his research adviser. Gilbert in turn gave out a complicated set of figures which he contended added up to the 2.3-percent reduction.

"'We're from Missouri and we'll have to be shown,' Shishkin countered. 'Our calculations show the O. P. A. promise can't possibly be borne out by the facts unless that agency has something up its sleeve we're not being told about.'"

Hence it appears the subsidy scheme, costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, will benefit nobody—producer or consumer—and the only gain is the gain in the votes the administration hopes will result from its efforts to fool both the farmers and the consumers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know the gentleman is so fair he will want the RECORD to show that debate was cut off without the side sponsoring an amendment to the Wolcott amendment being given one word of discussion on the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. RIZLEY. Well, everyone is familiar with the Wolcott amendment. Everyone knew what it was when it was

considered on the floor. Everyone knew it had to do with consumer subsidies. They knew it when it came back with the President's veto, because he spent a great deal of time going into that subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICAN FASCISM

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in a message to the Congress dated September 17, 1943, the President said:

> We shall not be able to claim that we have gained total victory in this war if any vestige of fascism in any of its malignant forms is permitted to survive anywhere in the world.

Every American worthy of the name will applaud this objective. Before becoming too enthusiastic, however, let us analyze this term "fascism," in connection with the President's broad denunciation, in order that we may better understand his statement.

The term had its origin in a type of government instituted in Italy. It conceived the individual to be the servant and ultimately the slave of the state. It contemplated subjecting every citizen to the will and decrees of the state in return for alleged benefits passed from the state to the individual. It idealized the thought that the individual could purchase something called social security in exchange for his liberty and freedom.

Some of our intellectual liberals in this country have defined fascism as "the type of government in which a small group controls the military, governmental, economic, and cultural life of the people." In other words, pure fascism means a centralization of power in the hands of one man or a small group who by their directives and decrees control and rule the lives, liberty, and fortunes of the people. It is a philosophy based upon the theory that the individual is subservient to the state, and as such, is willing to exchange his liberty and freedom for a promise of so-called social security. It may be brought about by the quick break of revolution or may be ultimately accomplished by an insidious gradualist policy operating through alleged democratic process. It may be tyrannical or benevolent, but in either case it involves surrender of human liberty and freedom in exchange for regimented existence under unlimited state control and direction.

In the light, therefore, of these accepted definitions of the term "fascism" and in view of the President's expressed determination to crush it anywhere in the world, is it not proper that we critically examine our own economy in order to determine whether fascism in any of its malignant forms is entrenching itself in the vitals of our own system of government?

I am fearful that a new political gangsterism has been developed in this country which seeks to include as Fascists all individuals or organizations who dare to express dissent from the existing New Deal order. Today the word "Fascist" is being bandied about by many self-styled liberals in order to cloak and cover their own political bigotry. It will be recalled that only a few years ago the word "Red" or "Bolshevik" was used in much the same way. Certain new political gangsters who seek to import foreign ideologies into our American system have developed what they think is a very clever technique. Their efforts may be observed in the incessant meetings that go on through the country under the pretense of helping China, extolling Russia, demanding a second front in the west, and so forth. Lately, these political racketeers have dropped all pretense and are demanding the suppression of this or that group of Americans because it is claimed that they are Fascists or that their principles are motivated by Fascist tendencies. This group is constantly engaged in well-organized and well-financed political intimidation.

I have no quarrel with those who seek to wipe out fascism as the term is well understood. I do want to call attention to the fact, however, that many of the same Fascist tendencies which we seek to destroy on foreign soil are finding their way into our own economy under a guise designated as liberalism. These new political self-styled liberals are constantly directing the attention of the American people to the terrorism of Fascist government abroad. They cleverly omit any disparagement of the Communist type of fascism. They always have an escape argument in their contention that while communism is Fascist in character, it is benevolent in purpose and hence should be applauded rather than condemned. They admit the Fascist character of many New Deal practices, but again side-step condemnation by the specious argument that such policies and practices have grown up under democratic process. They gloss over the development of true Fascist tendencies in our own domestic economy. The constant grasp for power of a well-entrenched small group in this country is a pure Fascist threat that should merit the condemnation of every thoughtful American. The constant growth of federalized bureaucracy, coupled with the incessant demand for greater and further Federal control—the constant destruction of State sovereignty practiced by entrenched bureaucracy and the constant grasp for power by the inner clique of the New Deal represent, in my judgment, the most direct Fascist threats that face our Nation today.

The strange fact is, however, that many of those who denounce fascism abroad are loud in their praises of entrenched bureaucracy here at home. Is it small wonder, therefore, that courageous men and women in these United States of America, without regard to party labels, are becoming sincerely alarmed over this typical Fascist threat? Is it not high time that those who are denouncing fascism in its broadest definition as applied to foreign states, should now be called upon to denounce with equal fervor the Fascist threat to our own economy which has steadily developed to a point where we are largely ruled by the decrees of mere men rather than by rules of law adopted by the people's representatives?

Is it not time that the actions of the Executive be critically examined in view of the pure Fascist character of many of his domestic actions? Are not his constant, and many times successful, attempts to override the express will of the people, as reflected in congressional action, typical Fascist tendencies? A few examples will suffice—Congress clearly expressed its will against the $25,000 salary limitation. The President, by Executive order, defied the congressional will. Congress definitely refused to appropriate money with which to build a building for the O. W. I. The President in direct defiance of Congress built the building with blank-check funds. Congress sought to exclude certain subversive individuals from the Federal pay roll. The President went out of his way to express his displeasure and to slap the people's Representatives in the face by advising both the executive and judicial departments that the action of Congress "is not in my judgment binding upon them." Congress has repeatedly expressed its opposition to subsidies and yet the Executive has placed part of the plan in operation.

Is it not clear, under every accepted definition of fascism that true fascism in one of its most malignant forms is entrenching itself in the very vitals of our system of economy? Are the men posing as liberals who are so busy these days attacking fascism so blind as not to see this threat to our own economy? They see it, I am sure, but in their mad attempts to put over their foreign ideologies, they constantly attempt to divert public attention away from our own economy in the hope that they can put over their plans for a socialized, planned economy while the American people are struggling with the problem of war.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

Mr. PATMAN. On that question of subsidy, the gentleman is in error.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield, and the gentleman from Texas knows the rules of this House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I merely wanted to ask a brief question and if the gentleman will yield I will be glad to withdraw the point. He is in error and we should not have an error go into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. THOMASON]. The Chair will count. Forty-two Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was put, and the motion was rejected.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 150]

Anderson, Calif.	Ford	Morrison, La.
Andrews	Fulmer	Mott
Arnold	Furlong	Murphy
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	Norman
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Norrell
Barden	Gerlach	Norton
Barry	Goodwin	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Green	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Harris, Va.	O'Connor
Beall	Hart	O'Leary
Bender	Hébert	O'Toole
Bland	Heffernan	Pace
Bonner	Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.
Bradley, Mich.	Herter	Pfeifer
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Philbin
Brehm	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Buckley	Hobbs	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Hoeven	Pracht
Burchill, N. Y.	Holifield	Ramey
Butler	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Capozzoli	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Jackson	Robsion, Ky.
Chapman	Jarman	Rogers, Calif.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Calvin D.	Scanlon
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Schiffler
Courtney	Kean	Schuetz
Cox	Kearney	Schwabe
Crawford	Kee	Shafer
Crosser	Kelley	Sheridan
Cullen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Snyder
Dawson	King	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Kirwan	Spence
Dickstein	Kunkel	Steagall
Dies	Lane	Taber
Dilweg	Lea	Taylor
Dirksen	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Ditter	McCowen	Towe
Domengeaux	McGehee	Treadway
Douglas	McGranery	Vincent, Ky.
Eaton	Maas	Vinson, Ga.
Eberharter	Mansfield, Mont.	Vursell
Ellis	Marcantonio	Welchel, Ohio
Fay	Martin, Iowa	Weiss
Feighan	May	Wene
Fish	Merritt	Whitten
Fisher	Merrow	Winter
Fitzpatrick	Miller, Pa.	Worley
Flannagan	Monroney	Wright
Fogarty	Morrison, La.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 280 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin may continue.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN FASCISM

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this observation: The gentleman now in the Well of the House was asked by one of his colleagues to yield. Upon his refusal to yield his colleague caused this roll to be called.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for the very fine exposition of this subject he has given us up to this time, and to state that it will be well worth the while of every Member of this House to listen to the balance of it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I may say to my colleague that the gentleman who is now speaking was in no way responsible for this call of the House. I fully appreciated the few who were here upon the floor while I was speaking. May I say to you, however, that acting under what I conceive to be the clear rules of the House, I did decline to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. He thereupon placed me in the embarrassing situation of either yielding to him or his forcing a call of the House by suggesting the absence of a quorum. I elected to let him pursue that course and the roll was called.

When I was interrupted by this demand for a quorum, I had defined the term "fascism" and indicated the necessity of critically exploring and examining our own economy with a view to determining whether under accepted definitions of fascism, this political philosophy was finding its way into our own economy.

Mr. Speaker, I will proceed with the discussion.

I recall asking one of the most prominent intellectual leftists in this country this question: "Do you think that continued delegation of arbitrary power to bureaucracy is a dangerous centralization of power?"

Answer: "I think it a very dangerous centralization of power."

"Have you been alarmed by the progress we have been making in the last few years toward centralization of power in the hands of bureaucracy?"

Answer: "I have been very much alarmed by it."

Certainly, if this intellectual leftist has been alarmed by what has been taking place in our own country, it is high time that the citizens who believe in liberty and freedom should begin to wake up. Freedom and liberty can never exist alone on mere sufferance, and they will fail unless courageously and vigorously defended.

Where are the men and women in whose veins flows the blood of the great liberals of the past? We are convinced that many of those who like to style themselves liberals are in reality the most reactionary group in the country. They are the ones who, while denouncing fascism are constantly planning and urging a program for an American domestic economy that is purely fascist in character. We are convinced that while comparatively few in number, they are well organized and highly articulate.

We are convinced, however, that the same spirit that motivated the thought and actions of the great liberal men and women of the past exists in the hearts and souls of an overwhelming majority of our citizens today. They are the true liberals. They may not be as articulate and as well organized as the entrenched groups of political gangsterism, but I have a profound faith that through the length and breadth of this land that spirit is again inflamed. Mr. Speaker, there is born into the souls of men and women a craving for fundamental rights of liberty and freedom. The signers of the Declaration of Independence gave clear expression to this spirit when they wrote:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The great liberals of that day, as exemplified by Thomas Jefferson, gave their all for the attainment of these fundamental rights. The struggle through the ages has been that of the common man trying to break through the restrictions of tyrannical kings and feudal lords in an effort to attain a place in life where liberty and freedom might prevail. History is replete with evidence of this continued battle. Courageous men and women shed their blood and gave their lives in the age-old effort to achieve liberty. The signing of the Magna Carta was a step in the direction of the attainment of such objectives. The French Revolution illustrates again the efforts of common people to take from tyrannical masters rights and privileges which the whole people in a properly managed society should enjoy. Those who courageously settled on this continent left European shores in order to establish their homes where they might find ecclesiastic and economic freedom and liberty. Yet there followed here onto this continent the long hand of oppressive government and tyranny. This was evidenced by Jefferson when he wrote in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence—

> But when a long train of abuses and usurpation pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right—it is their duty—to throw off such government and provide new guards for their future security.

Jefferson did not counsel a break with a government long-established without good and sufficient reasons. He very meticulously specified the charges. I challenge every citizen, in view of the present social and economic conditions facing our Nation, to read the recital of those charges. What was the fundamental complaint that is found woven into the fabric of all of those charges? The signers of the Declaration of Independence complained in substance of the denial by a tyrannical king of the fundamental rights of free people to liberty and the pursuit of individual happiness. It is significant in viewing these specifications to point out that there is no complaint lodged against the King because he failed to furnish the colonists with suitable and proper housing or that he failed to provide suitable and proper nutrition or adequate hospitalization or medical care, or that he failed to protect them against the ravages of the Indians. No complaint will be found because he failed to establish proper standards of living or wage scales. But they did complain of the denial by the King of specific fundamental rights that free men

and women should enjoy. Listen to some of their complaints:

He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices and the amount and payment of their salaries. He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of new officers to harass our people and eat out of our substance. He has rendered the military independent of and superior to civil power. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws. He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

Thus, in charge after charge, the great liberal minds of the early days of our Republic gave expression to the demand for recognition by the tyrant of the fundamental rights of the people. Aided and guided by the assistance and advice of the courageous men who directed and fought a successful revolution, a new Government was gradually established under a Constitution having for its fundamental purpose the establishment of justice and the protection and preservation of human liberty and freedom. For more than 150 years, the great liberal-minded forces of this Nation have zealously guarded and protected the rights and privileges of the people.

The Congress of the United States is the repository under our system of government of the fundamental and inherent rights of a free people. We prospered as a nation under this system. I do not mean to imply that the fight to preserve individual freedom and liberty has always been successful. There are many black pages in our history that clearly demonstrate the power of entrenched privilege. Fundamentally, however, the fight of the great liberal minds of our Nation has always been to preserve in the hands of the people these fundamental rights of freedom and liberty which found expression in our original Declaration of Independence. They conceived the Government to be an arbiter between the elements of special privilege and the rights of the common man. They conceived that government was an instrument to provide equality of opportunity for all the people, so that the poorest child in the Nation might, through perseverance and ability, achieve the highest position in the land.

In recent years, due to claimed social and economic crises, following one after the other, we have witnessed in this country a complete reversal of governmental attitude. Powers and privileges that should belong to the people's representatives in government and for which liberal souls through the ages shed their blood to obtain and preserve, have recklessly been delegated under alleged "democratic process" to a coordinate branch of government. The result has been that we have shifted the responsibility in large measure from the people's representatives into the hands of Federal bureaus piled upon Federal bureaus. In actual practice, these powers have been delegated to the President. He has set up one bureau after another in order to handle the mass of complex and conflicting social and economic problems that subservient Congresses have been apparently unable to solve for themselves.

We believe it fair to state that this abject surrender by the people's representatives of legislative responsibility, while technically achieved through democratic process, was in reality coerced and compelled by Executive intervention. The direct result of this shifting of responsibility is plainly apparent. We are now being ruled from above by a multitude of directives and regulations issued by a grasping, giant bureaucracy. They are the result of the whims, attitudes, and caprices of mere men who owe no responsibility to an electorate, but nevertheless they have the full force and effect of law.

Citizens today throughout the length and breadth of this great Republic are feeling the whiplash of bureaucratic process. These bureaucratic agencies of government, being operated by mere human beings, are lustful in their grasp for power. The result has been a duplication and multiplication and confusion of powers, all of which has resulted in a situation where the people of the Nation are now at last beginning to realize what being ruled by mere men instead of law means.

Do not misapprehend or misinterpret what I am saying. I fully realize that in order to conduct a successful global war, great grants of power, necessary for quick decision, must be lodged in the Executive. The difficulty, however, arises from the fact that this complexity of bureaucratic control over the lives and fortunes of the people of America, much of it unrelated to the war effort, was well under way long before Pearl Harbor. The exigencies of war have only added to the lust and grasp for more and more power. Is it not clear, therefore, that this centralization of power in the hands of the Executive, who is surrounded by a small group of "inner cabinet" advisors, results in effect in placing in the hands of one man or a small group of men the power to control the lives, liberty, and fortunes of the people? Does not this present situation meet every accepted test of Fascist government?

The defenders of this philosophy will immediately exclaim that it was accomplished through the medium of democratic process and that it is expanded and continued only because of the exigencies of war. As to the first of these contentions, I believe it only fair to state that in the delegation of power and authority to the Executive, Congress itself is charged with the responsibility. I do feel, however, that the influence of Executive persuasion manifested through the medium of tempting Federal judgeships or other juicy jobs, patronage, Treasury raids, useless spending, and the usual trappings of the spoils system, did away with much of the semblance of democratic process in the time before the war when these great grants of power were abjectly transferred to the Executive.

If we could be assured that it was the purpose and intention of the executive department of government to return these powers to the people at the conclusion of the war, we might not be so apprehensive. The fact is, however, that the propaganda is well under way now to try to make it clear that these emergent controls over the lives of our people must be retained in our post-war economy. These bureaucrats who have exercised such unlimited power will not surrender willingly when the crisis of war shall have passed. The American people are willing to sweat and to serve and to sacrifice in order to accomplish the ends of a just and lasting peace. More and more people, however, are becoming disturbed by the fact that this pattern of government now in vogue, most of it legally supposed to be temporary in character, may become a permanent pattern of government under a system of planned and controlled economy. There must be no interference with the necessary controls and regimentation incident to the successful prosecution of our war effort. It must be made clear, however, that we do not intend to permanently submit to the surrender of our fundamental rights when peace and order shall have been restored to the world. We insist that these great grants of power that have been thrust into the hands of the Executive shall be restored to the people through their Representatives in the Congress, and that any changes in our economy made necessary by post-war conditions shall result from congressional action rather than Executive order or decree. We insist that assurances be given that the pattern of government incident to national crises shall not be insidiously fastened upon us as a permanent pattern of government. We in this Nation want to be governed by law and not by the whims and caprices of mere men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, I would like to ask the gentleman to correct one statement he made to the effect that the President had gone contrary to the Congress on the question of subsidies. The last declaration, I will state to the gentleman, that Congress passed on was in favor of subsidies, and we have not made any declaration since that time. To that extent I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that his statement was in error.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, we want no return to the so-called good old days when entrenched privilege pillaged and raped the natural resources of our country and attempted to use the common people merely as pawns for the achievement of their own positions of affluence. On the other hand, neither do we want acceptance of a national economy, Fascist in character, based upon foreign ideologies.

We fully realize the responsibility of government in providing for human welfare. We know that governments are instituted to protect the people against special privilege, and that as conditions

change and society becomes more complex, it becomes the duty and obligation of government, through the enactment of just and equitable laws passed by the people's representatives, to provide for justice and equality of opportunity. We conceive it to be the duty of the Government not to act in the role of tyrant and master through the issuance of Executive decrees, but rather to provide safeguards for freedom of actior and freedom to work by assuming the role of constant arbiter between human rights and special privilege.

My colleagues, it is time for the people of America, regardless of party, to stop this Fascist threat here at home.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made a very fine historical speech, and most of us agree with him so far as his history is concerned. The gentleman, however, conveyed a message, or by innuendo left an impression, which is entirely without justification. He in his speech gave no bill of particulars.

What bill has been passed in the last 10 years, as he claims, that has a tendency toward fascism? In 1933, when the banks were threatened with destruction and when the President of the United States saved the banks and the deposits of 20,000,000 people; was that fascism? When the present administration under the leadership of President Roosevelt saved business, does the gentleman from Wisconsin say that was fascism? When he stepped in to help the millions of unemployed, innocent victims of the depression, and those dependent upon them, does the gentleman from Wisconsin say that constituted fascism?

I went to the church my conscience dictated me to go to yesterday morning. I know of no American whose freedom and liberties have been interfered with. I feel stronger today in the possession of those rights that make up personal liberty than I did 12 years ago when we were in the throes of an economic conflagration.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is shooting at the wrong target. He would be better off if he used as his target Hitler and Nazi Germany, Hirohito and vicious and imperialistic Japan, instead of a target that tends to bring about division among our people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WAGE INCREASE FOR RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to invite the attention of the Congress to a manifest injustice which should not only challenge its interest, but should also enlist the support of every impartial Member of this body.

More than a year has elapsed since the railroad employees of America sought in a peaceful and orderly manner to obtain a raise in their rate of pay comparable to the rise in the cost of living. Every fair-minded citizen who espouses the cause of economic justice and who recognizes the tremendous job that is being done so well by the railroads of this country under difficult conditions, realizes that the credit is largely due to the efficiency and fidelity of the employees of this great industry.

No one can deny that during this period an amicable settlement has been sought of this question, or that the employees have steadfastly followed and scrupulously complied with existing legislation. They have tried to compose their differences within the framework of the machinery set up to determine such questions.

These men have played the game fairly and have patiently followed the processes of negotiation and adjustment, while wage increases have been granted to compensate for the existing inequities in other industries.

Who are the men of whom I speak? They are some of the finest citizens of my district, of my State, and of the Nation. They are, first of all, fundamentally American. They believe in our form of government and support its institutions. They help provide for the maintenance of our schools, colleges, and churches. They frequently take an active interest in the affairs of their community. They buy bonds cheerfully and pay taxes with a minimum of muttering, as they unselfishly send their sons to battle, while they keep the wheels of transportation rolling and the sinews of war flowing to every front. No one appreciates more than they the gravity of the great struggle in which we are now engaged. No group of American labor is more devoted to the successful prosecution of this war or more determined to bring it to a victorious conclusion than are these men. Many of them, as well as the members of their families, are in the armed forces.

How big is their job and how well are they doing it? Without burdening you with a detailed recital of statistics, suffice it to say that in 1918 at peak performance, the railroads transported slightly over 400,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight, and handled about 43,000,000 miles of passenger travel. However, in 1942, with one-third less locomotives, one-fourth less freight cars in use, and 1,000,000 less employees than in 1918, these same roads transported over 630,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight, and handled 54,000,000 miles of passenger travel.

This is an amazing record which, according to reliable statistics, will be far surpassed this year—a matchless epic of performance, which is all the more impressive when you consider the difficulties under which the job is being done. The extraordinary demands made upon the railroads in wartime do not permit its equipment and rolling stock to be maintained at near perfection levels. Instead, the tremendous drain upon transportation facilities has made it necessary to do the best with what was available.

Railroading under normal conditions is a hazardous occupation, but in the stress of wartime, with insistent demands for the immediate delivery of precious cargoes of freight and passengers, it becomes doubly dangerous. Those engaged in this important industry must be mentally and physically fit. They must be able to withstand the rigors of temperatures ranging from 100° above to 50° below zero. They must accept snow, ice, and sleet in some sections and seasons as a matter of course, while at the same time seeing that the trains get through. Death frequently lurks in defective rails and switches, and from unseen and unsuspected sources misfortune stealthily strikes and able-bodied men are transformed into physical wrecks and hopeless cripples.

Truly, this is an industry that taxes the employee's physical capacity and health to the limits of human endurance. Yet these men have never spent an idle hour in the past 20 years because of strikes. They have never failed or faltered on the job. The record of their service is one of continuous devotion to duty and an abiding solicitation for the care of the property, equipment, and lives entrusted to their custody.

These men have bought millions of dollars worth of War bonds out of their earnings and savings, and I am reliably informed that they have applied for more War bonds than the Treasury has allotted them. This they do as they conceive it to be their duty as good citizens. They would like to continue the purchase of these bonds in the future in even greater amounts than in the past. But let me remind you that with the increase in taxes and the cost of living, together with the diminished family income due to so many of its members being in the armed forces, they will have to forego further purchases of bonds unless substantial adjustments are made in their wages and made now.

Unless this is done, what do you expect to happen to the morale of these men? Their faith in and their loyalty to the service has been attested in the following words which were taken from a report of the Lane Commission:

> That there has been such steadfast loyalty to the railroads, and so slight a disposition to use the lever of their necessity and their opportunity to compel by ruthless action an increase of wages is not without significance, and should not be passed without public recognition.

Mr. Speaker, that loyalty so eloquently referred to might quickly disappear and might easily turn to bitterness and dismay. This must not happen. The grave injustice of this situation can certainly be avoided by the simple expedient of approving an increase in wages for these loyal Americans, which will enable them to meet the rise in the cost of living and help carry the burdens of present-day taxation.

It must be remembered that no differences exist between management and labor at present regarding a raise in pay for the nonoperating railroad men. Both parties are agreed there should be an increase in pay of at least 8 cents an hour. But one bureaucrat here in

Washington in his imperious wisdom brushes aside this agreement and substitutes his caprice for the combined judgment of the men who best understand this problem—that is, the management and the Brotherhoods.

The railroads recognize that with increased business and improved earnings, they can afford a raise in pay of 8 cents an hour. It might be well to recall that in 1932, when the railroads were suffering, as all other businesses were suffering, a severe depression, the employees of the railroads took a cut of 10 percent in their earnings, and they did this out of a spirit of fairness, feeling that they should take note of the financial difficulties under which the roads were operating, and that they should help to keep the railroads running.

Intelligent management realizes the importance of keeping labor happy and contented, and in this instance, intelligent management has combined with labor in bringing about and seeking the approval of a wage adjustment.

What is the record of the Government in dealing with this particular problem? Why does it callously continue to refuse to approve of the raise agreed upon and frustrate the work and purposes of the management and the employees of the railroads? The patience of the employees has been taxed to the limit. The failure and refusal of an agency of the Government to approve the adjustments agreed upon is not only discouraging to everyone but demoralizing to the industry itself.

The records of this case disclose that in September 1942 the representatives of the railroad employees notified the companies of their desire to obtain an increase of 20 cents an hour, with a minimum hourly wage of 70 cents. The management denied this request. Then, in December 1942, management and the representatives of the employees endeavored to compromise their differences; and when this failed, the Mediation Board, in January 1943, undertook hearings. And when the interested parties were unable to reach an agreement, the President in February of 1943 issued Executive Orders Nos. 9172 and 9299, and appointed an Emergency Board to consider the question. Thereupon, after the Board had held numerous hearings in May of 1943 it recommended an increase in wages of 8 cents an hour. However, in June of 1943, Mr. Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, without any apparent justification and in complete defiance of the recommendations of the Emergency Board, denied an increase in pay. Then, in August of 1943, the management of the railroads and the representatives of the Brotherhoods reached an agreement based upon the findings and the recommendations of the Emergency Board increasing the rate of pay 8 cents an hour.

Since that time, Mr. Vinson has been in a complete official eclipse, insofar as the settlement of this question is concerned. He has done nothing, while the employees of the railroads have continued to carry on faithfully and unselfishly in the performance of their work. The railroads have been kept running and they have met the demands which the traffic of a nation at war has made upon them.

The official inaction of Mr. Vinson is matched only by his lack of understanding and appreciation of the importance of a solution of this problem now to the employees of the railroads and the industry itself.

It is an admitted fact that the rate of pay of the average railroad employee as compared with that of men of similar skill in other industries is concededly low. For example, skilled mechanics in railroad work receive only 95 cents an hour, whereas the rate of pay in other industries for the same work is considerably higher. In fact, the experienced railroad mechanic is paid a wage about equal to that of unskilled labor in certain other industries, yet unskilled labor of railroads receives as little as 46 cents an hour.

These men must pay the same rent, the same grocery bill, the same insurance, and virtually the same taxes as others receiving a higher rate of pay. In the end, there is little left for the railroad employee except the consolation that comes from the permanence of such a job by reason of the seniority gained through long years of service.

These men have not received increases in pay to the extent of 15 percent as recognized by the Little Steel formula, although that is the yardstick which has been used to provide the means for those in other industries to meet the rise in the cost of living.

Everyone devoutly hopes that it will not be necessary for the railroad employees of this Nation to resort to any other measures in order to obtain that which management agrees they are justly entitled to, and which every fair-minded American coversant with the case approves. Let me remind you that should these men become disgusted with the delay in disposing of this matter, and should a break-down occur in our transportation system, then this regrettable result would be due solely to official obstinacy and ineptitude, and what I believe to be administration maneuvering. The administration, in my judgment, is playing politics with wage-adjustment demands of railroad labor and thereby jeopardizing the efficiency of the Nation's transportation.

Mr. Speaker, it requires no strained construction of this deplorable affair to say that it bears all the earmarks of being made a political football. Mr. Vinson is the personal appointee of the President. So far as we know, he possesses little or no experience in the operation of a railroad and no interest in the mutual agreements of its management and employees. Mr. Vinson is not only the President's appointee but his alter ego in this matter. It is proper to conclude that Mr. Vinson was either acting under the orders or with the consent of the President in setting aside the recommendations of the Emergency Board and in since failing to approve the settlement reached by the railroads and the representatives of their employees.

To say that the President did not know of and did not approve of the conduct of Mr. Vinson in this case would be to conclude that the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth. Is there politics in this equation? Does the President propose at the eleventh hour to make a triumphant entry upon the scene, then dramatically override Mr. Vinson and have another board approve this agreement? And then claim that all the while he was the stalwart friend of labor and had saved them from this sickening situation?

It is not only well worth watching, but one could safely hazard the prediction that the President will at the appropriate time insist upon some other board or agency overriding Mr. Vinson's order and then claim the credit for the very small raise in wages to which everyone concedes these men are so justly entitled.

Mr. Speaker, the solution of this question does not lie with the Congress. It is beyond the power of Congress to intervene or to push Mr. Vinson off official dead center. However, the inexcusable delay and the responsibility for the failure to settle this question rests squarely upon the shoulders of the President and his personal appointee, Mr. Vinson.

The time is ripe—rotten ripe—for official action calling for the immediate approval of the agreement to raise the rate of wages of both operating and nonoperating railroad employees.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman's masterly presentation in behalf of the American railway worker and his condemnation of politics being played with the wage stabilization question. The gentleman has put the oil where the squeak is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. James Patton, president of the Farmers' Union, and a letter to him from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

TAXES AND INFLATION

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss a most important matter which affects the whole of the American people. I do not know of any proposal which is of more importance and demands as much attention as the question of taxation. The Treasury De-

partment has submitted to the Congress a request for the raising of ten and one-half billion annually in additional taxes. Secretary Morgenthau has emphasized to the Ways and Means Committee that should Congress follow his recommendations in raising this vast sum of money, the inflation spiral would be controlled and checked. Whether the full estimate should be provided at this time or a lesser amount, I will not attempt to discuss. To say the least, it is necessary that a tax bill be enacted as speedily as possible in order to meet the great demands of our war machine and to keep our Federal financial structure secure. It is the method by which the Secretary of the Treasury recommends that the revenues be raised that is so objectionable to anyone who would consider the facts.

Under the Treasury's proposal the taxpayer having a net income of $6,000 before personal exemptions were considered, would pay up to 28.3 percent, depending upon his family status. A person having a net income of $8,000 annually would pay up to 32 percent; $10,000 up to 35.5 percent; $15,000 up to 43.5 percent. The taxpayer would also be required to pay the 25 percent of the 1942 tax, one-half of which will be due and payable on March 15, 1944, and the remaining one-half on March 15, 1945. In addition to this, the State income tax and the other taxes he must also pay. Such heavy taxes would have the tendency to disrupt the plans of hundreds of thousands of families who are struggling to pay for their homes, purchase insurance, and educate their children. The Treasury's suggestion would relieve nine to ten million persons from the payment of the Victory tax and transfer this burden to the taxpayers in the upper brackets.

Recently I received a letter from a constituent who is an attorney, with regard to the excess tax burden now being borne by the middle income group. I quote from his letter:

Following is a comparison of my United States income taxes for the past 3 years:

	Taxable income	Tax
1940	$6,416.96	$155.13
1941	6,540.82	610.78
1942	7,998.68	1,531.61

For 1940 and 1941 the taxable income was practically the same, but the tax was practically quadrupled.

As between 1940 and 1942 the increase in income was approximately 25 percent, but the increase in taxes was practically 900 percent. The increase in income was $1,581.72, and the increase in tax was $1,376.48, which took all but $205.24 of the additional income, or more than 80 percent of it.

The 10 p. m. Columbia newscast on July 8 of this year included a Department of Commerce release stating that the cost of living was up 27 percent, wages were up 67 percent, and corporation profits were at an all-time high; and the commentator's conclusion was that salaried and professional classes "are taking the rap." The Commercial Appeal of July 23 carried a dispatch dated at Washington on July 22 attributing to the Department of Commerce a prophecy that by the end of the year savings and bank deposits may reach $100,000,000,000. In all of these statistics, the only one that affects the professional classes is the high cost of living.

We read almost daily that there must be new and higher taxes. Will they be made still higher for the fellow who has already been raised 900 percent in 2 years? Or will they be made higher for the people whose cash in bank is approaching one hundred billions?

If I am correct in thinking that an enormous inequity exists under the present pattern of income-tax law, cannot this discrimination be removed?

Should the proposal of Secretary Morgenthau be put into effect, this person's tax would be increased from $1,531.61 annually to approximately $2,500, an additional tax of about 60 percent.

The leaders of the Republican Party have announced that it will not favor an increase in the present individual income taxes, yet it gives no alternative or remedy for raising the badly needed revenue.

The administration has continued peacetime practices, including the 40-hour week with time and a half for overtime. On our Federal pay roll are 3,000,000 civilian employees. No wonder there is a necessity for the passage of additional tax legislation. Mr. Morgenthau made no mention of retrenchment in the operation of the departments of Government. I do not propose to cut necessary war appropriations one red copper cent; however, I am of the firm opinion that bureaus of the Federal Government can be consolidated and some of them eliminated completely. Much saving of useless spending has been brought about either through congressional action or forced upon the executive branch of the Government by Congress since Pearl Harbor. I refer to the abolition of the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the reduction in the appropriation for the domestic propaganda program of the Office of War Information, and others. It is imperative that Congress take definite steps to eliminate waste of public funds. This can, in a measure, be accomplished by a reduction of 300,000 employees from the Federal pay roll. This reduction in personnel can be effectuated without injuring the necessary governmental processes. It would make for more efficiency. In the year 1942 the Federal pay roll totaled $4,396,000,000. By cutting off 300,000 this would approximate one-tenth of the Federal employees and would result in a saving of $500,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very fine statement the gentleman is making. I agree with him in the splendid effort he is making to reduce expenses of government, especially with reference to nondefense activities. I wonder if the gentleman has seen the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that already during 1943 more than 100,000 employees have been dismissed from the Federal service.

Mr. GATHINGS. The Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman from Oklahoma is one of the ranking members, has made considerable headway toward economy, but more must be done. The reports I have read with regard to the civilian employees of the Government show that there has been a steady increase in their number, although the increase is not now as pronounced as it was 6 months or a year ago. However, with 2,600 lawyers in the Office of Price Administration doing work that could be accomplished by 100 lawyers, I am of the firm opinion that several hundred of them could be eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. Let me compliment him on the fine effort he has made in that direction. May I add that when the bill carrying the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration was under consideration I offered an amendment that would slice $50,000,000 from that appropriation.

Mr. GATHINGS. I recall that the gentleman did that. And that is not the first slash in governmental expenditures for which my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma has been responsible.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation at their quarterly meeting, September 3, 1943, adopted the following resolution:

We believe that fiscal and tax policies should be adopted that will retard inflation, that will be as nearly possible on a pay-as-you-go basis and will encourage the system of free enterprise.

I wanted to give the House the benefit of the thoughts and observations of that great farm organization.

Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1943, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial headed "Taxes—Or Inflation." It reads as follows:

If a satisfactory and adequate tax bill is not passed before the end of the year—if, as now seems possible, no tax bill whatever can be agreed upon—a serious inflation will be that much nearer. And the responsibility for this outcome will fall both upon the administration and upon the Republicans in Congress. Both sides now seem to be maneuvering with an eye principally on the 1944 campaign. Neither is facing up to the grim economic realities.

Let it be said to the credit of the administration that in the over-all amount it proposes to raise it has set its sights high. Its request for added revenues of $10,500,000,000 implies at least some recognition of the real dimensions of the inflationary gap. But, having set this goal, the Treasury proposed a set of taxes that failed to meet the situation. It was the Secretary of the Treasury himself who said: "We know where the bulk of the new money lies and where therefore lies also the greatest danger of inflationary pressure. Today four-fifths of all the income of the Nation is going to people earning less than $5,000 a year." He then put forward a program that was directed mainly against the other fifth of the national income. Indeed, his new program even proposed to exempt 9,000,000 present income taxpayers.

The administration has set itself against the one remaining tax that could yield substantial revenues and really reach the bulk of the country's income—a sales tax. Against such a tax it has brought extraordinary arguments. It has said that a sales tax would be inflationary. It has said that labor would

not stand for such a tax and would demand wage increases to compensate for it.

Let us see what it is that the Treasury is saying here, and what it is that it is approving. As a result of the war there has been a sharp curtailment of the volume of civilian goods remaining for consumers. The President and other spokesmen for the administration have again and again pointed out that because of this situation everyone must make sacrifices. But what has happened to industrial wages? Since the outbreak of the war living costs in this country have risen an average of 22 percent, hourly earnings of industrial workers have risen 41.8 percent, and weekly earnings of the same group have risen 69.3 percent. This means that industrial workers have not only retained their proportional share in national consumption, they have not only maintained as large an absolute consumption as ever, but they have actually increased their absolute command of civilian goods since the outbreak of war. This must mean that they have done all this at the expense of remaining groups in the country. Now administration spokesmen go before Congress and say, in effect, that industrial labor, which has made such gains, must not even be reached by a tax. The administration is telling such labor that it would in fact be justified in refusing to shoulder a tax and in trying to shift it on to someone else.

The argument that a sales tax would be inflationary does not deserve serious discussion, it is, in fact, perhaps the greatest single weapon remaining to us to curb inflation. The great cost of the war cannot be put on 5 percent of the population or even on one-fifth of the population. The increase of more than 20 percent in the cost of living that has already occurred since the beginning of the war is the equivalent of more than a 20-percent sales tax on every family in the country, with no exemptions whatever. The only difference is that no revenue from this unofficial sales tax goes to the Government to help pay for the war. It is dissipated among private groups.

But what of the Republican leadership in Congress? It sees the weakness of the administration's tax program. But it is apparently afraid to support a sales tax because of the political capital that it fears the administration would make of such support. Therefore, largely ignoring the extent of the inflationary danger, it talks as if no substantial increase in taxes were really necessary. It talks much of cutting out "wasteful" public expenditures.

The potential economies that could be made without danger to the war effort are great. But all economies are specific. The President can spend nothing that Congress does not authorize, and there are few expenditures that Republicans have had the courage not to approve. "We likewise recommend," said a statement of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee a few days ago, "that the President study the possibility of eliminating waste and extravagance in military expenditures." It has always been the duty of congressional committees to examine critically every request for expenditures for no matter what alleged purpose. Congressional committees cannot shirk this duty and then put the sole blame on the President for the result.

We are unlikely to get a satisfactory and adequate tax bill unless both the administration and the Republican Members of Congress display much more fiscal candor and courage than they have up to the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, every major war in history has been accompanied by inflation. The cruelest of all war taxes, and one most disastrous to the poor, is the hidden tax of inflation. Already war inflation has imposed upon the American people a hidden tax of 25 percent, which for the poor is equivalent to a 25-percent gross income tax. Eric A. Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, predicts for us an additional increase in the cost of living of 25 percent in 1944. All are agreed that the $156,000,000,000 of estimated national income for the year 1944 will exceed the total of available goods and services at present prices by at least $40,000,000,000. There are varying estimates of what percent of that inflationary gap will go into voluntary savings, but the most accepted estimate is $20,000,000,000. This would leave an additional $20,000,000,000 of "hot money" to enter the market place in competition for a diminishing supply of consumer goods. If, in the fall of 1936 and spring of 1937, the spending of a billion and a half of soldier bonus money gave us a temporary boom, when there was no curb on production, the inflationary effect of 13 times that sum may well be imagined. For the current fiscal year the Treasury Department estimates expenditures for all purposes at $107,000,000,000 and revenue at current rates at $39,000,000,000, exclusive of social-security taxes which would add $1,200,000,000 of trust-fund money, which would later be replaced. State and local taxes are estimated at $10,000,000,000. If we withdraw for governmental and war purposes a total of $51,000,000,000 from the American people, they will still have left twice the amount of money they had during the depression years of 1932, 1933, and 1934, although the goods available for domestic consumption will probably sink to the level of those depression years, at least in volume.

In this emergency we need to encourage thrift, pay off debts, buy War bonds, insurance, and contribute to other forms of personal savings. It is necessary during this war that a wage control be effective. It is also essential that we siphon off surplus purchasing power through taxation in order to reduce Government borrowing from the commercial banks, which is definitely inflationary. We should at the same time curb reckless spending in Government departments, which is definitely deflationary. Four-fifths of the entire national income is in the hands of those income earners whose wages are $5,000 a year or less, and two-thirds of the total income of the country is in the hands of those making $3,000 or less. The only practical, fair, and feasible way of reaching that great volume of war income is by means of consumer taxes. A wartime tax should serve two purposes—to raise a maximum of badly needed revenue and to discourage the inflationary purchase of scarce goods. The sales tax does both—it would permit income tax exemptions to be raised; it would establish a convenient and equitable method in which everyone would contribute to the financing of the war. In applying consumer taxes, the express provision should be written into the act that farm machinery, tools, implements, fertilizer, seed, and feed for cattle, hogs, and poultry should be exempt from such tax. Further increase in personal taxes curtails savings and dries up gifts to charity and at the same time only has little effect upon inflationary spending.

Additional income taxes plus reduction of personal exemptions, to bring other taxpayers into the income-tax field, will further complicate a tax structure already so involved that it approaches the point of unworkability. The increase in the personal income-tax rate will eliminate the profit incentive motive, leaving many with nothing except the spirit of patriotism to urge them to increased effort at a time when increased production is vital. The charge that a sales tax, known to be deflationary, can be made the instrument of inflation through wage increases can easily be met by a statutory provision that war sales taxes, like war income taxes, be considered by no Government agency in establishing an index of the cost of living or in considering demands for wage increases. The charge that a sales tax will fall with undue severity upon the very poor can easily be answered by the issuance of stamps in amounts sufficient to offset the impact of the new tax. Another method also could be used, and that is to increase income-tax exemptions, particularly for the married man with a family.

That will leave only the political argument against the sales-tax proposal which charges that organized labor is opposed even in a grave war emergency to any tax system that requires everyone to contribute something and which no one can successfully evade.

I cannot believe that the American Congress will fail to measure up to its responsibilities by courageously providing needed revenue for our gallant heroes who are so bravely fighting for the continuation of American ideals and principles. The sales tax is the practical and logical solution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have followed the gentleman's address with a great deal of interest. I certainly think he has given us considerable food for thought. I notice the gentleman recommends certain exemptions, and I believe that probably if the sales tax is put into effect it will be necessary to have certain exemptions, or else you are just going around and around.

The question I wish to ask is this: What amount of revenue could reasonably be expected to be derived from a sales tax if there are exempted the items mentioned in the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is expected that there would be derived from $5,800,000,000 to $6,200,000,000 from such a tax.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is that on the basis of a 10-percent retail tax?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes, on a 10-percent consumers' tax.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman exempt only those items he mentioned in his remarks, farm tools, farm machinery, and things used in the production of food, as I gather it?

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct. I would exempt those things just as I would exempt the articles that go into the production of food crops and other agricultural crops, food, and fiber.

Mr SPARKMAN. Would the gentleman exempt food, medicine, things essential for everyday living, or would he include them?

Mr. GATHINGS. The object of such a tax as I see it is to produce the needed revenue and reduce consumer purchases of scarce merchandise. This question should be carefully weighed.

Mr SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman believes a sales tax would be the most effective way of discouraging unnecessary spending?

Mr GATHINGS. Absolutely. There is no doubt at all but that the sales tax is the only reasonable and proper solution to discourage the spending of money by those who draw high wages from war employment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman may recall that 2 or 3 years ago the Treasury Department suggested some kind of a spending tax. I believe at that time not much attention was given to it, but I have often wondered if there would not be a great deal of merit in resurrecting that spending tax at this particular time and placing a rather steep tax or penalty on unnecessary spending. I am wondering if that would not prove to be a much greater deterrent to spending than would a consumer's retail sales tax.

Mr. GATHINGS. That should be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, but that would not take the place of a sales tax which is needed to get the revenue and which treats all alike. I believe we should all bear the burden of the cost of this war in which we are now engaged. In my judgment, the sales tax is the best way to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore adopted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED LIVESTOCK CEILING PRICES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration has announced a new method of dealing with ceiling prices on meat. Under the present situation the ceiling price is fixed on meat sold at wholesale and on retail sales. It is now proposed the sale of beef shall be controlled by the reflected value of the animal after it has been slaughtered. In other words, the packer and the processor will buy live cattle subject to the grade of meat after they have been slaughtered. For example, choice steers will have a maximum live price of $16. Good steers will bring a top price of $15.25; medium grade cattle, $13; common grades, $11; cutters and canners, $8.25. These are the maximum prices that may be paid, and minimum prices of approximately $1 per hundred are proposed, and the packer and processor will continue to receive the subsidies now being paid of $1.10 per hundred live weight. This, in my judgment, is impractical and wholly unworkable. There are so many different kinds and classes of livestock that it is almost impossible to put them into the classes and categories indicated under such proposal. You just cannot put two or three dozen different kinds and classes of cattle in a half dozen strait jackets and make it work. The proposal, I am advised, does not have the approval of any livestock organization nor the meat board. I do not think it even has the approval of the War Food Administration.

Several months ago the Office of Price Administration ordered a roll-back on the retail price of beef of about 10 percent and agreed to make up the difference by paying a subsidy from the Federal Treasury. The price of live cattle immediately went down more than $1 per hundred pounds, and since then has declined all the way from $1 to $3 per hundred. A subsidy of $1.10 per hundred has been paid ever since the roll-back order to packers and processors of this country. It might interest you to know that more than $3,500,000 has already been paid in support of the roll-back order. Of course, the farmer and stockmen did not get any of the money. They just got the roll-back. The $3,500,000 was paid to the packers. Also let me remind you again that although meat is a most important item of food it constitutes less than one-fourth of the amount the average consumer spends for food. The farmer gets only a small share of that. Now it is proposed under this order that no one has agreed to except officials in the Office of Price Administration, that livestock men and farmers shall be further regulated by an attempt to put ceiling prices on live cattle, but they propose to do it by the way of the back door.

Mr. Speaker, all of the rules and regulations that have been ordered by the Office of Price Administration on meat and livestock have confounded and confused the farmers and livestock men to a place where they not only have been discouraged but have crowded the livestock markets with cattle, with runs that have outnumbered our markets in many years. Three weeks ago there were more cattle on the principal markets of this country than we had in more than 25 years. Here are some figures. During the period of September 13 and ending with September 27 this year there were 861,400 cattle sold on our 12 principal markets. A year ago the figure was 100,000 less. Thousands of these cattle should have been finished but went to slaughter pens. Just last Monday, a week ago today, there were 64,800 cattle sold on the Kansas City market, the largest for any market in the world's history. Mr. Speaker, the livestock producers of this country are entitled to a fair deal. They should not have and do not expect exorbitant profits for their products, but they are entitled to have the assurance from their Government that they shall have a fair price for their products on a basis of what they are required to pay for the things they buy.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has asked our farmers and producers to increase the production of food. The American producers are willing to do everything they can to comply with that request. After all, they are among the most patriotic of American citizens. They want to do their share and more. All they ask is for a fair deal at the hands of their Government. I just do not believe they are getting it. The paralyzing of the livestock market by the Office of Price Administration regulations is bound to show up in a shortage of meat within the next year. All of which is unnecessary and without justification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for 10 minutes.

AUDITING OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1942, I introduced a resolution to cancel Executive Orders 9001 and 9023. These resolutions are the subject matter of testimony of Comptroller General Warren before the Military Affairs Committee. Had the resolution been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee and voted upon by the House, there would have been no necessity for Mr. Warren appearing before the Military Affairs Committee. The resolution 284 that I introduced on February 25, 1942, would have canceled the Executive orders that give the War Department purchasing officers power to audit their own contracts to the exclusion of the Comptroller General's Office.

Mr. Warren claims that by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, he is entitled to audit all contracts of the executive departments. The Executive orders removed the power of the Comptroller General over War Department, Maritime and Navy Department contracts for the manufacture of the sinews of war, and nine other agencies.

I sought at that time, and I am seeking again today, to have the Executive orders canceled. If the Congress adopts my resolution which I am reintroducing today, some 12 agencies of the Government will not have the power to audit their own contracts. The Comptroller General will have that power. It is significant that the Comptroller General did not urge the adoption of my resolution in February of 1942. The legislation before the Military Affairs Committee to which the Comptroller General is addressing his remarks now only touch upon the relationship of the General Accounting Office and the War Department. If my resolution is adopted, the same one I introduced in February of 1942, the issue will be met with 12 agencies that have been added to the list by the President with power to audit their own accounts to the exclusion of the Comptroller General.

There is only the matter of $5,000,000,000 involved in the War Department contracts; there is much more than this in the $220,000,000,000 unexpended balances for war purposes that the Comptroller General ought to audit for these 12 agencies.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, will you not look into this problem and see if good government does not demand and require that a separate agency like the General Accounting Office fulfill its responsibility under the Budget and Accounting Act to audit all of these war contracts?

I notice in Business Week the following article:

A WHIP TO CRACK?—NEW UNIT MAY COMPOSE DIFFERENCES OVER TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS AND RECONVERSION, BUT WHO'LL HANDLE THE SETTLEMENTS?

Now that the White House has taken a hand, it looks as though the free-for-all fight over termination of Government contracts will end in a series of compromises.

NEW POLICY UNIT

Acting on the President's orders, War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes has just set up a new unit to work out policies for termination and post-war conversion.

Procurement officers think that with O. W. M. cracking the whip, the services at last will get together and agree on the uniform termination policy they have been kicking around since the start of the war.

JOB FOR CONGRESS

Although establishment of the new O. W. M. unit will simplify things, it won't solve the big problem of whether settlements on canceled contracts shall be handled by the procurement agencies or by the General Accounting Office. That is still a job for Congress.

Until a few weeks ago, the services were making termination payments on their own, assuming that their legal authority to make contracts gave them power to settle up when they canceled an order. Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren kicked the props from under this theory with a letter to Congress insisting that his General Accounting Office was the only outfit with the authority to take care of claims against the Government.

A DEEPER SPLIT

The split between the services and the Comptroller General is something more than an ordinary consequence of departmental imperialism.

The procurement agencies are thinking primarily in terms of getting money out fast, so that contractors will have enough working capital to start reconversion to peacetime production.

G. A. O. is thinking of the possibility of padded claims and fraudulent cost estimates that may slip past if termination settlements aren't audited like any other disbursement.

COMPROMISE SPIRIT

As things look now, Congress will try to straddle the fence. One proposal that appeals to a good many Congressmen is to delegate G. A. O. representatives to work with the procurement officers on termination settlements. Should the G. A. O. man make no protest, the Army or Navy could arrange settlement and make final payment. In any case that looked suspicious, the G. A. O. representative could call for a detailed audit.

The big hitch here is that the Comptroller General doesn't have a large enough staff to put a man on every settlement team.

Ordinarily, G. A. O. would have no objection to expanding, but the current shortage of accountants and trained contract men may rule out the idea.

CENTRAL BOARD?

To economize on G. A. O. manpower and to get uniform administration, some Congressmen advocate a central board made up of representatives of the services, the War Production Board, and the Comptroller General.

The board would determine policy, draw up general rules, and review contested cases. Actual settlement would be handled by procurement officers of the various services. If O. W. M.'s new unit takes hold fast, Congress may make it the central board.

Procurement officers say that Congress also will have to give them a specific grant of authority to make advance payments on termination settlements. (Debate over whether the services had the power to make advance payments was one of the main things that held up adoption of the uniform termination clause for Government contracts.)

SEEK PERMISSIVE AUTHORITY

Although the services believe in advance payments, they want the grant of authority to be purely permissive, leaving them free to refuse advances in specific cases. Contractors, on the other hand, are pressing Congress to make advance payments mandatory.

The odds are that Congress will try for a compromise on this problem, too. It probably won't make advances compulsory in all cases. But it is pretty sure to set up a system of mandatory loans for small companies and contractors who can show hardship if payment is delayed.

WHICH TO CANCEL?

One problem that Congress can't handle, except in a general way, is the question of which contracts should be canceled and when. From the contractor's standpoint, this is one of the most important points of all.

If the Office of War Management's new unit can handle the job, it may get most of the responsibility for drawing up an overall termination program. A good many other agencies—the services, War Production Board, the Office of Civilian Requirements—would like the job, but the chances are that a central coordinating agency, like the Office of War Management, will come out with final authority.

FAST WORK NEEDED

Whichever outfit handles termination policy, it won't have long to plan its program. Present production schedules call for a net reduction in the number of Government contractors, beginning in the first quarter of 1944.

If Germany collapses next year, the war program, now set for $76,000,000,000 next year, will be cut back to an annual rate of about $40,000,000,000 or $50,000,000,000, possibly even less.

In any case, most of the eliminations of contractors from the program will come before the end of the war, either by expiration or by cancelation.

SIX BILLIONS CANCELED

Dollar volume of contracts canceled has passed the impressive total of $6,000,000,000, more than the value of all contracts terminated at the end of the last war.

But most of them haven't been hard to handle. About three-quarters of the cancelations to date have involved no claim against the Government, because they were incident to the placing of a new contract.

Settlements have been slow, averaging around 8 months. One reason for this is that contractors are busy with other war work and don't get around to filing claims.

SPEED-UP DUE

Even so, procurement officers admit that they will have to step up the whole procedure within the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think Business Week's suggested solution solves the problem. The Budget and Accounting Act intended for the Comptroller General to do the very job that Business Week suggests that Jimmie Byrnes or some other executive department of the Government will do.

I hope that my joint resolution will be adopted and that the Comptroller General will be the executive agent of Congress to audit these contracts.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes after the other special orders have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for 10 minutes.

PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Petroleum Administration for War goes merrily on with its program of refinery expansion and gasoline restriction. Mr. Ralph Davies, vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, is head of the Petroleum Administration for War, and he is assisted by representatives of many other major oil companies. The Petroleum Administration for War is authorizing the building of new refineries and the junking of presently existing and operating plants.

Down in Louisiana and in other southern and western States the Government is now building or has just completed building new oil refineries, using Government money and credit. It looks on without protest when existing plants now running at capacity, producing high-grade gasoline, for both war and civilian needs, are torn down and destroyed. The Cities Service Oil Co. is about to complete its large new refinery at Lake Charles, La., financed to a large extent, if not entirely, by the Federal Government, and I am glad to see the plant there. At the same time at Bossier City, La., the Louisiana Oil Refining Co. plant, the largest interior refinery in the State of Louisiana, has announced that it will completely close down its plant January 1, 1944. This refinery was built by private capital and has been operated for many years entirely by private capital. It is at this very moment producing efficiently thousands of gallons of gasoline each day to be used for both civilian needs and the war effort.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. As I understand it the Louisiana Refining Co. is a subsidiary of Cities Service.

Mr. BROOKS. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. And the refinery to which the gentleman has referred I understand is presently operating, making gasoline, and is soon to be torn down and moved.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that it has been announced that it will close down January 1, 1944, and will not resume operations.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Is it not a fact that the Petroleum Administration for War is urging increased production of

gasoline and the different products of petroleum that go into the war effort?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct, and I may say to the gentleman, too, that this refinery is located in an area in which there have been two and perhaps three new oil fields discovered within the last few months. Those fields need developing very badly. The oil can be taken out of the ground within 40 miles of that refinery and brought to the refinery and manufactured into refined petroleum for the use of the war effort and the civilian economy of the Nation.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement in view of the fact that we are suffering an increased shortage in refined products to meet our war and civilian economy. Certainly this matter is of so much importance that the attention of the Oil Administrator for War should be called to it, and he should see to it that our present operating refining facilities are not torn down but are operated to increase the output.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman may rest assured that I shall send the Oil Administrator for War a copy of the remarks that I am now making.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, New England is vitally interested in that program. What does Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, say to the gentleman?

Mr. BROOKS. I have dealt with the P. A. W., which is composed of the representatives of the large major refining companies of the United States. They are the ones who are familiar with the situation and are handling it; and they simply tell me that the refinery is going to be closed down on the 1st of January.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it because it is too expensive for them to operate, or is the P. A. W. closing it down?

Mr. BROOKS. No; they indicate that the trouble is a shortage of oil, but the point I am getting over is this: They are building new refineries, financed to a large extent by Government money. On the other hand existing refineries producing petroleum products are being closed down.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me that there ought to be an investigation.

Mr. BROOKS. It seems so to me also.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Can the gentleman advise the House as to the product of gasoline that is coming from this refinery?

Mr. BROOKS. It is 87-octane gasoline. It is the kind of gasoline that you use in your motorcar today. In fact, it is superior to that which you are using today in Washington in your motorcar.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Of course, 100-octane gasoline is one of the products which we are endeavoring to obtain increased production of and, because of that, our production of so-called premium gasoline is being reduced tremendously, on account of the present activity toward increasing 100-octane gasoline. Is that true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. May I ask the gentleman further: The fact is that this refinery is presently operating in the middle of the oil field; is that true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. The type of crude produced there is sweet crude and so-called sour crude, is it not?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Does the gentleman know whether or not this particular refinery has refining facilities to run sour crude?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think it has refining facilities to run sour crude, some of which is produced in the gentleman's district. I will say this, the refinery has been there operating, to my certain knowledge, for over 20 years, operating entirely on private funds. In the midst of a great war when we need refined petroleum and petroleum products more than we have ever needed them, they proceed to close down this refinery and to divert oil that is being consumed by this refinery hundreds of miles south.

I might say incidentally that the Government is now financing a pipe line to come from Houston by way of Lake Charles and pick up this same oil that is produced in my territory and in the gentleman's territory and bring it back within 40 miles of that refinery, on its way east.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Is it not a fact that the Government could extend the facilities of the present refinery for the production of byproducts from crude petroleum much cheaper and more economically than it could by constructing new refineries?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. Had the P. A. W. seen fit to enlarge that plant and put in a 100-octane unit, the products from that plant might have been consumed within 5 miles of that refinery by Army bases in that area.

I am informed that the process of tearing down this refinery has already begun, and that material is now being moved away. On the one hand is a refinery financed by the taxpayers of the Nation just being completed, and on the other hand is one privately financed and privately operated which is about to be torn down and junked.

I have received letters from many of the employees of the Louisiana Oil Refinery at Bossier City, La., who have told me that they have already been informed of the termination of their jobs. They have been urged to sell their homes where they have lived for many years and move to a distant point, accepting a new job. They do not want to move in the midst of a great war to a new community unless it is absolutely necessary in order to win this war.

Mr. Speaker, the situation I have portrayed to you arises in my own State. This is not the only instance, however, where new plants have been built and financed by the Government under the guise of the war effort, putting out of business privately built and operated plants. At the very time when there is a most acute shortage of critical materials and when high-grade steel is worth almost its weight in gold, millions of tons of materials vitally needed in the war effort have been uselessly consumed. The labor of thousands of our workers has been uselessly expended. Inconvenience, dislocation, and confusion has been caused by moving employees from one place to another from their homes to work at distant plants. The Petroleum Administration for War, headed by such men as Mr. Davies and other high officials in the major oil companies, must know that the day of reckoning is ahead. They must know that they cannot justify the building of new plants, Federally financed, in time of war, and the destroying of existing plants built with private capital and badly needed in the war effort.

In the meantime, the shortage of gasoline becomes more acute, and private business and industry of the Nation suffer almost to the point of extinction by the existing shortage of refined petroleum products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

KENNETH M. GRUENNERT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I recently read the citation which accompanied the posthumous award of a medal of honor to Kenneth E. Gruennert, an American sergeant of Infantry, for an act of supreme bravery near Buna, New Guinea. It impressed me once more with the special quality of individual heroism which our ground troops are called upon to display in this terrible war.

I confess that I feel a great sense of humility when I consider the almost unbelievable courage with which our soldiers are overcoming a ruthless and cunning enemy on battlefields all over the world. And I believe their deeds affect other Members of this House.

I mention Sergeant Gruennert's name because I know what he did. He advanced alone on hostile Japanese pillboxes which were holding up his platoon and put two of them out of action with grenades and his rifle before he was killed by snipers. For this display of conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action above and beyond the call of duty our highest decoration was awarded.

In their daily contacts with the enemy thousands of our infantrymen are performing acts, strictly in the line of duty, which call for such bravery under fire that they have raised the basic definition of a doughboy's duty to a very high level of courage, indeed.

Although I am informed that the basic principles of warfare do not change,

they are being applied quite differently in this war from the tactics of a quarter century ago. Instead of great, unwieldy armies, locked in trenches, we have small, highly mobile forces with mobile firepower. The maneuverability of today's artillery and its swift accessibility to any point of resistance requires the dispersal of men to minimize losses. Defense becomes a matter of small pockets of strength whose destruction will not cause the collapse of an entire position. Offensive is equally the advance of small, dispersed units, heavily armed.

This new type of warfare has put a heavy responsibility on the individual infantryman. He is a member of a combat team and he has been schooled in its maneuvers. But the success of the combat team in battle often depends upon the initiative of its individual members.

Hard training has made the infantryman a master of individual, personal combat, and I should think that this, more than anything else, has given him the superb self-confidence which permits his incredible feats of heroism. His mastery of surprise, his training in concealment, and in advancing without exposing himself to fire have given him an assurance which makes him simply unbeatable in the field.

You must feel, as I do, an excited admiration for these fine young Americans. Wherever I am I find that I cannot help but talk about them, trying to impress others here at home with what is happening on the roads, in the hills, and in the jungles overseas. There is something very inspiring in the realization that these men are conquering an enemy who has been taught that war is a natural way of life. There is something very reassuring in the knowledge that these men, nurtured in liberty, are taking the measure of legions toughened in a philosophy of slavery.

As an American I take deep pride in these accomplishments. There was a time when some of us wondered if the pioneer's strength, which had made our Nation great, was ebbing away on the soft tide of civilization. These men are the answer to that. These men, superbly armed, superbly conditioned, superbly trained as fighters. These men who, like Sergeant Gruennert, are not afraid to die if death is the price of victory. These infantrymen who fight with their weapons, with their hands, and with their hearts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a newspaper report of Mrs. Roosevelt's visit overseas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. MOTT (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. MAAS (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. IZAC (at the request of Mr. VINSON of Georgia), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. STEAGALL (at the request of Mr. STARNES of Alabama), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 11 a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The hearing which was scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 a. m., on the bill, H. R. 3334, relating to certain benefits to trainees in the Maritime Service, has been postponed until Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands Tuesday, October 26, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 1288, H. R. 3428, and H. R. 2641, and such other matters as may come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a hearing Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

874. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget relative to determining the number of employees required by the various units of the Department of Justice for the proper and efficient exercise of its functions for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

875. A letter from the Chief, Division of Budget and Accounts, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 for the Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for "General Administration, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

876. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting the information with respect to the number of persons needed for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

877. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting a revised copy of Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements for the Quarter ending December 31, 1943, covering regular operations of the Office of Civilian Defense; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

878. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a copy of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the second quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

879. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting one set of the Commission's requests for personnel for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

880. A letter from the War Food Administrator, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 330. Resolution for the consideration of S. 763, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 789). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Second interim report pursuant to House Resolution 30, Seventy-eighth Congress. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 2616. A bill to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 399. A bill for the relief of John Sims; with amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis; with amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1737. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1760. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten; with amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Nadine Gorman; with amendment (Rept. No. 796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Tom S. Steed; without amendment (Rept. No. 797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2792. A bill for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis; with amendment (Rept. No. 800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3512. A bill providing for the relief of contractors' employees on Wake Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3513 (by request). A bill to amend section 1313 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3514 (by request). A bill to liberalize the definition of widow of a veteran of World War 1 and World War 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3515 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3516 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to amend the Schedule of Disability Ratings, 1925, as amended, and make same applicable to ratings of veterans of World War 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3517 (by request). A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3518. A bill to facilitate the termination financing of war-production contracts of the Department of the Navy and subcontracts thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 3519. A bill to extend the excess-profits-tax exemption relating to strategic minerals to income attributable to the mining of fluorspar and the production of hydrofluoric acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3520. A bill to provide adjustments in the retirement classification and pay of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3521. A bill to give veterans preferential rights to purchase "jeeps" and other military vehicles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3522. A bill to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3523. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors or of other subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3524. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Harpers Ferry National Monument; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3526 (by request). A bill to amend section 33 of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 28, 1934; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3525 (by request). A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of death compensation benefits to widows and children of World War veterans under Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 3527. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3528. A bill to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3529. A bill to provide for loans to enable veterans of World War No. 2 to pay debts existing at the date of their discharge from the service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3530. A bill to authorize the construction and extension of certain marine hospitals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to suspend the provisions of the law relating to compulsory retirement for age of officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 49. Congressional resolution to enable members of the armed services to vote by absentee ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 331. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 332. Resolution recognizing the invalidity of Executive Orders No. 9001 and 9023 dated December 27, 1941, and January 16, 1942, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. Res. 333. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1649; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3531. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Russell H. Quynn, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3533. A bill for the relief of Ernest H. West; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of George S. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Billie Stooksberry and Lon L. Stooksberry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3536. A bill for the relief of H. A. Wilson, W. B. Conner, and Charles E. Hilliard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Bessie Eason; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3538. A bill for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan, to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3539. A bill for the relief of Carlos Manuel Perez Silva and Nilda Concepcion Ramos Perez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3540. A bill granting a pension to Oscar O. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3151. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Frank Tims, of Waxahachie, Tex., favoring House bill 3396; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3152. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Petition signed by Rev. Victor Hourez, pastor, and 55 members and friends of the Second Four Square Church of Long Beach, Calif., urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3153. Also, petition signed by 60 members of the Bethany Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Rev. Earl J. Edwards is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3154. Also, letter from Rev. Herbert C. Tweedie, pastor of the Community Presbyterian Church of Long Beach, Calif., and petitions signed by 36 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3155. Also, letter received from Mrs. Georgia S. Zimmerman, director of religious education, Lynwood Methodist Church, Lynwood, Calif., and petitions signed by 31 members of that church, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3156. Also, petition signed by Rev. J. T. Kraft, pastor of the Lutheran Church of Long Beach, Calif., and 36 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3157. Also, petition signed by Rev. Louis R. Lee, pastor of the Baptist Evangelistic Church of Compton, Calif., and 28 members of his congregation, uring the passage of House bill 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3158. Also, petition signed by Rev. William Harvey Beard, pastor of the West Side Church of Christ of Compton, Calif., and 43 members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3159. Also, petition signed by 184 members of the First Methodist Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Dr. George W. McDonald is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3160. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. John Farabee, of Joliet, Ill., and 24 citizens, urging early favorable consideration of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3161. By Mr. MAHON: Petition signed by J. J. Atkinson, N. W. Allphin, and 105 other residents of Lynn County, Tex., urging passage of House bill 836; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3162. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of May Hukill and others of Carthage, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Wagner-Murray bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3163. By Mr. SHAFER: Resolutions of the Michigan Petroleum Association, relative to supply and distribution of petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3164. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of E. S. Perrine and others, of Taney County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3165. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Bertha Junk Darby and nine other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3166. By Mr SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of North Charleston, W. Va., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3167. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Newspaper Guild of St. Louis, Mo., signed by 754 workers in the mechanical, commercial, and editorial departments of the St. Louis Metropolitan Newspaper, strongly urging the passage of proper legislation providing for subsidies as recommended by the President feeling that such subsidies will play a part in halting inflation and enabling a roll-back of prices to the September 1942 level. They further urge the passage of such legislation in the interest of maintaining a sound domestic economy and decent living standards; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3168. Also, petition of E. J. Eskilson and 46 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3169. Also, petition of R. M. Renz and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3170. Also, petition of Henry H. Berberich and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3171. Also, petition of George Kiburz and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3172. Also, petition of W. R. Stogsdill and 218 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3173. Also, petition of Mary Withum and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3174. Also, petition of Oliver M. Openlander and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3175. Also, petition of William R. Hays and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3176. Also, petition of S. R. Nelson and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3177. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Ruedlinger and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3178. Also, petition of W. J. Dracopoulos, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3179. Also, petition of T. J. Dracopoulos, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3180. Also, petition of the Continental Baking Co., of Washington, D. C., and signed by 72 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3181. Also, petition of the Covered Wagon, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3182. Also, petition of the Elks Club, of Washington, D. C., and signed by 47 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3183. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. John P. Blum, of Puyallup, Wash., and 110 others, urging that to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, Congress should prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States of America for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization and, therefore, requesting Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Mr. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3184. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Mrs. A. J. Abling, of Blissfield, Mich., and signed by 31 other residents of the community, urging the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3185. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 196 residents of Brunswick, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; requesting Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; and requesting that the petition be referred to the proper

committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3186. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Clara B. Mead, of Pomona, Calif., and 17 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3187. Also, petition, of Maude E. Remington, of Pomona, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3188. Also, petition of Martha Davis, of Pomona, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3189. Also, petition of Jennie B. Wilferth, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3190. Also, petition of Helen W. Macfarland, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3191. Also, petition of Shick MacDonald, of Alhambra, Calif., and nine others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3192. Also, petition of Mary J. Hill, of Monrovia, Calif., and 34 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3193. Also, petition of Birdie J. Wright, of Alhambra, Calif., and 19 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3194. Also, petition of Pearl M. Boileau, of Pomona, Calif., and 20 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3195. Also, petition of Olive S. Persons, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3196. Also, petition of Hattie M. Cannon, of Pomona, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3197. Also, petition of Harry G. Earle, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3198. Also, petition of M. E. Bridgeford, of Pomona, Calif., and seven others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3199. Also, petition of Clara M. Lee, of Pomona, Calif., and four others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3200. Also, petition of E. B. Brand, of Ontario, Calif., and six others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3201. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Strehlon, of Hollywood, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3202. Also, petition of C. C. Nevins, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3203. Also, petition of G. W. Mack, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3204. Also, petition of Irene V. Arnold, of Monterey Park, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3205. Also, petition of Mrs. James Wheatley, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3206. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy Schubarth, of Pomona, Calif., and nine others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3207. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy P. Duffield, Jr., of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3208. Also, petition of Lila Lusher, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3209. Also, petition of Alice S. Spencer, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3210. Also, petition of Mrs. Frankie Mae Patch, of Arcadia, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3211. Also, petition of Mrs. L. S. MacDougall, of Arcadia, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3212. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Russell, of Arcadia, Calif., and 18 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3213. Also, petition of Rev. E. B. Hager, of Monrovia, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3214. Also, petition of Moses Breeze, of Los Angeles, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3215. Also, petition of Wilma Freeman, of Arcadia, Calif., and 16 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3216. Also, petition of Mrs. J. C. Baldwin, of Arcadia, Calif., and 23 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3217. Also, petition of Martha Riford, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3218. Also, petition of Birdie J. Wright, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3219. Also, petition of Evia M. Walker, of Monterey Park, Calif., and five others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3220. Also, petition of Peter Beck, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3221. Also, petition of John M. Kephart, of Wilmar, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3222. Also, petition of Roselma B. Riggs, of Garvey, Calif., and 68 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3223. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3224. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Celia B. Zaner and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3225. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution by the subcommittee of the California guayule rubber committee, at San Francisco, Calif., recommending that the Rubber Reserve Corporation contract for the production and purchase of guayule and that the present emergency rubber project of the United States Department of Agriculture be made the agent of the Rubber Reserve Corporation to represent them in making such contracts, and that a price be determined for the delivery of rubber produced from the guayule shrub at the end of 1, 2, 3, 4, or other agreed number of years, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3226. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of Hon. Francis D. Culkin; to the Committee on Memorials.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O faithful Shepherd who dost neither slumber nor sleep, we are the people of Thy pasture and the sheep of Thy hand; in Thy will is our freedom; Thy rod and Thy staff comfort and keep us. Until Thou, good Shepherd, dost capture our hearts, wandering without direction on the plains of peril, we mistake the license which enslaves for the liberty which makes free indeed.

We would remember that other sheep Thou hast which are not of our fold. For all Thy people hasten the day of deliverance, when there shall be one shepherd and one fold in a common unity against the wolves of want and fear, tyranny and exploitation. May we so guard the treasures of our freedom, bought with a great cost, that we will not allow the fight for freedom to destroy the freedom for which we fight. May the crimson threads of today's fearful sacrifice be woven into the very fabric of society in a fairer pattern of opportunity and equality for all. We ask it in the Saviour's Name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 25, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 964. An act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; and

S. 1132. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on public matters.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DRAFT DEFERMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (H. DOC. NO. 343)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 25, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There has recently been much loose and harmful talk about the employees of the Federal Government. In an effort to discredit those in the public service, groundless charges are being made and irresponsible rumors circulated that the Federal Government is a haven for draft dodgers and slackers.

In simple justice to the many fine, public-spirited, and devoted persons in the Government employ, these unfair accusations must be emphatically denied.

Here are the true facts concerning the draft deferment of Government employees. I am sending them to you so that they may be made a part of the permanent record.

On July 31, 1943—the latest date for which complete figures are available—there were in the Government service 2,825,904 full-time employees, men and women, in the continental United States, less than 9 percent of whom work in Washington. According to the latest available information, it is estimated that there were 154,500 additional civilian employees outside the continental United States, the greater part of whom were working for the War and Navy Departments or for the Panama Canal.

In addition, there were 145,808 part-time paid employees, such as consultants, specialists, and forest-fire fighters. Two hundred fifty-one thousand six hundred and sixty-three persons were working without compensation or for $1 a year, such as members of local ration and draft boards and industrial advisors. It has been the Government's policy not to seek deferments for part-time or uncompensated employees or for dollar-a-year men. We can thus at the outset dispose of about 400,000 persons who under no circumstances can be regarded as draft dodgers.

Of the 2,825,904 full-time, paid civilian employees in the United States, 1,952,700 men and women, or more than two-thirds, are employed by the War and Navy Departments. Let us consider first these civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments.

The greater part of them are engaged in war production in Government arsenals, ordnance plants, powder factories, and navy yards, or in essential work at Government depots, warehouses, proving grounds, air bases, naval training stations, and Government hospitals. They consist of engineers, draftsmen, mechanics, skilled artisans, procurement experts, scientists, specialists, and administrative personnel. They perform many difficult and important functions with regard to the far-flung supply, production, and other problems of the Army and Navy.

If the items of war material now being made in these Government-owned plants were produced, instead, in civilian-owned plants, the working men and women would be the very same civilians—and in the same number. And they would be deferred as essential war workers the same as other essential war workers are deferred.

Those who constantly bemoan the rapid growth of Government pay rolls usually overlook the fact that it takes hundreds of thousands of men and women to produce guns and ammunition in Government arsenals and to construct and repair battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines in Government navy yards, the same as in privately owned and operated plants. One hundred percent of the battleships now in construction, 43 percent of the aircraft carriers, 10 percent of the cruisers, 8 percent of the destroyers, and about 31 percent of the submarines are being built in these Government yards. Our civilian workers make 86 percent of the Garand rifles built in this country. These are just a few examples.

The War and Navy Departments, like private manufacturers, must see to it that production is not disrupted by the drafting of their workers before systematic arrangements for their replacement are made. Accordingly replacement schedules, similar to those used in private war plants and factories, have been prepared for most Army and Navy civilian workers. Deferments for such workers in these departments operate on the same basis as in private industry, viz, the deferment lasts for a limited period of time, during which new people—women or older men or younger boys—are trained to take the place of those who are inducted into the Army or Navy, except those who are indispensable and irreplaceable. These replacement schedules have to be approved by the Selective Service System before they become effective.

The vast majority of these 1,952,700 civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments consist of women, men below or over draft age, men who have been classified as physically unfit, and fathers. According to the records of Selective Service, less than 5 percent of all of the civilian employees in these departments, or about 84,000, have been deferred for occupational reasons. Men of draft age are constantly being released for military duty and are being replaced in accordance with replacement schedules. This record is much better than the occupational deferments in private industry.

Those civilians in the Army and Navy who have been deferred are preponderantly workers in the field outside of Washington. Thus, of the 36,672 departmental employees of the War Department in Washington, 364 are now de-

ferred. Of the 19,000 departmental employees of the Navy in Washington, only 1,016 are now deferred. Those deferred are primarily engineers, draftsmen, naval architects, and other technical personnel.

If the slackers are not harbored by the War and Navy Departments, have they found their haven in the other Government departments and agencies?

No employee in the other Government departments and agencies is allowed to request his own deferment from his local draft board. No local draft board is allowed to defer any Government employee on occupational grounds unless the deferment has been requested by the employing agency and has received the approval of an independent Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees consisting of three public officials and organized by Executive order.

Derferment will be approved by this Review Committee only in the case of Government employees who occupy key positions, or who are engaged in highly specialized and essential work or who possess unique fitness and skill which are difficult to replace. The concept of a key position is narrowly limited to positions requiring an unusual degree of responsibility and specialized skill, and involving serious difficulty of replacement.

It is clear, therefore, that the standards of deferment of Government workers are much stricter than those governing deferments in private employment. A worker in private industry, unlike the Government employee, may request his own deferment, even though his employer does not see fit to do so. There is no agency in private industry comparable to this Review Committee of the Government which passes upon job classifications and carefully scrutinizes claims for deferment of workers. Nor, in private industry, is deferment limited to employees who hold key positions. Finally, the fact that the worker is engaged in any of the 2,000 occupations classified as essential by the War Manpower Commission may properly be considered by the local draft boards in the case of private workers; but, despite the fact that Government service has been classified as an essential activity, the local draft boards cannot defer a man in Government service, not on a replacement schedule, except in accordance with the foregoing rules. The Government, moreover, is handicapped by the fact that, due to budgetary limitations, it cannot always take on and train new employees to replace men who are about to be inducted.

I am informed that some local boards, on their own initiative, have granted occupational deferments to some Government employees without any prior request of the Government. Many of these deferments were obtained before the Executive order establishing the Review Committee was issued. These deferments are now unauthorized. We are actively searching out such cases and when they are discovered, appropriate action is being taken.

The figures compiled by the Review Committee reflect the strictness of the Government's policy on occupational deferments.

The Post Office Department is the largest employer in the Government after the War and Navy Departments. It has 315,741 employees, of whom 307,817 are located outside of Washington. These are the men who deliver the mail and operate local post offices. No deferments have been sought by the postal authorities for any employees with the single exception of postal inspectors. These inspectors are engaged in highly skilled work requiring years of experience. They investigate postal frauds, check the accounts of the local postmasters, and do important work for the Army and Navy. Only 61 men—all of them postal inspectors—have received deferments. Twelve of these 61 are fathers. The number deferred is, therefore, less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total Post Office personnel.

The Post Office certainly does not look like a haven for draft dodgers.

Of the remaining Government employees, nearly half are women. About 119,380 are men of draft age (exclusive of a few small agencies whose reports have not yet been submitted). Of these men, 25,537 are single, 26,195 are married without children, and 67,648 are married with children.

Let us turn first to the 25,537 single men. By August 15, 1943, 3,582 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction, ready to go into the armed forces; 11,667 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service; and 1,502 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 2,743. The lack of information with respect to the classification of these employees is due, in part, to the failure of some individual employees to report promptly to the Government their induction or any change in their draft status, and to the delays involved in compiling figures received from the field. Occupational deferments had been received by only 6,043.

I should like to analyze these 6,043 somewhat more in detail:

A. One thousand and seventy-seven of these are in the Department of Commerce;

One hundred and ninety in the Bureau of Standards are engaged in scientific work of prime importance to the war;

One hundred and thirty-nine in the Weather Bureau are meteorologists or weather observers;

One hundred and seventy-eight in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are engaged in exploration and mapping of coastal-defense waters;

Five hundred and fifty-four in the Civil Aeronautics Administration operate the network of Federal airways used almost exclusively now by Army and Navy aircraft;

Thirteen in the United States Patent Office are physicists, chemists, and scientists, studying patents of potential value in this mechanized war;

Three are bureau chiefs.

B. There are 1,225 single men in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who are in class II. These agents investigate cases of espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities, and perform other duties so intimately related to the war that they might easily be considered members of the armed forces.

C. Another 1,800 employed by various agencies and departments are overseas, many in actual combat zones. These consist mainly of employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey charting north Pacific waters, civil aeronautical personnel engaged in air traffic control and airways communications, radio monitor operators, operating railway workers, F. B. I. agents, operating and maintenance employees of the Panama Canal, technicians, engineers, pilots, members of the Foreign Diplomatic Service and representatives of foreign economic agencies.

D. Among the other deferred are 132 radio operators and radio technicians in the Federal Communications Commission, 337 engineers and geologists in the Department of the Interior, 352 specialists in the Department of Agriculture engaged in the inspection of food, the growing of guayule for rubber, in the protection of our national forests, or in the protection of our farms against plant or animal disease, 60 inspectors protecting our borders against illegal entry or smuggling; 60 scientists in the United States Public Health Service or the United States Food and Drug Administration; 278 scientists, engineers, and chemists in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority engaged in construction of flood-control dams and the building and operation of power plants; and 84 in the Maritime Commission supervising our ship-construction program.

This accounts for 5,455 of the 6,043 deferred single men. The remaining deferred employees occupy key positions in the various departments and agencies.

If the normal experience of Selective Service holds true with this group, about 40 percent would be ineligible, anyway, for military service by reason of their physical condition.

Nonproduction Federal employees abroad, i. e., those not engaged in actual production of war materials or facilities, are now being individually examined by the review committee to make certain that those only physically unfit for military service or those possessing exceptional qualifications are granted continued deferment.

The same holds true of the 26,195 married men without children in the Government employ. Of these 26,195 men, 5,287 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction on August 15, 1943, 6,730 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service, and 5,635 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 594.

The number deferred for occupational reasons was 7,949. Like the single men, they are all engaged in work essential to the prosecution of the war, and their

cases have been carefully examined by the review committee. Here, too, about 40 percent would be found ineligible for military service by reason of their physical condition.

There are, besides, 2,003 uniformed personnel running the War Shipping Administration training organization and 14,050 cadets receiving training in the training organization schools for service in the merchant marine, who have also been deferred. These men are not really part of the civilian establishment of the Government.

The broad, over-all, unfounded charges of "draft dodgers" in Government service are particularly unfair to our Federal personnel. I am convinced that they are anxious to put on their country's uniform and that they have been kept, often against their will, in their present jobs. Their Government itself, and not the men as individuals, decided that they could be more useful to its war effort where they are.

This attempted discrediting of the public service is also unfair to the many who left the Government to enter the armed forces and who plan to return to their positions after the war. Unfortunately the statistics of those ex-employees of the Government now in the armed services are incomplete, but their very number would silence the mud slingers. As of January 1, 1943, there were 238,154 Federal employees in the armed services. The estimated number today is approximately double that amount—or about a half million.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget (Executive Office of the President), the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense (Office for Emergency Management), the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS—PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of Honolulu, T. H., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CARE OF ALL WAR VETERANS—RESOLUTIONS OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have embodied in the RECORD two resolutions from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

To the Committee on Appropriations:

Whereas due to the ever-increasing number of applicants for hospitalization and domiciliary care in the various veteran facilities in the United States, by veterans of World War No. 1, the capacity of said veteran facilities are becoming inadequate; and

Whereas, due to the insurmountable number of applicants of World War No. 2 who are, and will continue to be, enrolled in the present veteran facilities, adequate room in said facilities are now overtaxed to the extent that applicants of World War No. 1 are having "No vacancies" written across their application for hospitalization: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Hillyard Post, No. 1474, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, request the Seventy-eighth Congress of these United States to appropriate $500,000,000 to be earmarked and placed at the disposal of the Veterans' Administration for the building and equipping of adequate veteran facilities, for the increasing number of applicants for hospitalization and domiciliary care.

To the Committee on Finance:

Whereas it being a fact that there are numerous Federal hospitals built and in operation throughout the United States to provide convalescence of servicemen of World War No. 2; and

Whereas due to the state of emergency caused by World War No. 2, an inadequate condition has arrived that in some States there are no facilities available for hospitalization and domiciliary care of veterans of other wars; and

Whereas it is a fact that there are many vacant beds in these convalescent hospitals, idle medical staff, nurses, orderlies, and other attendants on the pay roll in these Federal hospitals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Washington, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do request the Congress of these United States, by an act, do authorize the use of Federal hospitals by the Veterans' Administration of these United States, for veterans of the past and future wars declared by this Government. Said use for those veterans in need of hospitalization and domiciliary care.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 25, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 425. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn;

S. 514. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 694. An act for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

James W. Johnson, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York, in place of Joseph T. Higgins, resigned; and

Thomas M. Carey, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan; and

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, vice Steve Franklin Hamm, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

John J. Haggerty, of Maryland, to be comptroller, Post Office Department, vice William L. A. Slattery; and

Sundry postmasters.

ANNIVERSARY OF WRIGHT BROTHERS—JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution of the Senator from Ohio will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90), expressing on the fortieth anniversary the gratitude of the Nation on the achievement of the Wright brothers in making a heavier-than-air machine was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, House bill 2924, to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada, to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have in my hand a letter from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, which states that such action is agreeable to him. A bill which I believe is almost identical is already pending before the Foreign Relations Committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change of reference will be made as requested by the Senator from Texas.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. EASTLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

USE OF POST-OFFICE CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS INTERCHANGEABLY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Postmaster General may, in an emergency, when the interest of the Service

requires, temporarily assign any post-office clerk to the duties of city delivery carrier or any such carrier to the duties of such clerk and in an emergency, when the interest of the Service requires, may temporarily assign any post-office clerk or city delivery carrier to the duties of a railway postal clerk or any railway postal clerk to the duties of a post-office clerk or city delivery carrier without change of pay-roll status, the compensation of any temporarily assigned employee to be paid from the appropriation made for the work to which he is regularly assigned.

SEC. 2. This act shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY AT ANNUAL MEETING OF INDEPENDENT TIRE DEALERS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Independent Tire Dealers, held at New York City, N. Y., on October 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRESS OF THE WAR AND THE SOLDIERS' RIGHT TO VOTE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of voting by soldiers, delivered by Senator LUCAS before the National Association of Secretaries of State, at St. Louis, Mo., on October 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSE CLEANING IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "What America Needs Most Is a Thorough House Cleaning in Washington," delivered by him on October 25, 1943, and a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 86, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE PRO AMERICA ORGANIZATION OF WOMEN

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON before the Pro America Organization of Women, at Newark, N. J., on October 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY RESOLUTIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Post-War Foreign Policy Resolutions," delivered by Senator HATCH, on October 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY WAR DEPARTMENT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PRISONER-OF-WAR CAMPS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the administration of prisoner-of-war camps, prepared by the War Department under date of October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS BY FOREIGN GROUPS—STATEMENT BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, superintendent of the International Reform Federation, relative to the sale of intoxicating liquors by foreign groups, as proposed by Senate bill 1338, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEXAS NATURAL GAS SHOULD BE KEPT AND USED IN TEXAS

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Texas Natural Gas Should Be Kept and Used in Texas," prepared by Mr. W. N. Blanton, executive vice president of the Houston (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

PASSING OF MONARCHY—EDITORIAL FROM THE JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Monarchs," published in the New York Journal-American of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY, COLLEGES, AND COMMUNISM—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Army, Colleges, and Communism," published in the New York World-Telegram of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATIONS—LETTER FROM C. E. CHILDE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of Freight Rate Discriminations, addressed to him under date of October 21, 1943, by C. E. Childe, member, Board of Investigation and Research, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT BY DOROTHY THOMPSON ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION SPEECH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson commenting on the recent address on transportation problems delivered by the Vice President at Dallas, Tex., published in her column "On the Record" in the Washington Evening Star of October 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION—ARTICLE BY BARNET NOVER

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "We Are on Our Way," written by Barnet Nover, and published in the Washington Post of October 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WIN THE PEACE WHILE WINNING THE WAR—STATEMENT BY A. D. QUAINTANCE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by A. D. Quaintance, of Denver, Colo., with respect to the organization of the United Nations of the World, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to an editorial entitled "Legislative Sabotage," which was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The editorial appeared in the Washington Post, the issue of October 22, since the Senate voted on the so-called Federal school-aid bill.

I should like to commend the Post's straightforward and clear-cut analysis of the sorry action that ended the Senate's consideration of the aid-to-education bill last week. Let me repeat the editorial's comment on the opponents of the measure who shuddered so violently over the spectre of Federal control:

First they amended the bill to make it fit their accusations. Then they applied the garrote.

It is a bitter irony that the amendment which undermined and defeated the bill was offered as an assurance to an element of our people and a region of our land whose need for the benefits of the bill were greatest. For me this irony has a further embittering twist in that the amendment, which would have in effect undertaken to readjust, indeed, to revolutionize the relationship between the white and colored races of the South, against the will of both, was offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in whose State of almost three-quarters of a million population, there live but 201 Negroes.

This issue of the reconstruction period had a strange resurrection. The Negroes of the South were not to be taken in this time by any "40-acres-and-a-mule" slogan. They knew that the Langer amendment was not calculated to improve the southern interracial accommodation. They knew it was not calculated to increase the share of money for the education of colored people. The responsible Negro educational leadership were mindful of reconstruction history; they remembered the history of carpetbag crusaders; they knew the Langer amendment was offered but to kill the bill.

Paraphrasing a sentence of the Post editorial, I should like to say to the Members of this body that while the causes for the defeat of this bill may have been sectional, the consequences of its defeat will be national.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], I wish to serve notice that later this afternoon I will offer for the RECORD an editorial from a leading newspaper of South Carolina and a letter from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, exactly 29 minutes ago the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Legislative Sabotage," from the Washington Post, and made a little speech thereon. I stated at that time that I would quote an editorial from South Carolina and a letter from Tennessee. In reply to the Senator from Tennessee I shall first read the letter from Tennessee:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *September 22, 1943.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: I wish to thank you for the amendment sponsored by you in the Federal teachers' aid bill. Many people have been following this fight and, win or lose, many poor people thank you. I am speaking of simple people like me, people who are fighting for the right to be just people.

Respectfully yours,

LEE J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, I have before me an editorial from the News and Courier, a

daily of Charleston, S. C., of Friday morning, October 22. The editorial is entitled "Sound and Honest," and I respectfully call it to the attention of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and ask them to read the remarks they made after the majority of the Senate had voted 40 to 37 in favor of my amendment. I also call the attention of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] to the editorial. I emphasize to these Senators the fact that the editorial comes from the South. I now read the editorial:

SOUND AND HONEST

The amendment of Senator LANGER prohibiting racial discrimination in the spending of money to be appropriated by Congress for schools, which has "killed the bill," was a sound, an honest amendment. The southern Negroes are citizens. To appropriate from the national Treasury money for citizens' schools and leave to States the "right" to discriminate against some of the citizens would have been mean, disgraceful. Too many southern Congressmen have been supporting this measure. The Langer amendment has turned them against it. It has exposed them. It has made them ridiculous. Once the Federal Government shall begin to spend money for schools, it should and will know how the money is spent. It has no right in law or morals to permit discrimination in the spending of it, and the effect of the Langer amendment on southern Senators is proof that they expected their States to get the money and to engage in the discrimination. The News and Courier has opposed the $300,000,000 Federal appropriation for schools because Federal interference with schools was necessarily implied by it. That would be ruinous to the South. Southern Congressmen could not see so plain a thing. Senator LANGER has conferred a benefit on the South. He has saved Southern States from making another sale of themselves for a song—or a sop.

Mr. President, in view of what the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee said earlier today:

The responsible Negro educational leadership were mindful of reconstruction history; they remembered the history of carpetbag crusaders; they knew the * * * amendment was offered but to kill the bill.

I serve notice now that tomorrow at the first opportunity which may be afforded me, I shall present to the Senate quotations from leading Negro organizations of the United States of America.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1151) to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2886) to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion, training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1951. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; and

H. R. 3313. An act to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1951. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; and

H. R. 3313. An act to amend section 10 of the act of March 3, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," as amended.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], inserting after line 9 a new section.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the forceful and eloquent statements made yesterday by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have in my judgment made out a case for the resolution now pending before the Senate. I do not hope, I cannot hope, to add to the weight and persuasiveness of their presentation. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee which labored through long weeks with the problem presented by the several resolutions submitted to us. I joined in the report of the subcommittee, and I voted in the full committee for favorable committee action. In the circumstances, it seems proper to me to place before the full Senate the considerations which determined my committee votes.

Mr. President, I had original regret that any of these resolutions was before the Senate, and for a long while there was in my mind substantial doubt as to the wisdom of Senate action upon any of them. Certainly the President, upon whom rests the burden of initiation of policy and of negotiation in the field of foreign problems, has not asked us to assume his obligations in this regard or to advise him with respect thereto. New England ancestry and New England teachings cautioned me against forcing upon another unsought advice. I felt strongly, too, that we could not, in the changing present and with respect to an uncertain future, chart a course that might have in it greater danger of error than promise of good.

But Mr. President, the anxious study given to the various resolutions from which was evolved the committee's draft, or the Connally draft, and the thoughts with respect to the problem made known to the committee by many persons of high estate, and my desire for unanimity in committee recommendation persuaded me that I should join in the support of the resolution before the Senate. I give it my unqualified approval, and, as will the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, I shall oppose all amendments to it. I take this somewhat extreme attitude in opposition to amendments through no pride of participation in the committee's work, but because of my conviction that if we attempt to redraft this resolution upon this floor, we shall find ourselves in troubled waters, sailing an uncharted sea, with no known haven of safety. Mr. President, already a flood of amendments impend. Already the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida has in its few days of life undergone substantial change in form and substance. I venture the assertion that further study of this language by its proponents will bring further suggestions of change. I repeat, if we undertake the writing of this resolution upon this floor, we may bring forth a document for which all may wish to deny responsibility.

Mr. President, what is the purpose of all these resolutions? I think they represent the effort of Senators to state the great objectives of these United States in this war effort and in the world which is to follow the cessation of hostilities. I believe they are all an effort to state the aspirations of the people of our country. Does the resolution of the committee do this? I assert that it does.

First, Mr. President, the Senate is asked to resolve that the war against all our enemies shall be waged until complete victory is achieved. Is not this the first and great objective of America? Is it not clearly and affirmatively stated? Who would be satisfied with less? Who would ask for more?

Second, the resolution declares it is the purpose of the Senate to have the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and an honorable peace. Does not this objective commend itself to all? The thought might be expressed in many different words and phrases by many Senators, but would not their efforts arrive ultimately at precisely the same result? And if this be so, should we not unitedly accept this language upon which the committee so long studied?

Third, the Senate is asked to resolve that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Here to be sure is general language, but there are definite objectives clearly stated, and these are the prevention of aggression and the preservation of the

peace of the world. Again I ask, Is not this what the mothers and fathers and boys of America want? I venture that the people of our country have but a remote interest in the steps by which we attain these beneficient ends. The resolution suggests appropriate means by and through which these hopes may be realized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I shall be glad to yield to him.

I believe in respect for our constitutional processes. The resolution seeks to assure this regard. I would welcome our joinder with free and sovereign nations in establishing international authority to prevent aggression and to preserve peace. I want this authority, whatever its specific form or title, to have power appropriate and necessary to achieve our declared ends. I do not welcome efforts to amplify or to particularize as to the ways and means to be employed. I would not obscure the objectives or embarrass negotiations of the future by an excess of particularity now.

Mr. President, may I call to the Senate's attention an objection of moment, so it seems to me, to efforts to write this resolution in terms of specifications. What will be done at the peace conference will be determined there and not here. Whatever we write in a resolution is in the nature of authority to the President in his conduct of our foreign relations so far as the Senate can give it, and it is equally, in its definite terms, a limitation upon the President's freedom of action. And not only will it partake of the nature of a directive to the President, but it will as well inform other nations of what we expect of our representatives at the peace table. I do not believe it will contribute to a full and free conference of nations. I do not believe it will add to the effectiveness of our negotiators, if we announce to Great Britain and Russia and to all other free and sovereign nations that they must accept the machinery and the means proposed by amendments now pending before us for the working out of the problems of the world to be. I repeat, these will be the achievements or the failures of the peace conference.

Mr. President, the people of the State of Maine want this country to face the world unafraid; they would have America's voice raised in behalf of international law, codified, expanded, vitalized; they want a world of law, of order, of security, and of peace. Mr. President, they believe that such a world means a happier, a better, a richer life for all mankind. They want America, their children, and the generations yet unborn to share these blessings. They are willing to bear their part of the burdens involved in the attainment of these ends. They will sustain the President of the United States and all others in authority as they strive for the realization of these ideals.

Mr. President, I know of no greater contribution we here gathered can make to humankind than promptly to pass this resolution. Let the world know that the Senate of the United States stands united in this declaration of glorious purpose.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought I understood the able Senator to speak of assurance that there would be adequate power to carry out the objectives of the resolution. What power does the Senator contemplate would be possessed by this international authority, which might prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world?

Mr. WHITE. I think that is a matter to be determined by the nations when they meet. I assume that an authority will be set up, or that existing authority will be used, and that one or the other, or both, will have conferred upon them the power to do, as I expressed it, whatever may be necessary and appropriate to the attainment of the ends.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator contemplate that this international authority, which by the terms of the Connally resolution would have the power to preserve peace and to prevent aggression, would be vested with an international police force?

Mr. WHITE. The future must answer as to whether it is to have an international police force or not. Personally I believe that if we are to do this job effectively in future years, there must be a military force to effectuate the conclusions at which the governing body may arrive.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has been very kind. Will he yield once more?

Mr. WHITE. I yield once more. I see trouble looming up on my left. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Does the able Senator believe that the pending resolution fairly informs Senators that they are voting for this international authority to have a police force or military power at its disposal?

Mr. WHITE. I cannot answer definitely for other Senators, but I know what it means to me, and I believe that it means substantially the same thing to the other members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator said something about trouble on his left. I assure him that I rise in the utmost good faith. I think I know something of what the Senator believes as to international relationships, and what the part of this country is to be in years to come. I respect those views, and perhaps agree with him 100 percent. However, something which he said just now caused me to rise. If he can, I wish he would enlighten me. The Senator said that the resolution was, first, a declaration of war aims. I thought that was all the Senator had in mind. That shows the benefit of waiting until the Senator had finished. Later in his remarks he said that it was in the nature of advice to the President.

Mr. WHITE. I think that is the constitutional invitation which comes to us, and I assume that the resolution is in response to the constitutional suggestion, although I did say—and I think it is true—that the President had not asked us for advice, and that I was brought up to look with suspicion on unsought advice.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator then said that the resolution was in the nature of a grant of authority, or advice to the President.

Mr. WHITE. I assume the President will take notice of the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator also said that it was in the nature of a limitation. I am particularly interested to know what limitation would be placed on the President by this resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I am not timid about the resolution as it was reported from the committee; but the thought I wish to convey is that as we particularize in a resolution, if the President gives any heed to it at all, we limit the sweep of the President's discretion.

Mr. HATCH. If limitations are to be placed, by amendments or otherwise, then certainly the original resolution has the same force of limiting the powers of the President to the confines of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; except that it is pretty general language.

Mr. HATCH. It amounts to a warning, perhaps, to other nations of the world. What I am trying to find out—and I merely wish the Senator's opinion—is what limitation, if any, would be placed on the right of the President by the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I do not say that there is such a limitation in the resolution as reported by the committee; but I think that every time we go into details, add a qualifying phrase, or incorporate new matter in the resolution, we step over into the Presidential prerogative and advise him to follow the Senate rather than his own inclinations.

Mr. HATCH. From the answers which the Senator has just given, I interpret his meaning to be that under the resolution as reported by the committee there is in reality no limitation upon the President by the language of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I think that is true. I think it states outstanding objectives and that is about all it does. It pledges our loyalty to the principle of constitutional process. But aside from that, it is a statement which is reasonably clear to me of the major objectives of this country.

Mr. HATCH. It is not intended as a limitation upon the powers of the President, or as a warning to other countries that he is limited to the confines of this particular resolution?

Mr. WHITE. I believe I have answered the question to the best of my ability.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Maine knows the high respect which I have held for him, particularly for his

ability as a draftsman of legislation, during all the time I have been a Member of the Senate.

I was somewhat surprised by his statement that under the present circumstances he would not accede to any amendment to the pending resolution, no matter how good the amendment might be. Does the Senator feel that the fourteen Senators, including myself, should not take with regard to our amendment, the same position he has taken with regard to the resolution reported by the committee?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not wish to assume the privilege of advising other Senators. I will allow the Senator's own conscience to be his guide. However, as it came from the subcommittee, the pending resolution, represented the composite view of the members supporting it in the subcommittee. Many of us yielded something of our own inclinations in order that we might present a united report from the subcommittee to the full committee. I am anxious at this time that the Senate in the action it takes shall present to the world as complete unanimity as it is possible to bring about. I will give the Senator advice because I believe he has asked for it. If the Senator wants my advice, it is that he and others having like mind should yield, as some of the others of us did in the committee, their present inclinations and make the pending resolution a unanimous declaration of the people of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has referred to concessions which were made by various members of the subcommittee. Did his statement include the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHITE. It most assuredly did. The Senator from Texas was patient and courteous, and he gave of his great abilities to the effort to frame a resolution upon which we could all stand, and which could be presented to the world as the united voice of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As the Senator knows, the junior Senator from Ohio joined three other Senators in the submission of a resolution on March 16, 1943.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator also knows that in the consideration of the resolution by the subcommittee of which the Senator from Maine is a member, the four Senators to whom I have referred, who submitted Senate Resolution 114, have yielded to the views of others, or have modified their views, and have endeavored to go as far as they could toward meeting the situation, and have now submitted an amendment to Senate Resolution 192, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Therefore, it seems to me that Senators who are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee should have the same opportunity to present their convictions that has been accorded to members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have not suggested to anyone that debate should be curtailed. I am perfectly willing that the debate continue indefinitely. But I cannot help remarking that I hope that in the end the Senator will get his conscience under control, and that he will do what I recommend, namely, unite with the proponents of the pending resolution in giving to the world a showing of unanimity.

Mr. BURTON. What I wished to inquire about was the Senator's statement that he felt he could not accept any amendment to the original resolution, no matter how good it might be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator has put language into my mouth that I did not use, but I do not object to it.

Mr. BURTON. I used the words "no matter how good."

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The point is this: Suppose the amendment presented by the 14 Senators through the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] should be adopted by a majority of the Senate; would the Senator from Maine decline to vote for the resolution as amended?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is undertaking to commit me to something in the future. I will meet the problem when I have to. I am not looking for trouble. I have found enough of it already.

Mr. BURTON. But there is at least the possibility that under the circumstances I have mentioned the Senator might not vote for the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. I should then face the alternative of taking a negative attitude and voting against the resolution as amended, or going along with it. I will labor with that problem when I come to it.

Mr. BURTON. We are faced with the choice either of voting for a resolution which means very little, or an amendment to it which would make it of substantial value.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot agree with the Senator's premise. I think the amendment in its present form is subject to serious objections. I have not undertaken to analyze it on the floor of the Senate, but I believe that before the time for voting arrives the Senators themselves will alter the amendment.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, in the formative days of this Republic it was possible for us to be isolated because of the great wide oceans which separated us from other nations. Ocean travel was long, arduous, and dangerous.

That isolation has long since vanished. It gradually diminished because of the advent of ships operated by steam, resulting in speedy passage. Then came the airplane. The day the first airplane crossed the ocean marked the end of the doubtful isolation which we once enjoyed.

Isolation is simply a matter of transportation. There is no isolated spot if it can be reached speedily. It is said that even now there is no place in the world which cannot be reached within a space of 60 hours from any major airport. It should take no other statement than this to prove that isolation for America is archaic. But, Mr. President, air transportation is yet in its infancy. No one can envisage its future.

Today there are flying war machines which can easily and speedily cross the ocean carrying death and destruction as their cargo. It is a wonder that the Capitol in which we serve has not suffered from German air raids. In every room in this building, even now, there are warnings with instructions what to do in case of a raid.

In the tomorrow this danger will be multiplied many times. It would be possible for great air fleets carrying death-dealing missiles to lay waste this and other great American cities. If we here now permit to fail an effort to prevent such a catastrophe, we accept a responsibility too great to be considered.

Despite the efforts of a great President to prevent it we could not avoid entry in the last World War. Woodrow Wilson knew that should another war occur, we would not be able to remain aloof. He sought to prevent this by the formation of a league of nations which would provide for international cooperation in preventing war. It was largely our fault that this effort failed.

There is a growing number who believe that had his plan of international cooperation for peace been given a trial, the present terrible conflict would have been avoided.

Instead of joining in international cooperation to preserve peace, we again reverted to isolationism. We went even further than that. We entered upon a well meaning but totally fallacious policy of disarmament. We sank our ships and almost disbanded our Army. Other nations joined in somewhat the same course.

This weakening of military strength of the United States, France, and England gave the dictator nations their opportunity. Japan, long covetous of areas owned by other nations, began her theft of these lands. The objective was accomplished with such ease that Japan sought to expand her robberies.

Mussolini, once of Italy, taking a leaf out of the book of the Japanese, also traveled the same road of international burglary. He was successful for a time, even though his efforts were the greatest bluff in history.

This situation was made to order for the Prussian military machine. It permitted them to rearm and rebuild for the day when they would make another attempt against the peace and security of the world.

The result was that the time intervening between the signing of the last peace treaty and the beginning of the present war was simply an armistice period which the Nazis used to their advantage. If we fail to heed this record now and decline to seek to collaborate with our allies to prevent other dictators from again plunging the world into war, the time intervening between the victorious peace which is to come and the next conflict will be but another armistice. Again war will come. Again we will be drawn into it.

Mr. President, the ink was scarcely dry upon the signatures to the last treaty of peace until the German war machine was again at work to rearm for the next attempt against the peace of the world. One of the most valuable assets of those in Germany who framed the next assault was the most skillful propaganda machine the world has ever known. It was of great aid in avoiding the penalties of defeat. Such was the power of this propaganda that the world was caused to feel so sorry for Germany, that it has been said that instead of that nation making reparation payments, the victors were paying Germany.

Our Nation was not the only one adversely affected by the German propaganda machine. So insidious was its work that France and other nations were undermined in military strength and morals. They fell easy prey to the German war machine. Much of the areas overrun and captured by the Nazis in the early part of the war was accomplished with but little loss in material and men. Preparations for war in England and the United States were so delayed that we met defeat after defeat, simply because our aid was too little and too late.

This propaganda became so arrogant that Hitler boasted he could render the United States impotent by its use. That we could never be united sufficiently to successfully oppose him; that he could cause revolution within our borders. This was a boastful threat, but he succeeded in becoming the backbone of a mighty effort to prevent preparation on the part of other nations to meet his challenge for world domination.

Those of us who served in the Congress prior to our entering this war know of the powerful opposition to each and every effort that was made to prepare for a war which was inevitable. Perhaps never before in our history was there such well-organized opposition. This included those who were sincerely opposed to war and who thought and hoped there might be a way to avoid it.

Due to the fact that I was a woman, I felt as if much of this attack was concentrated on me. Why, I do not know; for certainly there should be no difference because of sex, and there is none when the interest of our country is at stake.

This is shown by the fact that in the present war as never before in history women have taken an important part. Not only do they constitute a great number of those engaged in defense work, but they are in active service in the various women's military and naval units. When the history of this war is written, the efforts of women in industry, active service, and in the home will be one of its brightest chapters. Before I leave this subject, let me say that sometimes I wonder which of the many roles which women are playing in this war is the greatest. Sometimes I think that those who wait, worry, and fear for the safety of their loved ones have the greatest cross to bear.

Mr. President, there is no need for me to picture the horrors of war. Daily we are reading and hearing of sickening scenes of death and destruction too terrible to contemplate. There is doubt that there has ever been such brutality shown in any war as that shown now by the Axis Nations, except perhaps in the campaigns of Attilla, the Hun.

No longer is it only the fighting men who are killed and wounded. Already millions of civilians, old men, women, and children, have fallen victims. Precisely how many is not known now nor will it be known with exactness in the years after the war, but a tally of estimates for the world battle zones produces the shocking total of more than 22,000,000 civilian dead. It is to prevent the possibility of such happenings in the future that we should now do everything we possibly can to insure against it.

The economic loss caused by war is too great to compute. The peoples of the world are staggering under a war debt so large as to bend their backs and those of generations to come, in an effort to pay it. If but a small portion of the immense sums of money which have been and are being spent for this war could have been diverted to other purposes, human existence could have been made much happier. It would have been sufficient almost to banish poverty, disease, and human suffering.

Mr. President, it is to prevent the recurrence of such conditions that the pending resolution is aimed.

This resolution is not difficult to understand. It is simple in its directives. It reads:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

In the passage of this resolution we are taking a long and encouraging step forward on the road to peace. The House of Representatives has already passed, by a large majority, a resolution somewhat similar.

There is no doubt that the Senate will approve the pending resolution. When that is done, the Congress will have placed itself on record before history and the world as being in full sympathy with the principle of collective security.

Its action will indicate clearly that here there is no great isolationist reaction against post-war cooperation with the rest of the world to prevent war. It is imperative for the Senate to give prompt and overwhelming approval to such a resolution. This would unquestionably have a wholesome effect on the temper and confidence of many leaders and peoples who might doubt our intention and determination to play an adequate international role in the years to come.

If the Senate does this, there will be greater reason to hope that tomorrow's world will be made into a genuinely cooperative one instead of falling back into the dangerous old game of power politics.

Mr. President, believing as I do that the adoption of a proper resolution will have this effect and will postpone, if not forever banish, war from the world, I shall gladly cast my vote for it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; and

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Chair and Senators will forgive me if I make the first words of my remarks a personal reference. My first political speech I made while I was a student in Harvard Law School, in the political campaign of Mr. Gaston, of Boston, against Senator Henry Cabot Lodge for the office of United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts, was on the issue of the League of Nations.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was saying that I rise today, as party to the amendment which is proposed to be

offered to the resolution reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, only because I believe, from the bottom of my heart, in the most effective form of international organization to promote the welfare and preserve the peace of the world I have begun by saying that the first political speech I ever made, I made when I was a student in Harvard Law School, when I went down to join the campaign of Mr. Gaston, of Boston, a Democratic candidate against the then senior United States Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, to speak in behalf of the League of Nations against the incumbent of that high office. For some 3 months in the year 1918 I had the honor to wear the uniform of my country as an 18-year-old boy.

There was no name save that of the Master himself which meant more to me, nay, means more to me today, than the name of the great prophet, Woodrow Wilson. I grew up under the spell of Woodrow Wilson's eloquence. My own heart, with the heart of all mankind, was moved by the magic of that man's great words. And I can seem still to hear the fervent appeal of that good and great man to his fellowmen to save their sons from the scourge of war.

I can seem to see in this debate today, Mr. President, the shadows of those figures who contested with Woodrow Wilson about the League of Nations, and I cannot feel that the issue presented upon the pending question is dissimilar from the issue tragically decided in the Senate on the 19th day of March 1919. I regard, therefore, the controversy which now rages in the Senate as simply a repetition of the League of Nations fight, or I might say, a continuation of the fight between those who before Pearl Harbor believed in America taking its full and fair part in world affairs, and those who also prior to Pearl Harbor days, clung to the discredited and dangerous doctrine of isolation.

I think all of us have a feeling, Mr. President, that this is historic ground upon which we are treading; that not only the people of the United States, but nations abroad—nay, free men wherever they are at liberty to listen—have their ears attuned to what may be at last the authentic and responsible utterance of the Senate of the United States upon this question. For the world wants to know, Mr. President, whether the Senate of the United States is again going to obstruct the moral leadership of this Nation in participation in world affairs as it did in 1918, 1919, and 1920.

The world wants to know whether we, in this body, have changed our sentiment, and whether the Senate is willing manfully and clearly to say that the United States not only must, but shall effectively, perform its full part in making the world a law-abiding community. In the making of their own plans the people of the world want to know whether they may depend upon the United States of America supporting and sustaining the principle of collective security, or whether they shall have to depend upon their own strength for the integrity and protection of their respective countries.

In the chancelries of Britain and Russia there must be many question marks about what their future course shall be, and those question marks, Mr. President, essentially relate to the uncertainty of what the United States of America will do after the war.

We have come to be regarded as courageous in war and cowardly in peace. It was not the soldiers who fought in Belleau Wood and Chateau Thierry and in the Argonne who lacked courage in 1918; it was not the fighting Americans who shirked in upholding the great traditions of this Nation, in doing our honorable part in conquering a tyrannical foe. No; it was in the Senate of the United States where men lacked courage and boldness and daring, and, Mr. President, some have feared, the sincerity of high purpose. It was not the shot and shell, Mr. President, upon those torn battlefields which made timid and frightened the representatives of the United States of America who wore their Nation's uniform; but it was the discordant, devilish, divisive sentiments and utterances from political sources in the United States that made Senators quake and unwilling to do their duty, not only to their country but to their Nation's dead and to posterity.

This has been a long fight, this fight to remove the scourge of war from the human race, and when I say from the human race, Mr. President, I mean essentially from the masses of average men and women, from the fireside of the average home. I mean, this fight to clutch the evil hand of war, which for generation after generation, as long as history has been recorded, has reached into the sanctuary of the home and torn a son from fond parents, snatched away a father from his tearful children, drawn the defender of a home from the clinging arms of a devoted wife. I say, Mr. President, that those who have tried to marshal the forces that might restrain that avaricious and bloody hand have had a long and so far, Mr. President, an unsuccessful and futile fight.

Is it because people love war? Is it because people invite it and court it? Is it because it is not ghastly and horrible? Not, Mr. President, in the opinion of those who have seen it. A Senator on this floor a few days ago told of being at an advance sector of the American front in the Solomons and of a shell exploding a few hundred yards in front of where he and others were, and of wounded, torn men being brought back and being placed in boats and transported to waiting vessels.

Mr. President, that Senator told his colleagues of the anguish of the wounded, of a man's face being shot away, of maggots forming in that man's facial wound. Is it because war is not horrible that we have so long and so futilely fought against it? Or is it because those who advocate peace have not had the courage to face the experiment of the maintenance of peace and to take the risks and the hazards involved in such trials?

Moreover, those who want war have had many things on their side. On a few occasions they have had those who profit by war to egg it on. They have had those who sought the gratification of some vain ambition for power to encourage it. Sometimes they have had the thoughtless and the indifferent on their side, though generally, Mr. President, those forces have been united, and they have been dynamic. But the forces of peace have not only been timid; they have often lacked leadership, they have seldom had unity. They have been pulled apart and weakened by so many discordant notes and so many divisive sentiments that they never have been able to present an effective force against this aggregation which desires to wage war.

So, Mr. President, it would seem that surely sometime we might awaken to our great responsibility in such a way as that which was suggested by President Wilson when he said:

> When I think of words piled on words, of debate following debate, when these unspeakable things that cannot be handled until the debate is over are happening in these pitiful parts of the world, I wonder that men do not wake up to the moral responsibility of what they are doing. Great peoples are driven out upon a desert, where there is no food and can be none, and they are compelled to die, and then men, women, and children thrown into a common grave, so imperfectly covered up that here and there is a pitiful arm stretched out to heaven, and there is no pity in the world. When shall we wake to the moral responsibility of this great occasion?

Mr. President, what we experience today is of course the fruition of history. What we suffer today is attributable, many good men and women believe, to what we have not dared to do in days past. The great war which now wages—and wars have become progressively worse—dates back probably at least to the end of the last war. Out of the chaos and confusion which followed the last war there grew up in Germany a broken democracy, and that infant struggling for existence was finally destroyed by an evil aggregation led by the most devilish and hellish of men, Adolf Hitler. I have said before upon the floor of the Senate that I saw upon the walls of public buildings in Munich in 1938, the scars of street fights in which 3,000 persons were supposed to have fallen dead in the battle between the soldiery and the Communists. Such was post-war Germany. Yet, Mr. President, it was out of the womb of those evil circumstances that Hitlerism was born. The democracies of the world seemed to think they had no responsibility to preserve that infant, the democratic government in Germany. They seemed to think the internal affairs of the German people were of no concern to men in other parts of the world. They seemed not to be aware that a threat to the liberty of people anywhere is a threat to the independence of people everywhere. They seemed not to be aware that the persecution of a minority in Germany endangered the integrity and the dignity of men all over the world. But due to the failure of the democratic nations and people of the world to protect that democratic infant, to make democracy work in Germany, there came the Nazis and, heading the Nazis, Hitler, letting loose

the scourge of war upon an unoffending and defenseless world.

So, Mr. President, if peace is to be preserved it must be by dynamic, not negative, forces. It must be by those who understand the origin and the source of war, and who strive to suppress it in its inception. For war, in the opinion of many scholars, is a recognized social institution which has grown up throughout the long past because it was the only way or the most effective way for peoples to gratify their ambitions, due to the failure of the leadership of mankind to provide any alternative method by which the legitimate aspirations, even of nations, might be achieved.

So, due to the failure of the statesmanship of the world to provide social institutions wherein international wrong might be complained of, and national redress sought—due to the failure of mankind to set up institutions which might govern the conduct of nations as well as of individuals, communities, and states, the powerful, the greedy, the ambitious have always resorted to the ready instrument of war.

Here in the Senate we have heard expressed many fears about what would be the result of our entering into some association or organization, the purpose of which should be to maintain the peace and promote the welfare of the world. Here upon this floor, Mr. President, a generation ago eloquent and determined voices were heard pointing out the danger of the League of Nations, pointing out the risk of article X of the League Covenant, pointing out the menace of article XI of the League Covenant, pointing out the exceedingly great danger of article XVI. Due to their persistence and their persuasiveness; due to the fact that the great leader of the opposition, after successfully leading the Nation in war and finally formulating a world peace, carrying it to his own fellow countrymen, and then, having made thirty-odd speeches in twenty-odd days, finally fell, a victim of overexertion, on September 26, 1919—I say, Mr. President, due to the persuasiveness and the persistence of those determined and eloquent men in the Senate of the United States, and due to the fact that the leader, the great leader, of the forces of progress and peace at last, like a great soldier who had done his due and his duty, fell a casualty of the great crusade, the Senate on the solemn day of the 19th of March 1920 defeated the League of Nations, betrayed the dead, and destroyed the hope of mankind.

So, Mr. President, when on the other side of the river the great unerring Judge shall put His finger upon those who bear the moral responsibility for the tragic present, in the humble opinion of one man of this generation that finger will not pass over the names of those who took the moral responsibility of bringing on another war in a generation.

During his tour to the West President Wilson said to a fellow citizenry, which hung upon his words, that there would be a war in 20 years. He did not realize that his prophecy would be fulfilled in less than 20 years. It was just 20 years after those utterances that global war again broke upon a pitiful world.

Great crowds met President Wilson at every station. They filled every hall and lined every street. They greeted with exaltation the hope that lay in him. That was of no avail here in the United States Senate, for it was not those masses who voted in the Senate. Their determined cry was not heard in this body. They were not members of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was stacked by a party leadership against the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, not only after it was conceived, but before the conference ever convened.

No, Mr. President. The people were not the ones who purposed to destroy a political opponent for personal political gain. It was not they who met in New York in early December of 1918 with ex-President Theodore Roosevelt and the then leader of the Senate, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and resolved upon the technique by which they would defeat the League of Nations, namely, the technique of endless debate and critical reservations.

The people of America did not know about that, Mr. President. They were not parties to it. They were not consulted in those councils. Probably they could not have done anything about it. Those whose sons were in the Army of Occupation and could not be brought home until the treaty of peace, which embraced an integral part of the League of Nations, was determined and ratified—those parents did not have a voice in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or on the floor of the Senate. Nor did those whose sons never came back from Flanders fields, who lie in foreign graves, whose blood intermingled with alien soil.

They did not seem to have a part in the debate, either, for it was not humanitarian considerations which actuated the opponents of that proposal. It must be said, in the light of impartial and cold history, that it was political chicanery, personal vanity, personal animosity toward the then President, which condemned to war another generation of boys and girls, many of whom were not yet born, and many others of whom were in their mothers' arms. They are now the soldiers of this great land, fighting on all the battle fronts of the world.

No, Mr. President, it was not those mothers and fathers who were heard when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee received, on July 10, 1919, the Treaty of Versailles and the included League of Nations Covenant and held it in committee for 6 weeks—in fact, held it in committee until public opinion seemed to demand that at least it eventually be permitted the light of day and the privilege of public consideration.

The scheme, so cleverly designed, to defeat the League of Nations, was not enunciated in public. It was not a part of the debate. Yet, Mr. President, it is a part of the history of the times. I hold in my hand a book entitled "The United States and World Organization, 1920-33," by Mr. Fleming, a professor in Vanderbilt University. On page 24 I find the following footnote:

After Borah's attack on the Covenant in the Senate, February 21, 1919, Lodge said to him, "My dear fellow, I agree with you absolutely, absolutely, but we can't beat the thing. Eighty-five percent of the Senate are for it. The best we can do is to get changes that will emasculate it as much as possible."

I read further from the footnote:

Lodge also wrote to Beveridge on January 30th—

This was 1919—

that caution had to be exercised until the new Senate had been organized and control of the Foreign Relations Committee secured.

I read further from the footnote on page 24:

When Lodge asked Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, to direct the organization of the Senate against the League, Watson—

The Senator Watson referred to, of course, was one of the Republican leaders—

Watson thought the League could not be defeated. "Senator," he said to Lodge, "I don't see how we are ever going to defeat this proposition. It appears to me that 80 percent of the people are for it. Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war, and imagine this opens a way to world peace, are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it."

Lodge replied—

Senators, listen to these Mephistophelean words:

Lodge replied, "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

"What do you mean by that?" Watson asked. "Illustrate it to me."

Lodge illustrated, and "then went on for 2 hours to explain other reservations, going into the details of the situation that would thus be evolved, until I became thoroughly satisfied that the treaty could be beaten in that way."

That was in February of 1919. The League Covenant had not at that time been adopted by the conference at Paris. At that time President Wilson had not returned to the United States with the treaty. At that time there was no language and no provision in the Covenant to which those Senators had any reason to object, because the League Covenant had not yet been written. Yet, sitting here in secrecy, under the honorable cloak of the Senate of the United States, the two most powerful men in this body, with utter disregard of what former Senator Watson called the hope of the oppressed everywhere that this thing might stop war, these two men, Mr. President, schemed and connived and conspired to defeat by indirection a document which they themselves had said 85 percent of the people of the United States wanted, which they said the ministers were advocating in the pulpits, and for which they said the church people all over this land were working and praying.

Mr. President, the League's opponents had a technique. That is what those men did, and time after time Senator Lodge states in his book, the Senate and the League of Nations, how he carefully evaluated the character and temperament of President Wilson to know, just like a skilled poker player, exactly what might be President Wilson's reaction to

their scheme and their strategy; and upon the very last pages of his apology Senator Lodge finally says, with some vanity, I must confess, "I did not err in my appraisal of what Wilson would do."

And so, Mr. President, without the American people even knowing about it, without them having a chance to pass on it or correct it, by the use of Senate procedures and technique, and by the power of those who controlled its committees and its conduct upon the floor, and by reason of the rule of the Senate requiring two-thirds of the Senators present to ratify a treaty, the League of Nations was defeated—this in spite of the fact that every historian who writes about it says that even up to the last day of its consideration in the Senate, not only were a distinct majority of the Senators in favor of it, but an overwhelming majority of the American people as well.

So, Mr. President, if that debate, if what the Senate did to that great document, did nothing more than to pull from this body the cover of the Senate technique, of the capacity to abuse Senate power, and turn the eyes of another generation oppressed by war upon such technique and into the recesses of every Senator's heart it might, for future generations, prove to have been worth while.

Mr. President, if this debate serves the purpose of disclosing to the American people the technique by which treaties are ratified, the power for abuse of power which Senators possess, the necessity for them literally to examine the consciences of Senators; if this debate challenges the Senate of the United States to take its full and fair part in the responsibility for what the Government shall do in world affairs in preventing World War No. 3; if what the Senate shall do as a result of this debate shall make the American people aware of by what precarious threads their peace hangs, and their assurance of World War No. 3 not coming to pass, it will have served a very honorable and a very effective purpose.

Not every one recalls, with respect to the League of Nations fight, that 9 months elapsed between the time the treaty reached the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the time when it was rejected here upon the floor of the Senate. Nine months, Mr. President, elapsed while the world waited and the Senate debated. Do we live in the same kind of world now? Does anyone believe that Mr. Stalin and his government will wait another 9 months—it might well have been 18—for the Senate of the United States to make up its mind, for those in favor of an affirmative course to overcome every obstructive opposition, before they do what they deem they should do in their own best interests? No, Mr. President, we do not live in so leisurely a world.

It is interesting to recall that from the beginning of this Republic up to the time the Treaty of Versailles was being considered by the Senate, the Senate had been engaged essentially in the consideration of bilateral treaties, that is, treaties between this and one other country. Hardly ever was it a multilateral, or a many-sided or a many-party treaty. Of course, the Senate has added many amendments in treaties; it has attached a great many reservations; but, it made little difference to the world what amendments and what reservations were adopted for they were seldom matters of international moment. And so the procedures and the techniques under the Constitution developed for dealing with bilateral treaties, for the first time actually came under scrutiny and trial when the multisided, many-party Treaty of Versailles came before this body for consideration on the 10th of July 1919. Yet, Mr. President, the Senate applied to that many-sided treaty the same leisurely legislative technique—while 26 other nations waited—that it had applied to simple bilateral treaties where only one other nation was involved in the engagement.

So, Mr. President, the verdict of history is that if that is the way the Senate shall exercise its treaty-making power, it is no longer the effective instrumentality for determining that nation's foreign policy of what we are pleased to call the world's greatest power.

That conclusion, in turn, requires one of three remedies: first, that Senators individually shall face up to their moral and legislative responsibility and duly advise the Executive and other nations currently as world problems emerge, and as world situations evolve; or, second, that we abrogate the two-thirds rule of the Senate by constitutional amendment, which may be brought about either by resolution proposed by two-thirds of the Members of the Congress and approved by three-fourths of the State legislatures, or State conventions, as the Congress shall determine whether it shall be by ratification or convention; or, third, that the Senators shall swear before God and their fellow countrymen that they will not abuse the power they possess under the Constitution by defeating another treaty which proposes a decent world order betraying another generation of dead, and again dashing from hope to despair the sentiment of mankind.

Then, why this debate today? Why these resolutions before the Senate? What precipitated them? Not only, Mr. President, because we are engaged in the world's most terrible war, not only because we ought to be penitent for what we have not done before, but I venture to say that we are discussing this subject today and that these resolutions are pending here because of the overwhelming demand of American public opinion that the Senate of the United States shall let the Nation and the world know its sentiment in no equivocal or uncertain way about what it will permit to be the future of the United Nations, the United States, and the people of the world.

I have a few polls, Mr. President, which I think are reflective of that sentiment. One is hardly 72 hours old. It was conducted by the National Opinion Research, maintained by the University of Denver, which, I think, is a reliable and impartial source. The question put was as follows:

> After the war, if two countries have a disagreement, do you think it would be better if some kind of organization worked with them to try to settle the disagreement?

Here are the statistics: Sixty-nine percent said, "Yes," an organization was needed; 26 percent, or approximately two and a half Americans out of every 10, felt that no international organization would be needed. So 69 responses were affirmative and 26 were negative. Five percent did not know, and that, Mr. President, is interesting, for only 5 percent of American public opinion appeared to be disinterested about this vital matter.

I refer to another poll. This was an institute poll, Mr. President, reported by the Public Opinion Quarterly, published by the School of Public Affairs at Princeton University. Here is the question which was put:

> Should the countries fighting the Axis set up an international police force after the war is over to try to keep the peace throughout the world?

That poll was taken on May 10, 1943, and here are the results:

Seventy-four percent of those polled answered, "Yes"; only 14 percent answered "No," and 12 percent had no opinion.

I cite a third poll, Mr. President, this time by the Associated Press, and this time not of the country, but of the Senate. Not from the hearts of the people came these answers, but from the seclusion of the Senate of the United States. The question put by the Associated Press was the following:

> Do you favor committing the Senate and the country now to a post-war course of preserving the peace through an international police force?

Here, Mr. President, is the reported result: Instead of a reflection of the affirmative opinion of 74 percent of those who were polled, only 24 Senators answered, "Yes" out of a body of 96; 32 Senators reflected the opinion of the 14 percent of the people stating they would vote "No" on the question of an international police force, and 40 Senators did not respond to the poll of the Senate, in contrast to only 12 percent of the citizenry polled who had no opinion on this vital subject.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The poll which the Senator has just read to the Senate was taken some months ago, was it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, it was taken some months ago. Let us hope, Mr. President, that the vote upon the pending amendment will indicate to what degree the Senate may have altered its heretofore disclosed sentiment.

In another poll, taken in January 1943 by a national organization, the question put was:

> In addition to waging war, should the allies start talking and preparing now for the kind of peace we want after the war, or should we think and plan only for winning the war, letting the peace plans wait?

That was a pertinent and proper inquiry.

The result was: Prepare now, 59.2 percent of those polled; wait, 38.4 percent; do not know, 2.3 percent. Those who qualified their answer consisted of only one-tenth of 1 percent.

So, Mr. President, let the response to that poll be noted by those who say, "Let us tarry a while, let us wait, let us hesitate, let us debate, let us deliberate, let us reflect, let us inquire as to what others are doing or are going to do.

Remember that 59.2 percent, for whatever it may be worth, of this poll of the American people said, "Prepare now for the kind of peace we want after the war while we experience the horrors of World War No. 2. Let us, before God, assure the race that we shall not have World War No. 3.

Another poll was conducted by Fortune magazine in April of this year. The question put was:

As far as America and the rest of the world are concerned, which one of the six policies come closest to what you would like to see us do when war is over?

Six proposals were made upon which the people were asked to express themselves. The first was:

World cooperation: Form a new league or association with all different nations of the world and take active part in making it work.

And here are the answers:

Farmers, 40.3; factory workers, 34.2 percent; high-school students—high-school students, Mr. President, who would probably have to go to war—50.9 percent.

The second proposal put was:

Form a United States to include all democratic countries.

That is, a United States of the world. To that proposal only 3.5 percent of the farmers said "Yes"; only 7.5 percent of factory workers said "Yes"; and only 6.4 percent of high-school students said "Yes."

The third proposal was:

Try to form some close connection with the British Empire.

This time only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the farmers said "Yes"; only 1.8 percent of the factory workers said "Yes"; and only 1.1 percent of high-school students said "Yes."

Then, Mr. President, came the question suggesting isolation and the first proposal was:

Have as little to do as possible with any countries in Europe or Asia, but form a new United States to include in one government all North and South American countries.

Two and five-tenths percent of the farmers voted "Yes", 6.2 percent of the factory workers voted "Yes," and 3.9 percent of the high-school students voted "Yes."

The next question was, "Use our influence to try to organize the world for peace but form no ties." Twenty-three and three-tenths percent of the farmers voted "Yes," 31.4 percent of the factory workers voted "Yes," 31.2 percent of the high-school students voted "Yes."

The next question was, "Stay at home—have as little as possible to do with other nations." Only 11.7 percent of the farmers voted "Yes," only 12 percent of the factory workers voted "Yes," only 4.2 percent of the high-school students voted "Yes."

Of those who answered the statement, "I do not know what we should do," 18 percent of the farmers said "Yes," 6.9 percent of the factory workers said "Yes," 2.3 percent of the high-school students said "Yes."

Mr. President, the significance of that poll is that the largest percentages of responses of an affirmative nature came in respect to the proposals which had the greatest strength, which contemplated the most effective world organization; and that is a very salutary observation.

Now one more. This was a poll taken by the American Institute of Public Opinion, commonly known as the Gallup Poll, and the question was, "Should the Government take steps now, before the end of the war, to set up with our allies a world organization to maintain the future peace of the world?"

The poll was taken on March 23 of this year, and this was the result. The national response was, "Yes" 64 percent, "No" 24 percent, "No opinion" 12 percent. Among Democratic voters the vote was 65 percent "Yes," 23 percent "No," and 12 percent "No opinion," and among the Republican voters 63 percent voted "Yes," showing little difference, 28 percent "No," only 3 percent difference, and 9 percent "No opinion," only 3 percent difference.

Again, Mr. President, this question was asked, "After this war, do you think the United States should stay out of world affairs, or take an active part in world affairs?"

The national response was 76 percent for taking an active part, 14 percent to stay out, 10 percent no opinion. Among the Democrats, 78 percent voted that we should take an active part, 12 percent to stay out, 10 percent no opinion, and among the Republican voters 76 percent, practically the same, to take an active part, 15 percent to stay out, 9 percent no opinion.

I think it is not unfair to say that those polls are as good a reflection of public opinion as could be found, and that, by and large, taking a cross-section of the American people, regardless of party, the American people today, as they did in the days of 1918 and 1919, want to see the United States of America assume the moral clear-cut, unequivocal leadership of the world, they want the United States Senate to say to all mankind, to every Government on the earth, "Fear not, the United States this time will not forsake you when we have won the victory, the United States this time will not shirk its obligations to mankind, the United States of America, which has so gloriously won the war, will not ignominiously forfeit the peace."

Mr. President, a few moments ago I quoted from the work of Mr. Fleming the footnote on page 24, where it is stated that Senator Watson, of Indiana, told Senator Henry Cabot Lodge that the ministers of the United States were preaching in their pulpits for an effective world organization, the League of Nations; that the church people all over America were advocating the League of Nations, and that they wanted it and prayed for it. What are the teachers, what are the preachers, what are the bishops, what are the rabbis, what is the clergy of America today saying about an effective international organization after the war?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, is the Senator about to discuss the declarations made by these great faiths?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I am.

Mr. HATCH. That is important, and if the Senator will yield for the purpose I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am confident that every Senator would like to know the solemn and deliberative opinion—let me add, the reverent sentiment—of 146 of the principal religious leaders of the United States, as embodied in a declaration made within the last month, entitled "Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Declaration on World Peace," issued by representatives of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths. Copies of the declaration may be obtained from the Church Peace Union and World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

Mr. President, the program of the religious leaders of the United States is contained in seven points. They are brief and they are pertinent, and I shall read them to the Senate:

CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

THE MORAL LAW MUST COVERN WORLD ORDER

1. The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL MUST BE ASSURED

2. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

THE RIGHTS OF OPPRESSED, WEAK, OR COLONIAL PEOPLES MUST BE PROTECTED

3. The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES MUST BE SECURED

4. National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE WITH JUSTICE MUST BE ORGANIZED

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION MUST BE DEVELOPED

6. International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

A JUST SOCIAL ORDER WITHIN EACH STATE MUST BE ACHIEVED

7. Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

In a world troubled to despair by recurring war the Protestant churches have been seeking to show how moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations. Their conclusions are in many important respects similar to those of men of other faiths. In this we rejoice, for world order cannot be achieved without the cooperation of all men of good will. We appeal to our constituency to give heed to the foregoing proposals enunciated by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, which must find expression in national policies. Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian Gospel.

Rt. Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, New York City, president, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church.

Bishop William Y. Bell, Cordele, Ga., president, Board of Evangelism, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.

Rev. Ferdinand Q. Blanchard, Cleveland, Ohio, moderator, General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches.

Rev. P. O. Bersell, Minneapolis, Minn., president, Lutheran Augustana Synod and National Lutheran Council.

Bishop A. R. Clippinger, Dayton, Ohio, president, Board of Administration of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ.

Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, New York City, moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Rev. Robert Cummins, Boston, Mass., general superintendent, Universalist Church.

Rev. Frederick May Eliot, Boston, Mass., president, American Unitarian Association.

Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp, Bethlehem, Pa., president, Provincial Elders' Conference of the Moravian Church.

Rev. L. W. Goebel, Chicago, president, General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Rev. C. E. Lemmon, Columbia, Mo., president, International Convention of the Disciples of Christ.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Boston, Mass., secretary, Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Rev. W. W. Peters, McPherson, Kans., moderator, General Conference of the Church of the Brethren.

Rev. Jacob Prins, Grand Rapids, Mich., president, General Synod of the Reformed Church in America.

Rev. Donald W. Richardson, Richmond, Va., moderator, General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Rev. Joseph C. Robbins, Wollaston, Mass., president, Northern Baptist Convention.

Rev. Albert N. Rogers, Yonkers, N. Y., president, General Conference of the Seventh Day Baptist Churches.

Bishop John S. Stamm, Harrisburg, Pa., president, Board of Bishops of the Evangelical Church.

Allen U. Tomlinson, Whittier, Calif., presiding clerk of the Five Years Meeting of the Society of Friends.

Bishop P. A. Wallace, Brooklyn, N. Y., senior bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

Bishop James C. Baker, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman, International Missionary Council.

Frank S. Bayley, Seattle, Wash., president, National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations.

Rev. G. Pitt Beers, New York City, chairman, Christian Commission for Camp and Defense Communities.

Mrs. J. D. Bragg, St. Louis, Mo., president, Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Board of Missions.

Dr. Arlo A. Brown, Madison, N. J., chairman, International Council of Religious Education.

Rev. Rex S. Clements, Bryn Mawr, Pa., president, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Rev. Charles E. Diehl, Memphis, Tenn., chairman, National Commission on Church Related Colleges.

Dr. John Foster Dulles, New York City, chairman, Federal Council's Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace.

Rev. Robert M. Hopkins, Indianapolis, Ind., president, United Christian Missionary Society.

Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

Dr. Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa., chairman, American Friends Service Committee.

John T. Manson, New Haven, Conn., president, American Bible Society.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City, chairman, Christian Conference on War and Peace.

Rev. William P. Merrill, New York City, president, the Church Peace Union.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta, Ga., president, board of missions of the Methodist Church.

Dr. John R. Mott, New York City, honorary chairman, International Missionary Council.

Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, Albany, N. Y., president, American Council, World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

Commissioner Edward J. Parker, New York City, national commander of the Salvation Army.

Mrs. Norman Vincent Peale, New York City, president, Home Missions Council of North America.

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, Philadelphia, president, International Society of Christian Endeavor.

Rev. Charles P. Proudfit, Chicago, president, Council of Church Boards of Education.

Dr. Leland Rex Robinson, Bronxville, N. Y., president, American Committee for Christian Refugees.

Rev. Russell H. Stafford, Boston, Mass., president, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Charles P. Taft 2d, Cincinnati, Ohio, chairman, Friends of the World Council of Churches.

Rev. Henry P. Van Dusen, New York City, president, American Association of Theological Schools.

Rev. A. Livingston Warnshuis, Bronxville, N. Y., chairman, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

Rev. Luther A. Weigle, New Haven, Conn., chairman, World's Sunday School Association.

Miss Amy Ogden Welcher, Hartford, Conn., president, United Council of Church Women.

Rev. Herbert L. Willett, Wilmette, Ill., president, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity.

Most Rev. Theophilus Pashkovsky, San Francisco, Calif., Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America.

Most Rev. Antony Bashir, Brooklyn, N. Y., Metropolitan of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church.

Rt. Rev. Bohdan, New York City, bishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America.

The American synagogue commends to the attention of its own constituency and to all men of faith the foregoing principles as a guide to thought and action in dealing with the grave world problems of our time. These seven principles, while they do not exhaust the teachings of the Jewish tradition on issues of social relationships, have their sanction in Judaism both Biblical and rabbinic. Judaism's highest goal has ever been "to amend the world through the kingdom of God." The synagogue therefore calls upon its adherents, both as citizens and as Jews, to seek after the implementation of these principles. They will thereby act in faithful conformity with the moral values of the Jewish religion, and at the same time serve the best interests of country and of mankind.

Dr. Israel Goldstein, New York City, president, Synagogue Council of America.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein, New York City, president, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Hebrew Union College.

Rabbi Saul Silber, Chicago, Ill., president, Hebrew Theological College.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, New York City, president, Jewish Institute of Religion.

Rabbi William Drazin, Savannah, Ga., president, Rabbinical Council of America.

Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Pittsburgh, Pa., president, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Louis M. Levitsky, Newark, N. J., president, Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, St. Louis, Mo., chairman, Commission on Justice and Peace of Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi Joseph Zeitlin, New York City, chairman, Social Justice Commission of Rabbinical Assembly of America.

Louis J. Moss, Brooklyn, N. Y., president, United Synagogue of America.

Dr. Samuel Nirenstein, New York City, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations.

Adolph Rosenberg, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mrs. Isidore Freedman, New York City, president, Women's Branch of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Mrs. Hugo Hartmann, Cincinnati, Ohio, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Mrs. Samuel Spiegel, New York City, president, Women's League of United Synagogue of America.

Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, New York City.

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Henry Cohen, Galveston, Tex.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D. C.

Rabbi B. Benedict Glazer, Detroit, Mich.

Rabbi Samuel H. Goldenson, New York City.

Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein, New York City.

Rabbi Julius Gordon, University City, Mo.

Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi James G. Heller, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rabbi Leo Jung, New York City.

Prof. Mordecai M. Kaplan, New York City.

Rabbi C. E. Hillel Kauvar, Denver, Colo.

Rabbi Jacob Kohn, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Isaac Landman, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi B. L. Levinthal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Rabbi Felix A. Levy, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Morris Goldstein, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, New York City.

Rabbi Edgar Magnin, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi Abraham A. Neuman, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, New York City.

Rabbi Irving F. Reichert, San Francisco, Calif.

Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio.

Rabbi Milton Steinberg, New York City.

Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, New York City.

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the foregoing postulates of a just peace as embodying the principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better social order.

Most Rev. Edward Mooney, archbishop of Detroit, chairman, administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Most Rev. Samuel Alphonsus Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, vice chairman, administrative board, N. C. W. C., chairman, bishops' committee on the Pope's peace points.

Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo, chairman, social action department, N. C. W. C., honorary president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Most Rev Edwin Vincent Byrne, archbishop of Santa Fe.

Most Rev. John J. Cantwell, archbishop of Los Angeles.

Most Rev. Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington.

Most Rev. Edward D. Howard, archbishop of Portland, Oreg.

Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio.

Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, O. P., archbishop of Cincinnati.

Most Rev. John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco.

Most Rev. Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans.

Most Rev. Constantine Bohachevsky, bishop of Ukranian Greek Catholic diocese, Philadelphia.

Most Rev. John A. Duffy, bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.

Most Rev. John M. Gannon, bishop of Erie, Pa.

Most Rev. Richard O. Gerow, bishop of Natchez, Miss.

Most Rev. Charles Hubert Le Blond, bishop of St. Joseph, Mo.

Most Rev. Aloisius J. Muench, bishop of Fargo, N. D.

Most Rev. John F. Noll, bishop of Fort Wayne, Ind.

Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Kansas City, Mo.

Most Rev. John B. Peterson, bishop of Manchester, N. H.

Most Rev. James H. Ryan, bishop of Omaha, Nebr.

Most Rev. Basil Takach, bishop (Greek Rite), diocese of Pittsburgh.

Most Rev. Emmet M. Walsh, bishop of Charleston, S. C.

Most Rev. Francis J. Haas, bishop-elect of Grand Rapids, Mich.

Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J., Denver, Colo., Regis College.

Rev John F. Cronin, S. S., Baltimore, Md., St. Mary's Seminary.

Rev. Hugh A. Donohue, San Francisco, Calif.

Rev. Vincent C. Donovan, O. P., New York City.

Rev. Cyprian Emanuel, O. F. M., St. Louis, Mo., Franciscan Monastery.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Reynold Hillenbrand, Mundelein, Ill., rector, Mundelein Seminary.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George Johnson, Washington, D. C., director, department of education, N. C. W. C.

Rev. John La Farge, S. J., New York City, executive editor, America.

Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S. J., St. Louis, Mo., editor, The Queen's Work.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick J. McCormick, Washington, D. C., rector, Catholic University.

Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., Notre Dame, Ind., president, Notre Dame University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A Ryan, Washington, D. C., director, social action department, N. C. W. C.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Washington, D. C., Catholic University.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Matthew Smith, Denver, Colo., editor, Denver Catholic Register.

Rev. Edward V. Stanford, O. S. A., Villanova, Pa., president, Villanova College.

Rev. Paul F. Tanner, Washington, D. C., director, youth department, N. C. W. C.

Mrs. Robert A. Angelo, York, Pa., president, National Council of Catholic Women.

Frederick P. Kenkel, St. Louis, Mo., director, central bureau, Catholic Central Verein.

Francis P. Matthews, Omaha, Nebr., supreme knight, Knights of Columbus.

Frances E. McMahon, Notre Dame, Ind., president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Charles P. O'Donnell, Washington, D. C., chairman, Post-War World Committee, Catholic Association for International Peace.

Wilbert J. O'Neill, Cleveland, Ohio, president, National Council of Catholic Men.

Harold A. Stevens, New York City, president, Catholic Interracial Council.

Mr. President, the fifth plank in that platform for peace is headed "International institutions to maintain peace with justice must be organized." I especially commend it to the proponents of the pending resolution; I commend its clear and certain language.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I understand that three leaders joined in issuing this joint statement. Incidentally, it is my understanding that it is the first time in the history of our country that some 150 leaders of the three great religious faiths have united in a statement on such a vital issue as this.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Minnesota is correct. Moreover, Mr. President, this is no instrument conceived upon the spur of the moment. This is no spontaneous declaration from the 146 leaders of the three great faiths. This is a document long deliberated upon, carefully framed, and scrupulously worded, and it represents the solemn reflection of the religious ministry and laity of the United States.

Mr. BALL. Does not the Senator think it is significant that these 150 leaders of the 3 great faiths were able to agree on an expression of principles so much more concrete, specific, and strong than the resolution the Senate now has before it?

Mr. PEPPER. It is most significant, I will say to the able Senator, and it shows that again, in the United States, public opinion has formed behind a purpose for peace through an effective international organization. The ministry is pleading with the Nation's Representatives to effectuate these minimum requirements of such an organization or institution.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Florida is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I understand that before the resolution was reported, three representatives of the three faiths requested an opportunity to be heard before the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is in the Chamber. I do not know of my own personal knowledge whether such a request was addressed to the committee or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will answer if the Senator wishes to have me do so.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me finish this statement. I know that this declaration was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that it was stated that these representatives would like to be heard. It was resolved by the committee, these representatives would like to be heard, that there would be no further hearings on the pending resolution.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator wishes to have me respond, I will do so. I am not seeking to offer any explanation, because the facts do not require any.

After the full committee had resolved not to hold any further hearings because we wanted prompt action, we received a

request locally, by telegram—they did not even call us on the telephone or come to see us—from two religious personages who asked for an opportunity to be heard. I simply said that the committee had already declared that it did not wish to hold any further hearings, and therefore I was not at liberty to invite them to appear. But they were here in Washington. The telegrams emanated from Washington. We were considering the question for months. The subcommittee did not decline to hear any one who wished to be heard. We were trying to obtain prompt action. For months the Senator from Minnesota has threatened that if we did not report the resolution promptly he would move to discharge the committee and get action. Now we have it here and we cannot get action.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I enjoyed his discussion of these religious characters. I thought he was going to say that they approved the amendment. Does the Senator claim that in their resolutions these religious leaders approved the amendment which he is sponsoring?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I propose to show by comparison that the minimum requirements of the religious leaders whom I have just quoted go far beyond the resolution reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and are far more in accord with the amendment to be offered by the junior Senator from Florida and the group whose names appear upon the amendment, than with the resolution as reported from the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator now in his possession—I do not mean to suggest that he get it, because he will probably try to get it anyway—any resolution or letter from the three religious leaders to the effect that they want the particular amendment which he is to offer? The Senator knows whether he has or not. I do not know.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have no such letter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does any other member of the group have such a letter or resolution? They are not all present in the Chamber.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. According to the news account, the Senator from Texas telegraphed the three Representatives that the committee had already voted not to hold hearings, and suggested that they file statements. I happen to have a copy of the letter which Msgr. John A. Ryan, of Washington, the Catholic representative, sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Monsignor Ryan was kind enough, knowing of my interest in this subject, to send me a copy

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question, if I may. I have been interrogated pretty sharply. Did these ministers request hearings before the subcommittee at the suggestion of any member of the group of Senators who are now active?

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator from Texas that they did not. They themselves wanted to be heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. They had a right to be heard if they had come in plenty of time. We were considering the question for months. The first suggestion which I received to the effect that they wanted to be heard was not from them, but from one of the group of Senators who thought that we ought to hear them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was the one who made the suggestion to the Senator from Texas. Is not that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator says he is, I presume he was.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know who else made the suggestion, but I do say to the Senator that I did make the suggestion that this group wanted to be heard, and that I thought the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations ought to hear the group. I made that suggestion, not because of any letter sent to me, but pursuant to a personal conversation with at least one representative of these great groups. I was informed that they wished to be heard. It was a voluntary suggestion from him to me. I had not promoted it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. If the committee of ministers wanted to get in contact with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and they went to the Senator from New Mexico, I think they went to the wrong place.

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator from Texas that they did not come to me as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, seeking to be heard. It developed in private conversation that these men wanted to be heard. I did not think that I was stepping outside the bounds of propriety as a United States Senator when I imparted that information to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. If I was wrong in that, I apologize to the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been dragged into this discussion. There is no occasion for the Senator from New Mexico to be offended.

Mr. HATCH. I am not offended.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no reason for him to apologize to the Foreign Relations Committee. He does not owe me an apology, and does not owe the committee an apology. The committee is willing to hear anyone any time; but we have been prodded and harassed. It has been said that we must have speed. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] had made dire threats on the floor of the Senate and in the press as to what he would do to the committee if we did not report a resolution. He was going to have the Senate discharge the committee. Senators have said, "We demand action. We must have action." Then when we try to give them action, they want to delay consideration by further hearings and more debate. Now they want to delay the debate. There is difficulty in obtaining a quorum.

That is my answer, Mr. President.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas that we finally got action, and I am very happy about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; the Senator got action which he did not want, and because he got it he is sore, and mad, and is trying to smear and emasculate the resolution and tell the rest of the world that it is not any good, and does not amount to anything—helping us a good deal with foreign nations, and in the war effort.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is not trying to emasculate the resolution, and the Senator from Texas very well knows it. The Senator from Minnesota merely seeks to put back into the resolution the principles which the Senator from Texas himself has espoused publicly on the floor of the Senate and in a speech at Houston, Tex., last summer.

If the Senator from Florida will yield to me further, I should like to say that I believe the Senate will be interested in a letter which Monsignor Ryan sent to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in response to an invitation. The religious groups were not heard by the committee, and I am not trying to blame the committee for it. I think, however, that the Senate is entitled to know their views on the pending resolution. The letter is dated October 22, 1943, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: By way of supplementing the memorandum on the principles for a just peace issued by the three religious bodies, which you were kind enough to invite me to send to your committee, I am submitting a brief comparison between point five of the religious leaders' statement with the final paragraph of the resolution reported out yesterday by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I shall make my observations under two heads: First, nature of the international agency to be established; second, the proposed functions of the international agency.

I

The statement of the religious bodies calls for the organization of "international institutions." The comparable expression in the Foreign Relations Committee statement is "international authority." "International institutions" is comprehensive and concrete; "international authority" is comprehensive but is neither concrete nor unambiguous. Of course, it would be improved by prefixing the article "an." Nevertheless, "authority" has too many meanings, one of which is "the power derived from opinion, respect, office, mental superiority, or the like." For example, we speak of the authority of Aristotle or of Thomas Jefferson. The Kellogg-Briand pacts which outlawed war enjoyed for a short time considerable "authority" and aroused great and widespread hopes as an instrument for preserving peace, and they were international in scope. Where are they now and what has become of their "authority"?

II

The proposed functions of these respective declarations. The statement issued by the religious bodies proposes that the international institutions set up "will develop a body of international law, guarantee the fulfill-

ment of international obligations, drastically limit and control armaments, provide for the compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies and employ adequate sanctions." The first four of these proposals are not even mentioned in the statement of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The fifth finds general expression in the last clause of the committee version. However, the word "power" is less concrete and definite than the phrase "adequate sanctions" which occurs in the last phrase of the religious statement. "Adequate sanctions" obviously comprises both military and economic forces. "Power" might be construed as meaning merely moral power, such as the Kellogg-Briand Pacts possessed but which proved utterly inadequate. Indeed, it is as unprecise and fluid as "authority." On the other hand, "adequate sanctions" can mean nothing less than economic or military forces, or both.

Not the least of the merits of the religious bodies' statement is its omission of the question-begging, irrelevant, and confusing word, "sovereignty." In the welter of recent discussion, this term functions all too frequently as an horrendous fetish or an empty shibboleth.

I remain, my dear Senator, with great respect,

Very sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

I thank the Senator from Florida for the time which he has allowed me.

Mr. PEPPER. I make the observation, for the attention of the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Senator from Minnesota has just quoted a letter from Msgr. John A. Ryan, of Washington, D. C., director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, one of the signers of the Catholic group declaration in the Pattern for Peace from which I have just read. One of the signers of the Pattern for Peace declaration, in addressing himself to the chairman of the committee, says that the committee's resolution does not meet the minimum requirements set out in this declaration of the ministry of the three principal faiths of this Nation.

A short while ago the able Senator asked the Senator from Minnesota, as well as other Senators, whether we had any communication from the religious groups from whom I have just read, approving our amendment. I think it would be only fair for me to make inquiry of the able chairman as to whether he has from those religious groups any communication approving the resolution of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am frank to say that we have not, and we have not received any communication approving the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I have not undertaken to make any capital out of the situation. It is the Senator from Florida who is quoting the pronouncements of the clerical gentlemen, as though that gave some verity or some standing to his amendment. They did not mention his amendment at all. They did not mention our resolution, except incidentally to say that the word "power" is not clear, and so forth and so on. But that does not in reverse prove that they are in favor of and are supporting the amendment of the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Florida and others have changed and modified their resolution and amendment several times. But the pending resolution is the one I am speaking about at the present time. The clerical gentlemen do not say they are supporting the amendment of the Senator from Florida; do they?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, they do not say they are supporting our amendment, but they lay down principles which are not embodied in the Connally resolution, and which are embodied in our amendment. That is the significant thing, and that is the thing which I am afraid our distinguished chairman has overlooked.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the distinguished chairman has overlooked it because it is not so.

Mr. PEPPER. I suppose, then, that the able chairman disagrees with the interpretation of Monsignor Ryan.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not disagree with someone who is not here; I disagree with the Senator from Florida, who is here, looking me in the eye. I say his interpretation is not correct. Is that plain? Does the Senator understand that?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, but does the Senator understand that I say to him exactly the same that he says to me, and with equal affirmance, and with equal strength, and with just as little qualification? Does the able Senator understand that?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; I understand it.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not want the Senator possibly to misunderstand me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the question has arisen as to whether or not the statement of these great religious groups endorses or approves any particular resolution. The fact that someone does not happen to have a letter approving our particular resolution or some other resolution has seemed to be of some importance. It is of no importance to me whether these groups have endorsed the pending resolution or not. The important thing is the principle which has been laid down by these religious groups.

It is the principle for which they stood, and on which for the first time in the history of this country they got together, and which they declared that is important, and I think, Mr. President, that it is important also that the principle endorsed by men representing, as I understand, some 16,000,000 citizens of this country in their respective States, be well considered by the Senate of the United States or by a committee or by any other body, for if any group in all this world has labored long and earnestly in the cause of peace, it is the religious group. As a reason why consideration should be given to such a declaration, I wish to read now from a letter written by Mr. William Agar to the New York Times under date of October 10 this year, commenting on this very statement:

These are minimum requirements—

Referring to the declaration—

which all men of good will can do their utmost to implement.

I agree with the statement that all men of good will, including every Member of the Senate, should do their best to implement that declaration.

The religious leaders of the country have fulfilled their duty. They have indicated the way to unite in a common effort to attain a just and peaceful world order.

We have heard a good deal on the floor of the United States Senate about uniting. I do not know any better way to unite than upon such immortal principles as are promulgated in this declaration.

But the practical steps—

The religious leaders have performed their duty—

But the practical steps required to implement their proposals must be taken by our politicians and statesmen.

Mr. President, we in the United States Senate today are charged with the responsibility of implementing this great declaration, and that, in a small measure, is what some of us are trying to do.

We do not fulfill our responsibilities as citizens in this matter merely by acquiescing to these proposals in our own minds. We must point out their importance to others and do our utmost to make our legislators follow the directives they give.

Those are not my words; I am reading from a letter published in the New York Times of October 10 this year.

For these moral principles will not save the world unless the men to whom we grant the power to frame the institutions and construct the machinery for the peace are guided by them.

I wish the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who stand on this floor and say that not one jot, not one tittle of this resolution shall be amended or changed but that it must be taken exactly as they have handed it down to us, would listen to these words, for it is our duty to construct the machinery for peace and to be guided by these immortal principles.

On the other hand, the best institutions and the most perfect machinery men can devise will fail without the wholehearted support of the vast majority of men. Our duty as citizens is, therefore, twofold. We must first urge and then support it with all the energy and good will we possess. If we fail this time, we will have nobody to blame but ourselves.

The Washington Post of October 7 said in an editorial:

The manifesto—

And I am still referring to the one the Senator from Florida has just placed in the RECORD—

is certainly an historic document. Its significance lies less in its actual content or in the position it takes concerning various problems of reconstruction than in the evidence it gives that leaders of the three great religious faiths are now willing openly to work together for the achievement of important objectives.

The Post editorial continues:

The most striking parts of the document, however, are its insistence on "adequate sanctions" to enforce when necessary the arbitration of international disputes, and on international economic collaboration, and the very strong position it takes against "the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states * * *" it goes far beyond any declaration of post-war policy made thus far by any of the now warring powers.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the comments I have here, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, various excerpts and editorials in full.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of October 11, 1943]

Clear, forthright, and brief, the document was designed as a minimum set of principles for practical cooperation among nations, not as a full program. More important to churchmen was the fact that the three faiths had been able to agree in every detail of the extremely precise and concrete statement * * * the goal of this declaration, like other religious peace pronouncements, is to influence public opinion enough to force the diplomats to take heed.

[From New York Times of October 20, 1943]

These are minimum requirements which all men of good will can do their utmost to implement. The religious leaders of the country have fulfilled their duty. They have indicated the way to unite in a common effort to attain a just and peaceful world order. But the practical steps required to implement their proposals must be taken by our politicians and statesmen. We do not fulfill our responsibilities as citizens in this matter merely by acquiescing to these proposals in our own minds. We must point out their importance to others and do our utmost to make our legislators follow the directives they give.

For these moral principles will not save the world unless the men to whom we grant the power to frame the institutions and construct the machinery for peace are guided by them. On the other hand, the best institutions and the most perfect machinery men can devise will fail without the wholehearted support of the vast majority of men. Our duty as citizens is therefore twofold. We must first urge and then support it with all the energy and good will we possess. If we fail this time we will have nobody to blame but ourselves.

[From Catholic Action of the South of October 14, 1943]

We believe that this action should have a profound influence on the peace discussions and postwar planning. Beyond doubt, it serves as a warning as to what the basis of a just and lasting peace, resting on moral principles must be, as viewed by religious leaders, who are the best qualified to point this out. The statement crystallizes the opinion of the religious leadership of the country, hence represents moral views that must bear weight with those who will have in their hands the tremendous task of planning world peace.

In our opinion these points dare not be overlooked or nullified, because of their very essential nature in the establishment of a lasting peace. One need but glance over the seven points to realize that they cover the major ills of humanity, and they offer the remedies for elimination of those injustices and fallacies that have caused so many woes and consequent wars. If they are ignored or nullified, we shall have before us only the clouds of future wars on the horizon.

[From the Washington Post of October 7, 1943]

The manifesto * * * is certainly an historic document. Its significance lies less in its actual content or in the position it takes concerning various problems of reconstruction than in the evidence it gives that leaders of the three great religious faiths are now willing openly to work together for the achievement of important objectives.

The most striking parts of the document, however, are its insistence on adequate sanctions to enforce when necessary the arbitration of international disputes on an international economic collaboration, and the very strong position it takes against the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states * * * it goes far beyond any declaration of postwar policy made thus far by any of the now warring powers.

[From America of October 9, 1943]

The declaration announces to our statesmen and economists and businessmen, as well as to the great masses of the people, certain elementary truths of natural justice in their application to the complex problem of an international world order. These truths belong to Christian teaching. They are not the whole of that teaching, nor its loftiest heritage. They are simply the indispensable minimum of that moral law which, in the language of Pope Pius XII, "the Creator Himself manifested in a natural order, and which He has engraved with indelible characters on the hearts of men * * *"

The proclamation of these truths places upon all men a grave responsibility for their fulfillment. This responsibility rests most heavily upon those who by reason of their position and influence can most easily see these aims effected. But it rests in a proportionate measure upon all men, and to Catholics above all falls the duty of providing the spiritual leadership in the moral combat for a just world. The seven points are not compiled merely to be dreamed over. Our responsibility will not have been fulfilled until we have, through study, fully grasped their meaning for ourselves, spread the knowledge of them, and seen that our elected representatives follow their direction when they apply themselves to working out the concrete problems of peace.

[From the Christian Century of October 13, 1943]

It needs to be borne in mind that this declaration represents the minimum demands of America's churches and synagogues as to the nature of the peace. As the preamble adopted by the Catholic signers in presenting the document to Roman Catholics states, the seven "postulates * * * express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men."

One other characteristic of this document gives it a peculiar authority. Although it has been written and signed by these religious leaders acting as individuals, behind every one of its seven points there stand declarations which carry maximum weight with the members of all three religious communities. The digest of "supporting documents" prepared by the Federal Council of Churches (and doubtless to be obtained from that body) makes this authoritative undergirding clear. Thus, every item in the declaration is given standing among Catholics by deliverances of Pope Pius XII. For Jews there are the supporting affirmations of the Synagogue Council, the Rabbinical Assembly, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and similar acknowledged sources of Jewish teaching. And for Protestants, every position is reinforced by the findings of the Oxford and Delaware conferences, as well as of numerous denominational conventions.

In the first place, as has been indicated already, it marks the formation of a true united front by the religious forces of this country to bring to bear their influence on the nature of the peace. As such, it marks a new stage in religious cooperation—a stage far advanced beyond any attained in the past. * * * That united front will in itself constitute a major influence for the making of a just, generous, and hopeful order—an influence tragically missing from pre-war society.

But now the churches and synagogues have lined up solidly behind a conception of world organization and order which utterly repudiates both the practice and the spirit of isolationism and acknowledges full responsibility for American participation in a whole network of international institutions. Neither the isolationism of withdrawal nor the isolationism of empire can find sanction in this pronouncement of the Nation's united religious forces.

Finally, the appearance of this declaration constitutes notice served on political leadership that it must submit its acts in making the peace to the review and judgment of church and synagogue as interpreters of the moral law. There have been distressing signs of late of a tendency in political quarters to drift back toward secret manipulations in that tradition of power politics out of which has come so much of the agony of the past. With Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leadership uniting on such a platform as this declaration lays down, political leaders who may be tempted to return to the moral nihilism of balance-of-power diplomacy and military-alliance statecraft must reckon with a condemnation not to be lightly provoked. Not only in Washington, but in London and in Moscow and in Chungking, the publication of this common agreement by American religious bodies as to the requirements of a just peace will from this moment constitute a tremendous fact which statesmanship must take into account.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of October 10, 1943]

To the American people, first, and to the peoples of all the embattled world, this news, which press and radio properly places among the vital announcements of military and political and economic and diplomatic happenings, and declarations of purposes and policies, will come as a great uplift of morale. It is both a revelation of the innermost purpose of the war and of the purpose which must be recognized in the winning of true peace to follow the war. * * *

Great as the domestic effect of the joint declaration undoubtedly must be classed, its world importance transcends even its vast national import. For it places beneath the

platform of the world policies of the United Nations, in a practical fashion, basic and indestructible principles, instead of the shifting and temporary devices of material and conflicting political, racial, economic, and military interests and expediencies to which our diplomats, and other secular leaders, have so vainly resorted since long before the First World War.

[From the New York Post of October 11, 1943]

Absolutely essential to the creation of a real peace, which must mean a peace which resolves differences, instead of hardening and perpetuating them, are principles acceptable to large bodies of men in all countries, including those of our enemies. The pacification of the world, after this war, is a missionary task. Statesmanship can be used as its instrument. But the spirit cannot be created out of nationalism and national interests, for nationalism, raised to the point where it has usurped all values and laid hold on the throne of God, is the basic cause of this war.

Therefore it is essential that a voice come out of the darkness to speak for the human race, and for principles untainted by national interests. That this voice should come from men of three creeds, who mutually seek to serve God and man, is altogether fitting and is the correct answer to Hitler.

[From the Boston Traveler of October 9, 1943]

A common call without precedent in world history has been issued by the three great religious faiths of America. In an hour of world crisis, leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish churches have issued a joint testament of faith in the rights of man and the dignity of the human spirit.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 7, 1943]

The importance of the church's militant leadership in winning the peace cannot be minimized. It is one of the vital forces which influence men's thoughts and actions and, united as the three great faiths now are, they can be a potent force in arousing the people of this country to the support of a realistic program to achieve the objectives they have set out as the moral basis for an enduring peace.

[From the Commonweal, New York, N. Y., of October 15, 1943]

The joint statement of October 7 is an important step toward winning the coming peace. Each of its seven points is backed up by more detailed enunciations of principle, such as papal allocutions, resolutions adopted by the Rabbinical Assembly and Protestant denominational and interdenominational statements. If these principles are unflinchingly insisted on by American adherents of the major religious bodies, there will, indeed, be some chance of winning the peace. This is interfaith activity at its utmost value.

[From the Catholic Courier of Rochester, N. Y.]

Extreme significance must be attached to the identical statement on peace issued simultaneously by members of the hierarchy and Protestant and Jewish religious authorities. Agreement by religious leaders on what constitutes basic principles for permanent peace will be of no little concern to industrial labor and political leaders as well as to legislators and those who direct foreign policy. * * *

To all who respect the role that religion should play in formulating plans for peace, the statement presents a basic frame of reference for the several specific plans and programs being brought to the fore.

The statement will bear fruit only in attaining specific application by those responsible for formulating post-war programs. Ultimately its effectiveness will rest upon a widespread popular acceptance and insistence.

[From the Church World, Portland, Maine, of October 8, 1943]

The real significance of the declaration of world peace, recently sponsored by nationally known representatives of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism would seem to lie in the fact that for the first time in our national history there is a concerted effort to read religion into the peace program which is now being formulated by the United Nations.

[From the Catholic Sentinel, Portland, Oreg., of October 14, 1943]

It is of interest to note that the program in six of its seven points makes allusion or direct mention of international organization as a necessary medium in the post-war era for the establishment and maintenance of peace. * * * The seven-point program is full of constructive thought, no matter how hard it may be to realize in full. And having the endorsement of representative Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, it should have a strong influence upon forthcoming legislation on the subject of peace.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in this connection, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me once more, I hand to him another strong statement by the joint commission on reconstruction adopted by the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2 of this year. I am going to ask the Senator from Florida if he would not like to read it in connection with his remarks at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the declaration handed me by the able Senator from New Mexico, being the report of the joint commission on reconstruction adopted by the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2–11, 1943, reads as follows:

In the light of this faith we seek a more unified world, possessing a world framework within which the nations may find security and freedom, and within which in peace the nations set themselves to cooperate for production and distribution.

The bitter experience of the past quarter of a century has underscored the basic Christian principle of the unity and mutual responsibility of all mankind in God. "We are members one of another; if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it. God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth." Practically, we believe the idea that the balancing of power with power would create a harmony of economic and political powers has broken down; "the freedom of the nations is today dependent on achieving a supranational unity in which each nation actively participates and which has the power to protect it against insecurity and conquest"; this will not be achieved by laissez faire but by ending the present international anarchy through the creation of an international authority.

According to the testimony yesterday on this floor by a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which reported the pending resolution, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], "international authority" are the exact words which were deleted from the resolution reported by the subcommittee. Senators will recall that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] said that the original draft of the Senate committee resolution provided for "an international authority," and that that language was deleted. It must be assumed, from such an able body of men, that it was purposefully deleted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Iowa is not present, and I ask, Is it not a fact that all he said was that the article "an" was eliminated?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator just quoted "an international authority," and then said that that language was deleted. The only deletion was of the article "an," still retaining the word "authority," which the Senator has denounced here.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is an element of correctness in what the able chairman of the committee has said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the Senator say how far that element extends.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says "an element of correctness." I was either correct or not correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wants to be captious about it, he was not correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas wants other Senators to respect his integrity and his sincerity, that is all he wants. The Senator from Texas was either correct or he was not, and when the Senator——

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator was not wholly correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator from Florida says that the Senator's statement has an element of correctness in it, he is insulting.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator wants to construe what I said as an offense, I regret it, but I cannot prevent it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator can be accurate, and say what he means.

Mr. PEPPER. I propose to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, say it, then.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I meant to say that there was an element of error in what I had said. The matter might as well be mentioned now as at any other time. I will say that in any discussion of this subject which the junior Senator from Florida makes, to the best of his limited ability, he will present to the Senate only that which possesses merit; but it has been rather apparent to the Senate how the able chairman of the committee, for 2 days now, has felt. First, when he had answered questions not more than 15 minutes yesterday, he advised the Senate, in a moment of noticeable impatience, that the debate had degenerated into a heckling; and he was the chairman of the committee, who should have been the authentic voice telling his fellow Senators what this

resolution meant. Had he not been questioned, he would not have taken up a single word of it. His prepared address speaks for itself. He has been impatient with debate. He did not desire debate, Mr. President, and now every time a remark is made here the Senator seems to take it as a personal affront.

I certainly have nothing but the highest respect and the greatest esteem for the able Senator from Texas. If I have unintentionally given him offense, I humbly apologize. But if I make a careless or improper use of a word, I do not like to have the able Senator not give me an opportunity to correct it without making a spectacle of an offense upon the floor of the Senate. I hope that nothing I shall say or give inference to will in any way offend any Senator, least of all the able chairman of this committee.

A few moments ago, in addressing the Senator from Minnesota, who had said nothing to give the able Senator from Texas offense, the able Senator in his way, into which he sometimes lapses, certainly questioned the good faith of the able Senator from Minnesota, and certainly said things to him, as the RECORD will attest, accusing him of obstruction and other things, at which the able Senator from Minnesota might, if he had been a little less broad-minded and sympathetic and understanding, have justly taken some offense.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Texas must remember that Senators have their sentiments, all Senators, including the able Senator from Texas, and they do not like to be browbeaten, either, and, if they are able to prevent it, they do not expect to be browbeaten by their colleagues, certainly by those for whom they have the warmest and the friendliest feelings.

Mr. President, I pause to apologize for any remark I may have made. I shall explain why I said "an element of correctness," by which I intended to correct my own inaccuracy. What I had uppermost in my mind was that the resolution of the committee does not say "an international authority," it says "international authority." I was reading from a resolution of a religious group, which used the words "an international authority." The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] in the presence of Senators on this floor—and I am not speaking in the absence of subcommittee members; I see several of them on the floor at the present time—stated yesterday that at one time the language of the resolution contained the words "an international authority." Our amendment says "an international organization." That is what we are contending for. We contend that that is different from "international authority." In our amendment the article "an" appears. So I lapsed into the error of saying there had been stricken out of the subcommittee draft the very thing this resolution speaks of "an international authority" and that "international authority" had been inserted. If I erred in saying they struck out "an international authority," I meant that they deleted the words, that they took "an international authority" out, and left only "international authority." When the Senator called my attention to the fact that all they actually deleted was "an," I meant to say, certainly with no offense, that there was an element of correctness in that.

I perhaps should have been more careful in choosing my words. But I am right, and I assume no Senator will question what a member of the subcommittee said here yesterday, that whereas this resolution says, "This will not be achieved by laissez faire but by ending the present international anarchy through the creation of an international authority based on law, and provided with power to enforce that law," at least the words "an international authority," all together, or the institution which would be an international authority, is not provided for in the resolution of the committee.

Certainly the article "an," which we think essential and vital—an organization something like the League of Nations, if you please—an organization which is an entity, something which is distinct from its membership, is not created in the resolution of the subcommittee. This is what they say, and the pertinent paragraph is the third:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority.

Not "an international organization," not "an international authority," but "international authority." This group of religious people say that if anarchy is to be avoided, that must be achieved through the creation of "an international authority," and I will say right now to the able Senator, the chairman of the committee, in charge of the resolution, that if he will substitute "an international authority" for "international authority," or if he will cause the article "an" to be placed in front of the word "international," I am confident that our group, which has offered an amendment seeking to establish "an international organization," will acquiesce, and delete that part of our amendment.

Mr. President, we think that is the very heart of the matter. We do not think the resolution of the subcommittee was intended to create an international organization or an international authority. We think that by studied ambiguity they have avoided that, lest they might have committed themselves with some certainty and positiveness to a particular principle or policy. It was not the intention of the committee, Mr. President, to face the Senate and say, "Yes, before the world we advocate and advise that the United States become a party to an international organization or authority to be constituted of the nations of the earth, which shall have an entity, an existence, in international affairs."

No; they preferred a resolution which will allow those who favor the League of Nations to say, "Yes, that is what we are getting. Look at the resolution. We are getting an international authority. Surely that is what is meant in the resolution."

On the other hand, the committee, by its resolution, makes it equally possible for those who so bitterly oppose an international organization of the league character to say, "Well, after all, what the committee is thinking about is some kind of cooperation among nations, a getting together into some kind of a working together and getting together from time to time."

Mr. President, that poses the essential heart of the question presented by our amendment. Our amendment may not be right. Our amendment may not be what the Senate should adopt. Our amendment, if it be adopted, may disappoint its authors. It might not stave off the horrors and the tragedy of World War No. 3, the shadows of which are cast in the Senate today. No, Mr. President, it might not gratify the hope of mankind that children yet to be born shall not die in blood and mud, but before God and fellow Senators I say it is something definite at least, and the committee resolution, like an old Mother Hubbard, covers everything and touches nothing.

Mr. President, I will resume the reading of the declaration of the Joint Commission on Reconstruction, which was adopted by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church held at Cleveland from the 2d to the 11th of October.

> We need to arm ourselves now with the moral purpose to fashion such a united world beyond the day of battle.
>
> We would, therefore, advocate the following propositions:
>
> 1. The coming peace must provide an overall arrangement for international collaboration in dealing with those common world problems which are capable of no purely national or regional solution: within such world framework purely regional affairs can be left to regional groups.

Mr. President, I propose later to discuss the details of the committee resolution, but show me in its language anything that proposes affirmative collaboration among nations. Show me anything equivalent to what appears in our amendment, which gives as the first and essential purpose of this international organization which we propose to create the purpose "to promote cooperation among nations."

On the other hand, when we read the resolution reported by the committee we find it says nothing about meeting economic problems. It says nothing about promoting cooperation among nations. It says nothing about an affirmative function of this international authority which is to be set up. It will be found in the last analysis that it is a sterile proposal to establish brute force as the policeman for the world. That is essentially what the resolution proposes. It proposes the creation of a policeman who shall have power to prevent aggression, and to preserve peace, and that is all the power he is given, unless it means that this organization can do anything anywhere at any time which it may propose to do, which is a blanket authority which no Senator would propose seriously to his colleagues to be granted to any kind of an organization or authority.

> 2. Such collaboration should include the supervision and control of all military estab-

lishments and the creation of international police power sufficient to set up an effective system of collective security, yet with machinery flexible enough to allow for adjustment of equitable changes and claims. The world has now become one: whatever happens anywhere in the long run happens to all: the world must therefore be organized accordingly.

3. Such collaboration must be able to deal with the broad world problems of finance and economics.

Mr. President, I read the resolution. Besides the first two catch-alls or whereases, which mean nothing, the third and pertinent paragraph reads as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, is there anything in that paragraph about economics, about promoting the welfare of the world by economic collaboration? Is there anything in it about finance? Is there anything in it about currency stabilization? Is there anything in it about relief and rehabilitation? Is there anything in it about disarmament? No, Mr. President, there is merely the sheer grant of power to enforce a military stringency upon the assertion of aggression, and with some general and meaningless commission to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if we are to understand that the three religious organizations to which he has referred have endorsed such a plan as the Senator has just outlined?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to my able friend from Nebraska that I was reading from a report made by the Joint Commission on Reconstruction, adopted by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2 to 11, 1943.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. I wish to ask the able Senator from Florida if the three religious organizations mentioned by him have endorsed the so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, or the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and other Senators, or both.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the honesty of the inquiry of the able Senator from Nebraska, and as best I can I will say that the summary of the situation is as follows: A little while ago, within the last few weeks, this group of leaders of the ministry of these three faiths—the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish—after a long deliberation and consideration, promulgated this declaration of theirs which they call A Pattern for Peace. One of the signers of that declaration in the Catholic faith was Monsignor Ryan. The able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] read a letter addressed to the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] from Monsignor Ryan, pointing out the deficiencies in the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Resolution 192, as compared to the declaration of the three religious groups. So far as I know, Monsignor Ryan in the letter did not say that he approved the amendment which we propose, but he emphasized the deficiencies of the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 192, and it is our position, I will say to my good friend from Nebraska, that taking the language of the three religious groups in their manifesto, which they said was the minimum for an effective world organization, greater agreement and accord will be found with the amendment offered by our group than with the resolution now pending reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that explanation.

Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the Senator's opinion that the three distinguished men who represent the three faiths were speaking for the churches or were voicing the opinion of the churches they represent, as to their attitude toward the principles laid down in the declaration of principles?

Mr. PEPPER. That is my opinion. I cannot say that they actually had authority to represent the churches.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking.

Mr. PEPPER. But I can say that I believe those eminent men—approximately 50 from each of the faiths mentioned—represent the sentiment of the leadership of the ministry of those three denominations.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as I was about to read, "such collaboration must be able to deal with the particular world problems of financial interest, the regulation of tariffs with an eye to the interest of the community of nations as a whole, and the establishment of free access to raw materials."

Is there anything in the resolution now before the Senate which would give the international authority it would create the slightest jurisdiction to interest itself in problems growing out of world tariffs? Is there in the resolution any suggestion which by any possible stretch of the imagination would give the international authority proposed by the committee, the jurisdiction of which is "to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," any authority to deal with the question of access to raw materials, which is one of the very proximate causes of the present conflict? I submit that in the pending resolution providing for the establishment of this international policeman with a gun and a club, Mr. President, which is the only possible interpretation of the language "international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," there is nothing which by any possible stretch of the imagination can give any authority for their international authority to deal in such an affirmative way with those problems and functions which alone may resolve the economic crisis and conflict among nations.

The able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has just handed to me a telegram delivered to him, dated at New York, October 25, 1943, and addressed to him. It reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *October 25, 1943.*

CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senator,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of the organized religious bodies of American citizens of Jewish faith we urge you reject all resolutions failing to conform to minimum requirements for peaceful world set forth in Protestant, Catholic, Jewish resolution of world peace, namely, international guarantee human rights all races and creeds, establishment international law, guarantee fulfillment international obligations, insure collective security by limiting and permanent control of armaments, compulsory arbitration of controversies with use of adequate sanctions. Vital you support every amendment which claries these essentials and admits no ambiguity.

SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, *President.*

Mr. President, that telegram was sent on the 25th of October. It was sent in reference to the pending debate in the Senate. While it does not mention the amendment of the group with which I have the honor to be identified, at the same time it is clear on the face of the telegram that it contemplates the ambiguity, the inadequacy, and the weakness of Resolution No. 192, which is now the principal resolution pending before the Senate; and I will say, Mr. President, that that is exactly the purpose of the group with which I am associated. We are not wedded to our amendment. If anyone has anything better, I believe every member of our group, some of whom are now on the floor, will support such an amendment. We are talking about the difference in principle between a meaningless and a meaningful declaration by the Senate of the United States as to the policy of the United States of America.

Mr. President, there is no misapprehension in any one's mind about what has happened here. The able Senator a minute ago was speaking about delay. I wish, however, to finish reading the declaration before I comment about that. I desire to reiterate, for myself, that I am told the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has an amendment, which I assume he has sent to the desk, relating to the restoration of world trade after the war. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall support that amendment. I believe the members of the group with which I am associated will support it, too, because the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi is an able, clarifying, and strengthening amendment.

I read again from the report of the joint commission on reconstruction of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

4. The nucleus of such international authority is already in existence in the United Nations.

Mr. President, does the resolution of the committee say anything about the

United Nations? Not a word. With whom does it say we should join in the establishment—not of "an" or of "this"—but "of international authority"? It says "with free and sovereign nations," but that leaves out of membership every noble people now overrun by tyranny and the terror of Hitler and his Axis co-partners. At least this Protestant Episcopal group realizes, as we did when we offered the amendment, that it is with the United Nations that we are fighting the war, and it should be with the United Nations, at least as a nucleus, that we should make the peace. That, Mr. President, has been totally ignored by those who wrote Senate Resolution 192.

What a difference in the sentiment and the spirit of the opponents in this matter. We will gladly yield to any betterment of our amendment. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would likewise do so. We will gladly yield to any better or any more clarifying amendment.

But what does the committee tell us? No; they would not even allow their colleagues on the full committee to amend the resolution in a single detail. The subcommittee is in fact but the instrumentality of the full committee. Since March of last year they have had a commission from their principal, the full committee, to write a resolution on this subject, and we all have a right to our individual opinion as to whether anything save the pressure of the country and of the House of Representatives in the passage of the Fulbright resolution ever would have brought to the floor of the Senate any kind of resolution from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. We have a right to exercise our own judgment and to entertain our own opinion as to whether it was desired, even by the responsible leadership of that committee, to bring out anything on the floor of the Senate, upon the announced fear that to precipitate discussion, perhaps even in the full committee, certainly on the floor of the Senate, would be dangerous to our allies' impression of us—dangerous, Mr. President, to our international standing and responsibility.

So I say that even in the full committee, when a subcommittee which had had this subject since last March, only on Tuesday of last week seriously began to consider this subject, it was understood that not an "i" was to be dotted and not a "t" crossed, save as fixed by the subcommittee.

Now the resolution has come to the floor. Ordinarily Senators do not profess to be wedded to a word. Surely one is open to the charge of presumptuousness if he thinks his language, however long it may have been deliberated upon, cannot possibly be improved in the Senate, with the scrutiny of 130,000,000 people turned upon it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In line with what the Senator is now saying, it has been suggested directly that we must not amend this resolution, because to attempt to do so on the floor of the Senate would be to write a resolution which would be dangerous. That suggestion has been made not once, but many times.

I will ask the able Senator, who is a member of the committee, if everything for which we contend here on the floor was not fully presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and if it had wanted to consider the amendments, it could have done so without running into any danger of writing a resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I will go further. I recite only facts. Woodrow Wilson once said, "Nothing is to be gained by leaving this essential thing unsaid." Since this question has been opened up, it might as well be said that when the four Senators—the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]—came before the committee there was a distinct impression that they came there as a matter of sufferance; not only that, but before they were invited to make their statement practically all the members of the subcommittee, in their presence, were called upon by the chairman and given an opportunity to state their views about the report and the resolution of the subcommittee. I can imagine how intimidating—whether consciously or unconsciously done—it was to those four brethren of the Senate, sitting there mouselike in the corner, to hear the members of the subcommittee, called upon by the chairman to do so, express and reiterate their conviction with respect to the resolution which they had reported, before any opportunity was given for discussion of it by them or by the full committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the Senator's statement, I think it ought to be stated to the Senate and to the country that one of the first things the subcommittee did after being appointed by the chairman, by direction of the whole committee, to consider all these resolutions, was to invite the four Senators who had sponsored the resolution to which the Senator is now referring to appear before the subcommittee. They accepted the invitation, appeared, and were fully heard. They all made their statements to the subcommittee.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. They made no further request to appear before the subcommittee; but in their statements before the subcommittee at that time they emphasized the fact that they were not wedded even to their own language, but hoped that the subcommittee could draft a resolution which would be practical and could be adopted.

After the subcommittee had spent weeks, and even months, working upon the resolution, it authorized a report by the subcommittee to the full committee. The full committee did not get that report until the meeting to which the Senator is now referring; and in the presence of the full committee and the members of the subcommittee, the chairman of the subcommittee made his report to the full committee, and members of the subcommittee were called upon to make any statements they desired to make in regard to the processes by which the subcommittee had arrived at its conclusions. There was no effort on the part of any member of the committee to intimidate the four Senators. They did not come there on sufferance. They came there because the committee thought they had a right to come. They were Members of the Senate. They were welcome, and they were heard with pleasure, I will say to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is one thing which the Senator from Kentucky has said which perhaps should be explained more fully.

The Senator from Kentucky said that soon after our resolution was submitted we appeared before the subcommittee at the invitation of the subcommittee. I think that is entirely correct. I do not think we went into the question fully at that meeting. Back in March many things were being considered which were not considered in October. One of the chief things was the contention that we ought not to say anything. We took the position that our resolution was not the last word. We had always taken that position, and we take it now, with respect to the amendment which we offer. If it can be improved, we will gladly accept the improvement.

The point I rose to make is this: On that day last March when we appeared before the subcommittee I left with the definite impression—I do not say that anyone told us so, because my recollection is not good—that before the subcommittee reported the resolution we would again meet together. I made no request to be heard further. I do not charge anyone with bad faith. I do not charge anyone with misrepresentation. I merely make that explanation as to why we did not ask further hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not criticizing any of the four Senators for not making a request for a further hearing. If they had made it, or if we had had any information that they wanted to come before the subcommittee further, I am satisfied that they would have been accorded that privilege.

What I rose to do was to dissipate the idea which the Senator from Florida is seeking to impress upon the Senate, that the Senators who had submitted the so-called B2-H2 resolution were invited before the committee and appeared as a quartet of orphans, at the sufferance of the subcommittee. That certainly is not true.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say in response to that statement that, being one of the four Senators who appeared, I did not feel exactly like an orphan. I do not

think we were intimidated, but I was grievously disappointed at the result.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a perfectly legitimate feeling on the part of the Senator, and it is one to which we are all accustomed. During our legislative experience we are frequently grievously disappointed. I was grievously disappointed the other day, and have been grievously disappointed on other occasions at the action of the Senate with respect to things on which I had my heart set; but that is an entirely different thing from being intimidated, or seeking to intimidate any one.

Mr. HATCH. The disappointment was not because the language of our resolution was not adopted. It was in part because we did not think the resolution adopted by the subcommittee and by the full committee was full enough, as we have argued, and as we shall continue to argue. I was particularly disappointed in the attitude of the full committee, and I am disappointed in the attitude on the floor of the Senate, that not one single word can be changed, that this work of the subcommittee is final, conclusive, and binding, not only on the full committee, but on every Member of the Senate, and that we are doing something tremendously wrong when we exercise the privilege of a United States Senator and suggest one simple amendment. I am terribly and grievously disappointed at that attitude.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad that my warm friend the distinguished majority leader gives me an opportunity to correct any impression I may have left that I intended to state that there had been any intentional intimidation of the four Senators named. I meant to say that I felt that the fact that they were invited before the committee, and that before they were permitted to be heard, the members, or most of the members, of the subcommittee were interrogated or allowed to make a statement, of necessity had a somewhat disquieting and disturbing effect—at least a cooling impression—upon the Senators waiting there to present their affirmative amendment to the members of the full committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I must say it was not too warm.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has conveyed, better than I could, the warmth of the hospitality which the group met on that day.

I wish to confirm what the able Senator from New Mexico has suggested, namely, that after the able Senators left, four members of the committee offered the exact resolution which we have given notice that we intend to offer on the floor of the Senate, with a change in only one respect. I believe we had left out the word "other" before "United Nations." On Tuesday we did not have any provision for the inclusion of additional nations besides the United Nations. We debated the matter for only a few minutes before the committee adjourned. Our next meeting was on Thursday. On Thursday our amendment was presented to and formally voted upon by the full Committee on Foreign Relations, exactly in the form in which it now appears, with the exception of one word. We did not have the word "other" before "United Nations," as we have now; but except in that respect, the amendment was exactly as it is today in print upon the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, what I was saying was that in Cleveland, in early October, the Joint Commission on Reconstruction of the Protestant Episcopal Church stated as follows:

> The nucleus of such International Authority is already in existence in the United Nations, born out of sheer necessity. We urge that now, while the fire of war is still hot, and interests and aims more easily welded, there be created a central Council of the United Nations "as an organ for cooperative action" in prosecuting the war and in preparing for and organizing the peace. The United Nations must remain a permanent body, ultimately reaching out toward universality by the inclusion of neutral and enemy states.

Mr. President, is there anything like that language in the resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Resolution 192? Does the resolution say anything about the United Nations being the nucleus, that it must be a permanent organization; that to it in due course must be added neutral and enemy states? Mr. President, what does our amendment say? I ask Senators to attend its language:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with—

Not "free and sovereign nations," which may mean anybody, but would not mean the members of the United Nations who are under the heel of Hitler—

> the other United Nations.

Join in peace with those with whom we fight in war. There are some 30 of them, Mr. President, now solemnly bound together, fighting together around the world. Are they not good enough to be confederates in the organization of peace?

Mr. President, in the Foreign Relations Committee we were assisted and aided by the suggestion of the members that in our first amendment we had made provision for the inclusion of the United Nations only, and had not provided for the inclusion of other member states. We gladly and proudly acknowledged our error, and endeavored to correct it before the committee as well as on the floor of the Senate.

I read from the amendment which we have before the Senate—

> join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted.

That is what we say. That is what the Protestant Episcopal convention in Cleveland had in mind in saying—

> The United Nations must remain a permanent body, ultimately reaching out toward universality by the inclusion of neutral and enemy states.

And further—

> 5. Any chance to create a stable world will depend primarily on the willingness of the United States to renounce isolation and to play its full part and assume its full responsibility and exercise leadership—

In what?—

> in such an International Authority.

Not "in such an International State," but "in such an International Authority."

The same "an", Mr. President, that the subcommittee deliberately deleted in the consideration of the resolution before they reported it to the full committee.

So I think it is only proper to say—and a little later I shall discuss in more detail the resolution of the religious groups—that surely, for whatever weight the Protestant Episcopal Reconstruction Commission may have, they are, throughout the land, more in accord with our amendment than they are with the resolution of the full committee.

Mr. President, there is one other statement which I should like to read. It is a paragraph of a declaration of the American Federation of Labor. It is taken from the report of the proceedings of the American Federation of Labor, and is dated at Boston, October 13, 1943:

> We hope that Congress will declare our basic foreign policy without unnecessary delay. Such a declaration is necessary to enable our foreign representatives and the executive branch to develop plans and negotiate agreements. We believe that world organization to keep the peace must begin with understandings between the governments of the democratic nations, and extended as rapidly as possible to other nations which manifest their desires in good faith to cooperate for the objectives served by democratic institutions. The right to representation of labor and other functional citizen groups must be provided in all world agencies. Such right is a condition essential to the protection against bureaucracy.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Florida has just read a statement of the position of a great labor organization. I wonder if I may presume on his time long enough to read a letter which I received this morning from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, one of the great farm organizations.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It gives me pleasure to read the letter. It is dated October 25, 1943, and is as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR BALL: As the Senate debate on American participation in post-war world affairs approaches, I desire to recall the position of the National Farmers Union to you and other Senators who have joined with you in attempting to strengthen the so-called Connally resolution.
>
> This position was set forth in the National Farmers Union program for 1943 adopted by delegates in convention at Oklahoma City on November 19, 1942. Under the heading, "No return to isolationism," the program contains the following statements:
>
> "(8) Full participation in the councils of the nations, to the end that we may live in abundance in a world that is governed by

law based on justice. This means that we cannot return to isolationism, but must participate in world affairs to protect the way of life we are determined to achieve.

"(9) Insistence upon world trade policies that will give all peoples everywhere the chance to earn a decent living. Trade barriers lead to wars. In this war trade is a weapon used by the Government for the best interests of the United States and the United Nations. When peace comes we must continue to exchange our surpluses with those of other nations without the intervention of international profiteers. Groups adversely affected must be provided with economic and technical assistance to bring about a sound adjustment."

In the first of these two statements of principle, the word "full" is important. The National Farmers Union, when it adopted that statement, meant unequivocally that it desired the United States to participate as completely as practicable in the organization of the world for a just and lasting peace.

The Connally resolution, as it is now drawn, is not sufficiently clear and definite on this point to justify its support by the National Farmers Union. Therefore, the union will support any amendment of the Connally resolution that will embody, however it is worded, the statement of principle quoted above.

The second of these principles, No. 9 in our program statement, is, it seems to us, of at least equal importance.

I should like to express through you the hope that the Senate in its debate on postwar forms of cooperation will not ignore the necessity of grappling with the economic problems, the solution of which is the real key to a real peace. I think you will agree with us that whatever organization finally is agreed upon will be but an empty shell unless it is based on a fair economic deal for the oppressed and exploited groups of the world. In other words, unless the peace is a democratic peace from an economic point of view, then it will be but another uneasy truce between wars.

Please feel free to use this letter in any way you wish.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

If I may presume further, I think Mr. Patton makes it very clear that the great democratic farm organization of which he is the head wants a stronger, clearer statement of the American position on post-war foreign policy than is contained in the pending resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota for his valuable contribution to the subject.

Mr. President, what I intended to say was that the fact this resolution has been brought out at all, that this subject is now being considered by the United States Senate, is due to the clamor, the demand, and the insistence of the people of the United States, and, I believe I may say, of the men in uniform and of the women in uniform of this Nation, that the United States Senate shall assure all mankind that it will not again, after they, the soldiers, have won the war, betray its obligation to them and make the United States again a defaulter before the world.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that clamor for an expression by the Senate of the United States is due to the fact that after the last war the United States led the world in a policy of economic isolation which largely contributed toward the present conflict, and that they want an expression from us that that will not be the conduct of this body in the world reorganization which will follow this war?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct; and I shall discuss now, Mr. President, why it is that the people want a declaration of policy and principle from the Senate before it is too late. If it had not been that the subject came up for debate and discussion the people back home, save for the impression they might have gained from our attitude previous to Pearl Harbor, which might be presumed or might not be presumed to have carried over to the present—I say, Mr. President, save for that presumption—the people might indulge or the inference or the deduction they might draw they would not have known how their Senators felt about saving the peace and the victory won by their sons.

Mr. President, I am one of those who run next year for reelection; one-third of the United States Senate will go before the American people next year for reelection. The people are entitled to know from a searching examination they can give our records how much we are willing to fight and, if necessary, to sacrifice in order to keep World War No. 3 from engulfing the children the older brothers left home when they went away to this war. If the Senate does not enunciate a clear-cut, unequivocal, positive, meaningful declaration which will have the weight and the dignity and integrity that a declaration of this body formally made should have, all in the world the people of this country can do, all that the returning soldiery can do, all that our allies can do is to hope and pray that the United States shall not become derelict again to its solemn obligation to mankind.

So, Mr. President, this time the American people do not wish to be crucified upon the altar of political ambition again; this time, Mr. President, the American soldiery and the American people, and perhaps even our allies, do not propose to be victims of American senatorial caprice. If there be those who would obstruct a sane world order, common decency demands that the full truth be disclosed to an interested people. Yet if the Senate adopts a resolution which means everything and nothing, it will be little less than purposely dishonest with the American people.

We have already, according to newspaper reports, the greatest diversity of opinion as to the construction of the resolution among members of the committee. In the absence of the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I am most reluctant to quote anything they said, but if I am not in error—and if I am I stand corrected by the truth as it may be—I read in the Washington newspapers that the able Senator from Georgia said that he would not favor an international police force, and, if I am not in error, I heard the able Senator from Maine, a member of the subcommittee, this morning say that, in his impression and by his construction, Senate Resolution 192 as reported by his subcommittee and committee authorized and allowed for an international police force.

Mr. President, I have understood that the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] who, within his right completely, has differed in international policy with some of us, including the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], has not changed his attitude or opinions, and proposes to vote for the resolution reported by the Senate committee, if the newspapers be correct and my memory be exact, because it means nothing.

Mr. President, the able Senator from North Dakota perhaps does not believe as I do in international collaboration in the setting up of an international organization, in affirmative cooperation among nations, in an international court with power to decide international controversies peacefully and if need be the use of military force to keep world peace; but is it fair for the able Senator from North Dakota—I refer to him only by way of illustration—to go before his constituents in North Dakota and say, "I do not agree to all these things, because I voted for the Connally resolution, Senate Resolution 192," meaning by that that he has not changed his views about what some of us please to call isolation—whether I am right or not in that appellation—and then have the junior Senator from Florida go before his people in Florida and say, "You know that I believe in international cooperation, and I attest that I have evidenced my belief by reference to Senate Resolution 192"? Mr. President, I ask all my associates in the Senate whether that is political integrity.

Some Senators say the resolution may be interpreted even to include the League of Nations. Is the able Senator from North Dakota going home to his people and say, "I voted for a League of Nations"? Are the members of the subcommittee going home and say, "I voted for a League of Nations"? Are other Senators going home and say, "I did not vote for a League of Nations; there is nothing in the resolution about a League of Nations."

Some, including the able Senator from Michigan, say it includes a provision for a world court. Mr. President, is the able Senator from North Dakota going home and say, "I voted for a world court"? He could hold this resolution up before any audience of literate men and women in his State and say, "See for yourselves whether I supported a world court." Yet the able Senator from Michigan, presumably, whenever he reports to his people, is going to say, "I voted for a world court."

Mr. President, yesterday I asked the question whether the Senate had not twice repudiated or failed to ratify the World Court. I said two Presidents had recommended to this body adherence to the World Court by the United States.

I was in error; four Presidents had recommended it to the United States Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator now want to convey to the Senate of the United States and to the people of the United States the idea that he and his associates have performed the miracle of stating something in such language that there cannot be two or more different constructions placed upon it?

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; I do not. By the language of the third provision of our amendment, if that is what the Senator has in mind, where we speak of "power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," we have purposely left open the question as to whether that power, including military force, should be the military forces of the several constituent states, or whether it should be a force that should be under the direct command of the international organization. I will say to the able Senator that if there is a deficiency in our amendment, we do not claim to be more than human, but we have thought that our amendment has less ambiguity than the resolution of the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator mean to say today that, in the great campaign which will follow next year, Senators differing in their views on this great proposition will not, under the language of the Senator's amendment, be able to go before different constituencies and place varying constructions on it as they can on Senate Resolution 192?

Mr. PEPPER. I would say that I believe there is not so much ambiguity in our amendment as there is in Resolution 192. Perhaps I may be in error, but that is our opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would expect the Senator to say that, and to defend the language of his amendment, as he so eloquently is defending it. But I call his attention to the fact that there probably is nothing written in the English language in more cogent, more concise, and more direct terms, than the Constitution of the United States; yet a day never passes that we do not find people of equal authority putting different constructions on it.

This morning, as well as yesterday, we had before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary some of the ablest lawyers of the United States, contending that the Constitution means one thing. Next Tuesday we will have lawyers of equal ability saying that it means something else. So that when a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and takes the language of Resolution 192 and says that the Senator from North Dakota will construe it one way and that he will construe it another way without taking a position on either Resolution 192 or the amendment offered to it by the able Senator from Florida I predict that, even if the immaculate language used in the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida shall be adopted by the Senate, he can look for many different constructions before Members of the Senate and the people of the United States generally get through construing it.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator is undoubtedly correct in what he says. Yet, let it be remembered that our amendment was offered as a clarifying and a strengthening amendment to Senate Resolution 192. It does not purport to make it perfect, but it does purport to make it clearer than it is in its present form. Now let me indicate the respect in which that may be said to be done. In the first place, we believe that the United Nations——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator coming to a further explanation of his remark as to why he did not clarify the military provision of his amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall discuss that later, but I will say, in continuation of what I was stating, that we believe that the United Nations should be the nucleus group. We have said that in our amendment, "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the United Nations." We are willing—and we believe they should be included—to include such other nations or free and sovereign states as may be invited to come in, either in the establishment of this organization, or in the maintenance of it after it is established, and we have said that by the language "and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted."

Mr. President, we believe that what should be created is an international organization. That is not a term or phrase that is exclusive of all but one meaning, but it is clear that an international organization is more analogous to something like the League of Nations than it is to some pact like the Congress of Vienna, for example, or some association of nations which does not create a new entity on the earth, and because we are leaning in the direction of the creation of an entity, namely, an international organization, we have eliminated some of the ambiguity which would be found in the use of the words "international authority."

In addition to that we have said, "with authority to settle international disputes peacefully." We believe there should be a world court, or something like a world court. We believe that there should be some kind of an international judicial power and authority, that there should be an international judicial institution. That is what Elihu Root said long ago, that is what William Howard Taft said, I believe, that is what other jurists of the United States have taken the leadership in from time to time; that is, the establishment of an international judicial authority to settle, in a juridical way, by the principles of international law and comity, international conflicts as they may arise.

Four times a world court has been proposed to the Senate, by three Republican Presidents and one Democratic President, but the Senate has never done more than to ratify it one time, with reservations not agreed to by more than five member nations. We feel that it would be taxing the credulity of the reading public too far to ask them to believe that the United States Senate, by adopting a resolution which said "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," by the use of that language, upon the background of its own history, intended to authorize, as the able Senator from Michigan said, the establishment of a world court.

Mr. President, we who favor a world court, we who believe that it is necessary to preserve the world peace, we who believe that the time has come when international conflicts can no longer be settled in the arena of force, we who believe that civilization has progressed to the point where surely civilized men can live rather than by the rule of the jungle—

The simple plan that they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can.

We, believing that we must create new social institutions to take the place of war, contend that it is only right and proper that the Senate of the United States, in clear and unequivocal language, shall say to the world, "We will not again, as we have done four times in the past, be heedless of the recommendations of the President of the United States that we adhere to a world court."

If we who want a world court are not entitled to claim that the insertion of that language has clarified our intention, then I am sadly in error in reading and in understanding the effect of the language.

Mr. President, to proceed to the point made by my able friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], we have said that the international organization we propose to create shall not only have authority to settle international disputes peacefully, but it shall have power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. There is not any ambiguity in our language as to whether we are willing to resort to force or not. Perhaps the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is correct in his interpretation that the language of Senate Resolution 192 authorizes the use of military force, but at least may there not be a reasonable difference of opinion about it? Suppose there are two Senators on the floor. Suppose one of them thinks that we should have no force behind this international authority except economic sanctions; suppose another Senator thinks that if necessary we should resort to military force in carrying out the decrees of this organization; is it not just to give those two equally conscientious Senators a

fair choice? We have left no ambiguity in our amendment. We say "with power." It may mean economic sanctions. That may be enough. I think generally that perhaps would be enough. But there may come a solemn time, Mr. President, when nations shall have to determine whether they are willing to spill the blood of their people to maintain law, or whether they are willing to let anarchy go upon such a rampage that it shall bathe the whole earth in blood.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to understand whether the Senator's amendment is broad enough to advise a treaty which might come back to us with enough scope in it on the one hand to provide for an international army containing American troops which would be committed to war without consent of Congress, or on the other hand to provide for military force including American troops that, we will say, would be improvised from time to time, with the consent of Congress? Is the amendment that broad?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would not under any circumstances say that. I would want to make important qualifications in that statement. I will be glad to tell the Senator what they are. For example, article X of the League of Nations contained two paragraphs. The first paragraph made it the obligation of member states to protect the territorial integrity and independence of all the member states of the League, as the able Senator well recalls. The second paragraph provided that in case of aggression it should be the duty of the Council of the League to convene the member states and to make such recommendations or to give such advice as should be proper in the opinion of the Council to meet effectively this aggression.

Not even President Wilson ever contended, to my knowledge, and so far as I know no advocate of the League ever contended, that there was any power in a treaty to make it obligatory upon the United States to consider itself in a state of war without the action of the two Houses of the Congress in the passage of a joint resolution signed by the President, as the Constitution of the United States requires.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then does the able Senator from Florida say that the language of his amendment completely excludes all possibility of the use of United States soldiers in the military forces of this particular organization referred to in the amendment, without the consent of Congress?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would not say that. I want to be completely candid with the able Senator. I would not say that it would not be within the power. The able Senator will understand that this is only a charter of authority, as it might be said. It would under our amendment, if I properly interpret it, be within the power of the member states of the organization we propose to create, for them, for example, to assign of their own accord a certain number of airplanes, a certain number of pilots, a certain number of mechanics, to become part of an international air force which might become subject immediately—of course, only by the sufferance of the power to whom they owed allegiance—to the instrumentality of the international organization to suppress military aggression. But, Mr. President, when it comes to throwing the full strength of the Nation into resistance to aggression, that is analogous to war, which only the Congress, of course, can declare.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am quite sure the Senator will appreciate that even an act of that kind, such employment of airplanes, even of limited scope, might be a perfect casus belli which would lead automatically into war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in anything we do we run the risk, of course, of war, but I believe it is the consensus of the country, and I hope of the Senate, that we have so long been the victim of the risk we have taken by not trying to preserve the peace, that we are now justified in undertaking certain even great risks in trying to preserve the peace and promote the prosperity of the world.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, as I understand, the Senator does comprehend the immediate use of a small amount of force including our troops for, let us say, police purposes, by the direction of some international organization, without the consent of Congress, so far as our troops are concerned?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator says "without the consent of Congress." I would not put it that way for this reason: Our air force, of course—we will use air force by way of illustration——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; I understand.

Mr. PEPPER. Our air force can exist only by Congressional appropriation. The officers of the air force can have their being only by senatorial confirmation. The President of the United States can carry on a military organization only by the actual consent of the Congress. What I mean to say is that it would be within the power of our Government, under this charter of authority, if it chose to do so, and if it were agreeable to the Congress, in the sense that Congress made available and did not revoke such authority, to allow a portion of our air force to be used as a part of an international air force, for example.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield further.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, the language of the amendment is broad enough to advise a treaty which might come back to us with enough scope in it so that American troops, assuming we ratified the treaty, could be committed to war without the consent of Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Not committed, I will say, to war, but, Mr. President, would be just like a police force that breaks up a mob and is used for the suppression of military aggression.

For example, the movement by Hitler into the Rhineland may not constitute an action which necessarily should cause a war, just as we do not declare war when we impose economic sanctions. But the language of the amendment would permit the exercise of sufficient force to overcome the threat to world security, Mr. President, provided always that our Government acquiesced in it, and provided, of course, provision were made for it in a treaty which we ratified.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will ask whether there is a distinction in the distinguished Senator's mind between a little war, or what we might call in the usual sense of the word police duties, and a big war.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that there is a distinction in my mind. Every great stream was at one time a spring or a trickle from the mountainside, or an emergence from the bowels of the earth. If one were able to cope with it and control it in its small stages one might be relieved of the necessity of meeting a roaring angry flood further down the stream of time and history.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to point out to me the language in his amendment which would prevent the President from bringing back to us a treaty which would authorize some international organization to involve us in war without the consent or concurrence of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place, Congress may be presumed to do its duty. In the second place, I do not consider that the Congress has constitutional authority to delegate to some other body the power to declare war for the United States. When the marines take action to protect property I do not regard that as declaring war, and the Congress does not regard that as declaring war. That is the distinction in respect to the expression "aggression."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am drawing a distinction in my own mind between routine police work and war, and I was endeavoring to direct attention for my own benefit to the distinctions in the Senator's mind.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it seems to me that on the question of where the power should reside—whether in the individual nations which are members of the authority or organization or in the authority or organization—neither our amendment nor the pending resolution—Senate Resolution 192—makes that question clear. I think it would be a perfectly plausible interpretation of Senate Resolution 192, as it reads, to say that it would authorize the President to negotiate a treaty creating international authority with power, including military force, to suppress aggression.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator refer to something beyond the mere exercise of small police power?

Mr. BALL. I think that is all anyone has ever actually contemplated in the way of international force—probably primarily air units to police the disarmament of the Axis, to put out the little fires before they grow into world wars. I do not think in our amendment we go into that question any more than the resolution as reported from the committee goes into it. I think either interpretation would be possible of either one.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, of course that is a very important question, and I am rather surprised that there is that much leeway in respect to the intent of the amendment, because it has the defect which the Senator has complained of in the resolution, namely, that there are too many alternatives.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to my able friend that I wonder if he would not acquit us of quite as much ambiguity in our amendment as there is in Senate Resolution 192, because we do say, in the first place, "including military force." We do not leave any doubt about that. There are cases in which we would countenance the use of military force. But we do something else; we make it clear that we would use that power, including military force, only to suppress military aggression. We do not leave it open, as Senate Resolution 192 leaves it open, and say "to prevent aggression."

The suggestion was just made to me by one of our able colleagues that it would have been perfectly proper to have used the analogy of the break in the dike or the dam being stopped up before the whole structure collapses. We all remember the story of the hero who put his arm into the break in the dike and thus saved a city and its people from devastation.

What we are thinking about is that there is the authority in the power we prescribe in the amendment for the group of nations which come together in this international organization to provide for the use of even military force. No doubt we were influenced in bringing it up by the suggestion made by Mr. Churchill who stated in his speech, which the Senator will recall, that the force might be of two types; it might either belong to the international organization—I am only paraphrasing the Prime Minister's words—or it might reside in the several constituent members, and be subject to levy. In other words, it is the difference between the Army of the United States, which is the instrumentality of that entity, the present United States of America, and the army which was under the command of General Washington, an army which was raised, not by law of the Congress, but by levy upon the member States engaged in the Revolution.

We should like to leave that open, so that experience and wisdom, as it may evolve, may determine the answer.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. To my mind the Senator has left open perhaps the most vital question with which we should concern ourselves. So far as I am concerned, I might consent to a limited police power, limited in obectives, carefully defined, to be called into action under certain conditions, whereas I never would consent to any sort of organization which would allow anyone to commit the United States to war without the consent of Congress. In the resolution, that is open.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. I would not subscribe to any agreement or power which would give any organization, other than the Congress of the United States, according to the Constitution, the power to declare war on behalf of the United States of America. However, I am sure my able friend, if he has doubt about that meaning of our amendment, must be even more troubled about the purport of Resolution 192, for it says "with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, what would have that power to prevent aggression? International authority. Senators have been saying that it might include the League of Nations, that they contemplate something like an association of nations, a compact, or something of the sort—at any rate, that the international authority which they propose, or that that international authority which they propose, would have "power to prevent aggression." They did not say that the several member states shall have the power to come together and furnish forces which might prevent aggression. They did not say that. They said the international authority that they propose to create would have the "power to prevent aggression."

Mr. President, do they mean to prevent aggression by sanctions only? Do they mean to prevent aggression by military force? If they mean to prevent aggression by military force, then they evidently give the same leeway about which the Senator from Colorado is disturbed in respect to our amendment, except I think the Senator would have to admit that they give more leeway than we do.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask the Senator whether in the use of the word "military," he has not inserted a word of unnecessary limitations. The word "military," as I understand it, is used in various senses: One, as distinguished from the Navy; and then, of course, sometimes it is used in referring to the armed forces generally.

What interpretation would prevail? Certainly, the word "military" is very frequently interpreted as being distinguished from the word "naval"; and it is quite possible that this language might be construed so that the restricted interpretation would be applied when a test were made.

If one goes into the matter of the etymology of the word—which, of course, is not controlling, but merely is suggestive, since it is a bit of a guide in pointing out the use of the root word in the past—one finds, of course, that the word "military" comes from the Latin word "miles" and refers to a foot soldier. Certainly it had nothing to do with naval operations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Maryland that the purpose in the use of that word was rather purposely to limit the language of the committee so as to show that when we conferred power upon this international authority it was not unlimited power to prevent any kind of aggression, but that we limited it to military aggression; the aggression which the international authority would have the power to prevent would be military aggression.

However, to proceed by considering the matter in another way, we would give not only economic power but military power to prevent military aggression.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But the Senator uses the phrase "military force."

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator wants to provide for the use of force, what would be the advantage in restricting such use merely to the use of land forces, and not including the use of the naval and air forces?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the word "military" was intended in the larger sense of the term, to apply to any of the armed forces which a nation might possess.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But that interpretation is not always put upon it. The Senator has used a word which is susceptible of various interpretations.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. Looking at it in one way, the word "military" might include only land forces and not naval forces. It might be best to say "including armed forces." I am sure that the group sponsoring the amendment would be indebted to the Senator if he should propose to clarify that language.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not offer the suggestion by way of criticism; but I make it because it seems to me that the Senator was using a word which had various interpretations and various meanings, always a source of danger to be avoided if possible.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct. We wished to make it clear that the power which the international authority would possess would be something more than economic sanctions, something more than persuasion, something more than mere civil force. We thought we were clarifying the language of the committee by making it clear that there was no intention to withhold the authority and power to use force which we may call armed force.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is undoubtedly aware of the fact that there are some precedents in which the Senate has advised, and on the strength of the advice, treaties have been concluded which have not been returned to the Senate for consent. I notice that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has an amendment which is brief. If the

Senator will permit me to do so I should like to read it.

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The amendment reads as follows:

That any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

In the view of the Senator, does his resolution contemplate that whatever might result from it should come back to the Senate for consent?

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly. The Senate must regard itself as morally bound by its advice. Of course, it has no legal power to prevent a subsequent Senate from going contrary to the advice given, and, of course, the present Senate has no power to dispense with the constitutional requirement that treaties must be ratified before they become the obligation of the Nation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was pointing out that there are precedents for the advice—perhaps rather particularized in those cases, and perhaps more particularized than either of the two proposals before us—being taken as the equivalent of consent, and the treaties therefore did not come back to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there can be no treaty binding the United States unless it be consented to by the United States Senate, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring in the ratification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree 100 percent with what the Senator has said, but there are precedents to the contrary.

Mr. PEPPER. I dare say that if the precedents exist, if they were carefully examined they would be found to be governmental acts which did not necessarily come in the category of treaties; or perhaps the question was not raised. In other words, the Senate cannot, by mere acquiescence, make an obligation a treaty obligation. It may allow the executive department of the Government to carry out an agreement which it may have made, and if the question is never raised, it may be regarded as the obligation of this country; but it cannot become a treaty, as the able Senator has said, without being ratified in the proper way by the United States Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator be good enough to yield while I read three rather short paragraphs on that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from the Digest of International Law, by Hackworth, volume V, on page 58. The first excerpt which I wish to read is as follows:

The regular procedure is for the President to send the signed treaty which he desires to ratify to the Senate and for the Senate, if it is willing to give its advice and consent to ratification, to pass a resolution to that effect. Occasionally the Senate has passed resolutions in advance of signature authorizing the President to enter into a treaty as particularly described in the resolution. An example of this latter procedure occurred when the conventions signed between the United States and Mexico on August 16, 1927, and August 17, 1929, extending the duration of the claims commissions provided for in earlier conventions were authorized by the Senate prior to adjournment and the authorization was acted upon by the President during the recess of the Senate.

The Department of State to Mrs. C. M. Keleham, June 25, 1931, MS. Department of State, file 026 Treaties/731.

I skip some matters which depart into other subjects, and come again to the subject which I have been discussing. I quote from page 59:

Since, therefore * * * the initiation of treaty negotiation, the negotiation of its terms, the framing of its provisions, its signature, and the final act of ratification are performed only by the President and without any control by the Senate, all resting entirely in his discretion, it seems clear that the Senatorial "advice and consent" may be given to a general treaty plan and that the President conforming to such plan in his negotiation of a treaty, such treaty may be legally proclaimed by him without the necessity of putting the signed document before the Senate for its final consideration.

Memorandum of the Solicitor for the Department of State (Clark), Aug. 5, 1911 1911 Solicitor's Opinions, part 2, pages 22. 228, 232, 245–246, 248.

This conclusion as to the lack of necessity for a second reference seems to have been acted upon in at least three cases; first, with reference to a secret article negotiated with the Creek Indians in 1790, in which case the Senate approved the substance of the article before it was signed by the parties, and there is no record that after its signature it was resubmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before it was proclaimed by the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator infer from the case mentioned that the instrument to which the Senate gave assent was in being at the time it gave the assent?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it could be inferred either way. I think it could have been on advice which was sufficiently particularized so that the President felt safe in making a treaty which would follow the advice, let us say, almost word for word, without resubmission; or it might have been a generalized advice followed by a treaty which was not submitted for consent.

Continuing:

Another instance of the same kind is found in connection with the negotiation of an additional article to a treaty with the Cherokee Indians in 1792. The President having laid the basis of the additional article before the Senate, the Senate advised and consented thereto, whereupon the President, through his agent, negotiated the additional article which was proclaimed before ever being resubmitted to the Senate. The additional article in this case was negotiated and signed as a separate and distinct instrument from the treaty itself. The third precedent is to be found in the additional article negotiated to the Jay Treaty of 1794. In that case the Senate ratified the original treaty "on condition that there be added to the said treaty an article, whereby it shall be agreed, etc." The said article was negotiated and signed. After full consideration by the President and Cabinet of the question as to whether or not it was necessary, after negotiation of this article, to resubmit the same to the Senate for its further advice and consent, it was decided that such resubmission was not necessary, and the treaty was accordingly proclaimed, including additional article without resubmission.

I thank the Senator for graciously yielding to me so that I could get that matter into the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. That is a valuable contribution to the literature on the subject. It is a very interesting subject. I propose to go into it in further detail tomorrow.

I would not, of course, say that it is impossible for the Senate to particularize its consent before the Executive acts, so that the Senate may fairly be said to have advised and consented to what the Executive, who is a partner in the treaty-making power, may have done. I would say that it is a matter of fair interpretation as to whether or not what the Senate has done may fairly be construed as indicating its advice and consent to the action taken by a two-thirds majority if it may have particularized before the act itself as to what was to be done, sufficiently so that a person might fairly say that the Senate advised and consented to it. I think that would be legal; but we were thinking more or less of a broad statement of principle, not pointed to a focus or related to an instrument with respect to which it could be fairly said that the Senate had actually advised and consented to that instrument.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as the Senator is concerned, and so far as his associates in sponsoring the amendment are concerned, are they willing to agree to the so-called Willis amendment, or its equivalent?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think it is necessary, I will say to my able friend, because the provisions of the Constitution, of course, are assumed to be a part of everything we do and say. The Constitution is very clear that what is done in respect to the making of a treaty must have the advice and consent of the Senate, with two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. I think such a provision in the amendment would be surplusage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The merit of the Senator's case as he has explained it is that he is particularizing through his amendment. The decisions which I have read put up a red lantern against particularization to the point where further submission to the Senate is not necessary. Therefore it seems to be only common prudence that the Senator's amendment, or the resolution itself, should have a distinct provision attached to it that a resulting treaty shall come back to the Senate for its traditional approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not entertain the fear which my able

friend from Colorado entertains, that anyone could or would construe the language either of the amendment or the resolution to be definite and particular enough to bind the Senate, as having advised and consented to it, if it did no more than pass a resolution proposing only to state a principle, and the President, pursuant to that general principle, executed some formal instrument with one or more foreign powers. I do not believe that anyone could use one of these short resolutions as a basis for contending that it is fair to say that the Senate had assented, by giving its proper advice and consent, so as to make it an obligation of the United States as a treaty.

If it went into great detail, as in the cases which the able Senator has particularized, and if the matter involved were merely a treaty with an Indian tribe, which would probably not be a matter of great national importance, involving some question of boundaries, payments, or their right to use lands, or a question concerning the payment of claims, or something like that, and the President should inquire of the Senate whether it would advise and consent, or whether it would recommend that he execute the agreement, if the Senate should advise and consent to it by a two-thirds vote, and sufficiently particularize what he was to do so that it would be a fair statement to say that the Senate intended to give him authority to go ahead and do it, and by giving him that authority, had advised and consented to it; that would be all right. But surely, on a matter of this importance and moment, no one would ever assume that the Senate, by a simple declaration of principle, even if it should go so far as to say that we favor the setting up of a world court, would mean thereby that it would agree to approve any kind of a court, constituted in any way, with any authority, which actually might be created as the result of the negotiation of the President with the foreign power.

I think it is extremely important that we give that advice—and I expect to go into the question fully tomorrow—because by giving the advice we at least lay down the broad outline of our views and sentiments.

There is certainly a degree of moral responsibility upon the Senate to make its ratification and its advice consistent; and certainly the proponents of such a treaty, if one were made, would be within their rights in coming back to the Senate when the question of ratification came up, and saying, "The Senate advised the Executive to make a treaty along these lines. We think it may be fairly said that he has followed the Senate's advice. We see no reason now to change our position." I believe it would be the duty of the Senate to ratify a treaty made pursuant to the advice which it gave; and I believe that such consideration should have considerable moral weight with the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator is firmly of the opinion that in this case such advice should not preclude a resubmission, I think the easy way to clarify it is to agree to an amendment to that effect, or at least make some unequivocal statement as to the requirement of Senate consent to a resulting treaty. So far as losing time in debate on a resubmission is concerned, I respectfully suggest that there is enough room for argument, for example, between one type of military force discussed awhile ago, and another type of military force, to occupy a long period of debate. There is no automatic foreclosure in the amendment of either arm of the debate.

Mr. PEPPER. What does the able Senator from Colorado understand to be the meaning of the words "acting through its constitutional processes" in the earlier part of paragraph 3 of both the resolution and the amendment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say to the able Senator that I am not sponsoring either provision. I am an earnest seeker after light.

Mr. PEPPER. If the able Senator and the majority of the Senate should not feel that the provision "acting through its constitutional processes" safeguards the Senate against the assumption that this advice would morally and legally bind it to ratify whatever may be executed pursuant to the advice, I am perfectly agreeable to an amendment which would so provide in appropriate language.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that something of that kind—something to require resubmission—is especially called for in view of the question already raised in the Senate as to what is an executive agreement, as distinguished from a treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator raises a very interesting question as to what is an international executory agreement and what is a treaty. I propose to address myself to that question tomorrow, Mr. President, and show that one of the reasons why it is so essential that the Senate give adequate advice to the Executive is that in two instances within the recent memory of Senators, other Senators have insisted that instruments which were agreed to by the Congress be distinctly regarded as international agreements and not treaties. In some instances it has been insisted that they should be regarded as treaties and not international agreements. In other words, I propose to show that Senators who have not had a distinct record in favor of collaboration among nations with respect to the Panama Treaty, and in respect to the Relief and Rehabilitation Organization, have clearly indicated that they do not expect any future international agreement setting up a world organization to be regarded as an international agreement which might be ratified by a majority vote of both Houses. They have taken pains to see to it that any such arrangement as that is regarded technically as a treaty, therefore requiring the vote of two-thirds of the Senate as a treaty does.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have listened to the debate between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Colorado, and this is the first time, in connection with the discussion of either the resolution or the amendment, that I have heard advanced the suggestion that what we might do here in connection with either would be binding upon the Senate, so far as the future is concerned. I have always understood that such action would be merely a recommendation to the President of the United States, and, indeed, not so much to the President, as more or less to the world, with respect to our position at this particular time. Our action would have nothing whatever to do with what some future Senate might do with respect to a treaty.

Mr. PEPPER. It would certainly have no legally binding effect.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I mean. It would merely express an opinion at this time, as to how the Senate, as now constituted, feels about international collaboration.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct, and I will say to him that he expresses my view exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as making a treaty was concerned, the President of the United States could either follow the views of the Senate or not follow them. It would be within his power to act as he chose, and it would be within the power of the Senate afterward either to ratify or not ratify any treaty the President might make in connection with the great problem confronting us. What we are all trying to do, as I see it, is to lay down some fundamental principle upon which the great majority can agree, in order to tell the President what the Senate believes is the proper path to pursue, and that if that path is pursued, ultimately, when the President returns to the Senate with some sort of a treaty in line with what we have agreed upon here, he can in advance depend upon the support of those in the Senate at that time. That is about the sum and substance of it. In other words, while I may be wrong about it, I do not believe that during previous wars resolutions of this character have been discussed in advance. Am I right or wrong about that?

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator is right about it. There have been many instances when the Senate has given advice, and I propose to refer to some of them in detail tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Insofar as a formal resolution is concerned, I think the resolution passed by the House is novel, and I think the resolution proposed in the Senate, if I understand the history of the past, is also new. The whole situation comes about because of what happened after the last war. It all comes about because we would like to tell our allies somewhat in advance as to what the United States Senate will do in the post-war period. As

I view the situation, because of our experience after the last war, when the President laid down his 14 points which it was thought would be adopted, but which were not ratified by the Senate, and because of what happened previous to Pearl Harbor, the Allied Nations want to know the sentiment and the attitude of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Only after I have warmly thanked the able Senator from Illinois for his very valuable contribution to the discussion.

Mr. HATCH. I do not care to open up the subject which the Senator from Illinois has touched upon by his questions, which are most pertinent, and which must be discussed before the debate shall be ended, but I do wish to add to what he said when he referred to other nations having a right to know the sentiment of the Senate, in view of the past history of our own country. I think the Senate of the United States is under an obligation to adopt some kind of a resolution, in order that our own people and our allies may know whether or not we are going to do as we did 25 years ago. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. I very cordially thank the very able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has raised a very important point, one which the Senate, in view of the citations given by the Senator from Colorado, cannot disregard. I gather from listening to the observations of the able Senator from Colorado and the cases he cited, that there have been instances in the past when previous action has been construed by the executive department as ratification, and the Executive has acted without referring a treaty to the Senate.

If I understood the Senator from Colorado correctly, the point he was making was that there might be danger in the Senate particularizing too much in a resolution of the kind before us at this time. I think the point is well taken, and I think it is one of the most cogent arguments I have heard made up to this time to sustain the contention that the Senate cannot afford now to particularize too much in advising the Executive as to what our stand is. In my opinion, the Senate can well afford to take the advice just given it, and in adopting the resolution, instead of particularizing to such an extent that the Executive might construe it as a ratification in advance, I think we should content ourselves by adopting the resolution in very general and broad terms, so that we may not have to regret our action a few months hence.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, from a remark or two the Senator from Florida has dropped, I apprehend he does not intend to conclude his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to my distinguished leader that his assumption is well founded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I think we might as well take a recess at this time.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no Executive Calendar, with the exception of the nominations of a few postmasters, and I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 26 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Harvey Robinson Livesay, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. Raymond Osborne Dart, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Frank Lieberman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 3, 1943.

Lt. Col. Brooks Collins Grant, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Bell Foster, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 17, 1943.

Lt. Col. Chauncey Elmo Dovell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 29, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. Arthur Lynn Burks, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from November 20, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Charles Hunter, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 21, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Edward Ernest Rose, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 11, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. George Jacob Rife, Veterinary Corps, with rank from November 27, 1943.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Thomas Grimsley Hester, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from November 10, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonels

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Edward Lewis Trett, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from November 27, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Charles Coburn Merrill, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from November 28, 1943.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Arthur Carl Piepkorn, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from November 15, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 26 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Julia C. Casey, Kingsland.

MINNESOTA

George Zahn, Bellingham.
Oscar T. Lokensgard, Boyd.
Gertrude C. Thompson, Cyrus.
John G. Hawley, Sandstone.
Benjamin C. Moe, Wanamingo.

NEVADA

Doris E. Larson, Stewart.

OKLAHOMA

William T. Barnes, Mountain Park.
Ella Miller, Ramona.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever.

We pray in the name of Him who bears our grief, our burdens, and carries the sorrows of all mankind. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following agencies:

War Manpower Commission.
National Youth Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the October 16 issue of the newspaper Feedstuffs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First, that I may address the House for 1 minute; and, second, that I may insert in the RECORD my remarks, including an editorial from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have had a great many problems submitted to us; we have appropriated a great deal of money. Many of us here are thinking of ways in which we can keep track of that money. The suggestion has been made that the Congress of the United States establish subcommittees or some such method by which it will be able to keep contact with the organizations that are spending this money. To this end, it has been suggested that we appropriate sufficient money to have the necessary research personnel at our disposal, so that we can make sure what these appropriations are actually used for.

I should like to call your attention to the insertions which I am making separately in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

WAGES OF RAILROAD WORKERS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CEILING PRICES ON LIVE CATTLE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that another wholly unnecessary and unjustified blow is about to be dealt the meat producers in this country. The Office of Price Administration is reported to have decided on a price ceiling order to apply to live cattle, and the order is now on the desk of Economic Stabilizer Fred M. Vinson for his final approval or disapproval.

This proposal has been studied by the livestock industry and has been condemned as unworkable. The National Advisory Committee on Livestock and Meat has likewise held that it is not practical to establish a ceiling price on live cattle. Ceiling prices on beef in the butcher shops has long been in effect. But there are so many different types, sizes, flesh conditions, ages, and other factors that enter into values of live animals, that it is simply not practical to put an arbitrary price ceiling on the live animal.

Now, what effect will such an order have on the producer? It will, like the roll-back, have the direct and certain result of discouraging and reducing production and marketing of cattle. It will add to the confusion and uncertainty that has already depressed the market.

With the increase in food production so vital at this time, it is hard to understand why more red tape and impractical regulations should be ordered. Increase in or maintaining of production results from practical, sound programs that have the effect of encouraging and not discouraging production. Mr. Vinson should not allow this proposal to go into effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PATRIOTISM PLUS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (H. DOC. 343)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 25, 1943.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: There has recently been much loose and harmful talk about the employees of the Federal Government. In an effort to discredit those in the public service, groundless charges are being made and irresponsible rumors circulated that the Federal Government is a haven for "draft dodgers" and "slackers."

In simple justice to the many fine, public-spirited, and devoted persons in the Government employ, these unfair accusations must be emphatically denied.

Here are the true facts concerning the draft deferment of Government employees. I am sending them to you so that they may be made a part of the permanent record.

On July 31, 1943 (the latest date for which complete figures are available), there were in the Government service 2,825,904 full-time employees—men and women—in the continental United States—less than 9 percent of whom work in Washington. According to the latest available information, it is estimated that there were 154,500 additional civilian employees ouside the continental United States, the greater part of whom were working for the War and Navy Departments or for the Panama Canal.

In addition, there were 145,808 part-time paid employees, such as consultants, specialists, and forest-fire fighters. Two hundred and fifty-one thousand six hundred and sixty-three persons were working without compensation or for $1 a year, such as members of local ration and draft boards and industrial advisers. It has been the Government's policy not to seek deferments for part-time or uncompensated employees or for dollar-a-year men. We can thus at the outset dispose of about 400,000 persons who under no circumstances can be regarded as "draft dodgers."

Of the 2,825,904 full-time, paid civilian employees in the United States, 1,952,700 men and women, or more than two-thirds, are employed by the War and Navy Departments. Let us consider first these civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments.

The greater part of them are engaged in war production in Government arsenals, ordnance plants, powder factories, and navy yards, or in essential work at Government depots, warehouses, proving grounds, air bases, naval training stations, and Government hospitals. They consist of engineers, draftsmen, mechanics, skilled artisans, procurement experts, scientists, specialists, and administrative personnel. They perform many difficult and important functions with regard to the far-flung supply, production, and other problems of the Army and Navy.

If the items of war material now being made in these Government-owned plants were produced, instead, in civilian-owned plants, the working men and women would be the very same civilians—and in the same number. And they would be deferred as essential war workers the same as other essential war workers are deferred.

Those who constantly bemoan the rapid growth of Government pay rolls usually overlook the fact that it takes hundreds of thousands of men and women to produce guns and ammunition in Government arsenals and to construct and repair battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines in Government navy yards, the same as in privately owned and operated plants. One hundred percent of the battleships now in construction, 43 percent of the aircraft carriers, 10 percent of the cruisers, 8 percent of the destroyers, and about 31 percent of the submarines are being built in these Government yards. Our civilian workers make 86 percent of the Garand rifles built in this country. These are just a few examples.

The War and Navy Departments, like private manufacturers, must see to it that production is not disrupted by the

drafting of their workers before systematic arrangements for their replacement are made. Accordingly, replacement schedules, similar to those used in private war plants and factories, have been prepared for most Army and Navy civilian workers. Deferments for such workers in these departments operate on the same basis as in private industry; viz, the deferment lasts for a limited period of time, during which new people—women or older men or younger boys—are trained to take the place of those who are inducted into the Army or Navy—except those who are indispensable and irreplaceable. These replacement schedules have to be approved by the Selective Service System before they become effective.

The vast majority of these 1,952,700 civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments consist of women, men below or over draft age, men who have been classified as physically unfit, and fathers. According to the records of Selective Service, less than 5 percent of all of the civilian employees in these departments—or about 84,000—have been deferred for occupational reasons. Men of draft age are constantly being released for military duty and are being replaced in accordance with replacement schedules. This record is much better than the occupational deferments in private industry.

Those civilians in the Army and Navy who have been deferred are preponderantly workers in the field outside of Washington. Thus, of the 36,672 departmental employees of the War Department in Washington, 364 are now deferred. Of the 19,000 departmental employees of the Navy in Washington, only 1,016 are now deferred. Those deferred are primarily engineers, draftsmen, naval architects, and other technical personnel.

If the slackers are not harbored by the War and Navy Departments, have they found their haven in the other Government departments and agencies?

No employee in the other Government departments and agencies is allowed to request his own deferment from his local draft board. No local draft board is allowed to defer any Government employee on occupational grounds unless the deferment has been requested by the employing agency and has received the approval of an independent Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees consisting of three public officials and organized by Executive order.

Deferment will be approved by this Review Committee only in the case of Government employees who occupy key positions, or who are engaged in highly specialized and essential work, or who possess unique fitness and skill which are difficult to replace. The concept of a key position is narrowly limited to positions requiring an unusual degree of responsibility and specialized skill, and involving serious difficulty of replacement.

It is clear, therefore, that the standards of deferment of Government workers are much stricter than those governing deferments in private employment. A worker in private industry, unlike the Government employee, may request his own deferment, even though his employer does not see fit to do so. There is no agency in private industry comparable to this Review Committee of the Government which passes upon job classifications and carefully scrutinizes claims for deferment of workers. Nor, in private industry, is deferment limited to employees who hold key positions. Finally, the fact that the worker is engaged in any of the 2,000 occupations classified as essential by the War Manpower Commission may properly be considered by the local draft boards in the case of private workers; but, despite the fact that Government service has been classified as an essential activity, the local draft boards cannot defer a man in Government service, not on a replacement schedule, except in accordance with the foregoing rules. The Government, moreover, is handicapped by the fact that, due to budgetary limitations, it cannot always take on and train new employees to replace men who are about to be inducted.

I am informed that some local boards, on their own initiative, have granted occupational deferments to some Government employees without any prior request of the Government. Many of these deferments were obtained before the Executive order establishing the Review Committee was issued. These deferments are now unauthorized. We are actively searching out such cases and when they are discovered appropriate action is being taken.

The figures compiled by the Review Committee reflect the strictness of the Government's policy on occupational deferments.

The Post Office Department is the largest employer in the Government after the War and Navy Departments. It has 315,741 employees, of whom 307,817 are located outside of Washington. These are the men who deliver the mail and operate local post offices. No deferments have been sought by the postal authorities for any employees with the single exception of postal inspectors. These inspectors are engaged in highly skilled work requiring years of experience. They investigate postal frauds, check the accounts of the local postmasters, and do important work for the Army and Navy. Only 61 men—all of them postal inspectors—have received deferments. Twelve of these 61 are fathers. The number deferred is, therefore, less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total post-office personnel.

The post office certainly does not look like a "haven" for "draft dodgers."

Of the remaining Government employees, nearly half are women. About 119,380 are men of draft age, exclusive of a few small agencies whose reports have not yet been submitted. Of these men, 25,537 are single, 26,195 are married without children, and 67,647 are married with children.

Let us turn first to the 25,537 single men. By August 15, 1943, 3,582 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction, ready to go into the armed forces; 11,667 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service, and 1,502 had been given a class III classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 2,743. The lack of information with respect to the classification of these employees is due, in part, to the failure of some individual employees to report promptly to the Government their induction or any change in their draft status, and to the delays involved in compiling figures received from the field. Occupational deferments had been received by only 6,043.

I should like to analyze these 6,043 somewhat more in detail:

A. One thousand and seventy-seven of these are in the Department of Commerce;

One hundred and ninety in the Bureau of Standards are engaged in scientific work of prime importance to the war;

One hundred and thirty-nine in the Weather Bureau are meteorologists or weather observers;

One hundred and seventy-eight in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are engaged in exploration and mapping of coastal defense waters;

Five hundred and fifty-four in the Civil Aeronautics Administration operate the net work of Federal airways used almost exclusively now by Army and Navy aircraft;

Thirteen in the United States Patent Office are physicists, chemists, and scientists, studying patents of potential value in this mechanized war;

Three are bureau chiefs.

B. There are 1,225 single men in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who are in class II. These agents investigate cases of espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities and perform other duties so intimately related to the war that they might easily be considered members of the armed forces.

C. Another 1,800 employed by various agencies and departments are overseas, many in actual combat zones. These consist mainly of employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey charting North Pacific waters, civil aeronautical personnel engaged in air traffic control and airways communications, radio monitor operators, operating railway workers, F. B. I. agents, operating and maintenance employees of the Panama Canal, technicians, engineers, pilots, members of the Foreign Diplomatic Service, and representatives of foreign economic agencies.

D. Among the other deferred are 132 radio operators and radio technicians in the Federal Communications Commission, 387 engineers and geologists in the Department of the Interior, 352 specialists in the Department of Agriculture engaged in the inspection of food, the growing of guayule for rubber, in the protection of our national forests, or in the protection of our farms against plant or animal disease, 60 inspectors protecting our borders against illegal entry or smuggling; 60 scientists in the United States Public Health Service or the

United States Food and Drug Administration; 278 scientists, engineers, and chemists in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority engaged in construction of flood-control dams and the building and operation of power plants, and 84 in the Maritime Commission supervising our ship-construction program.

This accounts for 5,455 of the 6,043 deferred single men. The remaining deferred employees occupy key positions in the various departments and agencies.

If the normal experience of selective service holds true with this group, about 40 percent would be ineligible anyway for military service by reason of their physical condition.

Nonproduction Federal employees abroad, that is, those not engaged in actual production of war materials or facilities, are now being individually examined by the Review Committee to make certain that those only physically unfit for military service or those possessing exceptional qualifications are granted continued deferment.

The same holds true of the 26,195 married men without children in the Government employ. Of these 26,195 men, 5,287 had been classified by Selective Service in class I and were awaiting induction on August 5, 1943, 6,730 had been placed in class IV as physically unfit for military service, and 5,635 had been given a class II classification by their boards because of dependency or hardship. No information was available as to the classification of some 594.

The number deferred for occupational reasons was 7,949. Like the single men, they are all engaged in work essential to the prosecution of the war and their cases have been carefully examined by the Review Committee. Here, too, about 40 percent would be found ineligible for military service by reason of their physical condition.

There are, besides, 2,003 uniformed personnel running the War Shipping Administration training organization and 14,050 cadets receiving training in the training-organization schools for service in the merchant marine, who have also been deferred. These men are not really part of the civilian establishment of the Government.

The broad, over-all, unfounded charges of "draft dodgers" in Government service are particularly unfair to our Federal personnel. I am convinced that they are anxious to put on their country's uniform and that they have been kept, often against their will, in their present jobs. Their Government itself, and not the men as individuals, decided that they could be more useful to its war effort where they are.

This attempted discrediting of the public service is also unfair to the many who left the Government to enter the armed forces and who plan to return to their positions after the war. Unfortunately the statistics of those ex-employees of the Government now in the armed services are incomplete, but their very number would silence the mud slingers. As of January 1, 1943, there were 238,154 Federal employees in the armed services. The estimated number today is approximately double that amount—or about a half million.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

AMENDMENT TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, 1940

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 330, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 763, amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and I would appreciate if the Chair would let me know when I have used 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order a very important bill providing for the inducting of all available men before fathers are called. It embodies the principles of the Kilday bill which, as you recollect, was passed by the House nearly 5 months ago and permitted to sleep that many months. It was not until a few days ago that a Senator or some Senators began to demand action against the drafting of fathers and this notwithstanding, as I have stated, that the Kilday bill has been over there awaiting action all these months. Finally the Senate has acted and instead of taking up the Kilday House bill a Senate bill was reported and passed, which the House Committee on Military Affairs has, after careful study and consideration, substituted its own bill and reported it to the House. That is the bill now before us as a substitute for the Senate bill and after 2 hours' general debate will be read under the 5-minute rule for amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the Committee on Military Affairs and especially the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], chairman of the subcommittee, in submitting to the House a real constructive, splendidly drafted, and safeguarded bill. When the hearing was held on the request of the Committee on Military Affairs for the granting of a rule for the special consideration of the bill by the House the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], another member of that committee, appeared before the Committee on Rules and upon their intelligent explanation of the provisions of the bill, I am pleased to say that the Committee on Rules unanimously granted a rule. I shall leave it to the chairman and subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to give the House a more detailed and complete explanation of the provisions of the bill, section by section, and to acquaint the House with the deliberations of and facts presented to their committee which led to the adoption of the committee substitute for the Senate bill. I feel that the substitute has been carefully worked out and will do what the vast majority of the Members desire to be done and what the country is seeking to have done with respect to the order of draft inductions.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased that the President of the United States has sent the message that has just been read. It is a timely message and thoroughly explains the number of men in the Government service who have been exempted and for whom exemption has been requested and should serve to estop certain gentlemen in continuing their harpings that thousands of Government employees have been wrongfully exempted. The President always does things on time and at the proper time. He saves me the task of explaining the situation in a much abler manner than I could attempt. Consequently, I will not waste your time or mine in calling attention to the unjustifiable criticism of some Members and others, particularly on the other side, who have been endeavoring to make the people believe that the entire Federal Government in Washington consisted of draft-evading employees. It was charged at one time that there were over 180,000 single men in the Government employ who should be in the armed services. I think the President has made it clear that there have been no unnecessary or unjustifiable exemptions in the case of Government employees. If there were, his appointment of a commission to make a thorough check and investigation of all those who might have been erroneously or wrongfully exempted, has corrected that situation.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot refuse to yield to the gentleman, who is a most useful member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HALLECK. I am always interested in what the very distinguished Chairman of the Rules Committee has to say. He referred a moment ago to some things that have been stated at times about people in the Federal service in Washington avoiding the draft or selective service. Of course, many such

things have been said in the past, but will not the gentleman agree with me that undoubtedly the saying of those things has done much to accomplish the better result that today exists? Does not the gentleman agree with me that there were many people who were deferred who since have gone into the service, and but for some of the things that were said here and at other places might yet be deferred?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Indiana knows that I love to agree with him at all times, especially when he is right. And, referring to the Members on that side, I think he is right more often than most of them and nearly all of the time is fair which, I regret, I cannot say about most of the Republicans. I congratulate him upon the tremendous amount of constructive work he has done to aid in solving the conditions that confront us.

I agree that criticism, fair, just criticism is healthy and beneficial. I am always pleased when a gentleman who has the facts carefully criticizes any wrongful act, but I do dislike and resent unfair, unjust, and untrue statements being made from time to time, statements that are not based on the facts and are without any evidence whatever behind them.

The gentleman from Indiana knows that already the President has acted by creating a board, which has investigated all those who might have been exempted, and I will not say that some of them have not been properly exempted.

I think this legislation is in the right direction, is wholesome and will be beneficial. I will tell you why I am especially interested in this proposal. Most of you have heard General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral King, and others. After listening to these men the country cannot take for granted that the war is already won. We have a hard, hard task before us. I feel that it is the duty of everyone of us and every red-blooded American to desist from doing anything that could in any way bring about disunity. We should work harmoniously, we should work unitedly in the interest of bringing about a perfectly coordinated activity that will help those millions who are now overseas to achieve an early victory and effect the defeat of the men who have so brutally brought about this war without any justification. It is my hope that within a short time the war will be ended and these courageous men who have been inducted will return to us in a healthy and uninjured condition.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, knows that as far as I am concerned as a Member of the House and as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I have had two serious difficulties in the enactment of all of this selective-service legislation. The first thing I had to come to that worked on my feelings and my heart quite a bit was the lowering of the draft age to include the 18- and 19-year-old youngsters. I had to surrender that position. Then I assumed the attitude of being opposed to inducting fathers until it became necessary to do so. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the proposed legislation that will be considered under the rule the gentleman is so ably discussing will ameliorate or lighten the shock somewhat on the fathers and the heads of homes in the country?

Mr. SABATH. There is no question that it will. I have stated in my humble way, perhaps not as clearly as I might have, that I feel that the Committee on Military Affairs has done a splendid job and has eliminated the objections and finally succeeded in evolving for the country a bill that will exempt the fathers until all the single men and nonfathers have been called. That I consider proper and just, and I believe the country demands it.

Mr. Speaker, to gain an early victory over the despicable Nazis and Japs so that freedom and liberty will continue to be ours, and so that our democratic form of government will not be destroyed, we must obtain and maintain complete unity and harmony.

To do this it is imperative to put a stop to the seditious activities of all malevolent forces in our midst, whether they be the direct or indirect tools of George Sylvester Viereck, or of the many professional organizers, publicists, or economists, and their vicious intolerant propaganda sheets, and those haters of the President and the New Deal who fail to realize that this is not the time to create discord, disunity, and resentment.

It is believed that men, whether in public or private life, who thrive on un-American and subversive activities should be stopped from disseminating propaganda which affects and precludes complete cooperation in order to enable us to give our armed forces the support and aid which they rightfully deserve.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of solidarity and unified action we should ferret out and bring to account anyone and everyone, it matters not what high position he may hold, many of whom feel themselves to be above the Government and the Constitution, and because not having been proceeded against criminally as yet are immune from the law and the wrath of public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a unanimous report from both the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Rules. I know of no opposition to it at least under the rule. When the consideration under the 5-minute rule is reached there may be some important amendments offered.

The bill is far more than a gesture, as some people have been trying to claim. If the intent of Congress is carried out—and I regret to say it is not always carried out these days—it will protect the married men with children and will take into the armed forces all available single men and married men without children. If that is done it will carry out not only the will of the Congress, I believe, on both sides of the aisle but the will of about 75 or 80 percent of the American people. I will discuss the main provision of the bill in a few minutes.

I thought I should like to make some comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Committee on Rules. Listening to him and to the President's report, one would think there was not a single draft dodger among the 3,000,000 Federal employees. The record shows that 84,000 deferments were requested officially by the administration. As I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the House, in my humble opinion that is exactly 84,000 too many. Not one of these jobs is indispensable. They can all be filled by older men, by veterans of the last war, by women, or by persons who are disabled; yet 84,000 deferments have been asked officially by the various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government. However, here is a total of 115,000 deferred by local boards, men who go before local boards and claim they are in the Government service and therefore ought to be deferred; and they have been given deferments, deferments not officially asked by the Government but requested by themselves because of their Federal jobs. They are hiding away in Government fox holes and dugouts, on safe jobs, many without children, with their wives on Government pay rolls, while 2 or 3 in a family are drafted back home.

I think the observation of the gentleman from Indiana nearly hit the nail on the head. For a long time Members of the House like the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and others, have been calling the attention of the House and the American public to the situation among the Federal officeholders hiding away in Government dugouts, and have literally forced a great many of them into the armed forces. I am told that Mr. Abe Fortas, the Under Secretary of the Interior, is going into the service on Monday. A number of speeches have been made about the draft status of Mr. Abe Fortas. He is probably a most estimable gentleman. Certainly it is not a question of personality. However, he is of draft age, 30 or 32 years of age, and is receiving $10,000 a year. He has a wife on the Government pay roll receiving $6,000 or $7,000 a year. Certainly he should lead the way in serving in our armed forces. He should have volunteered long ago and set an example to all the rest of the Federal employees to serve in defense of their country in time of war.

These cases have all been brought out repeatedly on the floor of the House, the Fortas case, the Ginsburg case—Ginsburg wanted to be a colonel overnight until the Congress stopped it—the Keyserling case—he is not in yet—the Nathan case, and others. I have not discussed them except the Fortas case because I did not know the facts, but other Members of the House have discussed them and have forced some of them into the armed forces, and a great

many others along with them. I do not believe that all of them are in yet by a jugful. I hope that all Government employees of draft age will be compelled to serve in our armed forces and that no deferments will be granted.

I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs on bringing out a highly important and constructive piece of legislation. This whole question of deferring the fathers has been kicked around and around and around in the other body for months at a time and compromise piled upon compromise until confusion became worse confounded. The House committee has brought in today a constructive piece of legislation that does exactly what we wanted to do in the beginning. I hope it will go through in 10 days' time and will be made effective and the intent of the law carried out by those in authority.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, in referring to the legislation heretofore having been kicked around has reference to the fact that in another body the principles embodied in this legislation were not merely kicked around, but were smothered to death.

Mr. FISH. Naturally, and massacred to make a political holiday.

Mr. MAY. And we hope that this will not meet a like fate.

Mr. FISH. It will not, because it is going to go through the House by an enormous vote, and I think the conferees will have to pay some attention to it, and besides it has public opinion behind it.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Agriculture be permitted to sit during general debate on this bill this afternoon for the purpose of hearing some members of the O. P. A. organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman explain how this bill will work out so far as the drafting of fathers is concerned?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I propose to do that, because I want to explain how this bill works in a simple manner. As I understand it, and if I am wrong I want to be corrected by members of the Military Committee, this is a very simple bill, and when bills are simple they are apt to be effective. All it does is to create a National and State pool so that single men will be taken first.

Let me answer my friend from New York, to put it in this way, that we assume that all of the single men from the State of New York have been taken into the draft, through the Selective Service Act, and that over in Connecticut there are 10,000 or 20,000 single men left. Under this bill it will put those 20,000 single men into the service so that they will be taken before the married men with children in New York. That is all it does, and that is all we want to do, if we have to take the married men. If this war goes on year after year, we may have to take all of the married men, and I would favor taking all of the men up to 64 if we were attacked in America and that it was necessary to do so. That is not the question before us. We have not the shipping to take all the eligibles, and therefore, we ought to take the single men first, and then the married men without children and last of all, married men with children. Further, it puts the power back where it belongs, under the head of the Selective Service, General Hershey, and takes it away from the Manpower Commission, that has evidently confused the whole issue.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let us go one step further, and assume now for a minute that all of the pool of single men are taken up. How are you going to take the married men? Will you take those without children first?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. The bill says so. But I am not here to explain the bill in detail, and that is not my function. The bill prescribes that after taking the single men, then the married men without children will be taken, and the pre-Pearl Harbor married men with children come last.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What will this bill do with regard to single men in industry, who have been deferred and whose places might be taken by older men or women?

Mr. FISH. I would like to have the committee explain that in detail but the bill requires industry to screen those, and not to give them exemptions which they have in the past, and arrange to get qualified men or women to substitute in their places. The question is, Have we come to the bottom of the barrel, and must we take, after all of the single men and the married men without children have been inducted, the married men with children? I submit that we have not approached the bottom of the barrel. It is not necessary in my opinion to take the pre-Pearl Harbor married men with children. First I believe you can get a great many right out of the Federal employees. I think we could obtain two or three hundred thousand more single men of draft age and married men without children out of the 3,000,000 Federal employees alone, and get more than that out of industry.

I propose to offer another suggestion that has not been raised in the House, I think, whereby in my humble opinion you can get another two or three hundred thousand men without any difficulty whatsoever. That is in reclassifying the Negroes. Perhaps the House might be interested in some figures as to the number of Negroes taken by the Selective Service, and the number that has been rejected. The figures are startling, and I am quite sure, speaking as a friend of the Negroes, that they would like to be in the armed forces, that they do not want to be set aside because of lack of education or because they cannot read or write.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes more.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that plans are being made to train men very quickly for the service now.

Mr. FISH. I hope so; and I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, having had some experience in the last war as an infantry commander of Negro troops, that some of our troops could not read or write. One of the best men in my outfit, George Jackson, of Goshen, N. Y., could not read or write, yet he could take a machine gun apart and put it together again blindfolded when hardly anybody else could do it with their eyes wide open. It does not require educational qualifications or school or college certificates, or ability to read and write to shoot a rifle, or to have good eyesight, to be able to march and fight in defense of your country.

I submit a great many of those who are fighting in the armies of our allies and our enemies cannot read or write. But they can shoot a gun and fight and kill and be killed.

These are the figures: Negro rejections 641,000 under the Selective Service Act. Negro inductions, 688,000. Practically an equal number of Negroes have been refused, largely on account of educational qualifications; not being able to read or write. There are other reasons, but that is the greatest one by far.

I submit there ought to be a rescreening and reclassification of all these rejected Negroes. They want to serve in the armed forces, but they are shut out largely because of that single fact, that they are not able to read and write. I submit that they will make just as good soldiers if properly trained; and they will shoot just as well if they have the proper eyesight. They are physically strong. Most of them from the South come off the farms and are healthy specimens and will probably make good soldiers. So, if you want manpower in the Army, if you want to increase it by two or three hundred thousand, then I suggest you rescreen or reclassify these 641,000 Negroes who have been rejected under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. With the utmost humility I want to ask the gentleman how about our allies below the Rio Grande? Have they no soldiers to offer as combatant troops? Has the gentleman thought that over?

Mr. FISH. I have thought that over.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. However, that is not worrying me very much because we cannot force them to fight. We cannot force them to go overseas. Has the gentleman ever thought that over that the Canadians, the Australians, and the South Africans are not drafted for overseas service and do not go except as volunteers? They are not drafted to fight overseas. To my mind, that is a far more important question because they are in the war 100 percent, like we are, yet their men are not obliged to serve overseas.

Mr. GIFFORD. They are doing it. They are going overseas, but south of the Rio Grande we cannot force them, but we can promise them and assure them so that they will be our allies that we will protect them.

Mr. FISH. Yes; we will protect them, anyway, but we are sending our boys overseas at 18 years of age. Even the British do not send them overseas at 18. They keep them until they are 19 before they are sent overseas to battle, yet we are reaching down into the bottom of the barrel and taking everybody, and half of our allies are not sending any draftees overseas. We ought to know those facts in considering our own manpower limitations.

Furthermore, let me point out to the gentleman, who is interested in economy, we have spent already more money on this war—and we have been in it less then 2 years—than all of our allies and our enemies combined.

Let me say in conclusion, we have been in this war 23 months—on the 7th of December it will be 2 years. In the last war colored troops were on the front line fighting within 12 months after war was declared. I know that to be a fact, because my own regiment was in the front lines in April 1918. Almost 2 years have gone by and I do not know of any colored infantry regiments being anywhere in a combat zone. I do not know of any colored combat troops anywhere, either in Europe or in the far Pacific or anywhere else, in a combat zone. They are serving as stevedores, noncombat engineers, in quartermaster detachments, and in unloading transports, but practically none of the 600,000 colored soldiers are in combat units fighting in the front line where they want to be and where they ought to be and have a right to be, the same as any other American troops.

I submit if you want to get 300,000 or 400,000 more colored soldiers all you have to do is to rescreen or reclassify those 641,000 rejected Negroes. Then you will not have to take married men with children for 6 months if ever. The people in my district and in your district are more interested in this bill than all the internationalism and international proposals that have been advanced and the proposed settlement of post-war problems which we cannot solve until we have won the war and know what the British and the Russian Governments war and peace aims are. The people back home are vitally interested in the immediate passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, then I shall not use any further time and I will not answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] as I would like to. I realize that many of the Members desire to get away and desire to finish this bill as it should be finished.

Therefore I shall now move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 763, with Mr. COLMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, as provided by the rule, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I might first point out the principal things this legislation is intended to accomplish. First among those is the fact that we are endeavoring to centralize control, management, and operation of the Selective Service Act exclusively in the hands of the Director of Selective Service. I think this will materially aid in eliminating the confusion that has existed from time to time by various orders going out from different agencies of the Government who had a part in the handling of selective service.

The second item of importance here is an endeavor to see to it that fathers shall be drafted after the drafting of single persons and nonfathers. By this means we hope that the drafting of fathers will be withheld as long as possible and that wherever there are pools of single men or of married men without children anywhere in the country that those men shall be inducted into the service ahead of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. This we hope will be done on both a Nation-wide as well as a State-wide basis.

Of course, we realize that it is not possible to induct the last available single person on any given date before a father would be drafted. This is especially true because of the fact that the status of countless persons changes from day to day. Persons deferred have the deferments canceled; classifications are constantly undergoing change; even the marital status may change; hence complete adherence to this procedure cannot be had, but it is our desire that selective service establish the necessary regulations so that in filling each quota call the available nonfathers known to exist on any given call day will be inducted wherever they may be located, either within the confines of a State or within a small area of a State, before the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers are inducted. On this basis quotas will be adjusted throughout the Nation to drain single individuals and nonfathers from those States where there is an excess, and likewise the quotas of the local boards in a State having an excess of single persons and nonfathers will be augmented so as to drain these individuals off, while reducing the quotas elsewhere where only fathers are available. As a matter of fact, Selective Service informs us they are endeavoring to do just that at the present time.

Also, we put a provision in that same section, which is section (m) in the House amendment, which provides that there shall be no group inductions. We provided in the law originally that men shall not be deferred because of any group classification or because of any industry classification, but that each question of deferment shall be handled upon an individual basis. We have included a converse provision in this bill which provides that when it comes to the induction of any person his case shall be handled individually and that he shall not be inducted into the armed services because he happens to be employed in a particular occupation ahead of others who are also classified I–A but happen to be employed in a different occupation; that all persons classified I–A shall be inducted into service in accordance with their order number. I believe the committee report reads "serial number"; it should read "order number."

Likewise, we have a provision here that where a registrant has received an occupational deferment that such occupational deferment is subject to review in the area in which that person is working. We feel that this should be done in order to obviate the difficulty that we have found existing here in the Federal Government where we have some 30,000 or more cases of unofficial occupational deferments, persons who have been deferred from military service simply on the action of the local draft board but with no official request from any Government department or agency having been made for the deferment of that individual.

By calling for a review of those occupational deferments in the area in which the person is employed, rather than in the State in which he registered, we feel that these unjustified occupational deferments will be eliminated. In other words, that the Government workers who are employed in the city of Washington, re-

gardless of the place in which they may have registered originally, if they are deferred, within 30 days after the enactment of this legislation those deferments will be processed by the appeals boards located here in the District of Columbia, and any new deferments that are granted locally will be reviewed within 10 days by the appeals board here in the area in which those persons are employed. This, I think, will very largely clear up many of these occupation deferments that have been granted. Similar unofficial deferments undoubtedly exist in industry, and it is felt that this provision calling for a review of all out-of-State deferments will remedy this situation.

A further point that is being considered in this legislation for the first time is that we are authorizing those persons who are about to be inducted to request a preinduction physical examination. Many persons have gone up for induction and have been told that they could not qualify, yet they had considered themselves to be physically fit, but it is not until they are actually on the point of induction that they get a full military physical examination and then find they are not physically fit, that they do not meet the standards and are going to be placed in IV–F. As a result they are rejected after they have disposed of their business, or their occupation, in the belief they are about to enter the military service. In this bill we authorize them to request and to receive a preinduction physical examination. That will obviate that situation. Men will be able to take their physical examinations and have that question settled. The results of the physical examination are to be reported back to the local draft board and are binding on the draft board just the same as the examination following induction.

Another provision creates a five-man medical board. On this board one member is to be an Army medical officer, one a Navy medical officer, and three are to be civilian physicians who are not in the employ of the Government.

This medical board is being directed to review the physical requirements of the armed services and to determine whether some changes cannot be recommended for the Army and Navy. The qualifications of those persons who are being used for limited service are likewise to be looked into and recommendations made in the hope that a larger number of men may be used for limited service and that more men may be used in the armed services without having so many rejected and placed in the category of IV–F.

We have added a final provision in the bill directing the Director of Selective Service or his chief liaison officer or some other officer in the Selective Service to request information from the various agencies of the Government regarding deferments, rejections, replacement schedules, and the like. In the past there occasionally has been some difficulty in obtaining the information that was desired, and for this reason we specifically mention not only the Director but his liaison officer or other officer whom he may designate to obtain this information and to report it back to both the House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs, as well as to make such reports at any interval of time at which those committees may request these reports.

The final section of the bill provides that any provisions of existing law, and other acts, which may conflict with the provisions of this act shall not affect this act. We did that in order that any broad provisions of power that may have been granted to the President under the War Powers Act or similar legislation will not obviate the intent of Congress at this time in trying to accomplish these purposes.

I might also make one comment that an amendment was suggested for the merchant seamen. These men are not directly a part of the armed services. On the contrary, they are, you may say, the unarmed warriors of this war, but because of the fact that they are a very essential group of men, it is my personal feeling they should be treated in similar manner to persons in the armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, these men who are in training at the present time are being deferred. Men who are engaged actively as seamen on cargo vessels and other ships are being deferred, but some of those who are engaged in the work of training these seamen have not been granted deferment by some of the boards. It is my feeling that these men should be granted deferments generally by the boards throughout the country and that the Director of Selective Service should see to it that the boards are notified that men engaged in this program, either as trainers or trainees, should be granted deferments so long as they remain active in that program.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. May I supplement the cases given by the gentleman by saying that those who actually have received training at the expense of the United States Government have been called back by the induction board and nothing I have been able to do or anyone else can keep them out. They have been taken in the Army, after the money has been spent by the United States to train them, and some of them were needed engineers.

Mr. COSTELLO. I agree with the gentleman, but I feel this can be handled directly by the regulations of Selective Service. We did not want to include them in here as a class because we did not want any group deferments any more than we wanted group inductions. We felt each case should be handled on an individual basis because of the nature of the work. Because they are necessary in the conduct of the war in connection with supplying the Army and the Navy we felt these men certainly should be given definite treatment by each board in the country on a uniform basis and they should be granted deferments so long as they remained active in that branch of service, the Merchant Marine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are these the young men who are officers and seamen on our merchant vessels?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me as though they are playing a very important part in this war and that the position taken by the gentleman from California is not only a sound one but a necessary one in connection with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. COSTELLO. I agree with the gentleman and I think that is true. In my opinion, the Selective Service will see to it that these men are uniformly granted deferments so long as they remain active in the merchant marine.

The United States Maritime Service is a statutory organization having military rank although not having military status as a part of the armed service. At present it is under the jurisdiction of the War Shipping Administration and its training program is quite similar in nature to that being conducted at the training stations of the Navy and the Coast Guard. The continuity of employment of persons engaged in the conduct of the training program is very essential for the efficient operation of the training stations. Approximately 3,000 men subject to Selective Service are engaged in conducting the training program for licensed and unlicensed personnel of our merchant marine. Although efforts have been made to use women or discharged veterans where possible in administrative work, it is generally necessary that a reasonable number of persons subject to the draft must necessarily be engaged in the training program and so require deferment. Uniform treatment for all such persons should be accorded and Selective Service should see to it that when each individual case is considered that the local boards realize the essential character of the work being performed and should grant the deferments required.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman spoke about men in the limited service. Is it not a fact that the armed forces today are releasing the limited service men, that there is no such thing as a limited service now and that people who were inducted for limited service and who were not physically fit, have been sent across?

Mr. COSTELLO. Some persons have been brought into the service for limited use only. In my opinion, a larger number should be so utilized. I feel by proper organization the War Department could without too great difficulty employ a larger number of persons with some slight physical handicaps.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The intention of using limited-service men was to put

them in a place where they could release able-bodied men?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes; in order to make it possible for the able-bodied men to be used for combat duty. The limited-service men were to be used at home and not called for combat duty.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman stated that the local board would have jurisdiction in the city in which the person lives; is that right?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes. The situation that we are providing for here is as follows: A person registers in the community in which he lives; subsequently he may move to another area and be employed. If that person is deferred, the deferment is to be reviewed by the appeal board in the area in which he works. It is only in the case where a man is deferred. If he is deferred, that deferment is reviewed by the appeal board in the area in which he works. They will pass upon whether it should have been granted or should not have been granted and their decision will be final in that particular case. As far as the individual is concerned, he still would be classified by his local board. If he is not deferred by his local board he may appeal to his State appeal board at the place in which he resided and registered. He can make his appeal in the normal fashion and in that manner. The provision we have in here is limited only to those cases where an occupational deferment has been granted. That occupational deferment must be reviewed by the appeal board in the area in which he works.

Mr. BLOOM. If that person in Washington should move out of Washington to Pittsburgh again, would he have another chance to go before the board there with reference to his particular case?

Mr. COSTELLO. If the person changes occupation or changes the place of his employment there should be a review of his classification. In other words, those who are already classified will be reviewed within 30 days after the passage of the act. No further review of continuing deferments would be necessary as long as they retain their same occupation. Those who are newly classified or newly deferred would be reviewed within the 10-day period.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not believe the gentleman made clear the fact that the employee himself may appeal to the appeal board in the locality where he is working if his own draft board has classified him as I–A and his own draft board is located in some other State.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is quite correct. In addition to that the language of this legislation provides that in the cases where occupational deferments have been granted, these shall be reviewed by the appeal boards in the areas in which the men are employed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. On the application of the employer?

Mr. COSTELLO. The review of an occupational deferment in these cases is mandatory and no request or application is required.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman probably listened to the spanking administered to us this morning by the President. If I recall correctly, the Costello committee was set up to look into this condition because we thought it existed. Is the gentleman in full accord with the views expressed by the President this morning? Has the gentleman been spanked?

Mr. COSTELLO. I will state to the gentleman I do not feel as though I had been spanked. I do not think the message was intended directly as a spanking. I think it was intended merely as an opportunity to present to the public the facts and figures concerning the Federal Government, which is something we have been trying to obtain for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state that the committee yesterday filed with the House a rather thorough report giving statistics on the Federal Government. I think it will bear out many of the contentions of the President that the question of deferments in the Federal Government is not too great a problem. But we have been anxious to get this information over a long period of time. We have been trying to find out who these 900,000 men of the ages of 18 to 37 in the Federal Government actually are, how they are classified, whether they are married and have dependents, and whether they are necessary. I believe the Review Board appointed by the President is going to see to it that those persons, particularly those single and nonfather persons in the Federal Government, who are not essential to the administration of the Government in its war effort, will definitely be inducted into the armed services in the very near future, and the Federal Government will be definitely cleaned out, leaving only those civilians who must of necessity remain.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has stated that persons deferred locally might have their cases reviewed in Washington if they are employed here. Is it not also true that if a person is registered in California and deferred in California and works in Pittsburgh that person's application would be reviewed by the Pittsburgh board where there is a war industry?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And that board might hold that he ought to be deferred, whereas his local board would not agree to the deferment?

Mr. COSTELLO. The local board must grant the deferment first, it must agree to it, before the appeal board acts. On the question of occupational deferment the language of the bill states, "In case of occupational deferment," so that when a local board has granted an occupational deferment that occupational deferment is subject to a review by the appeal board in the area in which the man is working. If that appeal board feels that he should not have been deferred, then it reports that back to the local board, and the decision of the appeal board in the area in which the man works is binding upon the local board. The deferment then would be rejected. It would not mean that they would be able to commit the local board to give a deferment where the local board had refused a deferment. The out-of-State appeal board could only act under this provision when the deferment has been given by the local board initially.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has five principal purposes. The first is to provide a revised appeal procedure in the case of occupational deferment of men employed outside the appeal area of registration. The next is to control the order of induction of men in accordance with the facts as to persons dependent upon them for support. Third, it centralizes the power and the responsibility with reference to the administration of the Selective Service System in the Director of Selective Service. Fourth, it provides a medical board to pass upon the physical standards of men for all branches of the service, and to be composed of a medical officer of the Army, one of the Navy, and three private practitioners of medicine, none of whom shall be in the employ of the Federal Government. Finally, it provides a machinery for preinduction physical examination.

Most unfortunately, the Senate did not see fit to pass the bill I offered last February which passed the House by a very considerable majority, and which would have provided an orderly procedure for the induction of men in accordance with the facts as to persons dependent upon them for support. There can be no doubt but that the House by an almost unanimous vote held that that should be the case, and that public opinion sustains it.

Subseqently, hearings were held in the Senate on a proposal to defer all fathers until January 1. I want to make it clear that I have never favored that proposal which was offered in the Senate. I have never favored any provision which would have arbitrarily and compulsorily deferred any portion of the men registered. I have taken the position that they should be called in an orderly manner, those with the fewer

obligations first, so that the families would be disrupted last.

Quite unfortunately, there has been an impression created throughout the Nation that the military commanders and the naval commanders have opposed legislation of this type. That is definitely an incorrect construction of the testimony of all of those who have appeared. In the hearings in the Senate committee General McNarney, the Deputy Chief of Staff; General Marshall, the Chief of Staff; and Admiral King, Chief of Naval Operations and Commander of the Fleet; all testified on this subject. In each instance they made clear the fact that they insisted upon a definite number of men by the 1st of January 1944, that those men should possess certain physical qualifications, and, other than that, that it was up to the Manpower Commission to procure those men.

Therefore, the provision we have here cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as anything other than an orderly procedure to carry out what they would rather have. General Marshall said that if they are available he would much rather have men without families, particularly should they be worried about the condition of their families and their support while they are away in the service. So, this bill cannot be regarded as being contrary to the wishes of the military commanders.

A very important provision of this bill is the one which prevents the induction of men because of occupations in which they are engaged. Under this provision it will become impossible for Mr. McNutt, as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to issue his so-called nondeferrable orders. I feel such orders have always been contrary to the law because of existing provisions of the statute to the effect that men should not be deferred because of occupations or by occupational groups. However, we placed it in this bill in plain language that they shall not be inducted by reason of the occupations in which they are engaged.

As to the centralization of authority, I want to say that there has been some confusion about that. In the original act, certain powers were delegated to the President. He was given the power, in the original act, to delegate any of the powers granted him to any official he might designate. Immediately upon the effective date of the Selective Service Act, the President delegated his powers under that act to the Director of Selective Service. Subsequently we passed the War Powers Act, and under that act the President rearranged his delegation of power and delegated those previously exercised by the Director of Selective Service to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who in turn delegated a portion of those powers to the Director of Selective Service. Therefore, the Military Affairs Committees of the House and of the Senate, have found that we have not been able to put our finger on the official who had authority to deal with occupational deferments or the matter of appeal; nor could we be certain at any time where that authority should be vested. This bill sees to it that authority is centralized in the Director of Selective Service. He is the man charged with the responsibility; he is the one responsible to Congress for proper enforcement of the rules and regulations and the law.

There has been some question as to whether the present physical standards of the armed services are higher than reasonably necessary. That has arisen primarily from the fact that up until the Navy was required to secure its men through Selective Service, the physical standards of the Army were not quite as high, in some instances, as those of the Navy. When the Navy was required to take its men from the Selective Service, the Army increased some of its physical standards to those of the Navy. To what extent that may have caused physical deferments is not yet known. However, it has been regarded as in the interest of the conservation of manpower to see to it that an impartial board composed of two medical officers of the services and three independent physicians be set up so that they may review the physical requirements of the respective services and revise them as the facts may warrant, to the end that there may be no wastage of manpower.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement that there will be a standardizing of the requirements for the service. For instance, I have a constituent who attempted to enlist in the Navy. He was examined and rejected. He then was drafted into the Navy. He was examined and rejected. He then was drafted into the Army. He then went to the hospital, and he is now having difficulty in getting discharged because he is in neither one service nor the other. One service turned him down and the other service has taken him. Will this bill prevent things like that?

Mr. KILDAY. The bill defines the duties of this board, as follows:

> who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed forces. The Commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established.

It will, therefore, be seen that we require that they establish these standards, and those heretofore deferred, because not meeting existing standards, are to be reexamined to determine whether they meet the new standards. We feel that this will go a long way toward eliminating some of the difficulties we have had in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. KILDAY. At this time, I would like to discuss section M of the present bill, which has for its purpose the adoption, in substance, of the Kilday bill, which we passed here in the spring. You will recall that under that bill categories were set up and the order in which men should be inducted provided. Under that bill it was provided that men with no dependents should come first; men with collateral dependents next; married men without children third; and finally, only, fathers of minor children.

It also provided that they should be inducted in that order on a State-wide basis. The present bill has been so drafted as to eliminate practically all of the technical objections brought forward by the Selective Service System as to the mechanics of its operation. The language here is believed to be sufficiently flexible that the difficulties of administration which were stressed at that time by the Selective Service System will be avoided.

However, instead of setting up categories as the former bill did, it provides that men shall be ordered to report to induction centers in such order that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers will be inducted after all other men not disqualified or deferred. So that it protects occupational deferments and does not relate to those physically disqualified. The original bill provided that it should be administered on a State-wide basis. This bill uses the language "on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and State-wide basis within the State." In the administration of the law, therefore, if there be a State in which all pre-Pearl Harbor fathers have been exhausted, and another State still has a supply, national drafts or requisitions shall be so arranged that a State with nothing left but fathers will have its quota diminished, and the one with a supply of men without dependents shall be increased. The same will be true within a State. Local boards which have exhausted all but pre-Pearl Harbor fathers will have their quotas reduced, while those still having a supply of men without children will have their quotas increased.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I do not have the bill before me and I am not quite familiar with the section numbers, but does the bill transfer jurisdiction over an applicant for occupational deferment to the board where he is at work, instead of leaving him under the jurisdiction of the board of his domicile?

Mr. KILDAY. Not exactly that. Section L of the bill provides that in a case where a man is registered in one appeal board area and is actually employed in another, if the board where he is registered but does not work, grants him occupational deferment, then within 10 days from the granting of that occupational deferment the matter shall be referred to the appeal board in the area in which he is working, for its determination as to whether or not he is occupying an essential position.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Well, is that necessary? That is objectionable to some of us I know, and I would like to know the reason for it.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe a proper study and understanding of the situation will eliminate those objections. We are holding the Director of Selective Service responsible for the elimination from industry of men not essential to those industries.

In carrying that out they have replacement tables and manning tables by which they determine positions which are essential and the order of their priority. Those are filed with the State Director of Selective Service and Training, and approved by him. Men are deferred or called in accordance with those manning tables.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Therefore, unless the board having jurisdiction of that industry has some orderly control over the manpower on that manning table, it cannot operate efficiently. As an example, the message from the President today sets up a system which exists under the Lodge-Maybank Act, which was passed sometime ago as to Federal employees. A Federal employee is not entitled to deferment unless the board within the Government has determined that he is essential, and shall have asked for his deferment.

In Washington, a Federal employee is not a glorified person, whereas in the communities a long way from Washington they may feel that he is the most important man in the entire Government service. The facts are there have been many deferments granted in those rural communities, in which the War Department or any other government department would not have asked for the deferment. Therefore, you cannot carry out the Lodge-Maybank Act unless you have some provision by which the people where the man is working are in a position to pass upon the facts of his particular case.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are many pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who have already been inducted into the armed services, who have two or three children, when there were many young men still available. Is there any relief granted to those men who have families with children, when there were young men in the State that could have been drafted?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill does not contain any such provision. It would constitute a disruption of the armed forces to do that now. You must charge that responsibility up to the other body who did not see fit to take action in proper time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I share the apprehension of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] and a great many other Members from the report of the committee and the explanation of the bill, as to the wisdom of the first paragraph of the first section, depriving the local board of final jurisdiction with respect to a review in deferred cases. I should like to ask the gentleman, assuming that a local board has deferred a registrant, and that that case has been reviewed by the board in which he is employed—and I have in mind particularly war industries—my question is: Would the local board have the right to place that man in another class, in class I–A and order him to be inducted here?

Mr. KILDAY. I am very much afraid the entire difficulty stems from the fact——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the answer to that question, if I may ask the gentleman? Would the local board notwithstanding the review and the deferment of the board in the area in which he is employed still have the right to reclassify him?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. The provision of this bill relates only to the case in which the local board grants him occupational deferment. If he is placed in class I–A that is not affected by this provision; the law remains as it is that the registrant would have the right to appeal within his own State set-up and his employer would have the right to appeal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that. My question is this: Assume the local board defers him, that he is now deferred, but that the local board desires to reconsider his case and change his classification, if he is continued in deferment by the board where he is employed is the local board thereby deprived of power to reclassify him?

Mr. KILDAY. I think not; and I do not think the situation the gentleman pictures could ever arise under this provision, because if the local board puts him in I–A, then his appeal is in his own State and not in the State in which he is employed, because they put him in I–A. It would have to go through his own State set-up.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that, but what about that case being reviewed subsequent to the deferment by the local board in the event the local board would like to reconsider and place him in another class?

Mr. KILDAY. That situation is not touched by this bill. It would be the same as it is now. There is no review now except from the local board to the board of appeals, to the State director, and to the President.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, as I understand it, the local board would be justified, irrespective of where he is employed, would of itself have power to reclassify him and put him in another class before they called fathers.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, but if they grant him industrial deferment then the question would be submitted to the appeal board where he is employed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then they could reconsider and put him in another class notwithstanding this provision for review.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. These two boards must concur before the deferment is continued, as I understand it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And if they did not concur confusion would be caused and a disagreement. Where would be the ultimate decision between them if any?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me read from page 17, line 6, which controls that situation:

> The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act, in the formulation of which it has been my privilege to share, contains three important provisions which I believe will prove tremendously valuable toward the solution of our increasingly critical military and civilian manpower problems.

First of these provisions is the addition of section 5 of the original act by which appeal boards are directed to review all deferments granted to individuals who are living and working outside the jurisdiction of the local draft board with which they are registered. The purpose of this provision will be immediately understood and appreciated when it is remembered that thousands and thousands of registrants have left their home communities, where they originally registered, to take wartime jobs across the State or even across the Nation. It is apparent that the local boards cannot possibly keep in personal touch with all these cases in a way to render invariably just and intelligent decisions upon requests for deferment.

In connection with the statement I just made, the special committee investigating draft deferments in the Government service and elsewhere made a report to this Congress on yesterday in which we stated that there were over 1,800,000 men on the Federal pay roll; that approximately 50 percent of those men, or over 900,000, were between the ages of 18 and 38. The Federal Government has requested the deferment of only a small percentage of those 900,000 men; I believe the figure is around 115,000; yet we find several hundred thousand men of draft age still on the public pay roll. Why is it? It must be and it is perfectly obvious, from the fact that many of them have been deferred on their own requests by their own local draft boards in States outside the District of Columbia. It is the hope of

this committee, therefore, that the first provision of this bill which makes it mandatory upon the appeals board here in the District of Columbia to review within 30 days all these deferments, that we take out of the Government service and put in the Army or the armed forces where they belong all these men who have been deferred not at the request of the Government but at their own request or the request of someone outside the service.

That fact has been strikingly demonstrated in the investigations which our special committee, for the study of draft practices, has been making. Right here in Federal departments and agencies we have found that a tremendous number of deferments have been granted by local boards merely upon the personal requests of individuals. This provision should effectively close the loophole through which great numbers of individuals are wrongfully avoiding service. It specifically directs in the cases of all individuals living and working outside the jurisdiction of the local boards with which they are registered that the appeal boards having jurisdiction over the immediate area shall promptly review all deferments.

Section 3 of this amendment amends section 10 (b) of the original act by specifically directing that the authority granted to the Executive of the Selective Training and Service Act shall be delegated to, and administered by the Director of Selective Service.

In that connection I call your attention to page 21, line 13, reading as follows:

> The President is authorized and directed to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except sec. 9 or sec. 10 (a) (3)).

It was the intention of the subcommittee, consisting of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and myself, that this should include all authority except that specified and excepted in the act; yet, let me read it over today. It sounds as though we might be saying to the President, "You are directed to delegate any of the power you may deem advisable." I, therefore, want to make it clear that the Committee on Military Affairs intended by this language to direct the President to delegate all the power vested in him under this act except that power under sections 9 and 10 A–3.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Well, now, if that is the intention of the committee, certainly there should be an amendment offered. That is not the way this bill is written, as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana. First, the President is authorized to use his discretion and divest himself of any power vested in him in respect to this particular matter if and when he so desires. If the gentleman would strike out the word "authorized" in line 13, or better, strike out the word "any" in line 14 and insert the word "all", then there would be no question. Why pass a statute when there is doubt among Members and the people who drew it as to what it means when it is so easy to make it clear?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I did not discover the language until this morning. I know what we intended to write in the act, and I make this statement in order that we may make a record, if the House deems advisable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming a local board in the District of Columbia takes a man off the deferred list that has been granted by his own local board in his home town.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The local board here cannot do that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I mean the appeal board. Assume it will take him off the deferred list, would it be mandatory on the local board to put him in class I–A.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Well, it would naturally follow.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would it be mandatory or could the local board still keep him on the deferred list?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The local board is powerful in itself except for rules and regulations made by the Director. They have the discretion in passing upon each individual case as to whether they will grant a deferment. Let us take a man who lives in Indiana and who is registered in one of the local boards in Indiana and working here in the Federal Government. He has been deferred by that board because of his employment. Under this act the appeal board here in the District of Columbia in 30 days would review that case. They might determine he was not essential and say that "We are going to cancel the deferment." It would then go back to the local board in Indiana. They still have the authority, and you cannot take it away from them, to pass upon his individual case, but the local board undoubtedly would not thereafter attempt to grant a deferment for this particular job.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But assuming they wished to grant a deferment, there is nothing mandatory in the bill itself compelling them to change it?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I believe the local board in such a case could not alter a specific decision rendered by an appeal board. The local board, however, would still have the lawful authority for other reasons to exercise jurisdiction and to render a new decision.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Assuming that this is reviewed in the district where the registrant is deferred in the first instance, and the local board approves his deferment. Assume that in the meantime the local board because of lack of registrants would like to change his classification. I ask the gentleman whether under the terms of section L that local board notwithstanding the approval of the deferment by the review board where he is employed, would have the right before the expiration of his original deferment to change his classification?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it would not, at least upon the same set of facts and circumstances. This amendment specifically provides that the decision of the appeal board shall be final, unless set aside by the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I get one answer from one member of the committee and another answer from another member.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not possible to define one man in the United States who can speak definitely as to those deferments? My observation has been that I cannot find out who does have the authority.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman mean to put it in the hands of the Director?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We have followed an entirely different philosophy in connection with the Selective Service. We have placed the responsibility in the hands of the local board where I think it should as nearly as practicable remain. As to putting the responsibility upon the Director of Selective Service for the administration of the act, that is what we do here. At least we intend to do it that way and I hope we may have some further discussion of the advisability of amending this section which I referred to and making the change as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan of the words "authorized" or "any."

There is another provision in this act which I want to briefly touch on, and that is the provision setting up a board of physicians. We have had a lot of complaint about the rejection of a number of men and the exemption of some because of physical and mental disabilities. There are a number of men physically fit and who could be used in combat service doing duties at home. We believe if this board is authorized and set up, one medical officer representing the Army, another medical officer representing the Navy, and three qualified civilian physicians, that they can determine a set of standards, rules, and regulations for all the armed forces as to the physical and mental requirements of those men who are to be taken into the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we believe if this board will function properly and as we intend it to function under this act, with the establishment of these standards and a review of these cases known as IV–F, that we can

take into the armed forces a number of men who are now avoiding service as a result of deferment and that they can replace many thousands of men who may be sent into combat service.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. From the study the gentleman has made of this legislation, does he feel that if the Selective Service boards would relinquish the thought that if a man does not pass certain mental tests, that is if a man is illiterate, if that provision were eliminated, would it not bring hundreds of thousands of men into the armed services?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman may not understand that we are taking illiterates into the Army now. For example, a week or two ago I went through the reception center at Fort Benjamin Harrison and was told by the officers after visiting their schools where we are teaching men to read and write. I found also that every month we are turning over to the Army approximately 3,000 of these men who came in as illiterates and who can now read and write. There are less than 3 percent of the illiterates inducted that are finally rejected because they do not show sufficient aptitude, or measure up to the necessary standards of the armed forces.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is the percentage of intake limited to the amount that the schools can handle?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I cannot answer that, but I am told that in Texas they have two or three schools. They have one, as I have stated, in the Fifth Service Command at Fort Benjamin Harrison. They are not taking all of the illiterates. It may be that there are not sufficient facilities to teach them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In regard to the boys rejected because of some physical disability that is more or less minor, what can be done to see that those individuals, if the Army cannot take them, are put in essential occupations? Businesses that are not essential can afford to pay them fabulous wages in order to get them.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman is talking about something other than the Selective Service Act. He is getting back to the Paul McNutt theory of using the Selective Service Act as a means to put across the proposed National Service Act. You cannot, under the Selective Service Act, force those men who have been rejected because of physical disability into an essential job.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman thinks it should be amended to do so?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not believe you could do it that way. This deals principally with those registrants who should be either in or out of the armed forces.

This simply means that one official, and only one, shall be responsible for the administration of the act. This provision, together with the very important further provision in paragraph (m), addition to section 5, should serve as unmistakably clear evidence that the Congress does not believe or expect the Selective Training and Service Act to be an adequate framework for a full-dress national manpower policy, which the administration has to date tried to make it by improvisation.

You will note that paragraph (m), mentioned above, specifically restates the original purpose of the Selective Service Act, namely, that draft eligibles shall be called into service in the order of their availability with respect to dependents, namely, first single men, then married men without dependents, and finally married men with children.

As further assurance that fathers shall be subject to call after all other classes, it is provided here that quotas for induction hereafter shall be based upon State and National levels. Notice that the committee has not undertaken to handicap the services by precluding fathers from service. It actually may be necessay, as the responsible military authorities have assured us, to call large numbers of fathers into service. All that is attempted by this provision is to insure that other classes of draft eligibles in all parts of the Nation are exhausted before fathers are taken. The evidence is plain that under present administration of the law that has not been the case to date.

Your committee is aware of the fact that this change from local to State and National levels will throw an additional administrative burden upon the Selective Service System, but we feel sure that the benefits which should accrue will much more than offset the added effort.

Of equal or greater importance is the fact that these two provisions together should do much to clear up the anomalous situation which has developed as a result of the administration's timid and vacillating attempts to hang its entire national manpower policy upon the limited framework of the Selective Training and Service Act. There is not now, and never has been, anything in this act to justify the arbitrary, contradictory, and confusing course the War Manpower Commission has followed from its inception. The provisions of this amendment should make it clear to the administration that this act was not, and is not designed for the purposes for which the War Manpower Commission tries to use it.

Also appearing as what your committee believes is an important addition is section 4, which adds a new subsection to section 10 of the original act. This sets up new machinery for the examination of the physical, mental, and moral requirements for the services. It is your committee's belief that there is vast potential military manpower in the classes of registrants heretofore disqualified for service. Hence this proposal to establish a commission of five physicians to review this entire field of potential manpower, and to determine what percentage of this group of men may be made available, at least for limited service.

Every individual who may be lifted out of a disqualified classification will contribute by just that much to relieving the increasing pressure upon our military and civilian manpower. Every such individual, even though he eventually qualifies only for limited service, will ease the load on the Selective Service System, and will eventually release some man better qualified for a higher order of duty, probably with combat units.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I propose to offer an amendment which will vitiate the distinction now made in the committee print between post-Pearl Harbor fathers and pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Forty-two days hence we are going to observe the second anniversary of Pearl Harbor, and it may become, strangely enough, a significant and lingering date for generations to come in the lives of fathers. It will be the strange issue of whether or not they were wedded before the 8th of December 1941 or after that date.

The basic purpose of deferring fathers, as I understand, was to protect the home, to preserve parental guidance for children, to maintain the sanctity of that fellowship, the greatest social unit in our entire social structure, namely, the home; but that fact is entirely ignored in this bill. A man could be a pre-Pearl Harbor father with one child or a post-Pearl Harbor father with many children, but his draft status will be measured not by his home and children but by whether or not he was married before or after the 8th day of December 1941. His draft status is going to depend upon a contingency, and that contingency is that day in our calendar when Japanese aviators fell out of the sky over Hawaii. To me that is a rather singular kind of thing to set up in a bill, and I prefer not to do it.

The amazing thing is that a man has to maintain a bona fide family relationship under this bill, and yet here is this singular distinction as to whether or not the man was married on the 8th of December or before, or the 9th of December or after. Had it been predicated upon the effective date of the Selective Service Act in 1940 it would be a different thing, because then every able-bodied male citizen within a certain age range was put on notice by solemn notification from this Congress by means of an enactment signed by the President that he would be amenable to military service under that act. But there is no such logic in making a distinction between a man who is a father who was married before the 8th of December 1941 and one who was married after the 8th of December 1941.

We do not make that distinction in any other law. If you are a father it

does not make any difference when you married, you are entitled to a marital status under the income-tax laws of this Nation. It does not make any difference what your marriage date was, we make no such distinction for children. This bill states that the child of a father who was married after December 8, 1941, shall be treated differently from the child of a father who was married before the 7th of December 1941. We do not make that distinction in the income-tax laws because every child, irrespective of when the father was married, is entitled to an identic exemption or deduction under the laws of this country. We do not make that distinction in the Dependent's Allowances Act. What difference does it make on what day a soldier was married or a man was married? His widow, his wife, his other dependents, his children will fare exactly the same under the Allotment Act irrespective of the date on which the father was married. So frankly, in all good logic, I cannot understand that kind of a distinction.

You cannot rationalize it on the basis of the age, either. It is possible that a pre-Pearl Harbor father might be 23 years old and in the very pink of physical condition and have one child, as against a post-Pearl Harbor father who may conceivably have 3 children and who is 30 years of age, and probably a little spavined and ringboned and not in the best physical condition; but the young man under this bill would stay home and the older man would go.

I cannot rationalize that kind of a distinction at all. It makes it just a little bit capricious. I therefore propose to offer an amendment at the appropriate time that will strike out that distinction. If it is the family vine and fig tree we are going to protect, why determine on what date that vine and fig tree was planted? So that will be the substance of the amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How does a man know when he has a bona fide relationship with his wife and children? I am thinking of the cases of men—and there are plenty of such cases in this country—who habitually have to be sought out by the court and put into jail for not supporting their wives or their children. They certainly have enough of a bona fide relationship that the authorities keep haling them into court to put them in jail for not supporting their wives and children. Is that a bona fide relationship under this bill or is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It might or might not be. I think it is predicated entirely on the circumstances. But what I suppose is contemplated here is, first of all, a marital status, a husband and father who customarily and regularly supports his family and lives with that family. I would say you would rationalize it on an entirely common-sense basis.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Should not the law say so?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the language used in this bill is susceptible of that kind of rational interpretation that I think will bring about the objective the committee has in mind. But let us not permit a distinction to remain in this measure as between fathers who were married before December 8, 1941, and those who were married after that date because it is indefensible, illogical, and discriminatory.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I desire, in the few minutes that I have at my disposal, to discuss one of the provisions of this bill. That is the provision which appears on page 13 and which reads as follows:

Provided, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions.

The purpose of this amendment is to nullify the so-called work-or-fight order which Mr. Paul V. McNutt, as Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, promulgated on February 2 of this year. You will no doubt recall that when we passed the Selective Service Act we wrote into it a specific provision to the effect that men may be deferred because of dependency, and that they may be deferred from military or naval service because of their occupations, but at no time, either in that act or subsequently, did Congress make it possible to induct men into industry either directly or indirectly. Yet, Mr. McNutt has ordered that that be done. Under his order men now in occupations which Mr. McNutt calls nonessential must transfer to essential occupations under penalty of being inducted into the armed services, regardless of their dependents. That, I submit, is contrary to express law as enacted by Congress. In the Selective Service Act, as well as in an amendment thereto, we recognize dependency as a ground of deferment.

Mr. McNutt's order, completely nullifying dependency as a ground for deferment, is clearly in defiance of Congress.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the amendment proposed here in this bill take away or specifically state that the Director of the War Manpower Commission does not have the power to do that?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. That is the very purpose of this amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And was it not intended to make it plain and clear that he did not have the right to do it?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. There is no question whatever about that. Congress never gave to anyone the power assumed by the McNutt decree. It is a clear usurpation of power. As an indication of the fact that Congress never intended that men should be inducted into the Service by occupational groups, I call attention to title II of the Family Allowance Act, which was an amendment to the Selective Service Act. In that amendment we provided as we had previously provided in the Selective Service Act, that no deferment from training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups, or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Having said that men could not be deferred by occupational groups, and never having conferred the right or authority on any governmental agency to say that they could be inducted into industry by occupational groups, it should not be necessary to write into law the amendment to which I am referring. However, because of the open defiance by the War Manpower Commission we are in the position where we must again state our position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Since Mr. McNutt has made it plain that he intends to add from time to time to his list of nonessential industries and occupations men in all occupations not already designated as essential, are very much confused as to where they stand.

Since last February these men have not known what course to take. Both their homes and their business have been affected.

In some instances they would be compelled to close their business and have transferred to occupations where they are of doubtful value to the war effort.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I find a great many men who have a bona fide feeling that they should not leave their present occupation and go into a draft-exempt occupation, that it is not exactly patriotic.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Louisiana is correct. Undoubtedly, many men have been placed in that position.

Read the act from the beginning to the end and read the hearings and debates, and you will find that Congress had but one thought in mind in enacting the Selective Service Act, and that was to provide for the training and service of men in the armed forces of the Nation. Neither directly nor indirectly did we seek to call or authorize the calling of men for induction into industry or

agriculture. Despite this position of Congress, the Chairman of the Manpower Commission, on February 2, 1943, announced that all men in certain industries and occupations which he termed nonessential would have to transfer to essential war work by April 1 or be called for induction into the armed forces regardless of their dependency status. In other words, notwithstanding the plain mandate of Congress that dependency shall be a ground for deferment, the Manpower Commission, by bureaucratic edict, decided otherwise. So again Congress is confronted with the necessity of passing legislation to reaffirm its intentions, and one of the provisions of this bill is for the purpose of doing just that.

You will recall that when Congress enacted the original Selective Service Act, which became effective on September 16, 1940, the President was authorized to provide for the deferment of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which rendered their deferment advisable. Later Congress became more specific on the subject. In the amendment which became effective on June 23, 1942—title II of the Family Allowance Act—the President was authorized to provide for the "deferment from training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes." Title II as passed by the House specifically listed the categories in about the same order set forth in the Kilday bill, which passed this House by a substantial vote. Title II was amended in the Senate, and the general language just quoted was adopted in conference in lieu of the specific categories included in the House bill. This was not because of any intention to dispense with such categories, but under the belief that the language finally approved expressed the same thing. In this connection I would call your attention to the statement of the managers on the part of the House accompanying the conference report, which statement, in part, read:

> The effect of these amendments is to make it clear that under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 it will be possible to carry out the policy expressed in the report of the House committee on H. R. 7119 to the effect that established families should be preserved so far as it is practicable and should not be indiscriminately uprooted. To this end these amendments authorized the deferment of men with wives and children until after the available single men have been inducted.

It is unnecessary, I believe, to point out that the Selective Service Act and all amendments thereto had to do entirely and solely with the selection of men for training and for service in the armed forces of the Nation. At no time did we seek to do otherwise. The title of the act itself is indicative of our intentions, namely, "To provide for the common defense by increasing the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and providing for its training." Nowhere is industry or agriculture even referred to except as provision is made to defer men from military training and service for occupational reasons. As a safeguard against deferring any occupations or groups, regardless of the status of the individuals belonging thereto, we provided in section 5 (e) of the Selective Service Act that—

> No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

If Congress provided against deferring groups of individuals it would necessarily follow, I submit, that Congress never intended that similar groups of individuals should be drafted for industry. While Congress made provision for deferring men for occupational reasons if their individual cases merited it, you will find nowhere any authority providing for the induction of men into industry or agriculture. Not having so provided it is obvious the order of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to which I have referred is without even the semblance of legal authority.

The order of the Manpower Commission completely abolished draft deferments for dependency as to individuals employed in certain industries and occupations. Even men with children were not excluded from the order. This, I submit, was clearly in violation of the Selective Service Act and the amendments thereto, particularly the amendment which provides for the deferment of men "who have wives or children or wives and children with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes."

Already we have seen the effect of this sweeping decree upon families and upon the business and the economic life of the Nation. As a consequence, men with dependents, regardless of the number, and regardless of their financial obligations, have been compelled to seek work in industries or occupations which Mr. McNutt has seen fit to label as essential and leave those industries and occupations he designates as nonessential. If work is not readily available these men must register with the United States Employment Service to be assigned anywhere or be subject to induction into the armed forces of the Nation. No provision, of course, has been made to suspend their financial obligations as was done in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act for those who enter the military service. Neither has provision been made for the transportation of men and their families from one area to another. Men inducted into the armed services begin at the same rate of pay, but men transferred to war plants may begin at any wage. The problems involved in carrying out Mr. McNutt's order have been as numerous as they have been complicated. I have merely touched upon some of them.

It is not difficult to understand the confusion which has existed among those who work in the industries and occupations, which might at any time be listed as nonessential. No one would think of contending that some of the types of business and occupations listed by Mr. McNutt as nonessential are essential to the war effort, but that is entirely beside the point. Men working in such industries and occupations would under existing law be taken into the military service prior to those working in essential places. Certainly the power assumed by Mr. McNutt is more power than should be exercised by any man, unless Congress, after a full hearing, decides that circumstances warrant it. Certainly no circumstances can warrant this assumption of power to legislate. Men were not called for induction into the armed forces of the Nation until Congress said it should be done. If they must be drafted for industry it should be only when Congress so directs. As Congress has not directed that this be done, but it is being done under an unwarranted assumption of power, we apparently are in the position where we must reiterate our already clear position if we are to terminate such power. The passage of this bill, with the proviso to which I have referred, should accomplish it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, speaking on the subject of fathers and Selective Service, I am desirous of making my position known to the Members of this House and to my constituents in Montana. When I was in Washington 3½ months, I made the following statement during the debate on the Kilday bill, April 12, 1943:

> I know that in Montana they have been taking married men and men with children for over a year, while here in the District of Columbia they are just beginning to take married men, and there are other large centers in the East where the same situation prevails.

I found out also that in some of the larger cities like New York there were still large reserves of eligible single men who had not as yet been called. As you know, it is my job to look after the interests of my district and State to the best of my ability in the National Capital. I have no sympathy for draft dodgers, whether they be single or married, because I feel that if this country is good enough to live in, it is good enough to defend. When Selective Service made its announcement about drafting fathers during the recess I wired General Hershey on August 5, 1943, for some information on the draft situation, as I do not like to make statements unless I can back them up. In his answer he informed me that there were 987,208 available nonfathers in the United States and that in Montana there were 3,089. This figure was for June 30, and for that date the estimated percent of militarily liable men in the armed forces was 31 percent for the United States and 33.6 percent for Montana, and that the percent inducted for the United States was 18.9 and for Montana 18.1 percent. This shows quite clearly that Montana, in this war as well as the last, is doing

its full share and a little more. I realize that no law can be absolutely perfect, but it is my considered opinion that the eligible single men from every State in the Union should have been taken before they started taking men with families. I realize that perhaps some men married to escape the draft, but certainly not all married men are draft dodgers and not all men who married since the war's start should be so classified. When you start to break up the home you are undermining one of the fundamental aspects of American life. If it is absolutely necessary to do so, then I am for it, but if there are inequalities I would like to see them ironed out first.

On September 20, after my return to Washington from the recess, I wrote General Hershey again for further information. My letter to Hershey and his reply of October 9 follow:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1943.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director, Selective Service System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: This is in further reference to your telegram to me of August 14. At that time you stated that as of June 30 there was estimated to be 987,208 physically fit available nonfathers and 3,087 for Montana. I would appreciate it if you will send me the latest figures you have on the available number of nonfathers in the United States and in the State of Montana as of the present time.

I would also like to know the number of illiterates who have been rejected for service because of lack of education and what is being done to rectify this condition so that these otherwise physically fit single men could be inducted. Also, I would appreciate receiving information on the number or percentage of men with contagious diseases who are now being inducted, as well as the possibility or the probability of induction of physically fit members of the prison population of the United States.

Thank you very much for sending me this information.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

OCTOBER 9, 1943.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This is in reply to your letter of September 20, 1943, concerning information in regard to available nonfathers, illiteracy, and other subjects.

As of August 31, 1943, there were 614,882 available nonfathers in the United States and 1,865 in Montana as reported by our State directors. Some of these registrants would, of course, be rejected at the induction stations for failure to meet the physical standards established by the armed forces.

Relative to illiteracy, our data extend only to June 1, 1943, at which time our estimates disclose 120,000 physically fit illiterate registrants had been deferred from military service. On that date, illiteracy standards per se were discontinued at the armed forces induction station. Registrants began to be accepted at that time without limitation if they could pass mental capacity tests which were initiated in the induction stations regardless of whether or not they could read or write.

In regard to programs for illiterate registrants, this agency has attempted in the last 2 years to encourage a national approach to this problem.

Thus far there have been a few individual localities which have attempted to teach illiterate registrants to read and write, but no Nation-wide program. However, on September 15, 1943, I directed all State directors of selective service to work with the chief State school officers of the States, and for local boards to work with local school systems in establishing classes for illiterates. At the same time the United States Commissioner of Education called upon the chief State school officers to attack this problem in cooperation with the components of this agency. It is too early at this time to determine what progress will be made.

Since June 1, 1943, when the armed forces changed from a policy of accepting only a certain percentage of illiterates each month, to the policy of inducting registrants who could not read or write provided they passed the mental-capacity tests, the Army has been giving special training to illiterates after they are in the armed forces and are teaching them to read and write.

In answer to your question concerning registrants with infectious diseases, a recent tabulation shows that of all registrants physically examined during June and July, and having venereal diseases as their principal defect, approximately 50 percent were inducted. Only 1 percent of those having other infectious diseases was inducted.

Special local boards have been set up in all penal or correctional institutions to process for induction registrants confined to such institutions who would be acceptable to the armed forces. For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the regulations covering this subject.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

It will be noted from General Hershey's reply that there is still a large number of available nonfathers, illiterates, and inmates of prisons who could be inducted and also that a substantial number of registrants with venereal diseases are now being taken into the armed forces.

This communication indicates to me that the Selective Service System is now doing a better job of inducting available registrants and is not too confined to technical restrictions as in past months. For this it is to be commended. However, I do think that more single, eligible men can and should be taken from the ranks of Government, industry, and professional athletics. These fields should be combed more closely so that the Selective Service System can be placed on a more definite and equitable schedule.

I am not here to defend the fathers—whose patriotism I do not question—but I am here to see if order cannot be brought out of chaos as far as the Selective Service System itself is concerned. For months and months heads of families have been kept in doubt as to their draft status; and, because of that, uncertainty and confusion have become the norm of these people who have their direct responsibilities to consider. The draft authorities have shifted one way and another and the men with the heaviest family responsibilities have been the victims. If these men are needed in the armed forces there is no reason for their blanket deferment. They should serve with the others. The Nation's security comes first. Provision has been made for dependents, and wives and children would not be left unprotected. The objection is not to the principle of drafting such of these men as are physically and otherwise fit but to the bungling, shifting methods of going at it. It has been stated here in Washington that probably only about 1 man in 20 among the fathers would be drafted, which leaves a free-for-all guessing contest as to whom it would be. That statement also suggests that after all the need must be found. Included would be a national pool of childless husbands and reclassification of other men now deferred.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend in the RECORD at this point a resolution from the Butte Miners Union No. 1 of the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of Butte, Mont.:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has recently promulgated an order whereby all fathers of the Nation within draft age are to be inducted into the armed forces regardless of the number of their dependents; and

Whereas this order if put into effect will be very destructive to the morale of our Nation. It will be the means of breaking up countless thousands of American homes and with the break-up of the home, where is our vaunted American civilization? and

Whereas the work on the home front, manufacturing and producing the weapons and implements of war, producing the food to supply the armed forces and our allies across the seas is just as important to the prosecution of the war as is the work of the men on the fighting fronts; and

Whereas this work and all these functions should properly be relegated to the fathers of the Nation and to those having many minor dependents in order to avoid the destruction of the America home: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Butte Miners Union No. 1, do hereby protest this order of Director Lewis B. Hershey; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our Congress to pass the necessary legislation making void this destructive order and that copies of this resolution be sent to Director Hershey, to President Roosevelt and to our Senators and Congressman.

BUTTE MINERS UNION, NO. 1, OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MINE, MILL, AND SMELTER WORKERS, C. I. O.

At this point Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I include my remarks on the Kilday bill on the floor of this House on April 12, 1943:

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate today with a great deal of interest, and I heard one of the distinguished gentlemen from New York make the statement that this country had just about reached rock bottom insofar as its manpower is concerned. I wish to disagree with that gentleman and tell him that we have not by any means reached rock bottom as yet. We have a great many factories in this country that are overmanned. We note at the present time great migration from those factories back to the farms. We have something like 250,000 illiterates who have been rejected for the Army who could be used, who could be educated to the proper level for such purposes, the fourth grade. We have a great many people who are diseased in various ways who at the present time are being utilized by cures. We have men in the penitentiaries throughout the country who could be used and should be used in the defense of this United States.

Insofar as the Selective Service Act is concerned, nobody in this country knows what it stands for. Every day you read a different

directive from the Selective Service people. No one can make any plans. No one can look into the future.

As far as the Kilday bill is concerned, I am going to vote for it, but I wish it was on a national scale rather than on a State-wide scale.

Insofar as statements made today are concerned, that most of the draft boards throughout the country have done a very good job, that is true, but they are only human. They have to follow orders. Consequently many States have been drained of their single men long before others. For instance, the State of Montana, from which I come, I think was the first State to draft married men. That has been going on there for over a year. Here in Washington they are just beginning to draft married men. Some boards in this city have not yet begun to do so. Many of our large metropolitan centers have not yet begun to draft married men, and they should be made to conform with what the rest of the country has had to do.

This bill brings about equality and not exemption. We must remember that the family is the foundation of American life. If we do not try to preserve it as long as we possibly can, we are going to break down some of the foundations which we have considered necessary in the make-up of this country.

We should realize also that we do not have the manpower to spread all over the world. We will have to conserve some of our manpower here at home for the jobs that will be necessary to do.

I urge you all, therefore, if you can possibly see your way to do so, to support the Kilday bill, which is a step in the right direction.

As a veteran of the First World War—with my only two brothers serving in this one—I am keenly interested in this matter. All I seek is a square deal for everybody, not deferments for a few and responsibilities for the many.

I am convinced that the great majority of this Nation's fathers while not living in enthusiastic anticipation of their debuts in khaki or blue, will when called, take up their appointed tasks in the armed services of our country with the same gallantry and loyalty as has been displayed by so many of their childless comrades.

However, the statements that fathers should cheerfully ignore all the responsibilities of marriage, children, and home, and without further thought rush into military service in an all-embracing surge of patriotism, must certainly originate with those who have no such responsibilities or comprehension of them.

Today is our reality and there is no escape from it but the dreams and hopes of tomorrow belong to our children. It is not a trust to be lightly tossed aside and all the patriotic speeches made by Members of this Congress, newspaper commentators, and the like, will not dispel the real anxiety of the serviceman with dependents for the welfare of his family while he is engaged in securing the "four freedoms" for the rest of the world.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to attempt to get some information which I think is of importance to the Members of the House and to the country. I understand that the practice is being followed of somebody connected with the Army, in effect taking boys who are attending medical schools, premedical schools, and other scientific schools, and putting them through what they call a screening process and then determining who is to be privileged to have the scientific education. When they so determine, then those persons whom they determine may have a scientific education, are immediately put on the Federal pay roll and they are educated at Federal expense. Possibly 5 years of college to be completed under that arrangement. I am asking the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] if he will be good enough to give us information with reference to that point.

Mr. COSTELLO. They are enrolled in these colleges as regular members of the armed services, either the Army or the Navy. However, that will last only for the period of the war or 6 months thereafter. At the end of the war they would be discharged from the armed forces, and the college education at Government expense would no longer continue. The purpose is to provide for a continuous supply of doctors and engineers in the event the war should last for a long period of years.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask again why it is that these boys are now at public expense being educated at a time when there is the heaviest draft upon the Treasury of the country and then when that draft is ended they will go off the Federal pay rolls? Has the gentleman any information with reference to that?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman's statement is correct. In other words, as long as they are in the armed services, assigned to the college, then they receive their uniforms, their housing, food, and clothing from the branch of the service in which they are enrolled. They also receive the pay of a soldier, $50 a month. That continues as long as they remain in college. Many of those men are sent there for special courses, particularly engineering, and those courses may last only 2 months or 6 months, or it might be 1 year.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does it not contemplate sometimes lasting 5 years? Two years premedical and three years in college?

Mr. COSTELLO. In case of the medical student who is studying for an M. D., that is correct. It would be over a long period of years, although even the medical courses are being speeded up. Vacations are being eliminated and class hours are extended and the courses are speeded up very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This being in the armed forces as a medical student is just a front. He is not fighting anybody. He is just getting an education at public expense.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is quite correct. Of course, the Congress provided for this procedure and authorized both the War and Navy Departments to send those members of the armed services who are necessary, to go to colleges throughout the country to be educated at public expense, particularly in the fields of engineering and medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the discussion started by the gentleman from Texas in reference to students in colleges and universities. Can the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs tell me approximately how many members of the armed forces are in school and how many of that number have more than 2 years to go to complete their university work?

Mr. MAY. I do not have the figures exactly, but I understand there are six hundred-odd thousand students in the schools and colleges of the country; but as to the number who have 2 years to go I do not know. The greater part of them would be confined to engineering and medical students.

I should like to state this additional fact for the benefit of the gentleman who has the floor and the membership of the House; there is one thing that has not been disclosed: When we inducted into the military service men down to 18 years of age and those up to 45, which top age was later reduced by the President in an Executive order to 38, we just about closed up the schools of the country. The result was that small schools and colleges were going broke throughout the country, and in order to utilize their facilities and help them out the Army was authorized by the Congress to provide an educational training program, particularly as it related to these two groups, engineers and physicians.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the chairman's opinion that this was done as a relief measure for colleges and universities?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the gentleman's contention that it was the intent of Congress when this was originally done that it include individuals who had many years to go to school, who could not possibly render a contribution to the war within the near future? It is true the Congress wanted the colleges utilized in the war-training program, but the details of these programs have been in the hands of the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. MAY. The principal reason was to provide the necessary personnel for military purposes and especially in the medical profession, because there was a great shortage there. It applies mostly to medical students who had had 1 or 2 years in college, or who even before going to college announced an intention of becoming a medical student, or following medicine as a profession.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the chairman. I have one other thing I wish to mention: During my visit to my home State this summer I attended a certain Rotary Club. The speaker did not know who I was, but the speaker happened to be a

public relations officer of the WAC's. She was enthusiastic about her program. I hasten to say that I very much agree that these young ladies in the WAVES, the WAC's, the MARINES, the SPARS, and so on, are doing a splendid job and I believe we should use them wherever they can be used. But this speaker made the statement at that time—and that was back in July—that there were still 1,000,000 men in the Army doing desk work.

I realize that some of that desk work is work that should be done by someone with training, experience, and judgment along military lines. But I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, Is that statement correct, that there are a million men in the Army doing desk work?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that quite naturally there must be a lot of desk work done by Army men, many of whom are not actually replaceable, for many of the questions to be dealt with and decided require the presence here in Washington of military officers and men of military training. Whether the figure reaches a million I do not know. An effort has been made to replace men doing purely clerical work, for example, with women. The War Department has been anxious to have two or three times as many WAC's as they now have, but for one reason or another they do not seem able to obtain as many women for the service as they would like and for that reason have not been in position to replace as many men as they want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not suppose anybody can answer this question, but the country is disturbed over the fact there are 300,000 or more men of draft age and status in the Government service who have been deferred. I wish someone on this floor could tell me why we should defer any Government employee. I do not run across very many people down in the departments who are doing work that could not be done by men not of military age, and by women. I do not know why we have so many seemingly indispensable men in the Government. The people back home do not consider bureaucrats indispensable.

Mr. MAY. I may state to the gentleman that there are certain positions that cannot be filled by women; for instance, special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There is a large group of men who have a definite background and training. They must be young men of the same character and caliber as the men who are enlisted in the services. You cannot replace them with women and you cannot replace them with older men. There is a peculiar type of occupation that is essential and irreplaceable. So far as the War and Navy Departments are concerned, you are bound to have people doing work that is peculiarly adaptable to men. In many positions of the Government people have had experience in handling the work and it is such that you cannot gain this experience in less than 6 years. Such people necessarily should be deferred. All we can hope for is that no large group is being deferred who can be replaced easily.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, not a very great percentage of the 3,000,000 on the pay roll of the Roosevelt administration fall in the category of the F. B. I. The other bureaus and agencies have too many deferments. Some of these deferred men have not been employed by the Government more than 1 month. The only way we can relieve the manpower shortage is to discharge 1,000,000 Government pay rollers and let the armed forces, industry, and agriculture absorb them. There would still be 2,000,000 to be paid by the taxpayers. This would mean that two people would do the work that three are now doing. I think the people back home are stretching their manpower that far and the Government should do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in using these 5 minutes is simply to call further attention to the remarks that the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] made on the floor here today in respect to the conflict that exists in securing and training men for the merchant-marine service by reason of certain conflicts between the local boards on the seacoast, and I am expressing the hope that this whole matter may be worked out by the administration, as proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]. At one time I had given serious consideration to the possibility of offering an amendment, but I believe that the suggested course of the gentleman from California is eminently wise.

I have been in close touch with the United States Maritime Training Service since it was established by act of Congress in 1938. It was doing a good job in training personnel for our merchant marine before the war and was able, because organized, to increase its training facilities promptly to provide the necessary personnel to supplement available qualified experienced seamen to man our largely augmented wartime fleet. The training program is absolutely essential to the conduct of the war, and I believe that the administrative staff engaged in its operation is performing the same kind of service as those engaged in the training of the personnel of the armed services and should be deferred from induction so long as they are actively engaged in that work. This can be accomplished on its merits by administrative action of the Director of Selective Service, and I wish to go on record as recommending that this be done. To my knowledge the Maritime Service is using women and men not subject to induction for this work wherever practicable, and they can be obtained, but there are many positions which this type of personnel cannot fill even if they can be found. The training program should not suffer for lack of the proper staff for its operation.

I was amazed to be confronted with many serious situations, including the following: A young man came to my office this summer wearing a blue uniform and said that he was about to be inducted into the—Army, I think it was. I said, "What are you wearing a blue uniform for?" He said, "I have been taken into the merchant marine service, I have been accepted, and I am now on leave from the merchant marine training academy by reason of a telegram sent to me that I have been classified as I–A and must be inducted into the Army." So far as I could see he had qualified with the law for service in the merchant marine.

I called up and found out that the man had been accepted by the merchant marine. He had received about half his training as an officer of the United States, ready to go out in a very little while upon his ship. I wrote the authorities in Richmond and called them up. For some reason he had to go into the service. He was inducted. He had several months' training up here at Sheepshead Bay which, of course, was lost.

Boys were accepted for merchant marine training and from my limited knowledge of the law and procedure I felt them to be qualified in every respect for training and for service in the merchant marine, yet one boy was brought back after several months' training. The other boy was up for induction the last time I knew anything about the matter. There was still another boy in merchant marine training whom they just could not reach because he was training at sea.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have had the same experience. I may say to the gentleman in the case I have in mind the young man was taken out of the training school before he completed his course and sent to the Army. Under the present set-up that has been rectified, has it not?

Mr. BLAND. It has not been rectified yet, so far as I know. I have been having trouble. I met a boy out on the Great Lakes who had been trained. He was an ordinary seaman. Some technicality had risen about his qualifications and they were trying to get him drafted as I–A and put in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS. In those cases the Government loses all of the training previously given those men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before us this afternoon is to exhaust all possible sources of manpower before we begin to disrupt the American home by taking into the armed services fathers with dependents and adding unnecessarily to the long and fast-growing list of dependents to be

supported by the Government of the United States. I am sure that every Member of the House will support this bill as reasonable and proper legislation. I shall support it and vote for it.

I desire to offer an observation. The statement has been made on the floor today that an order has been issued by Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the Manpower Commission, to the effect that men who are employed in nonessential industries would have to leave those industries and go into an essential industry or face the threat of induction into the armed service of the United States. That order may possibly mean that a great many men eligible for military service would be frozen in what is termed essential industry when they may not be needed in that industry. About 2 weeks ago I received a letter from a very intelligent and substantial citizen in my district on a subject foreign to what we are discussing this afternoon, but he included in that letter one observation which I think is pertinent to the debate now taking place on this floor. I desire to read it for the benefit of the House. He states:

I should like to insert, somewhat parenthetically, too, that during the summer I worked at the aircraft building at the Ford Rouge plant. From my experience there, and the actual lack of work done, I am always inclined to write and tell the news commentators who cry about the shortage of manpower, and work not being done because of that alibi, that if they would don working clothes, go into the place where I worked, and spend their time seeing what is being done to slow production they would cease their cry and try to encourage the workmen to do their best. From conversations with many other employees in other plants I feel that where I worked is not an exception to the rule. What I have stated above is not confidential and can be supported by numerous incidents which I could relate if you desire to know some of them.

What we do here today is by no means a reflection upon the patriotism of fathers. Three weeks ago I visited an indoctrination center of the Navy located in New England. Twelve hundred men are at that post. I was informed while there that 80 percent of those men were married and 50 percent were fathers. Yet they had enlisted in the armed service of their country regardless of their responsibility back home and were ready and willing to do their duty. So what we do here today is in no way a reflection upon married men.

When the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] had the floor this morning, I asked him why it was that many men in industry, whether essential or nonessential, could not be replaced either by older men or by women. I wish somebody on the committee, particularly a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, which has charge of this bill, would answer that question if they have the information. What percentage of the people in industry eligible for military service could be replaced by older men or women? Is there anybody on the committee that can answer that question? If so, I yield at this time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman I do not have any figures on the subject, but by reason of the fact that all the industries are being placed on a replacement schedule basis, the men who can be replaced will be in due course of time replaced and only essential personnel in industry will be deferred.

Mr. DONDERO. That should be done.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make clear a point with regard to farm labor. The question has been raised whether or not the present bill modifies in any way the exemption granted to those engaged in agriculture. I call your attention to the fact that the Tydings amendment, which is subsection (k) of section 5 of the act now in force, was adopted as a part of Public Law 772 and provides as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

The bill now under consideration makes an addition to section 5 adding subsections (l) and (m), which includes language in subsection (m) that indicates a change in the exemption for farm employment, the language in subsection (m) reading as follows:

Registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged * * * will be inducted.

Further in subsection (m) you will find the following qualifying phraseology:

Will be inducted after the induction of other registrants, not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act.

It happens that the Tydings amendment is one of the exemptions under that last language, so there is no intent by the committee or the drafters of this bill to modify the agricultural exemption. I thought it would be worth while to make that point clear at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these 2 minutes to ask a question of a member of the committee, and I should like to ask it of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], if I may.

In the committee discussion, did either of these questions come up? First, would boys in the last year of high school who come of draft age be taken during the first semester? My reason for asking that question is this: If they come of age in the second semester they are automatically deferred. It is a fact that if a man leaves college there is a very good chance of his going back after the war, but it is also a fact that if a boy is taken out of high school it is not so likely that he will go back. It seems to me that thought might be given to that point.

Now may I ask the other question? I have had this question handed to me to ask. It is in connection with the merchant marine, as well as the draft. Have you thought of taking boys out of institutions, such as Preston and the like? I use that name because the gentleman from California will understand it to be a correctional school.

Mr. COSTELLO. I would state to the gentleman in reply to his first question that he is quite correct regarding that statement, namely, that only those high school students in the last half of any year of high school are deferred until they complete that final half of the scholastic year. If they are in the first half, they have only started a school year and so have not advanced so far as to lose a material part of a year of schooling. For that reason, it would seem unwise to allow them a complete year's deferment, because here is what will happen if you should do this. For every high school boy who is starting in a high school year whom you would defer until the end of the year, you would have to replace with a father. Hence it would mean a greater increase in the number of fathers to be inducted into the service if you were to grant the high school students just starting a scholastic year deferment for that full period of a year; whereas, if a student is already two-thirds of the way through the year, it seems reasonable you should allow him to have the extra month, 2 months, or 3 months that might be needed to complete that half of the final part of the year.

Regarding the other matter, we have not gone into that. There is some question as to whether you should take men out of correctional institutions and put them directly into the military service alongside of men already in service.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I should like to offer an amendment on a subject which I think has been bothering a lot of my colleagues, as well as myself, and that is the amendment to make a distinction in the drafting of married men who are under 30 years of age and those who are over 30 years of age. I think it is obvious that the committee dealing with the subject of selective service has had a great many problems to consider, and the members of the committee are to be commended, but I think it would create little difficulty for the Selective Service to make the distinction as to these two age groups. By the time he is 30 to 35 years of age, he is usually established in some business to the extent that his condition is a great deal different than if he were 20 to 25 years of age.

I recognize that it is certainly tragic to draft a married man 25 years of age with a family, but I do think the man who is 30 and over does have additional handicaps to become a soldier. He does

have the more difficulty to take himself away from his established business and his family ties.

My attention was directed the other day to a married man who is being drafted. He is 34 years of age and has one boy 14 years of age.

I think there is a great deal to be said for making a distinction between those under 30 years of age who are married and have a family and those over. Personally, I am hopeful that my colleagues of the House will agree with me on my amendment, because I think it is something that should have the attention of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What distinction would the gentleman make between those 30 and under and those over 30? Would the gentleman take those who are 30 years or under first and then later take those over 30?

Mr. O'HARA. I would take those under 30 years of age first and those over 30 after those men under 30 have been exhausted.

Mr. STEFAN. Without taking into consideration the number of children they have or the condition of their businesses, the gentleman merely makes a line of demarcation at 30 years of age, that those 30 or under should go first, and those over 30 afterward?

Mr. O'HARA. That is right.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I also think this bill should be amended in one respect. I discussed the matter briefly with the members of the committee, and we are not quite in agreement. I would like to see in this reexamination of the physical standards, a reexamination and investigation of the so-called emotional standard of rejection. I find a good deal of complaint in my country about people who are sent for induction, who apparently look all right, but at the induction center are completely relieved from military service on the theory that they would blow up if they got into war. They might blow up if they were shot at, but I do not think they would blow up if they were put behind a typewriter, or had to carry some sacks of flour on their backs. There is a good deal of criticism and I think the so-called emotional and psychiatric tests with which the country is being flooded are not necessarily sound, and that certainly a man should not be completely rejected upon the theory he is emotionally unbalanced.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(l) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (d) of this section existing at the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 30 days after such date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within 10 days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service, and such decision shall be made public. The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

"(m) Under such rules and regulations as the Director of Selective Service may prescribe, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants, not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term 'child' as used in this section means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild, adopted child, foster child, or a person who is in the relationship of child to the registrant, who became such prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: Page 18, line 14, insert a new paragraph:

"*Provided further*, That no married man maintaining a bona fide family relationship, as provided herein, who is more than 30 years of age at the time of the passage of this act, shall be inducted until such time as all eligible individuals between the ages of 18 and 30 years, inclusive, shall have been inducted."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes allotted to me because of my other remarks, but, briefly, the amendment states a distinction which I think should be made in the induction of married men. It is serious, in fact, to get down to the point where we are drafting married men, and I believe that the drafting of these men over 30 years of age, when the Army themselves say that even a single man over 30 years of age is not as good a man for service as a younger man, it is all the more serious as it means disrupting a family and taking away from that family the fathers over 30 years of age. I think it is obvious to all of us in everyday life, if we look at the people in our own communities, that they are more set in their businesses and professions, and in their family life after the age of 30 years. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to decide somewhat along the line in respect to the provisions of my amendment, than it is for the War Department to dictate or for Selective Service to direct.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I ask whether in the debate of the Selective Service Act last year it was not brought out definitely that men over 30 could not stand the rigors of war as well as men under 30.

Mr. O'HARA. That is my understanding, and for that reason I hope the House will see fit to adopt this amendment, so that we will have a distinction which I think should be made.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. First let me correct one statement that has just been made. I believe in the debate a year ago on the Selective Service Act, the point was made that men above 38 years of age were not able to stand the rigors of military duty as well as those under, and for that reason the age limit was lowered from 45 years to 38 years, at the request of the War Department. The distinction was not made at the age of 30.

The gentleman's amendment will make a distinction between fathers under 30 and fathers over 30 years of age. If you are going to offer an amendment to classify the fathers, as to how they shall be brought in, I do not think that should be made as to married men who are 30 years of age any more than you should make it as to a single man under 30 years of age. If any question should arise as to groups of fathers who may be deferred a little longer before taking others, I think it should depend rather upon the age of the family, or the children, rather than on the age of the fathers. The hardship would be no greater if the father is 30 or 35 and there are two children 3 and 4 years of age, than if the father is 24, and there are two children 3 and 4 years of age. For that reason, it seems to me that the amendment is not wise. The age of the father is no criterion. I do not think 30 is any proper dividing line in the physical ability of a father or nonfather as to whether they could stand the rigors of military combat.

Mr. ROLPH. Do I understand that men over 30 up to 38 years of age could stand the rigors of this war as well as men under 30 years of age?

Mr. COSTELLO. Practically as well as those who are less than 30. The War Department is using men of that age at the present time and is not complaining about it. They did find that when they

got to be older than 38 in a great number of cases, physically they could not stand up, and that a majority of them required hospitalization at the very beginning of their training and became a great burden and expense. For that reason they asked that the age be reduced. But, men between 30 and 38 are able to stand training at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman undertake to maintain that a man in his thirties can stand the rigors of military training and campaigning as well as a man in his twenties?

Mr. COSTELLO. Perhaps not to the same extent, but there is no great breakdown on the part of men between 30 and 38 undergoing the physical training required by the War Department of those men. However, when they get over 38 they find that generally the men are not in the same condition and are not able to take that training. Naturally, the younger man is going to be able to stand up a little better than a man who is 5 or 10 years older. But in view of the fact that we have not made this distinction between nonfathers over 30 and married men without children who are under 30, I see no justification for coming in now and making that distinction among fathers between those who are under 30 and those who are over 30, purely on an age basis, because that is not a real basis. If it is on the question of dependency, I think some distinction might properly be made, but I think we are only adding a little confusion to the legislation and only making it more difficult to administer.

Mr. MAHON. Theoretically speaking it would be better to take the younger married men than the older married men?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is quite true. That would be true in all these categories—singles, nonfathers, and fathers.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the first place, in other countries of the world do they not call up their men by ages, rather than by industries?

Mr. COSTELLO. Largely, wherever conscription has been in effect it has been done by the age group because persons have been called in at a particular age to take training. So, the calls are based on that age class in which they have taken their training.

Mrs. BOLTON. And we are the only ones who do not?

Mr. COSTELLO. Due to the fact that we do not have universal conscription in peacetime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I shall not take the full 5 minutes. I wanted to pursue this question a little further. If I may, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] whose subcommittee has been studying the manpower problem covered in this bill. This question of ages was brought up in a very thoughtful letter which I received on the subject today, in which a constituent writes:

> It seems to me that if our need for men in the armed forces is such that we must now call upon fathers closely approaching the 38-year deadline that before doing so we again open up a call for the single and married men without children at least up to the age of 40. What I am trying to say is while a father under the age of 30 may well make a good soldier, is a father 30, 33, 34, or 36 or 37, going to make as good or at least any better a soldier than a single man 38, 39, or 40?

I am wondering if the committee has given any consideration to the possibility of opening up the calling of single men or married men without children between the ages of 38 and 40.

Mr. COSTELLO. In view of the fact that the War Department has indicated that largely those over thirty-eight have turned out to be hospital cases rather than soldiers, they have been opposed to it. But it seems to me there should be no difficulty about the War Department accepting for service those men who would volunteer between thirty-eight and forty-five who are physically fit and appear to be capable of taking the rigorous training required for combat duty.

Mr. CASE. Was there any testimony offered as to whether or not men between thirty-eight and forty have been found acceptable for service physically?

Mr. COSTELLO. That question was not gone into at the time of the consideration of this amendment. That was gone into at the time the changes were made in the Draft Act, where we lowered the age to 18. At that time General Marshall did make representations to our committee that those above 38 did not prove satisfactory, but in the main were proving a very great burden financially, because of the medical attention they required.

Mr. CASE. Was that entirely on account of the age or was there some consideration given to the psychological state of the soldier if he had a large family that he was taken away from?

Mr. COSTELLO. Those things were brought up before the committee, and there is no question about it that when you start taking a father into the service, the concern and worry over his dependents, his wife and children, is a matter of great concern and it does militate against getting the most efficient service from that individual. That is the very reason why we increased the allotments that were made available to men in the service, so that at least from a financial standpoint the welfare of the family would be reasonably well taken care of.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman's remark calls to mind a phrase used in a letter which I received from an American Indian who is in the service. He wrote, "I cannot get anything in my head in the Army because I have too many things in my mind." It may be a rather peculiar way of putting it, yet it suggests the proposition. A great many of these fathers who are taken from their business and families, when they think that arrangements are not complete for their care, find it difficult to apply themselves to the job of learning to be a soldier, so that their effectiveness is very greatly reduced.

Mr. COSTELLO. I might state to the gentleman that is the very reason why fathers have not been drafted heretofore. It is only because of the fact that we are getting down to the point where there are not available large groups of single persons or nonfathers that we come to the necessity of drafting fathers.

We did not want to do it merely because of the fact we felt they would not make as good soldiers as single men. This is why today we are confronted for the first time with the drafting of fathers on a large scale.

Mr. CASE. Summing it up then, the gentleman feels that the War Department's opposition to taking men between 38 and 40 does not make that a fruitful field for additional soldier material.

Mr. COSTELLO. Not as fruitful a field as taking fathers between 18 and 37, inclusive.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in one or two phrases in the gentleman's very clear statements that hitherto fathers had not been drafted. I think those of us who have had to answer the questions of fathers in our district who have been drafted would take a good deal of exception to that.

Mr. COSTELLO. I admit some fathers have been drafted into the service, but not on a large scale.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is on a rather large scale in some places, though possibly not so termed by the boards.

Mr. COSTELLO. The large-scale drafting of fathers is just now taking place.

Mrs. BOLTON. Also, the gentleman has stated that the psychological effect of family responsibility, and so forth, is greater in men over 30 than in men under 30, and has been taken into consideration to a degree. It would seem to me, therefore, that that in itself would be one reason for making the dividing line at such an age point.

I wish to ask the gentleman a very definite question with reference to officers' candidate schools: Are men over 30 now being accepted for training in officers' candidate schools?

Mr. COSTELLO. I believe so, but the number of men being accepted at the present time for officers' candidate schools is rather limited except in one or two branches. The need for officer training at the moment is not so very great, and for that reason the schools have been very considerably curtailed.

Mrs. BOLTON. I knew they had been curtailed but I understood the line of demarcation was pretty definitely set at the age of 30.

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know whether that is a fact or not. I believe some over 30 are being taken. I have not heard there was any definite regulation against their being selected.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 27, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 16, strike out all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and, on page 17, strike out lines 1 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a fair statement to say that need for men in the armed services has generally resulted in a reclassification by local boards and that those reclassifications have resulted in a change in classifications of those deferred for industry and agriculture so that those persons might be called before fathers.

Subsection (l) of section 1 provides a review of all deferments heretofore granted by the local boards for occupation by the review boards where the registrants are employed. It is my view that this impinges upon the authority of the local boards to change classifications at any time. Local boards are fundamental in the Selective Service; they are composed of local men who know the registrants, their characters, their occupations, and their qualifications as they are not known by those who reside in other States or other jurisdictions where the deferred registrants are employed.

In offering this amendment to strike out this subsection, may I say I have a high regard for the Committee on Military Affairs, its distinguished chairman, and the subcommittee that has carefully considered the bill under consideration. It is my view that the amendment I offer will strengthen rather than weaken the legislation and will promote the fundamental purpose of the legislation, to wit, to make more effective the Selective Service and to provide for the deferment of fathers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment I shall be pleased to yield.

I am constrained to offer this amendment because of the contradictory interpretations that have been given to me by several members of the committee in response to questions I have previously propounded with respect to the subsection I propose to strike out. I understand that the striking out of subsection (l), which authorizes a review by appeal boards of deferred registrants made for occupational reasons by the boards in the State or location of the employment and not by the local board, will not impair the remainder of the bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment I shall be pleased to yield because the gentleman yielded to me. Suppose, for instance, that a foreign board—and I use that phrase with all due respect—may declare, subject of course to appeal to the Director that the registrant shall be deferred, the decision is final and the local board now having the power to reclassify when there is demand for more men, including fathers, would be deprived of the power to reclassify before the expiration of the 6 months' period of deferment. Agricultural workers remain under the local boards. The local boards would have the power to reclassify agricultural workers, but not industrial workers in other areas—discrimination may result—the local board should pass on the deferment of all workers, and thus treat all alike. It is because this subsection undermines the power of the local boards fundamental in the Selective Service, the very foundation upon which the structure has been built, that I offer the amendment. It was said in support of the amendment that it would enable the boards in Washington to review the deferments that have been granted by boards in the local States. The boards in the local States have been progressing, they have been reviewing, and they have been withdrawing deferments. They know a lot more about what is going on in Washington now than they did 2 or 3 years ago or 6 months ago.

Whatever mistakes have been made, whatever discriminations there may be in the inductions or in the deferments under the Selective Service, have been made by the neighbors and by members of the local board who know the registrants, and their reputations and qualifications——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it was also stated that under the rules and regulations of the Selective Service, where the local board has made a deferment and wants to reclassify, now under the regulations, the appeal board in the place of employment would review rather than the local appeal boards. That is by regulation, if it be such, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to support any such legislation in derogation of the power and authority of the local boards.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman how he is going to reach the thousands of men who are eligible for military service now on the Government pay rolls and who enjoy a deferred status as a result of the deferments of their local boards outside the District of Columbia? The local board does not know about it. They do not know whether this man is essential in his Government job or not, but an appeal board here in the District will know that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I suggest to the gentleman that I answered that question in my initial statement. Reclassifications are being made of necessity and particularly where they have been deferred to work in shipyards and munition plants and come back home with reports that there are too many workers in such plants. They have been automatically reclassified. This would deprive the local board of that power. They are being reclassified by the local boards where they are employed in Washington. The chiefs of the bureaus here are being deprived of the power to request deferments from the local boards, and in my opinion that should reach the difficulty to which my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], for whom I have a high regard, has referred in advocacy of this subsection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We have 900,000 men of draft age in the Government service. Only 115,000 of those men are deferred at the request of the Federal Government. But thousands of them are still on the pay roll. The Government did not ask for their deferment. The local boards have deferred them at their own request or for some other reason.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In my judgment, the local boards, rather than boards in Washington and rather than the boards in the area of defense plants where the pay rolls are being increased, would do a whole lot better job and would reclassify them a lot sooner than will the appeal boards in the districts of employment.

The armed forces are inducting more men. Many local boards are without quotas. Fathers are being inducted. As I have stated, the local boards are reclassifying. If it comes to inducting registrants employed in an essential industry or agriculture and inducting fathers, many boards will defer fathers. Personally I believe that fathers should be deferred before essential workers. I have always so advocated. Unless the subsection about which I am doubtful is eliminated, the boards in other States where deferred registrants are employed or in other parts of the same State where they are employed will review, and in industrial areas I predict that they will follow the requests of employers and continue the deferment. At the same time, agricultural workers will be reclassified. The local board will be deprived of power to reclassify industrial workers and at the same time have the power to reclassify agricultural workers. The industrial workers were deferred because of the requests of industrial employers in other jurisdictions. The appeal boards will be less likely to reconsider deferment where defense plants and shipyards are located than the local boards. The result will be that local boards without men must choose either between fathers and agricultural workers. When agricultural workers are reclassified and exhausted, to meet the quota fathers will be inducted. The purpose of the pending bill will therefore be defeated. I

therefore offered the amendment to protect the jurisdiction of local boards and to enable local boards to prevent discrimination and to promote the deferment of fathers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the language of the section that it is proposed should be stricken from the bill, namely, that—

> Any occupational deferment made previously shall, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, and any occupational deferment made after the date of enactment shall, within 10 days, be submitted for review to a board of appeals in the area in which the registrant is employed.

The only purpose of that amendment is to say one thing; that is, that where a local board has already granted an occupational deferment, that occupational deferment shall be reviewed at the place in which the person is occupied or works. The appeal board there shall review it, and that appeal board can do one of two things—either say he is properly deferred because of his occupation or he is not. If they approve of the occupational deferment, the man retains his occupational-deferment classification and the local board is notified that it was correct; but if that board in the area where the man is working, investigating the job right there in that community, says that the work he is doing is not essential, that he should not be deferred, they reclassify him as I–A and notify the local board they were misinformed and that they made a mistake. That is all this section does.

You in no way take away the right of the local board. The local board still has the right to classify the individual registrant. Only when the local board gives an occupational deferment do the provisions of this section apply. It is only when deferment is granted, not when the deferment is refused. Under existing regulations, if a registrant is denied a deferment, he can then appeal from that decision of the local board, either to the appeal board of the State in which he resides or of the State in which he works. That is under existing regulations now. We are not interfering with that.

Here is something that you should keep in mind. In the Federal Government alone there are over 30,000 unofficial deferments. I repeat, 30,000 out of a known 115,000 deferments. How many unofficial deferments may exist in industry throughout the Nation we do not know; no one does; but we will come awfully close to finding out if the boards of appeal in the area in which those industries are located are called upon within 30 days after the passage of this amendment to review the occupational deferments of every out-of-State registrant who is working in that area. They will find out whether the local board has been fooled or not. Many of them may have been innocently fooled because the registrant may have written and told them how important he was to the industry. The man may be sweeping up a plant and that is all, but, if he describes his job in sufficiently glowing terms, it will sound as if he is the only one man in all the world who can do the work in that particular plant which he is doing. He may never use the word "sweep" at all. It may be that he says he is recovering spare parts for reprocessing in an aircraft plant, but he may be recovering them by sweeping them up off the floor and throwing them into a scrap salvage bin. It is to overcome these unofficial deferments, not only in Goverment but in industry as well, that this amendment has been offered to the existing law, and I think it should be put in.

The present rules and regulations are not eliminated. Those unofficial deferments in industry, I think, this provision will eliminate; therefore it should be retained in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that under the language of subsection (1), which I propose to strike out, if the reviewing board in the other jurisdictions decides that the man should be continued on the deferred list, the local board is without power to change that until the expiration of the 6 months' period of deferment?

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not know that they would not have the permission to reclassify him subsequently. Normally, when a deferment is granted, it is given for a limited period, 1 month, 2 months, or not in excess of 6 months, so it depends on the length of the period of deferment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But if he were classified for 6 months, then the local board would be deprived of any power, notwithstanding the need for additional men, to change that classification within the 6 months.

Mr. COSTELLO. I believe the gentleman is stating it correctly, and I think that should be true, because unless the individual does change his employment, unless he does change his type of work, if it is felt that he should be deferred, then definitely that deferment should take effect, but at the conclusion of that period the local board again has the right to classify him and can put him in I–A. When the local board does not defer, this question under this subsection would never arise.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] or the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. MAY]. There is a feature of this bill which I regard as very important, and about which I should like to vote intelligently, and that is with reference to a great many complaints I have had that many plants and industries are overstaffed, that there is a surplus of labor in these plants, and that many of the men who have been deferred on account of working in industry are escaping the draft, although at the same time there is a shortage of manpower on the farms and elsewhere by reason of that fact. I want to vote for such legislation as will seek to correct and discover and protect that surplus of manpower, to reclassify these men if they are in plants where they are not needed. May I ask the chairman of the committee or someone else to instruct me how I may vote intelligently in this bill to do that one thing?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has asked for instructions and I shall proceed to give them to him. In order to accomplish exactly what the gentleman wants to do he should vote against the Whittington amendment and vote for the bill when it comes up for passage.

The situation is that this very section we have written into this bill and that is now under debate on the motion to strike will bring about that very situation and enable us to find out whether 1,000 men in an aircraft corporation in California who are being kept back there as a reserve supply of manpower, as was shown in the Baruch report and in the hearings on this bill in the joint sessions of the House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs, shall be kept on there or shall go into the Army.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I know the committee has had under consideration what I have been talking about because I have talked to the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee investigating this matter the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] and others on the committee several times. Is it the purpose of this particular section to try to correct that evil?

Mr. MAY. That is the aim of the section in particular.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does the chairman of the committee think that the section of the bill we are now considering is sufficient to correct the evil complained of, or is there anything more we can do to make it stronger to get results? The situation is intolerable and should be corrected, and the American people are demanding its correction.

Mr. MAY. If it could have been made any stronger I think my committee, after holding hearings on this subject, would have written something into the bill to make it stronger.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, may I ask him this question: Admitting that there are those who are in the way in the defense plants and in the shipyards, is it not more likely that the local boards where the additional registrants are needed to meet their quotas will be more nearly likely to reclassify than will the jurisdiction where the shipyards and defense plants are located, and where there is agitation and efforts are being made to get labor to come in from other sections of the country?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In reply to the gentleman's question I may say that I am not familiar enough with the formula by which this is carried out to

know, but personally I should like to let both boards act on it if necessary to try to get the results I am seeking to accomplish, that is, getting rid of this surplus manpower. If one board does not do it, I am in favor of letting the other board do it, or both of them. What I want is results.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I answer the gentleman from Mississippi by saying that as one who represents a district with thousands and thousands of persons from out of the State and out of the district, I can say definitely that you should have a local board in the area of employment review every single case, because I am sure there are a lot of them that are escaping.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

May I point out this fact. This is a highly technical situation that has had very careful consideration in the committee. I am very much afraid the amendment would defeat exactly what its proponent hopes to accomplish. At the present time every industry in the United States, and the Federal Government as well, are controlled by the program of replacement of those people who are subject to military service by those who would not be subject. It has been successful in the airplane industry so that today in that industry the employees are 45 percent women.

Every one of those industries has had to file its manning table with the State Director of Selective Service. It has been approved and is administered under the direction of the State Director of Selective Service. In the State of California, let us say, where the airplane industry is concentrated, you have all of the men registered within that State on the manning table compelled to enter the service, being replaced by those not qualified for military service. You are weakening the manning tables when you permit men to remain in that plant who are registered outside of the State of California and are not subject to the provisions of the manning table, even though their duties be nonessential. There is no means by which local boards located at a distance from the place of employment can determine whether or not their duties are essential.

What is your protection against that appeal board? That appeal board is operating on the cases of those registered with it and who are covered by the manning tables. They are constantly faced with the necessity for withdrawing from the industry in the State of California those registered in the State of California and working in those plants. All of the time that board is compelling persons registered under it to leave the airplane industry or whatever war plant it is, and enter the service. A worker from outside of the State working in the same plant is not so controlled, but he will be under this bill. Therefore, instead of favoring the person working in that industry, that appeal board is going to be inclined in the opposite direction because every time it leaves that unnecessary out-of-State man in that industry, it is threatening to take one of its own people into the service and out of the industry in which he is employed.

You are overlooking the fact entirely that local boards do not have their quotas formulated on the number of men registered with the board. I claim that is wrong and have objected to it from the beginning. The quota is based not upon the number registered but upon the number registered with the local board and not deferred by it. Therefore, you are defeating the very purpose you are attempting to accomplish because it is those centers of population which furnish the vast numbers of industrial workers. By increasing their occupational deferments those local boards can diminish their pool of available men under the Draft Act. So long as you leave the matter as it now stands, those local boards can reduce their inductions by increasing their occupational deferments, which are not subject to investigation. With the adoption of the proposal in this bill, you accomplish what you want. If you adopt the amendment, you do not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In answer to the gentleman, I would say——

Mr. KILDAY. Oh, I did not yield for a statement. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the industrial areas from which the labor solicitors come would more nearly speak the language of this appeal board as to the need for these men than would the areas where these laborers are to be taken?

Mr. KILDAY. That is the gentleman's argument. I do not think it is a very sound one from the experience of the act.

Mr. WALTER. What sets in motion the function of the appeal board?

Mr. KILDAY. It is automatic. Those at present holding industrial deferments are to have their cases submitted to the appeal board within 30 days and those hereafter granted shall be submitted within 10 days.

Mr. WALTER. Who submits the case?

Mr. KILDAY. It will be submitted by the Selective Service System.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this provision in the proposed law. It is one that has been given a great deal of study and attention. I believe the trouble that has arisen today is due perhaps to the confusion that lies in the minds of some as to what is being done by this provision in this bill. This provision does not invade the jurisdiction of the local boards. It still preserves the original law which gives the local boards authority to pass judgment on questions of deferment. It permits a man subject to draft to go in to a local board, and submit his case to that local board, and let the local board pass judgment on whether or not he should be deferred. If he is an agricultural worker, that local board still has exclusive authority to pass judgment on whether or not he should be given agricultural deferment. No one else has that authority. That local board retains jurisdiction over that individual case until that man leaves that locality and goes to some distant point. I submit to you that when a man leaves Louisiana and goes to Washington State to work for occupational purposes, he has left the jurisdiction of the local board in Louisiana. It is a question of proof. A man who goes to Washington State with an occupational deferment given by local draft board, in doing this moves his occupational jurisdiction to Washington State where he is working. When he is in Washington State—I am just using Washington State for the purpose of this illustration—the matter to be presented to the board of appeals in Washington State is merely one of what is the nature and type of his occupation. That is the proof that can only be obtained by the board of appeals where the man is working, not by the local board of his former occupational residence in Louisiana. Therefore, if you want a thorough investigation of cases of deferment, you must go to the board of appeals where the man really works—the board that receives the information first-hand from the company or the industry asking for his occupational deferment. That board has the facilities in that local area to go out personally and investigate that industry, that occupation, and determine first-hand as to whether or not it is proper to continue the deferment given to the individual.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me cases where there is severe censure against certain industries because of so many occupationally deferred employees—men who have been brought into an area from many parts of the United States, from many local draft boards. The only way to determine how many are occupationally deferred by a certain company or a certain industry is to give the local appeal boards jurisdiction to take each one of those occupationally deferred cases and pass judgment on them.

I asked the committee, when this bill was before us, to include in this particular provision a stipulation that the findings of the boards of appeal shall be made public. I wanted it to be included for the purpose of showing local people how many deferments are being given to this industry or to that industry, or to this plant or to that plant. I think the pressure of local opinion which demands fair administration of this act will require that boards of appeal, which have to publish their decisions, be fair about granting occupational deferments in the cases before it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

I want to make this observation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and others who have spoken in behalf of this amendment: If you are interested in delaying the drafting of fathers until other categories, single men and married men without children, are inducted, you should vote against this amendment, because this amendment is the strongest part of the bill to delay the drafting of fathers by forcing into the service those men who are now enjoying erroneous or unwarranted deferments not only in Government service but in industry.

The gentleman from Texas a few moments ago stated that he had complaints from his district and from people in his State that there was a hoarding of manpower. If you strike out this section, you will have no way of reaching those men who are erroneously deferred in industry and in the Government. The appeal board in the locality where the man is employed knows more about whether that man is essential in that industry than does the local board that may be 3,000 miles away.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true that thousands who have been erroneously deferred were deferred by the local boards?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. And this committee, after exhaustive hearings, found that this was the only way to meet that situation?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. THOMASON. In that same connection, is it not true that as far as agricultural workers are concerned, they are taken care of by the law itself?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. This section of the bill applies to those men who have left the jurisdiction of their boards and are working in other jurisdictions, perhaps many thousand miles away.

This has been one of the most perplexing problems that the committee has had to deal with, the question of unwarranted or erroneous deferments. We have tried every way possible to reach those men in industry and in the Government service who should not be deferred. If you strike out this section you will defeat the very thing you are trying to do, that is, delay the drafting of fathers until the single men and married men without children have been taken into the service.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. As one who knows something about this subject, having one of those districts which has a great deal of employment, I will say the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] are absolutely correct in their statements, and this is the most important step that can be taken for the deferment of the drafting of fathers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Now, to erase from your minds any doubt about whether this bill takes away from an individual his right of appeal, it does not. As an example, if a man from North Carolina is employed in Baltimore in an aviation plant, with an occupational deferment from his local board, the reviewing board in Baltimore should determine whether he is essential in that plant.

A review board might revoke his deferment and notify the local board that the deferment was erroneously granted. The local board would then in all probability classify him I-A, but the man still has the right to appeal from that new classification to his local appeals board.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAY. The only thing involved here, of course, is to determine whether or not a local draft board back in some State knows more about what a man is doing and whether he is in an essential job in a distant State than the people in the community where he is working.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, the local boards should pass upon the men living and working in the jurisdiction of that board; but when a man leaves the jurisdiction of his local board and goes to some other State, then I think the appeals board in the State where the man is working will know more about the essentiality of that employee than the local board perhaps a thousand miles away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 17, line 18, strike out the word "were" and insert the word "are"; in line 19, strike out the words "prior to December 8, 1941" and insert the word "and."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the discussion on drafting fathers had reached its maximum temperature some weeks ago I believe the most effective argument that was made was that there was a waste of manpower in industry, that there was a surplus of eligible material apparent on the Federal pay roll and that there were a number of unencumbered individuals in the country who should first be called, and that thereafter fathers should be taken.

The Committee on Military Affairs has done a very creditable job in that direction. Here is an appeals section in the pending measure that will get at some of these indefensible deferments in industry. Here is another provision to set up a lay commission for the reexamination of the physical standards of the Army. Here is a provision that will get at the deferments on the Federal pay roll. The committee in a sense has said that we will get at all those eligibles first and then we will put the fathers at the tail end of the procession. That would have been the logical thing to do, but the committee did not go quite that far; they said: "We will put only some of the fathers at the end of the procession." My amendment proposes to put all fathers at the tail end of the procession by striking out a wholly illogical differentiation between fathers who were married before Pearl Harbor and those who were married after Pearl Harbor. After all, a home is a home. What difference does it make if the father was married on the 9th of December or on the 7th of December, 1941? A child is a child. What difference does it make whether the father of that child was married and this union was consummated on the 7th of December, 1941, or consummated on the 9th of December, 1941? The whole purpose for deferring fathers and putting them at the tail end of the procession of those who shall ultimately go into the military service is for the purpose of preserving the home, perpetuating the family unit; that is the basis. What the committee did was to say that they would put part of the fathers, those who were married before Pearl Harbor, at the tail end of the procession, that they should be inducted last, but no corresponding exemption was made for the fathers who were married after Pearl Harbor. The children of the fathers married after Pearl Harbor would be of a more tender age and might need even more the parental guidance and the presence of a father in the home than those whose children are older, because there is provision here that the child may be up to 18 years of age before the deferment passes. So I put it to you on the theory that this is an illogical distinction. We did not make it in the income-tax law. A child is a child and worth $350 of the taxpayer's money. We make no distinction as to whether a man was married on the 7th or 9th of December to get the deduction for a marital status. In exactly the same way you made no such distinction in the Dependents' Allowances Act: A child is a child, a dependent a dependent, a wife a wife, irrespective of whether that union was consummated on the 7th of December or on the 9th of December.

Why perpetuate this kind of illogical distinction in the law? Let us do this thing right. We are going to get at those who are on the Federal pay roll and have been deferred; we are going to get after those in industry who may live in one State under the jurisdiction of a local draft board and be working in another State; we are going to provide a commission for a study of the physical requirements for military service to make certain that all able-bodied persons within the age brackets will be made available for service. This bill will be a substantial answer to the frequent charges made that industry is hoarding manpower, the Federal rolls are harboring military talent, and that unencumbered men are being deferred for minor defects. To that extent, the bill is a creditable piece of work. Let us not now make the mistake of deferring only a part of the fathers until all other avail-

ables have been reached only because they were wed before or after a certain date. Why not think of the home and family as such without regard to the date on which a home and family came into existence and give to all families the benefit of this legislation. If the distinction were based upon the Draft Act of 1940 it would be a different matter. When that act was passed it was notice to every military eligible in the country that he might be called; but certainly pre-Pearl Harbor was no notice to anybody, and so why such a discrimination in the act? Let us adopt this amendment and eliminate it and say that fathers, pre-Pearl Harbor and post-Pearl Harbor alike shall come at the tail end of the procession after the long arm of the selective service has reached into industry, into the Federal Government, and found available manpower that can very well go into the armed services.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The implication of the date December 7, 1941, is that those who married after that date did so in order to become deferred as married people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There may be many who probably have taken advantage of October 1940, when the Draft Act became effective in the country, rather than the date of Pearl Harbor. The damage was done several years before, or at least 1 year before. While there may have been some people who rushed into wedlock the day after Pearl Harbor, it would be a small proportion of the total, so why penalize the good, upright, sincere, earnest father who probably had all the reason in the world to consummate wedlock, and place this stigma on him that will attend these fathers all the days of their lives? It will not be for next week, next month or next year. Twenty-five years hence, the stigma will still be there. They were either post-Pearl Harbor or pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

Mr. KLEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman's amendment speaks only of the date of the marriage. It says nothing about a definition of "child" on page 10.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have another amendment which I will offer.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am wondering if the gentleman's amendment would not encourage them to rush into wedlock from now on?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would have no such effect whatsoever. We are dealing here with a wholly artificial distinction between a father who was married before December 8, 1941, and one who was married after that date, and in so doing we are entirely forgetting the real issue that is involved, namely, the children and the home. The bill itself requires a bona fide family relationship with children under 18 in the case of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. And then it proceeds to ignore that relationship entirely in the case of post-Pearl Harbor fathers. I should like to hear some member of the committee defend that provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 58, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: On page 18, line 14, insert a new paragraph:

"*Provided further*, That no married man maintaining a bona fide family relationship as provided herein, who is more than 32 years of age at the time of the passage of this act, shall be inducted until such time as all eligible individuals between the ages of 18 and 32 years, inclusive, shall have been inducted."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, this is in substance the same amendment that was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. I regret exceedingly I was out of the Chamber when the gentleman offered it. His age limitation was set at 30 years. In order to renew the proposition I am merely changing the age limit to 32.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the pending bill. I think it is constructive legislation. But when the Selective Service actually reaches the bottom of the barrel and begins to induct fathers with children into the service the draft boards will reach out and take the fathers regardless of whether they are 18 or 38 years of age. That just does not make sense to me for a number of reasons.

First, if we can help, we do not want those fathers who are over 32 years of age in combat service, in the Infantry, in the Artillery, in the Air Force, in the Tank Corps, or, in fact, in any part of the combat service. But the draft boards under the law we are about to pass would have to take the married men with children of 38 just the same as they would take the married man with children of 28 or 18.

My amendment is offered on a nonpartisan basis. The bill itself is nonpartisan. Therefore, I am asking the Members to consider this amendment solely on the basis of its merit. Every one of us knows very well, because we are concerned with our constituents back home, whether he be Republican or Democrat, that men of 32 and older, who are married, have more children than do the younger men. They have been engaged in business for a long time and they are apt to have their entire business efforts of 10 or 15 years' hard work wiped out by being drafted into the armed forces. I submit, let us put married men 32 to 38, with children, in the last category so they will not have the fear hanging over them all the time that the long arm of the draft board will reach out and pluck them away from their business and families. I offer this as a completely nonpartisan proposition on its merits because, first, I do not think we need these older men of 32 and upward. Certainly they are not needed in the Army until the younger men are absorbed. Second, because it is a great hardship to all these married men over 32 years, with children, who are in business and have large families. Why not put them at the bottom of the barrel by this simple amendment making the age 32 so that when the fathers with children are called the draft boards will take those up to 32 first and those above 32 last? It does not change the bill in any other respect.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman's amendment would discriminate, does he not think, against thousands of men who are in the services and who are over 32 years of age?

Mr. FISH. There have been very few married men with children drafted up to now. I am concerned with the millions who are not in the service. We are talking in this bill about the future and what will happen in the future.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think he is also discriminating against the married men without children who are beyond 32 years of age?

Mr. FISH. I am talking about married men with children. There is where the hardship lies. Congress has already determined by law that a married man without a child should be drafted and I am for drafting them ahead of married men with children. My amendment simply has to do with married men with children and it puts those above 32 years at the very end of the eligibles. It is in the best interest of the military service, and in fairness to those who are in business and have families to support and bring up, I ask that the amendment be adopted. If my amendment is sound and meritorious it ought to be adopted. If it is not, it should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 24, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 (a) (2) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"To create and establish a Selective Service System, and shall provide for the classification of registrants and of persons who volunteer for induction under this act on the basis of availability for training and service, and shall establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. There shall be created one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia.

Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President, from recommendations made by the respective governors or comparable executive officials. No member of any such local board shall be a member of the land or naval forces of the United States, but each member of any such local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction under rules and regulations prescribed by the President. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service as provided in the last sentence of section 5 (1) of this act. No person who is an officer, member, agent, or employee of the Selective Service System, or of any such local or appeal board or other agency, shall be excepted from registration, or deferred from training and service, as provided for in this act, by reason of his status as such officer, member, agent, or employee."

(b) Section 10 (a) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and fix the compensation at a rate not in excess of $10,000 per annum, a Director of Selective Service who shall be directly responsible to him and to appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or of any reserve component thereof or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to sec. 10 (a) (2)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States: *Provided further*, That any person so appointed, assigned, or detailed to a position the compensation in respect of which is at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum shall be appointed, assigned, or detailed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Director of Selective Service may appoint necessary clerical and stenographic employees for local boards and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and without regard to the provisions of civil-service laws."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 21, line 9, after the word "amended", strike out the comma, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of line 9 and all of line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The President is authorized and directed to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in him under this act (except sec. 9 or sec. 10 (a) (3)). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 21, line 14, strike out "any" and insert in its stead "all."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I discussed this provision of the bill and this particular language. It was the intention of the subcommittee and the full committee when this bill was reported that the President be directed to delegate to the Director all of the authority given him under the Selective Service Act except that part of it specifically excepted in the section. As it is written with the word "any" there is some doubt as to whether it means all authority or a part of such authority. In order to resolve that doubt and have a definite understanding as to what we mean, I offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President is authorized and directed forthwith to appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom one only shall be an Army officer and one only a Navy officer, and the three remaining members shall be qualified civilian physicians not employed by the Federal Government, who shall examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men who may qualify under any new standards established."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 22, line 17, after "men", insert a comma and the following: "including those previously discharged from the armed services because of physical disability."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this brief explanation of the amendment. There have been discharged from the military service for various reasons about 550,000 men, many of whom are probably capable of very active military duty. The only thing this amendment proposes is that they be reexamined and reclassified. That is all it does.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. No time is specified here as to when this work shall be completed.

Mr. MAY. The assumption is that they will go at it as soon as this law is passed, as expeditiously as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAFOLLETTE: On page 22, line 2, after the comma following the word "mentally", insert the word "emotionally." Also, on page 22, line 9, after the word "physical", insert the words "and emotional."

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of reconsidering as well as we can the so-called psychiatric examinations which have been made of inductees. Having served in the last war and seen some of the men who came out of it, I am very well aware of the fact that there are men who are so emotionally constituted that they cannot stand up under gunfire, we will say. But I have observed, and I think it is true, that there has been no induction for any limited service of men who were considered to be emotionally unbalanced. To me, it is incredible that a man, who might not be able to stand up under the pressure of gun fire, could not serve behind a typewriter, or could not serve as a guard for prisoners. Prisoners do not have guns, and they cannot hurt you very much without them.

I think you will find that a great deal of the reason for the morale of the people being adversely affected by the operation of the Selective Service Act is that people feel that too often men have been declared unfit for any kind of military service purely because some psychiatrist says, "You are emotionally unbalanced." Some of these men rather boast of the fact that they are out. "I am crazy," they say. It is one of the few situations where I have seen people who seem to be proud of the fact that they are crazy.

This section calls for a reexamination of the standards by which we have been rejecting people for physical causes. I think it is proper to include in this direction a reexamination of the standards by which we have been rejecting them completely for so-called mental causes. I believe it is fair for me to say that the committee possibly thinks there is a good deal that is wrong with this psychiatric problem, but that my amendment would weaken their language. I do not believe it would. Certainly this question of emotional balance is not physical. If it were physical, we would not have all

these psychiatrists and other people hanging around induction centers.

Further, there is a definite difference between psychology, which is a science, and psychiatry, which today to the minds of many psychologists is simply a form of voodooism or exploring into the unknown. Professor Link, who has written The Return to Religion and is one of the outstanding psychologists in America, very ably points out the difference between the science of psychology and the immature development of the thing we call psychiatry and which I refuse to dignify as a science.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. I do not believe it will weaken the bill. I think you will get a good deal of response from the country if you will reexamine this so-called psychiatric rejection of people for all purposes. I think a man who handles shoes or clothing in civilian life can certainly find a place somewhere in the Quartermaster Corps, where he will not be frightened by bullets but where he can still render a service, and get somebody else into the Army from a farm somewhere who has enough guts to go in and fight.

It has been my observation that very few hard-working people, either from the city or the farm, have been excused from military service by these psychiatrists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAFOLLETTE) there were—ayes 30, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Any registrant within the categories herein defined when it appears that his induction will shortly occur shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War and Director of Selective Service, to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination.

The commanding officer of such induction station where such physical examination is conducted under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and this examination shall be accepted by the local board. Those registrants who are classified as I-A at the time of such physical examination and who are found physically qualified for military service as a result thereof, shall remain so classified and report for induction in regular order.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 23, line 9, after the word "order", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided further*, (a) That any person subject to training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and the Selective Service Regulations may, at any time prior to being placed in class I-A, apply to the induction station nearest his place of residence for an examination to determine his physical fitness for such training and service. Such examination shall be given any applicant within 60 days after the receipt of his application.

"(b) If any person fails to pass the examination given him under the provisions of section 1, such fact shall be immediately communicated to his local draft board, and such board shall thereupon place such person in class IV-F. If any person passes such examination, such fact shall not affect his status under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and the Selective Service Regulations, nor advance the time of his induction for training and service."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the whole question before the House today revolves itself around the question of manpower. My amendment is offered only because of my personal experience as a member of a local selective service board, before becoming a Member of this House. Men are sent to the induction center, who have sold their furniture, broken up their homes, and sold their businesses, and put to a great deal of hardship and embarrassment because after they reached the induction center they were rejected. I know one man who was a member of a distinguished law firm in the city of Chicago, who distributed all of his law business. His friends gave a party for him, showered him with gifts, and gave him a great send-off. He was rejected, and to this day he has not been able to go back and face his former associates. That is one side of the picture. The other side takes in industry and our war production. A man applies to a defense plant for work, and the first question he is asked is this: What is your standing in your local draft board? As soon as they find out the man might be subject to induction, they cannot afford to give him employment, and spend 3 or 4 months of time and money training that man, just to have him inducted into the Army. Whereas, if this amendment be adopted and enacted into law, that man can go to the induction center, and upon his request to the local service board, have his examination, and it can then be determined whether he would be I-A or IV-F. If he is IV-F then he can go to the defense plant and apply for employment, and in all probability obtain it, and thereby be of help to the war effort. I have no objection to section 5 of this bill that we have under consideration, but in that section it is left to the discretion of the local board to order a man to the induction center. My amendment does not in any way affect the rights of the local board under this bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman is entirely in error about the statement that they are not entitled to an examination, because in section 5, the language is—

when it appears that his induction will shortly occur, shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War, and Director of Selective Service, etc., to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the distinguished chairman of the committee will read section 5 again, it says—

when it appears that his induction will shortly occur.

I do not want that man to have to wait until his induction will shortly occur, but I want him to be able to ascertain his status in advance, so that he can be working to help the war effort in some defense plant, and not leave his prephysical examination to the local board shortly before his time for induction. I know that the War Department will in all probability say that this may cause a hardship upon the medical examining staff at the induction centers. Six or eight months ago I might have agreed with them. But at the present time, with the possibility of the number of men being drafted into the service slackening off from now on, I do not think it will be a hardship, and, after all, the dividends that will be received from these men being able to get this prephysical examination far outweighs the hardships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Director of Selective Service shall obtain necessary information pertaining to requests for deferments, deferments, exemptions, rejections, and replacement schedules of registrants from the various departments, agencies, and branches of the Government and shall report to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs such information and the manner in which the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, are being administered and the results thereof.

Such information shall be obtained by the Director of Selective Service through his chief liaison and legislative officer or such other liaison officer or officers as he may designate, and he shall make a report of such information monthly or at such other intervals as such committees may designate from time to time.

SEC. 7. Except as provided in this act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this act shall be in force.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLMER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 763, and pursuant to House Resolution 330 reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the United States News which refers to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances and to include therewith some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by President Quezon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. On the vote just now taken the Speaker declared the bill was passed without opposition. I voted "No" as loud as I could and I want it to be known.

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The Chair announced that the bill was passed and without objection a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Well, it seems I can neither hear nor talk.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what his committee is considering?

Mr. MAY. We are considering the bill which proposes to authorize the termination of war contracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hartford Courant of October 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein a speech delivered by me to the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, C. I. O., on Sunday, October 24, 1943, at McKeesport, Pa., on subsidies and roll-backs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement by the Arkansas Policy Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain data on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes this afternoon after the completion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a series of newspaper articles recently published dealing with the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address and other remarks made during naturalization proceedings in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's table and special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include a statement by Hon. Prentiss Brown, also a statement by President Roosevelt, and other statements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many people do not realize what has been saved by reason of the Price Administration. I know many people who have been irritated and annoyed by rules and regulations because of price and rationing requirements; notwithstanding that we would have already suffered from ruinous inflation and a dollar would not be worth 10 cents had we not had an Office of Price Administration and a price control as good as we have. May I invite your attention to just one item, steel? During the last war the price of sheet steel was $180 a ton; during this war it is $42 a ton, and it has not increased one penny in 3 years' time. The difference in cost to the American people and the war effort if we had to pay as much for steel now as we paid then would be $5,000,000,000 a year—just on that one item, steel. That is an enormous sum; in other words, instead of trying to raise $10,000,000,000 more taxes if the price of steel had not been held down we would be trying to raise $5,000,000,000 more just to take care of steel alone, and that is just one item out of many hundreds of thousands of different items that go into the cost of the war. It is true it is a major item.

Let us take copper. During the last war copper went to 37 cents a pound. During this war it has remained at 12 cents per pound and the reason is because we have had price control and subsidies. When new copper production was needed there were two ways of securing it: One was to encourage new production by increasing the price; the other was to give a higher price to new copper production only, the high-cost mines. The latter method is the one that was used, and by reason of using less than $80,000,000 in subsidies on copper, lead, and zinc, the American taxpayer will save over a billion dollars—over a billion dollars a year. Yet you say that subsidies will cost the taxpayers a lot of money.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I will yield on that point.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would give the House the figures on the price paid for these strategic war materials we have bought from foreign countries. I think he has those figures.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have those figures, but the gentleman would be rendering a distinct service if he himself would obtain them, which he could by merely requesting them, and placing them in the RECORD. I hope when he gets these figures he will compare them with the prices paid during the last war.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Texas is attempting to show—and rightly

so—the savings we have made in the purchase of these metals, but I think it would be fair while he is doing it also to show what we have paid not only to domestic producers of the metals he mentioned but also to the foreign producers.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman wishes to explore that, it is a matter for him to decide himself. No one disputes the statement I am making. Had the gentleman said I was not representing it correctly or that the price of certain metals was out of line—and I do not believe the gentleman did, either—I would be very glad to let him interrupt. Since there is no question about what I say, no one disputes it because I say they cannot dispute it, I see no reason why I should go out on a fishing expedition—and I say that respectfully to the gentleman—to explore something that the gentleman himself is interested in.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly the gentleman is also interested in the amount we are paying the foreign producers?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can get the information. He can take his telephone, call the R. F. C., and get the information in about 2 hours' time.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate all that.

Mr. PATMAN. I wish the gentleman would get it; and if there is anything wrong about this, I wish he would show it up.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate the information the gentleman is giving the House, but while he is at it I still insist that the gentleman should show all of the figures.

Mr. PATMAN. What would be the object of showing them? Why should I do it? What would they show?

Mr. JENSEN. It would give full information instead of partial information.

Mr. PATMAN. There are 1,800,000 different commodities and products. I cannot go into all of them. If the gentleman wants to go into any particular ones, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman distinguish between a subsidy to increase production and a subsidy to lower prices?

Mr. PATMAN. The subsidy for production is on copper and those products, and on farm products I cannot understand why they want to make the farmer the goat in this thing. They are perfectly willing to give subsidies on oil, copper, zinc, lead, in fact on everything they are perfectly willing to do that, but they do not want to do anything for agriculture. Why do they always want to single out the farmer and say that he shall be the goat?

We have been talking about the President not carrying out the will of Congress. In this case we passed a law, the date of it is October 2, 1942, in which we stated that the President is not only authorized but we wrote in it the language, and one of the gentleman's colleagues on that side was responsible for the language, that the President is authorized and directed to stabilize the cost of living and prices, wages, and salaries, as of September 15, 1942, insofar as practicable. That was a mandate we gave the President. If the President carries out that mandate and he holds the line, there is only one man can suffer in the agricultural set-up and that is the farmer because it will be rolled right back on him. The only way you can protect the farmer is through subsidies. So why make the farmer the goat in all this? We say everybody else is entitled to a subsidy but the farmer is not entitled to it.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Is it not a fact that the farmers' organizations appeared before our committee and protested against the payment of subsidies?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not willing to accept that as a statement for all the farmers in the country. I know that anybody opposing subsidies under present conditions is speaking against the interests of the American farmer. He is not speaking for them. I am thoroughly convinced of that.

Mr. ROLPH. We had the representatives of the national farm organizations before our committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not desire to comment upon that, I may say to the gentleman from California. I say it is against the interests of the American farmer to be against subsidies. You never hear of these other people opposing them in the other commodities and in the other production. It is only the farmers and they want to prohibit the farmer from receiving these subsidies in order to make up his extra cost of production. The farmer's labor has increased in price, many items of expense have increased in expense, and if he is forced to sell at a price that will enable the consumer to get the goods on the basis of prices as of September 14, 1942, the farmer has got to have more money. Now, what difference does it make to the farmer whether the Government pays a part of the money and the man who buys it pays the other part, or whether the man who buys it from him pays all of it? It does not make any difference to the farmer and it certainly should not, especially when he is trying to help hold down inflation which will help the farmer the same as everybody else.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has very pointedly called attention to the direction of the Congress that the President is required to keep the price level around that of September 15, 1942; yet every Member of Congress knows it is impossible for the President to do so unless subsidies are used in some form; therefore, it necessarily follows that the honorable thing for the Congress to do is to repeal that provision of the law, instead of directing the President to do something as of September 15, 1942, which cannot be done unless we vote subsidies; is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that is, No Member of Congress would dare do it.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a situation that I cannot understand. Ordinarily, you would think that the labor organizations would be right in here fighting for subsidies, but you do not hear much about them. I hope that the reports are not true that they are going to stand by in the hope that these prices will be increased which will give them an unanswerable argument for wage and salary increases. I hope that is not true, but the reports are out and you hear them around here that that is the policy they expect to pursue. If that be true they will be following a very short-sighted policy. It is better to receive in wages and salaries what they now receive and receive less than they think they are justly entitled to receive because the dollars that they receive now will be worth dollars and will buy something substantial, instead of receiving a lot more of such dollars that will not buy much. So it is better to get good dollars even though you do not get as many of them than to get a lot more dollars that are worth a lot less.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. What justification would the unions have at this time for asking that their food be cheaper when it is a fact that there never was a time in the history of this Nation that less of the union man's dollar goes for food than at this minute?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say they are demanding that food be cheaper, but that it not be increased.

The gentleman brought up a very interesting question that people are making more money now than they have ever made in the past. That is very true of a lot of people. We will say about half of the people of the country have gotten the benefit of this, so why increase them, but please do not overlook the millions and millions of people who have had no price increase so far as salaries and wages are concerned. Do not overlook the fourteen and a half million people, heads of families, sometimes four in the family, who are receiving fixed incomes from retirement benefits, such as railroad retirement, social security, servicemen's benefits, and old-age assistance, and things like that.

If the gentleman wants the price of living to go up, their dollars will buy less. There are about half of the people of this country who are not receiving the benefits from these high wages and high salaries, so when the gentleman advocates higher living costs he advocates that they receive fewer cents for every dollar they are receiving. I hope the gentleman does not want to do that.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman say that he favors passing on part of our board bill to our returning soldiers and children yet unborn, at a time when we can afford to pay our full board bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. That is a very appealing phrase about paying the board bill. Oftentimes a phrase can be used that will require an hour's logic and reason to answer, but in this particular case it will not require hours of logic and reason to answer. This is not paying anybody's board bill. It is preventing inflation, our No. 2 problem. Our No. 1 problem is winning this war, but inflation is just as dangerous to the security of the country, almost, as the loss of the war. It is possible for us to lose as much in property value and money value through inflation as we would lose if we were to lose the war. So our No. 2 problem here at home is preventing inflation.

The gentleman brings up this argument about the board bill. If we can pay a subsidy of a cent a pound on 2 pounds of sugar out of 10 and save the consumer 8 more cents because four-fifths of the sugar is imported and only one-fifth is produced here, that looks to me like pretty good business judgment for the taxpayers, when all the people are taxpayers now. People who use tobacco or gasoline or ride on public transportation, who go to picture shows or theaters—you can hardly buy anything these days or enjoy anything that you do not pay a tax to the Federal Government. If the people can permit a dollar of their money to be used on subsidies and save them up to $30, why is it not just good business sense?

Further, the gentleman's side is always arguing this paying the board bill, but I notice the gentleman's side does not oppose paying a subsidy for fuel oil. Is the gentleman against paying subsidies on fuel-oil transportation?

Mr. JENSEN. I have never taken a position on it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has not taken a position; all right. The members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that is bringing out this bill, are not opposed to paying that, so you are not opposed to helping pay the fuel bill. It is all right to pass that on to the returning servicemen.

Further, public housing has been supported by the gentleman, doubtless. Public housing is nothing more than paying a part of somebody's rent. So it is all right to pay out of the Public Treasury a part of the fuel bill and it is all right to pay out of the Public Treasury part of the rent, but it is just simply awful to use one dollar out of the Treasury to save the people $30. I cannot follow that logic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is talking about stopping inflation. If we take $1,000,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury and pay subsidies which will make prices less, there will be more dollars in the pockets of the American people. Is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would not expect me to answer that in 2 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. It should not take long to answer that question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not demonstrate as much knowledge on that question as I should like him to. I hope he studies it.

Mr. JENSEN. I would not insult the gentleman. I have demonstrated enough judgment on it so that the gentleman cannot answer my questions.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman believes that. I am glad he has some consolation.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter written by Mr. Prentiss Brown when he resigned as Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and also the President's reply. I am inserting these letters in the RECORD in the hope that the Members will read them. Mr. Brown points out how much has been done through the Office of Price Administration. He gives prices compared with prices during the First World War. He shows the things that have been done through the Price Administration. The President mentions something down here that I hope all of you notice. In his reply to Mr. Brown he says:

> It was inevitable that a few men would be so anxious to increase their income that they would resent the Government's preventing them from increasing prices. I believe with you, however, that the vast majority of the people realize that under war conditions price restrictions are necessary, and even though their profits are less, they recall the far greater sacrifices made by our boys in the armed services and loyally support the organization.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Does the gentleman endorse the proposed increase in the price of fuel oil of 35 cents per gallon?

Mr. PATMAN. I am for the proposed increase in the price of crude oil. We must encourage production of crude oil. It is very necessary in the war effort, anyway, to encourage production of crude oil, and I am for it.

The inconsistent thing about this matter is this, and I want you to think about it. The Members on the gentleman's side are fine, honorable, upright men. The gentleman from California is one of them.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. He says he is against subsidies.

Mr. ROLPH. I am against a blank check.

ALL RIGHT TO PAY A SUBSIDY ON OLEOMARGARINE BUT NOT ON BUTTER

Mr. PATMAN. This section that the gentleman helped write is against support prices. It prevents the Food Administration from announcing support prices, which are very vital and highly necessary, and then winds up by saying, "Although we are against subsidies, we hate them, they are wrong, however, this shall not apply to vegetable oils and fats and oil seeds." That opens up a big field there where you say subsidies are good. How can you justify that? How can you justify paying support prices on oleomargarine and not on butter?

Mr. ROLPH. We are in favor of support prices to increase production and aid the war effort.

Mr. PATMAN. Not under section 3. We stop it. Under section 3, on December 31 there will be no more support prices except in the cases the gentleman mentioned there as an exception, where they are all right on peanuts and cottonseed and soybeans and things like that. What I cannot understand is how the gentleman can be so hard against subsidies and why they are so bad, and yet he is willing to exempt so much in subsidies.

Mr. ROLPH. The amount I am willing to accept, as the gentleman well knows, is a very small amount comparatively.

Mr. PATMAN. Sixty million dollars per year and more—that one thing—and you know that runs into a lot of money, even in California.

Mr. ROLPH. But it is vastly different from billions of dollars.

Mr. PATMAN. Besides, the gentleman is not against the transportation or the fuel-oil subsidy, nor is he against the rent bill or the copper or the lead or zinc subsidy or any other subsidy except so far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. ROLPH. I voted for all of those in the price-control bill, as the gentleman did.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Mr. Brown's resignation as Price Administrator, and President Roosevelt's letter accepting it, as printed in the New York Times:

MR. BROWN'S LETTER

OCOTOBER 19, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit my resignation as Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

On September 22 last, I advised Justice Byrnes of my desire to leave and understand he told you of it. The policy of price control is now well defined in the law and in your orders. The main task from now on is administrative. I would not leave if I thought the Office would suffer. We have greatly improved our organization and I believe it is in competent hands.

We in price control face a difficult task in public relations. We are the expendables in the war on the domestic front. Many of the accomplishments of the present, particularly the change from an upward trend in living costs to a downward trend, are due in part to the efforts of executives who have left. The men now in our chief executive positions are experts in administration, and that is our prime task.

Thank you for the expression of your desire that I remain. When I took office it was my hope to leave when the appropriation bill for the remaining life of the agency was passed. I could not then do so because I had not yet

found the men who would carry on. Now we have them.

Price control is not only successful but is appreciated by the country. Below I give a few outstanding examples of our accomplishments. The country, contrary to what one might think from what he hears in Washington, is for price control and rationing as administered. Recent public surveys show it.

CORDIAL ATTITUDE CITED

I have made speeches in New York, Milwaukee, Omaha, Boston, and Chicago. I found the most cordial attitude and the newspaper and other public comment was excellent. The same general approval was expressed by numberless callers. The drive against O. P. A. before House committees last spring was intense.

It undoubtedly injured the agency in the congressional mind, but the recess and visits home improved the attitude toward us. I have had many expressions from Members of the Senate and House that are most encouraging.

A few outstanding facts are these: The upward trend in the cost of living has been definitely arrested. Taking the September 15, 1942, level as a basis, by May 1943, there was a 6.2-percent rise. Soon after the effect of dollars-and-cents prices, control of fresh vegetables, generally better enforcement, and the effect of your April 8 order began to be felt. June showed a reduction to 5.9 percent; August to 4.6 percent.

It is interesting to note the comparison of the wholesale prices of 1 year ago and those of today as contained in the New York Times commodity price index. The October 17 issue shows that the increases are mainly in those items, such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley, where either we did not have authority to act by reason of the parity limitation or the commodity had only recently reached parity.

GIVES EXAMPLES ON PRICES

A few outstanding examples of the solidity of price control are as follows:

Item	Price	
	Oct. 16, 1943	Oct. 17, 1942
Wheat.....bushel..	$1.94¼	$1.47½
Corn.....do....	1.21⅛	.95¾
Coffee.....pound..	.09¾	.09⅜
Sugar.....do....	.0560	.0560
Creamery butter.....do....	.42¼	.46½
Lard.....do....	.1392½	.1392½
Iron.....ton..	25.84	25.84
Steel.....do....	34.00	34.00
Copper.....pound..	.12	.12
Cotton print cloth.....yard..	.08971	.08971
Hides.....pound..	.18½	.15½
Gas (tank wagon).....gallon..	.1060	.1060
Crude oil.....barrel..	1.11	1.11

The great bulk of commodities are the same. The principal difficulty, as you know has been with fresh vegetables and fresh fruits which we are getting under control.

The price level and relationship of 1926 is generally looked upon as a reasonable base. The September 15, 1942, level was almost exactly at the 1926 level, being 99.4 percent of it. Last spring this index rose to 103 plus. It has been reduced to 102 plus percent and the trend is still downward.

BASIS FOR COMPARISON

To me the best basis for comparison has always been the percentage of price increase in the First World War against the percentage of increase in the Second World War. We use August of 1914 and September of 1939 as the bases because those are the dates in which the wars in Europe began, and the pressures on our prices commenced. The latest available figures are those after 49 months of war. I give below the percentage of increase:

Item	August 1914–18 World War No. 1[1] (percent price increase)	September 1939–43 World War No. 2[2] (percent price increase)
Cost of living, total[3]	80.3	24.9
Food	63.9	46.7
Clothing	85.3	28.5
House furnishings	77.2	24.8
Wholesale prices, total	96.1	37.5
Raw materials	102.1	60.5
Semimanufactures	131.3	24.7
Furnished products	87.6	26.0
Industrial commodities[4]	92.4	21.2
SELECTED MANUFACTURED ITEMS		
Steel plates (tank)	187.4	0
Plate glass	76.1	0
Wool blankets	164.7	[5] 50.0
Cotton hosiery (men's)	132.3	[5] 71.9
Blue denims	214.8	74.5
Prices received by farmers for all commodities	91	119
Prices received by farmers for 58 foods	78	116
Prices paid by farmers for commodities	[6] 71	34

[1] July 1914 to July 1918.
[2] August 1939 to August 1943.
[3] Rent and fuel, not available by months.
[4] All commodities other than farm products and foods.
[5] To May 1943, the latest available.
[6] 1914 to 1918, not available monthly for World War No. 1 period.

PRAISES THE ADMINISTRATION

On the basis of our entrance into the war, prices increased 29½ percent in the first 19 months of the First World War, while prices have increased by 12 percent in the first 19 months of this war.

A couple of important commodity-price comparisons might be of interest. Copper sold for 37 cents a pound during the First World War and sells for 12 cents now. Steel plate sold for $180 a ton in the First World War. It sells now for $42 a ton.

It is my deliberate judgment that as a result of your messages to Congress and the passage by Congress of the Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and the subsequent Executive orders of October and April, in the most complicated and intricate task of price control in the world (because our problems are greater than those of any other nation) in a period of tremendous increase in our national income, your administration has succeeded to a remarkable degree in alleviating the evils of rising prices and consequent inflation.

It was perfectly obvious that bitter complaint would be made, some of it justified, because no administration could hope to delve into the intricacies of the business structure without causing dislocations, distress, and dissatisfaction.

REPORTS MANY HARDSHIPS

I know that many real hardships have occurred. Regulation has been hard for our businessmen to take. It is getting easier. Individual casualties are most unfortunate, and in many lines of effort they have occurred all too frequently; but the over-all picture is what the Nation views.

The net income of the farmer is 90 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. The average weekly wage of the American laborer is 33 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. Corporation profits, after taxes, are 15 percent higher than those earned in 1941, while prices are but 12 percent greater than they were on December 7, 1941, when the Senate took up the subject of price control, resulting in the act of January 30, 1942. Business mortality is at the lowest figure on record.

Price control does not claim credit, but these results were achieved during the period of price control. Controls certainly did not prevent material gains for farmer, laborer, the businessman. During that time the Government of the United States and the citizens of the United States have saved tremendous sums of money over what would have been the cost to them if prices had followed the pattern of increases during the First World War.

VAST SAVINGS REPORTED

It is estimated by the research division of this agency that the Government will have saved over $67,000,000,000 by the end of 1943 and the saving to consumer and the general public is given as $22,000,000,000, a total of over $89,000,000,000.

These things have been done with a substantial reduction in the number of employees in the central office at Washington, D. C., the drop being from 4,800 last January to 4,200 at the present time. The rationing program has required larger employment in the offices outside of the Capital, the rise being from 39,000 to 49,000 in the field. We not only stayed within the congressional limitation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, but we were able to get along without an additional $23,000,000 that was provided, and we rather stand out as the agency which turned back money to the Government.

While I think the Congress cut us too much for the current fiscal year and eliminated some necessary expenditures, I take comfort in the fact that two appropriation committees, to whom we were able to present our requests in person in hearings, gave us substantially what we asked and that the reduction was made on the floor of the House of Representatives by those not as well informed as were the committee members. However, we have cut our cloth to the pattern.

DRAFT DEFERMENTS DENIED

Speaking of personnel, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that recently in the House of Representatives on the drafting-of-fathers issue it was implied on the floor by the gentleman who represents the Twenty-sixth District of New York that a sizable addition to the Army might be raised from those unfairly deferred in the Federal service, particularly in the Office of Price Administration.

I was somewhat surprised at this, as I had issued an order shortly after coming into office last January preventing the employment of any physically fit persons within the draft age, and directed that deferment should be requested only in the most extreme cases. I said, "There is no irreplaceable man in O. P. A."

I checked and found that out of 4,206 employees in Washington, only 5 within the draft age are now deferred, and that out of approximately 49,000 in the field there are only 2 of draft age deferred—7 out of 53,000. These 53,000 employees are only a part of the great organization we have built. There are 131,000 volunteers in our organization, making a grand total of 184,000 who are helping in this great task. They are a loyal and valiant army, and against rather heavy opposition are winning the battle for sharing what we have at a fair price.

This is the status of price control as I leave it.

SUPPORTS SUBSIDY PROGRAM

As I view the immediate future of the inflation struggle, I see two major problems for the administration:

1. The subsidy question. Without a subsidy plan the price structure cannot be held,

and wages will be forced upward. No thinking person can deny that the increase in prices and wages if we reject subsidies will greatly outrun the cost to the Government of the subsidies.

If it were merely a question of the subsidy money against the increase in price, it would be of little consequence. The danger lies in the impetus higher prices give to the wage demand. Without subsidies butter would sell at 60 instead of 50 cents. Add to that the increase in the price of meat, milk, and other commodities that would follow the rejection of subsidies, and you encourage, even justify, higher wages. It is this momentum to the wage demand, the inevitable twirl to the inflation spiral with its devastating result, that should cause the Congress to continue the program and reject crippling amendments to the Commodity Credit and R. F. C. legislation.

2. The matter of renewal of price control after July 1, 1944, when the law expires by limitation. The greatest danger is in the post-war period. There must be controls after June of 1944. I would advise a year's renewal with subsequent consideration by the Congress as to further renewals.

On these two problems, if as a private citizen I can aid by presenting my views to the appropriate committees, I will be happy to do so.

In closing I express to you and through you to Justice Byrnes my appreciation of the unfailing support given in our effort to carry into effect the intent of the acts of Congress and the Executive orders.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

DEAR PRENTISS: When Justice Byrnes told me of your desire to resign I asked him to urge you to reconsider. I did so because I knew you had possibly the most difficult task in the service of the Government and you were doing a grand job.

However, I recall that when I asked you to accept the appointment you advised me how you had neglected your private affairs while you were serving in the Senate and of your desire to return to Michigan at the earliest possible date. But you generously yielded to my request to take charge of O. P. A. temporarily until you could find someone to take over the task. When you tell me now that you have found men capable of carrying on and feel it your duty to leave, I cannot insist upon your remaining and with reluctance I must accept your resignation.

The story of the Office of Price Administration recited by you in your letter is a story of which you may justly be proud. I get great comfort from the opinion you express that the people of the country appreciate the accomplishments of the organization. The administration of the law required interference with the business and with the lives of the people. It is an interference justified only by the necessities of war.

It was inevitable that a few men would be so anxious to increase their income that they would resent the Government's preventing them from increasing prices. I believe with you, however, that the vast majority of the people realize that under war conditions price restrictions are necessary, and even though their profits are less, they recall the far greater sacrifices made by our boys in the armed services and loyally support the organization.

You have performed a difficult task with intelligence and, above all, with courage, and you have my sincere appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

THE O. P. A.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss the O. P. A. I am glad that the previous speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has inserted a recent letter from President Roosevelt to Director Brown and a letter from Director Brown to the President. We all admire the study made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the activities of the O. P. A. At this time I am especially interested in the operation of the O. P. A. in my city. What I shall say today to the House I say not in the spirit of criticism, but as a matter of information. In New York we are going through the unhappy days of change in directors, assistant directors, and employees. They have been resigning in large numbers for reasons beyond my knowledge, and for reasons not disclosed in their formal letters of resignation. We have had several national directors in a short space of time. In New York with millions of people vitally affected by every change, and deeply concerned, we find it difficult to explain these many changes. There is an apparent break-down in the organization of the O. P. A. The newspapers have taken occasion to editorialize, and most of them have been sharply critical, and some grossly unfair.

I am not prepared to suggest a remedy, but I want the RECORD to show that we in New York are concerned and we hope that the new director will make it his business at the first opportunity to study our local problem. Unless he does, and unless there are some radical changes in the organization, I fear that there may be a break-down of enforcement. The people working in the office are earnest and sincere, but when the directors and the head men quit overnight, leaving large staffs of people without adequate direction or control, you cannot expect good administration. Whether or not our problem is an internal conflict that cannot be reconciled, I am unprepared to say. But I do know something is lacking. The organization may be short of help or proper space but, whatever the cause, I hope that it will be given prompt, close, and serious attention, if necessary by the President himself.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937;

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a hearing Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10:00 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10:00 a. m., on Tuesday, November

2, 1943, in room 346 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 3, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 27, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 2832.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

881. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the true facts concerning the draft deferment of Government employees (H. Doc. No. 343), was taken from the Speaker's table; referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3541. A bill to grant veterans of the present war base pay and family allowances or allowances for quarters for 1 year after their separation from the service or release from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3542 (by request). A bill to amend title 1 of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations, to provide for rehabilitation of certain disabled veterans who served between September 16, 1940, and December 7, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3543. A bill to provide compensation upon discharge for physical disability of enlisted personnel of the naval service in cases where disability is service-connected but not the result of own misconduct; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 3544. A bill relating to the terms of the District Courts of the United States for the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3545. A bill to amend sections 2720 (a) and 3260 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the transfer tax, and the tax on manufacturers and dealers, in the case of certain small-game guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 3546. A bill to create an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to prohibit the use of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting by Government departments and agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 334. Resolution creating a Select Committee to investigate the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. Res. 335. Resolution creating a Select Committee of the House of Representatives to conduct investigations concerning the accuracy, value, integrity, and dependability of all statistical, fact-finding, and planning agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 3547. A bill for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Reily; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Joe Kaplan; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3227. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Roland Boehm and 80 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3228. Also, petition of Edw. Bircher and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3229. Also, petition of Mike Hummel and 360 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3230. Also, petition of W. Zais and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3231. Also, petition of Charlotte Mueller and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3232. Also, petition of William Renisch and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3233. Also, petition of William Bomeman and 40 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3234. Also, petition of Herman A. Wochele and 46 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3235. Also, petition of Miss F. Mahlik and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3236. Also, petition of John E. Koehler and 286 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3237. Also, petition of Hodges, Inc., of Washington, D. C., and signed by 60 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3238. Also, petition of Benson J. Woods, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3239. Also, petition of F. A. Callan, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3240. Also, petition of M. F. Parker, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3241. Also, petition of E. A. Rickenbacher, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3242. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of J. E. Mitchell, of Olympia, Wash., and 89 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3243. Also, petition of Mark Johnson of Hoquiam, Wash., and 26 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3244. Also, petition of L. C. Galyan, secretary, Building and Construction Trades Council of Bremerton and vicinity, and members of this council, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3245. Also, petition of the King County, Wash., Pomona Grange, urging passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in, into, and the exportation from the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3246. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 290, of Waterloo, Iowa, opposing House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3247. Also, petition of the Washington Park and Golf Club, Cedar Falls, Iowa, and signed by many residents of Black Hawk County, opposing House bill 2082, known as the Eryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3248. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of T. A. Rawlings, Gardner Chacksfield, Riner G. Saeger, C. J. Doll, Clyde W. Risch, John Asher, John C. Akin, Harry Overberg, Raymond J. Kern, Thomas Parker, Elmer C. Luchtendahl, Henry G. Stumpe, Carey A. Fleming, Robert Oaks, Charles Merk, George Flesch, Harry Manz, Joseph L. Kempf, Herman Fox, H. L. Gustin, H. J. Determan, George J. Kopp, Frank Haunsz, Robert W. Stone, W. C. Apfel, Harvey Tibbatts, Earl E. Baker, Albert J. Zeiser, Robert J. Fries, Frank Sholler, Edmund A. Moorman, Joseph Weber, Robert H. Kennedy, John J. Beckstedt, Peter N. Driscoll, Herbert W. Schwartz, and 641 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3249. By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of Kenneth Harris, of New Dorp, Staten Island, N. Y., and 87 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3250. By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Ill., and signed by Robert B. Irwin, secretary-manager, by order of the board of directors, with reference to bills and resolutions pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States pertaining to the subject of freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3251. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Clay County Medical Association, Clay City, Ill., opposing Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3252. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petitions sent by Mary Scott Russell, president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Georgia, and signed by numerous other citizens of Georgia, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3253. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. Gwilym Davis and 79 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3254. Also, petition of Sarah E. Ellsworth and 53 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3255. Also, petition of Rev. Samuel McDowell and 59 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3256. Also, petition of Mrs. S. H. Lewis and 44 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou mighty Sovereign of the sea, with each thought a prayer we come this day glimpsing seas wider and vaster than ever the Psalmist knew, as we take upon our lips his words of old: "There go the ships." There go the ships of our Nation's righteous cause; there go the ships whose thunder makes tyranny tremble, whose wealthy cargo is humanity's fears and its hopes of future years. Today we think of that expanding armada with pride and gratitude for the sweat and toil of the workmen who launched them, for the valiant crusaders who tread their decks, for the trained and tried officers who command them, and for the chaplains who minister in the things that matter most. Upon them all may there rest the benediction of Thy mercy which is like the wideness of the sea.

As on all the seas of the globe, in perils from above and beneath, farcalled, our navies sail away, God of our fathers, Thou knowest that every ship carries our faith, our hopes, our prayers, our pledge to be worthy of them until the peace is won for which they must suffer and for which we toil and pray. May our soldiers of the sea incline their hearts to keep Thy law and to be true to the sacred worship hour which hallows each ship when the pennant of our holy faith flies majestically above the Nation's flag yet so close that they merge into one banner of victory, dedicated to the service of God and the brotherhood of man. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 26, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 560. An act for the relief of Western Maryland Dairy, Inc.;

S. 841. An act for the relief of J. P. Woolsey;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Cleo Pickrell; and

S. 1346. An act for the relief of the R. B. Walker Funeral Home.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on public matters.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

POST-WAR EDUCATION FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 13, 1942, on signing the bill calling for the induction by selective service of young men 18 and 19 years old, I appointed a committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, to study the problem of education of our service men and women after the war. The objective was to enable those young people whose education had been interrupted to resume their schooling and to provide an oppor-

tunity for the education and technical training of other young men and women of ability after their discharge from the armed services.

This committee has sent me a preliminary report which I am herewith transmitting to the Congress for its consideration, and I hope for its early action.

We at home owe a special and continuing obligation to these men and women in the armed services.

During the war we have seen to it that they have received the best training and equipment, the best food, shelter, and medical attention, the best protection and care which planning, ingenuity, physical resources, and money could furnish in time of war. But after the war shall have been won the best way that we can repay a portion of that debt is to see to it, by planning and by action now, that those men and women are demobilized into an economy which is sound and prosperous, with a minimum of unemployment and dislocation; and that, with the assistance of government, they are given the opportunity to find a job for which they are fitted and trained in a field which offers some reasonable assurance of well-being and continuous employment.

For many what they desire most in the way of employment will require special training and further education. As a part of a general program for the benefit of the members of our armed services I believe that the Nation is morally obligated to provide this training and education and the necessary financial assistance by which they can be secured. It is an obligation which should be recognized now, and legislation to that end should be enacted as soon as possible.

This is a good time not merely to be thinking about the subject, but actually to do something about it. Nothing will be more conducive to the maintenance of high morale in our troops than the knowledge that steps are being taken now to give them education and technical training when the fighting is over.

Every day that the war continues interrupts the schooling and training of more men and women, and deprives them of the education and skills which they would otherwise acquire for use in later life. Not only the individual welfare of our troops, but the welfare of the Nation itself, requires that we reverse this trend just as quickly as possible after the war.

Vocational and educational opportunities for veterans should be of the widest range. There will be those of limited education who now appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the importance of general education, and who would welcome a year in school or college. There will be those who desire to learn a remunerative trade or to fit themselves more adequately for specialized work in agriculture or commerce. There will be others who want professional courses to prepare them for their life's work.

Lack of money should not prevent any veteran of this war from equipping himself for the most useful employment for which his aptitudes and willingness qualify him. The money invested in this training and schooling program will reap rich dividends in higher productivity, more intelligent leadership, and greater human happiness.

We must replenish our supply of persons qualified to discharge the heavy responsibilities of the post-war world. We have taught our youth how to wage war; we must also teach them how to live useful and happy lives in freedom, justice, and decency.

Specifically, I agree with the recommendations made by the committee in this regard as follows:

1. The Federal Government should make it financially feasible for every man and woman who has served honorably for a minimum period in the armed forces since September 16, 1940, to spend a period up to 1 calendar year in a school, a college, a technical institution, or in actual training in industry, so that he can further his education, learn a trade, or acquire the necessary knowledge and skill for farming, commerce, manufacturing, or other pursuits.

2. In addition, the Federal Government should make it financially possible for a limited number of ex-service men and women selected for their special aptitudes, to carry on their general, technical, or professional education for a further period of 1, 2, or 3 years.

This assistance from Government should include not only cost of instruction but a certain amount of money for maintenance.

One incidental benefit of permitting discharged veterans to put in a year or more of schooling or training would be to simplify and cushion the return to civilian employment of service personnel. And I might call to your attention the fact that it costs less per year to keep a man at school or college or training on the job, than to maintain him on active military duty for a year.

While the Federal Government should provide the necessary funds and should have the responsibility of seeing that they are spent providently and under generally accepted standards, the control of the educational processes and the certification of trainees and students should reside in the States and localities.

I am sure that the Congress will agree with me that the report of this committee constitutes a helpful and constructive point of departure in the working out of a practical program for the meeting of this situation. Various recommendations are contained in the report concerning the administration of the plan. While there may be differences as to some of the details, I am confident that the Congress will find merit in the general objectives.

So far as disabled soldiers are concerned, the Congress is aware that, pursuant to existing statutes, the Veterans' Administration is prepared to conduct a program of rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability. The program is designed to provide for the special needs of war-disabled veterans, and to furnish educational and training opportunities to help them take their places in civilian life. The program has already been initiated, and will be expanded as the war proceeds.

The new program of the Federal Security Agency will make provisions for veterans whose disabilities are not service connected.

The Army and the Navy require a large number of workers skilled and experienced in various occupations and professions. Men who are filling these posts are acquiring valuable training and experience. A man who has become a mechanical draftsman, a cartographer, a meteorologist, a cook, or a baker may succeed in finding a similar post in civilian life. In a great many other occupations, such as those dealing with tank or tractor maintenance and repair, or with radio operation and maintenance, men are acquiring basic skill and experience which will provide a solid foundation for learning a related civilian occupation.

In addition, the United States Armed Forces Institute, which is a joint operation of the Army and Navy, offers men and women in the armed services a chance to enroll in courses usually offered by colleges, high schools, technical and occupational schools, in which they can study in their off-duty time. The Institute prepares self-teaching textbooks which enable them to learn a subject entirely on their own initiative; or, if they prefer, they may join any one of hundreds of classes which have or are being established in Army camps and posts and in Navy installations, and in Army and Navy hospitals, here in the United States and in places all over the world. Or if they wish, they can study by the correspondence method with the Institute or with one of its overseas branches the same as any student in a correspondence school.

Opportunities for vocational training and for systematic schooling within the armed services will be expanded and reoriented during periods of demobilization and up to the moment of discharge.

Therefore, if the Congress adopts the general objective outlined herein, our men and women in the armed forces will be afforded opportunities for continuance of their education and vocational training—first, during the war; second, during the demobilization period; and, third, for a year or more after their separation from the service.

While the successful conclusion of this great war is by no means within our sight, yet it may well be said that the time to prepare for peace is at the height of war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 27, 1943.*

BUTTER RATION-POINT VALUE—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., relating to the ration-point value per pound on butter.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present point value of butter as fixed by the Office of Price Administration is excessive, and by reason thereof is depriving many families of fats vitally needed in order for workers in such families to do efficient work; and

Whereas it is authoritatively reported that there is plenty of butter in Government storage, so that there is no valid excuse for the existing high ration-point value: Therefore be it

Resolved by the county Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, in regular meeting assembled this 13th day of October 1943, That the Office of Price Administration be, and it is hereby, petitioned to immediately lower the ration-point value per pound of butter to a reasonable point value; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forthwith sent by the county clerk to the two Senators from Wisconsin and the Representatives in Congress from the county of Milwaukee; to Prentiss M. Brown, O. P. A. Administrator; and to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

PROTEST AGAINST IMPOSITION OF SALES TAX—RESOLUTION OF CONSUMERS' LEAGUE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Consumers' League of Rhode Island, protesting against the imposition of a Federal sales tax.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Treasury Department and the Congress of the United States are now concerned with applying new taxes to increase the funds needed by the Government to use in winning the war; and

Whereas in this connection, there is considerable sentiment for a general sales tax on all goods and services bought by the American people; and

Whereas such a sales tax would place the bulk of the burden of taxes on the 20,000,000 families estimated by O. P. A. to be living on less than $2,500 a year, whose purchases constitute 62 percent of all purchases of goods and services; and

Whereas this type of tax would favor those best able to pay by confining the tax to the relatively small percentage of their income used by this group to buy goods and services, and relieving them of the duty of paying on increased war profits and individual incomes; and

Whereas such a condition would result in hardship being worked on one group in the community while the group best able to bear the tax burden is relieved of its tax responsibility, thus negating the President's plan for equality of sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Consumers' League of Rhode Island unalterably oppose the enactment of a sales-tax law and favor the establishment of a tax program which will make for the sharing of war sacrifices by all the people of the community; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, all Rhode Island Senators and Congressmen, and to the press.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Republican Club in favor of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, establish a quota for the Chinese people, and make persons of the Chinese race eligible for naturalization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a report, No. 732, of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in the House of Representatives, and a proposed bill, No. 3070, now pending before the House, to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, and establish a quota for Chinese people, and make persons of the Chinese race eligible for naturalization; and

Whereas these exclusion laws originated many years ago, primarily for the purpose of stopping the flow of Chinese laborers into the construction camps of the country, and for other economic reasons; and

Whereas much has happened since then to relieve the condition bringing about such legislation; and

Whereas the people of the United States and of China have established such firm bonds of friendship and understanding that the people of the United States are eager to remove any legislation that makes discriminations against the Chinese with regard to entry into this country: Be it

Resolved by the National Republican Club, That we respectfully urge the passage of the proposed bill, No. 3070, repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, fixing an annual quota for China, and permitting the naturalization of Chinese.

POST-WAR DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS ARMY AND NAVY SUPPLIES TO EX-SERVICEMEN—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas after World War No. 1 the Government of the United States had on hand a large amount of Army and Navy clothing and supplies for which it had no use; and

Whereas these supplies were disposed of by sale to the highest bidders, who in turn disposed of them to the general public through so-called Army and Navy stores, and through other sources; and

Whereas such method of disposal made large fortunes for a comparatively few individuals and resulted in no benefit to ex-servicemen; and

Whereas after the termination of the present war there will be many ex-servicemen, especially disabled ex-servicemen, who will be struggling to establish themselves in business and adjust their lives to civilian activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, in regular session assembled, That we memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact such laws or prescribe such regulations as may be necessary so that after the termination of the present world war all surplus Army and Navy supplies will be disposed of by the United States Government only to ex-servicemen, with the first preference in their disposition to be given to disabled ex-servicemen, to the end that these ex-servicemen may establish themselves in business and be better enabled to earn a livelihood and adjust themselves into civilian life and activities after the termination of the war.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. KILGORE introduced a bill (S. 1477) for the relief of Carl M. Frasure, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MISSOURI RIVER AT KANSAS CITYS, MO. AND KANS. (H. DOC. NO. 342)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, together with a report dated June 9, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Missouri River and tributaries at Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans., be printed, with illustrations, as a document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE OF THE SENATE AND FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Does the Two-Thirds Rule of the Senate Impede U. S. Foreign Policy?" delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY on the Town Meeting of the Air, Thursday evening, October 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF FREE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REVERCOMB

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Preservation of Free Enterprise," delivered by him from New York on October 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFEAT OF FEDERAL-AID-TO-EDUCATION BILL—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. STROUT

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Robbing Children of Their Birthright," written by Richard L. Strout, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI DAY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "General Casimir Pulaski Day," published in the Hearst newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION—LETTERS FROM COLORADO

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, during the debate last week on the Federal-aid-to-education bill I was questioned as to the number of letters I had received from those other than school teachers favorable to the bill. I have had a survey made of my correspondence and find that there was one letter from a very fine Colorado lady, who is chairman of the legislative committee of a large or-

ganization of women in Colorado, and there were nine letters from which it could not be told whether the writers were school teachers.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AND MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed by me to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, under date of October 4, 1943, and his reply under date of October 5, 1943. The letters relate to a serious defect in the operation of the Social Security Act. I am glad to note that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has taken up the cudgels with respect to this matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1943.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I wish to call your attention to a very serious defect in the operation of the Social Security Act.

It is my understanding that employees who are called into the armed forces are put into the same position as an employee who leaves to go into some occupation not covered by the Social Security Act. In other words, if they have not been in private employment long enough to build up a sufficient number of credits, they will only be entitled to actual cash represented by the deductions paid during the time of their employment, and when they return from military duty, they will have to start all over again.

This certainly works an injustice on our service men. I urge that an amendment to the Social Security Act be passed, waiving the necessary requirements of the present law insofar as men in the armed forces are concerned, and that their benefits accrue on the same basis as they would if they had continued in private industry.

I ask that your committee give this matter your serious consideration. We must not penalize the boys who are fighting our battles for us.

Yours for Victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 5, 1943.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your letter of October 4, with reference to an amendment to the Social Security Act.

Your understanding of the Social Security Act as it affects men in the armed service may be correct. However, the whole Social Security question will be under examination after we have finished the Tax Act at which time the Social Security status of the men in the armed forces will be considered.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. GEORGE.

NAVY DAY LETTER FROM ADMIRAL KING

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before beginning my formal Navy Day speech, I desire to read a letter which will be of special interest to all Members of the Senate—a letter which contains sentiments of which all Senators may justly be proud.

The letter is from none other than Admiral King, the commander in chief of the United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations, whose inspiring leadership of the Navy in the present war has commanded the admiration of all Americans. The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1943.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Navy Day presents an opportunity, of which I am desirous of taking advantage, to send a message to the Members of Congress in appreciation of the hearty cooperation and support which they have given to the Navy since the outset of the war. The fact that the requests of the Navy have been acted upon promptly, unanimously, and without the slightest indication of partisanship, has been not only a source of encouragement to the personnel of the Navy, but has assured us that you have confidence in us and that the legislative branch of the Government is wholeheartedly behind us in our efforts to win the war.

It is a distinct privilege to take this opportunity to express, in the name of my fellow officers and of the enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, our appreciation of your cooperation.

Your unfailing aid and support has been an inspiration, and when the history of this war is written, the record will show that the Navy's achievements have been, in great measure, brought about by the confidence that the Congress has shown toward the Navy.

The Navy salutes the Members of the Congress as we march on together to what will be a complete victory and, we trust, a speedy one.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST J. KING,
Admiral, United States Navy; Commander in Chief, United States Fleet; and Chief of Naval Operations.

NAVY DAY, 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, today the people of the United States are observing Navy Day. Navy Day is appropriately fixed on the birthday of a great supporter and friend of the Navy, ex-President Theodore Roosevelt. Indeed, the Roosevelt name has occupied, and will always occupy, a high place in the history of the Navy. Our present Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been from the very outset of his public service intensely naval-minded and has rendered, since he became President of the United States, among his many other services to the country, an outstanding contribution in the development of our impregnable Navy.

I have said Americans are observing rather than celebrating Navy Day for a special reason. In the midst of war—with the security of the Nation and the very lives of our fellow citizens at stake—it is not seemly to observe this day in a carnival mood. It is much more appropriate that we observe Navy Day this year in solemnity, reviewing what has transpired and recognizing the sacrifices which all, particularly our fighting forces, must endure before certain victory is attained.

It should be said at the very outset of our observance of this day that the Members of the Congress and the people of the United States have supreme confidence in the ability of our Navy to triumph over whatever trials and difficulties the future may unfold. This confidence has been strengthened by the way in which our naval forces have already overcome in great measure the handicap resulting from the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Let us look back to Navy Day a year ago.

The United States Navy, operating in conjunction with the fleets of the United Nations, had only then begun to take the offensive against the enemy. Even the victory of the Battle of Midway, during which the Japanese lost over 4,800 killed or drowned, compared to American losses of 307, was not an offensive action. But, by October 27, 1942, we had successfully concluded the Battle of Santa Cruz Island—an offensive action from beginning to end. Since that day we have never lost the initiative.

Less than 2 weeks after Navy Day, 1942, the United States Navy took part in the Allied landing on north Africa. On the success of that action depended the entire north African campaign. Nor did the activities of our Navy become less after the eventful day in November. Great convoys of merchant vessels, escorted by ships of the United States Navy, carried supplies across the South Atlantic. Other convoys, carrying supplies to our comrades-in-arms, swarmed across the North Atlantic to Murmansk and Liverpool under the protecting guns and planes of our Navy.

The immensity of the convoy-protection problem can be better understood when one realizes that, for months after the north African landing, our supply routes were never less than 1,400 miles in length, and often many thousands of miles long. In those days, the enemy had a water route of between 90 and 150 miles to their front, and they could fly their planes directly to bases immediately behind their lines.

After Navy Day, 1942, the United States Navy participated in offensive operations throughout the Mediterranean area. American warships, together with warships of France, Greece, Canada, Poland, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, brought the battle to the enemy from the eastern Mediterranean to Sardinia, and from the islands formerly occupied by the enemy off the Tunisian coast to action along the shores of the Italian mainland.

Units of the United States Navy took part in the landing on Sicily and in the support of ground troops after that landing. Units of the United States Navy took part in the landing at Salerno, and they are even now working in the closest coordination with our advancing land forces.

The offensive action of the United States Navy in the Atlantic and in the Mediterranean has had an equally great counterpart in the offensive action of the United States Navy in the Pacific.

The battle of Santa Cruz Island was followed by the successful battle of Guadalcanal. From that day forward,

the story of the naval operations in that area has been one of unbroken victories.

Not the least of the attainments of the United States Navy during the past year has been the heroic role it played in driving the Japanese from their last foothold in the Western Hemisphere—the Aleutians. Assisted by units of the Canadian Navy, the United States Navy took part in the landing on Attu. Its ships and its planes blasted Kiska until the Japanese were forced to abandon it without a fight.

Everywhere along the outer defense zone of Japan, the United States Navy has attacked. Twice they have struck at Marcus and Wake Islands. Their blows have fallen at Malmahere, Makin Island, and on the Gilbert Islands. Japanese merchant shipping to the extent of over 2,500,000 tons has been sunk—75 percent of this tonnage by submarines of the United States Navy.

In the very midst of this war, our Navy has undergone a phenomenal growth. Three years ago, there were 1,076 vessels; today there are over 14,000. Three years ago, the Navy had 1,744 planes of various types; on July 31, 1943, 18,269 planes. In the month of September alone, 2,000 more planes were added to that number. Today, the Navy has more than 29,000 pilots, more than 24 times its pilot personnel of pre-war days, and more than double this number will be ready for action by next year.

The immense tonnage of the fighting ships of the United States Navy has been augmented during 1942–43 by the acquisition of large portions of the French and Italian Fleets. Thus, on Navy Day, 1943, the United Nations face the enemy with a naval strength many times greater than that of their foes.

In reviewing the activities of the past year, we should extend credit to the cooperation between the United States Navy and the fleets of our allies that has helped on our road to victory. The close coordination of land, sea, and air forces of our own armed services and the spur to action in the Far East which emerged from the Quebec Conference have been of inestimable value.

Officers and men of the United States Navy have always before them the dauntless example of the great naval heroes of the past, and in this very war the example of Admirals Norman R. Scott and Daniel J. Callaghan, who died in action on the bridges of their triumphant cruisers, and of thousands of other noble souls who have gone down to honored graves in submarines, surface craft, and airships.

The future holds much in achievement and, yes, in sacrifice, for the United States Navy. We can expect augmented naval action in the Atlantic. We can expect—with the release of units of our fleet from Mediterranean operations—smashing blows against the enemy in the Pacific. To paraphrase the great American naval hero, John Paul Jones, "We have not yet begun to fight."

The observance of Navy Day should embrace more than an expression of our pride in the size of our Naval Establishment, in the workmanship that has produced such powerful and varied types of fighting craft—on the sea, in the air, and under the sea.

On this Navy Day, more than ever before, our thoughts turn to the personnel of the Navy.

Wars are not won by steel and ammunition alone. In the last analysis, manpower wins battles. As chairman of your Committee on Naval Affairs, I am pleased to bear testimony of the fact that there is no group of naval officers and men superior to ours in courage, in knowledge of naval warfare, in the spirit of self-sacrifice, and in devotion to and pride in the Navy. Man for man, ship for ship on the sea, under the sea, and in the air, we have the most efficient Navy in the world.

It is, therefore, the officers and enlisted men of the Navy, which of course, includes the marines, the Coast Guard, the devoted women of the WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES, whom we especially felicitate on this occasion.

Those of us who have been privileged to have personal knowledge of the training and the caliber of the personnel of our Navy find it difficult adequately to express our admiration for them. They are representative of the very best type of Americans—in character, in physical and mental alertness, and in patriotism. Our Navy officers fear no danger; their personal comforts are inconsequential; they perform their duties without regard to danger, wholeheartedly and with a grim determination to face death calmly and heroically.

No tribute to the Navy would be adequate without particularly emphasizing the contribution being made by the enlisted men. They are the backbone of the Navy; they are recruited from the fiber of the average American home throughout the length and breadth of our land; they represent every color, class, and creed of our complex population; they know no set hours of work, they work all day and all night cheerfully when there is work to do, and if need be, they will fight all day and all night for their homeland and its ideals.

Today we salute the gallant and brave men of the Navy. Today from this Capitol, the temple of our Government of laws and not of men, the Representatives of the sovereign States of this great Republic extend to each and all of them our profound gratitude. We humbly thank the God of Nations for giving to our country in this great crisis such strong and noble defenders. May their efforts be rewarded with a complete and lasting victory, and may they soon return to us from all the seas of the world to receive publicly our plaudits and to enjoy with their loved ones and their fellow citizens the blessings of peace which through their unfaltering efforts we soon will enjoy.

To the men of the Navy, in every part of this war-stricken world, we cry out, "We shall not forget—we shall not forget."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that no words of mine could add to the eloquent language of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts; yet, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and a member of the minority party, I desire to express a few ideas on this day of commemoration.

This, the second Navy Day to be observed while the United States has been at war, is a day on which all of us whose very lives have depended upon the steadfast courage of the officers and men of the United States Navy, should solemnly offer up our prayers for the selfless sacrifices of those gallant heroes. In a spirit of reverent pride, we should recall what has happened in the past and look forward with confidence to the increasingly important role which the Navy will play in the events which will eventually lead to certain victory over our enemies.

In the span of a single year the entire world panorama of naval action has changed. Although the battle of Midway takes its place with the great battles of all time, it was still a defensive action. The Japanese were moving in force into the central Pacific. They were stopped. The autumn of 1942 found the United States Navy beginning to take the initiative, not only in the Pacific, but on every ocean.

Since the last Navy Day, the United States Fleet has taken part in the landing of troops in north Africa, in the landing of troops in Sicily, and in the landing of troops in Italy. Since the last Navy Day, American naval units have convoyed more than 4,000 ships of the United Nations, with more than 99½ percent of this number arriving safely at their destination. Since the last Navy Day our naval units have attacked the enemy in Norwegian coastal waters and at Wake Island. Since the last Navy Day, American naval units have helped to rid the Aleutians of their last Japanese invader. Since the last Navy Day, our Navy has supported our land advances in the Solomons and on New Guinea. Since the last Navy Day, our fighting naval forces have swelled to over 2,500,000 tons the toll of Japanese merchant shipping sent to the bottom of the Pacific. Since the last Navy Day, our naval units have brought the power of American sea might to bear against the outer bastions of Japan on Marcus Island and in the Gilberts.

Throughout the vast Pacific, the initiative—the ability to strike at the most vulnerable spots when and where those blows might do the most damage to the enemy—belongs to the United States Navy.

Admiral William F. Halsey has said:

> The Japanese have suffered losses out of all proportion to the efforts they have made to halt our offensive.

Those losses will be made even greater.

I need not tell the Senate what endurance, what sacrifices our certain victory in the future will entail. There will be many homes saddened by the loss of loved ones. But, this anguish will not be in vain. There will be other Navy Days—days on which you and I may again pay tribute to those who deemed no way of pain too hard that we might

live—days on which we may honor the officers and men of the United States Navy under the flag we love, in the security of a victorious peace.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 970) authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that the people of this country and the Members of the Senate will be sympathetic with the view which some of us so seriously entertain, that the adoption of Senate Resolution 192 is to begin the war against World War No. 3 by appeasement. We all know, Mr. President, that the thing that is important is not what the Senate now says, but what the Senate discloses to the world it will do after this war. It is not unnatural that Allied Nations look upon the policy of the United States with doubt and misgiving, for our record leaves a sorry tale of fidelity in peace to those who fought with us for a better world in war.

The Senate cannot escape the obligation of advising the people and the nations of the world that it does not propose again the betrayal of our obligations to our allies and our debt to our dead.

The League to Enforce Peace was led by the most celebrated group of men which probably could have been assembled in the country before the World War. When I look at the platform of the League to Enforce Peace, adopted in 1915, and when I compare that platform with Senate Resolution 192, after World War No. 1 and in the midst of a greater war, World War No. 2, and see the pitiable weakness of the latter, I wonder how far the Senate has retrogressed from the laudable purposes of the group who formulated the League to Enforce Peace in 1915.

Mr. President, let me read that platform of the League to Enforce Peace:

We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding signatories to the following:

First. All justifiable questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation, shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question.

Second. All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration, and recommendation.

Third. The signatory powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility, against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

Fourth. Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in article 1.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah? I happen to know that the Senator from Florida is trying his best to conclude his discussion by 1:30 o'clock this afternoon. He is very generous and desires to yield, but I am fearful that if questions are asked him he will not be able to conclude within the time he has set for himself.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe that the question I wish to ask, Mr. President, will be helpful to the Senator from Florida in what he is trying to accomplish.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have no desire to ask a question which will not build up what the Senator from Florida is saying.

Mr. PEPPER. I always welcome inquiry by the able Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there are two matters which I wish to call to the Senator's attention. The way in which the Senator stated his introduction to the quotation from the platform of the League to Enforce Peace implied that the Senate of the United States had adopted that platform. Is that true?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not intend to imply that. I was referring to the group of distinguished persons who adopted that platform in 1915.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Very well. There was one other statement made by the Senator from Florida which was just a slip of the tongue. He meant to say in 1915, before we got into the World War. The World War, which was in progress in 1915, was the stimulant which brought about the organization of the League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. PEPPER. As usual, the able and scholarly Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one other point which should be made. It has probably been made in the discussion already had. The League to Enforce Peace was not reaching out into the clear blue sky to build an organization around something which had not already become a part of the policy of the United States. It is true that the World War was a stimulus, but, as the Senator from Florida knows, there was the famous joint resolution of 1910 which passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives and was signed by the President. That joint resolution provided for the use of our Army and Navy in an international way. The story of the League to Enforce Peace is so important, and it led to so much good in international organization, that I felt that not even the slightest implication ought to go out that the Senate or the Congress sponsored it legally. At the same time, while Congress did not sponsor it legally, Congress had already paved the way for it, not only by the joint resolution of 1910, but also by joining the International Court of Arbitration.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his valuable contribution to the subject.

Mr. President, of course I do not intend to imply that the League to Enforce Peace was a congressional organization, or that its platform had congressional authority. What I wanted to emphasize was—and the able Senator from Utah has assisted me, as he usually does, by referring to the joint resolution of 1910 which the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] also mentioned in his address—how much we did or were willing to do in 1910, how much the League to Enforce Peace, which was a great outpouring of civilian sentiment, unofficial in character, but representing a distinguished collection of American mentalities and spirits, was willing to do in 1915, how much the world—except the United States—said in the League of Nations Covenant. Mr. President, how much we have said in the Atlantic Charter, how much we have said in the declaration of the United Nations, and how little we have said in Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. President, today is the heir of all history. Beginning with the prophets in the Old Testament, Isaiah and Micah, who dreamed of a federation of mankind under the fatherhood of God, and coming down through the leagues of the Greek and Roman city states, down through the temporal authority of the church, down through the aspirations and utterances of the Middle Ages, down through the Congress of Vienna and the various European congresses which succeeded it, down through the creation of the Pan American Union, down through the Hague conferences, and then, as I have said, down through the League of Nations Covenant and subsequent documents which I have enumerated, runs the growing stream of demand for an effective international organization which will rid the world of the scourge of war and promote the welfare of the people of the world.

Mr. President, in this good year—I should say, perhaps, due to its tragedy, this bad year of 1943—our Foreign Relations Committee, a committee which

put 50 amendments on the Treaty of Versailles when it reported it to the Senate, proposes to approach the prospect of World War No. 3 with no declaration, no sentiment, no expression, and no assurance stronger than Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. President, I read yesterday the declaration of the three faiths, the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish. I shall not read the whole declaration, but I shall read paragraph 5 headed "International institution to maintain peace with justice must be organized":

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

That great religious combination, Mr. President—the first time the representatives of the ministry of these three great faiths have ever come together, and, after long deliberation, produced a single document which expressed their common aspiration and their common prayer for peace for mankind—they, too, have asked the world, have asked the country, have asked the Senate to say something that is meaningful in approaching the dire prospect of World War No. 3.

I read yesterday, Mr. President, from the report of the conference on reconstruction of the great Protestant Episcopal Church which met at Cleveland, Ohio, October 2 to October 11 of this year, calling out for an organization which would deal affirmatively with the challenging economic problems, with the political and social and financial questions which confront us from every corner of the globe, and which will be more acute when the war is over than they are even during the progress of the war, and calling for the establishment of an international authority. Yet, Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is asked to ignore the kind of organization which should be created; it is asked to equivocate and leave purposely obscure the nature of that institution. It is left, Mr. President, with purposeful indefiniteness; I might say it is impregnated with studied ambiguity, in the hope that some passageway through the conflicting opinions of the Senate might easily be found which would deceive nobody save ourselves.

The resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee has not been willing to say more than international authority; so that one may contend, as was said by one Senator, that it includes a league of nations, and another Senator may say it does not; one Senator may say it authorizes a world court and another Senator deny it; one Senator may say that it authorizes, as was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], an international police force, and another member of the subcommittee may say he is for it because it does not provide for an international police force. One able Senator, who has been on the side of the isolation in this body since the controversy has raged, has said, if he is properly quoted in the press and I properly remember the quotation, that he is going to support the resolution because it does not mean anything, and another Senator, who has been on the same side, has indicated, I believe, that he is not going to support it, because, while it does not mean anything, he does not want to commit himself to anything that might mean anything.

So we have the spectacle of the able majority leader and the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who have been on the side of collaboration in world affairs, standing side by side with the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], who has been equally distinguished in his fight for isolation, both, Mr. President, unquestionably supporting with enthusiasm the same resolution. If those Senators have not changed their sentiments, then, we are not giving the Nation a fair assurance of what the sentiment of the Senate is.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the Senate cannot afford to be silent as to whether its purpose is an effective international organization, with affirmative and distinct functions after the war, although I hope it will be organized during the progress of the war. The pending resolution is not willing to say that we shall set up an organization which shall try to reconcile the difficult questions of access to raw materials, of stabilizing world currencies, of providing for the international development of international resources by the capital of all willing men and nations. It is unwilling to try to provide any machinery by which the economic conflict and clash of national interest upon national interest might be peacefully resolved.

But, Mr. President, Senate Resolution 192 contains another strange and significant silence and that is that it fails to provide by even a suggestion or intimation that there should be set up as a part of the international institution which we envisage an ancillary institution the purpose of which would be to settle peacefully the disputes of the nations of the world. Yet the judicial leaders, the jurists of the United States of America, from the days of Elihu Root, and before and since, have been leaders in world opinion, according to their professions at least, in the insistence that there must be a resort to law in the settlement of international conflicts rather than recurrence and retrogression to the rule of the jungle in settling the affairs of nations.

Yet, Mr. President, we see the Foreign Relations Committee seriously and impatiently propose to the Senate that we say not a word about a world court which has been recommended to the Senate of the United States by three Republican and one Democratic President—not a word, Mr. President, to give assurance that we will not do again what we did when those three Republican Presidents and the one Democratic President proposed that the Senate adhere to an international court to promote justice by peaceful methods among the nations and the peoples of the world. Not a word, Mr. President, do they say in Senate Resolution 192 about the United States of America even advocating the settlement of international disputes by judicial and peaceful means.

We know what the sad history of the World Court in this body is. It came to this body, Mr. President, under the recommendation of President Harding. Shortly after the recommendation for adherence was made by President Harding, it was repeated by President Coolidge; indeed, I believe both recommendations occurred in 1923, one in February and the other later in the year. Yet, Mr. President, because of the Senate technique, which was conceived of by the founding fathers in the Constitution as being properly applicable to bilateral treaties, the kind which they were accustomed to think of in those days, treaties of importance generally only to the two nations parties thereto, and because the founding fathers were afraid that this newly created Government might give certain fishing rights off the coast of New England to some foreign power in adverse effect upon their own interest, they put a provision in the Constitution requiring that no treaty can be made save by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting upon it. I say, Mr. President, due to that constitutional requirement, which has proved, by what we did to the League of Nations and the World Court, to be not only outmoded and antiquated, but a danger to the security of the Nation and to the world—I say because of that constitutional requirement, put into the Constitution to meet conditions which no longer exist, and because of the Senate technique, the procedure by which, when we deal with treaties, we regard ourselves as dealing with an ordinary piece of legislation, regardless of how many nations waited, regardless of what high hopes were theirs, regardless of the consequences and effect in relation to the security of the world, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate held that recommendation for adherence to a world court month after month and year after year, and the Senate debated it month after month and year after year, so that, although it was proposed in 1923, it finally cleared the hurdle of the Senate in 1926, 3 years later.

That was after we had blighted the hope of mankind by doing a similar thing to the League of Nations.

I believe the Senate attached five reservations to the protocol for a world court, recommended, as I stated, by three Republican Presidents. In a spirit of egotism which sometimes gets hold of us, unbecoming to us, we presumed that surely the signatory powers to the world court would take anything we sent back as a reservation—a bit of vanity. Those signatory powers at least indicated enough integrity and pride that only five of the whole number acceded to the reservations put on by the Senate of the United States, and the document was allowed to die insofar as our adherence

was concerned, and for 2 years no President of the United States dared to make public mention of the matter again.

It came back before the Senate in 1930, I believe, by President Hoover. Later it was recommended by President Roosevelt. Finally, in 1935, although there was a majority vote in the Senate in favor of adherence, because a two-thirds vote was not gained in this body, again the United States Senate failed to take its honorable part in setting up a world institution which might maintain and preserve world peace. Yet, in the face of that history of this body, we are asked to believe that a resolution which says "That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," can fairly be said to indicate that we will adhere to a world court. That may have been in the minds of the committee which drafted the language.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator is now discussing is of vast importance, and I shall add to my statement of awhile ago by saying that I have on my desk three closely typed pages defining the word "power," and in all those definitions the word "law" and the word "justice" do not appear a single time.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. I thoroughly concur in what he has said.

I say, Mr. President, that the purpose to adhere to the World Court may have been in the minds, secretly, of the drafters of Resolution 192, but by no fair import can it be presumed by those who do not have access to their secret sentiments and expressions to have been considered.

Mr. President, is the United States of America to lag behind the rest of the world forever in the provision or in the honest effort to provide for social institutions which will be the alternative to the social iniquity of war? This great, bold, brave, strong Nation; this Nation wherein reigns the supremacy of law and not the government of man; this Nation, which in theory is supposed to have been a leader in every humane movement on the globe, somehow or other has had its virility, its moral stamina, sapped by some strange apathy, and it dares not utter a decent sentiment worthy of acceptance in the councils of world opinion. Yet, after all that has gone before, after the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations, after a 3-year fight one time and a 5-year fight another—the final recommendation for our adherence to the World Court came here the second time in 1930, and was rejected in 1935—after all the tragedy of that further failure to observe our obligations to the other nations and the world, today, in the midst of war, which many of us from our hearts believe is a direct consequence of those failures, and the attitude which was responsible for those failures, now, instead of being penitent, instead of standing up and saying that if God and the dead will forgive us, the Senate of the United States will assume the moral leadership which this Nation should exhibit to the world, we are confronted with a measly, lukewarm, milk-and-water resolution intended to be obscure.

In Resolution 192 the framers have not seen fit to define the character of international authority which they propose. Not only have they failed to provide an affirmative function for it, that it be the instrumentality by which cooperation among the nations of the world might be promoted, not only has it been strangely silent about the establishment of institutions to settle peacefully international conflicts, but it leaves equally uncertain the question whether this authority which they propose shall have any power at all or not, nor does it leave the inference that it was intended to have power which I am sure Senators would never allow.

I refer to this language in the resolution, "with power"—that is, the organization shall have power—"to prevent aggression." Then the other words are "and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, what does that mean? What is the power in an international authority to prevent aggression? At what point will the power be exercised? By whom will it be wielded? What shall be the nature of the power? Against whom will it be asserted? Under what circumstances will it be invoked? Is the power limited, or is it illimitable? Does it include military force or not? Was it intended to be meaningless? one might fairly ask.

"With power to prevent aggression." Speaking of generality, speaking of breadth of authority and commission, speaking of the illimitable content in language, I know of no language which could be drafted which could possibly be broader than that.

Did the drafters mean that this organization of authority would have the power to go into the economies of the several nations, go into the school systems of the several States, scrutinize the industry and the economy of world powers, and stifle at their very inception the forces which later express themselves in military aggression? They say, "prevent aggression." They do not say, "military aggression." Do they mean to prevent economic aggression? If so, this authority might say the United States of America is reaching out dangerously to the forefront of world economy.

No, Mr. President, obviously they did not mean that. Yet they did not limit it. We do in our amendment. We say "to suppress military aggression." We thought that was probably as far as we should propose to go at the present time, to make it clear that it was only the force of arms which we proposed to stifle. We would by this international organization exercise a power to break up a forming mob of war mongers. We clarify it in our amendment, but Resolution 192 leaves the matter completely uncertain.

Mr. President, I have spoken about the possible breadth of construction. Again let us observe the resolution's narrowness. Does it mean that military force will be used if necessary to prevent aggression? It does not say so. We certainly were not willing to adhere to article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which envisaged the use of military force if necessary. Is the Senate being told by its committee that we should advocate adherence to article X of the League of Nations, to article XI, and article XVI? Have we come now to be ready to use military force? The resolution does not say so, Mr. President. Certainly no one fairly reading the proposal would be advised that it is our intention to do so. When I said a bit ago that the broad language of Senate Resolution 192 might give this international authority power to stifle economic aggression, it is only fair to say that it might have the power also to suppress political aggression, and that might be construed to mean any kind of leadership by a nation in world affairs.

So we have made it distinct, Mr. President, in our proposed amendment. We do mean, if necessary, to use military force, and by military force we mean any kind of armed strength which a nation may manifest, not of course just that which we call military as distinguished from naval or air, but any kind of a strength which is a part of the armed power of a modern state.

Mr. President, I say this peculiar resolution is strangely contradictory. It speaks of power to prevent aggression without the slightest suggestion of the outline of that power. Yet it could well mean that its sponsors propose to exercise only some mild persuasion or some gentle economic sanction, which had been a failure in stopping World War No. 2 now bloodying the earth and massacring mankind. That, Mr. President, is the resolution behind which we are supposed to mobilize world moral opinion. That is what the United States Senate tells its citizenry and its soldiers we shall commit ourselves to in the desperate effort to stave off World War No. 3 and preserve the peace that they shall win.

I have here, Mr. President, but I shall not go into them in detail, two advisory resolutions which were given by the Senate in the years 1920 and 1929. The first one was on the 14th of December, 1920, submitted in the Senate by Senator Borah of Idaho. It reads as follows:

Whereas a representative and official of the Japanese Government has advised the world that the Japanese Government could not consent even to consider a program of disarmament on account of the naval building program of the United States; and

Whereas by this statement the world is informed and expected to believe that Japan sincerely desires to support a program of disarmament, but cannot in safety to herself do so on account of the attitude and building program of this Government; and

Whereas the only navies whose size and efficiency require consideration on the part

of this Government in determining the question of the size of our Navy are those of Great Britain and of Japan, two Governments long associated by an alliance; and

Whereas the United States is now and has ever been in favor of a practical program of disarmament: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Governments of Great Britain and Japan, respectively, that this Government will at once take up directly with their Governments and without waiting upon the action of any other nation the question of disarmament, with a view of quickly coming to an understanding by which the building naval programs of each of said Governments, to wit, that of Great Britain, Japan, and the United States, shall be reduced annually during the next 5 years 50 percent of the present estimates or figures.

Second, that it is the sense of the Congress, in case such an understanding can be had, that it will conform its appropriation and building plans to such agreement.

Resolved further, That this proposition is suggested by the Congress of the United States to accomplish immediately a substantial reduction of the naval armaments of the world.

Mr. President, that was a forthright declaration proposed to and enacted by the Senate of the United States. Later on in 1929 another resolution was adopted in the Senate. The resolution as adopted was the language of an amendment submitted by Senator Reed of Missouri to language proposed by Senator Borah, and is as follows:

First. That the Congress favors a treaty, or treaties, with all the principal maritime nations regulating the conduct of beligerents and neutrals in war at sea, including the inviolability of private property thereon.

Second. That such treaties be negotiated if practically possible prior to the meeting of the conference on the limitation of armaments in 1931.

There we have two instances where the Senate took advantage of its constitutional right to advise the Executive and to declare the policy of the Government with respect to international affairs. Was there ever such a challenge to the Government to do that as there is now? There is in progress in Moscow a conference among three of the principal United Nations. I ask Senators, and I do not disclose any lack of authority to the enemy, because they are informed of our institutions—surely now the whole world knows what the Senate can do—I ask Senators what can our poor Secretary of State agree to that will bind this Government in the absence of action by the Senate of the United States? If the President were there seated with the Prime Ministers of Britain and Russia in earnest consultation about the pattern of the post-war world, whether he be Republican or Democrat or of some other party affiliation, I ask Senators what could that troubled Executive say in the absence of a sentiment expressed authoritatively by the Senate of the United States?

I say, Mr. President, that the time has come for the American people to know the sordid truth, that unless the Senate of the United States is willing to commit itself under God that it will not abuse the power it possesses by its technical machinery to throttle international treaty, and unless it pledges itself to the country that it will not abuse the privilege of unlimited debate permissible under its rules, unless it gives a covenant to the Nation that it will not take advantage of the two-thirds requirement for the ratification of treaties, unless the Senate of the United States voluntarily is willing to do that, the American people might as well now know that World War No. 3 is destined to come, because the Senate is not going to ratify any treaty setting up effective machinery which will keep the world peace. And I make it as a sad prediction and a sorrowful prophecy, the Senate is not going to ratify a decent and effective international world organization after the war.

Mr. President, let the people beware. Let the people beware.

Oh, Mr. President, if only there could have been some prescient eye, if there could have been some omniscient mind in the midst of World War No. 1 who could have come to the Senate and said, "Senators, I saw men die yesterday. Senators, men are going to die tomorrow in Belleau Woods, in the Argonne, in the Meuse River territory. I have seen the orders. I know the campaign. I should like to carry a message of assurance from the Senate of the United States before they die. Shall they die in vain?"

Mr. President, I should hate to have to take a message from the United States Senate to the soldiery of the United States of America upon the battle fronts of the world. What in the name of God could I tell them? What could the Secretary of State tell them, and what could the President tell them?

When President Woodrow Wilson, bearing upon his shoulders and in his heart the hope of the earth, sat for 6 months and formulated a decent treaty, which included an effective world organization, and came back to the Senate, he was treated more like a public enemy almost than the enemy itself by some Members of that body, so bitter were they in their political animosity to him. They relished the sight of his broken body. The only thing that disturbed them was the fact that they could not conquer his unconquerable spirit. Though he died wasted in body, that dominant purpose was just as clear, that spiritual dominance as mighty and superior, as it was when kings bowed to his step and when oppressed mankind tearfully humbled themselves before his magnificent prophecy and leadership. It was only in the United States Senate that he was unappreciated. It was only in the Foreign Relations Committee that he was demeaned, save on the dirty platforms of opponents who willed to destroy him for political purposes. And I am not so sure, Mr. President—at least, we have done nothing to give any confidence to any yearning heart that looks to us for solace—that we are not going to do the same thing again.

I do not believe that the members who wrote this resolution were timid of themselves—not all of them—but there is an unseen hand which has clutched the pen of those who strove to write this resolution. Whenever they reached with bold stroke to strike out the brave words there were whisperings of isolationists, there were whisperings of political controversy, there were doubts as to whether the Senate would take it or not.

Mr. President, not failure, but low aim, is crime. If any Senator is not in favor of an effective world organization he has the power, whether he has a moral right or not, to say so. What is to be gained by deceiving anyone? Why not let all know our sentiments? Yet we all know that this resolution is one of appeasement to some opposition which they dare not arouse.

Will the resolution destroy that opposition? Will it emasculate the controversy which they so much fear? No, Mr. President; all it will do, is to afford a political umbrella to those who might like to get out of the rain of public indignation next year or later. All it does, Mr. President, is to deceive ourselves and the credulous who might have overconfidence in what we really aspire to achieve.

Mr. President, I should like to say, since I have spoken on what has been said in the past, that it might not be inappropriate to quote something which was conceived—it is old to most of us—as early as 1842, a sight of a great soul which I wish might be as clear to the Senate. It is Tennyson's inspired vision:

For I dipt into the future,
Far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world,
And all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce,
Argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight,
Dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting,
And there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies
Grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world-wide whisper
Of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples
Plunging thru the thunderstorm;
Till the war drum throbb'd no longer,
And the battle flags were furl'd
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.
There the common sense of most
Shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber,
Lapt in universal law.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know the names of the proposed conferees.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from

Colorado that I talked to the distinguished chairman of the committee, and that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], suggested the following conferees—of course, the Chair names the conferees—but the following names have been suggested to the Chair:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Those Senators happen to be the ranking members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, those recommendations are entirely satisfactory to me. It is a little unusual for the motion to be made by the Senator from Alabama, inasmuch as the Senator from Colorado was delegated by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to be the manager of the legislation on the floor of the Senate. I wanted to be certain that no Senator was being left out in the consideration of the proposed legislation in the conference.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that the reason why I acted in the matter was because of the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. He is detained at the present moment on important public business, and could not be here, and requested that I take this action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The explanation is entirely satisfactory, let me say to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 179, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution would increase by $5,000 the amount authorized to be expended by the Committee on Military Affairs, in line with the general resolution which was adopted in the early part of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration, and would support the measure if it were properly explained by the Senator. Why does the committee need $5,000?

Mr. LUCAS. At the beginning of the session, as the Senator will remember, we appropriated for each committee the sum of $5,000 for general expenses. The Military Affairs Committee has expended the $5,000, and is asking for an additional $5,000 for hearings and other necessary expenses of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Was the $5,000 heretofore appropriated the only appropriation made this year?

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the only appropriation which has been made for the Military Affairs Committee. In the beginning the general appropriation was $5,000, but from time to time other resolutions have been reported from the Military Affairs Committee for special investigations. This resolution is in line with the general resolutions making appropriations to Senate committees. The Committee on Military Affairs has expended the $5,000 which was appropriated at the beginning of the session, and is now requesting more.

I have withheld this resolution for some time. I do not see the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee present in the Chamber, but the clerk of the committee informs me that the committee is in dire need of additional money to carry on the work of that important committee.

Mr. McNARY. Has the Senator's committee reported favorably?

Mr. LUCAS. It has.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 179) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on September 14, 1943, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 32, agreed to January 14, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $5,000.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—EXPENSES OF H. C. LOWRY IN CONNECTION WITH CONTEST

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 162, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I hope the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], whom I saw in the Chamber a moment ago, will return to the Chamber. He is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections which reported the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the able Senator specify the purpose of this resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amount stated in the resolution, $381.33, is for the payment of expenses incurred by one of the attorneys for those who protested against the seating of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. The claim has been pending for some time. The subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, headed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], held hearings on this claim and recommended that the attorney be paid.

Mr. McNARY. Is this the last amount of money we will be asked to appropriate in the matter of the charges against the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I think this is the last. I certainly hope it is the last.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 162) reported by Mr. GREEN from the Committee on Privileges and Elections on June 28, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding $381.33, for the payments of expenses incurred by H. C. Lowry in connection with the contest of the seat in the Senate from the State of North Dakota now occupied by Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. BURTON obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I understand he is about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Ohio is to speak next, so I understand, but I think he would be willing to allow me to proceed for 5 or 6 minutes at the outside. I do not insist on having a quorum present when I speak, but I think a quorum should be present when the Senator from Ohio speaks. He has been very gracious about the matter of permitting me to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am sure it is the intention to have a quorum present to listen to the able junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have a quorum present for the Senator from Ohio. My speech is not sufficiently important to justify calling for a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, after the able senior Senator from Tennessee has concluded his remarks, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much, and I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I am going to vote for the Connally resolution looking to an agreement to be signed by the peaceful nations after the war to keep the peace of the world. It is a simple, well-worded forthright expression of our intentions, and I believe has no hidden or uncertain meaning. Apparently, it says what it

means and means what it says, and stops there.

I had thought very well of the Fulbright resolution and the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution; but after listening to my distinguished and earnest friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], day before yesterday, I would certainly be opposed to either of those resolutions. It seems that the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution must have something hidden in it, judging from the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. He is opposed to the Connally resolution because it is "so vague and general as to leave every individual Member free in his own conscience to advocate, support, or oppose whatever interpretation might suit him in the future." I quote the exact words of the Senator from Minnesota. I wonder if there was something hidden in the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is upholding and which would prevent us from voting what in our own conscience we believe we should advocate, support, or oppose when the peace terms come before us for consideration. If there is, it ought not to be there. I am sure the Senator does not intend to have anything hidden there.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator permit me to finsh my thought? Then I shall be glad to yield.

If I thought the Connally resolution had in it a hidden meaning of any kind that I could be accused of not living up to because of any particular interpretation of it, I would not vote for it. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for bringing up the question. I think if ever there was a time when every Senator should be free and untrammeled to vote as he believes is right, it is when the peace treaty comes before us for consideration after this war is over.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as one of the authors of the so-called B. H. resolution, I wish to assure the Senator from Tennessee that there is nothing hidden in that resolution which he would not support. Let me assure the Senator from Tennessee that I have read with more than ordinary interest of the part which he played on the floor of the Senate during the great debate over the League of Nations. As a member of his party, I am proud of the stand which the Senator from Tennessee took at that time, and I have no doubt that the Senator from Tennessee will work and vote as ably and as strongly when another peace treaty comes before the Senate as he did the last time.

I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that so far as we are concerned we have no doubts. The Senator from Tennessee does not need a resolution of any kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, to be on the safe side I am giving notice now that while I am supporting the Connally resolution I am doing so because I believe in what, on its face, it advocates. If there is any vague or hidden meaning in it, I am not going to be bound by any such hidden meaning, but I am going to interpret the terms of the Connally resolution myself when it comes to agreeing to the peace terms.

Let me say to my friend from Minnesota, whom I admire very much, that I am greatly obliged to him for being so frank with the Senate as to state what is intended by the resolution which he espouses.

To be assured by the Senator from Minnesota that the Connally resolution leaves "every individual Member free in his own conscience to advocate, support, or oppose whatever interpretation might suit him in the future"—and I quote his exact words—makes me very much stronger for the Connally resolution. It is the highest praise which could be bestowed on the Connally resolution. I am for peace terms backed by force to make those terms effective; but to be bound in the future by somebody else's opinion as to what this or any other resolution means is something that I would not for a moment think of doing.

Mr. President, I was in the Senate during the last World War when very similar questions arose toward its close. I was very strongly for President Wilson's League of Nations. I believed then, and believe now, that if the United States had entered into that Covenant the world would not now be at war, and this Nation would not now be at war. I regretted the defeat of that great instrument then, and I regret it now.

It will be remembered that practically all the nations of the earth, including Great Britain, Italy, France, Germany, Austria, Poland, Russia, and nearly all the other nations signed the League of Nations Covenant and agreed among themselves to abide by its terms. We alone of the great nations stayed out. But all those nations, some of them our present allies and some of them our present enemies, refused to carry out the covenants to which they themselves then solemnly agreed. Under those circumstances it seems to me it should be apparent to all thinking persons that we should be exceedingly careful and guarded about our agreements during and after this war, and not be bound in advance by any general resolution except as it expresses our earnest hope and devout wish that we can agree upon some world arrangement that will effectively prevent future wars. Do Senators realize that that is all we have at stake in this war? We have nothing else at stake in this war but the permanent preservation of the peace.

If we are to aid in keeping the peace of the world—and, of course, we should aid—then our allies as well as our enemies should put in our hands such naval and air bases and make such agreements for adjoining land, sea, and air routes as will make our aid in keeping world peace effective. Our peace commissioners should ever keep this foremost in their minds.

We do not want to extend our own boundaries or to interfere with the boundaries of other nations; but if world peace is to be kept and if the United States is to pledge herself to aid in keeping it, we must have the necessary protected world air and sea bases, stations, and routes, wherever they may be, and to whomsoever they may now belong, with full and perpetual title thereto and sovereignty over them to the end that we may take a part in the policing of the world. We should not be put in the position of a policeman on the beat without a mace, a "billy," or a gun.

We fought a war before and bore the largest part of the costs thereof without any real return of the great sums we advanced our allies. We received no tangible benefits therefrom. Then we utterly lost the peace. This time we have spent tremendously greater sums, advanced to our allies far more than we did then, and therefore we must win the peace by seeing to it that there shall be no more wars. Prevention of future wars is all that we can gain out of this war. We must never again lose sight of that main fact. We must remain firm and unfettered at the peace table, so that we can better obtain a permanent and enduring peace. Otherwise we shall have spent in vain the blood and efforts of our boys and untold billions of money in two world wars.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I desire to be free and untrammeled when the peace comes, and if there is any hidden meaning in the resolution which we are asked to adopt, I am not going to be bound by it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have finished my statement, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have the floor. I know my rights. I am willing to yield for a moment. I wish to give the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] an opportunity to start his speech, concerning which agreement was reached earlier in the day. But I am not going to stand for long debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am entirely through, but shall be glad to answer if the Senator from Minnesota wishes to ask a question.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the able Senator from Tennessee quoted absolutely correctly a statement which I made last Monday. I wish to thank him for that. I think, however, that he was wrong in drawing the inference from the statement that there is any hidden meaning in the amendment which other Senators and I have submitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not say that I drew such conclusion, but I mean to say that it put me on guard that that sort of an interpretation might be put on some language contained in the pending resolution, and for that reason I give notice that I shall not be bound by it.

Mr. BALL. I might say that the only purpose which I can see in the resolution now is to state the present position of the Senate of the United States. I may also state that if the resolution stated that position as clearly as the Senator from Tennessee has stated his position, I would support it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator with all my heart.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in approaching the discussion of this subject I do it with the thought that this is the one time when this resolution will be before the entire Senate; I do it with the thought that each Member of the Senate, whether he has served on the Committee on Foreign Relations or otherwise, in casting his vote would like to cast it in the light of such considerations as occur to any Member of the Senate at any time. Therefore, I am hopeful that even members of the subcommittee in reaching their conclusions on this measure will give careful consideration to each of the amendments which have been seriously presented on the floor, and, in the event that any of those amendments be adopted by a majority of the Senate, that they will then accept them and proceed to adopt the resolution as amended, because I believe it is clear that today, as the Secretary of State of the United States sits in conference with a foreign nation, it would be helpful to him to have a resolution of this kind adopted by the Senate, and it would be helpful to him to have it in as clear and explicit terms as it is possible to make it.

In support of the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and 13 other Senators, including myself, I shall endeavor to demonstrate 4 propositions:

First. There is need now for a Senate resolution on the post-war foreign policy of the United States. I shall, under that heading, attempt to develop a number of general considerations which I do not believe have, as yet, been fully analyzed in our consideration of the subject in the Senate, and from which, I believe, flow the considerations that should influence us in passing upon the other propositions which I present.

Second. Senate Resolution 192, as reported by the committee fails to measure up to the need and opportunity of the time.

Third. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and other Senators supplies what is most seriously needed in the resolution and is thoroughly consistent with the interests and needs of the country.

Fourth. It is vitally important to adopt immediately, by a substantial vote, the resolution, if so amended.

Senate Resolution 192, as reported by the committee, reads as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and other Senators would change the last paragraph of the resolution so that that paragraph would read as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, in our international relations today, we face fundamental responsibilities and opportunities in many ways comparable to the fundamental responsibilities and opportunities we faced in our interstate relations which led to our Declaration of Independence in 1776 and to our Constitution in 1787. Our responsibility and our opportunity are comparable to those of the men who met the extraordinary crises of those times with constructive measures fitted to the needs of those times. They blazed the trail which has demonstrated the soundness of their faith in God and man as the foundation on which this Nation was built. We will do well to steep ourselves in this faith as we face the issues of our time.

Considerable has been said in the debate in comparing our situation with that which existed in 1918. I prefer at this time to emphasize our relation to the situation as it existed in 1776 and 1787, at which time constructive action was taken by this Nation. The precise issues and the conditions are not now the same as they were then, but the faith and the principles which led our forefathers to meet their issues fearlessly and constructively are the same faith and the same principles upon which we should again base our conduct if we are to carry forward the crusade they began, and if we are to meet our crisis in the life of America as well as they met theirs. They did not dodge the issue, they met the issue. Let us catch their spirit and live up to their standards.

These are the times that try men's souls. * * * Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us—that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; 'tis dearness only that gives everything its value.

Tom Paine wrote those words in the crisis just before the American Revolution. Those words might well have been written this morning to inspire us to meet the difficulties of the present conflict. We must not think that we can maintain in the crisis of today the freedom for which we fight any more easily than were our forefathers able to protect it after they had won it. There is today the same need for that deep faith in God and in our fellow men that filled the Declaration of Independence, and that led to the constructive policy that has made America the hope of mankind. We must not scoff at the fundamental seriousness of the issue today. We must recognize it or we shall fail to meet our opportunity.

I shall quote briefly from the documents of those days so that we may derive inspiration from those sources, and then proceed on our own account to make decisions worthy of our forefathers, and also worthy of the opportunities which grow out of this great World War for independence now being fought. Our decisions must fit the new horizons of our time as well as their decisions fitted the new horizons of their time. Our great responsibility is both to make sure that we do not fail in our responsibility to preserve the gains made by our forefathers, and that we do not fail to develop, under the conditions of our own time, solutions consistent with the principles on which our Nation was founded. We will do well to refresh our recollection of those principles.

We will do well to read from the Declaration of Independence the declaration of faith and principles and be guided by them. As we read them in this Chamber now, it is for us to apply them to the conditions of 1943. We will find them valuable. Let us think of them as applied to the conditions of our fellow men and allies under the tyranny of Axis conquerors, who look to us in America for leadership in order that peace and freedom may be retained when it has been won.

I quote from the Declaration of Independence, but reading it in the light in which it would be read in any of the occupied territories:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends—

And here I refer to the Axis governments of today—

it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient

causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

I continue reading from the Declaration of Independence, but reading it in the light of the conditions of the world today, having in mind our example, and the conditions against which we are fighting. It continues:

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

I call attention to the fact that today the forms of government of the world have twice in one generation brought about, or sought to bring about, an absolute despotism, and the obligation now falls upon us, as clearly as it did upon our forefathers years ago, to throw off such kinds of government as have brought about that condition, or made it possible.

The Declaration of Independence concludes:

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Mr. President, the full breadth and the everlasting inspiration of these words in their relation to the fundamentals of our Government were restated 80 years later with extraordinary clearness by Abraham Lincoln. It will be well for us, after 75 years more, to catch the depth of meaning which Lincoln found in these words as we seek again to deal with the fundamentals for which we fight.

At Springfield, Ill., in 1857, in discussing this very clause of the Declaration of Independence Lincoln said:

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color., size, intellect, moral developments, or soical capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men equal—equal in certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon.

Then Lincoln added:

They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence, and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere.

In the quotation I have just read I call attention to the emphasis which Lincoln placed upon the responsibility of future generations, which would include ours, to apply the principles of our forefathers as far as circumstances will permit, and we face the new circumstances today. He emphasized that the responsibility of this Nation and its leaders was an everlasting responsibility, which depended upon those who succeeded to the trusteeship of our national powers to make sure that we continued to apply the principles with the same vision and vigor as did those who declared them in the first instance.

Discussing the same subject in 1858, Lincoln said of his forefathers and ours:

These by their representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole race of men: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This was their majestic interpretation of the economy of the universe. This was their lofty, and wise, and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures—yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows: They grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children, and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages.

I may well pause in my reading to say that we are now living in the age of "their children's children," and that "the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages" are facing the issue of slavery.

Wise statesmen as they were—

Lincoln continued—

they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future—

Which has now become the present—some man—

And there I would interpolate Hitler—some faction—

And I might interpolate, the Nazis—some interest—

And I might interpolate, the Axis—

should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men were entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity—

That is our generation—

their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began, so that truth and justice and mercy and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the land; so that no man would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.

There ends the quotation from Lincoln in 1858.

The foregoing words emphasize beyond all possibility of doubt the continuing force which Abraham Lincoln believed that the faith and principles of our Declaration of Independence should have at all times in guiding the conduct of the American people. He uses the language in its true meaning as applicable to all humanity everywhere for all times. This undoubtedly was the meaning in which the language was used by the writers of the Declaration of Independence, for they regarded themselves as expressing in that document a divine philosophy as broad as humanity itself, of which our own experience in America was but one local expression. The important thing for us to realize is that which was so well realized by them and by Lincoln. It is that we must constantly be faithful to this principle in all our conduct if we are to be faithful to America. And yet, at the same time, in the words of Lincoln in 1857, it is equally important that we so gage our conduct that the enforcement of this right will follow as far as circumstances shall permit. We owe an obligation to retain the gains which we have made in the application of it and to expand those gains in accordance with its deepest meaning while at the same time so restraining ourselves that we shall not, by overeagerness or by impracticality, lose that which we have in seeking after unrealities. We must follow the middle course, but that does not mean the easy course or the course of inaction. We shall fail as greatly in our trusteeship if we do too little as if we do too much. We must neither bury our talents nor put them in the bank. We must develop them if we are to be good and faithful servants of America. We shall fail in our trusteeship if we do not advance to meet the opportunities of our time as our forefathers advanced to meet the opportunities of their time.

Lincoln, on his way to his inauguration in 1861, visited Independence Hall, and in that hall made the following memorable statement, again emphasizing the constructive force which he read into our Declaration of Independence, and which we equally should read into it today. It will help to guide us today. He said:

I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here in this place, where were collected the wisdom and patriotism and devotion to principle from which sprang the institutions under which we live. You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to the present distracted condition of the country.

I may insert here—and how comparable is that to the task ahead of the Senate of restoring peace to the present distracted conditions of the world.

I can say in return, sir—

Continued Lincoln—

that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn so far as I have been able to draw them from the sentiments which originated and were given to the world from this hall. I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here and framed and adopted that Declaration of Independence. I have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that independence.

And then comes this striking sentence from the Lincoln statement made in Independence Hall:

It was not the mere matter of a separation of the Colonies from the motherland, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but I hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Now, my friends, can this country be saved on this basis? If it can I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it cannot be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender.

Having in mind the devoted service of Lincoln's next 4 years and his assassination in Washington, this dedication of his to the principle of the Declaration of Independence and its relation to the world for all future time, has especially deep significance for us.

From this discussion it is clear that by declaring the right of every human being to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we have a foundation principle to guide us. Its application must be made clear first within our Nation, and our conduct on behalf of America must be consistent with its development throughout humanity. Our first responsibility is to preserve it here in America under the ever-changing conditions of this constantly developing world. Since the days of Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln, there have been no developments which have changed the meaning of the principle. There have been great developments in the fields of transportation, communication, and international economic, social, and political relationships. These put upon us the responsibility of adjusting our own governmental machinery so as to keep up with the new conditions of our time. To this end I believe that a declaration of a post-war foreign policy for the United States calculated to preserve the peace of America and the principles of freedom for the individual will be helpful. I believe that the proposed declaration, Senate Resolution 192, as submitted in the Senate fails to meet this need. I believe that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators to that declaration will meet that need, and I believe that it is important in justice to our forefathers, to the present generation, and to the generations to come that we adopt the policy stated in such resolution as it will be stated if the pending amendment is agreed to.

Before undertaking to discuss the issue, however, I believe that we should derive inspiration not only from the Declaration of Independence, but from the Constitution of the United States and especially from the proceedings at the time of its development as a constructive step—and I emphasize "a constructive step" in the history of our country in meeting new conditions—and I emphasize "new conditions"—with an appropriate new solution—I emphasize "new solution"—developed consistently with the principles of the Declaration of Independence and with the new issues then confronting our forefathers of their application of those principles.

One of the great and practical leaders in our colonial times was Benjamin Franklin. He was a businessman and inventor, a scholar, and in many ways a genius. He was much loved. He was a man of great practical common sense. He was also a man of deep faith in God and in his fellow men. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention. He took part in many of its deliberations. The ability of that convention to rise above personalities and petty and narrow considerations in order to reach high, constructive, and bold conclusions based upon tolerance and devotion to the welfare of the Nation, as contrasted with any of its parts, reflects the influence of Benjamin Franklin. In Madison's notes of the proceedings of June 28, 1787, in the Constitutional Convention we have the record of a famous statement by Benjamin Franklin which might well be read into the RECORD of our proceedings and of the debate at this time. He said:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom since we have been running about in search of it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I do not desire to delay the proceedings at all. The Senator from Ohio is making a very able and a very constructive speech, one which may well affect the destiny of this Nation. I should like to have a larger attendance of Senators on the floor. For that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, preceding the quorum call I was speaking under the heading "There is need now for a Senate resolution on the post-war foreign policy of the United States." I was referring to the somewhat similar situation which existed at the time of the presentation of a new Constitution in this country, so far as the present situation raises difficult issues and confronts us with new conditions, calling for new solutions.

In that connection, I was about to read a quotation from Benjamin Franklin, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention. On June 28, 1787, he said:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks' close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We, indeed, seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states all round Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances.

In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend? or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that "except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

"I, therefore, beg leave to move—that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business."

It is with this breadth of vision, with this readiness to consider the suggestions of all Members of the deliberative body as well as the suggestions of those submitting an original proposal, with this

willingness to adopt new and constructive measures and above all with this depth of faith in God and in man that guided the Convention of 1787 that we must consider the issues of today. We must lift them far above all questions of partisanship, personalities, and prejudices if we are to reach an answer as nearly right and as closely consistent with the principles of our Declaration of Independence as did our forefathers.

In reaching the momentous conclusions which the members of the Constitutional Convention reached they faced many problems dealing with limitations which they found necessary to impose upon those free and sovereign States in order to provide for the best interests and safety of them all. As a result of the approval of the several sovereign States of the terms of the new Constitution, we today have an outstanding example of the wise use of the sovereign powers of those States for their common welfare. Any contract into which an individual enters, binds him to an obligation which restricts his freedom of action to the extent of the terms of that contract. In return he receives some consideration in the form of acts or obligations of others which makes it worth while for him to enter the contract. He still remains a free and self-respecting individual and through his contractual agreements he has gained new resources while also assuming new obligations.

So the sovereign States which accepted the Constitution of the United States have still retained their sovereignty, although voluntarily limiting its scope to the extent agreed upon in the Constitution in consideration of the benefits derived from the Constitution. Through the exercise of this right of contract the several States, or perhaps more accurately, the people of the several States, have added greatly to their own lasting freedom and security. It is entirely a question of discretion as to what extent and in what manner this right of contract should be exercised.

In accepting the Constitution of the United States of America, the sovereign States found it to be to their advantage to go much further than usually will be the case in agreements between sovereign states. Experience, however, has many times over justified their unusual action in that particular case.

Now the United States of America in turn faces its own problem on lasting freedom and security in a world that has shrunk for many purposes of transportation and communication to an area comparable to the continental areas two centuries ago. To jump at the conclusion, however, that because of the success of the Constitution of the United States of America in meeting the novel problem of our Thirteen Sovereign States in 1787, a similar constitution will meet the novel problems of the nations of the world in 1943, is to fail to appreciate the tremendous differences between those situations with the same clarity that we may see the superficial similarities in those situations.

As trustees of America, our first duty is to America and to the people of America. America must yield nothing except as she sees in it, in the light of all the circumstances, a corresponding benefit to America and to the people of America. She will do well also to assure herself that the step shall be consistent with the principles of her Declaration of Independence, and with her faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

On the other hand, if we are to be as true to the people of America, to the principles of the American Declaration of Independence, and to the cause of human freedom and security, we shall face the novel problems of our time with the same degree of candor, and the same depth of faith in God and in our own people, as did our forefathers in 1787.

If we are faithful to our trust, we shall look the new facts in the face and not hesitate to meet those new facts with such new policies as shall be fitted to them. We shall not attempt to feed oats to our national automobile.

We shall provide it with the best engine, the best fuel, and the best mechanical service we can find for it, and it probably will have some nove' features to it if we are up to date.

It would be equally unfaithful to our trust either to declare now that we advise the creation forthwith of a United States of the World on our 1787 model, or to declare now that we advise that in spite of the tragedy of two world wars in one generation we shall not do anything substantially to change the course of the world that permitted those wars to occur.

To fail to recommend some constructive post-war foreign policy that will translate into action at least the primary lesson of the tragedies of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 is to default in the leadership placed in our hands. I believe that Senate Resolution 192, as submitted, does default in substantially that degree. I believe that the amendment here under consideration cures the default and meets the obligation imposed upon us, as I shall explain when considering its terms.

Our highest obligation can be met only if we can find those policies which will be of the greatest permanent benefit to the people of the United States of America. I believe that we can find them in a course of action thoroughly consistent with the principles of our Declaration of Independence, and of such a character that they will be of lasting benefit not only to the people of the United States of America, but to the other parties to the proposal and fundamentally in the interests of all humanity, including the people of the small as well as the large nations of the world.

We do not need and we should not attempt, at this time, to indicate the details of those policies. It will be helpful, however, to indicate with clarity certain fundamentals of those policies so that people of this Nation and of our allied nations, both large and small, may work together in this war and after this war with a deeper and greater understanding than is now the case.

To illustrate the thinking of George Washington along the lines of principle, as he concluded his services as the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention, I quote from his letter of September 17, 1787, transmitting the draft of the Constitution to the United States in Congress assembled. He said:

> It is obviously impracticable in the Federal Government of these States to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest. The magnitude of the sacrifice must depend as well on situation and circumstance as on the object to be obtained. It is at all times difficult to draw with precision the line between those rights which must be surrendered and those which may be reserved, and on the present occasion this difficulty was increased by a difference among the several States as to their situation, extent, habits, and particular interests.
>
> In all our deliberations on this subject we kept steadily in our view that which appears to us the greatest interest of every true American, the consolidation of our Union, in which is involved our prosperity, felicity, safety, perhaps our national existence. This important consideration, seriously and deeply impressed on our minds, led each State in the Convention to be less rigid on points of inferior magnitude than might have been otherwise expected, and thus the Constitution which we now present is the result of a spirit of amity and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable.
>
> That it will meet the full and entire approbation of every State is not perhaps to be expected, but each will doubtless consider that had her interest been alone consulted the consequences might have been particularly disagreeable or injurious to others; that it is liable to as few exceptions as could reasonably have been expected, we hope and believe; that it may promote the lasting welfare of that country so dear to us all, and secure her freedom and happiness is our most ardent wish.

Washington thus emphasized the necessity for giving up minor advantages in favor of a greater good and in favor of the constructive action agreed upon to solve the difficulties presented. The impressive thing is that the solution recommended was not one of colorless compromise. It resulted in the colorful conception of the "greatest single document ever struck off at any one time by the hand of man."

Of this document George Washington said:

> If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.

The result of this policy at that time produced the Constitution. It saved and advanced the cause of self-government. Let us therefore in 1943 "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair." Let us also have faith in God and in man.

Finally, Alexander Hamilton, in the first Federalist paper introduced the subject in a way which well expresses the fundamental importance of the issue facing the American people then and now. He said:

> It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of

this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. If there be any truth in the remark, the crisis at which we are arrived may with propriety be regarded as the era in which that decision is to be made; and a wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the greatest misfortune of mankind.

Mr. President, it is in the light of the example of these men and of these declarations of principle and of procedure that we can best approach our responsibility to our Nation in declaring its international policy now. We will do well to use the vision and the perspective of these men as we seek to discharge our modern trusteeship of the principles and our trusteeship of the interests of the Nation which they established. While we must safeguard the gains of our people, we must be sure that we do not belittle those gains or stunt their future growth. We must not look through the telescope from the large end into the little end as we examine the still distant future in which our forefathers were so deeply interested and for which they planned with such constructive wisdom and unbounded faith. We must use the telescope as they did, look far into the future, and steer a straight and bold course, guided by the same star of liberty and the same star of hope by which they chose their course. Today the helm is in our hands. The time for hesitancy has passed. The time calls for candor, clarity, courage, and continued faith in the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The event is in the hand of God, and America is His instrument.

I. THERE IS NEED NOW FOR A SENATE RESOLUTION ON THE POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, I propose to demonstrate that there is need now for a Senate resolution on post-war foreign policy by developing two propositions. Both are fundamentally important and each can be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt. One is that there should be post-war planning going on now, participated in by the United States Government, including the United States Senate. The other is, that there should be expression given now to the fundamental post-war foreign policy of the United States Senate.

A. THERE SHOULD BE POST-WAR PLANNING GOING ON NOW, PARTICIPATED IN BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Our first and consuming obligation is to devote ourselves to planning and winning the war completely in both hemispheres. Nothing can take the primary place of this obligation. Nothing that we may do, either as to post-war planning or in any other field can be permitted to interfere with the performance of this obligation. If we are to undertake post-war planning, it must be so done that it contributes to the unity of the United Nations in the war and to the winning of the war. I am confident that post-war planning of great value can be and should be done within that limitation.

We must win the war completely in both hemispheres or we shall not have the peace which we seek and for which we plan. On the other hand, if we win the fighting and have no plans beyond that point, we may well find that, within the United States and within the Western Hemisphere, as well as in the balance of the world, we shall not retain the peace which we shall have won. Furthermore, in order that the peace may be worth the infinite price which will be paid for it, it must be a just, a lasting, and a living peace that will adapt itself to the changing conditions of many years to come.

It is easy, but unsound, to say that we must devote our entire time to winning the war now, and that we will take up the peace when the war is over and peace has come. Life is not so simple as that. The sound planning of man-made advances cannot be left to hurried improvisation. A habit of improvisation may be thoughtless in personal affairs; it is treason to humanity in world affairs. It is as great a crime on the part of a government to permit its people to drift into an emergency without carefully prepared plans to meet it, as it is for a commanding general to permit his troops to drift into a military emergency without carefully prepared plans to meet it. In modern warfare, it is impossible to leave successful battle plans to improvisation. Not only is time needed for thinking out the best solution; time is needed to provide the logistics. The same is true to an even greater extent in the complicated field of modern international economic, social, and political progress.

The term "logistics" is comparatively new in civilian vocabulary. In military terms it embraces the details of the transport, quartering, and supply of troops. In global warfare this is now a major and often a deciding factor between overwhelming success and disastrous defeat. On most of our fighting fronts there must be 6 months or more of planning and preparation before a military action can be launched on a successful and substantial scale. How much more necessary it is, then, that there be a year or more of planning and preparation for the economic, social, and political stability of the post-war world. A general who failed to make the necessary advance plans and preparations for a large-scale military movement would be so delinquent in his duty to his country that he would be relieved of his command as soon as this failure was known. Those responsible for the governmental leadership of this Nation in its economic, social, and political development owe no less a duty to the public to plan and prepare for the Nation's post-war policies. It is these post-war policies that will determine whether our Nation and the world will be able to enjoy after the war the freedom and the peace which the armies will have won. Failure to make these plans and preparations can force upon this Nation, and upon the world, such economic, social, and political collapse and chaos as will result in a regimentation and totalitarian control so strict as to cause the United Nations to wonder whether they did not lose instead of win the war against totalitarianism and dictatorship.

It has been well said by former President Herbert Hoover and former Ambassador Hugh Gibson, in their book The Problems of Lasting Peace, that "nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace." This is common sense. It states an important distinction between war and peace. War is much like an explosion or a disaster. It can result from many kinds of blunders or accidents. Peace, on the other hand, is more like a building. It must have a firm foundation. It must be well planned. It must have good specifications. It must be skillfully built. After it is built, it must be carefully maintained. Otherwise, we cannot have a beautiful or useful building. Yet, if the building has firm foundations, good plans, good specifications, is skillfully built and carefully maintained, it can be of great beauty and of great use. It can be an important contribution to the welfare of mankind. Peace, like a building, is a man-made product. Peace can only be of great value if it rests on firm foundations, is well planned in general and in detail, is skillfully constructed, and is carefully maintained.

No general can wait to plan or prepare for his next campaign until after his current campaign is complete. He must fight his present campaign and plan and prepare for his next campaign at the same time. He even must think several campaigns ahead and be ready for all possible alternative situations. Likewise, if we are to have a successful peace after the war, we must plan for it and prepare for it during the war. Industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government, including the Senate of the United States, have a primary responsibility to plan for the post-war period. If the war had ended in Europe a month or two ago, or if it should end in Europe today or tomorrow, neither industry, labor, agriculture, nor our Government, including the Senate of the United States, would be ready for the emergency.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I was very much interested in the parallel the Senator has been drawing, and his conclusion that the same degree of advance planning and preparation is necessary for the success of any program to maintain peace in the world as is essential for success in planning for a military campaign.

I think there is perhaps one difference the Senator has not pointed out as much as he might, namely, the fact that, while a general in command of an army can make his plans, and no one can interfere with him, and when he issues his orders they go through; on the other hand, in this democratic Republic, the Government can make plans to maintain the peace, once we have won, but those plans can be carried out only if

they are supported, approved, and ratified by the American people, and by their representatives in the United States Senate. That, I believe, is why it is so extremely important that the Senate give the American people clear, concrete leadership in indicating the direction in which we believe now lies the best hope for the future peace of the world.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his emphasis on that point, which of course carries with it an indication that there is a great need for time to accomplish that extra step involved in self-government, for consideration by the people and their representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was very much taken by the able Senator's figure of speech comparing the situation to a building. I think every Senator agrees that we want a very fine house, a beautiful house, a highly functional house, but I think every Senator is also interested in these questions—where is the house to be, how many rooms are there to be in it, what is the exposure of the house to be, who is going to be the architect of the house, and who is going to occupy the master bedroom? I trust the Senator will illuminate his figure of speech a little further along those lines in relation to the amendment which he is sponsoring.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado. The point he makes is of course one which is clear, and which will be emphasized as I go along, that we are not now writing the treaty of peace, we are not now publishing the blueprints, which will come at a later stage, but we are now making the preliminary plans, and we are now making a start with the decision that we shall have a house.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we are all agreed that we should have a house. I think that in giving our sketch here, if we may call this a sketch that we are working on, we have to have in mind the kind of house we really want, the kind of house we expect to live in. A mere abstract architect's first sketch is a rather useless thing. Any good housewife planning a house is thinking about her closets, thinking about the basement, thinking about where the furnace is to be, thinking about where the washing machine is to be, thinking about the exposures, thinking about just how the house is to be set on the lot, thinking abut the arrangement of the rooms, thinking about the electrical connections, and so forth and so on. The Senator is giving a general direction, but until someone else shall then give a more detailed sketch, I doubt if we are doing anything except that which is quite futile.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is dealing with the blueprints. The items the Senator is speaking of, with which the housewife is so much concerned, appear in the blueprint stage, and there is a point where generalities do not serve any beneficial purpose. I am attempting to indicate, and I shall indicate, that there are two particulars which should be included in any expression of a Senate policy at this time, and those two are missing from the resolution, but are contained in the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope the Senator will develop this subject, and during his illuminating and able address will relate his references to the declarations of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution having to do with human liberty to the amendment which he is sponsoring.

Mr. BURTON. I may say that the reason why those declarations were emphasized was because of the consideration of the Declaration of Independence during the deliberations that went into the drafting of the Constitution. During the drafting of the Constitution the striking thing was that the members of the convention were faced with a novel situation involving some agreements affecting the sovereignty of the States, and they did not hesitate to make a straightforward, constructive solution. I may add that in the light of their experience with the same principles behind us, we face this issue, and I have pointed out clearly that I do not believe it is the same set of circumstances. I do not believe we should be setting up a United States of the world, but I do believe we should be as ready to examine into the precise conditions of our times and as ready to apply novel and practical considerations to meet them as our forefathers were to meet the conditions of their times.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senator has quite eloquently emphasized the ideology of the Declaration of Independence. The Senator opened his address with emphasis on that. I was hoping and I have been waiting for him to tie that in to the particular amendment which he sponsors. The reason I am interested in it is that of course we all know there is not a democracy south of the Rio Grande. We also know that China is not a democracy. We also know that Russia is not a democracy. I am wondering how we can amalgamate and work something constructive out of those conflicting ideologies which were not present in the making of the Constitution.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, that is why I endeavored to make it clear—and I am happy the Senator brought up the point—that of course there is a grave danger in going too far. The point is to go as far as circumstances require, but still continually having in mind the principle upon which this Nation has been built and the value which that principle is in the world today.

We were a little Nation in those days, and we fought our way in spite of that fact. Today there are many little nations in the world and many large nations. Two great wars have been fought in our time which were brought about by an attempt to enslave the world.

Mr. President, I believe the people of our time are moved by the same sentiments which moved our forefathers in the days of the Declaration of Independence. But, in the light of our own experience, I urge that we keep the results of our own experiment clearly in view. We want that to be a beacon light to the world. We want to show the smaller nations of the world that we are sympathetic to them as others were sympathetic to us in our early years.

I do not mean to attempt to impose upon others what they do not wish. I do not mean to talk about an empire of the United States. I do mean that our responsibility is to keep fully alive and vigorous the principles of the Declaration of Independence in order that others may see them, and that we shall do nothing in conflict with those principles, but to tie them in closely with the present day. I believe that if today we fail in our great leadership to safeguard the peace of the future we shall fail to do our duty as the custodians of those principles, and shall unnecessarily subject ourselves and the world to a repetition of the imposition of the tyranny of the past.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio allow me to read from a quotation which might have some bearing on the question under debate?

Mr. BURTON. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Colorado has, of course, posed a very important question. I should like to read two or three paragraphs from a very remarkable speech delivered on September 22, 1938, by the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Maxim Litvinov, who was the representative of the Soviet Union at the League of Nations and spoke at the League of Nations assembled in Geneva, as Senators will note, just a few days before Munich. Here are two or three paragraphs which I think have a bearing upon, and answer to, the question the able Senator from Colorado asks. Mr. Litvinov said:

> After long doubts and hesitations, the Soviet Union joined the League—

Referring to the League of Nations—

> in order to add the strength of its 170,000,000 people to the forces of peace. In the present hour of bitter disillusionment, the Soviet Union is far from regretting this decision, if only because there would undoubtedly have otherwise been attempts to attribute the alleged impotence and collapse of the League to its absence.
>
> But having entered the League, it has been unfailingly loyal to the League obligations which it undertook and has faithfully performed and will endeavor to continue to carry out all the decisions and recommendations of the League directed to preserving peace and combatting aggression, irrespective of whether those decisions coincided with its immediate interests as a state.

The concluding paragraph of this very remarkable speech is as follows:

> Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet Government takes pride in the fact that it has not acceded to such a policy—

That is, the policy of appeasement which other nations have accorded—

> and has invariably pursued the principles set forth by the League of Nations, which were approved by almost every nation in the world; nor has it any intention of abandoning them for the future, being convinced that in the present conditions it is impossible otherwise to safeguard a genuine peace and genuine international justice. It falls upon other governments likewise to return to this policy.

Mr. President, I thought it might have some bearing upon the Senator's question to show that in 1938, before Munich, the Soviet Union, as its Foreign Minister says in his speech, advised Czechoslovakia that the Soviet Union was ready to honor its obligations. It called upon the western powers not to permit the collective security of the League of Nations collapse, and Mr. Litvinov pointed out the catastrophe which would follow.

So to be perfectly frank, the record of Russia for international collaboration, at least until the collapse of the League of Nations, is equally as good as that of any other principal nation in the world.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to permit me to impose upon him just a little further?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe it is not entirely pertinent, but it might throw further interesting background upon what the Senator has just said if I were to read very briefly from the history of the Holy Alliance. May I do that, I ask the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to have the Senator to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, volume 11, page 633, as follows:

THE HOLY ALLIANCE

The famous declaration known by this name was signed in the first instance by Alexander I, Emperor of Russia, Francis I, Emperor of Austria, and Frederick William III, King of Prussia, on September 26, 1815. This document, the text of which was not published until 1816, laid down—

I invite the Senator's especial attention to the high order of ideology involved in the proclamations connected with the Holy Alliance—

laid down that the reciprocal relations of the powers were henceforth to be based on the sublime truths which the holy religion of our Saviour teaches; that the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace * * * must have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps; that the three monarchs would, accordingly, remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity and on all occasions and in all places, lend each other aid and assistance, while regarding themselves toward their subjects and armies as fathers of families (art. I); that the said governments and their subjects would consider themselves as members of one and the same Christian nation (art. II). In the last article (III) all the powers who should choose solemnly to avow the sacred principles which have dictated this act were invited to join this Holy Alliance.

Mr. President, that originated from the Emperor of Russia. I will omit some of the details of further history of the Holy Alliance, and simply come to the conclusion:

As a diplomatic instrument the Holy Alliance never became effective. Nonetheless, its principles and the fact of its signature had a powerful effect during the nineteenth century. It strongly influenced Nicholas I of Russia, to whom the brotherhood of sovereigns by divine right was an article of faith, inspiring the principles of the Convention of Berlin (between Russia, Austria, and Prussia) in 1833, and the Czar's intervention in 1849 to crush the Hungarian insurrection on behalf of his brother of Austria. That it had become synonymous with a conspiracy against popular liberties was, however, a mere accident of the point of view of those who interpreted its principles. It was capable of other and more noble interpretations, and it was avowedly the inspiration of the famous rescript of the Emperor Nicholas II which resulted in the first international peace conference at The Hague in 1899.

I thought that would be somewhat of a contribution to the discussion of the history of Russia's ideology in these matters.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is not recommending that as a pattern, I assume.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Colorado has spoken of an ideology which came into being in 1815 through an alliance of nations. From what the able junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] said a few minutes ago, and in reading the remarkable speech made by Maxim Litvinov, there was brought to my mind this current true fact: When Hitler in 1938 marched with his legions to the border of Czechoslovakia they were stopped by the Czech Army. Dr. Eduard Benes was President of that Republic at that time. The Czechs had the greatest army in Europe, with the possible exception of the Russian and the German Armies. It will be recalled that Hitler and his army did not make an attack upon Czechoslovakia then. Czechoslovakia is almost as much of a republic as our country is. Its constitution is patterned after the Constitution of the United States. It had freedom of worship, freedom of press, freedom of speech, and all the other unalienable rights which were guaranteed in our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

In that crisis, who was the friend of Czechoslovakia? Who was the real friend who came to the rescue of Czechoslovakia? It was Russia. Call her a Communist nation, if you will; but she stood by the side of that republic. In that republic lived men and women who were free. They believed in a theory of government entirely different from the theory of government believed in by the Russian people; but in that crisis the friend of Czechoslovakia was Russia, and Stalin told Benes that if the Czechoslovakian Army would stand and fight the Nazy Army when Czechoslovakia was attacked, Russia would come to her rescue. That is current history; that is a fact. I present it here because the issue based on ideologies has been raised. In other words, Russia's position relative to Czechoslovakia in 1938 is a clear-cut demonstration that Russia in the post-war era, in my humble opinion, will sit by the side of a government of democratic form, such as our own and such as Czechoslovakia, and will deal with the other nations of the earth on fair and equitable terms. She wants a just and lasting peace, the same as all other Allied Nations do.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I should merely like to have it clear in the RECORD at this point that I appreciate the discussion. I desire to reiterate the fact that the point I am arguing is that the ideology of the United States Government, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, I believe is adequate for our purpose; that I believe we can afford to uphold it as the basis of our future philosophy, and that it gives plenty of room for us to deal with any other nation in the world. I am merely asking that in applying that ideology to the world we shall be consistent to our own ideology and shall adapt it to the needs of the time, and the needs of the time change from century to century.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will go further than the Senator from Illinois has gone, and will say that Russia not only proved herself a friend of Czechoslovakia, but she has proved herself a friend of the entire Allied world.

I will go further. The point I was making is that I was fearful that the Senator from Ohio was making his base so strictly an ideological one that automatically we would be precluded from any sort of cooperation with any of the other nations of the world except the democracies, and they are too few for any sort of organization.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator gave expression to those thoughts. The United States of America, of course, has dealt with the other nations of the world throughout its life, and I believe our ideology is strong enough so that we can afford to do business with every other nation in the world. We are fighting on the same side with Russia and are glad to have Rusria fighting on the same side with us; and I believe it will be agreed that one of the principles of our ideology is to remain active in connection with all the other nations in the world in peace as well as in war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes, Mr. President; and I believe the Senator will agree that, if we have a right to proselyte them as to their ideologies, they have a perfect right to proselyte us as to ours, and that would lead to war, not peace.

Mr. BURTON. I am glad the Senator has raised that point. I am arguing that the United States, in moving for world peace, should cling to its internal policies and, as we deal with the world, still cling to our internal policies and our ideology in relation to the world. In that I believe there is a beacon of light to which many of the people of this country would wish to look and in which they would find much encouragement. I am not seeking to proselyte. I am seekink to continue along the straight and narrow path for which our forefathers fought, and to which we should be dedicated today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for permitting the interruption.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his contribution.

Mr. President, if the war had ended in Europe a month or two ago, or if it should end in Europe today or tomorrow, neither

industry, labor, agriculture, nor our Government, including the Senate of the United States, would be ready for the emergency.

We should already have developed our work on this throughout America to a greater extent than we have done so. It is not too late to do better, but there is no time to be lost.

In whatever we do in industry, labor, agriculture, or the Government, including the Senate of the United States, to plan and prepare for the post-war period, we must do it in a way that will bind our Nation together and will bind ourselves and our allies together in fighting the war. To do otherwise would be to become our own enemies. Therefore, it remains for us to find ways of doing this work that will strengthen, rather than weaken, our military efforts. This can be done by greater cooperation within America, between industry, labor, agriculture, and government. If we will only have greater faith in each other and work together, our Nation will be stronger for it, and the Allied cause will be stronger for it.

The Senate can contribute to it by clarifying its post-war foreign policies. This avoids confusion and gives leadership. It substitutes directness for indirection. It provides positive progress in place of rather hesitant drift, it seems to me. The best way to do this now will be to agree to the pending clarifying amendment proposed by the 14 Senators, and to adopt by an overwhelming vote the resolution as amended.

Therefore, we must fight our way across the one-way bridge to military victory. No general, however, would plan to capture a bridge merely so as to seize the bridgehead on the other side. He would capture it so as to go somewhere from the other side. Before he captured it, he would plan where and how he would go beyond it. So in this instance, we must plan where we shall go in peace, after victory on the battlefield. I see three roads to lasting peace. Each calls for the careful planning and preparation of our advance along it. The first is the road to post-war internal stability within the United States. The second is the road to post-war regional stability within the Western Hemisphere. The third is the road to post-war world-wide stability. A separate examination of each of these three roads will demonstrate the benefits that can flow from planning and preparing our advance along them.

INTERNAL STABILITY—WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Our internal stability within the United States for years to come will be vital to ourselves. Also, it will be vital as an important element in world-wide stability. In addition, it will stand as an outstanding good or bad example of the practice of the principles we have preached since 1776.

As America turns from the governmentally financed war production of her first total war to the far freer privately financed production of useful goods, she will do so under the heaviest taxes in her history and under a national bonded debt 10 times heavier than at any time before the war. Her debt is now about $150,000,000,000. It will be increased this year by a deficit of about $68,000,000,000. This makes $218,000,000,000. It will reach at least $300,000,000,000 by the end of the fighting. The interest charge on this debt at 2 percent would be $6,000,000,000, or about the size of the ordinary civilian budget of the Federal Government.

Yet, if America is to survive, we must carry this burden in our stride. Our War bonds which represent this debt are held by every church, insurance company, bank, trustee, and practically every family in America. We must pay the interest on them. We must pay enough of their maturities to enable us to refund the rest. These bonds are evidence of our national credit. To carry these bonds and pay our current taxes, we must produce a larger national income in real wealth than at any time before the war.

I believe that we can do this, because in this war we have discovered new productive strength within ourselves, and there are available for development new products of tremendous value. Our stability will depend upon our ability to use much of our new productive strength and to market our new products. Our ability to do this will depend in turn upon first-class cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government in a spirit of mutual helpfulness coupled with a desire to develop the resources and the markets of the world. We need both the resources and the markets. It will call for participation by industry, labor, agriculture, and government in preventing the abuses by private interests of their new opportunities for world markets. It will require also a fair return to industry, labor, and agriculture for their initiative and their efforts in producing the wealth which the world needs.

To fail, within the United States, to develop this post-war prosperity through increased production of civilian goods, soon would mean a shortage of food, clothing, shelter, and of other goods in the midst of a world capable of producing more than enough to meet the shortage, provided there be peace, stability, and a reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. Such a disaster here, coupled with the taxes that we shall have upon us, would bring about a depression that would make the last one look like comparative prosperity. It would force upon us totalitarian regimentation in fact if not also in name. To permit this to occur through lack of planning, preparation, and cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government would be criminal. For the Senate of the United States to fail to see its share of the responsibility or to fail to take its share of leadership necessary to avoid this calamity and to reestablish prosperity would be inexcusable. The decision should not be delayed. A part of it is involved in the resolution now before the Senate.

To develop this post-war prosperity in America we must have peace, stability, reasonable assurance of stability, and a readiness to develop new discoveries and new opportunities. I speak in terms of aviation, radio, electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, possibly atomic power, electric welding, light metals, improved housing, refrigeration and cooling devices, chemistry, chemurgy, plastics, wood, fiber glass, soybeans, sulfa drugs, and countless other "acres of diamonds" available close at hand.

Using aviation as a specific example, we find that 3 years ago America produced $280,000,000 worth of airplanes; 2 years ago $1,800,000,000; 1 year ago $6,400,000,000. This year it will be over $20,000,000,000; efforts are being made to raise it to thirty or forty billion dollars next year. By way of comparison our automobile industry at its peak produced only $4,000,000,000 worth of automobiles a year. I cite this not because I expect or want us to continue to produce four-engine bomber planes at this rate in time of peace. I cite this because for a short time following the day of military victory, we shall have available a capacity in plants, tools, skilled workmen, skilled supervisors, pilots, ground crews, and airports sufficient to revolutionize the transportation and communication systems of civilization. It has been estimated that if we prepare carefully we may be able to turn to private production and industry 10 percent of this capacity. The opportunity is so extraordinary and the investment so great that it deserves our every attention to do this much or more.

Aviation can provide savings in time and in money of infinite value to us and to all the world. It can open new resources and new markets of equally immeasurable worth. It should be noted, however, that its greatest value lies in its longest trips. Its full value may well depend upon its world-wide success. This world-wide scope is characteristic of many of the opportunities of tomorrow when all the world will have become a neighborhood. I will emphasize later a further vital relation that military aviation may have, both to our internal stability and to world-wide stability.

The radio is another example of a new industry of limitless value. Its greatest success likewise may depend in large part upon its world-wide operations.

The automotive industry brings to mind the tremendous recent developments in the use of light metals, in the efficiency of gasoline engines, and in the quality of gasoline. Post-war civilian automobiles may travel 50 miles on a gallon of gasoline. This means tremendous new value in the automobile of tomorrow. The potential market will be world-wide.

Henry Ford has estimated that in his opinion great advances can be made in reducing the cost of agricultural production. He has pointed out that in industry when the cost of labor increased this was absorbed by improving mechanical equipment and general methods of production. The increased cost of labor has not been absorbed as well in agriculture. Henry Ford has estimated, however, that through the improved efficiency of agricultural mechanical equipment, the reduction in the weight and cost of that equipment and the reduction in the cost and need for repairs of that equipment, to say nothing of extended and improved use of fertilizers and the

development of farmer cooperatives, the cost of agricultural production can be reduced by about 50 percent. If this estimate is good for even half that much, it will amount to a saving of 25 percent in the cost of production. This would be a tremendous gain to America and to the world.

For all this to take place, however, there must be a successful reconversion from wartime governmentally financed industry to peacetime privately financed industry.

This calls for the practical consideration of many steps to be taken in connection with the termination of war contracts, the provision of financial reserves in the face of renegotiation and taxation, the establishment and maintenance of labor relations which shall be fair to labor, industry, and consumer alike, and shall increase rather than reduce the total value and volume of industrial production.

In the field of internal stability within the United States, therefore, there must be post-war planning taking place now if this stability is to be secured. While it is true that the problems of the internal post-war stability have many international aspects, they have also many purely internal aspects. As to the internal aspects, post-war planning and preparation should now be under way if we are to meet them successfully. In this field we know the problems, we know the men concerned, and we have the primary responsibility for successful action. The responsibility rests upon industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government of the United States. The process can be aided by governmental leadership. The Senate has taken commendable action in providing a post-war planning committee under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. There is no need for specific reference to this internal planning program in the pending resolution relating to foreign policy. Even in post-war planning and governmental effort in the local field of internal stability, we have many incidental indications of a related need for post-war planning in the larger and more difficult field of international affairs. For example, to be concrete, the close relationship between international problems and the problem of internal stability is apparent in such an industry as aviation. Aviation, in its natural course, will reach into countless international issues, and must receive consideration in planning our foreign policy and our own internal development as producers in that field, or as users of that service will call for peace, stability, and the assurance of stability for many years to come.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. In speaking earlier about the need of internal stability in the United States, the Senator developed the fact that at the end of the war we shall probably have a debt of at least $300,000,000,000, the interest charges alone on which will be $6,000,000,000, plus normal Government expenditures of—if they stay that low—$12,000,000,000. The Senator pointed out that we simply must keep our economy running in high gear in order to carry such a load. He has pointed out some connections between the problem of internal stability by reconversion of America to peacetime production and our international picture.

I think there is one other connection, and that is, that if we do not have a real effective system of collective security in the world the United States will have to depend for security solely on its own armed strength. Then, in addition to the load of $12,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 of taxes, we shall have to add, for an indefinite period of time, for military expenditures, $10,000,000,000, $15,000,000,000, or $20,000,000,000 a year. I doubt if we could build an economy which could carry that much of a tax load without a reduction in the standards of living of every family in America.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I think a vital factor in America's ability to recover will be that we shall not have the burden of extreme military expenditures which would probably keep us on a basis of financial deficit.

REGIONAL STABILITY—WITHIN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Regional stability in the Western Hemisphere is likewise of extreme importance to us. Our responsibility for planning and preparing for post-war stability in this hemisphere is closely comparable to our responsibility for planning and preparing for it within the United States. In the Western Hemisphere all the nations are at peace with each other, and most of them are allies in the fight against totalitarian slavery.

Improved transportation and new industrial production will increase prosperity throughout North, Central, and South America in a way that will benefit the entire Western Hemisphere, including ourselves, if we can but have peace, stability, and reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. Under such conditions private industry within this new, great neighborhood of the Americas will prosper "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season." Within this hemisphere, as well as within the United States, the primary responsibility for planning and for leadership again rests with the people and Government of the United States because of our dominating position in the hemisphere. Again, we know the people; we know the problems. Europe will not look after this for us, and we do not wish Europe to do so. It is traditionally a part of the Monroe Doctrine that the Americas shall look after themselves so far as possible.

In the future era of a global neighborhood, the Western Hemisphere will find itself more closely related than ever before to the markets, the resources, and the competition of the rest of the world. This increases rather than lessens the necessity for post-war planning within the Western Hemisphere. This again calls for cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government.

We have in the Pan American Union an agency for hemispheric cooperation which is helpful in meeting our needs. It provides a natural method for decentralizing a portion of the international problems of the world so as to relieve the world of those problems which have a peculiarly hemispheric character. Here, again, however, we have an example of the need for post-war planning, and there is room for greater progress along the line. International aviation in the Western Hemisphere is a good example of where it is needed now. In the foreign-policy resolution relating to world-wide stability there is no need for referring especially to these hemispheric problems. It is important, however, to make sure that in whatever declarations of post-war foreign policy we may make, opportunity shall be preserved for the nations of the Western Hemisphere to proceed to handle their regional problems in the future much as they have done in the past.

WORLD-WIDE STABILITY

This brings us to the greater and more difficult problem of world-wide stability. Here the issues are of many kinds. Here also post-war planning by the United States, and in particular by the United States Senate, is appropriate and necessary. It is equally important, however, to recognize that there are several different types of issues to be considered. On some of them more action can and should be taken now than on others. It is quite as important not to do now the things that should not be done now as it is to do now the things that should be done now. Questions of world-wide stability are different from those of internal or even regional stability in that they immediately involve other nations besides ourselves and besides those with which we have a natural association through our location in this hemisphere or through our membership in the Pan American Union. In the field of world-wide stability, unlike the field of internal and regional stability, we do not and cannot know at first hand all the people involved nor all angles of the problems involved. There also are questions concerned with the regional stability of regions outside the Western Hemisphere with which we have as little to do and should have as little to do as the nations of Europe and Asia should have to do with our problems in our hemisphere. Furthermore, in the field of global international problems which do have a world-wide character we necessarily share the general responsibility for the solution of them with the other nations of the world. We cannot and should not dictate these solutions to the world, and the world should not dictate them to us. Whatever decisions are made or procedures adopted, these should be developed through the joint consideration and joint action of all of the nations concerned. Some special leadership may be feasible on the part of certain nations because of their greater size and power. It is fundamental, however, to the philosophy of the United States of America that the smaller and independent nations shall

receive fair treatment. Whatever post-war plans may be developed they should be the result of consideration on the part of all those nations that are affected by them. Accordingly, a preliminary necessity arises in this field for bringing all those nations together for early and preliminary consideration of these plans.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I believe I have heard everything he has said, and I want to compliment him on presenting a very lucid and at times a very inspirational statement of fact, history and the problem at hand. Just now the Senator's remarks caused me to think along this line: Apparently he is not suggesting any definite plan which he would recommend at this time for a world organization. Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON. I am supporting the amendment presented by the 14 Senators, which includes the recommendation for an international organization to do certain things as there stated. To that extent, I am making such a recommendation, and I believe that is one of the two vitally important minimum provisions which should be included in the statement of policy by the Senate at this time.

Mr. WILEY. From the remarks the Senator made a few moments ago, apparently he feels that if there were an over-all authority there might be also regional authorities, because, as in the Western Hemisphere there are specific problems which should be handled by the nations of the Western Hemisphere without interference from the East or the West, likewise there is a similar situation as affecting Europe. I take that to be his idea, following Mr. Churchill's thought of a concert of nations.

Mr. BURTON. I do not know about Mr. Churchill's thought because I am not prepared to identify it as such; but I am prepared to say that there has been a natural trend, particularly strong during the last 20 years, since the last war, and up to this time, of the decentralization of some international problems, based upon improved activity and greater transportation and communication facilities, which, in a natural way, may very well lead to a partial solution of the great difficulty of attempting to handle the entire world through one organization. In that there lies great hope, and there certainly could be nothing to conflict with that natural trend in any resolution we might adopt at this time which would enable the solution to adapt itself, as I am trying to argue, to conditions of the times, which may be somewhat different from what they have been at other times. That may very well be. Certainly the Pan American Union will continue to exercise its functions. Probably in Central Europe there might arise at some time a different type of problems, but with regionalized authority and an over-all organization there may be a substantial guaranty of peace for years to come.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator, of course, recalls that one of the problems of the League of Nations was that a number of South American republics were members of the League, and when what might be called isolated European problems were presented they had a vote on them. Probably from that experience we have learned that it would be feasible, providing all the occupants could be induced to come into the house, to segregate, so to speak, even the apartment house into various regions, so that those of the Western Hemisphere could take care of their own problems, if they were Western Hemisphere problems, and so forth. There is one thing that bothers me, and I should like to have it made clear in my own mind, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that the purpose of this debate is, primarily, not to provide any definite plan but to indicate to ourselves and to the world that America is willing—"Barkis is willin'," in other words—to cooperate with right-minded nations to try to find a solution to the problem of war. Is not that primarily the purpose of this debate?

Mr. BURTON. I think probably that is the purpose of the resolution as reported by the committee, but I believe that, in order to make that purpose really valuable to the President, to the people, and to our allies and ourselves, there are two propositions which should be more clearly expressed than they are expressed in the resolution, and, therefore, I am supporting the amendment to it.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will yield further, assume, then, that that is the purpose, it must be clear to everyone that before that purpose can be effectuated the contracting parties, whether the United Nations or others, will get together around the table and there develop a plan which ultimately will be put into effect and which we hope will make the future peace of the world secure. Is not that correct?

Mr. BURTON. Yes. I am trying to emphasize the fact that when we enter into the world-wide field of international relations others have just as much to say about it from their point of view as we have to say from our point of view, and we are, therefore, in our approach trying to express the principle that we should not dictate to them and they should not dictate to us; and the solution which may come out of it may be as different from the one we took into it as the solution which came out of the Constitutional Convention differed from that which any man took into that Convention.

Mr. WILEY. About half an hour ago the Senator brought out the idea that we were building a house; he brought out the idea that there would have to be a foundation, a superstructure, and so forth. Would it not be a little more clear to say that instead of building the house we are taking the first step to assemble the architects and lay the plans so that the apartment house may be built?

Mr. BURTON. We certainly are not in the blueprint stage; we are way behind that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe we must keep in mind, if I may respectfully so suggest, that we are telling the architect something; we are saying something to the man who is going to negotiate the treaty, and when the treaty comes back to the Senate for consideration it has to bear some reasonable identity to that which we are telling him now; and unless that which we are telling him now is clear enough so that he can recognize an identity and be bound by something that is done here, that which we are doing is an entirely futile thing.

Mr. BURTON. I agree with what the Senator from Colorado says. It is entirely an expression of difference of degree as to how far there is wisdom in what we do at this time. I shall be concrete as I move on to the provisions which I am advocating.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. As a young lad I spent a good many years in the Southwestern States, where tortillas and cyclones were prevalent. The safety of human life depended upon the building, and nearly always the first thing the early settlers built for their own safety and security was not the house, the mansion, with the exposures east or west, or a plan as to who was to occupy the master bedroom, but they built first a storm cellar. My idea is we are trying to construct first of all a storm cellar for the safety and security of the people of this Nation.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

EMERGENCY WORLD-WIDE PROBLEMS

Turning now to the emergency world-wide problems as a classification of a type of world war problems that are before us, I think it is important for us to classify the type of problems we face, because the treatment of all of them cannot be identical.

There are, first of all, the emergency problems requiring immediate attention, and then there are those involving long-term considerations, and not calling for immediate treatment. The emergency world-wide civilian problems require immediate international planning, preparation, and action on the part of the United Nations just as much as do the battles of the war itself. The issues involved present themselves on as short notice as do military emergencies. They require prompt treatment. Prompt planning and preparation for them is therefore as important as the planning and preparation for any battle. Some of this already is under way. Among the problems are those of demobilization, the administration of occupied territories, and the provision for foreign relief and rehabilitation.

These world-wide civilian problems are of such an urgent nature that they are good examples of the fact that some post-war issues involving world-wide stability inescapably require immediate action long before the coming of the peace.

In the field of demobilization, it is important that there be an understanding among the United Nations. If and when some portions of the war shall end before others, there will be a natural desire on the part of many to return to private industry as rapidly as possible. On the other hand, it is of common importance to the world, including ourselves, that the remainder of the fighting continue with the greatest possible vigor until complete victory is won in both hemispheres. There should, therefore, be international understandings reached on the subject of demobilization even though those understandings need not rise to the formality of treaties. It should be recognized that we and the other nations have a common interest not only in fighting the war to successful determination in both hemispheres but also in the return as soon as possible of every nation to a productive and self-sustaining basis. In our own country, as well as in others, there will be a natural desire to reestablish peacetime industries, and there will be important international considerations involved in determining the extent to which each nation should be free to proceed with its own demobilization policy.

Similarly, in the administration of occupied territories, whether they be the pre-war territories of our allies or of our enemies, it is essential that there be a well-coordinated international program for administering these territories. This becomes exceedingly important when enemy territory is occupied. Executive consideration has been given to this issue among the United Nations, and it is important that mature international policies be developed in the clearest manner possible.

The administration of foreign relief and rehabilitation is another example of the emergency post-war program which must be met. Preliminary steps are under way at the invitation of the United States Government for the consideration of the general issues involved. In the meantime, temporary international agreements are being worked out on an emergency basis.

The action of the United States in this regard, in the first instance, was sought to be made a purely executive action. This would have been extremely unfortunate in view of the important part which congressional appropriations necessarily will have in this problem. A program now has been developed whereby appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress are familiar with the contemplated procedure and are in touch with the development of the program.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator speaks about temporary international arrangements or agreements. I have not the Constitution before me, but I know it provides that all treaties and agreements with foreign nations shall be made by the President and concurred in by the Senate of the United States by a two-thirds majority. Where does the Senator find provision for the making of temporary agreements without compliance with the provision of the Constitution as to ratification? I do not understand how that can be done under our Constitution. The Constitution was made for both war and peace, and it seems to me that we should adhere to it. We are sworn on our oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. I have had that oath administered to me eight times during my service in the House and in the Senate, and that oath is supposed to be a very essential matter. In my judgment it is the most essential oath I ever took in my life, and I do not feel like preparing or planning for temporary agreements to be made by someone in the United States other than in accordance with the constitutional provision.

I read from page 402 of the Senate Manual, which is in the possession of every Senator, a part of section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution:

> The President * * * shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

That language is clear and unmistakable, and under our oaths of office we are bound to adhere to that provision.

The Senator has spoken of temporary agreements. I notice in the press that Mr. Landis had been sent to Egypt to grant bounties and subsidies and relief in that part of the world, and that Mr. Baldwin had been sent to some other place, Sicily, I believe, to grant relief to the people in that part of the world. In view of the constitutional provision, I am wondering how relief can be granted in the methods the Senator from Ohio is suggesting. I do not think we have any authority to do it except by agreements entered into by the constitutional method.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Tennessee will find no more ardent advocate of observance of the constitutional provision as to treaties than the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that. It is because I have great confidence in the Senator from Ohio that I am asking him this question. He is an able Senator and a fine man, and I should like to have him answer my question.

Mr. BURTON. I can give the Senator my understanding of the matter, and there are present representatives of the Committee on Foreign Relations who, I am sure, can expand my answer further for the Senator's benefit.

As I understand, a treaty, of course, must be handled precisely as the Senator has stated, and I state that in my opinion an instrument which rises to the dignity of the one referred to in the discussion we are carrying on, which involves peace among all the nations, to endure from now on, through an organization or otherwise, would certainly rise to the point of the greatest dignity among international agreements, and should be a treaty, and should come under the provision which requires ratification by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate. However, I understand that there are many agreements which are not treaties, for example, agreements often of short duration. For instance, there was the recent action of the Senate and the House together in authorizing reciprocal trade agreements. Those are not subject to ratification by two-thirds of the Senate, but by authorization of a majority of the House and the Senate an agreement may be entered into, and then the agreement, not a treaty, is carried out under the provisions of the act of Congress.

Furthermore, I have understood that in some instances there has been action by both Houses in cases which have been on the border line, such cases where it has been rather difficult to determine whether the matter in question happened to be a treaty or was not a treaty.

As I understand, there was some controversy when the State of Texas was admitted to the Union as to whether it should come in by treaty or by agreement. I believe it came in by agreement. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]?

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Constitution provides that a new State may be admitted to the Union by Congress. A State cannot be admitted except by action of both Houses. In the case of the admission of Texas into the Union, a treaty was made which was rejected by the Senate. Texas was admitted as a new State by passage by Congress of a joint resolution. The only way it could have been admitted was by the passage of a joint resolution, because the Constitution specifically states that a new State shall be admitted by Congress, meaning both Houses of Congress.

Mr. BURTON. Also, as I understand, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, conducts a great many negotiations in his military capacity, and, particularly in the present war, has entered into a great many military agreements which have been regarded as Executive agreements. A question arose, as I understand, with respect to the relief and rehabilitation subject, a matter which is on the border line, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] called it to the attention of the Secretary of State in time to prevent its being handled merely as an Executive agreement. I understand the matter has been worked out now so that it is not to be in the form of a formal treaty, but that it will come before the two Houses of Congress in some other form before it finally becomes effective. I ask the Senator from Michigan if I am correct in that statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it is of any interest in respect to the present discussion I shall be glad very briefly to reply to the very able Senator's question.

The inquiry raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] of course is an imponderable one: When does an international obligation cease to rise to the dignity of a treaty? When does it, in lesser degree, cease to require joint action of the two Houses of Congress, or when can it be a power exercised solely by the Executive?

In the relief and rehabilitation agreement to which the able Senator from Ohio refers, I think we probably have as good an example of the entire gamut as we have had under any other circumstances. In this instance the Executive and the State Department at first announced that the relief and rehabilitation draft agreement would be executed by Executive agreement. It was to be done exclusively by the administrative arm of the Government, without reference to Congress.

As the Senator from Ohio indicates, I challenged that interpretation of the situation by a resolution which requested the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to inquire into the question whether or not the relief and rehabilitation draft rose to the dignity of a treaty. The committee immediately considered the matter, and subsequently appointed a subcommittee on the subject. I think it was very clearly the opinion of the committee that as originally drawn the relief and rehabilitation draft agreement did involve practically illimitable obligations on the United States almost in perpetuity, and that as drawn it was a treaty, or should have been. Certainly it was not an obligation such as could be concluded merely by Executive agreement.

Thereupon a special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and two Under Secretaries of the Department of State undertook to rewrite the draft agreement so as to eliminate from it those illimitable commitments which carried it into the realm of a treaty, and which brought it back into what we thought was the realm of an agreement. We succeeded in rewriting it to a point where it is now literally nothing more than the authorization of appropriation, and there is no commitment in the text to anything except the expenditure of such moneys as are specifically appropriated from time to time by Congress for this purpose. Furthermore, the agreement itself will be textually included within the measure providing for the authorization of the appropriations.

If I may finish, I will say that that is as good an example as I know of to illustrate the question which the Senator raises. I was convinced in the first instance that the relief and rehabilitation agreement should have been a treaty. The President was convinced that he could proceed by Executive agreement. There we have the two extremes of the possibilities. We have rewritten the text so that, in my opinion and in the opinion of the State Department, we can now proceed on the basis of joint action by the two Houses, by action which is less than treaty action, because the text itself has become merely the authorization of an appropriation. Therefore it seems to me that the question raised by the Senator from Tennessee is one which can be answered only in respect to the text of the particular agreement or treaty or Executive order which is under discussion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What has become of the measure to which the Senator referred? Has it been passed by both Houses?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No. The unofficial agreement to proceed in this fashion was made in the Foreign Relations Committee perhaps 3 or 4 weeks ago, without any action of the committee, simply in a general conference. It was the understanding that it would take about 6 weeks to complete the agreement. It is my understanding that at the end of 6 weeks the relief and rehabilitation agreement embodied in an authorization for appropriation will be submitted to both Houses of Congress, so that both Houses will pass not only on the authorization but also on the text of the agreement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. This very question has arisen many times, and it has always seemed to me to involve a question of fact, that is to say whether there is a distinction between an agreement and a treaty. If there is a distinction, and the distinction is recognized in the Constitution of the United States, then the atmosphere seems to be cleared, because then the provisions referred to by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee apply to one thing, which is a treaty, and do not apply to the other thing, which is an agreement.

I interpose at this point in order to point out the place in the Constitution where the difference between a treaty and a contract is recognized. Section 10 of article I of the Constitution provides:

No State shall enter into any treaty—

I do not need to read the remainder of the section. What I have read is good for the purpose of showing that the Constitution is dealing with the subject under consideration—a treaty. In subsection 3 we find this language:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress—

I am omitting some of the provision—

enter into any agreement or compact—

I omit some more language—

with a foreign power.

I do not conclude the reading of the sentence. It is not necessary to do so. I have read into the RECORD sufficient to show that the founding fathers recognized the distinction between a treaty and a compact, and that they made an absolute prohibition against a State entering into a treaty, but that they made only a conditional prohibition to a State entering into a compact or agreement, and to this day, if a State can secure from the Congress permission to do so, it may enter into an agreement or compact with a foreign country.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Tennessee has, of course, properly pointed out the provision of the Constitution which requires the ratification, by two-thirds majority of the Senate, of any instrument which, as the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has pointed out, has the characteristics of a treaty and not an agreement.

Assuming that is the necessary constitutional power of the Senate, then may not the Senate properly consider whether there is any proper way to avoid complete absence of any assurance on the part of the Senate as to what it will do, or whether such assurance can be given before the actual occurrence of the event at some indefinite time in the future, after the treaty has run the gamut of the rules of the Senate with respect to consideration and debate?

In other words, without anyone's having any idea of questioning or circumventing the constitutional right of the Senate to pass upon a proposed treaty before it becomes a treaty, may not the Senate recognize what the significance of the complete exercise of that power, without anything more, is to the country and to the world? May it not take into consideration the kind of world organization we are now contemplating, to which 20, 30, 40, or 50 states might be signatory powers, and the consequence if we wait until the war is over and the conference is held, and until 20, 30, 40, or 50 powers have agreed to an instrument, before we ever indicate in any way fairly and clearly our policy, and if we say we will keep the world and our President in complete ignorance until the document comes back to us and until we debate it and finally vote upon it one way or the other by a two-thirds vote? Is not the very existence of that constitutional power of the Senate enough, under the present circumstances of the world, to make the Senate try to find some way to give other advice and direction which will tend to minimize the possible danger of a method which failed us in respect to the League of Nations?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida, and I assume that the reason why he is advocating the action we are taking now is in order to meet the needs of that situation, and I believe such procedure is constructive.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I heard the Senator make a statement a few moments ago which I am sure I correctly understood. It was to the effect that in his opinion the adoption of either the pending resolution or the resolution as proposed to be amended would in no wise empower the President to make any agreement or

treaty, whatever it might be, which would not be required to be sent back to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. BURTON. That is my position; that either under the resolution of the committee or under the resolution as proposed to be amended, the document would come back to the Senate. I propose to state that specifically later on, and also to express my entire willingness to emphasize that point, as suggested by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and to write in a separate paragraph to that effect if the Senator wishes to have that done.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. That had always been my view; but when I read in the RECORD the colloquy which occurred yesterday between the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I found that there seems to be a precedent on the basis of which, were the Senate to agree to a resolution similar to one now pending, it would be possible for it to be said that under it we were consenting, let us say, to an alliance between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, and then it could be proclaimed, because the resolution would be broad enough to include that.

Mr. BURTON. I am frank to say to the Senator that I can recognize the possibility of a legal argument that our action was so specific and concrete that someone might interpret it as advice and consent before the document was before us, that it so clearly describes the document that it might just as well have been before us.

I can see nothing in the amendment which is before the Senate which would approach that, but I would not have the slightest objection to incorporating in the amendment the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, so it would be plain, and so there could be no argument on that score.

Mr. WHEELER. In view of the precedent which has been called to the attention of the Senate and the citation by Mr. Hackworth, who was the counsel for the State Department for a great number of years, certainly something of that kind ought to be put in the resolution.

Mr. BURTON. In referring for a further moment to the matter of relief and rehabilitation, let me say that I believe this question is an example of an emergency issue of great importance, both to the rest of the world and to the United States. Not only does it involve important international relations affecting the conduct of the war and the condition of the people in occupied territories, but it involves serious financial questions for all nations contributing to, as well as for those benefiting from, its large expenditures.

It is natural and appropriate that the United States will wish to help the people of the occupied territories in meeting their emergency needs for food, clothing, and shelter. It is equally clear that neither the United States nor the Allies will be able to meet these needs fully or for an extended period. There is a serious limitation upon our capacity to supply these needs for foreign relief and rehabilitation in addition to supplying the needs of our own military and civilian population together with the needs of our allies represented in the lend-lease program. Any exaggeration of the extent to which the United States and others may supply the desired relief and rehabilitation of occupied territories is bound to lead to disappointment and to bitterness where precisely the opposite result should be the case. Therefore, in this field in particular, there attaches great importance to early post-war planning and to preparation among the United Nations, including the United States of America, to determine just what the procedures, the contributions, and the limitations to the relief and rehabilitation program shall be.

In these three fields of emergency international policy it has been essential for many weeks that international action be taken. In my opinion it would have been helpful if the Senate of the United States had expressed itself to some extent upon these issues, and had taken a more active personal part in the planning of the action, or if it had been given that opportunity, at least to a greater degree than was the case, by the Executive. The need for continued planning exists, and it should be a part of any program of post-war activity, whether or not it becomes a part of the general peace negotiations, of the long-term post-war program, or is included expressly in any declaration of senatorial policy on the subject.

WORLD-WIDE MILITARY STABILITY

We now come to what I regard as practically a critical consideration, a major consideration, in the world-wide stability program: World-wide military stability.

The long-term problems of world-wide stability are divisible into those involving military, economic, social, and political stability. Of these, the questions of military stability are separable from the rest. They present an important aspect which bears not only upon the long-term stability of the world but also upon immediate post-war stability and upon the conduct of the war itself.

Of all the factors in the whole post-war field the one that is more clear than all others is that on the day when the fighting is over and the war won and the armistice comes, there will then be, for a moment at least, military stability in the area of the world covered by that victory and that armistice. From this it also follows that if the United Nations, which will have constituted the United Nations military championship team which will have won that victory, shall remain united, that fact will carry with it the best possible assurance of the continuity of the military stability of that moment. On the other hand, to the extent that the United Nations shall cease to be united in peace as they were in war, there inevitably will be introduced an element of uncertainty as to the military stability of the world. Such disintegration of unity among the United Nations would not, thank God, necessarily mean war among them. It would, however, necessarily mean the creation of uncertainty among them as to the military prospects of the future. This would make it necessary for each nation to offset that uncertainty to the best of its ability.

As long as the Axis Powers were able to attack the free nations of the world separately, the Axis Powers were successful. One by one the Axis occupied the territory of the free nations; one by one the Axis took from those nations their freedom to exercise their cherished sovereignty; one by one, in varying degrees, the Axis reduced the population of those territories to slavery. On the other hand, when the United Nations finally united their strength, their combined resistance became successful. It is upon that continued unity of effort that the United Nations rely for their victory in the war. From a purely military standpoint, therefore, even apart from all other considerations, it would seem clear that the primary policy of military stability in each of the United Nations should be to insure their military unity of action in time of peace as well as in time of war. The planning for this and the need of this is so great that it should be given primary consideration in any discussion of world-wide post-war stability.

It is important that this unity extend to all of the United Nations and not merely to some of them. To the extent that any are omitted, an element of military uncertainty immediately is introduced which not only is unnecessary but which compels those separated from the rest to provide, as best they can, for their military security apart from the United Nations. This is the natural first step away from peace and toward World War No. 3. In the case of large powers, this would mean continued and large expenditures for military purposes substantially in excess of what otherwise would be necessary. In the case of the smaller or weaker powers it would mean a search by them for strong allies. Those, in turn, would seek further alliances or provide larger armaments for their protection and the protection of those joining with them.

Such a course of generally increasing armaments would also have a bad effect in our case, for example, upon our chances for internal industrial recovery and stability. As has just been brought out by the questions of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the need for retaining or increasing our military strength as a result of the lack of military unity among the United Nations would place an increased burden of public expense upon us at precisely the time when our greatest need would be for a decrease rather than an increase in governmental expenditures of every kind. Such a need might force us to a continued program of deficiency financing at the very time when our internal stability called, above all things, for a balanced Budget. It might destroy our best chance of recovery.

From the point of view of internal recovery, as well as of military policy, it

thus becomes a primary consideration that the United States Senate include in its post-war foreign policy, without fail and without ambiguity, the unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war.

The importance of this principle should not be confused or clouded by premature discussions of the details of post-war military organization or by the use of such a widely misunderstood term as that of an "international police force."

The need which exists does not turn upon the provision of an international police force in the sense associated with the policing of cities and other local communities. The suggestion of the need for an international gestapo is completely without foundation. The need for defining the form of the military force which may be available in connection with the continued unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war is inappropriate and unnecessary. The only essential consideration is one that hardly requires explanation. It is that on the day of victory the United Nations will be exercising a unity of military strength which will make it unnecessary for them to arm against each other, and which will provide the greatest protection in the history of the world against successful military aggression or violation of the peace of the world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the hour is growing late. It will be necessary to have an executive session. I rise to propose a unanimous consent agreement. I know that the Senator from Ohio has not concluded his remarks, and will not be able to do so for approximately an hour. I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at 12 o'clock the Senator from Ohio be recognized, and that he may proceed with his remarks at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no intention of objecting, if the Senator is weary.

Mr. BURTON. I am perfectly willing to proceed, if the Senator prefers to have me do so, but I shall have a substantial amount left for tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with this request, let me say that it is highly important that this resolution be passed at the earliest practicable moment. Mr. Hull is now at Moscow, in conference with the representatives of other great nations associated with us in this war, and which presumably will be associated with us in any post-war peace arrangement which may be made. The longer this debate is dragged along, the more likely it is that there will be created in the minds of those at Moscow and elsewhere abroad the impression that there is a real, substantial division of sentiment in the United States Senate and throughout the country as to whether we shall adopt a post-war resolution. For that reason I wish to serve notice now, not with any idea of inconveniencing Senators, but with the idea of conserving time, that I shall undertake to insist that the debate proceed until 5 o'clock each afternoon, unless there are some mitigating circumstances.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator need not withdraw his request.

Mr. HATCH. I notice that it is now 10 minutes before 5. I thought we could go ahead until 5 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not yield any further. I am making this suggestion for the future. I am trying to be amenable and agreeable. What I have said is of the utmost importance. While that conference is under way, we are here wrangling over whether an "an" should be inserted somewhere in the resolution, and whether "organization" and "authority" are of equal dignity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow the Senator from Ohio have the floor and proceed with his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the request?

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] be permitted to resume the floor tomorrow upon the convening of the Senate, and proceed with his address.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator's request include any limitation on how long the Senator from Ohio shall speak?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Only time will tell that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ELSTON of Ohio, and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Navy and the Marine Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Haggerty to be comptroller, Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Barc to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack R. Caufield to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE—JAMES W. JOHNSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James W. Johnson to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I do not wish to keep the Senate in session unnecessarily, but in connection with the nomination of Mr. James W. Johnson, which has just been confirmed, I should like to have a short statement which I have prepared printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WAGNER'S statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to endorse and support the nomination of James W. Johnson as collector of internal revenue for the third New York collection district, in place of Joseph T. Higgins, who recently resigned to become a candidate for the city court bench.

Mr. Johnson has had a long and distinguished career in the service of his community, State, and country. After graduation in 1917 from the academy of Howard University in Washington, D. C., he entered the College of the City of New York. Shortly thereafter he enlisted in the Army and saw active combat service overseas with the Field Artillery.

On returning to civilian life, he received his Bachelor of Laws degree from New York University in 1926. He engaged in the practice of law, and served as attorney for the H. O. L. C. and as special counsel for the Paul Lawrence Dunbar Apartments and the Dunbar National Bank.

He was appointed chief, office deputy collector of the third New York collection district on April 21, 1939, later was promoted to the position of assistant to the collector with supervision over the office and field divisions.

He completed specialized courses in taxation and received the degree of Master of Laws from the School of Law of New York University, in June 1940. Since the resignation of Collector Higgins, Mr. Johnson has served as acting collector.

In addition to this background of experience and legal scholarship, Mr. Johnson has been active in community affairs and national defense.

He served as regimental adjutant of the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry, New York National Guard, converted and redesignated Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Coast Artillery (AA), from November 1933 to December 1940, under four commanding officers. He holds the New York State Long and Faithful Service decoration for 10 years' service in the New York National Guard. He is a graduate of the National Guard and Reserve Officers Course, 1937, of the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga. Since the onset of World War No. 2, he has served as deputy warden and military aide of the thirty-second precinct of the New York City Civilian Defense Service. During 1942, with the assistance of volunteer instructors from the Fifteenth Regiment, New York Guard, he conducted an intensive course of basic military drill instruction for the air raid wardens of the thirty-second precinct.

Mr. Johnson is married and has been a resident of New York City since 1911. He is a former national president of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity and among his affiliations are the American Legion, Veterans' Corps, Fifteenth Regiment, Harlem Lawyers Association, National Bar Association, Beaver Ramapo Democratic Club, Delta Sigma Kappa Fraternity, and the Reveille Club of New York.

The appointment of Mr. Johnson to head the second largest collection district in the country is a splendid and deserving recognition of the merit principle in advancement in Government administration. It reflects also, in these world-shaking times, the ever-increasing recognition of equality of opportunity in our national life, for all men and women of ability, regardless of race or color.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas M. Carey to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 27 (legislative day of October 26), 1943:

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Lawrence B. Richardson, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, to rank from the 15th day of November 1943.

Capt. Timothy J. Keleher to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of June 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Stanley S. Nicolay, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 10th day of April 1941.

Frederick W. Riggs, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

John W. Southworth, a citizen of Oregon.
John F. Paul, a citizen of Iowa.
Ernest T. Savignano, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Hugh W. Breakenridge, a citizen of Iowa.
Robert "E" McDowell, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 27 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John J. Haggerty to be comptroller, Post Office Department.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John J. Barc to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan.

Jack R. Caufield to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James W. Johnson to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York.

Thomas M. Carey to be collector of internal revenue for the eighteenth district of Ohio.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Vernon F. Jones, Thawville.

OHIO

Ella M. Manson, Apple Creek.
Edgar K. Brown, Arcanum.
Jesse H. O'Roark, Covington.
Fred L. Diffenderfer, Greentown.
Howard J. Swearingen, Kensington.
O. Pauline Myers, Long Bottom.
Mary Doman, Lyndhurst.
Joann E. Johnston, Macedonia.
Frank W. White, Milford.
Mary C. Melody, New Paris.
Emma Duff, South Solon.
Robert S. McKelvey, Toronto.
Elinor E. Arick, Valley City.

UTAH

Edna F. Nicholls, Farmington.
Reuben J. Peterson, Santaquin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Roland Q. Leavell, pastor, First Baptist Church, Tampa, Fla., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in days past, our hope in years to come, our refuge from the stormy blasts, and our eternal home, Thou Lord God of all the earth, the Mighty Eternal Creator, the One in whom we live and move and have our being, we turn to Thee this day with gratitude in our hearts for Thy blessings and with petitions upon our lips for Thy gracious presence and providential power to rest upon us. We beseech Thee, Heavenly Father, for wisdom and guidance, and Thy love to be imparted to the Congress of the United States today, and to all of those who are in authority. Help us each to remember that when the righteous are in authority the people rejoice. May this be a glad day as we turn to Thee, and from Thee receive the spirit of sobriety and righteousness and godliness, both in our relationship to Thee and in our attitude and service toward our fellow man. We pray Thy blessing upon the nations of the earth; upon all the peoples who need Thy help. Hasten the day when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, and Thy kingdom shall come and Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. And until that day help us to be faithful to our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. We ask in His name that is above every name, and for His glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 15, 1943:

H. R. 3291. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

On October 18, 1943:

H. R. 305. An act for the relief of Howard Morgan;

H. R. 693. An act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942;

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson; and

H. R. 2250. An act to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service.

On October 19, 1943:

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Jacob Wolozin;

H. R. 2649. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or

near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.," approved April 20, 1942; and

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier.

On October 21, 1943:

H. R. 304. An act for the relief of J. E. Martin.

On October 23, 1943:

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Cross to George F. Thompson; and

H. R. 3029. An act to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

On October 25, 1943:

H. R. 533. An act for the relief of John P. von Rosenberg; and

H. R. 3230. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

On October 26, 1943:

H. R. 2838. An act relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; and

H. R. 3208. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FORD was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

NAVY DAY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and in that time have the Clerk read a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES FLEET,
HEADQUARTERS OF THE
COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1943.

The Honorable CARL VINSON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee
on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Navy Day presents an opportunity, of which I am desirous of taking advantage, to send a message to the Members of Congress in appreciation of the hearty cooperation and support which they have given to the Navy since the outset of the war. The fact that the requests of the Navy have been acted upon promptly, unanimously, and without the slightest indication of partisanship, has been not only a source of encouragement to the personnel of the Navy, but has assured us that you have confidence in us and that the legislative branch of the Government is whole-heartedly behind us in our efforts to win the war.

It is a distinct privilege to take this opportunity to express, in the name of my fellow officers and of the enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, our appreciation of your cooperation.

Your unfailing aid and support has been an inspiration, and when the history of this war is written, the record will show that the Navy's achievements have been, in great measure, brought about by the confidence that the Congress has shown toward the Navy.

The Navy salutes the Members of the Congress as we march on together to what will be a complete victory and, we trust, a speedy one.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. KING,
Admiral, United States Navy; Commander in Chief, United States Fleet; and Chief of Naval Operations.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this bill is entirely noncontroversial.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is.

Mr. MICHENER. And it has the unanimous support of the committee?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], a member of the committee, on the minority side.

Mr. HOWELL. It is true this bill has the unanimous support, not only of the subcommittee but of the full committee. That also applies to the amendment which is being offered.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to. The bill is primarily for this purpose: The men in the Public Health Service, who are in the armed forces, are neither fish nor fowl. There are, at the present time, 468 officers with the Coast Guard, from the Public Health; 55 on duty with the Army; and the 24 additional officers are on foreign duty. If those men are killed in action, as they have been, they neither come under the military benefits, though they are serving in the military forces, nor do they come under employees' compensation. Five or 6 of them have been killed, and 6 of them have been captured in the Philippines and are now in prison. I think arrangements have been made to take care of the families of those 6 men now in prison. That is the amendment which was offered to the Senate bill, in order that we might do as required by the Budget during the war; not in emergency, but during this war.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Does that include any of the Red Cross field workers?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The Red Cross field workers do not come under the Public Health.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Are they not in the same position as the Public Health workers?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That may be, but I doubt if our committee would have jurisdiction of them. This is a Public Health Service bill.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, this bill in no way affects Red Cross workers?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No, sir; it does not. I may say further, it does not create any new bureaus or anything like that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It in no way affects veterans' legislation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; it does not.

Mr. MICHENER. And it in no way affects the rights of the States?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How many individuals will this affect?

Mr. BULWINKLE. At the present time there are about 13 officers that it affects. Of course, if some more are killed, they would come under this legislation.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand, this amendment will put these Public Health officers on the same basis as enlisted men or commissioned officers in the Army?

Mr. BULWINKLE. If they are on duty with the armed forces; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand, they are not under the United States Compensation Act at all?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand a great many civilian employees working for contractors, for instance, at Wake Island, were under the United States compensation law and are getting compensation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the amendment is a very good one.

Mr. MICHENER. It must be a very good bill and amendment when the able Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is generally very careful, very belligerent, and very controversial, comes in with a unanimous report. I am pleased to withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I just say, Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman withdraws his reservation that the subcommittee had hearings on this subject under H. R. 6409, which is slightly different from S. 400. We decided then to recodify the whole Public Health law. It should be done, but on account of the emergency existing in this situation the subcommittee and the committee deemed it best not to go into that now.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency shall consist of the Office of the Surgeon General, the National Institute of Health, and two bureaus, to be known as the Bureau of Medical Services and the Bureau of State Services. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator, is hereby authorized and directed to assign to the Office of the Surgeon General, to the National Institute of Health, and to the two bureaus, respectively, the several functions of the Public Health Service, and to establish within the

Office of the Surgeon General, the National Institute of Health, and the two bureaus, respectively, such divisions, sections, and other units as may be required to perform their functions; and, under such supervision and direction, he may abolish existing divisions, sections, and other units, and, hereafter, may establish, transfer, and consolidate divisions, sections, and other units and reassign their functions for the efficiency of the Service.

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Institute of Health and the chiefs of each of the bureaus, established by section 1 of this act, and the officer assigned as Chief Medical Officer of the United States Coast Guard, shall be commissioned medical officers detailed by the Surgeon General from the regular corps, and while so detailed shall be Assistant Surgeons General and shall have the same grade and shall receive the same pay and allowances as the Assistant to the Surgeon General.

SEC. 3. When commissioned officers below the grade of medical director are detailed by the Surgeon General from the regular corps to serve as chiefs of divisions, not more than six of such officers at one time while so detailed shall have the temporary grade and receive temporarily the pay and allowances of a medical director; and there is authorized to be established in the Office of the Surgeon General a Dental Division and a Sanitary Engineering Division; the chief of each such Dental and Sanitary Engineering Division shall be a commissioned dental officer and a commissioned sanitary engineer officer, respectively, of the regular corps detailed by the Surgeon General, and while each such dental and sanitary engineer officer is so detailed, he shall have the grade, pay, and allowances of an Assistant Surgeon General as provided by section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. In time of war or national emergency determined by the President, any commissioned officer of the regular corps of the Public Health Service may be appointed to higher temporary grade with the pay and allowances thereof without vacating his permanent appointment, and any officer so promoted to a higher grade at any time after December 7, 1941, shall be deemed for all purposes to have accepted his promotion to higher grade upon the date of approval, unless he shall expressly decline such promotion, and shall receive the pay and allowances of the higher grade from such date unless he is entitled under some other provision of law to receive the pay and allowances of the higher grade from an earlier date. No such officer who shall have subscribed to the oath of office required by section 1757, Revised Statutes, shall be required to renew such oath or to take a new oath upon his promotion to a higher grade, if his service after the taking of such an oath shall have been continuous. Hereafter reserve officers of the Public Health Service may be distributed in the several grades without regard to the proportion which at any time obtains or has obtained among the commissioned medical officers of such Service. For the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter graduates of reputable osteopathic colleges shall be eligible for appointment as reserve officers in the Public Health Service.

SEC. 5. The record of each commissioned officer of the regular corps initially appointed above the grade of Assistant Surgeon, after the first 3 years of service in such grade, shall be reviewed under regulations approved by the President, and any such officer who is found to be unqualified for further service shall be separated from the Service and paid 6 months' pay and allowances.

SEC. 6. In case of the absence or disability of the Surgeon General and the Assistant to the Surgeon General, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of both, the Assistant Surgeons General shall act as Surgeon General in the order of their designation for such purpose by the Surgeon General.

SEC. 7. Section 9 of the act of April 9, 1930 (U. S. C. 42, sec. 37; 46 Stat. 151), is hereby amended by the addition of the following language at the end of said section:

"(d) Original appointments in the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve, may be made to a junior grade which shall correspond to that held by a second lieutenant in the Medical Department of the Army and persons so appointed shall be entitled to the same pay and allowances as a second lieutenant in the Medical Department of the Army. After not less than one nor more than 2 years of service each such appointee in the regular corps may be examined under regulations prescribed by the President and upon such examination shall either be promoted to the grade of assistant surgeon or be separated from the Service."

SEC. 8. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve, shall be entitled to the same pay, allowances, and all other rights, benefits, and privileges, now or hereafter authorized or provided for officers of corresponding grade (and their surviving dependents) of the Medical Corps of the Army, regular and reserve, respectively, including but not limited to burial payments, death benefits, pensions, retirement, insurance, disability and survivors' benefits, civil reemployment rights, civil liability, travel and other allowances, including allowances of military attachés of corresponding grades while serving as public health attachés with the State Department at foreign posts; and all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service detailed for duty with the Army or Navy under provisions of law shall be held and considered to be in the active military service of the United States, and such officers while so detailed shall be subject to all of the laws and regulations now or hereafter operative for the government of the respective services to which they are detailed: *Provided*, That this section shall apply in like manner to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve, and to their surviving dependents, if any, who were serving outside of the continental limits of the United States on December 7, 1941, or who since December 7, 1941, have been made prisoners of war or who have been disabled or who have lost their lives while on active duty, and: *Provided further*, That all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service not detailed for duty with the Army or Navy as above provided shall continue to serve under the direction and control of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service unless specifically detailed for duty with another executive department or independent establishment in accordance with provisions of law.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Public Health Service Act of 1943." For the purpose of any reorganization under section 1 of this act the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is hereby authorized to make such transfer of funds between appropriations as may be necessary for the continuance of transferred functions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, strike out beginning with line 12, down through line 19 on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 8. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'full military benefits' means all rights, privileges, immunities, and benefits provided under any law of the United States in the case of commissioned military and naval personnel of the United States (including their surviving beneficiaries) on account of active military or naval service, including, but not limited to, burial payments in the event of death, six months' pay and allowances in case of death, veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, retirement, including retirement for disability, the rights provided under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, as amended, the National Service Life Insurance Act as amended, travel allowances, including per diem allowances for travel without regard to repeated travel between two or more places in the same vicinity, allowances for uniforms, exemption of certain pay from Federal income taxation, and other benefits, privileges and exemptions under the Internal Revenue laws.

"(2) The term 'limited military benefits' means full military benefits, except veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, and eligibility under the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended.

"(b) Beginning with the date of enactment of this act, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries)—

"(1) In time of war, shall be entitled to limited military benefits with respect to all active service in the Public Health Service.

"(2) While such officers are detailed for duty with the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such duty.

"(3) While such officers are serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska in time of war, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such service.

"(c) In time of war, the President may by Executive Order declare the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service a part of the military forces of the United States and provide the extent to which it shall be subject to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Upon the issuance of such an Executive Order, all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to active service rendered while the Public Health Service is a part of the military forces of the United States.

"SEC. 9. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries), shall be entitled to receive the same benefits for injury or death in the performance of their duties as civil officers and employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That any such officer or beneficiary of such officer eligible to receive any benefit authorized by this section who is also eligible to receive any payment or benefit (except the proceeds of any insurance policy) under any provision of law other than such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, on account of the same injury or death, shall elect which benefit he shall receive.

"SEC. 10. The surviving beneficiaries of any commissioned officer of the Public Health Service, regular or reserve, who, since December 7, 1941, and prior to the enactment of this act, has lost his life while on active duty in the Public Health Service or while detailed to the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall receive 6 months' pay and allowances as provided in the act of June 4, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., sup. II, title 34, sec. 943), and, unless entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, shall receive the benefits provided under section 9 of this act."

Page 6, line 20, strike out "9" and insert "11."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill S. 400 and that these remarks appear in the proceedings in connection with the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. This bill which has just been presented to the House by the unanimous consent of the membership and adopted by a unanimous vote is intended to correct certain inequalities and defects in the existing Public Health Service as well as to adapt other features presently in the law to war purposes. For those reasons, I am in favor of the bill.

On the grounds that the bill may be regarded a war measure, I did not offer any objection to its immediate consideration but I do not approve of all of the provisions of the bill. However, the operation of the bill is limited to a date not later than 6 months after the war.

I direct attention to section 4 of the bill. On line 5, page 4, is found the following language:

> For the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter, graduates of reputable osteopathic colleges shall be eligible for appointment as reserve officers in the Public Health Service.

I seriously questioned the wisdom of including osteopaths in this bill because it presumably places the imprimatur of the Congress upon the campaign of the doctors of osteopathy to be recognized as the professional equals of the doctors of medicine. We all know that the requirements for admission to a college of osteopathy and the course of study and training at those colleges do not remotely compare with the entrance requirements and medical training of the average medical school. This provision was not requested by the Public Health Service and as a matter of fact I believe it is unsatisfactory to that Service. The osteopaths were included in this bill in another body without the advice and consent of the Surgeon General.

The dictionary defines osteopathy in these terms:

> A system of the art of healing which emphasizes the power of the body to heal itself, and whose therapy majors in manipulation.

I will admit that osteopaths do good work and help patients suffering from those ailments that osteopaths are permitted and eligible to treat. But I cannot and will not admit that most of the ills from which our armed forces suffer requiring treatments, involving serious surgical operations, are usual to the practice of an osteopath. I think it unwise to dignify a person with such limited training and experience with a commission and a rank equal that of a doctor of medicine.

There is no intention on my part to reflect in any way upon the fine character and ability of that vast army of fine men and women who are engaged in the field of osteopathy. I congratulate every citizen, especially those ministering to the sick, for the work he is doing to win the war. At this time, we should not lose sight of the fact that our action here, today, might be asserted as a reason why, in other official circles, a diploma in osteopathy should be given the same weight and rating as a diploma in medicine.

I know it is the view of practically every member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in voting to report this bill to the House, containing legislation which is urgent, that the vote was cast upon the basis of compromise with another body on the osteopath section of the bill, and not because the committee members favored the bill in its entirety.

I am sorry that the time element made it necessary to rush this bill through the House, but on the basis of the emergency I presume we must bow to expediency.

It is my most fervent hope that the Surgeon General of the United States will administer this act, particularly the section relating to osteopaths, in his usually competent and realistic manner.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks by inserting a letter from Dr. Parran in regard to this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1943.

Hon. A. L. BULWINKLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BULWINKLE: As the war progresses it becomes increasingly urgent that the Public Health Service have the benefit of the additional legislation contemplated in your bill, H. R. 3379, and in S. 400. While the more complete codification of the Public Health Service laws as contemplated in H. R. 3379 is highly desirable, some of our legislative needs are so urgent that I hope your committee will give consideration to the possibility of the prompt passage of S. 400.

You will recall that in testimony before your subcommittee on H. R. 649 I pointed out the need for reorganizing and simplifying the administrative structure of the Public Health Service. I also pointed out the fact that Public Health Service officers were serving on several of the battle fronts with our armed forces, and that an increasing number are on active and very hazardous duty with the Coast Guard, both on Coast Guard cutters and on landing barges. Yet our officers on these assignments do not have a clearly defined status under present law and there is some doubt as to whether or not their surviving dependents are entitled to benefits which accrue to surviving dependents of Army, Navy, and Coast Guard personnel.

Moreover, a considerable number of our medical and sanitary engineering officers are serving in the war zones but are not attached to the military forces. This is particularly true of a group of officers serving in north Africa and Italy on assignment to the State Department for epidemic control and health duties in connection with the civil population of occupied areas. These officers have absolutely no protection for themselves or their families. In fact, our regular officers, under present law, who are in this status are excluded from both the benefits available to the military forces and to civil employees under the provisions of the United States employees' compensation laws.

The surviving dependents of none of our officers are entitled to the 6 months' pay and allowances which is provided by law for all of the other services (including the Coast and Geodetic Survey) paid in accordance with the provisions of the Joint Service Pay Act. As a result of war casualties several very pathetic cases have developed in which widows and children are left destitute. These cases are important in themselves. Moreover, failure of the Congress to provide some protection for them creates, as you well appreciate, a growing problem of morale which affects the whole corps. Our officers are subject to orders and must serve wherever assigned on any duty no matter how hazardous. They are doing this cheerfully, but in fairness to them, I feel I should bring to your attention the need for providing some measure of protection for them and their families in the event of disability or death in line of duty.

It is believed that section 8 of S. 400 needs revision in order to limit the benefits provided therein, so as to bring such benefits into accord with the statement of policy expressed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his letter to the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, a copy of which is on file with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Your continued sympathetic interest in the problem facing the Public Health Service is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present a report from the House Committee on Military Affairs on House Resolution 328.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to furnish the House of Representatives with the following information:

(1) The number of beds now available in all hospitals under the jurisdiction of the United States or the District of Columbia, or in private institutions under contract with the United States, and the number of bed patients in such hospitals;

(2) The number of beds to be available in hospitals now under construction by the United States, together with the approximate dates on which such hospitals will be placed in service;

(3) Plans for future construction of Government hospitals; and

(4) The maximum number of war casualties which it is estimated must be hospitalized at any one time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report may be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the committee report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT NO. 803 TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE RESOLUTION 328

The Committee on Military Affairs to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 328) requesting certain information from the President with respect to Government hospitals having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it be laid upon the table.

Your committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 328 (a privileged resolution), and having heard testimony

thereon, recommends to the House that the resolution be tabled.

The War Department produced testimony in answer to the numerous questions propounded in the resolution, and the other departments of Government concerned who were called upon for a report, have filed with the House Military Affairs Committee detailed information and answers to the various questions which reports are on file in the records of the committee and available for consideration and study by all Members of the House of Representatives.

The facts called for in the resolution and disclosed by the testimony before the committee by a witness on behalf of the War Department are of a confidential character and not for publication.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand this report is available to all Members of the House.

Mr. MAY. It is in the committee files.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is all I wanted, Mr. Speaker. I felt that the Members should know exactly how many beds were available now and how many beds would be available in the future because we must see that the veterans returning have an adequate number of beds as they come back and that we are building enough hospital facilities for the future. I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. I am sure that information will be available.

Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was agreed to, and the resolution was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I was granted permission to insert in the RECORD a speech by the commander of the American Legion. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the 2-page limit, that it will cost $112.50 to print. I renew my request notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the matter may be printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, in one to include an editorial in connection with harmonious labor conditions in San Francisco, and in the other matter in connection with the oil situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the renegotiation of war contracts and to include therein two letters and a short article on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include a condensation of an address given before the American Bankers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 28—Czechoslovakian Independence Day—is an occasion for an understanding examination of the accomplishments of this valiant and progressive nation.

During 4 years of Nazi occupation, the Czechoslovak Republic has never ceased to exist de jure for the United States. At this very moment Czechoslovakia maintains accredited representatives in this country.

Thomas G. Masaryk, together with other Czechoslovakian leaders, brought forth the Czechoslovakian Declaration of Independence at Washington, D. C., on October 18, 1918. Later, on October 28, 1918, the Washington declaration was officially proclaimed in Prague. But even before the Washington declaration, Americans who shared Masaryk's proud traditions as well as his ancestry contributed to the greatness of the United States. Men and women who were born in the land of Masaryk have tilled American soil, developed American business and industry, and fought and died to perpetuate the American spirit of liberty.

Throughout almost 21 years of peaceful relations between the United States and the Czechoslovak Republic—prior to the Nazi invasion—the people of the Czechoslovak nation have impressed their friends in the United States with their high standard of decency and justice and the fair treatment of minorities.

When the Nazis invaded Czechoslovakia, those of us who knew the dauntless courage of her people realized that the Nazis might occupy the lands, but that they could never overpower the free will of Czechoslovaks. How well were our expectations attained! No matter what burdens of toil and torture were heaped upon them, the Czechoslovaks fought back. They fought back with every weapon at their disposal. In spite of all that Heydrich and Himmler could do to make life unendurable and death painful, the unwavering patriotism of the Czechoslovak people has survived. It strikes at the invader from the farms of Bohemia and Moravia, where Czechoslovak farmers hide their harvest or destroy it rather than have it fall into the hands of their oppressors. It strikes at the invader in the form of sabotage of locomotives, telegraph wires, and war production plants. Thousands have died for this resistance. Still it goes on. It is going on today within Czechoslovakia.

On the fighting fronts Czechoslovaks are arrayed against their Nazi foes. Czechoslovaks fought gallantly at Tobruk. Czechoslovak pilots have escorted American bombers on missions over Germany. In many parts of the world Czechoslovaks fight for the same God-given liberties which inspire our own countrymen to battle.

On Czechoslovakian Independence Day—October 28, 1943—we of the United States honor our brave ally of Czechoslovakia, our sister republic, a land in which even the children are heroes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the other special orders today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker I join with the very able Member from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] in his tribute and in his expression of deep affection and high regard for Czechoslovakia. There is no more able Representative in the House than the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. We all know of his deep study of international questions.

I feel we owe a debt of gratitude to him for his many speeches in this House on the subject of Czechoslovakia and the Czech people. He has not only kept us well informed of conditions that exist in the district in Nebraska which he so well represents, but also regarding the conditions of the Czech people whom he knows and in whose welfare he is so deeply interested, both in the United States and Czechoslovakia. He is a member of the very powerful House Committee on Appropriations. With his fine knowledge of foreign countries, he has been an active and helpful influence in securing appropriations for our Foreign Service.

We know of President Masaryk's stay in the United States, we know of his admiration for our country, and we have a great admiration for him and his country. It was my privilege to know his son, Jan Masaryk, who was chargé d'affaires at the last World War period. As an indication of the friendliness and interest that he and his country showed for the United States, he discovered that the wounded World War veterans at a certain hospital liked red roses; so he used to send me at intervals red roses to take to our wounded veterans. That is typical of the kindliness and friendliness of the people of Czechoslovakia. I want to pay high tribute to their courage and their wish for a government which is as free as ours, and I hope that that freedom may come soon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include part of an interview printed in the Youngstown Vindicator with our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

A SPEECH WHICH ALL SHOULD READ

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the country a very important speech which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A4484. In recognition of the significance of this speech, it was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. HARVE TIBEOTT. It is a broadcast delivered by the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. GERALD W. LANDIS, on the subject of The Great Food Muddle.

This speech is replete with important facts on one of the most serious problems confronting the country today. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] deserves the commendation of the country for having brought this matter to our attention in this way. I feel that his great work in helping to straighten out this food muddle and in reducing the waste of foodstuffs ranks with the remarkable work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] in bringing about a reduction in other Government extravagances. I hope that insofar as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD circulates, every citizen will have the opportunity to read this revealing speech by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], who is one of the most active members of the special Republican food-study committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD; second, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD; and third, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF MAJORITY LEADER ON NAVY DAY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] who is going to make a Navy Day speech today may precede all other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today after the other special orders heretofore granted have been disposed of for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

REVISION OF POSTAL RATE STRUCTURE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the press and radio reported that the Ways and Means Committee of the House had undertaken to revise the postal rate structure. As ranking minority member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee may I say that I resent this action.

Early in the present Congress I introduced a resolution calling for the examination of the entire postal rate structure. Subsequent to that the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] requested a survey by the Post Office Department so that we might do the job in an efficient, intelligent manner. Up to the moment this report has not been received; therefore I doubt that any revision which the Ways and Means Committee may make at the present time is being done in a comprehensive manner and with full knowledge of all the facts and issues involved.

I hope we are not developing here in the House a group of "superduper" committees that are going to invade the prerogatives of established committees of the House. In my opinion, if the postal rates are to be revised, they should be revised by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS: "LET US NOT BE PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH"

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to you in regard to a subject that will face the thousands of our industries, and in particular the smaller ones, at the termination of the war; namely, "working capital" with which to convert to peacetime production, thereby helping to solve the difficult problem of unemployment that will face the country during the transition period.

For six weeks the Ways and Means Committee listened to witnesses from every type of industry and from every section of the Nation. Naturally, there were numerous complaints as to the arbitrary manner in which contracts were renegotiated with resultant reduction of expected profits. However, what seemed to be universally feared was that renegotiation before taxes, as practiced, did not allow the setting up of post-war reserves as provided in the 1942 tax bill.

Many small and middle-sized companies, under urge from the War or Navy Departments, are producing five or six times their pre-war output. Part of the working capital for this increased output has been supplied by Government guaranteed loans, but in most cases the company's own working capital has, in one way or another, become involved in the war effort, and is no longer available in the form of cash which will be so required for reconversion purposes once the war ends.

It is my belief that the Ways and Means Committee will give consideration to actually providing post-war reserves for companies that have been renegotiated. This was intended in the 1942 tax bill. The question that will shortly be before this House, and of even greater importance, if possible, than reserves, is the termination of war contracts and the settlement of the Government's liability thereunder in a speedy and definite manner.

Before giving consideration to accounting and legal details involved in the cancelation of war contracts, the Congress should give thought to the over-all subject of reconversion back to peacetime economy and how important to this reconversion is the proper handling of the question of termination of contracts.

It is my personal opinion that the war contracts belong to the war era and their speedy settlement will serve to bridge the gap between industry's war operations and industry's reconversion back to peacetime pursuits, which will provide sufficient jobs to absorb our present labor force, as well as providing jobs for our returning soldiers.

War is destructive. It is a destroyer of men we can never replace and we will never forget those who have given their lives in the service of their country. War is a destroyer of materials. Because we realize this we accept with as much equanimity as possible the loss of ships and guns and airplanes. Yet, except in the case of dereliction in duty, none of us would recommend a repayment by an

officer in charge of material lost or destroyed. If my premise that war contracts are part of the war era is correct, I think that we must approach contract cancelation with a certain openness of mind.

Our industries, like our soldiers and their officers, have done a monumental job, but once the guns stop firing another and equally important responsibility will face them. I have full confidence that with the same genius with which they converted from peace production to the manufacture of the materials of war, which caused our Army and Navy to be the best equipped in the history of all wars, and also provides supplies so liberally to our allies—with this same genius American industry will convert back to peace. To do this they must quickly settle old scores, have their working capital which is tied up in war inventories released to them in cash, and, above all, be assured that, except in the case of fraud or misstatement, a settlement is a settlement.

During the summer months and at the time of the hearings on renegotiation of contracts I had the occasion to talk to both procurement officers and contractors who had been renegotiated. From these conversations I came to two conclusions: First, that the procurement officers, after 2 years of experience, were a pretty competent lot and capable of doing a good job of cost accounting; second, that where contracts were terminated, and over 10,000 have so far been terminated by the War Department alone, the complaint seemed to be a lack of liberality and a close-fistedness on the part of the Government. This is a good sign as far as the general taxpayer is concerned. On the other hand, the contractor, who is also a citizen and a taxpayer and the provider of jobs, must have the right of appeal to a court or to special courts. In such a case not only justice but speed should be of the essence.

On October 15 Judge Patterson, Under Secretary of War, appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee. I feel that his statement, together with the draft of a bill for the termination of contracts, deserves the study of every Member of this body. I, myself, am deeply interested because of my membership on the committee that writes our tax legislation. Without fear of serious contradiction I can assure you, my colleagues, that unless we assume a broad-minded attitude on this subject of termination and are willing to admit in advance that there will be some inequalities and that some "chiselers" will "chisel," settlement of war contracts will be delayed due to trying to establish the last penny of claim. Delay will cause uncertainty as to the amount of working capital the company will really have available, which in turn will cause hesitation on the part of industry to undertake new commitments. As a result, business activity will decline, unemployment will develop, and you and I, my brothers, will have to appropriate funds for unemployment relief far in excess of any amount that might be lost to the Government through quick and final settlement of war contracts. Let us strive to avoid any "penny wise, pound foolish" policy.

During the hearings on renegotiation of war contracts, complaint was expressed that the procurement officers and renegotiators had no definite set of regulations on which settlements were based. Apparently this objection has been recognized, as the Under Secretary in his statement of October 15 recommends the creation of an interdepartmental committee to adopt uniform regulations for termination of contracts. Based upon these regulations, together with the experience gained by procurement officers in making contracts and later on renegotiating them, there should be no great difficulty in arriving at a negotiated agreement for cancelation.

The bill offered by the War Department provided for partial payments on account of contract termination prior to final settlement up to 90 percent of the certified claim. Payment may be made to the prime contractor or directly to a subcontractor. This is a most important feature of the bill and will bring quick relief to many small companies whose financial set-up might not be sufficiently strong to await a termination of settlement of its prime contractor. Provision is made in the bill to charge 6 percent interest on any overpayment and to have the overpayment considered as a loan callable on demand.

The bill also contains provisions for financing reconversion requirements through commercial bank loans guaranteed by designated departments of the Government when necessary. Personally, I believe that the system of government guaranty should be eliminated as rapidly as possible. The commercial banks of the country are in a strong position as far as commercial loans are concerned. This will afford them the opportunity to get back into the banking business and, in cooperation with investment banking houses, help finance the return to post-war peacetime economy.

There remain two important items of the War Department bill and Judge Patterson's statement. The bill authorizes advance or partial payments to contractors in settlement of termination claims. It is my belief that these payments should be mandatory upon the presentation of a certificate or sworn statement of the contractor which he has drafted and based upon the aforementioned interdepartmental committee uniform regulations. These payments which are in the nature of a loan without interest would, of course, be liquidated by payments received in settlement. Any overpayment or excess loan should bear 6 percent interest until repaid, and be callable upon demand.

The final item and one that will probably cause considerable discussion is the right of the Comptroller General to post audit all settlements.

Judge Patterson, in his statement, quotes authority for his belief that the procurement departments may make contracts as well as terminate them without independent review. Not being a lawyer, I would scarcely have the presumption to pass upon the legal merits of the question as they exist. I do, however, have a very profound conviction that the only way of preventing our national economy from going into a tailspin is by a quick reconversion of industry back to peacetime pursuits. This absolutely cannot be done if any fear exists in the minds of businessmen that the termination contract they have made is not final, and that there is a chance that the money they are using to start a new peacetime venture and pay the wages of their workmen may be taken from them due to a post audit by an independent bureau of the Government.

During the past 7 weeks or more I have listened as a member of the Ways and Means Committee to the testimony of many witnesses. I have heard the industries of our great country blackguarded as being selfish and greedy; I have heard them extolled. After all, and with considered thought, I believe American industrial management is 99½ percent what we are proud it is—fighters, full of manufacturing genius, leaders in social welfare due to enlightened self-interest, and last but not least, the people who have built our great country and given jobs at the highest wages ever known to countless thousands and who, if given a chance, will provide opportunity to our returning soldiers and sailors.

Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a certain element of the radical press, including PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, is now lambasting certain Members of the United States Senate, including our former distinguished colleague, Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for bringing out a resolution that, in my opinion, more nearly expresses the will of the American people than anything that has yet been suggested. The so-called Fulbright resolution was not submitted to the House for amendments, but was rushed through under suspension of the rules, which deprived us of any opportunity to amend or change it in any way. It denied us the opportunity to even offer a motion to recommit or any chance to change or correct it in any way whatsoever.

In my opinion, if the Connally resolution and the Fulbright resolution were

both put up to the Members of this House and a vote taken as between the two, the Connally resolution would be chosen by a majority of at least three or four to one over the Fulbright provisions.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3366.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut and Mr. MURDOCK asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in relation to what our friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] has just said with reference to the termination of war contracts, I wish to add a thought with respect to the liquidation of inventories—goods, plants, machinery, and so forth—which the Government will probably have on hand, which are now estimated to range in the neighborhood of $75,000,000,000, as against an approximately $7,000,000,000 inventory which the Government had on hand at the end of World War No. 1. Adding to the inventory of $75,000,000,000 the estimated $75,000,000,000 of contracts which will have to be terminated will give us a rough figure of $150,000,000,000, based on today's estimates made by some of our students and experts. It seems to me it will be necessary for Congress to enact legislation setting up a liquidation board of some kind or another, because I believe the figures show that in 1940 the total manufactured products of this country amounted to about $76,000,000,000, so with the plants and equipment and inventories we shall have almost as much as the total value of the manufactured goods in this country say in 1940 amounted to. If we liquidate at the rate of $500,000,000 per month, it will take us many years to handle the job.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, since the question of the termination of war contracts has been raised on the floor today, I feel it proper at this time to say to the House that the Committee on Military Affairs is today completing hearings on the pending legislation on the subject. We are all perfectly aware of the gravity of the problem involved. The gentleman from Illinois said the termination of these war contracts is going to be one of the greatest problems of these times. I wish to add to his statement by saying that it is right now one of the grave problems of these times. We are going into executive session within a few hours for the purpose of trying to write legislation that will be fair to the contractors and fair to the Government, and that we hope will be a proper solution of this grave and important question.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and referred to the Committee on Education and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On November 13, 1942, on signing the bill calling for the induction by Selective Service of young men 18 and 19 years old, I appointed a committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, to study the problem of education of our service men and women after the war. The objective was to enable those young people, whose education had been interrupted, to resume their schooling, and to provide an opportunity for the education and technical training of other young men and women of ability, after their discharge from the armed services.

This committee has sent me a preliminary report which I am herewith transmitting to the Congress for its consideration, and, I hope, for its early action.

We, at home, owe a special and continuing obligation to these men and women in the armed services.

During the war we have seen to it that they have received the best training and equipment, the best food, shelter, and medical attention, the best protection and care which planning, ingenuity, physical resources, and money could furnish in time of war. But after the war shall have been won, the best way that we can repay a portion of that debt is to see to it, by planning and by action now, that those men and women are demobilized into an economy which is sound and prosperous, with a minimum of unemployment and dislocation; and that, with the assistance of government, they are given the opportunity to find a job for which they are fitted and trained, in a field which offers some reasonable assurance of well-being and continuous employment.

For many, what they desire most in the way of employment will require special training and further education. As a part of a general program for the benefit of the members of our armed services, I believe that the Nation is morally obligated to provide this training and education and the necessary financial assistance by which they can be secured. It is an obligation which should be recognized now; and legislation to that end should be enacted as soon as possible.

This is a good time not merely to be thinking about the subject but actually to do something about it. Nothing will be more conducive to the maintenance of high morale in our troops than the knowledge that steps are being taken now to give them education and technical training when the fighting is over.

Every day that the war continues interrupts the schooling and training of more men and women and deprives them of the education and skills which they would otherwise acquire for use in later life. Not only the individual welfare of our troops but the welfare of the Nation itself requires that we reverse this trend just as quickly as possible after the war.

Vocational and educational opportunities for veterans should be of the widest range. There will be those of limited education who now appreciate, perhaps for the first time, the importance of general education, and who would welcome a year in school or college. There will be those who desire to learn a remunerative trade or to fit themselves more adequately for specialized work in agriculture or commerce. There will be others who want professional courses to prepare them for their life's work.

Lack of money should not prevent any veteran of this war from equipping himself for the most useful employment for which his aptitudes and willingness qualify him. The money invested in this training and schooling program will reap rich dividends in higher productivity, more intelligent leadership, and greater human happiness.

We must replenish our supply of persons qualified to discharge the heavy responsibilities of the post-war world. We have taught our youth how to wage war; we must also teach them how to live useful and happy lives in freedom, justice, and decency.

Specifically, I agree with the recommendations made by the committee in this regard, as follows:

1. The Federal Government should make it financially feasible for every man and woman who has served honorably for a minimum period in the armed forces since September 16, 1940, to spend a period up to 1 calendar year in a school, a college, a technical institution, or in actual training in industry, so that he can further his education, learn a trade, or acquire the necessary knowledge and skill for farming, commerce, manufacturing, or other pursuits.

2. In addition, the Federal Government should make it financially possible for a limited number of ex-servicemen and women selected for their special aptitudes, to carry on their general, technical, or professional education for a further period of 1, 2, or 3 years.

This assistance from Government should include not only cost of instruction but a certain amount of money for maintenance.

One incidental benefit of permitting discharged veterans to put in a year or more of schooling or training would be to simplify and cushion the return to civilian employment of service personnel. And I might call to your attention the fact that it costs less per year to keep a man at school or college or training on the job than to maintain him on active military duty for a year.

While the Federal Government should provide the necessary funds and should have the responsibility of seeing that they are spent providently and under generally accepted standards, the control of the educational processes and the certification of trainees and students should reside in the States and localities.

I am sure that the Congress will agree with me that the report of this committee constitutes a helpful and constructive point of departure in the working out of a practical program for the meeting of this situation. Various recommendations are contained in the report concerning the administration of the plan. While there may be differences as to some of the details, I am confident that the Congress will find merit in the general objectives.

So far as disabled soldiers are concerned, the Congress is aware that, pursuant to existing statutes, the Veterans' Administration is prepared to conduct a program of rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability. The program is designed to provide for the special needs of war-disabled veterans, and to furnish educational and training opportunities to help them take their places in civilian life. The program has already been initiated, and will be expanded as the war proceeds. The new program of the Federal Security Agency will make provisions for veterans whose disabilities are not service connected.

The Army and the Navy require a large number of workers skilled and experienced in various occupations and professions. Men who are filling these posts are acquiring valuable training and experience. A man who has become a mechanical draftsman, a cartographer, a meteorologist, a cook, or a baker may succeed in finding a similar post in civilian life. In a great many other occupations, such as those dealing with tank or tractor maintenance and repair, or with radio operation and maintenance, men are acquiring basic skill and experience which will provide a solid foundation for learning a related civilian occupation.

In addition, the United States Armed Forces Institute, which is a joint operation of the Army and Navy, offers men and women in the armed services a chance to enroll in courses usually offered by colleges, high schools, technical, and occupational schools, in which they can study in their off-duty time. The institute prepares self-teaching textbooks which enable them to learn a subject entirely on their own initiative; or, if they prefer, they may join any one of hundreds of classes which have or are being established in Army camps and posts and in Navy installations, and in Army and Navy hospitals, here in the United States and in places all over the world. Or, if they wish, they can study by the correspondence method with the institute or with one of its overseas branches the same as any student in a correspondence school.

Opportunities for vocational training and for systematic schooling within the armed services will be expanded and reoriented during periods of demobilization and up to the moment of discharge.

Therefore, if the Congress adopts the general objective outlined herein, our men and women in the armed forces will be afforded opportunities for continuance of their education and vocational training—first, during the war, second, during the demobilization period, and, third, for a year or more after their separation from the service.

While the successful conclusion of this great war is by no means within our sight, yet it may well be said that the time to prepare for peace is at the height of war.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 27, 1943.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] for 15 minutes.

OUR NAVY AND NAVY DAY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that, on this Navy Day, 1943, the floor of this House should be used as a rostrum from which to pay a tribute to the United States Naval Service, consisting of our Navy, our Coast Guard, and our Marine Corps.

The resources and effort and manpower of this Nation have been used to the utmost, since the beginning of the national emergency, to build this country's seapower into the biggest, most effective, and hardest-hitting naval force the world has ever known.

On this second Navy Day of our Nation during wartime, we can point with pride to our Navy's ships and submarines and planes. They are equal or superior to any similar types under any other flag, both as to quantity and quality. But we are, of course, proudest of all of the officers and men who man those ships, those submarines, and those naval planes. We can point with equal pride to the men and the women in the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps. They are our own people, members of our own families, our relatives, and our close friends. They are Americans all.

On this occasion—using information made available by the Navy Department at my request—I would like to speak of the size of our Naval Service, both as to manpower and matériel. I would like to describe some of the Navy's accomplishments at sea, on the home front, and in a field about which very little has yet been told—our Navy's assistance to the navies of our allies. And, particularly, I would like to say something about the spirit of the Navy men who are now at battle stations on all the seas of the globe.

After slightly less than 2 years at war, our Navy can point to many accomplishments.

The Mediterranean is no longer an Axis lake. It is a United Nations' highway to Russia, India, and the entire Asiatic area.

We are slowly winning the Battle of the Atlantic. According to Navy Department figures, there were fewer losses to German submarines in September than for any month since the beginning of the war. In fact, there is reason to believe that, during September, Hitler lost more submarines than we lost merchant ships—and that is a rate which means suicide for the German undersea effort.

In all the landings in Africa, Sicily, and Italy proper, the United States Navy has helped supply the original punch which put our troops and equipment ashore. And, on more than one occasion, the guns of our warships have battered attacking German troops and tanks, allowing our men to hold the beach heads they had won at great cost in effort and in human life.

In the Pacific, we have broken the back of the Jap attack—the Jap offensive has been stopped on every front. Today our joint Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard forces are pushing the Jap back to his final battlefields in the very heart of the Rising Sun.

Recently, you have read of the attacks by our Navy sea-air task forces on some of the Jap-held strongholds in the central Pacific. This week I have been informed that, through the proper concentration of our vastly increased Pacific forces, it is now possible for the Navy to establish air superiority—at least temporarily—over any one of Japan's central Pacific strongholds, and at any time our Navy desires to do so. Less than 2 years ago, you will remember, the Japs were able to advance at will almost to the gateway of Australia to the south, and far into the Aleutians on the north.

Navy Day, this year, is vastly different from last year and the year before. Our days on the defensive have passed.

This year the Japs are having to take it—when we can find them—whether they like it or not.

Today the total personnel of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard is approximately two and a half million men, with more than 2,000,000 in the Navy, approximately 320,000 in the Marine Corps, and approximately 160,000 in the Coast Guard. This is well over 10 times the size of this force in July of 1940. It is approximately 4 times the approximate Navy figure attained at this Nation's peak during the First World War. Included in this total are approximately 50,000 WAVES, SPARS, and women MARINES.

During the past 3 years, the Navy has trained over a million and a half officers and men. As of July 1, 1943, a total of 17,437 officers and 167,886 enlisted men were in training. The percentage of officers trained in the last fiscal year rose 267 percent over the year before. Similarly, the percentage of enlisted personnel trained in the last fiscal year rose 173 percent over the year before.

The Navy college program V–12 was created to maintain a continuing flow to the Navy of young officers. There are 77,000 young men now in the colleges and universities throughout the country in the V–12 program. This program is administered in selected institutions under contract to the Navy for instruction, housing, messing, and other facilities. The Navy contracted for existing facilities and fitted the V–12 program into existing college patterns. The object of this training is to provide the basic educational background necessary for the assimilation of the technical and profound knowledge required of Navy officers. Following the successful completion of V–12, prospective midshipmen attend a Navy midshipman school. There are 4 of these throughout the country, located at the following places: The Naval Academy, Columbia University, Northwestern University, and the University of Notre Dame. These schools were originated at the suggestion of President Roosevelt when he was the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and they are now the Navy's principal source of new seagoing officers.

The Navy has in operation a program of voluntary in-service education. This is designed to utilize "thinking" time, which is the time officers and men are off duty and wonder what to do, and what will happen to them after the war is over. This program includes both correspondence courses of study, and also group instruction at educational service centers. These have been established at many outlying bases, such as training stations and naval hospitals. They offer opportunities for studying anything from professional Navy subjects to bookkeeping and foreign languages. Correspondence courses offer a wide variety of subjects as well and also lead to high school and college credits. In other words, the Navy is not only training men to do better jobs in the Navy—these men are receiving an education which will fit them for better jobs after the war.

Of course, mere numbers cannot begin to tell the story of the United States Navy as a sea-air fighting team. This is best told in reference to the spirit of the Navy's fighting men—men who are carrying on the tradition of John Paul Jones, Stephen Decatur, Perry, and Farragut. A brief anecdote will help illustrate this point.

In the early days of this war, when the Japs had the upper hand in the Pacific, one of our destroyers was commanded by a Massachusetts man, Capt. L. A. Abercrombie, of Lawrence, Mass. Captain Abercrombie tells the story of a day when his ship was patrolling in Japanese waters. Two torpedoes were observed heading for the ship. They missed, just barely. The ship was heeled over to dodge two more Jap torpedoes. The ship's "talker" was describing the action over the loudspeaker.

From down in the bowels of the ship came the excited voice of an engineer, who either could not hear what the "talker" was saying or who could not believe what he had heard. "Repeat, repeat," screamed the engineer.

"Two Jap torpedoes just missed the ship," repeated the "talker." There was a brief silence from below, and then came these words: "Let us go get the blankety-blank. But do not tell me any more—you might scare me." I am happy to add that—P. S.—Captain Abercrombie's ship did "get the blankety-blank."

Now for some figures on ships and planes: Today the United States Fleet constitutes by far the largest sea force in all the history of the world. This fleet consists of approximately 15,000 vessels of all types and more than 20,000 naval planes. Of the Navy's ships, more than 800 are hard-hitting combat types, exclusive of landing craft, auxiliaries, tenders, and other such smaller vessels. Of the Navy's planes, by far the larger majority are first-line combat aircraft, equal and superior to anything they have faced thus far in this war. The figures on the production of this gigantic fleet are perhaps now familiar to you. It is interesting to point out, however, that this flood of production is just now reaching its full tide and is scheduled to continue at its present maximum rate. During the 4 months in the second half of 1943, beginning with July of this year, Navy production has more than doubled the totals achieved in the entire 6 months of the first half of this year.

In speaking of the Navy's program of new building, however—and the almost unbelievable achievements in this field—there is another side of the story about which very little has been told up to this time. I refer to the maintenance, overhaul, and repair of battle damage to our own ships, and particularly the work we have done on the navies of the United Nations.

I am informed that the spirit of cooperation between our Navy and the navies of our allies has been splendid throughout.

Not long ago the announcement was made in London that at one time the British Mediterranean Fleet could put forward only three cruisers which were in combat condition. The Italian Fleet was overwhelmingly superior. Since that fleet is no longer in opposition to our forces, and since much of the remnants of Hitler's shrinking sea power have been immobilized, it can now be safely told that for a large part of this war the navy yards of the United States have been used as repair bases for the British Navy and the navies of other United Nations.

From the beginning of the lend-lease program on March 11, 1941, United States navy yards have repaired foreign combatant vessels under the flags of England, France, Poland, Russia, Cuba, Venezuela, Ecuador, Chile, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Mexico, Colombia, Nicaragua, Canada, and Greece. This work has been done in 10 navy yards in the United States and outside the continental limits, and in more than 20 private shipyards within this country. Under this program of aid to our allies, more than 80 large combatant ships have been overhauled, outfitted, or repaired after damage in battle. Of these foreign warships, there have been approximately 7 aircraft carriers, 10 battleships, 27 cruisers, 40 destroyers, almost 30 corvettes, and numerous smaller types.

One British aircraft carrier came into a United States navy yard so badly damaged as a result of combat with the Axis forces in the Atlantic that this ship required 6 months to place back in commission. Not only had this carrier been heavily bombed, she had been swept by fire that almost gutted the ship as a result of bombing.

A United Nations' cruiser now under repair had both the bow and the stern blown off. Two other Allied cruisers came into United States yards with the bows blown off. Another foreign cruiser is now under overhaul with the stern blown off.

A British destroyer which had received action damage came into port with the keel buckled about 18 inches. This would be a long drydock job and in order not to tie up a dock for this length of time, the ship was sent to the navy yard, Charleston, where a new drydock was being built. The ship went into the drydock with the first flooding of the dock. Work on the ship was undertaken at the same time the egress and entrance to the dock were being completed.

These are merely a few of the instances of our aid to the navies of the United Nations, about which little has been told in the past. Actually, almost 20 percent of all the repair and overhaul work in American navy yards has been done on foreign warships. This work, especially in the beginning, taxed the resourcefulness of our yards in adapting United States methods and materials to the requirements and specifications of foreign naval services. For instance, our workmen had to learn that on a British ship, a portable electric cable is a "wandering lead," that on a French ship a cylinder head is a "chemise," and that in Spanish, spare parts are known as "refreshments." One of our overhaul problems was in itself a seagoing league of nations. This problem concerned 10 gunboats which had been built in Spain, to British specifications, which had French guns, German engines, and

which belonged to the Government of Mexico. The technical difficulties in these repair problems were almost staggering to the imagination. But, in keeping the ships of our allies in fighting trim, we were thereby adding to the strength of the sea force opposed to the Axis, and we were gaining time while building up our own forces.

Even before Pearl Harbor the Navy realized that the larger fleet which was being built as a result of the national emergency would require vastly increased repair facilities and personnel to keep this enlarged fleet in operation. To meet this situation our navy yard working forces were doubled, tripled, and then quadrupled as fast as men could be recruited. When skilled men were no longer available, untrained men and women were brought in to work alongside the skilled, until they could pick up their share of the work load. As an example, the force at one of our east coast navy yards expanded from 1,500 in 1937 to almost 30,000 in 1943. One of our larger navy yards now employs approximately 70,000 workers, and the forces are still increasing.

During 1 month of this year, there were 436 naval vessels under repair in 9 navy yards working on repair and overhaul jobs which cost a total of $20,000,000. In many cases, where important units of the fighting fleet are needed by specified dates, the yard personnel has virtually accomplished the impossible in meeting the dead line. There are many unsung heroes among our yard workmen and foremen who have worked long, hard hours to get a ship back to the battle line in record time.

But on this Navy Day it would not be logical or proper for me to talk to you about ships alone, or about the civilian workers who build and repair these ships.

The lion's share of the credit for all of the Navy's achievements thus far in the war properly goes to the Navy's fighting men, working shoulder to shoulder with the fighting men of the other two branches of the naval service—the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard.

Let us review briefly some of the accomplishments of these fighting men since that black Sunday morning of December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, not quite 2 years ago.

No American will ever forget the heroic stand of the Marines on Wake Island. Outnumbered, their supplies, equipment, and ammunition almost gone, they were asked in a radio message what they wanted. And the message flashed back—"Send us more Japs."

In May of 1942 the Japs were advancing in every direction throughout the Pacific. Australia had the invasion jitters—and well she might have had. The Japs were headed in that direction, and the Japs had not yet been stopped. The Japs had crushed their way into Hong Kong. They had captured the Philippines. They had moved into French Indochina and into Burma. They had not halted at the great and supposedly impregnable bastion of Singapore. They had raped and gutted the Netherlands East Indies. The Japs at no point had been checked or stopped. And the Japs' taunting cry rang out—"Where is the United States Navy?"

Well, the Japs got the answer to that question in May of 1942 as they moved their invasion fleet into the Coral Sea, presumably aimed at an Australian conquest. The United States Navy was there to greet them with fireworks. The Jap fleet was routed, part of it sent to the bottom of the Coral Sea, and Australia—although not yet out of danger—could afford to breathe a little easier.

Maybe the Japs thought the Battle of the Coral Sea was an accident—or maybe they believed their own propaganda when they claimed that the United States Navy had been crippled for good at Pearl Harbor. At any rate, just 1 month later they tried it again. This time the thrust came at Midway. The Japs aimed their blow with the biggest invasion fleet in the history of modern warfare—a total of more than 80 ships of all kinds. Quite a few of those ships will never see Japan again—among them 4 of Japan's best aircraft carriers—because they are now on the bottom of the sea off Midway. The Japs now knew where they could find the United States Navy.

The next move was up to us, and we made it—we threw an invasion force into the Solomon Islands. For more than 3 months the Japs used every trick and every combination of force at their command in an effort to retake the Solomon invasion points. You know the result. Today "Guadalcanal" is an American household word. And we are steadily pushing forward in the south Pacific area, just as we pushed forward in the Aleutians until the battered Jap forces turned tail and retreated toward Tokyo.

Today our Pacific sea and air forces no longer worry so much about where the Japs will strike next. They are worrying about where they can find the Japs next. And the Navy has shown us, in terms of battles fought and won, that the best defense is to attack, both in the Pacific and the Atlantic.

The Navy has added to our national traditions such words as "Midway," "Guadalcanal," "the Coral Sea," and others which future Americans will find large in their history books. And other such names are now in the making—with battle plans already completed, and with officers and men waiting only for the signal to go. After a recent Navy raid on the Marcus Islands, a Japanese propaganda announcer told the Japanese people that they must work and fight harder, because the Marcus Island raid could just as easily have been made on Japan itself. So far, gentlemen—and I have made inquiries in this regard—the United States Navy has not seen fit to call this Japanese spokesman a liar. There is every reason to believe that the future of our naval operations holds great battles—perhaps with great losses—but also certain to provide great advances forward in the over-all pattern of final and ultimate destruction of the Japanese military power in the Pacific.

We know that there will be no lack of spirit on the part of the men who are called on to perform their share of the sacrifice and effort needed for victory. Here is just one example—told for the first time—of this fighting spirit on the part of our Navy men. This story concerns a Navy Seabee, member of a naval construction battalion—those men who land with the marines and build the advance bases—the men who fight with a monkey wrench or a shovel in one hand and a tommy gun in the other.

At an advance base in the southwest Pacific, Seabee Richard Herman Maurer, of Seattle, Wash., was reported absent without leave late in July. Mauer was absent without leave until the end of August, at which time he was called before a court martial and asked to explain his conduct.

It developed he had gone A. W. O. L. only because he saw a chance to get in a crack at the Japs. Leaving his island base, he attached himself to a party of marine raiders who had been ordered on a daring mission into the Japs' own territory, an island in Japanese-held waters. Here is a paraphrase of the report turned in by the marine commanding officer, and which has been furnished to me by the Navy Department:

> During the attack on the Japanese, Seabee Maurer displayed outstanding qualities of courage and heroism as a member of a machine gun squad, manning a machine gun alone when every other man in the gun crew was killed or wounded. He serviced this gun under heavy enemy machine gun, rifle, and mortar fire. His actions at all times were in keeping with the highest traditions of the Naval Service. He is herewith recommended for the award of the Silver Star for gallantry in action against the Japanese enemy.

That is just one example. There are thousands of others in the battles which have made the United States Navy supreme on every sea where the battles are now raging. But there are examples in our own land, too, of the heroism which comes with sacrifice—the wives now without husbands and children without fathers; the parents whose sons are represented by a gold star in the window; the thousands of patriotic Americans who are reminded of loved ones by a white cross in the Solomons or the beaches of Africa or Italy.

On this Navy Day, 1943, we know that we have a great Navy—and we know that it will show itself to be even greater as this war goes on. All our best naval and military authorities tell me that the battles which still lie ahead will be long and hard. We do not know how long this war will last, or how much it will cost in national wealth and human life. But we are on our way. We know that victory—no matter how long it takes—is certain. And on this Navy Day, we can strive for nothing higher than the pledge that we as a Nation will live up to the heroism and sacrifice that the men of our Navy have already written in our history—to stand as long as our flag shall wave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). Under previous order of the

House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for the time today to discuss very briefly the question of subsidies, I had that thought only from something that had been said here about a week ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. The gentleman, in talking about subsidies, had said that he approved generally of the subject of subsidies. Then he made this statement, which I thought might be a text for what I was going to say:

I hesitate to speak with any authority about the farmer, because I know so little from practical experience about farming.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] were here today it was my intention to say to him, and to assure him that I am not speaking too seriously, that perhaps it is fortunate for the gentleman from Pennsylvania and for myself, and for many other Members of the Congress of the United States that it is not necessary that we should know personally about farming in order to realize that the present policy of subsidies will be a failure, is a failure, and for 1,600 years has been a failure on every successive attempt to use it. If the gentleman were here, I would like to point out to him that we can go back as far as the time of Diocletian, who had some of the same ideas the administrative agencies have today in Washington. The ideas have changed very little over 1,600 years. There is one mark of similarity in them in that they were failures in his day and failures today, and so I have here quotations from a number of books, speaking of that period, and I quote from them. One says that Diocletian fixed a maximum price for foods and other articles of commerce. He, however, did something which the present agencies have not yet come to. He fixed at that time a maximum price for wages. I skip the comments of this author and quote merely his conclusion:

The effect was disastrous. It brought about disturbance in the food supply, and many traders were ruined.

There are other quotations, all of them coming to the same conclusion.

Another author says that the same expedient has been tried before and has been often tried since, and that as a temporary measure in a critical time it might be of some use, but as a general measure it is certain to do great harm, and then he says " will cause great bloodshed," which I am glad to say has ceased to be the effect over the period of 1,600 years.

So I turn to another comment on the conditions of that time from a man who is even more in favor of the idea than the previous author. He says that "probably the idea failed because it was too simple and too rigid in that it made no allowance for the necessary differences between wholesale and retail prices and for the cost of transportation, and for seasonal variations," which is something that we can take out of the historical comments 1,600 years ago and apply easily to 1943.

Unfortunately, a little different situation has come onto the floor since I asked for time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] was very sincere and spoke very well. However, in the peripatetic appearance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], he has been speaking on the subject of subsidies, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1925, that gentleman says:

The inconsistency and what borders at least upon hypocrisy is the fact that the so-called opponents of subsidies have said that they are against all subsidies.

And so on, indicating that there is an inconsistency in that some feel that subsidies may be applied to one purpose and not to another. I suggest that it is a serious thing to accuse the Congress of the United States of inconsistency and of hypocrisy, and so I turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, and I quote the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in which he said:

On the general proposition of subsidies ordinarily I am against subsidies. I do not think it is the right approach.

Then he says—and I wish to include the entire quotation—

Now we are at war, and in some way we must keep down inflation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from the act, which is being used by the administrative agencies for the purpose of applying, and I say without authority, subsidies in the present effort to keep down the cost of living. I repeat that this has been tried many times, and I shall say again, has never been successful.

There is one element that enters into it which the gentleman from Texas ignores. If the gentleman from Texas is to speak after me today, I wish him to speak upon this point, and not to evade this point, but to speak directly upon this point. That is, that the whole idea of the present subsidy program of the administration is to maintain and to increase production. I challenge any Member of the Congress, I challenge the gentleman from Texas, to tell me where once in the history of the world a subsidy program, as now applied, has ever maintained production and ever increased production.

So I read from the Executive order itself. The Executive order is dated April 8, 1943. This is the famous "hold the line" order. I do not know what it holds, but it does not hold any line. This is a résumé of the order rather than the language. I quote:

Nothing in the order was to prevent either of them from making such readjustments in price relationships appropriate for various commodities or classes or qualities or grades thereof, or for various marketing areas, or from authorizing such support prices, subsidies, or other inducements—

And this is the only way in which subsidies were to be offered—

as may be authorized by law or may be deemed necessary to maintain or to increase production.

The point that I am making today in the brief time at my disposal—and I wish I had taken more; however, the gentleman from Texas had not spoken when I asked for time—the point I am making is that the whole theory of the subsidy program is to maintain and to increase production, which it will not do, which every farmer knows it will not do, and which the representative of every farming area knows it will not do, and which, therefore, will have a most tragic effect upon rural areas.

So we turn to the nation which is the highest example of regimentation, in my opinion, which exists in the world today. That is Germany. Germany began back in 1933 with the ideas of regimentation and of subsidies and of the control of the production of foods. I went to Germany in the summer of 1935 to see just exactly what had been done. We might divide that experiment into two parts. The first part was from 1925 to 1933. We could go back to 1925, but let us start with the coming of the Third Reich in Germany, and quote people who have sympathetically written about it.

Only after 1933—

Says this writer—

did subsidies become a conscious part of the Germany policy. Before the advent of the Nazi government there were only a few disconnected measures, and since then agriculture has been subjected to a more or less comprehensive program for self-sufficiency. One survey of Germany's attempt has shown that on the whole, agricultural production has not been increased and imports have not been materially reduced.

I would like to read more but the idea is the same. It is the conclusion we are interested in today.

Another writer:

Even in 1936 Germany was still compelled to import about 20 percent of her foodstuffs.

Thus, says he:

The idea has contributed nothing toward agricultural self-sufficiency during the period of its experimental control.

Another one:

The drive, initiated since 1933 for complete agricultural self-sufficiency, has failed—

And I interpolate—

by the subsidy plan.

Here we have a German writer who says:

Since 1933 the German Government has spent large amounts on subsidies to increase production in order to make Germany self-sufficient with respect to foods. In spite of these subsidies, there is no essential increase of agricultural production to be expected for many years.

Another one, and this is an English writer, says:

In spite of all these efforts the Nazi agricultural policy has been a failure, both in the economic and in the social field.

Another one:

Despite all promises and efforts to the contrary, Nazi agricultural policy is leading therefore to an almost complete destruction of the liberty and social position of the independent farmers.

There is nothing new about a subsidy program. There is nothing that we do not already know, including its ultimate failure.

Italy tried the same thing under the same system of regimentation. This writer says:

Despite constant propaganda, coercion, and various subsidies, there has been little, if any, increase in land utilization, crop yields, or the number of livestock. In 1932 there were 29,372,000 hectares under cultivation; in 1937 this area was reduced to 28,742,000 hectares.

That is exactly what is happening in the United States and will happen under this program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman believe that the subsidy program in Germany and Italy was tried out largely to get political support for the Nazi administration, rather than to increase production?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the gentleman suggesting that is the same basis of the subsidy policy in the United States?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, history repeats.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It has been said to, yes. However, let us turn to the efforts of Great Britain, which, with these same examples—of all times—before it, was not led into this mistaken idea of subsidies into which we are being led, but which said to the farmers of England, "Produce." As a consequence, the farmers produced. I quote:

The Minister of Agriculture announced that he would provide farmers with a guaranty of fixed prices for food produced during the war and for 1 year after its conclusion. This guaranty has provided a strong impetus to farmers to produce maximum crops.

A recent increase of sown land to 18,000,000 acres represents a 40-percent improvement over the pre-war figures.

Mr. Speaker, my time is running out faster than I had hoped. It seems to me almost as though the clock had been speeded up. I should like to submit the results on France, with which I am also personally familiar, taking the years 1935 and 1937, on the opposite swing of the pendulum—that is, when they had too much grain. They decided to purchase grain by injecting the government into the picture. They tried to control the production of grain, and I ask you to believe me, Mr. Speaker, with even more disastrous results. When I was there the grain was costing something like $2.09 a bushel to the consumer, $1.91 to the farmer, and $1.18 to the livestock men. In fact, I saw quoted in the same paper over there the Government price on grain and the black market price on grain. It was called "le gangster blé"—"gangster wheat"—they having taken that name from the United States, which I am somewhat inclined to view as a dubious honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day next Monday and special orders heretofore entered I may again have 20 minutes to continue what I really want to lay before the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I shall merely say so that the gentleman from Texas may be adequately warned that I shall then point out to him that in the issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17 last the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had a little exchange on the floor. The gentleman from Texas said:

The O. P. A. has made a lot of mistakes.

I can agree with that. He said:

We are nearer run-away inflation than we have ever been before.

I say I agree with that but that we attribute it to different reasons. I attribute it to the present system of subsidies, plus the present system of uncontrolled incomes, plus insufficient production. I say that combination is the greatest incentive to run-away inflation this Nation has ever known in its entire history. Then the gentleman from Texas said:

There is not a Member of this House listening now, or a Member of this House who would vote to repeal the price- and the rent-control law. I do not believe there is a single one who would do it.

And the gentleman from Mississippi said:

The gentleman cannot speak for the whole of the Congress on that proposition.

Which I think is a statement of fact. The gentleman from Texas then said:

I am not speaking for the whole Congress.

He further said:

Is the gentleman opposed to price control?

And so forth. And the gentleman from Mississippi said:

I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I opposed the law originally. I would repeal it now and I would go back to the program followed in the First World War.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time next Monday in order to point out that the program followed in the First World War was a sound program. It was a program inaugurated under a Democratic administration, it was a successful program, and we should return to it now, as nearly as it would be possible to return to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make today and to include therein certain tables and other excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech made by Mr. Thurman W. Van Metre, economist and professor of transportation at Columbia University. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will cost $157.50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES—NO OTHER WAY TO HOLD DOWN THE COST OF LIVING AND ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, to my mind there is only one way to keep down the cost of living, prevent inflation, and encourage needed production, and that is by the payment of subsidies. This question has been pictured to the country as being a new one, but the first act of a general nature passed by the American Congress more than 150 years ago was a tariff act, and that act has remained in effect in one form or another ever since the establishment of our Government. That is a subsidy, nothing more and nothing less. It has cost our people up to $4,000,000,000 a year. There are many other subsidies that could be mentioned. I merely mention this to advise you that I do not consider the question a new one at all; it is just as old as the Government itself. The charge of being new is used to try to keep the farmers from getting the benefit of subsidies.

OPPONENTS NOT AGAINST ALL SUBSIDIES

The Members of this House who are attempting to deny the farmers of this country the benefit of a fair price by denying to them the benefit of subsidies do not oppose all subsidies, they only oppose some subsidies; and I state again that for anyone to campaign on an issue against a subsidy and say it is fundamentally wrong, that the Treasury should not use this money for the purpose of paying subsidies and then at the same time say: "I am for certain subsidies" which of course are just as fundamentally wrong, is bordering upon the hypocritical, and is certainly inconsistent.

ONE HUNDRED BILLION ALREADY SAVED ON COST OF WAR

The cost of our war to date would have been almost $100,000,000,000 more and our national debt would have been increased by that amount had not price control been as effective as it has been and had not subsidies been used to keep down the cost of items that go into our war machinery. I again repeat to you an outstanding case where subsidies have been used to great advantage. I could give you many. During World War No. 1 prices went out the roof. The gentleman who just preceded me is advocating a return to the policies of World War No. 1. Anyone who reads that record will be convinced very quickly that it would not be in the public interest to return to the price policies of World War No. 1.

PRICE POLICIES OF WORLD WAR NO. 1 BAD

In the first place, we paid 30 cents a pound for sugar instead of less than 7 cents a pound as the price is today. The price of sugar has not increased 1 penny in this war. Furthermore, we paid more than 90 cents a pound for coffee during the First World War, while we are paying less than 30 cents a pound today in this war. I could enumerate a number of things that increased from 3 to 10 times as much under the policies of World War No. 1 as they have increased under the price policies and laws of World War No. 2. So just a casual glance at the figures will convince anyone that only a person who is willing to tolerate ruinous inflation, runaway prices, unbridled inflation, and an extremely high cost of living could afford to advocate such policies as we had in World War No. 1. In this war we have endeavored to profit by the experiences of the past, which is as it should be.

FIRST PRICE CONTROL ACT

In January 1942, we passed a law known as the First Price Control Act, the hearings having commenced on that bill in August preceding its final enactment in January 1942. Congress made a mistake then by not having prices fixed for everything, wages, salaries, commodities, and everything else, but we were led to believe that we should not do that, that if we would give the Price Administrator the power to slap a price ceiling on anything that looked like it was going to get out of line it would be sufficient power for him to have to keep these prices under control. It was a beautiful theory and we passed the bill that way. We were mistaken and it did not work, so very soon thereafter the President of the United States came out with a message to Congress stating that the Congress should pass a price-control act that would place a price ceiling on not only prices but also wages and salaries and specified by using the phrase, "Items that affect the cost of living."

SECOND PRICE CONTROL ACT—PRESIDENT DIRECTED BY CONGRESS

So the Congress passed the Second Price Control Act, dated October 2, 1942. That Second Price Control Act not only authorized the President of the United States but it directed him.

That is one case where the Congress has used a directive on the Chief Executive of our Nation. The President is directed under the October 2, 1942, act to fix all prices, wages and salaries and items that go into the cost of living on the basis of prices existing on September 15, 1942 insofar as practicable and we only permit him under the act to deviate from that where he finds it is necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.

CONGRESS DIRECTS PRESIDENT TO HOLD LINE AS OF SEPTEMBER 15, 1942

In other words, the legislative body has directed the Chief Executive to hold that line as of September 15, 1942. The labor groups claim he has held that line very much to their detriment. They insist that the cost of living has gone up sufficiently so that they should not only have the benefit of the so-called Little Steel formula of a 15-percent increase but they should have an increase that is in excess of that 15 percent.

WILL WE FIX THIRD LINE FOR PRESIDENT TO HOLD?

The point is whether we will fix another line to hold. The First Price Control Act fixed the line as the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941. That was the first line we were expecting to hold and we failed to hold it. Then we came back and we directed the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, and he has been attempting to hold it. So the question is, Will we go back and repeal that directive and will we fix another line to try to hold? Or will we destroy the line and have no line at all to attempt to hold? If so, how many more lines are we going to establish and when are we going to hold the line? That is the point.

INFLATION SERIOUS NOW—A FIGHT IS NOW BEING WAGED TO INCREASE THE COST OF LIVING

The question of inflation is more serious today than it has ever been in the history of the American Government. You see here an effort on the part of our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle to increase the cost of living. That is what it is. You are making a fight to increase the cost of living. That is your fight. Whether you are willing to admit it or not, that is what you are driving at. You are trying to increase the cost of living and destroy the only guide we have to hold prices. When you increase the cost of living, obviously wages and salaries must be increased too. You are not holding the line. Then when you increase wages and salaries, that causes the cost of production to go up, so you will have to increase prices again. And when you increase prices again you have got to come back and increase wages and salaries again. So it becomes a race between prices on the one side and wages and salaries on the other. That is what you are advocating.

INFLATION ADVOCATED

You are advocating a race, you are advocating inflation, you are advocating increasing the cost of living, that is what you are advocating, and when you have this race between prices and wages, prices and wages will go out the roof—the same effect you can get from mercury by putting a lighted match under the thermometer. The mercury will go out the top. That is what will happen to prices.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Unfortunately I missed the first part of the gentleman's talk. I just wonder if the gentleman has commented upon the increased cost of the war if we do have this inflationary spiral inasmuch as the Government purchases a large part of the food and also the materials of war.

REPUBLICANS ADVOCATING AN INCREASE IN THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. PATMAN. I have not expanded upon that, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am talking frankly. I have no dislike for a person who is not a member of the party that I happen to be affiliated with. Some of my very best friends are members of the other party and some of the most able men in the House are members of the other party. This is not a party issue with me. We are in a war and we have to win this war. We have to also succeed on the second front, which is to stop inflation. Inflation is almost as bad as losing the war. So we have a real fight here at home. I cannot understand why our Republican friends keep advocating increasing the cost of living and increasing the cost of everything.

NO ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTED

Maybe subsidies is not the right way to do it, maybe that is not the right way to hold it down. Let us say for the sake of argument it is not, that we should use some other method. What method are you going to use? Will you please suggest it? How are you going to keep the cost of living down without subsidies? I would like to know. If there is another way just as good I would be for it, but our Republican friends place themselves in the position of advocating an increase in the cost of living as against subsidies, and offer no alternative. They just want to increase the cost of living. I cannot understand why they want inflation.

FIRST CROP OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 MILLIONAIRES

Further, something else I cannot understand about our friend is this. The President asked for a $15,000,000,000 tax bill. Instead of giving him a $15,000,000,000 tax bill, a solid front on the part of our Republican friends forced through what was known as the Ruml plan, or 75 percent of it, which, instead of taking taxes way from the people, actually gave back to the people $7,500,000,000, going in the other direction, causing inflation.

Incidentally, that was the first crop of war millionaires made in this war, made by legislative action, a congressional crop of war millionaires. The Ruml plan just gave back $7,500,000,000, much of it to war millionaires. Now they say not only do they want to give that money away but they do not want to put any more taxes on them. They are against taxes. They want to give money away. They are for an increased cost of living.

Where is this country going, if you adopt a policy like that?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say with reference to the last remark of the gentleman that I agree with him thoroughly that we made a great mistake when we forgave $7,000,000,000 on war profits made in 1942. Congress certainly legislated a crop of war millionaires in that Ruml plan and paved the way for heavier unjust taxes.

But that is not why I rose to question the gentleman. I, too, came in in the midst of the gentleman's remarks. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to make some comparison between the increased cost of living in this war and in the First World War?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not today, but, if the gentleman will take the RECORD of yesterday and look on page 8777, he will find a statement that compares the cost of different principal items in this war with the cost in the last war. They are contained in a statement presented by Mr. Prentiss Brown when he resigned as Price Administrator recently.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the gentleman that I think that in spite of all the fault we are finding with our attempts to hold the line we have actually held the line this time to a certain extent, and to a remarkable extent, so that the increased cost of living due to this war is nothing in comparison with that of the preceding war. Our great middle class would already have been destroyed under the operation of so-called natural law, if we had not done what has been done.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right. Even though we feel that we are entitled to more money, we are not getting enough rent on our property, or we should have higher wages, but we should remember this, that it is better to get money that is worth something, that will buy something, and be worth nearly 100 cents on the dollar than to have this race between wages and prices, with money eventually not being worth very much of anything.

WIPE OUT MIDDLE CLASS

The best way on earth to wipe out the middle class in this country is to increase the cost of living, as advocated by our Republican friends. In other words, they are advocating wiping out the middle class. There will be two classes, then, the very poor and the very rich. Only the very rich can survive inflation.

Mr. MURDOCK. At the present time the items which have increased in cost are few, relatively, whereas in the First World War, the items that increased in cost were almost 100 percent. I recall distinctly at the time of the other World War, and no doubt the gentlemen about me will also remember it personally, that practically every item of consumption increased in cost, most of them as much as 300 percent. There was one item nationally advertised in those days, and it was said that postage stamps and this particular well-known food item were the only two purchasable things which had not increased in price. The manufacturer then made that claim in high-class magazine advertisements. At least, that cannot be said now.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice that in this war, even after remitting much of it to the war profiteers—$7,500,000,000—they are proposing to increase even the postage rate 25 percent. Even the postage stamp will not get by; they will increase the postage rate by 25 percent. The recipient of an old-age pension will have to pay 25 percent to inquire why his check has not arrived.

IN WARTIME

I know in wartime you have to be for many things you do not like. In a legislative body we oftentimes have to vote for something and accept something bad in order to keep from having to take something that is worse. That is the way legislative processes are. We have to give and take. We cannot have legislation unless we do give and take. A Member of Congress, of either the House or the Senate, who stands up and says, "These are my convictions. I am not going to yield. As a matter of right and justice I know that I should not yield, therefore I will not yield anything," never accomplishes anything. He just keeps his views and convictions, and that is all he has. He never gets anything done. Every major law that is passed by the Congress represents a compromise of view or a sacrifice of opinion on the part of practically every Member of these two bodies. We have to give and take. In time of war that is especially true.

I do not like taxes and I do not like to vote for them, but sometimes we have to take something bad, as I said, to keep from taking something worse. It is better to have taxes and preserve our country and protect it from inflation than not to have taxes and have our country destroyed by inflation. So the alternative is sometimes so bad that we are compelled to take something we do not like.

POPULAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS

I guess the most popular Member of Congress would be one who could take this attitude. A constituent could say, "I don't like that tax bill." The Member would say, "Well, I voted against it. I voted against all tax bills." The constituent could say, "I sure do like the money you gave us for this college over here or this soil-conservation project. I like that." The Member could say, "Well, I voted for that."

In other words, to vote for all appropriations and against all tax bills is a fine way for a Member of Congress to stand pretty well before his constituents, but it does not protect the country. It does not save the country.

We must look beyond just this temporary period, we must look into the future and we must guard against the things that might happen in the future.

On the tax question especially I should like to say something. I think we are making an awful mistake. I am going to say something that is very unpopular. It is very unpopular to say what I have been saying about the O. P. A., I know that. No one has to tell me that, but I believe it is in the public interest.

NOT TAXING ENOUGH

There is another thing that is really unpopular that I want to say, and that is we are not taxing enough. I do not know where the money should come from, but it should come from somewhere. We are paying about one-third of the cost of this war as we go along, while Great Britain and Canada are paying 50 percent, or near 55 percent. We are not paying enough of the cost of this war as we go along. We are borrowing too much on long-term bonds. There is the interest that will have to be paid, and the result will be that by the time these bonds are paid, we will be paying $1 and $2 interest on every dollar that we have borrowed. Whereas, if we tax now and pay the money now, it will not only help us by $1 on the war debt but the equivalent of $2 and $3. Therefore we should pay every dollar we can as we go along.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I notice in the newspaper this morning a release from the Treasury Department in which it is said that the people of this country, under the present tax plan, will pay more taxes than the people in England and Canada.

Mr. PATMAN. That was a very artful statement. I do not know anything about it. I merely saw the headline in the paper. I did not have time to read it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is per capita.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, well, of course, figures do not lie, but sometimes liars figure; and I am not calling the gentleman a liar; neither am I denouncing the author of the figures. I am only explaining the process.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That article had reference to the per capita payment and it did not compare income.

Mr. PATMAN. They are doing just one thing here, and they added to the crop of millionaires by not making them pay 25 percent last year. Add not only the present taxes, but 25-percent taxes due from last year, and you make this per capita high, and I make this statement, and I challenge anyone to successfully contradict it. If you take the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, and you consider the taxes paid in the United States and the taxes paid in Canada and in England, you will find that the income-tax payers in England and in Canada pay 300 percent more than we do in the United States for these 2 years. But through the use of trick figures anyone will be able to show that the per capita for 1 year is quite different, and obviously that is what they are trying to show. They overlook the juggling around that they are going through in getting those figures. There is another reason why we should pay more of the cost of this war as we go along.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. I was wondering if the gentleman understands that the

trick figures he refers to are the official release that comes from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know whose they are.

Mr. GEARHART. It is Mr. Randolph Paul.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know anything about them except what has been said here.

Mr. GEARHART. He is the chief counsel of the Treasury Department.

Mr. PATMAN. I say this, and I challenge Mr. Paul or any other person to contradict it, that if you take what you pay in taxes for 2 years, you will find that in Canada and in England they are paying 300 percent more than we are paying in the United States—for the 2 years 1942 and 1943 that is—the same class of taxpayers, or the average, and that statement cannot be successfully challenged or contradicted.

There is another reason why we should pay more taxes and that is to syphon off the excess purchasing power. Many people here are saying, why do we have so many people working for the O. P. A., while in Canada they have only a few and in England they have only a few and here we have several thousand. The problems are different. England and Canada have such high taxes, they syphon off so much of that excess purchasing power, that the people do not have the money with which to go into the competitive markets and compete with one another, as we do here for various articles. Therefore, the problem is a difficult one here and not difficult over there. So, in order to keep down inflation, we should syphon off more of the excess purchasing power through taxes, and pay it on this war debt, because every dollar we pay now saves us two or three dollars that would have to be paid in the future, much of it to be paid by our returning servicemen, who are fighting to save us and our country on the 55 battle fronts of the world.

I am reminded of subsidies again by a gentleman near me. Let us take copper, for instance. We are paying out on copper, lead, zinc, about $80,000,000 in subsidies. We had two alternatives. We wanted more copper production. The Anaconda and the Phelps-Dodge are the two No. 1 copper producers, and they were making plenty of money at 12 cents a pound. We wanted more copper. There are other mines that could be operated, but we would have to pay them 15 cents or 17 cents or 23 cents or 34 cents a pound, and so the question was, Why increase the price of copper to 35 cents in order to bring in these high-price mines? So what did we do? We kept the price at 12 cents a pound on the present high-grade mines that were receiving 12 cents a pound, and we paid a subsidy of 5 or 10 or 15 cents a pound in order to get production in the other mines. We increased production 10 percent and that is the limit, and we saved the high price on 90 percent of the copper. It was successful. You are advocating just the opposite of that. Now, by paying less than $80,000,000 a year on copper, we are saving the taxpayers a billion dollars a year. Is not that good business? Is not that good sense?

It can be used in the same way with a lot of other commodities. All of them, it cannot; I will admit that. But, why restrict it? Why not leave it to somebody to say "Pick out the commodities where they can be used successfully and save the taxpayers money but do not use it where it cannot be used successfully?"

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman please take butter for his example—butter and milk, because that is much more widely used than copper. There is a subsidy being paid on it and production is falling daily.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. Let us take milk now. I know the gentleman made some reference to one gentleman who spoke on this who was not a farmer, but what he said about that is perfectly all right. It happens in this case I was a farmer, and at one time Congressman Marvin Jones, of Texas, and I were the only two Members of this House who at one time had been tenant farmers, who had actually worked on a farm; plowed and hoed, and picked cotton and everything else. So, I was a tenant farmer and I know something about farming. I know it from the standpoint of the farmer. And I will be very glad to endeavor to answer the gentleman's question about milk.

MUST TAKE CARE OF FARMER

Now, milk is one of the most important food items. Food is just as important as bullets. Unless you have enough food you cannot win any war. Suppose you only had 90 percent enough bullets in a battle, you would lose the battle just the same. If you have only 90 percent enough food you will likely lose the battle. So we have to encourage production and must not run any risk of having too little food. There are two ways of doing it. One way is to increase the price; get into a race with wages and salaries and cause inflation, which we are all bound to admit, because it increases the cost of living. The other way is to take care of the farmer, who works harder than any other person I know for the money he receives, and under the most adverse and hardship conditions of any person who works. We have to take care of him and encourage him to produce food. So instead of increasing the cost of living and instead of breaking through that line which the Congress has directed the President to hold, there is only one other way we can do it, and that is to tell that farmer: "Now, your labor has increased; your food bill has increased; your other items of expenses have increased and you cannot sell this milk for the price we have fixed on it. So we will make up that difference in a subsidy so as to encourage you to produce." What difference does it make to the farmer if he receives the price he wants, part of it from the Treasury of the United States and part of it from the one to whom he sells, or whether he receives it all from the Treasury or all from the one to whom he sells? It makes no difference on earth. You are not going to have production unless you take care of that farmer.

Now, under this bill which we are all talking about, whether we name it or not, subsidies will end at the close of this year. All support prices will end. Of all the things that the farmer wants, the one thing he wants more than anything else is to know how much he is going to get for what he raises. We have been able to give him support prices in the past, but under this bill that is brought out you cannot give him any more support prices. Support prices will work to encourage production. Potatoes are a fine example.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield right there? I think the gentleman should be corrected.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; if I am wrong I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman reads the bill carefully he will find section 3, in which there is a direction that they will continue to issue support prices, and they will continue to make loans under the so-called Steagall bill. I know the gentleman does not want to be inaccurate.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is bringing up something that was not contended in the committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What he means is that the support prices which I announced will stop because they have been using the power to announce support prices in order to effectuate the consumers' subsidies. Then the bill goes on to say that they will continue to announce support prices. It directs them to continue to announce support prices.

Mr. PATMAN. I know what the bill provides. Of course, the gentleman knows. I was in there when the bill was written. The gentleman was there when the bill was written. In fact, it is his amendment. You know he is the author of this high-cost-of-living amendment. The amendment says, if I can read the English language, that all support prices and all subsidies that were authorized before October 13 may go on until December 31. That is all. So they all end December 31.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield. Now the gentleman is bringing up something that was not contended in the committee. I never heard it mentioned before. It is a new theory and a new definition and a new interpretation entirely.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When the gentleman revises his remarks this evening will he add to them, following the language which he has just quoted, the very next sentence in that section?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; you know that section 3 is one of the most cleverly written sections that I have ever read. I give the gentleman credit. He is very clever. I presume I should change my statement about no support prices at all to no satisfactory support prices. The prices that will be authorized as support prices un-

der the amendment will be too low to obtain production and therefore the same as no support prices at all. I will insert a comment by Judge Marvin Jones that will bear out the point I am making.

The gentleman from Michigan for the minority Members starts out in the amendment by saying that a subsidy is one of the worst things on earth—a subsidy. No one in the world ought to have to pay anybody else's grocery bill. It is all right to help pay your fuel bill, your rent bill, but it is all wrong to help pay anybody's grocery bill. He is against all kinds of subsidies—provided, however—I wonde why he put it in there—

Provided, however, That this shall not apply to vegetable oils and fats, and oil seeds.

And I should like to ask the gentleman now how he can justify advocating the payment of a subsidy on oleomargarine to benefit one producing oleomargarine, but will not permit it to benefit the man who produces butter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman can imagine oleomargarine being used as a lubricant of munitions of warfare, he is correct in his premise.

Mr. PATMAN. But this is "vegetable oils and fats and oil seeds" whether you eat them or whether you use them on machinery. That is the first time I ever heard of oleo being used for lubrication of machinery.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me answer the gentleman's question. We exempted vegetable fats and oils and oil seeds because that is vegetable oil used in the lubrication of the machinery of war.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, butter may be used the same way. You did not exempt butter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If oleomargarine is used as a lubricant of machinery of war, then the gentleman is correct in his premise.

Mr. PATMAN. Why did not the gentleman exempt other fats and oils if used for that purpose?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, there is no restrictive language in that section 3 to those fats and oils that are used as lubricants; it is all-inclusive.

Mr. PATMAN. That is all.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from Texas is entirely correct when he says that you can subsidize oleomargarine under the bill as it is presently written but you cannot subsidize butter.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished ranking member on the minority side pointed out the mandatory loan provision of the Steagall bill. I am certain the gentleman from Michigan knows that those loans are only 90 percent of parity and that every single essential item necessary to encourage war production of foods is above the 90 percent of parity level. It is a foolish gesture to the farmer therefore to say that this 90 percent mandatory loan provision of the Steagall bill protects them at this time in their prices.

Mr. PATMAN. It does not. In other words, this principle that is announced here will be antagonistic to what we have done for the farmers.

PAY MORE COST OF WAR

There is one other thing I want to say: We should pay more of the cost of this war as we go along. We should pay it now, because $1 paid now will equal two or three dollars in the future and also will help keep down inflation. Furthermore it will be in fairness to the men who are winning this war upon the battlefields of the world. It is absolutely wrong for us to sit here and pay no more of the cost of this war and then let the men, the millions of them, go forth to the battle fronts of the world, bare their breasts to the enemy's bullets and come back here injured and maimed, some of them, and have to bear not only the cost of the war but compound interest on it doubled and trebled after they get back. It is absolutely wrong, and for that reason I am respectfully suggesting to my friends that they consider requiring us all to pay more of the cost of the war as we go.

I cannot understand the logic of my friend from Michigan. He brings up a point of view I never heard of before; I never heard it; it is something entirely new to me. He says nothing about it, I never heard him say anything about it, never heard him make any statement about it until he brings it up by just reaching out and clutching it out of the thin air. There is something I cannot understand. My friend is in favor of copper subsidies; he is in favor of lead subsidies; he is in favor of zinc subsidies; he is in favor of rent subsidies, public housing; he is in favor of helping pay the fuel bill of the people in New England through this subsidy on transportation of oil; he is in favor of a subsidy to cottonseed producers and soybean producers, and peanut producers, but he is against a food subsidy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does not the gentleman from Texas believe that the gentleman from Michigan is competent to speak for himself as to what he is in favor of?

Mr. PATMAN. He certainly is; and he is one of the most alert and able Members of this body. That is the reason I cannot understand why he would get in that inconsistent position; I just cannot understand it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I hope the gentleman from Texas will be tolerant enough to allow me in the future to state what I am in favor of.

Mr. PATMAN. The only reason I am mentioning these things now is because I have not been on the committee with the gentleman for years and years and years, and heard him express himself and answer these questions without knowing his views. Now, if I have misquoted him in any way, I yield to him now to correct me. Is not the gentleman in favor of all these subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish the gentleman would not quote me categorically.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask the gentleman, Do I misquote you? If I do, wherein did I misquote you?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman quoted me as being in favor of certain subsidies. I can sum it all up, if the gentleman wants to know my stand.

Mr. PATMAN. I will not yield to the gentleman for a speech. I am not yielding, Mr. Speaker, for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman will not yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If I made an error, I will yield to him for a correction of that error.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Although the gentleman asked me a question? Does he want to yield to me further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield if I made a mistake for the gentleman to correct it, because I do not want any mistake going into this RECORD, but I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman yield for a statement after he has seen fit to quote me categorically? He does not yield to me for a statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a correction and I apologize to the gentleman if I have misquoted him. I do not believe the gentleman will say I misquoted him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can make a statement in one sentence which will correct all the inaccuracies which the gentleman has stated.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield further.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I said the gentleman favored the copper subsidy, the lead subsidy, the zinc subsidy, the rent subsidy——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Wait a minute right there.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where have you ever heard me say that I favored the rent subsidy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman states I misquoted him on one, and I correct that. He does not deny he is for a lead subsidy, a zinc subsidy, a copper subsidy, and a fuel subsidy, but he said he is not for a rent subsidy. I will say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] says he is not for a rent subsidy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will speak for myself in that respect.

Mr. PATMAN. What is that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. My objection is that the gentleman is attempting to speak for me. I will speak for myself on those things.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman says I have misquoted him, I yield for a correction, but I am not yielding for anything else.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will correct the gentleman then if he will yield to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think the gentleman——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, then I make the point of order a quorum is not present. He is not going to say these things about me.

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield for a correction if I have made an error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to him to correct any errors that I have made.

Mr. WOLCOTT. My principal objection, if the gentleman from Texas will bear with me——

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object to his quoting me as being in favor of something, or being against something, when it is not based upon facts or anything which I have ever said or that the gentleman has ever heard me say.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman heard what I said. He is not denying it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order temporarily.

Mr. PATMAN. He is not denying it, and he will not deny it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it means denying it, I will deny it; and I wish the gentleman in his remarks from now on would quote himself. He knows what he believes, I know what I believe, and let me speak for myself.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is able to take care of himself.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I am.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say, too, that the gentleman not only favored copper and the lead and the zinc and the housing subsidies—he has some question about housing, so I withdraw that—but he is in favor of a subsidy on peanuts, a subsidy on cottonseed, a subsidy on oil seed, soybeans, and all those things. So how can a man consistently say he is against all subsidies if he favors those subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me for an answer?

Mr. PATMAN. And he expresses the sentiment of the Members on that side of the aisle.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me for an answer?

Mr. PATMAN. He is the head man, and he is a good one. He is the head man on the minority side of the Banking and Currency Committee, and they all vote exactly with him on this question. I only refer to him because he represents the Members of the minority party on this question. Nothing personal is intended.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for the answer to that question?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Speaking only for myself but not anybody else, and I am glad of the compliment the gentleman has paid me and, of course, I appreciate it, I have never been against any subsidy being paid by any agency of the Government for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production, whether it had to do with strategic or critical materials or food.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer that. How can the gentleman consistently say that when he is opposing a subsidy on dairy products? We can have plenty of production if they could pay the right kind of a subsidy and at the same time keep down the cost of living.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Texas keeps slipping back into copper and lead and zinc and a lot of other things. I am trying to keep the gentleman on the subject he started on, and that was milk and dairy products.

Mr. PATMAN. I thought I convinced the gentleman that was the only way to do it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman's theory is correct—and I respect the gentleman's statement—why is it that the production then is falling?

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman this: Does he know any other way to encourage the production of dairy products and farm products without increasing the cost of living?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is yes.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; what is it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is that we shall set a price for production, and we shall cut out the present method of giving the handlers more than they ever had in peacetimes and more than they expect today.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And not increase the cost to the consumer.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me ask the gentleman if he knows of any way to keep down the cost of living. The plan the gentleman is advocating would mean an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not correct.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman wants to advocate an increase in the cost of living, that is for him, it is not for me. He has a perfect right to do it. He is responsible to his people, and I am responsible to mine. I have no right to criticize him and he has no right to criticize me. But I have time and again challenged the Members on the other side of the aisle to name a way except subsidies to cut down the cost of living and at the same time encourage production of needed foods.

The Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on September 29, 1943, on the bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation. In his testimony he outlined what his policy would be on the subsidy program as well as other policies. His statement was as follows:

In appearing before this committee today in connection with the bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and to increase its borrowing capacity by $500,000,000, I want to point out at the outset that 1944 is to be an all-out food-production year. All of our thinking must come back to that.

It won't be easy for farmers to reach the high production goals in 1944 with the planned acreage of 380,000,000 acres—16,000,000 acres more even than this year. We must give farmers every financial and physical aid in their effort to produce the largest possible volume of food.

I hope that it won't ever be necessary to draw on the full borrowing capacity of the Corporation for crop loans and price supports. But at the same time, in order to assure production we must be in a position to make good our guaranties to farmers of prices that are necessary to see them through the growing, harvesting, and marketing seasons.

You, of course, are familiar with the effort to stabilize consumer prices. We are also committed to a policy of getting a larger production of food this year than last. This may make necessary some additional support prices.

For 1944 we expect the volume of production to be greater—we hope considerably greater. Farmers' costs will be higher than this year, and so farmer returns will need to be somewhat more.

I believe we should have the authority to make whatever price guaranties may be necessary to get an all-out agricultural production in 1944.

I have stated repeatedly that in the development of the food program we shall put the main reliance upon the farmers themselves, and thus build up the program from the grass roots. It is my intention to continue to consult Members of Congress from time to time as to these programs.

While we are in this meeting today, the farmers all over the country—at every crossroads and in every county—are trying to figure out the best way to increase their 1944 production. We want to help them in every practical way.

We expect that costs of production will not rise as much during this coming year as they have risen during the first 2 or 3 years of the war. But they may rise some. In order to increase production, we want to be able to meet that rise in our farm price supports.

I know that the Nation's farmers and ranchmen will produce an abundance if they have the necessary tools, equipment, and repairs, fertilizer, credit, labor, and a price that is adequate to cover the extra costs and hazards of increased production. We shall continue to drive for every possible physical and financial aid to production.

In my judgment, the best way to get production is to have a definite support price that will last throughout the season. It should be high enough to cover the added risks and hazards that go with increased production and it should be announced early. This means that the Government would stand ready to buy any surplus of a commodity that might not flow into the regular channels at the time, and to absorb whatever loss may be necessary.

As I have indicated, the bulk of the borrowing capacity which is proposed in the present bill will be used in commitments to support prices to farmers at not less than 85 to 90 percent of parity, as we are directed to do by Congress. Even though we don't lend up to the full amount of these commitments, we must stand ready to make good at all times to see the farmers through in return for the great effort they are making to meet all of our food requirements—to keep our boys at the front well fed and our war workers and other civilians at home in the best possible physical condition to produce the guns, the planes, the ships, and other munitions of war.

I want to bring one specific point to the attention of the committee. Under the present law, the Commodity Credit Corporation

cannot sell any commodity except grain for feeding at less than the parity price. Such a provision appears reasonable for commodities that can be stored. However, we are announcing some price supports for perishable commodities. In the case of perishable commodities the Corporation should be permitted to dispose of such commodities at less than parity where necessary to prevent waste of food.

I am also attaching herewith a statement prepared by the War Food Administration relative to the effect of section 3 of the proposed bill and also the program on certain commodities for 1943. It is as follows:

Except for competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseeds, and the right under section 4 of H. R. 3477 for Commodity Credit Corporation to sell perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of substantial loss due to spoilage, section 3 would prohibit Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other Government agency, from making any payments or absorbing any losses for the purpose of reducing or maintaining, or in lieu of increasing, ceiling prices on agricultural commodities or commodities processed in whole or substantial part therefrom. The provisions of this section would compel ceiling prices on such commodities to reflect to producers a price not less than the highest of the following: The support price, the comparable or parity price, or the highest average price received by producers from January 1, 1942, to September 15, 1942.

The probable effect, by commodities, of the provisions of this section on price ceilings and price-supporting activities of Commodity Credit Corporation and other Government agencies would be as follows:

1. Increases in maximum prices.

(a) Such increases as might be necessary in the ceiling price of pork products to reflect not less than $13.75 per hundredweight at Chicago for good to choice butcher hogs of weights from 200 to 270 pounds.

(b) An increase of 5 cents per pound in the ceiling price of butter.

(c) An increase of approximately 4 cents per pound in the ceiling price of American cheddar cheese.

(d) Increases of as much as $1.20 per hundredweight on some varieties of dry edible beans and lesser increases for other varieties.

(e) Such increases in the prices of canned corn, tomatoes, green beans and peas, as would be necessary to reflect increases of 25 to 50 percent in the cost of the raw materials and certain approved increases in labor costs.

(f) Increases of about $45 per ton in the ceiling prices for prunes and raisins.

(g) Increase of at least one-half cent per pound in the ceiling price of sugar in order to reflect the present support price of sugar beets. This increase would apply to all sugar although domestic sugar beets supply only one-fourth to one-fifth of the sugar consumed in the United States.

2. Discontinuation of the support price payment operations being carried out with respect to dry edible beans, canning crops, cheese, prunes, raisins, sugar beets, sugarcane, butter, beef, pork, hay for feeding dairy cattle in the drought areas of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina, and sales of wheat for feed at less than the cost of such wheat.

3. Since specific support prices have not been announced with respect to beef cattle, the provisions of section 3 would not make it mandatory that ceiling prices on meat products be increased, but if such ceiling prices were not increased, prices to producers probably would be reduced by the amount of the present payments that are being made with respect to beef. A similar situation would prevail with respect to hogs to the extent that the present payments make it possible for packers to pay more than the support price.

The ultimate cost to the Government of stopping these programs would be several times greater than the losses now being incurred. At the same time, many price ceilings would be more difficult to enforce.

Section 3 would definitely tie support prices to ceiling prices. This would mean that by or before January 1, 1944, in all cases in which price supports are above ceiling prices the ceiling prices would be increased to the support-price level. In connection with support prices for 1944 such prices could not in any case be above the new ceiling price. The practical effect of this would be to freeze support prices at present levels which in many cases would mean substantially less production in 1944.

Estimated losses resulting from price-support commitments and operations due to increased costs are as follows:

Program	Period covered	Estimated loss (in millions)
Commodity Credit Corporation:		
Dry beans	1943 crop	$8
Potatoes	do	20
Prunes	do	7
Raisins	do	7
Canning vegetables	do	30
Sugar	do	50
Cheddar cheese	1943	25
Fluid milk	1943	5
Oilseeds and products	1943 crops	60
Feed wheat	Fiscal year 1944	70
Dairy feed payments	1943	60
Miscellaneous	1943	8
Total		350
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Meat and butter	June to December 1943	200

Section 3 of H. R. 3477 provides that support prices can be continued but any maximum price hereafter established shall not be below the support price therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729 approved October 2, 1942.

In order to refresh the memory of the Members of the House as to just what section 3 is, the section that will stop subsidies after December 31, 1943, and stop support prices except as authorized, which will be unsatisfactory, I am inserting it herewith. It is as follows:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729; approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS ON SECTION 3

At my request the War Food Administrator, the Honorable Marvin Jones, commented upon this section for my information. His letter is inserted herewith. It will be noticed that Mr. Jones states in one part of his explanation:

This will involve some subsidies, but they are subsidies that are established primarily for the purpose of securing production, and the expenditures will be much less, both on the part of the Government and on the part of the public, than if the stabilization line were broken.

The entire letter is as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 21, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR WRIGHT: In response to your request, I am enclosing a statement prepared in the War Food Administration showing the probable effect by commodities of the provisions of section 3 of the proposed commodity credit bill, should it be adopted in its present form. I believe this analysis is substantially correct and is as accurate an estimate as can be made at this time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation already has in operation support prices on a number of different commodities. These were instituted in order to maintain the present ceiling prices and at the same time secure the necessary war food production. They will involve a loss of approximately $350,000,000 for the year 1943. A table showing the losses in the food program for 1943 is hereto attached.

We have included in both the attached analysis and the table R. F. C. losses for 1943 (as estimated by that agency), since the proposed bill as now worded would affect that agency.

To adopt the bill in its present form would require one of two things:

1. The lifting of all ceiling prices to support price levels, both those now prevailing and any that may be established in the future. This would jeopardize the entire stabilization program.

2. The other and more probable effect would be to reduce all support prices to present ceiling prices. This would materially hamper production.

It seems to me that it would be wise to permit the continuation of the present program of the War Food Administration and to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to produce the necessary food for the coming year. This will involve some subsidies, but they are subsidies that are established primarily for the purpose of securing production, and the expenditures will be much less, both on the part of the Government and on the part of the public, than if the stabilization line were broken.

If section 3, in its present form, is included in the bill, it will practically destroy the support price program. Carrying forward the support price program will involve some losses. This, however, would apply only to the commodities where the support price must be above the level of ceiling prices if we are to secure the necessary war food production.

The support price program for this year has involved the loss of only about $350,000,000. It has resulted in tremendous production. We will need even greater production in the coming year. The adoption of the bill would force a complete change, embark us on a course of great uncertainty, and jeopardize beyond measure our prospective 1944 production, which is vital to the war effort. This program has not only enabled us to realize these goals but to secure production in excess of the goals that were established.

We would like to suggest one of three courses in connection with this measure:

1. Strike out all of section 3. This would still leave the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities limited by the provision in the Agriculture Appropriation Act which forbids the selling of Government owned or controlled commodities below parity, with certain exceptions named in that provision.

2. If the Congress decides to retain section 3, we feel that it would be wise if an amendment were attached which would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to use not exceeding $600,000,000 for the year 1944, along the lines of our present price support program. The clause respecting any other agency should be eliminated, since such questions should be determined when that agency is before the committee.

3. If it is decided to retain section 3 without any provision as to funds, we suggest the amendment set out in draft B, attached hereto. This latter would have the effect of permitting the continuation of a program along similar lines to that now being maintained, subject to the limitations set out in the Agriculture Appropriation Act.

We feel that the language as reported by the committee in section 3 would completely tie the hands of the War Food Administration and that section 3 should either be completely eliminated or modified somewhat along the lines suggested in the proposed amendments.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

THE GROUPS SECTION 3 WILL FURTHER DEPRESS BY INCREASING THEIR COST OF LIVING

The proposal to include section 3 in H. R. 3477 is nothing more or less than a proposal to increase the cost of living. There is no other way that I know of that will permit the President to hold the line on prices, wages, and salaries except through the use of subsidies. Our opponents have been challenged repeatedly to suggest an alternative, but they cannot suggest one. Therefore, they are in effect openly advocating an increase in the cost of living and, indirectly, runaway inflation. I am inserting herewith a table showing the number of people who are receiving fixed incomes of different types and who will be quickly and very seriously affected by any cost-of-living increase. It is as follows:

Recipients of fixed incomes, by type of payment [1]

	Number of recipients (millions) [2]
A. Public assistance	[3] 2.94
1. Old-age assistance	2.17
2. Aid to dependent children	.31
3. Aid to the blind	.08
4. General relief	.38
Footnotes at end of table.	
B. Government salaries	4.58
1. Federal (excluding military) [4]	1.34
2. State and local (excluding public education)	1.92
3. Public education	1.32
C. Military allotments [5]	4.75
D. Veterans' pensions	.86
E. Old-age and survivors' insurance	.69
1. Lump-sum payments	.01
2. Monthly payments [3]	.68
F. Railroad retirement [4]	.16
G. Civil-service pensions [3]	.07
Total	14.05

[1] Excluding interest, rents, and military pay; exclusive also of life-insurance payments, which are not available.

[2] Only recipients are indicated. Reliable data on the total number of persons dependent upon fixed incomes (i. e., recipients and their dependents) are not available. It may be estimated by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor that approximately 6,000,000 workers are currently receiving wages of less than 40 cents an hour.

[3] May 1943.

[4] Latest monthly data.

[5] Army, October 1943; Navy, August 1943.

Sources: Public Assistance and Old Age and Survivors' Insurance, Social Security Board; Veterans' Pensions, Veterans' Bureau; Federal Employment and Civil Service Retirement Benefits, United States Civil Service Commission; State and Local Government Employment, Bureau of Census; Public Education, Constants used by Bureau of Census; Military Allotments, War and Navy Departments; Railroad Retirement, Monthly Review of Railroad Retirement Board, includes retirement operations and lump-sum death benefits.

PRICES—THIS WAR COMPARED WITH LAST

I am also inserting herewith a table showing how the cost of the war has been held down and how the cost to consumers in our country has been held down during this war as compared with World War No. 1. It is as follows:

Percentage increase in the cost of living after 48 months of war—World Wars No. 1 and 2 [1]

	World War No. 1	World War No. 2
	Percent	*Percent*
Cost of living, total	50.3	24.9
Food	63.9	46.7
Clothing	85.3	28.5
Rent	3.2	3.5
Fuel, electricity, and ice	35.2	10.6
Housefurnishings	77.2	24.8
Miscellaneous	49.9	15.7

[1] World War No. 2 data show change between August 1939 and August 1943, except for rent, where the latest available figure is for June 1943. World War No. 1 data show changes between July 1914 and July 1918, except for fuel, electricity, ice, and miscellaneous. No monthly data are available for these categories; therefore the figures show the change from the yearly average of 1914 to the yearly average of 1918.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC SUBSIDY

I am inserting herewith a table showing how the copper, lead, and zinc subsidy has worked in the public interest. The subsidies on these three products have saved the consumers, including the Government's war cost, more than $2,000,000,000 for the year 1943. It is as follows:

Difference between cost of copper, lead, and zinc under highest prices reached during World War No. 1 and under present premium price plan

	Copper	Lead	Zinc	Total
1. World War No. 1 highest price (cents per pound)	37	12¼	27	.....
2. World War No. 2 ceiling price (cents per pound)	12	6½	8¼	.....
3. Difference (cents per pound)	25	5¾	18¾	.....
4. 1943 production (million short tons)	3.2	1.0	1.3	.....
5. Cost of difference between ceiling price and World War No. 1 high (millions of dollars)	1,600	115	488	2,203
6. Premium payments (millions of dollars)	35	9	34	78
7. Net difference (millions of dollars)	1,565	106	454	2,125

I am also inserting herewith a table showing the net savings to consumers of fuel oil in the New England States by reason of subsidies on transportation. It is as follows:

Savings from subsidy on transportation of petroleum products into district 1

	Average per barrel	Aggregate
	Dollars	*Millions of dollars*
1. Price increase that would be required without subsidy	1.20	606
2. Actual price increase	.43	216
3. Gross saving	.77	390
4. Subsidy	.20	100
5. Net saving	.57	290

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Without making any argument on the subsidy question, I simply wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that on December 1 the O. P. A. and its sister agencies forced a subsidy on the cheese industry of Wisconsin without asking the cheese industry or the cheesemakers or the men who produce the milk or produce the cheese. If the gentleman will take the time to look up the record, he will find that every month since December 1, 1942, there has been a reduction in the production of cheese. If a subsidy is going to increase production, that is one thing, but if it is just a plaything for some super-duper federally financed agency, that is another thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report from the

Special Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore granted by the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] for 30 minutes.

THE ALUMINUM SITUATION

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the facts concerning the production of aluminum, its present supply and control of both the production and raw material sources seem to me to present a picture shadowed with the gravest of implications. This picture, involving as it does, the very safety of our Nation is one which cannot longer be ignored. The factual record seems to be unmistakably clear. No matter whose figures are used, it is evident that the vital problem of a future supply of aluminum has been and is being shockingly mishandled. The present critical state of our vital aluminum supply, highlighted by a series of conflicting and contradictory statements dating back to December 1939, demands a full and complete examination and discussion. The motivation responsible for this situation should be searched out and brought to light.

Apparently at no time during the last 4 years has a long-range over-all plan for aluminum production and future supply been clearly and concisely outlined by anyone. Let me cite a few items from the printed record on this subject appearing in the daily press. On August 12, 1939, Mr. I. W. Wilson, vice president of the Aluminum Co. of America, testified in the antitrust suit that Alcoa can "supply the United States Government, both Army and Navy with all the aluminum it will require for national defense within the next year" and "a substantial surplus" for the British "on top of ordinary domestic requirements."

Then, 1 year and 3 months after that, on November 25, 1940, in fact, President Arthur E. Davis of Alcoa, in a letter to a customer, the Reynolds Co., made this statement:

> Just now we are rather hard up for aluminum. No further commitment on our part is possible.

However, just 3 days later, on November 28, Marion B. Folsom, expert adviser on aluminum for the National Defense Advisory Committee stated:

> There is certain to be plenty of aluminum for this country's military and civilian requirements with the British plane program in addition. If necessary the United States can supply all the aluminum, without recourse to sources abroad. There is ample ore in Arkansas for all needs for several years. There is no need for priorities in the aluminum industry because expected production will allow for increases in civilian use.

But less than 1 month later, on December 24, 1940, newspaper headlines read, "United States aluminum shortage reported — National Defense Advisory Committee considers mandatory priorities." The story went on to say that Northrup Aircraft Corporation announced on December 23 curtailed production because of the aluminum shortage. Then, a few days later on December 29, Mr. Stettinius, then chairman of the National Defense Advisory Committee, contradicted that by saying that there was no serious shortage in aluminum supply for aircraft and other military items now required for national defense.

However, just a half month later on January 15, 1941, Glenn L. Martin reported that slow aluminum deliveries were delaying plane production and the House Naval Affairs Committee held hearings and received testimony concerning delay in aluminum deliveries holding up plane production.

Just 1 month later the New York Times remarked editorially:

> It is a temporary sort of bottleneck that seems to have occurred lately with regard to aluminum.

But the Times was too modest in its statement, because less than 10 days later on February 24, mandatory priorities on aluminum were placed in effect by the Office of Production Management and Mr. Stettinius stated that the situation had changed within 2 months.

A week later on March 1, the Office of Production Management announced that most of the current aluminum supply would be required for defense. And, 2 weeks later on March 15, announced rationing of aluminum for civilian uses with cuts ranging up to 75 percent.

Those confusing statements were all made within a period of slightly more than a year and they serve to illustrate the almost total lack of knowledge by those in authority on the subject of aluminum needs and aluminum production.

It soon became evident, however, with the need emphasized by the sharp step-up in airplane production, and with plans for the future calling for heretofore unheard of numbers of planes, that the aluminum problem for war was much too large a one even for the gigantic Aluminum Co. of America, and a genuine program of increased aluminum production was then launched. The success of the program to increase aluminum production is unquestioned. Our highest production prior to the war was 200,000 tons per year. A really brilliant job of plant expansion, accomplished by the War Production Board with the cooperation of the Defense Plant Corporation, the Aluminum Co. of America, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Reynolds Metals Co., has multiplied aluminum production more than six times. Our production this year will run to 1,250,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could conclude my speech at this point for I have recited what is apparently a success story. It is a story told us over and over again and is a story of achievement in which we may well take great pride. Less than 2 weeks ago, in fact, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, acting head of the War Production Board, told a group of Members of Congress, of which I was one, that the aluminum situation for war was in splendid shape and, to use his exact words, he said, "We have so much aluminum that it is running out of our ears." Mr. Wilson was obviously proud of the achievement of the War Production Board in thus meeting the emergency need for aluminum.

But the story of the current large production of finished aluminum just recited is not the whole story. It represents merely the show window of the true aluminum situation. I cannot imagine how Mr. Wilson or anyone else can find pride or comfort in the actual facts of our aluminum supply situation.

Mr. Speaker, I will now endeavor to set forth some of the facts behind the afore-mentioned window dressing. These facts may be obtained or verified by anyone from easily available sources.

Two principal steps are required in the production of aluminum: First, a fine white powder called alumina must be extracted from the ore by a process of crushing, washing, and chemical action. Secondly, alumina is then converted into the product we know as aluminium by an electrolytic process. The principal raw material or ore from which alumina is obtained is known as bauxite. As the industry now operates aluminum cannot be made unless there is alumina to make it from, and the alumina cannot be obtained unless we have bauxite from which to obtain it. In other words, our splendid plants constructed and equipped and producing 1,250,000 tons of aluminum annually are just so much junk unless they have available to them the raw material from which to produce the finished aluminum. Obviously then, we should have readily available vast stores of bauxite.

But we do not have a supply of bauxite in the United States to last longer than 2 years.

Estimates of the remaining bauxite deposits in this country vary widely. The aluminum industry is geared to the production of alumina from high-grade bauxite. Of this material there is probably not more than 8,500,000 tons remaining although there is a reliable estimate that I have seen that lowers this figure to less than 6,000,000 tons. Translated into time, this supply of bauxite remaining in the United States will maintain our aluminum industry which uses 7,000,000 tons annually, approximately 1 year. When that supply of high-grade bauxite is gone, it is gone forever. So far as it is known today there are no more deposits of high-grade ore worth mentioning. About a year ago the Bureau of Mines sent out

20 exploration parties to hunt new bauxite supplies. These explorations are still going on and it is reported that some 6,000,000 tons or more have been located. But not much of this ore is considered high-grade material and the aluminum industry is definitely geared to the use of high-grade bauxite. If we include the low-grade ore deposits along with the remaining high-grade ore, we probably have enough bauxite, both low and high grade, to run the aluminium industry at its present rate for 3 years. I am informed, however, that the processes for using the low-grade ores, the term "low grade" meaning bauxite containing more than 8 percent silica, are not yet completely successful and it is reliably stated, also, that new discoveries of bauxite deposits are deep in the ground and contain more iron than current reduction processes can cope with. In addition to this, more than a year would be required to do the necessary preliminary mining work. I think, therefore, that we must conclude that the available and dependable supply of bauxite, including a usable amount of low-grade ore, cannot be counted upon to last longer than 2 years from this date.

How then can our sorely needed production of airplanes be continued, when our bauxite supply is gone? The answer is that it is entirely possible that it cannot be continued at all if war reverses should stop our bauxite fleet. If plane production is continued, it will only be by the use of vast amounts of shipping space and with the sacrifice of lives of sailors and gun crews plus the maintenance of a small army of occupation in a country with which we are not at war.

A large portion of the bauxite ore we are now using comes from Dutch Guiana in South America and must be shipped up the Atlantic coast and through the Caribbean Sea. The bauxite for the Canadian aluminum plants which we supply is shipped up the Atlantic coast from British Guiana in South America to the plant in Canada. Dutch Guiana is our principal source of the raw material from which aluminum is made, and presently, when the Arkansas deposits are gone, it will be our only source of this material unless steps are taken immediately to secure a supply of raw materials from other and readily available sources within the United States.

Bauxite is not the only raw-material source for the production of aluminum.

It is possible to produce alumina from aluminum-bearing clays, which exist in many parts of the United States in unlimited quantities. This is not a new and suddenly discovered fact. The Aluminum Co. of America, the War Production Board, and the Bureau of Mines have known about processes for extracting alumina from clay for a considerable time. Even though scientists have long ago checked and approved at least five different processes for obtaining alumina from clay, only a mere handful of alumina is now being produced from that source. In spite of all of the facts I have just stated, the War Production Board not long ago announced a decision denying the construction of plants in the United States for the perfection of three processes for producing alumina from clay.

The history of the several efforts which have been made to get preliminary plants for the production of alumina from clay into existence is a record of delay and disappointment. Although such development should have been started more than 2 years ago, it has not yet begun, and there is no evidence as of this hour to indicate it ever will be begun on a scale that will insure national security of an aluminum supply in the face of any war reverses.

On March 16, 1941, a detailed proposal for the construction of a plant for the production of alumina from domestic alunite, a type of aluminum-bearing clay found in the State of Utah, was presented to the Interior Department and defense officials by responsible individuals. This proposal was promptly acted upon by the Bureau of Mines, which reported favorably on the proposal on April 18, 1941. On July 6, approval of the alunite process was announced. However, emphasis was still being placed on bauxite importation, and on June 17 of the same year, 1941, Arthur E. Davis, chairman of the board of the Aluminum Co. of America, testified before the Senate committee, expressing concern over the inability to obtain enough ships to get bauxite ore into this country from South America.

In November 1942, after considerable investigation, engineering, and chemical study, several developers of processes for producing alumina from clay appeared, but at that time it was stated that the processes were not sufficiently developed. But oddly enough, along with that announcement came a statement that plans were already being made for the expansion of alumina production from monopoly controlled bauxite from Dutch Guiana.

Early this year, however, the National Academy of Sciences approved three new processes for the development of alumina from clay. The Academy gave its approval for the construction of minimum size plants in three regions, one in the South, one in Wyoming, and another in the Pacific Northwest. By midyear all three proposals had cleared the various steps and were finally approved for construction by the War Production Board. But on or about the 18th of July, approval for construction of the plant in the Northwest was withdrawn because of an alleged shortage of manpower in Oregon and Washington, and early in September, it was learned that approval had been canceled by the War Production Board for the construction of the other two plants on the ground that the development of alumina from clay was unnecessary. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to make what some might consider an attack upon a business enterprise, an industry, if you please, that has loyally endeavored to meet its war-production obligations. Nevertheless, in order to present a clear and understandable picture of this entire situation, I must speak plainly, very plainly.

Until very recently, the Aluminum Co. of America was the only producer of virgin aluminum in the United States. It has held this unique and very profitable position for 53 years. Down through the years, this company did a good job of improving its methods and of finding new uses for aluminum and of getting widespread distribution of the metal for the benefit of the people of the country. During that period, also, the cost of aluminum was reduced from about $8 per pound to a few cents per pound. The company has always been ably managed and very farsighted. The amount of bauxite available in the United States being limited, this company soon obtained control of most of the entire available supply. The next most easily accessible source was in South America in Dutch Guiana and now the Aluminum Co. of America controls nearly all of the deposits down there. The remainder, I am told, are controlled by the British Aluminum Co.

Until the Reynolds Metals Co., formerly producers of metal foil wrappers, went into the business of producing straight aluminum, obtaining part of its alumina from a limited supply of ore near Lister Hill, Ala., the Aluminum Co. of America had a complete and total monopoly on aluminum production. It still controls 93 percent.

When we entered the period of war emergency and the time of need for vastly expanded aluminum production, this monopolistic situation had both great advantages and equally great disadvantages. The advantages consisted principally of large production with centralized control and a single producing company with which to deal. The disadvantages of the monopolistic situation in the aluminum supply are not so simple to enumerate nor so easy to identify. Being the sole and only producer of aluminum, the only knowledge of aluminum production available to Government war agencies came obviously from the Aluminum Co. of America. Practically all known supplies of raw material were controlled by the company. And there must still exist a very natural desire on the part of the owners and operators of the Aluminum Co. of America to protect its position and not permit the war emergency to destroy its very profitable monopolistic control of the vital metal.

If aluminum could be obtained in no other way than from bauxite, we doubtless would have to accept the situation as we find it and continue to run the risk of protecting bauxite shipping supply lines from South America. We might also have to continue to obtain our aluminum solely from a monopoly corporation. But there is another way of obtaining aluminum. It can now be obtained from clay. There is so much aluminum-bearing clay in the United States that a monopolistic control of the source of aluminum ores could not possibly be obtained by the Aluminum Co. of America

or any other corporation. In other words, the necessity in the interest of national security to provide a domestic and dependable and inexhaustible supply of alumina from clay will in fact destroy the 53 years complete supremacy in aluminum production enjoyed by the one company. It is not reasonable therefore to believe that this company would seriously lend any of its knowledge or any other help to proposals to establish alumina production from clays abundantly available in the United States. Least of all would the Aluminum Co. of America want to see the vast deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the States of Oregon and Washington opened up and developed. Approximately 40 percent of all war aluminum production is in those two States. The manufacture of aluminum requires vast amounts of electricity. Cheap hydroelectric power is available from the enormous dams on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee and at Bonneville. The amount of aluminum produced from the Columbia River power plants within the last 12 months is equivalent to the metal requirements of 70,000 fighting planes. With power cheap and plentiful there and with alumina available from clays almost at the door of the plants, it is easy to visualize peacetime production of aluminum for the people of this country at unheard-of low prices and manufactured by numerous privately owned and competing enterprises. But if aluminum is not developed from Northwest clay deposits or from any other United States clay deposits, in commercial quantities, the Aluminum Co. of America will continue to enjoy its monopoly.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Briefly, for a question.

Mr. HAYS. First I compliment the gentleman very much and appreciate what he is giving us in the way of information. I come from the State of Arkansas, where we have this large supply. I wondered if the gentleman was aware of the efforts being made to deal with this iron-content problem in the supply of bauxite, that is available in Arkansas, and if he can enlighten us on the possibility of that relieving the situation?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I can only say that my information is limited. It is known that there are new discoveries, and that they do have a high percentage of iron. The Bureau of Mines tells me there is some doubt about the efficiency of the process for obtaining alumina from bauxite which has a nigh iron content and therefore they do not really know as yet what the production from these deposits will be.

Mr. HAYS. The available supply, according to my information, is in the hands of independent owners.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Of the new deposits?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, to compliment the gentleman on the dissertation that he is giving us on this all-important subject, and in connection with that to ask him if he has familiarized himself with the Walthall process, that was announced some 2 or 3 years ago by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the so-called process of extracting alumina from clay. In that connection I would like to say that about a year ago in a conversation with Dr. Miller, the Chief Chemist of the Tennessee Valley Authority, he told me that he was confident that with that process at its then point of development aluminum could be produced in quantities at 15 cents per pound, which was the then prevailing price of aluminum, and I saw him actually making aluminum in a pilot plant, capable of turning out 1 ton a day.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation and I know that is correct, and I believe that process is now one of those under discussion. Is that the one located in South Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand it, these plants to be located do not confine themselves to any particular process but would concern themselves with the supply of the entire field, the use of both clays and low-grade deposits.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Different processes are known. They do work, but they have been delayed in the matter of development.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. I, too, compliment the gentleman on this very fine study of this important problem, and I ask if it is not true that there are a number of processes that have been approved by scientists and experts, who have given as their judgment the workability of that process, so that alumina may be developed from a number of different deposits which are located throughout the United States, for which we may obtain the raw materials to make aluminum.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I shall answer the gentleman by saying that it is very well known by Government agencies and many private individuals that there are at least six processes known to be proven and approved by the National Academy of Sciences, and passed by the Young committee, and at one time passed by the War Production Board but later three of them were withheld from development.

In time of peace we can and we have paid the prices as set by monopolies in various fields. We either pay the price or we go without—and undesirable as that situation may be to the public, it is not one that involves loss of life or any danger to national security.

But in time of war, the price we seem to be paying and perhaps shall continue to pay as a result of monopoly control of the vitally essential material, aluminum, is a large one indeed, for we are paying not only with money but in blood as well. It is a costly and dangerous business to ship bauxite ore from Dutch Guiana up the Atlantic coast to the United States. But we are doing it and have done it for years and we will continue to do it on an expanding basis unless we have the wisdom to break the monopoly hold and establish the alumina from clay industries in the United States.

Hundreds of sailors have paid with their lives in an effort to keep the bauxite fleet running from Dutch Ginana. It would not be proper to reveal exact figures at this time, but I can tell you this, we have already lost more sailors and gun crews from bauxite boats than we would need in manpower numbers to build an alumina-from-clay plant in the Northwest. And yet they talk about a manpower shortage and cite it as the reason for not allowing that construction. To maintain even the present rate of importation of bauxite, the annual requirement is 200 shiploads, and let me point out that each ship carries a crew of from 40 to 60 men, including the gunners. That takes manpower.

General MacArthur and General Eisenhower would, I am sure, be very happy to receive 200 more shiploads of supplies of planes and ammunition each year the war goes on.

Nor is everything sweetness and light down in South America where this bauxite is mined. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House will recall that it was necessary to send troops to Dutch Guiana to protect the bauxite mines in that country with military force in order to prevent sabotage and disorders of the native population and to protect our supply of bauxite. I have never heard that those troops have been recalled. We still maintain this army there as a part of the price we are paying to protect a monopoly aluminum supply. I checked on that matter this morning, with both the War Department and the State Department, and I am told that the troops are still in Dutch Guiana and probably will remain there. And yet they say that manpower cannot be obtained to build a small plant for the development of alumina from clay in the Northwest. Only some 300 men would be needed.

I do not know what rate of wages the native miners of Dutch Guiana receive but I believe it is a fair guess that they are not paid anywhere near as much as are the American workmen who operate the bauxite mines in Arkansas.

Possibly the difference in wages is the reason, or there may be other reasons, but as of October 1, the mining of bauxite from our dwindling resources in Arkansas was reduced 65 percent, and the loyal miners who have toiled and strained to keep our aluminum plants producing by jumping their production from 100,000 tons per month to 700,000 tons per month are being laid off or put into other work.

I have had some interesting correspondence from the head of the International Union of the Aluminum Workers of America which I shall place in the RECORD at another time. The miners know this story and do not like it. I quote the concluding sentences in the letter written on October 4 this year by the head of Aluminum Workers of American Union to Mr. Arthur H. Bunker, Director

of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board:

Now along comes W. P. B. threatening to institute a strike of its own which will cut production 65 percent. I shall not "sell" this scheme to the Arkansas miners, not until the seaman tell us that the bauxite route is once more safe, not until the War Shipping Administration tells us that they have enough ships for the war fronts and not until the War Manpower Commission shows us that shortage of Arkansas labor is more crucial than the shortage of seamen. Until such time my conscience compels me to denounce your order and instruct our members to insist on continuing to get out the bauxite.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. Most of the bauxite deposits are in Arkansas in my own district. What the gentleman said is correct. There is no shortage of labor. We had a number of contractors who were induced to go in there and start production. Some of them have been laid off entirely. Others have been reduced in their quantity of production and many of them are going broke. They do have a very large reserve of bauxite, probably four or five million dollars worth, enough maybe to last this country a year, but it is deplorable that with that amount in reserve, production has been discontinued.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is even more deplorable when we realize that the curtailment of 65 percent does two things. The employment goes to labor in South America when we do not have a labor shortage in Arkansas, and this curtailment compels additional sailors to risk their lives in bringing the bauxite here from Dutch Guiana.

There is another and very heavy and serious wartime price we are paying for the maintenance of the monopolistic situation of the Aluminum Co. of America. The rail transportation burden is very heavy. The Oregon and Washington aluminum plants use a total of about 600,000 tons of alumina per year. Alumina, which is obtained from imported and domestic bauxite, is a white powdered sugar type of war material that is used to feed the aluminum manufacturing plants, and is extracted from the ore in only three plants, all of which are located in the Southeast section of the country, in Arkansas and Louisiana. The average distance of shipment, therefore, from these alumina producing plants to Northwest alumina reduction plants is 2,600 miles.

Assuming that this alumina is shipped in standard freight cars having a capacity of 80,000 pounds, a total annual movement of 15,250 cars is required to maintain the Oregon and Washington aluminum production. This amount of rail shipping continually ties up some 650 freight cars in loading, in transit, and unloading. Although when the entire amount of railroad freight capacity is considered, this item of 650 cars does not represent an extremely large percentage of the total. Nevertheless it is a substantial amount. And under present circumstances when our transportation facilities are loaded to the maximum, when freight trains are moving night and day and at fast speeds, and still unable to quite keep up with demands, the additional burden of equipment requirements for alumina transportation to the Northwest could and should be relieved.

In terms of our future security, no matter how short the war turns out to be, and certainly no one can predict its length either in months or in years, it is essential that the clay processes be developed to commercial scale operation. Even if we did not use another pound of Arkansas bauxite, the reserves there are inadequate to support any future emergency aluminum program just as they have proven inadequate for this war.

The immediate development of United States alumina from clay processes is therefore absolutely necessary in order to provide security of supply for aluminum in the future, to save the lives of sailors and gun crews, to relieve protective troops now on guard at the South American bauxite mines, to relieve the burden on both ocean and rail shipping, and for the future as a guaranty of free competitive enterprise. There can be no bona fide excuse for further delay in developing domestic alumina production.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) entitled "An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist upon the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. ELSTON of Ohio, and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I was granted permission to address the House for 15 minutes following the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCCORD] The gentleman from Tennessee has kindly consented that I may proceed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no obection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, something is happening—something dramatic and fundamental—to the way of life itself on the American farm. Because we who constitute the legislative and executive branches of this great democracy are responsible for this phenomenal change, we should, in my opinion, give serious thought to what it means in the present and in the future.

I am speaking of rural electrification, not only in my own State of Florida, but in the 46 States whose farm people are being served with electricity through the rural electric cooperatives.

When we of the Congress set up the Rural Electrification Administration 8 years ago to sponsor and guide and lend money to farm cooperatives, little did we dream that within such a short time 1,300,000 farm people would avail themselves of what has become such a truly great development.

It is the purpose of R. E. A. to carry electricity to farm communities which have not been able to receive it from other sources. Owing to high operating cost, municipal power plants and privately owned utilities have not been able to embark extensively upon service in rural communities. To carry current to isolated farms would mean loss of money to the municipality or to the company. Farmers themselves doing their own management economically are able to serve themselves with electrical current at a minimum cost and without money loss. In Florida as a whole, friendly electrical service relations exist and R. E. A. is bound to expand in sparsely settled rural areas.

THE SITUATION WAS OVERRIPE

There must have been some reason for the success of this program—and that reason today is obvious. Only 10 percent of the farm people of America enjoyed the blessings of electricity in their homes when R. E. A. was born. The farmers in the South and the North and East and the West had been gradually becoming poorer and increasingly discontented for more than a decade. No one seemed to understand just why. Perhaps there were many reasons, but this one significant fact stands out: This had become an electrical age in which, throughout commerce and industry, 2 cents worth of electricity was doing the daily labor of one man. Farm people found themselves still pumping their water by hand; still milking their cows by hand; still hauling their feed to town for grinding; still washing their clothes by hand; still using the old wood or coal cook stoves; still spending hot hours over the old flatiron; still without refrigerators in their homes; still without radios. It is true that the farm does not lend itself as easily to electrification as does commerce and industry, but it is also true that with electricity the farmers can substantially increase their incomes; lighten their burdens; improve their health and add to their comfort and happiness in living.

During all the 19 years I have served in the Congress, I think I have never done anything of which I am today more justly proud than my support of not only the original Electrification Act but subsequent legislation as well. The rural electric cooperatives of America—private successful corporations of farmers—are, I am happy to observe, today serving

approximately 29 percent of America's farm homes. In my State of Florida there are 12 cooperatives serving a total of 8,339 farmers. What is more important perhaps for our immediate consideration is the fact that in the United States there are 6,000,000 farm homes and farm establishments still unserved, and in my State of Florida alone there are 42,648 still unserved.

THE RECORD OF THE "CO-OPS" IN FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, when the prediction was made that during the year 1942 more food would be produced than during any other year in our Nation's history, we heard the cry from the far corners, "It can't be done." People everywhere were conscious that the farm boys and the farmhands and, in many cases, the farm operators had gone to war. One out of four of them had left the farm to either enter the armed forces or work in the war plants. There was fear that the country's food supply might dwindle to an all-time low. But those who held such fear had failed to reckon with this new force in the farm economy—with this new servant who had come to replace the boys who had answered their country's call. Senator George Norris, coauthor of the R. E. A. Act, speaking of this new force at the first national convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis last January, said:

> This electricity that gets into the farm home means a new helper in that home, and she is a remarkable helper, too—the harder she works, the better she likes it, and the longer she works and the more she works, the less she charges for it, and she never takes off any Thursday afternoon or forenoon, either. She works 24 hours a day and enjoys every minute of it. That is the kind of helper the Rural Electrification Administration has brought into the farm home. The helper is grinding the feed, pumping the water, doing all kinds of work, and the more he does, the better he gets, the cheaper he gets, the more efficient he becomes.

This, my friends, is the secret of America's record food production in 1942.

Because of scarcity of copper and of steel and other materials, the War Production Board stopped all construction of rural electric lines by its P–46 order of July 21 last year. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—the national association of the cooperatives—of whom my former colleague, Clyde T. Ellis, is the executive manager, believed that by connecting more and more farms, substantially more and more food could be produced. We owe a vote of thanks to the national association of the cooperatives for doing the research which finally convinced the War Production Board as to what this new farm servant could do. The national association told the War Production Board that the composite opinion of the cooperatives was that 23 percent more of the vital foods could be produced on the then unelectrified farms if electricity could be made available to them. The War Production Board and the War Food Administration, by a series of orders, have permitted and are today permitting rather extensive construction for the electrification of still more farms.

William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, speaking before the cooperatives of Georgia on the 12th day of this month said, and I quote from his address as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator GEORGE on Monday of this week:

> Spot checks in representative areas have been made to determine the effect of the electricity on farm production among these newly connected farmers. These spot checks indicate that the benefit to livestock production through the ability of the farmer to maintain his present production with decreased labor, or increased production with present labor, is equivalent to 34 percent.

And he went on to say:

> The labor saved by the availability of electricity may have been almost equally reflected in increased production of field crops.

Think of it gentlemen, an increase of 34 percent because of electricity being made available to the farm home.

I am hopeful it will be possible for this program to continue to expand even during the war because I am deeply aware that every day that passes, as we liberate the occupied countries and attempt to feed their poor, starving people, increases the burden and demand on the American farm. This new servant, electricity, while at the same time vastly helping our own people, may be directly responsible for saving from starvation perhaps hundreds of thousands of helpless men, women, and children.

But, gentlemen, this program has had hardly more than a glorious beginning. It is the duty and responsibility of all of us here to assist in every way possible to do all of the preliminary work so that the day the war is over, construction can get under way in order that the unserved 60 percent of the American farm homes can be likewise blessed.

I am happy to announce that I am advised by the Rural Electrification authorities that many additional projects are being planned and prepared. Think of the happiness it will bring to 6,000,000 farm people. Think too of what it will mean in terms of employment in the factories that will produce the materials and employment in actual construction and operation in the rural areas—employment for these young men who are going to be coming back pretty soon from the far-flung battlefields of the earth.

And the beauty of this program is that it costs nobody anything. I grant you that the Government lends the money but the Government turns around and borrows the money on the mortgages given by the cooperatives. Actually this money is costing the Government less than 1 percent. The Government loans the money at from about 2½ to 3 percent interest and I am reliably informed that the Federal Government has benefited around $7,000,000 on these R. E. A. loans, even after the total cost of the administration of R. E. A. to date is deducted. All loans are self-liquidating.

I desire, therefore, to call to the attention of every Member of this House the fact that there is pending before us today what is known as the Russell-Rankin bill, a bill designed to make it easier for these cooperatives to connect more members and especially in the more sparsely settled areas.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN, wherein he said to the cooperatives of America, "Electricity is the lifeblood of an advancing civilization."

FARM LEADERSHIP

Mr. Speaker, I speak feelingly concerning the welfare of the farmers of our Nation. I was born and reared on a small farm in Bradford County, Fla., and performed the usual duties, services, and labor, I hope, of the average farm boy. I have chopped wood, sawed wood, pumped water, milked cows, and studied school lessons by the light of a kerosene lamp and by the light from the flame of the open fireplace. I have observed the usual duties performed by the mother and housewife of washing by hand, ironing with a flatiron in front of a blazing fire, cooking on the hot wood stove on a sweltering August day, and the many other usual duties. No; there were no electric fans or refrigerators; no electric lights or radios.

Now it happens that in the same community where I was reared, we have the R. E. A. The farm homes there of the neighbors of my childhood are now enjoying the economic aid, the comforts, and the conveniences of cheap R. E. A. current. Yes; they have there washing machines, electric wood saws, electric feed grinders, electric irons, fans, refrigerators, cooking stoves, sewing machines, radios, and other electrical equipment and services.

From the soil springs the wealth of the Nation. Likewise from the soil springs, I have always believed, superior strength and citizen leadership. Your Nation today is drawing from its farm population and farm origin a large portion of its leadership in industry, finance, war, education, religious, and civic affairs. In my humble opinion, no American is greater than the farmer who lives and toils in the open under the blue canopy of heaven, and honestly and diligently wrings his living from the breast of Mother Earth. He shall in the future as in the past contribute his portion, not only in supplying the peoples of the earth with food and textiles, but also with great leadership in the affairs of men. Yes, they are entitled to rural electrification.

FLORIDA'S GREAT PART IN NAVAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is indeed quite appropriate that we pause today to pay tribute to our great American Navy. In no period of the world's history has any navy surpassed in performance that which has been accomplished by the American Navy during the present global war. Far flung to every corner of the world, it has met the enemy in battle and in every instance where combatting forces were anything like equal in number, the American Navy has come out on top.

The brilliant performances of our Navy at Wake Island, the Solomon Islands, at

Midway, in the Battle of the Coral Sea, at Guadalcanal, Attu, Sicily, and in countless other places, will ever go down in history as the most brilliant of all armed conflicts.

Florida, I believe, can well point with pride to the wonderful training accomplishments of the Navy within this State. She has contributed the lion's share of pilots and other naval air-power personnel. The naval Air Operational Training Corps has operated most effectively at such well-known Florida naval air stations and auxiliaries as Pensacola, Jacksonville, Miami, Banana River, Key West, Vero Beach, Fort Lauderdale, Melbourne, Sanford, Daytona Beach, Lake City, Hollywood, and other places Many of the 30,000 per year potential pilots and of the tens of thousands of naval air specialists are there trained under the most favorable conditions of any training in the world. High naval officials and the War Administration well recognized the unequaled opportunities, climatic and otherwise, in Florida for naval air operational training.

It is appropriate, I believe, also, that we should especially remember today the great American achievement during the pending conflict of generalship and naval-vessel construction. American shipyards have turned out more ship tonnage than all combined nations in any like period in the history of the world. Florida has done its part in this ship construction. Some $40,000,000 worth of ships have already been completed and launched in Florida, and in Florida yards, $186,000,000 worth of shipbuilding contracts are now under construction. The Federal Government has expended in my State for shore facilities, aviation and naval operating bases, approximately $150,000,000 since January 1940. This, my friends, indicates in part the great degree in which Florida is participating in the naval program.

It is significant that so many of the Florida-trained pilots and other naval air personnel have participated in so many actual conflicts during this war, and I am proud to say that they, in the hottest of conflicts, have indeed acquitted themselves well.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McCORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, if we are facing the hungriest world that has ever existed, as some of the thought at this time seems to indicate, then it becomes necessary that we be alert, to the end that our production may be kept up to the standard of efficiency so that when the hungry world does exist we will have something in our storehouse to take care of it.

I am not an alarmist, but anyone who has given serious consideration to the possibility of our agricultural industry's supplying food and feedstuffs essential to the needs of a world at war cannot escape the conclusion that a food shortage of grave proportions is apparent at this very time. I have been very closely associated with the farming and dairy industries during the greater part of my life and have watched with pride and interest the development, particularly of the dairy industry, in my home State of Tennessee. For 20 years I have sold at auction considerably more Jersey cattle than any other man in the United States or Canada, and quite naturally I am especially interested in the present demoralized condition within our dairy industry. Scientists have proved that the dairy cow is the most efficient converter of feedstuffs into protein and energy-building foods. Food officials have shown concern at last over the unfavorable milk-production prospects in the East, South, and far West. Numerous suggestions have been put forth for remedying the present situation. It is not my purpose in this discussion to place any blame for this condition on any particular person, agency, or branch of our Government. We have been warned repeatedly that the condition we now find ourselves in was imminent. We have been too slow in taking steps to correct our mistakes and misguided efforts. I am anxious that we thoroughly understand the position we are now in, particularly in the dairy industry and that a program be developed immediately that will assure adequate production of milk for ourselves and our allies.

Briefly stated, the milk supply situation is this: Milk production is falling below last year's level even though we have more milch cows than ever before. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics predicts a total production for this year of 118,000,000,000 pounds as compared with 119,000,000,000 pounds last year. It is further predicted that the output next year may decline to 115,000,000,000 pounds. The goal set for next year's production as the minimum necessity to meet military, lend-lease, and civilian requirements is 122,000,000,000 pounds, which simply means that we are faced with a production next year falling 7,000,000,000 pounds short of the necessary minimum requirements. During the past 2 or 3 months production of milk has shown more than the usual decline. Total milk production for the month of August is estimated at 10,600,000,000 pounds this year, which figure is some 200,000,000 pounds less than the production in the same month last year. Milk production per cow was 5 to 6 percent lower on September 1, 1943, than on the same date last year. In some Southern and Southwestern States the percentage of decrease per cow is alarming. It is unnecessary to call your attention to the shortage of byproducts of milk at this time. Officials of the War Food Administration are evidently much concerned over this condition in that they have already established in 48 metropolitan areas a quota system limiting retail sales of whole fluid milk for human consumption and there is evidence that this program will of necessity be extended to other areas in the near future. While total milk production has been declining, the demand has sharply increased. It is estimated that there has been a 20-percent increase in demand for fluid milk for human consumption since 1941.

There are several reasons for this decline in production of milk. They might be listed in order of their importance as follows: feed situation, price-control policies, increased labor cost, shortage of machinery and equipment, and drought. Only the first two of these will be discussed at length.

In order to understand the condition that exists, it is necessary to review the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relative to the establishment of ceiling prices on agricultural commodities. Probably no provision in the act provoked more bitter controversy than that section relating to agricultural commodities. There are approximately 50,000,000 people living on farms and 130,000,000 million people in our country dependent upon agricultural commodities for their very subsistence. This fact within itself was sufficient to insure a thorough hearing and consideration of the question in our Congress and I believe that the law as enacted is adequate to resolve the conflicting interests at present. Congress provided in this law that no maximum price should be established for any agricultural commodity below a figure which would reflect to the producer parity price for such commodity or the highest price received by such producer for such commodity between January 1 and September 15, 1942, and further provided that modification should be made in maximum ceiling prices established for agricultural commodities or commodities processed in substantial part from agricultural commodities in any case where it appeared that such modification was necessary in order to increase production or by reason of increased labor or other costs. Such a provision was a part of the bill from its inception and was justified on the ground that it would provide the producer with an adequate opportunity to realize the parity goal which is conceded to be a reasonable return to the producer and one that will assure adequate production. It is obvious, however, now, and was just as obvious at the time of the passage of this act, that if price increases in cost elements are permitted to endure for some time before a control is imposed, the result will be a justifiable demand for a higher price; for example, the original act precluded the establishment of maximum prices on agricultural commodities until these commodities had reached 110 percent of the parity price or a comparable price adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials. The price of wheat on March 15, 1942, was $1.05 per bushel—110 percent of parity for wheat on that date would have been $1.44 per bushel. The market price of corn on March 15, 1942, was 78.4 cents per bushel—110 percent of parity was $1.04 per bushel; thus, it can readily be seen that Congress intended that wheat should rise 39 cents per bushel before price ceilings would be applicable and that corn should rise approximately 26 cents per bushel before ceilings would be applicable.

This is true similarly with other grains and feeds so that it is clear that when ceilings were placed on wholesale and retail sales of fluid milk and an increase in the essential cost elements, especially feeds, was thus encouraged by legisla-

tion that eventually there must be an adjustment in ceilings on wholesale and retail fluid milk sales, therefore, Congress quite wisely provided in the amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, that modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodities when it appeared that such modification was necessary to increase the production for war or where by reason of increased labor or other cost to the producers of such commodity the maximum price originally established would not reflect such increased cost.

With this picture of the law under which we are operating in mind, we should consider the programs that have been adopted and the result of these programs regardless of who was responsible for them. It is presently conceded that we have entirely too much livestock. Official reports of the Department of Agriculture indicate that in spite of the fact that our 1943–44 feed supply is the second largest on record, being only 4 percent smaller than last year's yield, that because of record livestock requirements, stocks of feed grain carried over at the close of the year are expected to be the smallest since the drought years and that the rate of feeding per animal unit on January 1, 1944, is expected to be 10 percent below the 1942–43 rate. Some grain has been brought in from Canada, but shortage of shipping facilities and other problems sharply limit supplies that we may expect from this source. Stocks of wheat are running low and will be insufficient to meet the winter's needs. The War Food Administration has, therefore, suggested sharp reduction in the number of hogs and beef cattle normally finished on grains and concentrate feeds. I am informed that the War Food Administration has further stated that milk production should be maintained at all costs. It is entirely possible, if this is true, that we may be confronted with the proposition of granting priorities on protein concentrate feed to the dairy cow.

I sincerely believe that the ceiling price established on corn at the rate of $1.07 per bushel, Chicago basis, and the support price placed under hogs, have dealt a more damaging blow to the dairy industry from the standpoint of increased costs of production than any combination of factors. It has placed the dairyman in a position where he cannot compete with hog producers for corn. The experiences the Commodity Credit Corporation has had since last May in trying to allocate corn to the industrial consumers, and the grave shortage of corn with which we were faced, are ample proof of the fact that this program diverted corn so essential to the manufacture of reasonably priced mixed feeds and protein concentrates to the hog. Farmers in the Corn Belt could not be expected to market their corn at $1.07 when if fed to hogs it would bring the equivalent of $1.30 to $1.40 a bushel. This corn shortage has been primarily responsible for the sharp incline in feed prices during the past 4 or 5 months. The processor of mixed feeds who is forced to pay in the open market, for example, $50 per ton for oats or barley as a substitute for corn at $38 per ton cannot be blamed for the fact that from December 1942 until August 1943 feed costs increased some 15 percent or more and that there has been even a greater increase since the latter date.

Available statistics indicate that at the time ceiling prices were placed on wholesale and retail sales of fluid milk for human consumption there was a fairly desirable relationship between milk and feed prices. With minor exceptions, I am informed, there have been few adjustments in these ceiling prices on milk, despite the fact that since the effective date of the regulation establishing these ceilings, feed costs have risen to a point where officials of the War Food Administration admit it has become necessary to subsidize producers in order to offset increased feed costs and assure adequate production of milk. It has been my experience that producers generally are opposed to a subsidy in this form. Thus we can readily see that what has actually happened is that the price at which the producer sells has been stabilized, while the price of feedstuffs so essential to his production has continued to rise and that the producer is not realizing a profit sufficient to assure adequate production. Such a condition is an inevitable consequence of the application and enforcement of only one phase of the Emergency Price Control Act as applicable to agricultural commodities. I believe that Congress has recognized in a sense that price is a predominant factor in assuring adequate production of agricultural commodities, and I further believe that where by legislation Congress has authorized the placing of price ceilings on commodities processed in substantial part from agricultural commodities and has further prohibited the placing or establishment of ceilings on other commodities essential to the production of the former commodities on which ceilings have already been placed until parity levels have been reached, that it is the obligation of Congress to adjust the former ceilings to compare favorably with prices of the latter after they have reached parity level.

It is a rather easy matter to criticize. It is often more difficult to suggest a solution. However, I believe that the solution of the problem confronting us is relatively simple and I offer the following suggestions. These suggestions are offered on the assumption that we must maintain our milk production at present levels, and if possible, meet future goals. The first thing probably that should be done, and I believe that such a program is now under way, is that the numbers of our livestock must be brought in line with our feed supplies. We must immediately establish a correct feeding value relationship between carbohydrates used in protein feed concentrates, principally corn, oats, and barley. This, I have been told, would require a slightly upward revision in present corn ceilings so as to place the dairyman in a position where he can compete with hog producers for corn. We must establish ceilings on all ingredients of dairy feed practically all which have reached parity level and are now subject to the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act. We must grant an upward revision of whole milk ceilings, particularly in those areas that have experienced the sharpest rise in feed costs and the lowest increase in prices of whole milk so as to assure adequate production which means a reasonable profit to the producer. If these things were done, there would be no necessity for the present feed subsidy program now being administered by the War Food Administration. It might be necessary and advisable to subsidize producers only to the extent of the costs of transportation of feedstuffs into the drought areas. It might also be desirable, if corn ceilings were raised, to subsidize industrial consumers of corn and wet and dry processors to offset their increased cost of production resulting from increasing corn ceilings. The number of such processors is relatively small and the program would require a relatively small expenditure as compared to the present subsidy being paid to millions of milk-producing farmers.

It might be argued that an adjustment of fluid milk prices in all areas to bring such prices into proper economical relationship with present production and distribution costs would increase the cost of living and thereby tend toward inflation. Such a proposition is a debatable one and accurate figures to support either side of the argument are difficult to arrive at. If we concede that there should be a general increase in fluid milk prices in the normal proportion to the increased feed costs, those in favor of subsidies would be in a much better position. However, we are not living in normal times and I can see no practical reason why a sufficient increase could not be granted to offset the increased cost of production without regard to normal procedures. Milk production generally has failed to meet established quotas and is currently less than corresponding periods 1 year ago; therefore, the necessity for immediate action to remedy the situation. It is frequently charged that the rise in prices in agriculture commodities is largely responsible for the degree of inflation we now face; however, of the rise in national income of $42,000,000,000 from 1939 to 1942, agriculture has received 14 percent—86 percent of this rise has gone into nonagricultural incomes. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that retail prices in fluid milk have increased 20 percent since January 1941. It has been estimated that the additional increase needed to offset the increased cost of production due principally to increased feed costs would raise this figure to 23.9 percent increase

over the January 1941 prices or 6.6 percent over the actual June 1943 prices. Using these figures as a basis, it is calculated that the suggested increase in retail prices necessary to maintain production of dairy products would raise the cost of living less than 1 cent a day or less than 1 percent.

It is conceded that the over-all cost of administering the present subsidy program will run 3 or 4 percent of the total amount of the subsidy payments. This cost alone is significant, but to my mind is negligible when compared to the amounts that will be expended by the producers throughout the Nation in complying with the procedure set up to handle the program to which I can say with confidence that 90 percent of the producers in my area are opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee for the very well-thought-out and very thoughtful expression on an extremely serious subject. I wish all Members of Congress were here to listen to the gentleman this afternoon.

Mr. McCORD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORD. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to say that I think my colleague has presented one of the most constructive approaches to this very serious problem. I am sure that the Jersey breeders of Tennessee used good judgment when they had him as their president for the number of years they did have him.

Mr. McCORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to add to that by saying, as one interested in milk production in a dairy district, that I have been intensely interested in his remarks. I may say that in my district in Michigan the farmers in one section, not radical farmers, are refusing to deliver their milk but are keeping it on the farms because all they do deliver they are delivering at a loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, it will be recalled that this Congress has made a consistent effort to remove certain named individuals from the Government pay rolls. The Urgent Deficiency Appropriations Act of 1943 as enacted by the Congress prohibited any Government department or agency from employing at any time in the future after November 15, 1943, certain three named individuals unless they were appointed to the office by the President and confirmed by the Senate prior to that date. This provision in this urgent deficiency bill, as you will recall, represented a very distinct compromise between the attitude of the other body and the overwhelming sentiment of the House.

Among these individuals so named was one Robert Morss Lovett, who had been serving as Secretary of the Virgin Islands. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, in a display of venom and caustic criticism seldom indulged in by any high-ranking officer of the Government, denounced the action of the Congress of the United States. In so doing the Secretary of the Interior clearly demonstrated his contempt for the action of the Congress and indicated a fixed determination on his part to thwart the will of the Congress if he could devise a scheme to effect his purpose.

In this attitude he was apparently supported by the President of the United States, who sent a statement to the Congress with regard to his reluctance to the signing of H. R. 2714. In this statement, among other things, the President said:

> This rider is an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of both the executive and judicial branches under our Constitution. It is not, in my judgment, binding upon them.

Secretary Ickes taking his cue from the statement of the President that in his opinion the action of the Congress was not binding either upon the executive or the judicial branches of the Government has now determined to deliberately snap his fingers at the Congress and to retain Robert Morse Lovett upon the Federal pay roll notwithstanding. In a conversation yesterday with Mr. Ickes he advised me that he had just appointed Mr. Lovett to the position of executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands. He further advised me that such a position existed in the set-up down in the Virgin Islands and that he felt at perfect liberty to appoint Mr. Lovett to perform those functions. By the way, the appointment to this position does not require senatorial confirmation under general law.

I asked Mr. Ickes to send me a copy of his order so appointing Mr. Lovett to this new position and I received it this morning, or at least a photostatic copy of it, issued September 6, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert this order as part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The order referred to follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, September 6, 1943.

Order No. 1870.

Pursuant to authority conferred by section 23 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (act of June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1813, 25 U. S. C. sec. 1405v), the executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands is designated as the official charged with the performance of the following duties:

1. He shall serve as chairman of the Police Commission, of the Board of Review and Equalization of Taxes, and of the Liquor Control Board.

2. He shall serve as a member of the Harbor Pollution Board, the Labor Policies Board and the Lottery Board.

3. He shall register patents, copyrights, and trade-marks in the Virgin Islands.

4. He shall participate in the supervision of programs relating to public welfare, health, and social security, of the juvenile school, and of the Virgin Islands cooperatives.

5. He shall serve as certifying officer.

6. Whenever the position of government secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant, he shall record and preserve the laws enacted by the legislative authorities of the Virgin Islands.

7. Whenever the position of government secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant, he shall promulgate all proclamations and orders of the Governor and all laws enacted by the legislative authorities of the Virgin Islands.

8. Whenever the position of government secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant, he shall have custody of the seal of the Virgin Islands and shall countersign and affix the seal to all executive proclamations and all other executive documents.

9. He shall perform such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

This order shall take effect immediately.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KEEFE. In this order he stipulates the duties and responsibilities of the office of executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands. It is very remarkable, because having checked the substantive law that defines the duties and responsibilities of the secretary of the Virgin Islands I find on a reading of this order that Mr. Ickes, attempting to be very clever as he usually is, has provided that whenever the position of secretary of the Virgin Islands shall be vacant then this new executive assistant has all of the powers that are stipulated in general law as belonging to the secretary transferred to him. The office of secretary of the Virgin Islands I am advised by virtue of the action of the Secretary of the Interior is now vacant and Mr. Lovett whom this Congress tried to remove repeatedly from the pay roll of the Government has now been appointed by Mr. Ickes in clear and plain defiance of the expressed attitude of the Congress of the United States to another position in the Virgin Islands to which he has transferred the powers, the duties, and responsibilities of the office of Secretary of the Virgin Islands that he formerly occupied.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Is this Mr. Lovett one of the gentlemen who was investigated by the Kerr committee of the House?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Lovett is one of the gentlemen whom the Kerr committee recommended be separated from the pay roll and which this House by an overwhelming majority sustained, as the gentleman will recall.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does this appointment as assistant to the Governor carry more salary than the office of secretary of the Virgin Islands?

Mr. KEEFE. Unfortunately, the order setting forth the duties and responsibilities of the office of executive assistant to the Governor does not specify the salary, but under the general law under which the Virgin Islands operate I think it is safe to say that the salary that will be paid to this executive assistant will be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The question is squarely up to the Congress again. I wonder what the Congress is going to do about it. I wonder what the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department is going to do about it. That committee held hearings in addition to those that were conducted by the Kerr committee and in their report when that appropriation bill came before the Congress took the same attitude as did the Kerr committee. Are we as a Congress going to express our determination and then allow an executive officer of the Government to flout the Congress before all the people of the United States?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman believe there possibly might be some justification for an executive officer's doing a thing like that in view of the statement of the President to the Congress that a law passed by the Congress was, in the judgment of the President, unconstitutional and did not bind any executive of the Government or the judiciary? In other words, the President stated in a message to Congress that an act of Congress should not be observed by an Executive or even by the Supreme Court of the United States, whose function it is to pass upon the constitutionality of the laws passed by the Congress. I think that is one of the most dangerous statements ever submitted by a President to the Congress in reference to a law properly passed by the Congress and written on the statute books.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I am in complete accord with his statement and I think I referred to the fact that Mr. Ickes, no doubt, felt sustained in his action because of this message which the President sent to the Congress. But I want to call to the attention of the majority leader when he asked for a bill of particulars in connection with the speech I made Monday that I did give a bill of particulars. I want to add this one to the specifications that are contained in that speech: I ask any citizen if he cannot see in this a situation where the Executive tells the people of this country that neither he nor the judiciary are to be bound by an act of the Congress of the United States. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whom I know has as high a regard for the fundamentals of government as I have whether or not he cannot see in that action the very evidence of fascism creeping into our own Government which I tried to describe last Monday. May I give him another one before he answers that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman asked a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I will give the gentleman time to answer, but I want to put another one to him so he will answer both of them at the same time.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is awfully kind of the gentleman. I will listen.

Mr. KEEFE. I recall—and I think the gentleman recalls—that this action of the Secretary of the Interior is very similar to the action of the National Labor Relations Board a couple of years ago. It will be recalled that the Appropriations Committee of the House struck from an appropriation provision for the payment of the salaries of the Board of Economic Research in the National Labor Relations Board headed by David Saposs. I am sure the gentleman recalls that. The action of the Appropriations Committee at that time was sustained by practically the unanimous vote of the House and the other body and become a part of the law by virtue of the signature of the President.

Now, what did the National Labor Relations Board do? It defied the Congress of the United States and changed the name of this outfit from the "Board of Economic Research" to the "Technical Service Bureau" of the National Labor Relations Board. It in effect told the Congress: "We do not intend to be guided by your instructions as contained in the report accompanying that bill. We have changed the name of the outfit. True, Saposs and his entire gang are doing the same work, at the same salaries and occupying the same offices, but we are going to thwart the will of Congress by merely changing the name and we do not intend to comply."

We were compelled to go before the Deficiency Committee of the House and write into a deficiency bill a clear mandate to compel the National Labor Relations Board to do what this Congress had directly ordered it to do. I ask the gentleman, in view of the statement which he made last Monday, does he not see in that attitude upon the part of bureaucracy and administrative officers of Government, who go out of their way to flout the actions of Congress, under any accepted designation of fascism, the development of a Fascist threat in our own economy?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. In relation to this charge of yours on fascism, you are bringing in a little small matter to support a broad statement of that kind. Of course, that is the last thing in the world the people of America are fearful of. As a matter of fact, the charge against Lovett was that he was a Communist or communistically inclined, as I remember it. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin, trying to use that isolated case to support the broad statement he made the other day, endeavors to make Lovett out as a Fascist. The other day my friend had no facts to support his statements, no bill of particulars, and he is giving no bill of particulars now. If he wants to talk about the Lovett case by itself, that is one thing, but when he undertakes to bring that in to support the statements that he made about our national economy taking the road of fascism, then the gentleman states something that I challenge.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman concluded?

I gave the gentleman plenty of time to answer. The gentleman has not answered the questions or the arguments. The gentleman with his usual great intelligence apparently fails to see the point at issue at all. I do not think that he fails to see it. I think he sees it the same as Dr. Goodwin Watson said he saw it when he was before our committee. He is one of the great intellectual leftists of this country. He clearly pointed out the grave danger that is facing our country due to the spread of this doctrine that grows out of the centralized control that is being exercised over the lives of our people through unrestrained bureaucracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not need 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Five minutes?

Mr. KEEFE. I just want 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the distinguished gentleman, who ought to know better, and who as one of the leaders of this House investigated communism years ago, that if he took advantage of the information which he gained as a result of that investigation he would know there is not an intelligent person in the world who does not know that communism is Fascist in character, and that the only explanation that is given to communism to distinguish it from other Fascist philosophies is that its supporters contend that while it is Fascist in character it is benevolent in purpose.

I say to you that the gentleman has not answered the question I have proposed. This attitude on the part of bureaucratic heads of agencies and executive heads of the departments in flaunting the will of the people as expressed through their Representatives in the

Congress is the purest threat of fascism that faces our country today. I can think of no more direct threat than the contempt in which Harold Ickes holds the Congress, when he flatly refuses to do what the plain mandate of the Congress requires him to do and elects to battle the thing out to prove that the executives in the executive department of the Government and the administrators of the agencies of government have more power than the people's Representatives in the Congress itself.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. This question has troubled me a great deal: How far under the Constitution may the Congress go in virtually removing an employee of the Executive branch of the Government by refusing to appropriate for his salary?

Mr. KEEFE. That is a question which Mr. Ickes and those associated with him claimed they were going to take immediately into the Supreme Court of the United States for a determination. I stated on the floor of this House that I wished they would do so. I hope that question will be determined. I do not want it determined by the subterfuge that he has adopted of creating a new job and appointing Lovett to that job without attempting to solve the basic constitutional question that may be involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin is, of course, a strong advocate.

The gentleman made some observations about what I learned as the result of being chairman of an investigating committee. The gentleman from Massachusets learned enough that the most powerful piece of legislation in the past 50 years to meet subversive influences in this country was passed as a result of that investigation, the McCormack Act, compelling foreign propagandists to register.

The gentleman has created a new theory, something new—the road of economic fascism. Of course, anybody who is an impartial observer or analyzer of current events realizes there is no foundation to that.

Further, he picks out this Lovett case as an illustration to support his theory. I remember that years ago a famous and outstanding President of the United States, when Chief Justice Taney, as I remember, made a decision the then President did not like, said, "Let Chief Justice Taney enforce the law." Certainly that is an outstanding observation, but I would never call it fascism.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NAVY DAY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, patriotic Americans throughout this country are observing this date as Navy Day. October 27 marks the anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth, and since he is regarded as the greatest advocate of safety through naval power in modern history, it seems to me that the selection of this date for an annual appraisal of our strength afloat is particularly appropriate.

I would like to point out that the year which has passed since the last observance of Navy Day undoubtedly has been an unprecedented year in naval history. The most powerful ships ever built have taken their places in our fleet. Never before have so many ships of all sizes and types been constructed and placed in service so quickly. We have become the possessor, through the will of the American people, of the greatest floating power that the world has ever seen. Today, as never before, the safety of this country and the sanctity of our shores depends upon these ships and the officers and bluejackets who man them. For this reason I think it might be well to consider some of their accomplishments during the past 12 months, and to weigh the responsibilities they face in the immediate future.

All of us remember, too well, those bleak and discouraging days immediately following Pearl Harbor. It is no secret now that during the months which followed that treacherous attack, the strength of our enemy surpassed that which we could throw into the Pacific. For the first 12 months after that black date the Japanese were able to progress southward at a phenomenal rate, ruthlessly subjecting unprepared and practically unarmed peoples to their will, committing a series of unprecedented atrocities and carrying on the most brutal type of warfare. At that time, we must admit now, we were unprepared to stop them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out today that because of the very fact that American ingenuity and American industrial management was able to get behind the armed forces, and particularly the Navy, to the extent that they have done, the situation as it was 1 year ago has completely reversed itself. Exactly 1 year ago yesterday, the Navy proved beyond a possible doubt that it was an attacking force of terrific impact, capacity, and daring. For on the night of October 26, 1942, several hundred miles northwest of the Santa Cruz Islands, the carrier task force intercepted a Japanese task force coming down with the obvious intention of retaking Guadalcanal.

Guadalcanal had been taken very dearly by marines on land and naval ships and air power at sea. The Japs wanted the prize back and were willing to pay dearly for it. They did pay an exhorbitant price for their effort. But the effort itself was futile, for the Battle of the Santa Cruz Islands, as the engagement has now come to be known, went to the attacking power of the United States naval command.

Our forces on that occasion consisted of the carriers *Hornet* and *Enterprise*, one new battleship, the light cruisers *Atlanta* and *Juneau* and other cruisers and destroyers. The Japanese forces, which we know to have been of superior fire power and containing at least two battleships and three aircraft carriers, was completely and decisively whipped. In that battle we lost the *Hornet* and an accompanying large destroyer, the *Porter*. That grand ship, which for so long has been known as battleship X, but which the public now knows as the *South Dakota*, under the command of Capt. (now Rear Admiral) Thomas Gatch, put up a fight which will go down in our naval annals as one of the most decisive sea battles of all times.

Captain Gatch and his men have received many honors since the details of that battle became known to the public, but I assure you that these honors were well deserved. During that short battle, the *South Dakota* put up such a barrage of antiaircraft fire from the twenty 5-inch guns and dozens of smaller antiaircraft guns that no less than 32 Jap planes attempting to sink her were brought down. The *South Dakota*, herself, received some direct hits but was able to keep firing until the surviving Jap ships turned tail and ran.

In the fall of 1942 our naval forces began what we might term the offensive phase of this war in earnest. Last November 8, the world was electrified by the news that the United States was invading Africa. That invasion, Mr. Speaker, was a sea-borne thrust on a gigantic scale. The Navy escorted an unbelievable number of ships safely across submarine-infested waters and got them there on schedule, and safely.

Naval gunfire played a large part in that invasion just as it did in stopping the German tanks and saving the beachhead at Gela in Sicily, and in turning the tide of battle in the first bloody hours of Salerno, almost a year later. To show you what part the Navy played in that operation, let me point out that during the first 12 hours of the invasion of the Italian mainland, the Navy lost more men than the Army.

Only a few days after the initial thrust into Africa, and while our men were marching across Tunisia, there occurred the major battle for Guadalcanal, which dwarfed all previous ones in number of enemy warships sunk or damaged. It also marked the first major naval encounter without the use of carriers by either side. This battle was fought at

close range, in darkness, and once again American fire power and American seamanship demonstrated its superiority over that of our foes.

And so, motivated by a spirit of attack and attack wherever possible day in and day out, we carried the fight to the Japanese well into 1943. And this year, because of the naval power including air and submarine power that we have been able to develop, we have seen the retaking of the Aleutians, the invasion of New Guinea, New Georgia, and the conquest of Sicily and southern Italy. Some 2 years ago naval authorities promised that the year 1943 was to witness our attacking forces shaped into a spearhead of might, brains, and strategy, rocking the enemy in the Pacific, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean. I need not point out to you today, Mr. Speaker, how true this prophecy has proved to be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman in speaking in observance of Navy Day has mentioned certain ships of the Navy and has also mentioned a crucial battle. In that battle we unfortunately lost the *Hornet*, but another ship that did high honor to the country and to the Navy, the *Enterprise*, is still afloat, as far as I know. I know the gentleman will bear with me while I read into the RECORD at this point the citation the President recently awarded the *Enterprise*, which is known as the pride of the United States Fleet:

CITATION

For consistently outstanding performance and distinguished achievement during repeated action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, December 7, 1941, to November 15, 1942. Participating in nearly every major carrier engagement in the first year of the war, the *Enterprise* and her air group, exclusive of her far-flung destruction of hostile shore installations throughout the battle area, did sink or damage, on her own, a total of 35 Japanese vessels and shot down a total of 185 Japanese aircraft. Her aggressive fighting spirit and superb combat efficiency are fitting tribute to the officers and men who so gallantly established her as a solid bulwark in defense of the American Nation.

I think the *Enterprise* and such ships as the battleship *South Dakota* give good testimony to what our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is stating here today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To recall to the House the gallant fight the *Lexington* made before she sank. She did great damage to the enemy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the officers who served in many of the engagements in which this great airplane carrier *Enterprise* was engaged is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as a naval officer with the rank of lieutenant commander and one whose bravery and devotion to duty was demonstrated in full measure while he was on active duty with the naval forces in the Pacific.

The Navy during this past year has maintained a bridge of ships from our Atlantic ports to Murmansk, to England, to Africa, and uninterrupted sea lanes to Alaska, the Aleutians, Australia, and the regions of the South Pacific. Today the route to Australia and the islands of the Pacific is a great highway dotted with our naval bases serving as service stations to keep supplies moving to our fighting men and our allies. Few people of this country realize, for instance, that more than $3,000,000,000 in food and war material safely have been transported to Russia under convoy of the American Navy. From this past May through August the Navy escorted 4,000 ships averaging 10,000 tons each safely across the Atlantic. During these months our losses from submarines were less than one-half of 1 percent. All these miracles of salvation have come to pass in the last year. Why? Simply because, Mr. Speaker, sea power, or more properly what is now called sea-air power, made them possible.

We cannot deny today that we have suffered losses in ships and more regrettably in men, but I think that we can take consolation in the fact that enemy losses have been infinitely greater and much harder to sustain than ours. At the beginning of this war we estimated that Japan had 7,500,000 tons of shipping. Today at least one-third of that shipping is resting on the bottom of the Pacific, and our submarines, which had such a great part in sending them there, have very definite plans for similarly effective operations in the future.

Sir Francis Bacon once said, Mr. Speaker, that—

He that commands the sea is at greater liberty and may take as much or as little of the war as he will.

That has always been true and is still true. The seas are highways, and to wage intercontinental war, control of these highways, which are lines of commerce, is essential. Unless we control the highways, we cannot control the destination. We cannot hope to control a distant land, or the skies above it, unless we control the seas between these two points. We have learned that ships alone can no longer do it. And to resort to Bacon again, he said further that—

He that will not attempt new remedies must expect new evils.

Thus, we have learned through experience up to this time that modern sea power is an air-sea team. One without the other is inadequate. We must have the airplane, the battleship, the carrier, the destroyer, the submarine, all working together and all straining toward one objective—victory. The team, we know, is indivisible.

Only last week Secretary Knox announced that the United States Navy was constructing the three largest, fastest, and most powerful aircraft carriers yet to be built. This is another proof that air and sea power cannot be evaluated independently. Air power can strike the enemy where it hurts most, but to do so with any effectiveness it is dependent on ships for gasoline, bombs, ground personnel, repair and maintenance facilities, supplies and, of course, first of all upon sea-borne men and machinery to build the distant air fields.

Sea power spoiled Napoleon's African adventure just as it spoiled Hitler's and just as it is proving a stop for the plans of Japanese militarists in the Pacific. I hope that the real meaning of sea power is becoming clearer and clearer to the American people as our offensive develops in intensity. I hope that the American people realize that without dominion on the seas, this war at best would become a stalemate and at worst a defeat. Let us not forget that sea power saved us from defeat and that it is the key to our victory. And it might be well for Congress at this time to reflect for a few moments on our past history before we make too many definite plans for future policies.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1812, we had a Navy of which this country was justly proud. But then we neglected it for 30 years. In 1845, we had a little scare and started building or talking of building, but the fright was soon over and with it any thought of naval expansion. There actually was no considerable program of naval expansion in this country until 1883 when the Federal Government was so prosperous that some money was spent on the Navy. Between the close of the War between the States and 1883, there had been no legislation allowing for new naval vessels. They could repair them but not build them. The Navy tried to get around this restriction by building a new ship on the keel of an old one—an action which caused Congress at that time, properly enough, to pass a law limiting expenditures for repairs to a percentage of the original cost.

When this country became so alarmed over the possibility of an invasion of our coast by Admiral Cevera's Spanish Fleet, we had only five good battleships designed for coastal events, but when the admiral's fleet reached the Azores, there was a terrific clamor in this country to increase the Navy, more quickly than the building facilities of that day could provide. But from the time of the Spanish War and on up through the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, this country was Navy conscious and they were convinced that our safety lay in enough ships with guns on them to defend our coast. When World War No. 1 spread over Europe, the American people were still in this mood and Woodrow Wilson, who certainly was a friend of the Navy, had little trouble in convincing our people or Congress that we must have an adequate fleet to meet the threat from the Kaiser.

But then we all know what happened after the World War. We had the Washington Disarmament Conference in 1922 when we decided to sink or scrap at least a million tons in good American fighting ships, including two brand new battleships already completed, seven battleships and six battle cruisers which were on the ways and building. It cost us some $75,000,000 to scrap these ships.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, our record on defense is a spotty, erratic history—a history of indecision and confused perception of our responsibility as a Nation with tremendous overseas commitments and the responsibility for the defense of one of the longest coast lines of any nation in the world.

A distinguished physician once remarked, Mr. Speaker, that his only explanation for the survival of the human race was that women forgot childbirth so easily. Similiarly it seems to be the same with war: people seem to forget the causes of war which generally turn out to be obvious signs of weakness. A nation unable to defend itself is always a temptation for conquest on the part of others capable of waging war.

On this Navy Day, I would like to leave these thoughts with the people of this great and prosperous country. At the conclusion of this war the United States will, for the first time in its history have the strongest naval power in the world—a circumstance of profound historical significance. It is my earnest hope that when our enemies are crushed, defeated, and disarmed, we will remember and go on remembering that in our sea power lies our security. We must not forget this fact, that the great Navy we have built at such a cost and with such travail is a mighty instrument in our hands for peace as well as for war. It will continue to be until new methods of war and commerce are devised or until man, the rational animal, with God's help, fashions the machinery of rational living and enduring peace.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the people of this country that our present generation of fighting men, the officers and bluejackets who are manning our ships, are displaying a nobleness of fighting spirit and a determination to win and to preserve this country for their children which is as as striking and as heroic as any individual or collective acts of heroism preserved in the history books of this Nation. We owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to these men which we will find it hard to repay.

In describing the war which has been carried to the enemy by the American Navy, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to overlook the officers and men of the Coast Guard who have played such a gallant part in this war, nor the men of the Marine Corps, both of these fighting services serving with the Navy.

In our initial landing on Guadalcanal, for instance, the Coast Guard played an important part in landing the marines who stormed that Jap stronghold; the Coast Guard has been carrying on a continuing battle against submarines in the Atlantic and around our coasts; the Marines, as we all know, have formed the spearhead of our attacking forces everywhere in the Pacific, and have created new and magnificent traditions and records of accomplishments to add to their already-glorious history. More recently, the Coast Guard continued its great record of service to this country by landing many of our fighters on Sicily and the Italian mainland.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the most beneficial way through which we could express our gratitude for what these men of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard have been doing would be to guarantee to the best of our ability that they or their children would not be called upon to go through a similar struggle at such a cost in life and waste of material. I would further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the most practical way we could do this would be to preserve the American Fleet when our enemies are crushed, and use it, as the man whose birthday we are celebrating today wanted to use it—as a big stick to keep down the bullies of the world and insure freedom and the blessings of peace to those who come after us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I would be somewhat derelict in my own duty to Congress today, sitting here listening to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] if I did not stand up—and I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of Congress—and pay tribute to him as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Today there was inserted in the RECORD a letter from the commander in chief of the United States Navy, Admiral King, in which he paid high tribute to Members of Congress for their unfailing devotion to the wants of the Navy, and of the work that we have done, and to every Member of Congress for what he has done to help win the war. The Navy requires that a great deal of legislative matters be acted upon promptly. I can say, and I know I again speak for all Members of Congress, that no civilian living today has done more, both before the war and during the war, for the United States Navy than has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Secondly, I know that Admiral King also refers in his tribute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] who as chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations has done yeoman work in aiding the establishment of the greatest fleet in the world.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. More than that, no living man in America today knows as much about the Navy as does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] in the very fine and deserving compliment that he has paid to our distinguished friend the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. Just one further observation: When the history of this era and of this crisis is written, the name of the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, will stand out as one of the most prominent figures of this trying period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I am certain, has just expressed the unanimous feeling of this House in praising the work accomplished by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], together with the other members of this very important and able committee. The gentleman has spoken of the letter of praise and appreciation sent by Admiral King to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. Just a short time ago I was permitted the opportunity of reading this very fine letter from Admiral King.

Admiral King is considered an excellent naval officer, efficient and careful in the conduct of his operations. He shoulders a tremendous responsibility today and is an extremely busy officer. A letter of citation from him at this time, therefore, not only carries weight but brings honor to this House. His praise of the work of the Naval Affairs Committee and the cooperation, help, and constant labor of its distinguished chairman from Georgia not only is a fine tribute for work well done but constitutes an honor for these members for great accomplishment during this day, when every man is trying earnestly to perform his duty for our country. Expressing his appreciation for the cooperation and support of the Navy by the Members of the House is greatly appreciated. In reply to this fine letter I believe I voice the feeling of the House in saying we appreciate the great value to the Navy and to the country of our able naval officer, Admiral King, and the dynamic Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox.

Today is Navy Day. The attention of the people throughout the country, in fact throughout the whole of the civilized world is drawn to the accomplishments of the American Navy. Its great traditions and achievements of days gone by set the pattern for future achievements. Its glorious leadership of earlier days, molded the heroic leadership of today. America has confidence in its Navy. This confidence can only be justified in great ships, courageous officers, brave sailors, molded into the soul of a unit that is determined to strike forever until victory is gained.

In paying tribute to the Navy today, I salute a great and honorable friend of many years. Over a long time I have known its problems, its troubles, its desires. Throughout these many years I have stood solidly in complete support of all of its undertakings, its hopes, its desires. At one time there were only a few of us. Since Pearl Harbor I am proud to say, the membership of this House has unanimously supported the Navy in all of its undertakings. Today, the Congress is proud of the American Navy, the most powerful in the world.

A gigantic task lies ahead. It is almost beyond comprehension, and yet it must be comprehended. It requires a tremendous fleet; sound and accurate judgment based on accurate information; a knowledge of the enemy and his activities, brave, courageous officers and men acting together as a fighting unit. I cannot say how great this job is, but the Navy must know. I can say, and do say, with all my force, the job to be done is so important that it not only compels but commands efficient leadership and challenges that leadership to place in command of every ship and every branch of the naval service the ablest, best qualified, and most highly and competently trained men. There is no room for personal feelings, personal bickerings, personal aggrandizement, internal politics, and personal favoritism. This Congress will not tolerate any such actions, nor any smoke of internal discontent. The Congress wants this war victoriously finished as soon as possible and will vigorously oppose any action interfering with this objective. The best qualified man for the particular job to be accomplished is the ruling principle. There can be no other.

In paying tribute to the accomplishments of the Navy today, I am glad to point out to the Navy that the Congress has not permitted in the past, and will not permit now or in the future, any encroachment on its activities by other departments of the Government or by civilian agencies of the Government. We are well aware of and quite well informed regarding the activities, work, and jobs that must be performed by the military services. We will not permit any interference from any source whatsoever. The Congress knows the character and qualities of the Navy, its officers and enlisted men. The Congress has complete confidence in the Navy and is constantly standing by to help and protect whenever possible its functions and activities. The Congress is eternally vigilant.

In our tribute today, I salute the thousands of officers and men in the United States Naval Reserve. This very important group of men, without which the Navy could not function, made up of young men and older men, have given up everything in most cases, in order to fight beside the regulars for their country. It is a great sacrifice they are making. They have given up their careers. Many of these men will not have an opportunity to take their places again in civilian life.

Many of these men have had but very brief training in the Navy, with all there is they must know and yet have gone out in command of small ships. It is a tribute to the old-line naval officers who have trained them, and a greater tribute to the youngsters who have absorbed that training and who have fought so courageously and gallantly.

When regular naval men enter into the naval service, they enter from the viewpoint of a career and making a life work of it. They know what the future holds for them. But the Naval Reserve men have gone in by the thousands because the country was attacked and they wanted to do their part. They are performing their duties today like line veterans and we are proud of their accomplishments. The Navy owes much, very much, to them. Their loyalty, their good will, constitutes strength for the Navy of the future.

In closing I should like to add my tribute, and praise to the distinguished Naval Affairs Committee for splendid work well done and to its most able chairman for his leadership and statesmanship.

To the great American Navy I salute all it stands for, all it has accomplished, all of its officers, enlisted men, heroes on the high seas, and the determined unnoticed heroes working steadily at their assigned posts of duty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] made some interesting comments regarding a confidential O. P. A. study concerning profits in certain industries, particularly in the meat-packing business.

I hold no brief for the packers, nor in fact for anyone else. There are, however, certain features about the report which deserve further notice.

This O. P. A. report refers to certain figures as "profits before income taxes." We have, I am afraid, brought in some confusion lately by speaking about profits before taxes. To refer to profits without explaining that the figures represent earnings before payment of income taxes creates a distorted and unjustified picture. It would be just as logical to speak of profits before payment of wages or of freight charges. Every large company now has a heavy tax bill to pay. If it did not have a substantial sum on hand to pay its taxes it would probably be bankrupt. Also misleading is that no consideration is given to the fact that in one of the pre-war years, 1938, used by the O. P. A. as a basis of comparison, the meat-packing industry actually operated at a loss.

In 1942 net income after payment of taxes—and other expenses incident to operating—per pound of meat sold by the industry was a fraction of 1 cent, the average over the 10 years, 1933–42 still being only a fraction of a cent, this including the year 1938 when substantial losses were suffered by the industry as a whole. During the 10-year period 1933 to 1942, inclusive, all manufacturing industries made an average profit of 5.3 percent on sales whereas the meat-packing industry made a profit of only 1.1 percent on sales of every description. In 1942 the volume of sales by meat packers was more than half the volume of sales for all food-manufacturing industries combined, but the volume of earnings in the meat-packing industry was less than one-fourth of that obtained by all food manufacturers combined.

It is unfortunate that the complexities of the meat business are not understood. Some packers handling the entire meat and byproducts line may have a hundred or more different processes, each of which can be, and with some companies is, a separate business. Some of these processes have been profitable—others highly unprofitable, and it follows that those processors handling only the unprofitable items in many cases either have been forced out of business or forced to curtail operations drastically.

Further, many industries have been operating on a cost-plus basis. This is not so in this industry. On the contrary the Government purchases at times have not even taken into account the actual out-of-pocket cost of the meat to the meat packer. So heavy losses instead of profits have been incurred on some of this Government business.

The meat-packing industry is for the most part efficiently operated. Years of experience and the utilization of byproducts have enabled the industry to produce at a very low margin of cost.

The following figures are profits after taxes as percent of net sales:

	1936–39 average	1942
Coca-Cola Co.	34.7	19.6
E. I. du Pont de Nemours	29.7	12.2
General Foods	9.7	6
All meat packing	.7	1.2
For industries		
All food products, excluding meat	4.9	4.2
Automobiles	9.7	5.2
Chemicals	10.3	4.6
Agricultural implements	9.2	6.2

I also include a table showing a comparison of the operations of packers subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1938–42:

Comparison of the operations of packers subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1938–42

	1938, 815 concerns	1939, 830 concerns	1940, 821 concerns	1941, 829 concerns	1942, 815 concerns
Average net worth [1]	$854,755,193	$848,523,793	$858,418,102	$898,133,497	$935,745,082
Total income	3,408,024,036	3,437,295,584	3,579,582,415	4,566,142,640	6,391,188,253
Total expenses	3,406,015,573	3,384,741,059	3,517,096,661	4,478,227,932	6,302,909,349
Net gain	2,008,463	52,554,525	62,485,754	87,914,708	88,278,904
Percentage net gain to net worth	0.23	6.19	7.27	9.89	9.43

[1] These figures represent the average of the total net worth of all reporting concerns at the beginning and end of their fiscal years.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion, training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold a hearing Thursday, October 28, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 11 a. m. on Friday, October 29, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

882. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting copies of communications which have been addressed to the president of the Cuban House of Representatives by the presidents of the Chambers of Deputies of the Republic of Chile and Venezuela, concerning resolutions which have been adopted by those legislative bodies providing for special sessions on April 14 of each year; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

883. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Alexander Frederick Lebel from the group of 256 cases involving suspension of deportation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

884. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle; with amendment (Rept. No. 805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Public lands. H. R. 2641. A bill to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 807. Report on the disposition of certain papers from several agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 98. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation with respect to contemplated requirements with respect to the labeling, production, marketing, and distribution of articles and commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3552. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3553. A bill to increase certain allowances provided by law for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3554. A bill to amend section 1 (5) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide that the established railroad freight rates cover the receipt and delivery of loaded cars at the points of loading and unloading; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3555. A bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 3556. A bill to create an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3557. A bill to authorize former members of the armed forces to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3558. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contractors or of other subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3559. A bill to centralize the purchase of paper for printing and binding and blankbook work in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By M. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3560. A bill granting a pension to Anna E. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio:

H. R. 3561. A bill granting a pension to Miss Mary Welsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Edwin R. Samsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3563. A bill for the relief of Joseph Brunette; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3257. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Alma L. Davis and 32 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or trans-

portation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3258. Also, petition of C. K. Stake and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3259. Also, petition of George Steitwick and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3260. Also, petition of Emma L. Childers and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3261. Also, petition of E. S. Bayley and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3262. Also, petition of Amanda Pitsimmons and 20 other residents of Clarkston and Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3263. Also, petition of Betty Morgan and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3264. Also, petition of Amy Thompson and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3265. Also, petition of Mrs. E. M. Williams and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3266. Also, petition of Mary B. Hendrick and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3267. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Lenhart and 19 other residents of Ritzville, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3268. Also, petition of R. Dalzell and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3269. Also, petition of Esther N. Brakefield and 17 other residents of Colbert and Opportunity, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3270. Also, petition of Mrs. R. M. Kennedy and 20 other residents of Spokane, Wash., favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3271. Also, petition of Mrs. John Auer and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3272. Also, petition of M. S. Allison and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3273. Also, petition of Mrs. Earl D. Fleming and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3274. Also, petition of C. E. Long and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3275. Also, petition of R. P. Egan and 28 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3276. Also, petition of Charles E. Hennessey and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3277. Also, petition of Myrtle M. Johnson and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3278. Also, petition of H. A. Anderson and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3279. Also, petition of H. E. Osborne and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3280. Also, petition of Ed C. Marks and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3281. Also, petition of Hugh W. Deher and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3282. Also, petition of J. W. Kronenberg and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3283. Also, petition of John J. Roman and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3284. Also, petition of Jack A. Ferris and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3285. Also, petition of William E. Gibson and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3286. Also, petition of E. C. Daniels and 30 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3287. Also, petition of J. A. Pas and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3288. Also, petition of J. W. Chase and 13 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the

reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3289. Also, petition of Gordon R. Bimham and 29 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3290. Also, petition of H. R. Fischuoller and 29 other residents of Spokane and Omak, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3291. Also, petition of J. H. Abrams and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3292. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ralph L. Wathser, Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3293. Also, petition of Albert Baker, of Washington, D. C., and 53 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibiton for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3294. Also, petition of A. W. Edwards, of Washington, D. C., and 233 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibiton for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3295. Also, petition of S. J. Rappapart, of Washington, D. C., and 12 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3296. Also, petition of Mrs. Alma Rappaport, of Washington, D. C., and 14 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3297. Also, petition of Charles Kucham and 99 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3298. Also, petition of William A. Stevens and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3299. Also, petition of Peter W. Senn and 60 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3300. Also, petition of Mrs. Jacob Devus and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3301. Also, petition of Elmer Markway and 54 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3302. Also, petition of F. Hummel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3303. Also, petition of H. Koenig, Local No. 1, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers of America, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3304. Also, petition of Andrew Baum and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3305. Also, petition of J. Pfaff and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition legislation for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3306. Also, petition of H. Heiligenmann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3307. By Mr COFFEE: Petition of W. T. Moorehead of Roy, Wash., and 102 others, protesting against consideration by Congress of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, and condemning any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition, by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3308. Also, petition of the board of trustees of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, calling attention to the enormous quantity and food value of ocean fisheries, stressing specifically the incalculable benefits provided the Nation by the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Northwest; recalling the antebellum threats to the salmon and general fishing industry of the north Pacific coast by the invasion of Japanese and other foreigners; expressing apprehension at the possibility of such minatory interferences in the future; declaring now is the time to take adequate precautions against invasion by the Japanese and other foreigners; to be provided by the Secretary of State of the United States, with the cooperation of the Washington State delegation in Congress; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3309. By Mr. STEAGALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Dothan, Ala., urging the early consideration and passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, author of liberty, facing in these epic days determined foes who violate every cherished right which mankind has slowly won and who would turn the wistful eyes of man backward toward the jungle, we thank Thee that more and more even the lurid glare of tyranny is revealing the spiritual glory of democracy as in Thy name it fights for its life. Startle us with the deep meaning for all mankind that a new moment has come in the old story of our planet. Strengthen our determination to seize the day as the full tide is at the flood to sail boldly out to wider seas of human rights.

"Create in us the splendor that dawns
when hearts are kind,
That knows not race nor station as
boundaries of the mind;
That learns to value beauty in heart,
and brain and soul,
And long to bind God's children into one
perfect whole."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 27, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF KATE E. HAMILTON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 108)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 514, entitled "An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton."

This bill authorizes and directs the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of $7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from November 23, 1939, until the date of payment by the Secretary in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid.

Mrs. Kate E. Hamilton died intestate in Memphis, Tenn., on December 1, 1930. On December 31, 1931, Mrs. Blanche H. Karsch paid an estate tax with interest of $26,017.15, and on January 24, 1933, paid an additional tax, with interest, amounting to $1,400.40. Litigation involving the estate was not completed until 1939.

Mrs. Karsch filed a claim for refund on November 25, 1939, which was rejected on December 15, 1939, by virtue of section 319 (b) of title III (Estate Tax) of the Revenue Act of 1926 which provides as follows:

All claims for the refunding of the tax imposed by this title alleged to have been

erroneously or illegally assessed or collected must be presented to the Commissioner within 3 years next after the payment of such tax.

It appears that the court proceedings were instituted prior to the expiration of the date for filing claims for refund and that a timely claim to protect the interest of the estate could properly have been filed.

Congress has determined that it is sound policy to include in all the revenue acts statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a certain period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to obtain a refund of an overpayment of taxes. This bill selects a single taxpayer for special treatment by excepting her from this policy. The whole body of Federal taxpayers is thus discriminated against, and a precedent is established, opening the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 514 to the long-continued policy of Congress, and do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to file claims within the period fixed by law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 28, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ALEXANDER FREDERICK LEBEL—SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

A letter from the Attorney General referring to his letter of June 15, 1943, in relation to the case (among others) of Alexander Frederick Lebel, involving suspension of deportation, stating that new and additional evidence has appeared which warrants reconsideration of the proceedings, and requesting that the case be withdrawn from the Congress, as suspension of deportation is believed not to be warranted; to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the various units of his department for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Capt. and Mrs. James A. Ryan, of Honolulu, T. H., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts; to the Committee on Immigration.

A letter from the president of the American Automobile Association, together with a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that association, favoring the appointment of a congressional joint committee to make a thorough investigation relating to petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A resolution adopted by the New Orleans (La.) League of Women Voters, favoring prompt agreement by the Senate in a proposal to the effect that the United States participate with the other United Nations and nations of like intent in establishing a system of collective world security; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1161, the so-called general welfare bill, granting old-age assistance, etc.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Selden, Dresden, and Jennings, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask leave to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by various residents of Portland, Maine, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petition was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration a resolution adopted by the national affairs committee of the National Republican Club, and I should like to have referred with it the accompanying letter, although I do not ask to have the letter published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were received and referred to the Committee on Immigration, and the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB ON THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

Whereas there is a report, No. 732, of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the House of Representatives and a proposed bill, No. 3070, now pending before the House, to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws and establish a quota for Chinese people and make persons of the Chinese race eligible for naturalization; and

Whereas these exclusion laws originated many years ago, primarily for the purpose of stopping the flow of Chinese laborers into the construction camps of the country, and for other economic reasons; and

Whereas much has happened since then to relieve the condition bringing about such legislation; and

Whereas the people of the United States and of China have established such firm bonds of friendship and understanding that the people of the United States are eager to remove any legislation that makes discriminations against the Chinese with regard to entry into this country: Be it

Resolved by the National Republican Club, That we respectfully urge the passage of the proposed bill, No. 3070, repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, fixing an annual quota for China, and permitting the naturalization of Chinese.

RALPH W. GWINN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Relations.
WILLIAM S. BENNET,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.

Approved:

THOMAS J. CURRAN,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 921. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 487);

H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale; with an amendment (Rept. No. 488); and

H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 489).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 273. A bill to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 490);

H. R. 400. A bill for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt; without amendment (Rept. No. 491);

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Dalton; without amendment (Rept. No 492);

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 493);

H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of John E. Haas; without amendment (Rept. No. 494); and

H. R. 2675. A bill providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a); without amendment (Rept. No. 495).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Andrew Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 496).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of William Carroll Knox; with an amendment (Rept. No. 497)

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 498);

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 499);

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of M. C. Roberts; without amendment (Rept. No. 500); and

H. R. 2824. A bill for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps; without amendment (Rept. No. 501).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list

of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 27, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; and

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1478. A bill to provide for the conservation and proper disposal of surplus war properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 1479. A bill providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1480. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 1481. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 1482. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making possible the crediting under such act of certain periods of State service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; and

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1485. A bill relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1486. A bill providing for the rendering and publication of opinions by the Attorney General with respect to Executive orders of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1487. A bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROHIBITING FEDERAL CONTROL OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR STATE PUBLIC-SCHOOL PURPOSES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 88) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting Federal control of funds appropriated for public-school purposes in the States, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO TERMINATION OF GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 198), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas the termination of Government procurement contracts made in furtherance of the war effort has occurred and will probably continue to an extent which will create many complex problems involving the reconversion of American industry to peacetime enterprise and otherwise affecting the war and post-war economy of the United States; and

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war requires that the termination of such contracts be conducted and consummated according to policies and procedures which will be fair and equitable to contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers on the one hand and to the Government on the other: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, heretofore designated by the chairman of that committee, in connection with the termination of war procurement contracts, be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult regarding the termination of Government procurement contracts and problems relating thereto; be it further

Resolved, That such subcommittee be authorized and directed to consider and make recommendations to the full committee with respect to the subjects above-mentioned and all legislative proposals pertaining thereto which are now pending before the Military Affairs Committee or are hereafter referred to it in regular course. The subcommittee shall report to the full committee, which shall in turn report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of the foregoing study and investigations, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of this resolution such subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist such subcommittee upon the request of the chairman thereof. The subcommittee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary and may utilize the services or facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The powers and expenditures authorized by this resolution shall be deemed retroactive to the date when such subcommittee commenced its operations and functions following its designation by the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

FOOD FOR VICTORY AND JOBS FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Food for Victory and Jobs for Peace," delivered by the Vice President before a meeting sponsored by Food for Freedom, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, on October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of collaboration for post-war world peace, delivered by him on Wednesday, October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATION, TOLERANCE, INDUSTRY, AND CHARITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF WATERWAYS—ADDRESS BY COL. MILES REBER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Col. Miles Reber, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, division engineer of the Missouri River Division, before the Mississippi Valley Association meeting at St. Louis, Mo., October 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION AND THE WEST—ADDRESS BY HON. HARRY W. BASHORE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Reclamation and the West," delivered by Hon. Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, at the twelfth annual convention of the National Reclamation Association in Denver, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN TRADE IN THE AIR AGE—ADDRESS BY JUAN T. TRIPPE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Foreign Trade in the Air Age," delivered by Juan T. Trippe, president, Pan American Airways System, before the thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention, held at New York City, October 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

"AN" BECOMES AN ISSUE—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'An' Becomes an Issue," published in the New York Times for October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Under the order of the Senate of yesterday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained from the Senate on important public busines.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Desiring to have my position on the Pepper amendment placed in the RECORD, yet hesitating to take the time of the Senate at present to speak on the subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an interview which I gave to the Providence Journal, and which appeared therein on October 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEN EXPLAINS POST-WAR POSITION—SENATOR SAYS HE SUPPORTED CONNALLY RESOLUTION AS "BETTER THAN NONE."

Despite the fact that he and four associates on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered the Connally post-war resolution inadequate in a number of respects, they finally voted for it in its original form because it was "better than none." Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN said in a statement here yesterday.

Senator GREEN and his four associates—Senators WAGNER, MURRAY, GUFFEY, and PEPPER—sought unsuccessfully on Thursday to amend the resolution, but joined in approval of the measure when it came to a final vote.

He said he and his associates felt the resolution inadequate because of its lack of mention of peaceful settlement of international disputes, implied rather than expressed its reference to the use of force, spoke of "free and sovereign nations" rather than the United Nations, and was ambiguous in its language.

His statement follows:

"I am glad of the opportunity to explain the attitude of those Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee who, yesterday, proposed to change the draft of the so-called Connally post-war resolution.

"The amendment proposed was the result of objections to the wording of the Connally resolution based on its difference from the proposal previously made by Senators BALL, BURTON, HILL, and HATCH. None of those four is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee but certain of the committee members were in sympathy with that group and met with them and discussed proposed changes to achieve the general purpose they had had in mind.

"It was decided best to abandon the original resolution proposed by the four Senators and to seek to amend the so-called Connally resolution in the least degree possible to accomplish the desired result.

GROUNDS FOR OBJECTIONS

"The objection to the phrasing of the Connally resolution was on several grounds. In the first place, nowhere was any mention made in the Connally resolution of other means for establishing and maintaining peace than by the use of force. There was no reference to settling international disputes peacefully as was the fundamental purpose of the League of Nations. It seemed to us that emphasis should be laid on peaceful settlement primarily.

"Another objection was that the reference to the use of force itself was implied rather than expressed. The purpose of preventing aggression and of preserving the peace of the world was stated rather than the means of attaining that beneficent purpose. We thought it better to mention expressly the use of power, including military force, in order to attain that purpose.

UNITED NATIONS NOT MENTIONED

"Another objection to the Connally resolution was that it proposed joint action 'by free and sovereign nations.' No reference was made to the United Nations. We believe that the United Nations, having joined in winning the war, should join in setting up the peace. We did think also that they all should be included and with the addition of such free and sovereign nations as might be admitted by them from time to time. It may be thought by many that the terms 'sovereign nations' and 'United Nations' are coextensive, but it should be remembered that many people contend that some of the United Nations, like Canada and Australia, are not sovereign nations, and they might justify later action in opposing a treaty on that ground. It seemed to us that no language should be used so ambiguous as to possibly exclude Canada from the provisions of this resolution.

"Furthermore, if some of the United Nations are to be excluded they all might be excluded with the exception of one or two of the most powerful. It seemed to us that, too, would be unfortunate. In other words, the difference arises as to whether the resolution should make possible an alliance with, say, two foreign nations of those now engaged in the war, to the exclusion of the others. We believe that the changes suggested do not violate the principles which most of the members of the committee favoring the Connally resolution approved of.

LANGUAGE AMBIGUOUS

"We do think that the language of the Connally resolution is so ambiguous as to make it possible for those who disagree with those principles to say that they are supported by their understanding of those ambiguous phrases. In other words, the question is whether these principles we have recommended should be expressed openly and should be brought to the front now to let those Senators who disagree with them explain their opposition publicly, rather than to hide behind ambiguous phrases which mean different things to different persons and thus get votes on the floor of the Senate by those who would not otherwise support the resolution. We believe that two-thirds of the Senate would vote for the resolution as amended, although it might not get as many votes as the Connally resolution. We believe, however, that the clarity of statement would help the winning of the war, both at home and abroad.

"Finally, the five Senators, after the rejection of their amendment, voted for the Connally resolution, believing that such action was better than none."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, resuming my discussion of the pending amendment to Senate Resolution 192, I believe it will be helpful, particularly for the purposes of the RECORD, to place in the RECORD at this time the legislative history of the active effort which has been made for the past 7 or more months to bring a measure of this sort before the United States Senate and the people of the country.

Shortly after the convening of the present session of Congress a number of resolutions dealing with post-war policies were submitted in the Senate. I recall that among them were resolutions submitted by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. On March 16, 1943, Senate Resolution 114 was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for himself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Ohio who is speaking. This became known as the B-2 H-2 resolution because of the initials of its sponsors. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 114) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

Mr. BURTON. That resolution was forthwith referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe it was on March 31, 1943, that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was appointed, to which there were referred not only this resolution but all resolutions dealing with this subject up to that time. While public hearings were not held by the subcommittee, nevertheless it has held many meetings, and the four sponsors of Senate Resolution 114 have been courteously afforded the opportunity to appear more than once in conference with the subcommittee in order that the issues involved might be brought before the Senate and before the country at the earliest possible date.

At this point many Members of the House of Representatives felt that there was something before the country which commanded their interest. As a matter of fact, this was the first time perhaps in the history of the country that on a major issue of this sort the Senate was undertaking to advise as well as to consent to a treaty of this magnitude. Therefore, in order that the House of Representatives might also have an opportunity to express its opinion upon the questions of foreign relations involved, especially as they might relate to later appropriations or might relate to later agreements which would call for some action of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate, there was introduced on June 15, 1943, House Concurrent Resolution No. 25 by Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, which I will now read into the RECORD:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

On July 2, 1943, there was submitted in the Senate by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], both members of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 16, dealing with this same subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That this Congress favors (1) the prosecution of the war to conclusive victory; (2) the participation by the United States in post-war cooperation between sovereign nations to prevent, by any necessary means, the recurrence of military aggression and to establish permanent peace with justice in a free world; (3) the present examination of these aims, so far as consistent with the united war effort, and their ultimate achievement by due constitutional process and with faithful recognition of American responsibilities and American interests.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, shortly thereafter the Congress took its summer recess. During that time a number of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives felt that this was an appropriate opportunity to bring the whole question before the public. Already there had expired several months since March 16. There was great need, in the opinion of these Members of Congress, that the position of Congress, and particularly of the Senate, be expressed to the President, to the people, and to our allies. In order to assist in bringing this matter before the President, before our allies, and before the people, some 10 teams were organized consisting of a Member of the Senate and a Member of the House in each case, and in each case members of the opposite political parties. Each team toured the country and brought the matter to the attention of the public.

During the recess period there also were made several important speeches, to which I wish to make reference as indicating the progress the campaign was having. On August 27, 1943, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and also chairman of the subcommittee, made a striking address in Texas which has been placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and appears at page A3770. This statement is so clear on many of the issues involved, and is so clearly in concurrence with the position which I am taking at this time, that I wish to read into the RECORD two or three short quotations from it so as to indicate the progress the campaign had made up to that time. The Senator from Texas made, on August 27, this impressive statement:

So long as the nations imposing the peace shall be ready and willing to maintain that peace by the last argument of military force, it will live. The United Nations must, when our enemies are mastered, establish an international agency to determine disputes over boundaries, over all of the quarrels that lead to international war and to arrest aggression and criminal conquest.

Such an agency, unless invested with power to enforce its decisions, cannot survive. It must have authority to call upon member nations for troops and navies, when necessary, to enforce its decrees and impose upon aggressors and violators of the law of nations punishment for their crimes.

A little further on in the same address the Senator from Texas said the following:

The Senate of the United States will at an early date consider a resolution expressing the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world-peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen.

A little further on in his speech the Senator said:

From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venomous head. The United States must be a member of the peace agency.

A little further on he said:

Russia must be a party.

A little further on he said:

Great Britain must be a party. Great old China must have a seat.

And a little further on the Senator from Texas said:

Other members of the United Nations must have a place at the council table.

Those statements, Mr. President, are of particular value to us as we consider the issue at this time.

On September 11, 1943, the Vice President of the United States, speaking at Chicago, made the following statement relating to the resolutions then pending under the title of Senate Resolution 114:

The first step toward getting the seven new freedoms is to pass through the Senate of the United States some such resolution as No. 114, which provides for the United States taking the initiative in calling meetings of the United Nations. This resolution looks toward a court or board to listen to international disputes, a military force to prevent military aggression, and the gradual addition of such other machinery as may be necessary. I am for the resolution as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough.

The amendment pending before the Senate goes nearly as far as Senate Resolution 114 goes. It certainly does fall within the scope of that resolution, and goes to the extent that an endorsement of Senate Resolution 114 would mean an endorsement of the amendment now pending.

On September 12, 1943, the Secretary of State of the United States, Hon. Cordell Hull, made an important statement on the same issue. The entire statement is of great value in considering the problem. The statement has been placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of the remarks of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and appears at page A3775, I wish to read into the RECORD at this point two paragraphs from it. The first is as follows—Secretary Hull is speaking:

It is abundantly clear that a system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose. Readiness to use

force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable if effective substitutes for war are to be found.

Secretary Hull then continued as follows:

Political differences which present a threat to the peace of the world should be submitted to agencies which would use the remedies of discussion, negotiation, conciliation, and good offices.

Disputes of a legal character which present a threat to the peace of the world should be adjudicated by an international court of justice whose decisions would be based upon application of principles of law.

But to assure peace there must also be means for restraining aggressors and nations that seek to resort to force for the accomplishment of purposes of their own. The peacefully inclined nations must, in the interest of general peace and security, be willing to accept responsibility for this task in accordance with their respective capacities.

On September 14, 1943, the Congress reconvened. Immediately the House of Representatives proceeded to the consideration of the issue. Before discussing that I wish also to make reference to one other event which took place during the recess. Although not officially an action of either the House or the Senate, nevertheless it reflected the considered opinion of a large number of governors of States of the United States and of Members of this body and of Members of the House of Representatives. On September 7, 1943, there was adopted at Mackinac Island the Mackinac resolution on foreign policy. It was unanimously adopted there by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council.

Among the members of that council particularly active in the drafting of that policy were the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Mackinac declaration of foreign policy to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACKINAC DECLARATION OF FOREIGN POLICY ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE REPUBLICAN POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 7, 1943

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility:

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives would be impractical, and specific commitments by this Council, by the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an Advisory Council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for:

1. Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation;

2. Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our Republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies; and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings, we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

Mr. BURTON. From that statement I read into the RECORD especially the following short paragraph as bearing directly upon the issue before us:

Therefore we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

* * * * *

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

It was in the light of that campaign waged both within and without the walls of Congress that Congress reconvened on September 14, and without delay the House of Representatives proceeded at once to the consideration of the issue.

On September 21 the House adopted, by a vote of 360 to 29, as I recall, House Concurrent Resolution No. 25, the so-called Fulbright resolution, in the original form in which it was presented, with a slight amendment adding the words "through its constitutional processes." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point House Concurrent Resolution 25, as finally adopted.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President on September 24, the Fulbright resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Twenty days later—on October 14, 1943—the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted in this body Senate Resolution 192, the resolution now pending. Five days later, on October 19, the sponsors of the B.H. resolution, Senate Resolution 114, appeared before the full Committee on Foreign Relations and presented their recommendations for an amendment.

On October 21, 1943, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations approved Senate Resolution 192 precisely as originally introduced. Four days later the debate upon it began in the Senate, and immediately on that day 14 Senators joined in presenting the amendment known as the Pepper amendment, which is now being considered by this body. For the past 3 days the sponsors of the original resolution, Senate Resolution 114, have joined with other Senators in urging the adoption of the amendment. I believe the RECORD shows that throughout the past 7½ months many Senators have urgently pressed for action along the lines now proposed to be taken. There has been no lack of diligence on their part at any point. There is not now. We welcome the increased interest of the public and the increased interest of the Senate in the issue.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the point I had reached at the time when the Senate took its recess yesterday evening. I was then discussing the importance, to my mind, of maintaining military unity among the United Nations in time of peace as well as in time of war. In the midst of that argument I said that it is obviously to the advantage of each of the member nations of the United Nations to continue some such association. It is obviously unnecessary to destroy the unity of such nations through the discussion of proposed changes in

the form in which such military relationship shall continue in the days after the armistice, as compared with the days before the armistice. If need be, it can continue in precisely the same form as that of the military association which now exists, and that would eliminate the necessity for considering any amendment of form at the time.

A further reason for emphasizing the wisdom of this continued military unity among the United Nations is found in the development of aviation since World War No. 1. In past ages, and even at the end of World War No. 1, the military unity of the Allies and any program of continued association of their military forces was seriously handicapped in its practical value by the great difficulty of sending those forces to the point of danger in sufficient time to check military aggression at its inception.

In this regard, an analogy to a city fire department is helpful. It is well recognized in fire-fighting policy that while there is value in highly developed fire-fighting equipment, the greatest and most practical value of any fire department rests upon its ability to reach a fire quickly while the fire still is small. If the department can get there quickly most fires can be extinguished with a bucket of water or a single fire extinguisher. On the other hand, if the most highly developed fire engine is slow in getting to the fire it can do little more than to let the fire burn itself out and to attempt to control its spread to other areas.

With the development of aviation to the extraordinary degree of efficiency which it has attained in this war, it becomes possible for the first time in the history of the world for those nations which dominate the air not only to dominate the military situation, but to reach any new point of danger almost immediately and on short notice. Most points are far nearer to the important capitals of the world than a 60-hour flight. When the United Nations win World War No. 2 they will at the same time have demonstrated their dominance of the air. Their continued military unity in the post-war period, expressed especially through military aviation, will enable them to maintain military stability and to suppress military aggression in a far more effective manner than ever before has been possible. The enlarged navies of the world will also be available for global service on a scale heretofore impossible.

The increased value of military aviations adds much new practicality to the maintenance of the military stability in the world. It provides also for some continued appropriate use of a part of the tremendous investment in military aviation equipment which will be available at the conclusion of the war. This maintenance of the united strength of the military, naval, and air forces of the Allies will be far more economical than could be any program of competitive armaments.

The one international course which thus seems clear above all others in the light of our experience in this war and in the light of our having suffered two great wars in the same generation is that we should retain intact in time of peace at least the military unity among all of the United Nations which has made that peace possible in the face of the greatest attack upon civilization in the history of the world. I may say here that this is not required by Senate Resolution 192 as introduced, but as I shall demonstrate later it is required by our proposed amendment to that resolution.

Added to the immediate military effect of this policy of continued military unity, it has at least two important indirect effects in the economic, social, and political fields.

First, it gives to the many smaller and weaker nations a natural chance for survival. Their safety is best secured through this means. In their safety from military aggression lies the foundation of their otherwise completely uncertain economic, social, and political stability. Correspondingly, because of the assurance of such safety, their primary reasons for upsetting the economic, social, and political structure of the world in their own respective interests no longer becomes a controlling consideration. Without this assurance their very struggle for survival introduces endless complications and uncertainties into the peace of the world in the future, as it has in the past.

Secondly in such a situation, for example, as faces Russia, the best alternative that can be suggested to her anxiety for controlled or allied buffer provinces or states is the substantial elimination of danger to her from beyond her borders. As long as the United Nations maintain in peace the same military unity that they have in this war there is little need for Russia to arm herself against the world. A substitution of such an accord, to be of the greatest value, requires that its extent be of the greatest scope. A universal accord would make separate large individual military expenditures and defenses both unnecessary and contrary to the spirit of the accord.

WORLD-WIDE POST-WAR ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL STABILITY

At this point we turn to the other long-term considerations of world-wide post-war policy. These involve the economic, social, and political fields. It is here especially that we should not attempt to prescribe or determine in detail the blueprint of the future. With each of these wide fields all the other nations of the world, and particularly all the other United Nations, are concerned as well as ourselves. It is important that the adjustment of these relations develop through the participation of as many as possible of the nations in the consideration of them. Even here, however, there are some aspects of these problems as to which much more can and should be done now than as to others. There need be no general rule for the problems presented, for they are by no means all of the same kind.

Beginning with a negative generality, first of all, there should be no official expression in detail or blueprint of the attitude of our Government or of our Senate issued now as to the solutions we seek in this field as a whole. Many of the questions involved concern nations whose governments are now in exile. Other questions undoubtedly will require consideration and investigation extending over substantial periods of time. Still others may depend upon a free self-determination of the desires of the people in particular territories or parts of territories. Others may call for the exercise of temporary control by the United Nations as a whole or by one or more trustee nations designated for that purpose.

It is quite probably that the solutions to all of these problems should not be attempted at a single meeting or even single series of meetings. The solution of them should not be attempted by any one nation in advance of a meeting of the nations directly concerned with them. We may well give thought to the principles involved and to our own recommendations upon any or all of these problems in the light of the facts available to us prior to a further opportunity for international consideration of them, but we should not attempt to reach, or much less to announce, conclusions upon them.

On the other hand, some world-wide problems, especially of an economic nature, are of such immediate importance to the world that progress upon them as independent issues might well be made in advance of the consideration of other problems.

Incidentally, the personal associations thus developed through the international friendly consideration of these independent issues may be helpful in later considering others. The procedures developed in evolving solutions of these issues likewise may be helpful in providing procedures for the solution of other post-war problems. Among problems of this nature are those involving international aviation and the stabilization of currencies, to say nothing of the consideration of international loans and banking procedure. Whatever progress can be made along these lines should be made as soon as practicable so as to contribute to the stability of all nations, including our own, in planning their internal industrial and agricultural recoveries following the war.

It also may be well to agree upon plans of procedure for the subsequent consideration of the broader issues so that in the event of any termination of hostilities there will not be a period of confusion before progress is attempted on the world-wide economic, social, and political problems of the post-war period. Stability of procedure will be a great aid to the orderly post-war adjustment of international issues.

Insofar as formal expressions of opinion may be made upon any of these international economic, social, or political issues at this time, the important thing is to avoid limitations upon the scope of ther free consideration at a later date. The best way to avoid such limitations is to continue planning, but to make no official reports on those plans now.

To illustrate the difficulty of attempting the consideration now of world-wide political readjustments, it is necessary only to think of the infinite variety of proposals which may be presented. The

important thing is that their ultimate solution be adapted to the particular time when it is reached. There have been natural, gradual, and important trends and developments in the relations between the nations of the world during the past 20 years which between now and the time for decision upon the world-wide political relations may well influence the solution to be reached. For example, while recognizing the importance of some international organization among the united and other nations so as to insure the unity of policy of those nations at least from a military standpoint, it is obvious that at present the brief document which binds the United Nations together is of an extremely limited type.

Its declarations are as follows:

First. Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

Second. Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

It is primarily a military understanding and its force is largely expended when the war is won and a common peace is made.

The need for a continuing organization which will provide means for settling international disputes peacefully, whether they be of a justiciable or other nature, is one calling for joint consideration simultaneously by all the parties concerned in such an effort. In the past one of the difficulties in securing such a universal organization has been its relation to many regional issues. It may well be that the trend toward the decentralization or regionalization of some international issues will now be helpful in reaching an appropriate solution after this war.

Some over-all international organization, recognizing the decentralization of some questions among regional organizations, might be the natural development of the post-war period. Early consideration, therefore, should be given to a world-wide organization of some kind under the impetus of the unity of effort involved in the common conduct of the war. In view, however, of the countless alternative forms which it might take, it is important that definite expressions as to it, or proposed blueprints of it, be not issued officially by the United States, or by the United States Senate, at this time.

CONCLUSION AS TO POST-WAR PLANNING

This brings me to a statement of conclusions as to the post-war planning feature of this argument.

The preceding discussion demonstrates that there is unquestionable need for immediate post-war planning for internal stability within the United States on the part of industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government, including the Senate. It demonstrates also that there is unquestionable need for post-war planning for regional stability in the Western Hemisphere on the part of industry, labor, agriculture, and the governments of the nations in the Western Hemisphere, including the Senate of the United States.

It demonstrates that in the field of world-wide stability, there must be, and there is, post-war planning being done by this Nation and by our allies directly concerned with such subjects of immediate emergency as those of the administration of occupied territories and the relief and rehabilitation of those territories. In this latter field there is especial need for participation by the Senate of the United States in the post-war planning because of the large appropriations involved and because of the grave necessity for not exaggerating to the world the amount and kind of relief and rehabilitation that is to be provided. Also on the question of military demobilization following partial or complete cessation of hostilities, further international post-war planning and consultation should be undertaken at an early date.

In the field of long-term, world-wide military post-war stability, I have demonstrated that there should be retained in time of peace the priceless unity already attained in time of war among the United Nations. The need for defining or developing any new form which this military unity should take is by no means as important as the continuance of the actual fact of the unity already gained. An important incident of this unity is its assistance in making possible great reductions in the internatonal expenditures for the maintenance of military forces by the United States and by other nations in comparison to what would be the case if such unity were not retained.

In the field of economic, social, and political stability a few specific questions call for early consideration. Such questions as those of international aviation and international finance well may now be made the subject of common conference among the nations especially affected so that there may be no unnecessary delay or confusion in the establishment of international civilian trade and transportation as soon as opportunity offers for its resumption. Generally, however, in the field of economic, social, and political international post-war stability, activities now should be confined to informal study and planning, coupled with the development, if possible, of an international procedure for the early consideration of these issues in an orderly manner after the fighting has been completed. The degree to which these types of issues should be considered, and the manner in which such consideration should be handled, should be determined by the degree to which such consideration shall contribute to the winning of the war.

To emphasize further the obligation which is upon us here at home to do post-war planning and preparation in anticipation of the post-war period, I invite attention to a simple letter which a young soldier sent to his mother. In it he said:

Please don't change the furniture in the living room. Please don't change the pictures on the wall. Please don't change anything on the mantelpiece. When I get home I want to see home the way I think of it and the way I dream of it.

Putting it in a larger sense, what this man wants to see when he returns to America is America in the way he thinks of it and in the way he dreams of it. He wants to see a land of opportunity where he and his wife and their children and their children's children can live and develop higher standards of living in peace and stability with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. He wants a victory worth the price paid for it. It is our great responsibility to see to it that such an America is ready for him. This cannot happen without the hardest and best kind of planning and effort. We cannot ask him to do this planning and work of preparation. It is our own responsibility. The need will not be met if we leave it to improvisation. The need will be met only through thoughtful common sense, businesslike planning, and cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and the Government.

This brings me to the separate hearing that there should be an expression of post-war policy by the Senate of the United States now, but it should be limited to certain vital fundamental issues of foreign policy.

Recognizing this demonstrated need for post-war planning and preparation just described, it is quite a different thing to determine the extent to which the Senate of the United States should give formal expression to policies along these lines in advance of the final presentation to the Senate of the concrete issues presented by a treaty negotiated by the President without the advice of the Senate.

Day before yesterday the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] raised a question as to the general wisdom of volunteering advice on this issue before it is asked for, and he cited the fact that the President of the United States had as yet submitted to the Senate no request for advice on this issue. The rule of conduct to which the Senator refers applies to the case of a person under no obligation or trusteeship carrying with it a positive duty to advise or to determine the course of conduct of others.

An entirely different situation, however, arises as soon as a person accepts a trusteeship or other obligation placing upon him the duty to advise and consent with others on important matters of policy. A trustee owes not merely a negative but a positive duty to discover and to perform the duties of his trust. Grover Cleveland well characterized public office as a public trust. It is in that sense of a trusteeship that the Members of the Senate under the Constitution owe a positive duty to the people of the United States to advise and consent on the making of treaties.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is a very able lawyer. As he made his remarks just now, it occurred to me—I think I am

correct—that there is a well-known principle of law that a person who is under obligation and duty to speak, and who remains silent, is thereafter forever estopped from raising his voice in protest.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator states the law as I understand it to be. That is particularly true in the case of a trusteeship. That is the position which I believe we occupy—a trusteeship for the people. Our obligation is therefore to speak, and speak now, as the Senator from New Mexico has so well said.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I assume that the word "advice" as used by the Senator is in connection with the language which relates to the obligation of the President to advise with the Senate after he has negotiated a treaty. Is that the "advice" to which the Senator refers or does he refer to the general obligation on the part of the Senate to report, as each individual Senator should, to his constituency on public affairs? If the Senator can tell me to which kind of advice he has reference I should like to propound another question.

Mr. BURTON. I will answer that by saying I refer to both. Of course, a Senator must also be under trusteeship to report to his constituents, but the language of the Constitution to which I refer does not place an obligation solely on the President. It does not say he shall ask for advice; it says, "he shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." There are examples in the past of the President having sought the advice of the Senate; there are many examples of advice having been rendered before decision has been reached, but in this extraordinary case it seems to me the example of the past indicates there is need in our trusteeship to speak rather than remain silent at the moment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, I do not disagree with the Senator on the general principle. The Senator will bear in mind that a year ago last September I submitted a resolution which was directed to the Foreign Relations Committee calling for the creation of what I called a foreign relations liaison committee between the Senate and the President. The purpose of that committee, as the Senator will bear in mind, might be multifold, but its primary purpose was to bring about between the Senate and the executive branch of the Government an exchange of opinion and of ideas out of which could be formulated the American concept of what the so-called postwar order should be. But the Foreign Relations Committee has not seen fit to give consideration to my resolution. Of course it might be said that has not been an unusual experience, but there has been no formulation of a definite plan.

As I see it, what we are doing here today is, first, to give ourselves a "shot in the arm"—and when I say "today" I mean when we are acting on a resolution on this subject—we are trying to clarify, as Elbert Hubbard said, our own mind. When a man makes a talk, that is the main purpose of the talk, to clarify his own thinking.

Secondly, we are trying to give to our own constituents in this country an idea of what we think may be worked out between the international collaborators in the future. We certainly are not advising the President in any sense that would interfere with his constitutional power to negotiate a treaty; are we?

Mr. BURTON. Not at all. The Senator will recall in the original Senate Resolution 114 we spelled it out that we advised the Government of the United States to initiate meetings, but pointing out that it was entirely in the President's hands to proceed with negotiations.

Mr. WILEY. But is not the primary purpose of the debate here—I cannot see it otherwise—to assure the hungry heart of mank'nd, that, as I said yesterday, "Barkis is willin'," America is willing to do her part in negotiating and in collaborating, but that we recognize that that, as we have said, is a two-way street in which all must function harmoniously; we say to the world that we are ready to "play ball" with you if you are willing to "play ball" with us? Is not that the sum and substance of it?

Mr. BURTON. I agree to that, but, in addition to what the Senator has said along that line, I think there is an obligation to make our position clear to the people, as he says, and to the President, and to the Allies. Each of the three are definitely concerned to know our policy, which will be vitally affected by the clearness with which we act and with which they react.

Mr. WILEY. We agree on that. Can we make a blueprint, can we lay out a plan, when, as was stated yesterday by the Senator from Colorado, the plan, the blueprint, must be the result of consultation between the "architects" of all the contracting nations? In other words, we might have one idea, Russia might have another, Britain another, China another, and so on. It is our function to give and take, and, out of that, formulate an instrumentality which will bring about the constructive result which we want, to wit, peace, and an antidote to war. But we cannot lay down the blueprint, we can make suggestions. It is like marriage; man and wife have to give and take if they want to live harmoniously. Our problem is to work out a way that will result in harmonious international action, to the end that war will be wiped out; but I cannot see that we can now lay out a blueprint because the blueprint or plan is not the sole job of America.

Mr. BURTON. No, and I believe we should not. I thank the Senator for his clear statement for the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said a moment ago something which I desire to have clearly understood. He raised the point that nothing in the advice we may give could affect in any way the right or power of the President to go ahead and negotiate a treaty. There is nothing in this advice which would limit that right or confine him to the limitations of the advice given. I think that is very important, because the Senate should not take the position of saying, "Now, Mr. President, we have advised you thus far. If you go once beyond that advice any treaty you send to the Senate will not be ratified." I think that is an important point, and I want to say here as a part of the RECORD that every Senator who has spoken thus far has denied that kind of an interpretation. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] yesterday spoke of it as a limitation, but reasserted his belief as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has done, that this advice is not in any sense a limitation upon the right of the President to negotiate a treaty or treaties.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, the term "advice" has no effect upon the constitutional power of the President to negotiate. Of course, if the President should at any stage not heed the advice, the Senate has "its power"; it need not ratify the treaty. That is the way I view the word "advice." But, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further in this matter——

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think we owe an obligation to the country to clarify the issue here and make it plain that what the Senate is seeking to do on this floor in the debate is simply to give an expression of the concept of the Senate of its obligation in the inception step toward a possible treaty or international arrangement. It is not a treaty we are talking about here; it is not an international compact or agreement. Because of the attitude of our people and the attitude of the people of the world, who are entitled to have a forceful, straightforward, outright expression of opinion by the Senate of the United States, we are taking action.

I have listened to practically all the debate on the floor, and I am frank to say that, in my opinion, I could vote for either one of these resolutions. I think that there has been, to a large extent, something in the nature of a smoke screen thrown up, unintentionally, so that the people throughout the land think that here and now we are determining the destiny of the earth. I do not think that is true. I think that, by and large, all we are doing is saying to the citizens of this country and to all the peoples of the earth, "The Senate of the United States feels the world has turned a corner. This people is ready to cooperate if you are ready to cooperate; but we are not ready to sell our birthright as Americans in a deal with any international scoundrels or with any racketeers, international or otherwise. What we want is to sit down with fair

dealers and square dealers and try to solve the problem of war." It seems to me, Mr. President, that is the gist and the heart and the very nucleus of what we are saying in this debate. If there is anything else in it, I should like to have the Senator explain what it is.

Mr. BURTON. I think the Senator has well stated the issue we are facing.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The point last made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, that the office of Senator is charged with a trust in respect of the treaty making power, is a very strong point, in my opinion, and one I am glad to have him make in this important record he is making today.

I am sure it will not hurt his claim any if I ask permission to read into the RECORD at this point something on the same subject, a report by Representative TUCKER for the Judiciary Committee of the House, in the Forty-eighth Congress, in making a report which has become Document No. 16 of the Sixty-seventh Congress. It is entitled "Power of the President To Negotiate Treaties." This report was printed at the request of Senator Brandegee back in 1921, during the time when we were considering peace after the First World War. In the report the following appears:

> It will not be denied that the power is exclusive; that is, that all which is involved in the power to make treaties is exclusively vested in the President and the Senate.

I omit a portion, to come to this point:

> Even as to those matters, which are clearly within the scope of the treaty power, there can be no question that it is, like all other powers, a trust power, delegated to the Government for the great objects named in the preamble to the Constitution, and implied in the other clauses of that instrument. It cannot be so exercised as to defeat the purposes of the Constitution.
>
> While it will be conceded that a treaty may make peace, yet it is equally true it cannot make peace upon terms which would surrender a State of the Union to a foreign power, nor make invasion of a State by a foreign power lawful, in the face of the duty of the United States to protect every State against invasion (Constitution of the United States, art. IV, sec. 4), nor to dissolve the Union, nor to change the Constitution itself, nor to divest the States of powers reserved to each by the tenth amendment to the Constitution, nor to deny the essential rights of liberty secured by its express terms to its people, as in respect of the habeas corpus, bills of attainder, and the like (Constitution of the United States, art. I, sec. 9). It cannot be held with any show of reason that these limitations upon legislative power, these duties imposed on the United States as a governmental corporate being, can be set at naught by a treaty of peace. Such a construction of the Constitution, besides being a reductio ad absurdum, is contrary to the whole framework of the system, and to its plainly expressed purposes.
>
> So that it cannot be maintained that this power is absolute and unlimited, even as to the rightful subjects within its scope. As to such subjects the power is limited in its exercise by the plain and expressed or clearly implied trusts upon which the power was delegated.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. In a moment. I am indebted to the Senator from Vermont for that excellent emphasis on the trusteeship of the public office of Senator, and I regard it as directly in line with the point I was making, that that trusteeship imposes upon Senators a positive obligation to speak, which might well be absent if we were not trustees and under no obligation, therefore, to take positive action.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. Is it not the sum and substance of what he just read that, while generally we say that a treaty is, with the Constitution, the law of the land, no treaty can in anywise interfere with the inherent sovereignty of the Government? In other words, without amending the Constitution itself we could not make a treaty which would strike at the very sovereignty of the people, in the sense that there would be a release or a loss of sovereignty?

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont for a reply.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that question is capable of being debated for a long time.

Mr. WILEY. I want to rest the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me undertake to respond even if I do not fully answer the question.

If the Senator is speaking of unconditioned sovereignty—notice, I do not say unconditional—if the Senator is speaking of unconditioned sovereignty, in other words, unconditioned nationalism, as we speak of it more recently in these debates, I would say that our trust would be performed according to law and according to fundamental principle and according to the habit of civilization, if we saw fit in a treaty of peace so to condition our nationalism, so to condition our sovereignty, as to meet the necessary conditions which are assumed by our vis-à-vis in negotiating the treaty. In other words, the word "sovereignty" is a bogy. This is a spurious issue, it is not a real issue. It is just one of those things we see in a great rush of public opinion in times such as these.

There is no ground of objection to the United States entering upon a treaty with other sovereign nations in which certain specified elements of international government, which ordinarily are exercised by us, are given up in consideration of a like surrender by our vis-à-vis.

I am not sure I have answered the Senator's question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I think I follow the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I would agree if he would say that the very purpose of making the so-called agreement, in which he said we surrendered something, was to make sure that our fundamental sovereignty was not surrendered. Then his statement would be valid.

Mr. AUSTIN. We are not surrendering sovereignty.

Mr. WILEY. Or losing the constitutional freedoms and rights provided for in the fundamental law of the land. In other words, the Senator read from a Supreme Court decision——

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it was a report by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, through Mr. Tucker.

Mr. HATCH. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, does not the Senator think that is a Supreme Court decision?

Mr. WILEY. I should say that the gentleman quoted by the able Senator spoke with the wisdom of such judges as I hope will grace the Supreme Court of the United States for many years to come, when he said that we could not by treaty give up the sovereignty of a State, and could not by treaty take away from the people their constitutional rights, and so on.

The Senator from Ohio has been very kind but, of course, he understands our primary reason is to give him a breathing spell. I do not think the word "sovereignty" has exactly the connotation which the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] applies to it. As I speak of sovereignty, I speak of something which is precious. I speak of that which my grandfather obtained when he came to this country. Although he still could not understand the English language, he could obtain 160 acres of land and own that land himself. As a boy, going to his farm, I remember he would dig his fingers into the soil and hold up some of it. He loved the soil. He exercised American sovereignty over 160 acres of land, and he never forgot that that was his soil. He left his homeland, and came to this country. He could not then read the language. He went to the town meetings and learned to exercise his right to vote. When he did that something came into his blood and his bones which made him stand erect, for in his homeland he was not competent to own land or to vote or to hold public office. After he came to this country he became inspired with something called American sovereignty, and he was a part of the national sovereignty. I say that I do not think we, as trustees, can barter that thing away—the sovereignty of the State or the people. Certainly each one of us, as a Senator of the United States, is a trustee of his State, not only in the exercise of one function but of all functions. The sense in which I speak of sovereignty is that we cannot, by a treaty, take from a citizen his inherent rights which were derived from God Almighty. That is fundamental in the Constitution. I want it plainly understood that, in any resolution I vote for here, there is no attempt on my part to say to anyone, to the Senate, or the President, that sovereignty, in that sense, can be taken away by treaty.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator from Wisconsin has agreed with me, although he does not realize it.

Mr. WILEY. I believe we are not far apart.

Mr. AUSTIN. The sovereignty of the United States cannot be given away by treaty or in any other way under the sun.

Mr. WILEY. I agree.

Mr. AUSTIN. That cannot be done. Therefore, it is a serious matter to be talking about sovereignty when that is not the thing with which we are dealing. When we talk about a sovereign nation we are simply speaking of a unit of government. But I will try to show, when the proper time comes for me to do so, the difference between the noun "sovereignty" and the words "sovereign nations." Sovereignty does not die when the king dies in a royal government. Sovereignty does not die if men fail to perform their trusts. Thank God, sovereignty lives on, and it is the most indestructible thing in the United States. It is the spirit of the United States, and it is far above the law, and it is never suspended and never dies until the country dies.

Mr. President, we are not going to make any treaty or try to make any treaty which would destroy the United States or destroy any substantial part of it, or change the allegiance of the people of the Government of the United States in any way at all; but it would be to stultify the Government to say that because we are a sovereign state we cannot enter into a treaty with our neighbors and suspend for the time being some par icular function of government in consideration of the other government suspending a corresponding function.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to yield, but I wish to say that there really is a limitation on the time I have to speak, because other Senators are to follow me, and I should like to ask the Senator to be quite brief.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall be. With reference to the very cogent remarks the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has made I think I should like to say, so it may be in the RECORD, that sovereignty in this country is in the people and, therefore, it cannot be destroyed so long as the people live.

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The people have delegated certain powers to the Senate of the United States as being representative of the people. The question now is, To what extent has any part of the power of the people been delegated to the Congress of the United States and to the United States Government? As the Senator from Vermont has said, sovereignty of a government and sovereign nations are two different things, because a nation may be sovereign when sovereignty does not reside in the people.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true. I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to say that I agree with the conclusions of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. However, I desire to call attention to the old fable of the boy who lived two or three thousand years ago, who loved his camel so well that he permitted him to put his nose under the flap of the tent. Pretty soon the camel worked his shoulders under the tent, and then the remainder of his anatomy, so there was no room for the boy in the tent.

Mr. President, what I wish to make sure of is that in our dealings now we, as trustees—and, oh, what a world of meaning the word "trustees" implies—we as trustees will not be affected by a mirage so that we lose the wisdom and vision necessary in acting for America in this crucial period of the world's history. A trustee cannot handle things as if they were his own. The things he handles as trustee are sacred. They belong to those who have constituted him a trustee.

Mr. President, today I am reminded of that ancient land called Greece, the land of Pericles, of Anaxagoras, of Euripides, Socrates, and Plato, the land of Homer and of Aristotle, the mother of art, of oratory, of philosophy, mythology, and literature, a land of beauty, soul, and flame, which brought light to Europe and the world. Three years ago today, according to a newspaper article which I hold in my hand and which I shall presently ask to have placed in the RECORD, there was a man who claimed sovereignty over Greece. His name was Mussolini. He told Greece "where to get off," but Greece did not obey him. She fought to sustain her sovereignty, and put up a tremendous battle. Mussolini then called on Hitler, and together they raped Greece. They slaughtered Greeks by the tens of thousands, and the sovereignty of Greece went out the window.

I do not want any such thing to happen here, Mr. President. In America the sons of old Hellas are making it sure that it shall not happen here. America will soon liberate Greece from the heel of Hitler, and once more Greece shall be free. The words of Byron come to me:

The isles of Greece! the isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung,
Where grew the arts of war and peace,
Where Delos rose and Phoebus sprung!
Eternal summer gilds them yet,
But all, except their sun, is set,

* * * * *

The mountains look on Marathon—
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free;
For, standing on the Persians' grave,
I could not deem myself a slave.

I ask that a short article appearing in the Washington News of this date, by William Philip Simms, under the heading "Debt to Greece," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT TO GREECE

(By William Philip Simms)

At 3 o'clock in the morning of October 28, 1940—just 3 years ago today—occurred one of those relatively minor incidents which later on writers record as a turning point in history.

The incident was Italy's ultimatum to Greece. Rome charged Athens with allowing the British to use Greek bases and, true to form, the Italian dictator gave Greeve just 3 hours to back down. Her curt "no" changed the whole course of events in southeastern Europe if not of the war itself.

Unquestionably Hitler wished the Balkans to remain quiet. What he wanted from that area was friendly neutrality, oil, foodstuffs, and raw materials. War would upset the economy of the region and possibly hamper his plans rapidly to defeat Russia, knock out Britain, and end the war by the winter of 1941.

Little Greece, with less population than New York and smaller than Florida, upset the Axis apple cart. At 5:30 a. m. Italian troops crossed the Albanian frontier and the war was on. Mussolini had been told it would be a walkover, that the country was lousy with fifth columnists, that the Greeks wouldn't fight. The Greek Navy consisted of one old cruiser, 10 destroyers, and a few smaller craft. The Italian Fleet ranked only after the American, British, and Japanese. The Greek Army had only 10 divisions ready for battle, and even these were without modern equipment. They had no tanks, almost no heavy artillery, and only about 200 obsolete planes. The Italians were not only mechanized, but every division was composed of veterans who had learned their trade in Spain. On paper, Greece did not have a chance. Il Duce certainly thought so, and his blunder helped the Axis lose the war.

What the Greeks lacked in equipment they made up in spunk. With their planes, the Italians leveled Greek villages. With their Fiat tanks, they blazed their advance. Five columns penetrated Greece and for a time her plight seemed hopeless. But presently the Italians slowed down, then stopped. The light mountain batteries of the Greeks, hauled to the peaks by main strength and awkwardness, picked off enemy tanks, one by one. Light machine guns, hidden high up among the crags, mowed down Italian infantry slogging through the passes and utterly demoralized them. Soon Mussolini's men were in full retreat, back into Albania whence they started.

Hitler's fear had been well-founded. Much as he hated to do it, he found it necessary to go to the rescue of his pal. Otherwise the whole Balkans would explode in his face. He began to work on Yugoslavia. He frightened the government of the regent, Price Paul, into joining the Axis in March 1941, but there was a military revolt, young King Peter II assumed his royal powers and Yugoslavia joined the Allies.

What Hitler had wanted of Yugoslavia was an easy road to Greece. Now he was in a worse fix than ever. He not only had to put Greece down, but Yugoslavia as well. And this would take time and men. Eventually, of course, all this was done, but before Yugoslavia and Greece and Crete were occupied the Axis had received a staggering and unexpected set-back.

* * * * *

Today, therefore, is one of the real anniversaries of the United Nations. Paraphrasing Prime Minister Churchill, seldom have so many great nations owed so much to one so little.

Almost certainly the next few months will see a major Allied invasion of southeastern Europe, and its success will be due in no small part to the firm stand of King George II of Greece and his little, poorly equipped army.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Iowa. I believe he wishes to make a correction in the RECORD.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on Monday, when there was a colloquy on the floor—I believe I held the floor at the time—with reference to the interpretation of the words "free and sovereign nations" as applied to the Governments which have adhered to the United Nations document, I expressed the opinion that three of these governments so adherring, the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, India, and the Commonwealth of the Philippines would not come under the definition of "free and sovereign nations." At that time I was not aware that we have exchanged representatives with the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, and that it is to all intents and purposes a free and sovereign nation. The representatives of that nation have asked me to make the correction on the floor. I now confess my ignorance of that fact, and say that in my opinion Luxemburg would be in the same category as the other governments in exile which have adhered to the United Nations and exchanged representatives.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to read a few short excerpts from Hackworth's Digest of International Law with respect to the relation of Senate advice to the negotiation of treaties?

Mr. BURTON. I should be glad to have the Senator do so at this point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from page 27, volume 5:

In the United States, negotiation of treaties is an Executive function. In upholding the validity of the arms embargo with respect to a shipment to Bolivia, Mr. Justice Sutherland, in discussing the power of the President in foreign affairs, said:

Not only * * * is the Federal power over external affairs in origin and essential character different from that over internal affairs, but participation in the exercise of the power is significantly limited. In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. He makes treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate; but he alone negotiates. Into the field of negotiation the Senate cannot intrude; and Congress itself is powerless to invade it.

The citation is *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation, et al.* (299 U. S. 304, 319 (1936)).

I continue the quotation from Hackworth's Digest:

He (the President) negotiates and initiates treaties. Neither the resolutions of Congress nor of the Senate control him in this. If he does not wish to make a treaty, the treaty is not made. If he makes a treaty, it has no binding force upon the United States without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate present and voting. Of course, where a treaty provision requires for its performance legislative action, as, for instance, the appropriation of money to meet payment agreed to in the treaty, congressional neglect or refusal may defeat the performance of the treaty; but it cannot affect its binding obligation.

Then the Digest goes on to quote from a rather famous statement by Senator Spooner, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Let me inquire what was the citation in reference to the previous statement of Mr. Justice Sutherland which the Senator from Colorado quoted?

Mr. MILLIKIN. United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation et al.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator did not read all the decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I said I read an excerpt.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt briefly, I should like to say that the decision goes on to say, in substance, that while it is true the President has sole power to negotiate, in so doing he must confine himself within constitutional limitations, or words to that effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not challenge that for a moment; I would be among the first, I hope, to argue it. I am simply trying to bring into perspective the relationship of Senate advice to the negotiating power of the President.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I appreciate that; but the Senator did not read the decision in full, and I thought the most important part was left out. That is not the Senator's fault; it is the fault of the man who made the compilation from which the Senator read.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will further yield, I shall read somewhat less than I intended to do:

The President negotiates the treaty, to begin with. He may employ such agencies as he chooses to negotiate the proposed treaty. He may employ the ambassador, if there be one, or a minister or a chargé d'affaires, or he may use a person in private life whom he thinks by his skill or knowledge of the language or people of the country with which he is about to deal is best fitted to negotiate the treaty. He may issue to the agent chosen by him—and neither Congress nor the Senate has any concern as to whom he chooses—such instructions as seem to him wise. He may vary them from day to day. That is his concern. The Senate has no right to demand that he shall unfold to the world or to it, even in executive session, his instructions or the prospect or progress of the negotiation.

I omit some of the text and then read:

The President is so supreme under the Constitution in the matter of treaties, excluding only the Senate's ratification, that he may negotiate a treaty, he may send it to the Senate, it may receive by way of "advice and consent" the unanimous judgment of the Senate that it is in the highest degree for the public interest, and yet the President is as free when it is sent back to the White House with resolution of ratification attached, to put it in his desk, never again to see the light of day, as he was free to determine in the first instance whether he would or would not negotiate it.

Mr. President, I offer that as a contribution to the effort to bring into perspective the relationship of the advice of the Senate to the President's negotiating powers.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator for his statement. I wish to read into the RECORD at this point the phrase from the Constitution bearing on the question:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

His power is, of course, limited expressly to being "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties." He may negotiate, but the power to make treaties is expressly limited by the phrase "with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Before this colloquy began I was referring to the obligation resting upon Members of the Senate as public officers, as trustees. The obligation which is placed upon them is more in the nature of the obligation placed on a private citizen who, as a trustee, accepts a trusteeship or other obligation placing upon him the duty to advise and consent with others on important matters of policy. A trustee owes not merely a negative duty but a positive duty to discover and to perform the duties of his trust—not merely the duty to speak or to remain silent as to the details of the trust.

The danger in this whole situation is that the Senate remains so negative in its attitude that it renders little or no service of value to the Nation. The danger is that the Senate shall leave all action to the President at a time when the Senate itself also has a clear duty to act. To my mind it is the positive and inescapable duty of the Senate to advise now both the public and the President of the course that should be followed to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. The Senate stands as a trustee especially for the men who gave their lives in 1918, and for those who are giving their lives now, so that there may be peace in the world, and so that their children and their children's children may enjoy life, liberty, and the opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. As Senators, we are trustees, and it is our sacred trust to see to it that these men shall not have died in vain. We cannot discharge that trust merely by waiting for the President to act. We cannot discharge that trust by doing little or nothing. We can discharge that trust only by doing all that can be done to secure and maintain a great and lasting peace, a just and lasting peace. In particular, the Senate owes it to these men to do better by them in 1943 than was done by them in 1918. We must provide a better guaranty of peace continuing 25 years from now, than was done by the Senate 25 years ago.

In the field of internal stability within the United States and of regional stability within the Western Hemisphere, the Senate has its usual legislative responsibility and its obligation to investigate conditions with a view to making policies. It does not, however, in this regard act separately from the House of Representatives, nor does it act under any constitutional rule requiring an extraordinary majority. Accordingly, in those fields of internal and regional action while there is need for post-war planning, there is no need for reference to such action in the Senate resolution now pending before us.

In the field of foreign policy, however, insofar as action may be taken by treaty on behalf of the United States, an exceptional situation arises which justifies and will be benefited by an expression of advice by the Senate upon the most vital and fundamental of the considerations involved. To the extent that action shall be taken in our foreign affairs by Executive agreement or by agreement passed upon through an act of Congress, a special Senatorial obligation does not equally arise. In the case, however, of a treaty, a treaty, according to the Constitution, cannot become binding upon the United States unless made by the President and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present. To the extent that our post-war foreign policies are not to be acted upon by treaty, the special obligation for the Senate to give advice therefore does not so clearly arise. It is not clear as to just what conditions make it necessary to proceed by treaty. However, an international agreement through which the peace of substantially the entire world is to be declared, and through which international policies are to be established for the maintenance of that peace for many years to come, apparently would rise to the highest dignity of international agreements and, therefore, would be expected to be in the form of a treaty. It is highly appropriate, therefore, to expect that a treaty on this subject will be submitted to the Senate and that its ratification will depend upon the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present.

The requirement of a two-thirds vote is an extraordinary legislative procedure for determining of any current governmental policy. We should have that in mind as we face this issue, and not be guided by the ordinary safeguards which we place around majority action. We face an unusual legislative responsibility. The difficulty, however, of obtaining a two-thirds favorable vote on any important new and constructive measure is so great that it deserves exceptional and thoughtful consideration on the part of the body which is permitted to act under such a requirement. This requirement was placed in the Constitution when the Senate was to consist originally of 26 Members, and at a time when the bi-party system did not exist and when it was hoped by most of our leaders, including George Washington, that it would not come into existence. The extraordinary character of this rule generally is not now fully appreciated by the public. It is contrary to the general philosophy of a government which guides its policies by majority vote. It is fundamental in the philosophy of faith in the people and of faith in their elected representatives that the minority shall accept the guidance of the majority when formally stated. It contributes to the stability of a self-governing nation that such nation shall thus accept the leadership of the majority of its people when those people act directly, and shall accept the leadership of the majority of the elected representatives of the people when the people act through their legislature.

A two-thirds rule, however, acts in reverse. It subjects both the majority of the legislative body and the majority of the public, to the rule of the minority of the legislative body, provided only that such minority shall equal one-third plus one of the voting quorum. This rule presents the unusual situation that even though the majority of the public might be convinced that a treaty were definitely in the best interests of the Nation and although a substantial majority of the Senate, together with the President of the United States, were likewise convinced that such a treaty would be for the best interests of the United States; yet, if one-third plus one of the Senators present, voted against it, then the minority would win and the majority of both the Senate and the public would lose. A two-thirds rule, therefore, is in effect not so much a rule by two-thirds as it is a control by one-third plus one.

Whatever may be said for the rule, it puts a premium upon inaction or weak action, for it makes it necessary to obtain a 2-to-1 vote in order to secure any affirmative action.

Accepting this constitutional requirement at its full face value, as we do and should, the responsibility now rests upon the Senate, and particularly upon the majority of the Senate, to see to it that every proposal involving the two-thirds rule is so fully presented to the Senate and to the public that the vote upon it is a vote squarely upon the merits and rises far above all considerations of partisanship, personalities, or prejudices. There is no room, certainly, under a two-thirds rule, for the loss of any vote on the majority side—and I am not speaking of political majorities—for reasons separated from the issue itself. In any contest in which a two-thirds rule is to apply it thus becomes the obligation of the Senate to see to it that any constructive treaty presented is so thoroughly in the interests of the United States of America and of the public as a whole, and is so thoroughly debated and understood, that the public will become so interested in it as to insist upon its approval by the Senate by the constitutional 2-to-1 vote. It becomes doubly important, in a matter of this kind, to make sure that the public understands the issue and understands it soon enough, so that, as the issue finally arises, they will be fully informed.

In the present instance a treaty is not yet before the Senate. In the present instance, therefore, the pending resolution can be validly adopted by a bare majority. The purpose of the pending resolution, however, is to lay the foundation for the subsequent approval of a peace treaty by a two-thirds vote. The purpose of the pending resolution, therefore, will not be served unless it advances the probability of the approval of such a treaty as will contribute substantially to the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace. If this resolution gives only slight guidance as to the treaty, its advice is of but slight value to the President and to the public. Likewise, it will have served but little in testing the sentiment of the Senate on the probability of securing a two-thirds vote for a certain type of treaty. Therefore, although there is good reason for the adoption of some resolution by the Senate at this time on the question of the post-war foreign policy of this country, this reason disappears in the same proportion as the indefiniteness of the resolution increases. Accordingly, I shall attempt to demonstrate that, although there is need for some resolution of the Senate on this subject at this time, Senate Resolution 192, as introduced, is inadequate to meet that need. I shall also attempt to demonstrate that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and 13 other Senators adds sufficient definiteness and vitality to the resolution to justify the adoption of the resolution if so amended.

THE RESOLUTION SHOULD MEET CERTAIN TESTS

In order to visualize the tests which a resolution of this kind should pass, I should like to analyze the tests which I believe such resolutions should meet.

The opportunity to adopt a constructive Senate resolution on post-war American foreign policy following this war will come but once. That opportunity is here now. The question is, Do the present resolution and the proposed amendment to it meet the tests that they should meet?

What are the tests that a Senate resolution on post-war American foreign policy should meet at this time? I suggest the following six tests:

First. In substance it should state a robust American policy, expressing the purposes, the ideals, and the best interests of America in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace in the post-war world in a way that will inspire the confidence of America in that policy.

I believe that the pending resolution, as it stands, does not meet that test as to substance. It does not have sufficient substance to meet the test, as I see it.

Most of these tests are tests of form.

Second. In form, it should outline that policy for later expression in a treaty to be negotiated by the President and to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. It should not imply any authority to make a treaty without such further advice and consent. If it did so, I believe it would go outside its proper scope. I do not believe this resolution fails in that test.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to the two-thirds rule, if the Senate should adopt the Pepper amendment, and the President should perfect a treaty, or take any action which came within the scope of the resolution, would the Senate be in duty bound to ratify the treaty after it was negotiated? If the President should keep within the terms of the resolution, as the Senator has outlined it in substance, and should use his own interpretation in perfecting the treaty, would the Senate be in duty bound to ratify the treaty when it was brought to the Senate for ratification if the treaty were perfected within the provisions of the resolution?

Mr. BURTON. I think the question deserves a little analysis in giving the answer. From the legal, technical point of view, of course, each Senate is legally and technically entitled each time to vote as it sees fit. From the moral point of view, those who were not Members of the Senate at the time the resolution was passed would have a lesser moral obligation to be bound by it than those who were Members of the Senate at the time the resolution was passed. But what is the moral obligation upon which, in international relations, we must substantially stand, and upon which we must rely? It is this, as I see it: To the extent that the President does conform to the things to which we state in the resolution we will consent, as a matter of moral obligation to him, to the country, and to the Allies, we should stand by those points. He may introduce 14 or 15, or some other number of points as to which we have no obligation. On those points we may be unwilling to advise and consent, and therefore may be unwilling to accept the treaty as a whole. Our obligation runs to the specific points which we state, and that is one reason for not stating too many of them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. Continuing with the tests which such a resolution should meet:

Third. In form it should be sufficiently definite to be of substantial help to the President in his negotiation of a treaty and sufficiently general not to handicap his discretion within the scope of the policy.

Fourth. In form it should be sufficiently definite to be of substantial help in clarifying America's post-war policy to the American people and to inspire their confidence in it.

Fifth. In form it should be sufficiently definite to be of substantial help in clarifying America's post-war policy to our allies and to inspire their cooperation with it.

Sixth. Finally, in form it should be sufficiently definite to test the sentiment of the Senate on some substantial point of post-war policy.

II. SENATE RESOLUTION IS INADEQUATE

Turning now to the resolution as pending and as reported to the Senate, I believe that Senate Resolution 192 as it stands is of little value, and fails to meet the need and opportunity of the time.

Senate Resolution 192 as it stands is inadequate. To my mind, it fails to meet adequately the one test of substance and four of the five tests of form which I have just stated. It is of some little value, but it fails to meet the need and the opportunity of our time. If possible, it should be strengthened.

The senior Senator from Michigan has described it as the lowest common denominator of the views of seven members of the subcommittee of eight that presented it to the standing Committee on Foreign Relations. It did not drop low enough to include the views of the eighth member of the subcommittee because to do so it would have had to drop to zero. He was opposed to any resolution whatever at this time.

The senior Senator from Michigan, by his description of the resolution, has described its weakness. It was reduced to the lowest terms of positive expression that the members could write and still have any resolution. It was reduced to such low terms that in order to gain all seven votes it lost substantially all of its substance. It might have been better to have lost a vote or two in exchange for a paragraph of added substance.

A sounder mathematical simile for the process confronting the Senate would be to seek the highest common factor of positive agreement that can be found in a substantial majority of the Senate, instead of the lowest common denominator to which the views of the Senate can be reduced.

I am hopeful that through this discussion we shall find that there is a substantially higher common factor of positive policy to be found among a substantial majority of the Senate than is found in the original form of Senate Resolution 192. It will be to the interest of America to raise the positive quality of this resolution, and I hope that as thus amended it will command the support of a substantial majority of the Senate.

Based upon the presentation which I have made of the needs of our post-war policy and of the essential spirit of America, I believe that there are two important factors that make up the minimum of that policy if it is to meet the first test of substance which I have prescribed for the resolution. The first test is that it shall state a robust American policy, expressing the purposes, the ideals, and the best interests of America in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace in the post-war world in a way that will inspire the confidence of America in that policy.

Those two minimum factors, to my mind, are the following:

First. The inclusion in the post-war program of all of the United Nations—large and small—for it is through them all that this war is being won and the post-war peace is to be made possible. As a minimum, we should declare for the unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war.

Second. The provision for some continuing form of post-war international organization that will be capable of meeting the changing needs of the future.

To leave out either of these two requirements would show a failure to appreciate the sacrifices of some of our allies and of their priceless combined support. To leave out either of these requirements would be to endanger the peace and reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come, which is essential to America's internal stability and to the recovery of our system of private enterprise. To leave out either of these requirements would be to omit from the resolution the spirit of those declarations to mankind which inspired the Declaration of Independence, and which stand today as a beacon light of everlasting faith in God and man that kindles the dream of life, liberty, and the opportunity for the pursuit of happiness in the hearts and minds of every freedom-loving man and woman in the world, wherever and however oppressed he may be. This faith in America is something that we must strengthen rather than destroy.

A study of Senate Resolution 192 shows that it fails to meet the first test of substance, and that it also fails to meet four of my five tests of form.

Senate Resolution 192 is so general as to post-war policy that it does not mean much. This, in fact, strengthens it under the second test of form, because it thereby makes it too general to be used as authority for the President to conclude a treaty without further and more specific consent of the Senate.

In fact, Senate Resolution 192 means in substance little more than a declaration that in the post-war world the United States should join with two or more nations in some international plan to prevent aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world. There is some value in this declaration but it is not worthy of the opportunity now available to the Senate to take the leadership in making sure that the victory we are fighting for shall be made worthy of the price that our people and the other people of the United Nations are paying for it.

Senate Resolution 192, therefore, is to me so general that it can be interpreted as expressing a willingness to accept anything from a Federal Union with two or more nations on one extreme, to a loose military alliance with two or more nations on the other, leaving the choice of intermediate policy substantially as broad in the future as it is now. Between these extremes it leaves ample room for a policy in accordance with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators. It also leaves the road wide open for America to decline to enter into any international organization or any international agreement whatever. There are left open many alternatives. It does not invite in all the United Nations, and it does not declare in favor of joining an international organization to meet the changing needs of the future. What this resolution fails to state is far more important than what it does state.

Similarly Senate Resolution 192 as it stands, fails to meet four of the five tests of form which I have described. The resolution is so general that it can mean anything to anybody. There is little, if anything, in it that it must mean to

everybody. The latter test is the proper test of the effectiveness of legislation.

Senate Resolution 192, therefore, meets my second test and the only one of the six. It is so drawn as to outline the policy it approves in such a general manner that it cannot be interpreted as authorizing the President to bind the United States to any treaty without the further advice and consent of the Senate to such treaty. Personally, however, I do not object to emphasizing this requirement even by the addition of the further amendment proposed by the Junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] which reads as follows:

> That any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Senate Resolution 192 does not, however, meet any of the remaining four tests which I have defined. It is not sufficiently definite to be of substantial help to the President in his negotiation of a treaty. It is not sufficiently definite, to my mind, to be of substantial help to the American people or to our allies in clarifying America's post-war policy, and it is not sufficiently definite so that a vote upon it can effectively test the sentiment of the Senate on any substantial point of post-war policy.

III. THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY SENATOR PEPPER AND OTHERS WOULD MAKE SENATE RESOLUTION 192 ACCEPTABLE

The proposed amendment supplies what is most seriously lacking in the present resolution and is thoroughly consistent with the interests and needs of this country.

The proposed amendment would change the third paragraph of Senate Resolution 192 so that it would read as follows:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

While this amendment leaves much to be desired it is a substantial improvement over the third paragraph of Senate Resolution 192, which merely reads as follows:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The proposed amendment would enable Senate Resolution 192, as amended, to meet all the six tests which I have presented.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to know whether the Senator from Ohio is satisfied that the clause beginning in line 5 and ending in line 6 indicates the policy held by the Senate that the President could easily agree upon any form subsequently to be adopted by the Senate, of a judicial tribunal to hear and decide cases and controversies that arise among nations.

Mr. BURTON. I am frank to say to the Senator that it is not as clear and as specific as I should like to have it in that regard; but, just as this amendment varies considerably from the original Senate Resolution 114, we have endeavored to follow language a little broader, and I believe that it is sufficiently broad to include what the Senator suggests. My interpretation would include that authority, but the amendment does not refer to justiciable questions; it does not refer to courts. I will read in a moment from an authoritative statement by Secretary Hull indicating his interpretation of the need at the present time. We are acting in the light of such expressions which would indicate that that certainly is one of the kind of things that should be before us when we say "promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully."

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree that that is very near the minimum that could be said on the subject. If I had doubt that this phrase would include the expression of a policy on our part that we favor the President negotiating, if possible, the establishment of some sort of tribunal that would try out these issues and thus substitute justice for force, I would offer an amendment to it. I wonder if the 14 distinguished Senators would welcome the idea of another Senator proposing an amendment to such a phrase as that?

Mr. BURTON. I cannot speak for the other 14 Senators, but I think it is not a matter of such complexity that it might not be handled in a clear-cut manner by an amendment which would be accepted by them, rather than as a proposal calling for a separate vote. This itself was modified from the form in which it was originally presented to conform with the suggestions made by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and I think, as it stands, it is worthy of support. I think it would be quite appropriate for the Senator from Vermont to suggest to the Senator in charge of the amendment the possibility of accepting a minor modification which would clarify and not limit it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the distinguished Senator from Ohio care to define or express an opinion as to what is meant by the first five words in line 5, "to promote cooperation among nations"? Does that apply only to the peace or does it apply to promoting cooperation from an economic standpoint and from a social standpoint? What is included in the scope of those five words, if the Senator cares to express an opinion?

Mr. BURTON. Those are general words. I think that perhaps one of the best ways to throw light upon them at the moment would be to read a brief quotation from a speech made by the Secretary of State of the United States, Cordell Hull, on September 12, shortly before this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have that in his speech?

Mr. BURTON. I will put it in now. It was placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] under date of September 14, 1943. The quotation which I read appears at page A4065. Of course, there are other statements in the speech bearing on the point, but this paragraph, I think, may throw light on the particular thought:

> Organized international cooperation can be successful only to the extent to which the nations of the world are willing to accept certain fundamental propositions.
>
> First, each nation should maintain a stable government. Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization—so long as it conducts its affairs in such a way as not to menace the peace and security of other nations.
>
> Second, each nation should conduct its economic affairs in such a way as to promote the most effective utilization of its human and material resources and the greatest practicable measure of economic welfare and social security for all of its citizens. Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms of its internal economic and social organization—but it should conduct its affairs in such a way as to respect the rights of others and to play its necessary part in a system of sound international economic relations.
>
> Third, each nation should be willing to submit differences arising between it and other nations to processes of peaceful settlement—

I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the language there used—

> Each should be willing to submit differences arising between it and other nations to processes of peaceful settlement, and should be prepared to carry out other obligations that may devolve upon it in an effective system of organized peace.
>
> All of this calls for the creation of a system of international relations based on rules of morality, law, and justice as distinguished from the anarchy of unbridled and discordant nationalisms, economic and political. The outstanding characteristic of such a system is liberty under law for nations as well as individuals. Its method is peaceful cooperation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the statement of Secretary Hull; but is it the answer of the Senator in support of the words in the amendment which I have quoted? Is that as far as they go, or is there any responsibility placed on the United States in this directive to the President not only to cooperate but to give economic and social help to others of the United Nations that are a part of this international organization?

Mr. BURTON. I think that Secretary Hull has stated the case clearly, and I certainly do not enlarge it to the point

of approaching support of the world. I concur in Secretary Hull's statement of the relationship between internal and external relations—both sides of the question—and his words "peaceful cooperation" tie in with the language of the amendment; and, mind you, this language is being considered by the Senate in October in the light of official statements made in September, and placed in the RECORD of the Senate just before the resolution was submitted to the Senate by the very same Senator who had Secretary Hull's address printed in the RECORD. I do not mean that he presented the amendment, but he submitted the resolution we are proposing to amend.

Mr. President, I repeat that the proposed amendment, as I see it, would enable Senate Resolution 192, as amended, to meet all the six tests I have presented.

First. The amendment states a robust American policy, expressing the purposes, the ideals, and the best interests of America in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace in the post-war world in a way that will inspire the confidence of America in that policy.

To be sure, the policy expressed meets little more than the minimum test for such a policy, but nevertheless there is great value in those two minimum features.

The amendment calls for the United States joining with at least all of the United Nations in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to meet the changing needs of the future.

It goes further than this. It provides for including with the United Nations also "such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted." It also provides that such international organization shall be generally available to meet the needs of the times. It provides for the establishment and maintenance of it "to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

This recognition of all the United Nations, and this reference to other nations to be added to them, is a recognition of the rights and aspirations of the small as well as the large nations of the earth. Again I remind the Senate that the United States once was one of the small nations of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I agree with the Senator that all the small nations should have just and fair treatment, but my mind runs back to a debate which occurred in the Senate about 24 years ago, when one of the great issues before this body was the unfair and unjust advantage which one of the great nations would possess, over the United States especially, if the League of Nations covenant were adopted as it was presented. It was argued on the floor of the Senate for days, as one of the reasons why the League of Nations should be defeated, that one great nation, under the very system the Senator points out in the amendment, would have five votes in the League Assembly, whereas the United States would have only one. The Senator can readily understand that such an argument, that one nation in the League would have five votes, because it had five different subgovernments, so to speak, such as Australia and other dominions, would bring on contention. It did cause contention, and was one of the factors which brought about the defeat of the League of Nations. I am making this statement although I was a very earnest advocate of the League of Nations, and worked very strenuously and vigorously to have the League of Nations agreed to by this body. But one of the reasons for its defeat was a provision in the League covenant identical with that which the Senator now wants to insert in the proposal he is sponsoring. In other words, if we are to treat dominions as independent governments, naturally we will have the same argument again.

It has been a long time since I have read the debates of that former day; I have not looked at them lately, but my recollection is that it was argued on this floor that if we were going to allow one member of the League to have a vote for each dominion, why was not the United States entitled to have a separate vote for a great State, such as the State of New York, or the great State of Pennsylvania, or the great State of Texas, or the great State of Florida, whose interests might be somewhat different? I am not taking a stand against the dominions which would have been granted votes. I think Australia is a wonderful country, and, whether it is or not, it deserves to be a free and independent government. That is my own view about the matter. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, is in a somewhat similar position. But if the Senator's amendment is to bring up for discussion, when the treaty comes before the Senate, the same subject which was raised 24 years ago, and which was so strenuously and vigorously fought over, and which in part helped defeat the League of Nations, why insert it before we even have a peace treaty before us?

Mr. BURTON. I agree with the Senator from Tennesseee; it should not be inserted, and it is not inserted. It would be far from my desire to insert it or to insert the implication of it. What I read to the Senator is this, in the amendment:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization.

Nothing is said about the form it would take, and nothing is intended to be said about the form it would take.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator read again about the free nations?

Mr. BURTON. It reads:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. "Such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted." Why is that language used? When we say "sovereign nations," that is all-inclusive. Why add the additional language, if it is not intended, or if it does not have the possibility, to raise the very question which aided greatly in the defeat of the League of Nations?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I shall yield in a moment. Before the Senator from Tennessee leaves the point as to what may be possible, it is just as possible to present any kind of argument bearing on that kind of a question under the original resolution as it would be under the resolution as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true, but we do not commit ourselves to it.

Mr. BURTON. Neither do we under the amendment, I point out to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why use the language if there is not committal in it? Why use that language? Why use that surplusage? It is said in the very outset that the sovereign nations are included. Why talk about independent nations after that?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was very much interested in the comment and the inquiry of the able Senator from Tennessee. I thought perhaps that from his memory of the League of Nations contest in the Senate he might perhaps refer to the understanding I have, that President Wilson and the other proponents of the League repeatedly asserted that the argument of equality of vote, which pertained to the Assembly of the League, was not applicable to the governing body of the League, which was the Council, and that it was an exaggerated argument even when it was made in those days, and made by the opponents of the League, who were looking for almost any kind of an argument to hurl against the institution which Woodrow Wilson proposed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed, the Senator is exactly correct, but it raised the question, it gave room for argument, just as this provision will give room for argument in the future. It gave room for the argument which was made. President Wilson did take the position the Senator has stated.

I cannot say offhand, but I am quite sure my good friend Jim Reed, then a Senator from Missouri, who was one of the greatest orators and one of the greatest debaters ever to serve in this body, at least since I have been a Member of it, a wonderful speaker, used that argument not once, but many times, and men such as the brilliant Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the gifted Philander C. Knox, the eloquent William E. Borah, and Hiram W. Johnson, of California, one of the most eloquent, persuasive,

dramatic, and forceful debaters in the Senate at that time, and still a powerful and outstanding figure in this body, as well as other Senators, who were fighting the League, used it to the very limit. I do not want anything to go into the pending resolution which would give rise to any such possibility when we come to passing upon the peace terms. What we want to do, in my opinion, is to obtain a peace treaty which will prevent future wars. As I stated yesterday, that is the only thing the United States is fighting for, the prevention of future wars. We have no other interest in this great war now being waged in the world. We do not want the territory of any other nation; we do not want the domain of any other nation; we do not want the property of any other nation; all we want is to be allowed to live in peace with the rest of the world, and we want to guarantee that peace, and in my judgment that is all that need be said at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As the able Senator from Ohio has pointed out, the amendment of the group of which the able Senator is a member proposes only that the nations which shall compose the organization be those specified in the amendment, but the way they shall vote, the number of votes that each shall have, is not specified or provided for in the amendment which is being advocated by the Senator from Ohio. One might just as well say that the United States Senate should not agree to Senate Resolution 192 because it says all free and sovereign nations shall constitute the membership of the authority envisaged by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because that means that Costa Rica, which is a free and sovereign nation, shall have the same vote and the same influence and the same power in the international authority that the United States of America, or Russia, or the United Kingdom would have. I use Costa Rica only by way of illustration, because it is a much smaller country in population and in national wealth and in area than the United States of America; and I can well imagine what Senator Reed and what Senator Borah and what Senator Knox would have said, and what whoever may be their counterparts in the next League of Nations debate would say about a proposal to the effect that the United States of America, with 130,000,000 people, which is going to have to bear a considerable part of the responsibility for maintaining this organization, shall have no more strength and influence and power in it than our fine neighbor, for example, Costa Rica, in Central America.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Florida. Let me say that I think the amendment raises no greater difficulty on that point than the resolution itself. The fact is inherent in world affairs today. We ought to meet the situation as constructively as our forefathers did in dealing with New York, Virginia, or Connecticut when framing the Constitution, and I believe that we should leave the field of the mechanics to negotiation at a later date.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me? Because of the very able and enlightening address being made by him, I am very reluctant to interrupt him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I have been warned to conclude because another Senator is to follow me and his statement will bear on another matter. I shall yield, however, but I hope the Senator may be brief.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope my question will not entail a long answer. I do not want to be technical or meticulous, but it seems to me that the whole debate is largely centered and hangs on words. I wonder what, if any, significance the Senator attaches to these words? In Senate resolution 192 we find the words "with power to prevent aggression." In the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and his distinguished associates, we find instead of "to prevent" the words "to suppress." In the debate yesterday there was brought out in explanation of the word "suppress" the example of the break in the dike in which the boy placed his hand to suppress the flow of water, thereby saving the dike. Another example given was the suppressing of small fires.

In my opinion, what we need in a resolution of this kind, and what we should accomplish by a subsequent treaty, is not a situation which allows military aggression to get under way before intervention by international authority, but intervention before such military aggression gets started. So in my opinion the words "to prevent aggression" are much stronger than the words "to suppress." In other words I refer to the old saying that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" or in the case of the amendment "a pound of suppression."

I wonder if the Senator has an explanation of those words, "to prevent aggression," and whether he agrees with me that the word "suppress" always refers to an existing condition? In other words you cannot suppress a thing until it actually exists. On the other hand, if action is taken in time, you can prevent the objectionable thing from coming into existence.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, replying to the able Senator from Utah, my thought would be that the natural interpretation and the primary interpretation of the word "suppress" is precisely what he gives to it. "Military force, to suppress military aggression" would be clearly applicable to the suppression of military aggression already under way. The reason for including that language is that we thought it vital that the force be such that it can suppress aggression when it is small, it can act upon it after it is growing—it can go all the way. Whereas the word "prevent" might very well exclude such action, for by the language of the resolution itself not even military aggression is proposed to be suppressed. It would not justify anything more than the exercise of the power of persuasion or power of economic sanction, whatever power it may be to prevent something from taking place, the power named in the Kellogg Pact. In order to meet the serious situation resulting from the initiation of military aggression we have inserted the language we consider necessary in the amendment, and coupled with it are the words "and to preserve the peace of the world." We think that language is adequate to cover the requirements we deem necessary.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly again?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot agree with the Senator's explanation but I shall not prolong the argument on that point. I should like to call his attention, however, to one point. I do so because of a question asked by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] with reference to the possibility under the amendment of cooperation between nations in the economy of the world or in economic questions. We find in the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and his associates, including the able Senator from Ohio, this language, "to suppress military aggression." From past experience I can conceive of economic aggression on the part of a nation such as Germany, including future attempts at infiltration of nazi-ism in the South American countries, for example, for the very purposes of economic aggression. I think that such type of economic aggression, so objectionable in a world that wants peace, is included and could be prevented under Senate Resolution 192, whereas in the amendment which the Senator is sponsoring the only aggression to be suppressed is military aggression. So, in my opinion, as one very humble Member of the Senate, it seems to me the language of Senate Resolution 192, both with reference to military aspects and also to economic aspects, is in much more definite and much stronger terms than the amendment which is sponsored by the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I respond to the question of the Senator from Utah and disagree with his interpretation, for the reason that I will endeavor to explain. It seems to me that the language of the amendment bearing on this feature is far preferable and more adapted to the proprieties of the situation than is the original language. In the first place, there rises the question of suppressing military aggression. It is of vital importance that there be military force available on the part of the United Nations to suppress military aggression. The great danger which we faced at the beginning of this war resulted from our lack of available military force, and that situation, I believe, is met clearly in the amendment but not in the resolution.

It seems to me that we should not need to employ military force to suppress economic aggression. We must meet economic aggression with ample power, whatever it may be. The language in the amendment is "and with power"—of all kinds; the same kind of power provided for in the resolution—with

power of all kinds, and, to avoid misconception, we use the words "including military force," and "to suppress military aggression"; and finally, "and to preserve the peace of the world." We provide full power to preserve the peace of the world on the economic aggression side.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BURTON I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is not the Senator criticizing Senate Resolution 192 with reference to prevention of military aggression because of the fact that military force is not stated specifically in the resolution? Then he reads into Senate Resolution 192, referring to the aspect of economic aggression, that it might be construed that we could stop that by military force. In my opinion such criticism of Senate Resolution 192 is hardly justified. A fair construction of the resolution, in my opinion, is that any power that is made available by international authority which may be organized, is there ready, whether it be military power or economic sanctions, or what not, not only to stop unfair but let us say dangerously ambitious economic aggression, and it also includes military power, if necessary, to prevent military aggression before it gets under way. For instance, suppose after the treaty is completed we find some nation, secretly and under all the cover that is possible, building up her military power. Under Senate Resolution 192, in my opinion, the international authority could intervene at that point, before that nation got under way with her military aggression, and could say to her, "Here! You are building up military power in violation of world peace, and we want you to stop it, and under this international authority we will stop it."

But as I understand the Senator's amendment, the military aggression must get under way, it must be moving, it must be actually in existence, before the power about which he talks can step in and "suppress" it.

Mr BURTON. I think the Senator from Utah misunderstands the language, and does not interpret it in accordance with its clear meaning. The language of Senate Resolution 192 as it stands is limiting language or has the grave danger of limitation because it is not specific on the question of the use of military force to suppress military aggression. There is a great temptation in time of need to avoid the use of it, as occurred at the beginning of the present war.

But if the Senator will read the language of the amendment, certainly the word 'power"—the same word which is in the original resolution—is in the amendment, and the effect of "power, including military force," certainly is not less than that of "power," as it stands, without the additional words "including military force."

Therefore there would be "power, including military force"; in addition to the word "power," which was in the original resolution, there would be added specifications and we would add the words "to suppress military aggression," so as to make clear that it covers that point, and the words "and to preserve the peace of the world" cover that generality.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to be sure that the interpretation the Senator from Utah has just placed upon Senate Resolution 192 is a proper one, and I think the authors of the resolution may also be interested.

Mr MURDOCK. They are not responsible for my interpretation.

Mr. HATCH. I understand, but the Senator is an able lawyer and has a keen mind and the interpretation he places upon the resolution is entitled to consideration. I simply want to be sure that I correctly understood the Senator. Does the Senator interpret the words of Senate Resolution 192 "with power to prevent aggression" as meaning that under that language military power could be used to prevent military aggression, political aggression, or any kind of aggression whatever? Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, my answer is that Senate Resolution 192 is not limited or qualified as to what power can be used, either to prevent unfair economic aggression or military aggression.

Mr. HATCH. Then I am correct in understanding that under the Senator's interpretation military power could be used, as he said, to prevent too ambitious economic aggression.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would be possible under this resolution, in preventing dangerously ambitious economic aggresison, to resort to military force, but the possibility in my opinion is very remote.

Mr. HATCH. I assure the Senator that that interpretation has never before been given to the resolution, either by its authors or by other Senators. That is the reason why I am interested.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, I make that interpretation on my own responsibility; but in doing so I want to add that in my opinion, the time will never come when military force will be necessary in order to prevent economic aggression; but the time will come, in my opinion, when economic power, such as economic sanctions, will be wholly necessary to stop unfair and dangerously aggressive economic practices by one country in another. I do not think the time will ever come when the use of the military will be necessary for the suppression of economic aggression.

Mr. HATCH. But it could come.

Mr. MURDOCK. But even if the time should come when the international authority thought it wise and prudent in maintaining the peace of the world, it could, if necessary, stop unfair and dangerous economic aggression by military power. Let me call the attention of the able Senator to the fact that there are few of the wars of history that are not traceable to economic ambitions or injustices. Therefore, if economic ambition and injustice cause war, such economic aggression as is likely to cause war should be stopped, even if resort to military force by international authority is necessary.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to ask these questions. I should like to ask one other question of the Senator before concluding, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. BURTON. I yield, but again I state to the Senator from Utah that I am under obligation to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to conclude my remarks so as to enable him to proceed. I should like to conclude my remarks as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall refrain, from now on, from interrupting the Senator; but at this time I should like to have him tell me whether by the use of the word "suppress" he means that the military aggression must be under way and must be on the move before, under this amendment, we could step in and prevent it.

Mr. BURTON. As I stated a little while ago, that is the natural and primary meaning of the word "suppress." I believe it can be expanded to a broader meaning, but I do not rely upon the expansion to a broader meaning. I rely upon the effect of the words "with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." I believe those words amply meet the necessity.

Mr. President, from now on I shall proceed with my remarks. Being under compulsion to conclude my remarks soon, I shall decline to yield further, although I appreciate the importance and materiality of the points which have been made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has been very generous, and I thank him very much, indeed.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this recognition of all of the United Nations, and this reference to other nations to be added to them, is a recognition of the rights and aspirations of the small as well as of the large nations of the world. It is an expression of America's traditional interest in the welfare of all human beings and in their inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It also is a recognition of the vital, practical importance to America of the continuance of world-wide peace with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. It is a recognition of the need for preserving the unity of the United Nations in peace as well as in war, both from the point of view of military force and otherwise.

This amendment meets the second test in the same manner as does the original resolution. Its definition of policies is not carried to such an extreme that such definition could possibly be interpreted as a consent to some treaty that is as yet unseen and unwritten, and thereby could authorize, by any extension of authority, its final determination by the President without returning it to the Senate. Here again, however, the addition of the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Indiana might well,

to my mind, still further emphasize the appropriate intent of the Senate.

The Pepper amendment, by its definiteness on the points mentioned, enables Senate Resolution 192 to meet each of my remaining four tests of acceptability. The amendment is definite where the original resolution is not. Yet this definiteness is so limited to fundamentals that it cannot handicap the appropriate discretion of the President in negotiating a treaty, and it will strengthen his hands in every international relationship he may experience.

I believe it will be helpful, in consideration of the phrase "such free and sovereign nations" and the need and propriety of including in the resolution the phrase "all the United Nations," to made reference to the extraordinarily able and clear speech of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], delivered on August 27, in Texas. The speech is printed at page A3770 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I refer particularly to the following quotation:

> So long as the nations imposing the peace shall be ready and willing to maintain that peace by the last argument of military force, it will live. The United Nations must, when our enemies are mastered, establish an international agency to determine disputes over boundaries, over all the quarrels that lead to international war and to arrest aggression and criminal conquest.
>
> Such an agency, unless invested with power to enforce its decisions, cannot survive. It must have authority to call upon member nations for troops and navies, when necessary, to enforce its decrees and impose upon aggressors and violators of the law of nations punishment for their crimes.

Then the Senator from Texas, illustrative of his convictions in this matter, pointed out the following:

> From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venemous head. The United States must be a member of the peace agency. Without that membership it will fail. Russia must be a part. * * * Great Britain must be a member. Great old China must have a seat. * * * Other members of the United Nations must have a place at the council table.

Again:

> The Senate of the United States will at an early date consider a resolution expressing the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for giving prominence and prestige to the remarks of the Senator from Texas. I rise only to inquire whether or not he takes any issue with what I said.

Mr. BURTON. I agree thoroughly with those remarks; and I wish to point out, as I am sure the Senator realizes, that in our advocacy of those remarks in this proposed amendment we are really endeavoring, I believe, to carry out the conviction of the Senator from Texas, which he evidently was forced to yield in the course of reaching a compromise on this resolution. I believe the Senate can well come to his rescue in that regard and put him in a position where, on the final vote, he may be able to vote for his original convictions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator again for giving prominence to my remarks. He implies that the Senator from Texas was forced to do something. The Senator from Texas has views, but he does not have all the views in the world. He is not so stubborn or arbitrary as not to go along because his exact language is not adopted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am delighted to hear this expression from the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am sure that he will not again say that this resolution must not be amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to engage in any flippant argument with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico is not being flippant.

Mr. CONNALLY. I referred to his argument, not to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I did not wish to imply that the Senator from Texas had been forced. I did wish to imply that he had yielded his best judgment to the compromise. I am sure that his conviction is what it originally was; and if others can save him from the necessity of yielding at this point, I am sure that in the final analysis he will welcome with enthusiasm his original position if it is supported by the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with the construction which the Senator places upon the present situation. I have nothing to retract from what I said. Those have been my views for 25 years or longer. I am not a new convert. I am not laboring under any fantastic illusion that my particular language or my particular words ought to be adopted in legislation. My conviction is that everything I said in that speech can be accomplished properly, legally, and constitutionally under the language of Senate Resolution 192 as presented to the Senate. I have surrendered nothing of principle. I may have surrendered phraseology. We may have taken out an "an". We may have used the word "authority" instead of "organization" on the theory that "authority" is broader than "organization." We used the word "authority" because it was broad enough to cover the utilization of the World Court, the League of Nations, if necessary or practicable, and The Hague Conventions; and broad enough to cover a further authorization to create a new and additional organization to effectuate the broad objectives of preventing aggression with power.

What is power? Let us look to the lexicographers, and not to the perfervid oratory of Senators. What does the dictionary say? Power includes mental power. There is the World Court, and there are other agencies for discussing and settling problems by mental processes. Power includes moral power. It includes physical power. Everyone knows what physical power is. It is a sword, a cannon, a piece of artillery, or a navy.

What is desired beyond this broad authorization? We are not agreeing in advance to ratify any treaty which may be brought back, but we are saying to the world, "We are willing to cooperate within this broad field." We are saying to the President, "This is our attitude, and this is our advice." After all, the President is the man who is going to make the treaty. Are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] so afraid of their President that they must instruct him in the minutiae? Must we tell him where to put a comma and where to put a period? Shall we say to the President, "We are advising you, and if you do not use this language, we will not stand by you"?

Mr. BURTON. Treating the remarks of the Senator from Texas on August 27 in a purely objective manner, and referring to it merely as language, I wish to point out that the language which he used at that time has been omitted from Senate Resolution 192, and is proposed to be reinserted by the amendment which we are supporting. I believe that from the point of view of the Secretary of State, in his present negotiations, for example, seeking clarification of the point of view of the United States Senate, he will find greater help if the advice of the Senate can be put in the language in which it was put by him on September 12, in which it was put by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on August 27, and in which it is put in the proposed amendment, rather than in the language of the original resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude with emphasis on the fact that it is vitally important to adopt immediately, by a substantial vote, in accordance with constitutional processes, the resolution as proposed to be amended.

IV. IT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT TO ADOPT IMMEDIATELY BY A SUBSTANTIAL VOTE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES, THE RESOLUTION AS THUS AMENDED

When General MacArthur was welcomed to Australia he included in his response the following statement:

> I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen.

That is the spirit on the front line. There is no question that the men on the front line are doing their share. It is for us to live up to their standard and to our responsibility to them. Our first duty is

to help in every way we can to win the war. Senate Resolution 192, amended as proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in the name of himself and 13 other Senators, would tend both to unite our Nation and to unite our allies. Our great obligation, next to winning the war, is to make sure that when the war is won it will stay won. This amended resolution would help to that end. We must do everything in our power to make sure that we shall establish, following the war, internal stability in this Nation for the benefit of its people. The opportunity to do so will have been won jointly by all who have fought this war to victory. Full success, however, will depend upon the establishment of peace with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. It is only thus that we shall have a peace worthy of the infinite price paid for it. It is through such a determination to establish and to maintain peace as is expressed in the resolution as proposed to be amended that we can establish a national policy worthy of those who are fighting this war and worthy of those who established this Nation.

We shall live up to the destiny of this Nation if, but only if, we have that deep faith in God and in man which makes us willing to maintain in peace as well as in war that high devotion to this Nation that has won and preserved its freedom. To paraphrase General MacArthur's noble statement: "We are engaged in the great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die and to this end we pledge the full resources of all the mighty power of our country and all the blood of our countrymen."

This is too deep a dedication for us to falter in carrying out our share in it. It is for us, through our efforts to establish and maintain the peace of the world, to see to it that our young men and women who shall come back from the war shall find here the America of lasting peace, assured stability, high ideals, and high opportunity of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL ON HIS VISIT TO WAR FRONTS

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I happen to know that many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle are very much interested in hearing the address which the Senator from Georgia is about to begin, and I hope he will yield to me in order that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from Alabama, I will yield, but I may say that my remarks will largely be a repetition of my statement in the Senate on October 7 last.

Mr. HILL. I can assure the Senator that many Senators are anxious to hear his address. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, published reports of statements purporting to have been made in secret sessions of the Senate by individual members of the Senate committee which recently visited the war theaters overseas have been the subject of much criticism and comment in recent weeks.

The summary of the findings of the committee as a body, outlining opinions on which all of the Senators who participated in the trip were in complete agreement, was given to the press and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Very little has been said or published about those conclusions. Perhaps they were not spectacular enough.

The fragmentary handling by the press of the reporting by some Senator or Senators who saw fit to disregard the rules of the Senate applying secrecy to executive sessions caused a great deal of confusion and distortion in the accounts of what transpired appearing in the press and given over the radio. There seems to be a natural tendency on the part of most human beings to emphasize critical statements and gloss over those which are commendatory in character.

The widespread publicity given the deliberations of a secret session reflects no credit on the Senate. It will probably be a long time before another executive session is held. It does seem that a Member or Members of this body who cannot resist the impulse to report secret proceedings to newsmen would at least make an attempt to present a more complete picture. It may well be that it was unwise to arrange an executive session in the first instance. I personally had no objection to making a general statement of my views and observations in public, but it was felt that an executive session would enable the members of the committee to speak more freely on such matters as the number of troops and amount of equipment in each area, and other plans and details of the war which it would be against the public interest to make available to our enemies.

I believed that if the expedition were to prove of any value to the Senate and thereby to the country in dealing with war legislation or post-war problems, I should be perfectly frank in making my report. Nothing was further from my purpose than to engender any bitterness, either at home or between us and our allies, which would in the slightest degree adversely affect our united effort in the great struggle for life and freedom in which we are all engaged, and I have no apologies for any statement that I made.

In view of the fragmentary and somewhat garbled reports which have been circulated and discussed, I have decided, in order to clear the atmosphere and make plain my own views, to make in open session of the Senate the same report, insofar as possible, I made in the executive session. I have omitted only facts which might be valuable to our enemies. During the course of the sessions a number of questions were asked, and I, of course, cannot remember all of them or repeat my answers verbatim. I am, however, using the same notes and manuscript to which I referred in the executive session held October 7. I do not expect my colleagues to welcome the opportunity to hear the same statement twice, but I feel that in justice to myself I should repeat it. If any Member of the Senate desires to repeat the questions asked in the executive sessions I shall endeavor to answer them just as I did in the first place, if my memory will permit.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am not undertaking to speak for the committee. This is not a committee report in any sense of the word. It is a statement of my own individual views. As is natural in such a case, each individual Senator who went on the trip returned with some ideas and opinions that differed from those held by his colleagues. All of us did not see and hear the same things, and there were instances of different constructions being placed upon what we did see and hear. Despite the fact that practically every statement made by any member of the committee is attributed to "the five Senators," there are a number of matters on which we are not in agreement.

I now pass, Mr. President, to the manuscript which I used on October 7.

It may facilitate an understanding of the reports of the members of the committee designated to visit the American war operations overseas to preface the discussion with a brief outline of the route traveled by the committee in the course of its investigation.

Leaving Washington on July 25, we flew via Presque Isle, Maine, to an air base in Newfoundland, and from there we proceeded to another airfield in Labrador.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will not the Senator bring the map to which he is now referring from the corner of the Chamber to the front, so that we all may

understand him better, as we would like to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was only prepared to use the map to describe the course of the trip of the committee, and that will occupy only a short time. I shall be happy to have the map moved, however, if the Senator desires, but it is a rather large map.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest that it be moved down to the front.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

[The map was moved to the Well of the Senate in front of the desk.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I repeat, leaving Washington on July 25, we flew to Presque Isle, Maine, and from there to a large air base in Newfoundland. From this field in Newfoundland [indicating on map] we proceeded to another large base in Labrador used by planes flying across the Atlantic for delivery to England. From this field in Labrador [indicating] we flew across the awesome ice cap, and peaks and glaciers of Greenland, following the Great Circle route to a field in Iceland [indicating]. From Iceland we went to the United Kingdom, where we spent a number of days, practically half the time with our Eighth Air Force. From a gigantic airport in southwest England we took off at midnight one night for Marrakech, in north Africa [indicating].

We spent more than a week in the north African theater of operations, and visited all the important cities along the Mediterranean, as well as Casablanca on the Atlantic, and all the troop concentrations that are scattered along the entire rim of north Africa, as well as the scene of the fighting there last spring. Leaving Cairo, we traveled across Arabia to Basra and Abadan [indicating] on the Persian Gulf. There, in a climate so hot that the actual temperature recorded by thermometer defies belief, our men are assembling and delivering to the Russians vast quantities of war matériel under lend-lease.

From this theater we proceeded to Karachi, in India [indicating], and thence across India by New Delhi and Assam Province and over the Burma Hump into China, visiting Kunming and Chungking. Coming back out of China we proceeded to Calcutta, and from Calcutta across the Bay of Bengal to Ceylon. From Ceylon we crossed the Indian Ocean to Carnarvon on the west coast of Australia. We were told that ours was the first land plane ever to make this flight across the Indian Ocean. We visited Port Darwin and Townsville, from which place we flew across the Coral Sea to General MacArthur's headquarters in New Guinea. Returning to Australia we landed at Brisbane, from which city, after a visit to Sydney and Melbourne, we took off for New Caledonia. We came home across the Pacific, stopping at Fiji Islands, Samoa, Christmas Island, and Hawaii on our way to Los Angeles, whence we took the last long jump across the entire United States to Washington.

This represents the route taken by the four-motored Liberator transport in which we left Washington. The party did not stay together throughout the entire trip, but went to different places within each area visited in other planes. The large plane in which we left Washington flew nearly 37,000 miles, and members of the committee traveled several thousand miles in other planes when visiting points where a four-motored plane could not land. About one-eighth of the total time of the trip was consumed in travel through the air. Most of the remaining seven-eighths was spent in an earnest effort to gather information.

Upon my appointment as chairman of the committee I announced that we were in no sense a committee on the conduct of the war, and that I did not consider it within our province to undertake to advise or interfere with Allied military and naval leaders in their direction of the strategy of the war. I did feel that the committee could perform a very useful function for the Senate by securing first-hand information from the various theaters of operations as to the provisions being made for the health and well-being of our troops, as well as finding out what the men were thinking and talking about, the condition of their morale, the suitability of the tools of war being produced at such great effort and expense, and the general effectiveness with which the war is being prosecuted. I also believed that the things heard and observed by such a Senate committee would be helpful in dealing with the questions arising from our relations with the other Allied powers, and in preparing for the many trying and complex issues whose solution must have final approval by the Senate after the war is over.

No one would claim that any person could become conversant with all phases of our far-flung activities in a trip of little more than two months' duration. All that one could hope to do was to get a fair idea of the general atmosphere prevailing in each of the theaters visited. This we endeavored to do by personal contact and observation. We slept in palaces and in pup tents. We ate with those who are directing the destinies of nations, and with enlisted men at their mess. We conferred with high officials of every government visited, as well as with the commanding officers in every theater of operations. We had explanations of strategy, tactics, and objectives, illustrated by maps and in some cases by moving pictures. We talked to wounded men in hospitals who had just been brought in from the front, as well as with men of all ranks belonging to every branch of the service.

We spent days with the Fifth Army as they were undergoing the final phases of intensive training in amphibious operations preparatory to the invasion of Italy, as well as with Commando units and Marines training for jungle fighting in the South Pacific. We saw bomber and fighter squadrons briefed for attack take off in their planes, both from England and in the Pacific theater. We visited men in their barracks, and chatted with them as they relaxed in Red Cross canteens. We attended the moving-picture and the U. S. O. shows, to which the men in the more remote places look forward so avidly.

The men who are actually fighting this war are thinking about post-war problems, as well as things at home and the conduct of the war. I wish that every Member of the Senate could have been with me to share my discomfort during a two-hour grilling by several hundred Servicemen in a Red Cross canteen in New Delhi, which they have named "Duration Den." It would have required not only all the powers of prophecy of the entire Senate, but full and frank replies from the heads of all the Allied powers to answer some of the questions propounded. Any idea that the men are only thinking about the end of the war and getting home would be disabused by a visit to any overseas station.

What I have seen and heard does not make me an expert on all things pertaining to the war, but I have a much clearer picture than I could possibly have gained by zealous attendance on committee hearings for 12 months. Not only is this war the greatest undertaking the American people have ever embarked upon, but even after having visited all the theaters of operations it is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the job to which the power and might of the United States and our allies have been harnessed all around the globe. It was a great experience to see first-hand the difficulties and obstacles which are requiring such a tremendous expenditure of human energy and material resources, and which demand ingenuity, heroism, and a spirit of sacrifice on the part of millions of our boys and girls.

The over-all problem of transportation involved in this war is so great as to stagger the imagination. It taxes to the limit the resources of our Nation and the human endurance of our people engaged in it. The most striking single difficulty is that involved in the effort to supply our forces in China and our Chinese allies. After having been brought thousands of miles by steamship into the harbor of Calcutta, every pound of supplies going to General Chennault's gallant air forces in China must now be loaded or unloaded nine different times, as well as being flown over the towering peaks of the Burma "hump" before they can be utilized against the enemy.

The job of maintenance and repair in this mechanized war is an onerous one. Veritable factories must follow each army. American engineers and mechanics have built great machine shops at various places across the vast reaches of north Africa, on the scorching rim of the Persian Gulf, in Australia, and on the islands of the South Pacific, where planes, tanks, trucks, and ships are either assembled or repaired. I never ceased to marvel at their efficiency. We saw production lines at these remote stations receive airplane engines that seemed to be completely wrecked. A few hours later they emerged wrapped in cellophane, and as precisely tooled and efficient as a new engine coming from a plant in the United States.

One benefit we will derive from the enormous expenditures of this awful war lies in the training of large numbers of the finest craftsmen and mechanics in

the world. Both the Army and the Navy have accomplished wonders in this respect. Boys who 12 months ago were either unemployed or doing work requiring no skill are today repairing the most delicate instruments, such as radar and radio equipment, telephone exchanges, submarine periscopes, and are working with the countless finely balanced machines which are necessary in the operation of airplanes, submarines, and other complicated mechanisms of war.

Every American may well be proud of the manner in which our armed forces have met the problem of maintenance and supply. Our difficulties have been so far solved that our troops are now unquestionably the best fed, best equipped, and best provided armed forces the world has ever seen. In some of the remote areas the ration is not as tasty and varied as one would like, but all of our men have plenty of nourishing food and clothes adapted to the climate in which they serve and fight.

The completeness of the hospital facilities both in the field and at permanent stations, and the speed with which the sick and wounded receive treatment are almost unbelievable. I do not think we failed to visit a hospital at a single place we stopped, and I talked with doctors, nurses, and patients. Men are recovering from wounds in a few weeks in this war which would have proved fatal heretofore, and the use of the sulfa drug, blood plasma, and new methods of treatment are accomplishing miracles. Most of these hospital units moved to the front completely staffed with doctors and nurses from our leading hospitals in the States. The quality of medical treatment received by the sick and wounded in our armed forces is incomparably superior to the average treatment received by the civilian population at home.

All Senators have talked to eyewitnesses who have vividly portrayed some of the difficulties and obstacles with which our fighting men must contend in the course of operations, as well as the indomitable courage and resourcefulness of our boys who are engaged in actual combat. I shall not repeat them. All of us heard sagas of individual heroism and accomplishment which make the stories of the Knights of the Round Table pale in comparison. It was hard to believe that the quiet and modest chap you met in a hospital cheerfully bearing three or four gaping wounds was a hero who had either killed 11 Japs single-handed or had flown through the hell of fire which greeted the men who struck the Ploesti oil refineries. I shall never forget the emotions I experienced as I sat with 50 fighter pilots of the Eighth Air Force in England and heard a handsome blond squadron leader about 25 years old instruct his men on a mission across the Channel. He sounded as casual as if he were discussing the proper play to run in a football game. Nor can I forget the fine-looking boy, a veteran of 6 months' jungle fighting at 19, who 12 hours before had received a bullet in his leg while fighting the Japs in the Solomons. It so happened that I knew his family quite well. He was more interested in talking about conditions in Georgia than in New Georgia. After telling me that he hoped to be back in action within 3 weeks, he wound up by expressing concern about the people back home, saying: "Look after the folks at home, Senator, and we will take care of these Japs out here."

The fighting in Europe is against a determined, well-equipped, and resourceful enemy. It does more or less follow the orthodox conception of war. The war in the Pacific is a battle to the death. Tales of incredible and shocking brutality by the Japanese in the treatment of our men, including the wounded, make it easy to understand why no quarter is now being asked or given. The Jap had the early advantage of training in jungle fighting. They are patient and cunning. A Japanese sniper will tie himself in a tree and remain there for 3 or 4 days. Another will spend several hours crawling as short a distance as a hundred yards for a shot at an American soldier or marine. They have a great trick of slipping behind our lines and feigning death along a path on which reinforcements must travel and throwing a grenade into a detachment of our men. They had mastered all the arts of camouflage in jungle fighting. The best illustration I can use to describe the jungle fighting in the islands of the South Pacific is to compare it with Indian warfare in early colonial days, with the jungle more fearsome and difficult to penetrate than any primeval forest.

Our men have had to learn jungle fighting the hard way, but they have finally mastered it, and today they are beating the Jap at his own game.

NAVAL OPERATIONS

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I undertook to observe as many of the activities of our Navy in the areas visited as possible. I am frank to say that I believe the Navy is doing a disservice to many American heroes by overstressing its policy of remaining the "silent service." Sailors handled every one of the landing barges which took the troops and Marines ashore in the South Pacific, as they did in north Africa, in Sicily, and in Italy. They kept the noses of their ships, which are easy targets for bomb and shell, against the sands of the beaches until the last soldier and the last piece of equipment was ashore. Ofttimes the guns of destroyers and cruisers blazed the path for our infantry and tanks. Due to the constant vigilance required to fend off attacks by airplanes and submarines, the men manning these ships often do not get more than 2 or 3 hours' sleep a day for as long as a week. In Sicily one of our light cruisers broke up a tank attack by a regiment of the Hermann Goering Division just before it was apparently about to result in disaster to one of our divisions which had not had time to set up its heavy defense equipment. In my judgment the American people are entitled to know more about what the Navy has been doing in order that they may properly appreciate the sacrifices of the men who go down to the sea in ships.

It is inspiring to observe that in both the Army and the Navy morale seems to be higher where the hazard is greatest. This is particularly true of the men who man our "pigboats," or submarines. I had an opportunity to talk to the officers and men of many of our underwater craft who are carrying the war to the very shores of Japan. I asked a lad who was a member of the crew of a submarine in drydock at Pearl Harbor, where a huge dent caused by a depth charge was being ironed out, whether he would prefer service on a surface ship. His reply was, "Hell, no. It's safer down there than up above when those airplanes come in with their torpedoes and bombs."

CHINA'S DIFFICULTIES

Due to the great importance of China to the Allied cause, I regretted that our visit there was not long enough to enable us to have time to go more fully into the details of the situation there. We did, however, have ample opportunity to confer with Generals Stilwell and Chennault and to visit with the generalissimo and the leading figures of his government at Chungking.

Some of the conditions noted in China were most disturbing. Such industries as the country possessed were largely in the area occupied by the Japanese. The country has been in an exhausting war for a number of years, and they have suffered great losses. Chinese troops are poorly equipped, and in their present state of affairs are confined to defensive and guerrilla action. To apply the word "army" to the forces of China is not to use that word in the sense usually understood when referring to the armed forces of other leading Allied Powers. Their form of government lacks many of the elements of a democracy, as the term is generally accepted in our country. The generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, is a great patriot. In him rests China's last best hope of salvation as a free and unified democratic state. If any one man in China can accomplish this, he will do it. He is confronted with great difficulties, the details of which I shall not relate.

Notwithstanding all his handicaps, the generalissimo refuses even to discuss peace overtures with the Japs, and the fact that China is still in the war as our ally requires the attention of 15 or more Japanese divisions.

In my opinion, General Chennault is one of the most brilliant soldiers this war has produced. With an incredibly small number of effective airplanes, he is contributing greatly to keeping China a factor in the war. Certainly no man has ever done more with so little. Considering the limitations upon him, General Stilwell is also rendering a great service to his country and the Allied cause.

It is requiring a superhuman effort to furnish General Chennault's air forces, but the maintenance of air bases in China is of such importance that we should attack the problem of supplying him with redoubled vigor.

On account of her proximity to Japan and her knowledge of the Japanese people, China has the most effective intelligence service on Japanese activities of any of the Allied Powers.

We received information from the most reliable sources in China to the effect that we were still continuing to underestimate the strength of Japan, particularly in the field of production. We were advised that instead of the 500 planes generally estimated here, the Japs were making more than a thousand planes a month, and were producing twice as much shipping as they were before Pearl Harbor. This may be the answer to the amazement of our commanding officers in the South Pacific as to where the Japs get the planes to replace the large numbers that are shot down so rapidly there.

In addition to the ocean shipping, the Japanese are manufacturing large numbers of lightweight shallow-draft wooden ships powered by Diesel engines. They are using them for interisland transportation, and in some cases over considerable distances. Much timber is being taken from occupied China for the purpose of constructing these ships, and we were also told that they had even used some of the trees from the Emperor's sacred forest in Japan for this construction. I asked some of our submarine commanders about this, and they confirmed the reports that we had received in China. These ships constitute quite a problem to our submarines. Ofttimes submarine commanders do not feel justified in expending a long way from home priceless torpedoes in sinking such small craft. They surface, and sink them with gunfire. Practically all of these wooden ships are armed, and we have undoubtedly sustained some losses of submarines in these actions.

One unit of the Chinese Army is fully trained and equipped. Our transport planes which are flying equipment in to General Chennault returned with cargoes of Chinese soldiers. Many thousands of these men who could not be armed and equipped in China have been flown out to a point where equipment could be provided, and are now fully armed, completely furnished with motorized transport, and have been thoroughly trained in all of the latest methods of warfare. Our officers are confident that they are first-class fighting men and will give a good account of themselves when they come to grips with the enemy.

LEAVE AFTER LONG SERVICE OVERSEAS

The first question asked by every enlisted man and junior officer who has been overseas any considerable length of time is, "When are we going to get some leave to go home?" All of the veterans realize the value of the experience they have acquired in actual combat, and practically none of them expect to be released from service until the job is done, but there is an overwhelming feeling on the part of those who have been overseas for many long months that arrangements should be made to give them a respite from their trials and dangers, and a chance to see their families.

Every member of the committee is agreed that the War Department should immediately adopt some policy of returning troops home for a leave or rest after certain services have been performed. This has worked well in the case of the crews of our airplanes, who are allowed a fixed period of rest after a certain number of sorties, which varies in different theaters of operations. I believe it would be a great incentive to the men and would still further reinforce the fine morale that is now displayed if all of them had definite prospect of a visit home after the performance of a certain task or period of service for which they are assigned. For obvious reasons this is a difficult matter on which to legislate, but the committee has made strong recommendations to the War Department and the Navy Department that a fair policy of leaves be promulgated.

The one bright spot in many of the isolated places where our men are serving has been the American Red Cross and the U. S. O. troupes. There is no way to compute what these touches of home life have meant to boys who are working and fighting under almost impossible conditions. The girls in the Red Cross canteens have been worth their weight in gold, and the resourcefulness they have displayed in all conceivable circumstances has been amazing. We met several of the U. S. O. troupes. Some of them were tired and worn, but they were still carrying on, and I am sure that none of them have ever played to more appreciative audiences. A report to the headquarters of our forces in the Middle East on the trials of a group of these entertainers whose stage was the burning sands of the deserts enabled us to have a better appreciation of what these stage people are doing. The report read:

Attitude of troupe so far is very good. Tonight will play Basra and depart for Khorramshaar tomorrow. Accordion now useless as heat melted wax.

Men who live close to death think on the spiritual side of life. We attended church services at several places, and were much impressed by the manner in which the chaplains are carrying out their multifold duties. We likewise visited several cemeteries where rest those heroes who have made the supreme sacrifice. Even in the haste and confusion of war our honored dead have not been neglected. Those who have loved ones or friends who have fallen in battle would be comforted if they could see the well-kept cemeteries where they sleep, and the solicitude of the chaplains in charge to have every grave properly marked amidst surroundings of appropriate dignity.

SEABEES AND ENGINEERS

Any account of our observations without a word of praise to the Navy Seabees and the Army Engineers would be incomplete as well as unjust to some of the heroes of this war. From the frozen lava beds of Iceland to the blistering sands of the deserts, these men work as high as 20 hours some days constructing facilities that are essential to modern war. When the history of this war is written, their unselfish sacrifices and tireless labor should adorn one of its brightest pages. To date they have received far too little credit.

EXPECTATIONS OF RELIEF

I was very much concerned to note that for some reason many of the most recent of our allies and our late enemies have great expectations as to what they are to receive from the United States in the way of relief and rehabilitation. It is very unfortunate that their expectations are so high. The widespread idea that we are preparing to look after all of the needs of the world and to restore the destruction wrought by this war has caused me seriously to question the wisdom of delegating to a civilian agency the responsibility of handling relief and rehabilitation abroad. The establishment of a large civilian agency with widespread activities is likely either to generate unnecessary bitterness by failing to fulfill hopes that are excessive or else prove to be a more expensive undertaking than the American people should be compelled to finance. I believe it would be much better for all concerned if the people of north Africa and Italy, particularly, were frankly given to understand now that, while willing to assist to a reasonable extent, we do not consider it the responsibility of the United States to rebuild destroyed cities or embark upon any long-time program of relief.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to yield at all?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to yielding. I was endeavoring to present the statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. At that point would not the Senator also confirm that some of the most responsible men we saw, from some of the other countries, felt that was very wise?

Mr. RUSSELL. One man who occupies a very responsible position with a nation, a man who should be familiar with the circumstances in that area, confirmed my ideas about that, and told the entire group that he thought it would be much better to put it on a temporary basis.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that within 3 or 4 months they would be able to get on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And not become mendicants of this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Let them know that in the last analysis they will be compelled to work out their own destiny and restore the destruction of war by their own efforts.

Such necessary relief can be handled by the Army, even if a unit has to be established for that purpose. The Army can supply rations in the areas that have suffered most severely, and thereby prevent actual starvation. In no case should relief or rehabilitation assume such proportions that the recipients will have reason to expect or depend on American bounty for any long period of time. I hope that I do not sound callous when I say that in my opinion this relief should be on a tem-

porary basis, and so far as adults are concerned should be confined to the very minimum, a sufficiency for a short period to maintain life, but kept so small that it will not stifle a desire to supplement the ration received from us through other efforts. We should be very careful not to publicize or embark upon a policy which will either lead to greater misunderstanding or result in stupendous charges against the Treasury that our people should not be called upon to meet.

OUR BRITISH ALLIES

Wherever we went we were most courteously received by the officials of the British Empire. I was much impressed by their frankness in discussing not only the conduct of the war but post-war problems. The people of England have made great sacrifices in this war and have displayed a fortitude, in the face of constant danger, which we might well emulate. Many of their cities have been heavily bombed. The food in England was poorer than in any other place we visited. All clothing is strictly rationed. Civilians have practically no gasoline and are converting their cars and trucks to charcoal burners.

The British people have hospitably received the American soldiers who are stationed in their midst. From a military standpoint, they have displayed every quality that one could ask in an ally. The British Tommy is a first-class soldier. Wherever I had an opportunity to visit with our Navy both enlisted men and officers spoke in glowing terms of the skill and seamanship and the courage of the British tar. The Royal Navy is still living up to its finest traditions. The heroic exploits of the Royal Air Force already belong to the legends of this war. As fighting men they are good partners to have in a scrap.

We had some opportunity to observe the operation of the British Government not only at home but throughout the Empire. I came home with a healthy respect bordering on envy for the efficiency of the British in administration, and in the handling of their relations with other nations, and in their own vast dominion. The British have a definite foreign policy with respect to every corner of the globe. Every civil servant and every officer of any rank is apparently fully acquainted with Empire policy as it applies either militarily, diplomatically, or commercially. Every action of the responsible officials of government is designed to promote that policy.

If our Nation has a definite policy which extends longer than 6 months after the conclusion of the war in any of the far-flung lands in which American troops are fighting and American dollars are being spent, I was unable to find anyone among our officers abroad who could define it.

We cannot afford to rely upon even so splendid an ally as the United Kingdom to protect all our interests, or there will be inevitable conflict and confusion after the war. Our civil agencies abroad are numerous, but too often they are either working at cross purposes or, worse to relate, in some cases have no apparent purpose. Our post-war interests are being neglected, and we stand to get very little or no return from our immense expenditures.

In places our representation abroad was apparently weak. Too many of our representatives still appear to rely upon ancient protocol and the easy ways and flowery terms which have been in vogue in the past. This is a day of realism, as might be expected when great peoples are fighting for their very lives. Realists are directing this war in the field as well as in places of power, not only in enemy lands but among our allies. We would do well to assume a more realistic attitude. In my opinion all of our civilian agencies operating outside the United States should be coordinated in the hands of some two-fisted American who has an understanding of American interests in all international matters. The old type of kid-glove diplomacy, including high-flown but vague phraseology, does not have any place in today's international dealings. Everyone can understand men like Admiral Standley, who bluntly speak their minds; and whatever may have been his other qualifications I believe that representatives of his type will create more respect and genuine good will for the United States throughout the world than many of the men and most of the methods we are now employing.

We should keep closer check on the expensive tools of war that we are dealing out on such a gigantic scale under lend-lease arrangements. In the Mediterranean area and the Middle East our British allies have stressed the fact that they have given large quantities of war supplies to Turkey as very effective propaganda to gain the good will of the 250,000,000 Mohammedans of the world. Much of this military equipment transferred by England to Turkey is American-made and American-financed equipment, and was transferred to England under lend-lease. Every sensible person realizes that we will not be paid in full for all of the material of war which we have advanced to our allies under lend-lease. No one really expects it. In my judgment, it is a very poor policy to permit lend-lease equipment, paid for by the people of the United States, to be used to buy good will even for our closest friend when good will is such an important commodity. If it is good business for England to get credit with Turkey and the friends of Turkey for helping that nation in time of danger, it would seem to me to be worth something to the United States.

In like manner some of the equipment which is included in the British transfers to Russia is American-made or American-bought. American food handled on a lend-lease basis has likewise been used by the British Food Commission to feed refugees and other hungry peoples of the earth, and I doubt that the recipient is always aware of the fact that the United States was the true benefactor.

I would be the last to do or say anything which would cause any breach between our country and our British allies. I believe that the future peace of the world largely depends upon a complete understanding between us. However, matters of this kind can surely be adjusted without disturbing good relations. No people are perfect, including our own; and I feel that there will be a better understanding and more mutual respect between us and less possibility of feeling which might prevent or postpone a complete accord after the war if such matters are worked out as we go along.

One source of irritation to our men who are serving in that large portion of the world which is under the aegis of that great news agency, Reuter's, is the paucity of news as to the American war effort. After having traveled for practically a month in that area I can understand how they feel. On some days it would have been difficult from reading the papers to know that the United States was participating in the war at all. National pride, of course, colors our own news, and we are not slow to boast about the accomplishments of our armed forces.

However, it seems to me that, on the whole, our press has been much fairer with our allies in reporting the war than they have been with us. I could give many illustrations, but this excerpt from a leading paper in Australia illustrates what I am talking about. The article was written on the day that Italy surrendered. Despite the kindness with which our troops have been received in Australia, it is disturbing to an American soldier there to read:

> There is great joy in Britain that Italy's downfall should so largely be a British Empire affair. Empire forces were responsible for 90 percent of the battles from the first battle in East Africa right to the final landing on the Italian mainland.

THE INDIA-BURMA THEATER

All in all, the morale of our troops in India appeared to be lower than in any other theater. India is in many respects a very depressing place for troops to be stationed. This great country of 350,000,000 souls is a land of contrasts, of great wealth of the few and indescribable poverty and filth of the many. A great famine is sweeping some of the provinces, causing unspeakable suffering and many deaths from starvation. Any investigation of the complex problem posed by the conflicts between castes and creeds, Indian Nationalists and British Government, ancient ingrained habit and today's civilization, was not within the scope of our duties. The days that I spent in India, however, did confirm me in the belief that it would require unremitting investigation over many years to even faintly understand the so-called Indian problem, and that those who have never been there, but have a 5-minute solution, are extremely foolhardy. There was much comment on the part of our troops on the very apparent lethargy of the British war effort in that area. This lethargy has undoubtedly

affected morale. I have no knowledge of what should be implied from the appointment of Lord Mountbatten to command the large forces assembled in this theater, but I have reason to hope that it means that the period of inactivity is about to be ended. I met Lord Mountbatten in London. Any opinion formed on such a brief meeting may easily be erroneous, but I am strongly impressed that Mountbatten is not the type of man who will permit the Japs to continue to occupy Burma and to strengthen their hold on Malaya and the Indies, without annoyance. He struck me as being a man of action, who will not be content with a moribund strategy of defense.

PETROLEUM

This war of mechanized transport, involving millions of vehicles from huge ocean liners to the innumerable jeeps which have become so indispensable, is consuming petroleum products in staggering amounts. Up to now we have been depleting our petroleum stocks at a ruinous rate, supplying not only our own forces but those of our allies. It is high time to utilize the petroleum deposits of other parts of the world. Otherwise, the end of the war will find our own deposits practically exhausted.

The President's statement this week that plans are being made to accomplish this is highly gratifying. There may have been sound reasons heretofore for not more widely employing the huge deposits of the Persian Gulf. These reasons were based upon difficulties of transportation. With the opening of the Mediterranean and the great increase in construction of shipping, there is no longer any valid reason for not giving our oil deposits a rest, and tapping those of other areas.

At one time we were shipping high octane gasoline to Russia, which has great petroleum reserves, but lacked refineries. Refineries have now been supplied Russia. We should no longer be compelled to draw on our dwindling petroleum reserves for use in most of the foreign theaters of operation.

POST-WAR AIR RIGHTS

All of us are concerned about American rights in air bases and air facilities which have been constructed at our expense all over the world. There should be no delay in having some definite understanding and agreement as to the post-war rights of our commercial aviation. Certainly we occupy a better position to negotiate such understandings now than we will after the war is over. We cannot expect to have sovereignty over all bases that we have constructed for military purposes, but we should be able to assure to American enterprise an equal chance with others in these bases we have paid for, and the right to operate in all parts of the world.

Air power is the decisive factor in this war. With the great developments being made daily in aviation, the peace of the world and the outcome of any future wars will depend directly upon air power. Planes must have bases from which to operate. We should begin now to plan for the post-war period, both to assure the future defense of the United States and to assist in maintaining world peace on a basis of justice and equality.

Many of our close offshore bases are built on lands under foreign flags. I have never been satisfied with the 99-year lease given the United States in the destroyer deal negotiated by this country before we entered the war. This is not any 99-year country! Where would we be today if Jefferson had handled the Louisiana Purchase on any such basis, or if our rights in Florida, or if even the Alaska Purchase, had been subjected to any such limitation? If we can be trusted for 99 years to occupy and develop defenses on the lands belonging to our allies, but essential to our defense, there is no reason why future generations, who will still be paying for this war, should be denied the protection these bases afford.

Time can bring remarkable changes. War will move much faster in the future than it has even in this day of blitz. With the tide of lend-lease running high from our shores, future generations of Americans should not be subjected to the danger of having these bases, built and maintained by Americans, used against them 100 years from now. It should be possible to work out some arrangements which will give us permanently such protection as these bases may afford.

There are many other important spots on the globe which have been fortified and developed with American money and sweat, which will become increasingly important to the defense of the United States with the rapid improvement of air and sea transportation. The smaller the world becomes, the closer are these bases to our shores.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the importance of some arrangement with the Government of Iceland in the post-war period which will permit us to use the very expensive facilities we have constructed on that island. A glance at the map will show that heavy bombers and submarines based on Iceland can close all of the shipping lanes of the north Atlantic. In any future war, control of Iceland means control of the north Atlantic Ocean.

We are now in Iceland at the invitation of the Icelandic Government issued before Pearl Harbor. Our British allies, appreciating the significance and importance of Iceland, had moved in some time before. It was a very fortunate thing that they did, because if Germany had beaten the British to Iceland it could have prolonged this war by years, and undoubtedly would have enormously increased the losses of the Allied Nations. Iceland, with 120,000 people, occupying an area of 40,000 square miles, manifestly cannot defend itself against aggression. A strong enemy in Iceland would ever be a great menace to the security of the United States. We should endeavor to protect the millions of dollars and the tremendous effort that we have spent to secure our northern flank and sea lanes in this war by building fields and bases in Iceland. If in the future we should have another war it would cost the lives of many American boys and the expenditure of even greater sums to restore our present position.

Dakar, on the West Coast of Africa, occupies the same position in relation to the South Atlantic that Iceland does to the North Atlantic. As a matter of self-defense we should see to it either that we have some rights in Dakar or that it does not fall into unfriendly hands, or is not committed to the custody of those who are unable to defend this vital base which can dominate the South Atlantic and threaten all South America.

In the Pacific our boys are already fighting and dying over and around the islands that were mandated to Japan after the last World War. Much more precious blood will be shed before the Japs are finally rooted out. Certainly as a result of the sacrifices of these men, and to prevent the further killing of the boys of the second or third generation moving back into these islands in some future war, we should have some definite policy with respect to the future status of these islands that will assure the defense of the United States, as well as contribute to the peace of the world. We have rights in these islands that are being purchased today with the blood of American boys.

I spent several days on the island of New Caledonia, one of the westernmost of the Pacific islands. This is a French possession. In order to assure an open sea route to Australia and the bases of operations against the Japs in the islands of the Pacific, we have spent many million dollars fortifying this island. It has a fine, natural, land-locked harbor. We have built wharves and docks, seaplane bases, airfields, and roads, barracks, and hospitals, and placed heavy defense artillery to beat off the strongest Japanese attack. We have in operation at our bases there some of the finest repair and machine shops that I saw anywhere in the world. In brief, New Caledonia has been transformed by American dollars and American sweat and sacrifice into an all but impregnable fortress. So long as it is in friendly hands and we have any considerable naval and air power, no enemy from the west can with safety attack either North or South America without first reducing it.

In the past we have heard a great deal about the fortification of Guam. I do not know what future plans or program for the fortification of Guam the American Congress will be compelled to pass upon; but I believe that if we could obtain rights in New Caledonia and utilize the fortifications and facilities already existing, it would save much of the expense of fortifying Guam. It seems to me that negotiations should be entered into at the earliest possible date looking to the acquisition, by fair and just arrangements, either of title to all of New Caledonia or perpetual rights in and to the bases and facilities we have constructed. I know that there are those who will hurl the charge of imperialism at such suggestions and claim that they are in derogation to the terms of the Atlantic Charter. I do not think that there is anything imperialistic about it.

Call it what you will, it is a realistic step to prevent another generation of Americans, who will undoubtedly still be paying for the present war, from being compelled to pay again in blood and treasure in taking these islands back from the same enemy who may obtain them if we follow the policy of take and abandon after this war is over.

American boys will soon be dying to free the soil of France from a foreign invader. We are now equipping many French divisions in north Africa with American arms in order that they may join in the fight for the liberation of France. We are supplying the French people in north Africa with petroleum, clothing, and many other articles through lend-lease. When the motherland of France is freed from the German invader we will undoubtedly spend huge sums for relief and rehabilitation in France. It is not too much to ask that for the sake of the future defense of America we be given some rights in an island which means nothing to the defense of France but may be vital to our own defense.

OVERCONFIDENCE A GREAT DANGER

Nothing that I saw in the course of my travels would justify any confidence that the war is nearly over. Indeed, I believe that overoptimism is one of the enemies which the American people must constantly fight, day and night. The German Army, though extended to the limit, is still a most formidable military organization. Their first-line troops are still the equal of any in skill and fanatical bravery.

While in north Africa we were told of an incident in Sicily involving a company of German parachute troops who were posted in an olive grove with orders to delay at any cost the American advance for 12 hours. When the grove was finally stormed and captured, over 200 of the 250 men stationed there were dead, and the remainder, with 4 or 5 exceptions, were wounded. One of the unwounded leaped at his American captor and bit him entirely through the hand. The Germans are giving ground in Russia and in Italy, but discipline is still strong, and their retreats are still orderly. They are falling back to ever stronger defenses, and it is always well to bear in mind that up to the time of the armistice in 1918 the German Army was carrying out orders and was still a strong and organized fighting force.

Any hope for an early defeat of Germany must depend upon the collapse of the Army due to shortage of fighting equipment, or to a break-down of civilian morale and revolution within. They are taking a terrific pounding by day and by night from our gallant airmen and the R. A. F. We will soon be in a position to increase substantially the bombing of Germany from bases in Italy as well as from England, and the number of German factories destroyed and families driven from their homes will greatly increase.

But all of this is not done without losses to us. The Germans have turned from the production of bombers to fighter planes in the effort to stop the destruction of their homeland from the air. They are devising new methods such as the rocket guns and small parachute bombs dropped from the air in the effort to destroy our air forces. While our military authorities say the price we are paying is not excessive in comparison with the destruction our air forces are causing, we must frankly face the fact that the increasing tempo of bombing likewise brings about increasingly severe losses of our own in men and equipment.

In the Pacific we have only whipped the Japanese in the outposts of their ill-gotten empire. The bulk of their Army and the major units of their Navy have not yet been brought into action. We have a long, hard, bloody job before us, and I fear that the sacrifices, shocks, and losses we must yet endure are much greater than the average American citizen anticipates.

In summation of my observations, I would say:

First. American production has justified our proudest boasts by turning out tools of war of high quality in huge quantities. The men in the field are satisfied with the weapons issued them. We are making great strides in assembling the facilities of transportation necessary to fight a war on every continent and every sea of the globe. This stupendous effort constitutes a great drain upon our natural resources. We should pay more attention to the utilization of raw materials of other lands, lest the end of the war find those resources virtually untapped and our own exhausted. We should be more careful in the distribution of the products of American industry financed by American taxpayers.

Second. Our lack of a post-war policy and stronger representation abroad in some key positions is likely to cost us dearly in the post-war period. All agencies having to do with any phase of the war effort abroad should be coordinated.

Third. We must constantly combat any tendency to underestimate our enemies or to delude ourselves with optimism. The slightest relaxation in the national war effort at home will be paid in the blood of American boys fighting overseas.

Fourth. The American Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are well fed, well equipped, and every reasonable provision has been made for their health, comfort, and welfare. No armed force in history has ever been so well supplied. Command and staff work have been of the highest caliber. Our leaders have to date accomplished all that the American people could have reasonably expected of them.

Fifth. The general conduct of our troops in action has been good. Their discipline is satisfactory and they are daily becoming more efficient in the grim business of war. Combat experience is forging our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps into the toughest and most efficient fighting machine the world has ever seen. No one who has ever had any contact with troops would contend that every man is a fearless hero, who craves contact with the enemy, but as organizations our men have displayed courage and a willingness to fight and sacrifice which measures up to or surpasses the finest traditions of our armed services. The number of individuals who have performed remarkable feats of heroism, requiring resourcefulness and great personal bravery, is unusually high. The men in uniform have made up their minds to see this thing through to victory, whatever it may take. If our civilian population gives them unstinted support, they will win the total victory over our enemies perhaps sooner than we have any right to expect.

Mr. President, what I have said is the record, as complete as I can make it, of my remarks in the executive session of the Senate on October 7. It has not been altered materially in either form or substance. I tried to be factual, and to speak as objectively as possible.

We are told that what was said here has caused a great deal of bitterness and resentment in the United Kingdom. If this be true as to my own case, my high opinion of the British people would cause me to believe that the accounts they received must have been distorted even worse than by our own press. Not a word of my statement was intended as an attack on Great Britain. If any official of the British Empire, or if the British press or people, be offended, it is regrettable, for no offense is intended. But I would not have this statement construed anywhere as an apology for my position. If offense be found, I must say in all candor that our British allies have become unduly sensitive if an American citizen and Senator cannot discuss the operations and policies of his own government, of which I am a part, without raising a storm of furor and resentment throughout the United Kingdom and the Empire.

My admiration for the British people is almost extravagant, but it must be remembered that I think and speak as a citizen and a Senator of the United States. What I saw was through American eyes. I observed, weighed, and reported as an American who properly holds the future welfare of these United States above any other consideration. I would regret if any word of mine should cause dissension or ill feeling between the United States and any of our allies, but if that word be necessary to protect a legitimate vital interest, either during this war or in the post-war world, I would still feel duty-bound to speak.

The chain which binds the United Nations together is frail indeed if there are links which cannot stand the strain of expression of opinion made in good faith in the parliamentary bodies of a democracy. There are a few who have expressed the opinion that it is sheer impertinence for a Member of the American Congress to discuss our relations with the British or the part being played by them in the war. Such people would do well to observe the fine restraint and poise shown by the American people when officials of the British Empire tell us what is expected of us, and adopt it as a model of future behavior. Only a

few days ago that pillar of empire and great world figure, General Smuts, in a speech which was widely publicized throughout the world as an expression of official British opinion, told the people of the United States very frankly that we were expected to furnish in large measure the men who will make the bloody assault to breach Hitler's fortress of Europe. Few Americans failed to grasp all the implications of General Smuts' statement. The lives of American boys are infinitely more precious to us than all the material which will ever be handled under lend-lease. Nevertheless, General Smuts' statement did not evoke any great public resentment and outcry in the United States. The President did not send a message to Congress commenting with thinly veiled sarcasm on advice from abroad. I have not seen in the American press caricatures of General Smuts, ridiculing him for making a public statement as to what he considered the obligation of America in the performance of its duty to the common effort. I have not heard of any Member of Congress becoming unduly excited.

Every patriotic American expects our country to do its full part in this war, but I do not believe that doing our part requires us so to keep our light under a bushel that, where permitted to think, we are expected to speak in whispers of the contribution of our own country to the cause of Allied victory.

I therefore am not greatly disturbed by that portion of the American press or officialdom which sees ghosts every time any person in American public life has the temerity to suggest that it is proper for our allies to appreciate the extent of our efforts and sacrifices in this war as we appreciate their efforts and sacrifices. We have come to a pretty pass if a citizen of the United States cannot support with wholehearted devotion the cause of his own country without subjecting himself to the charge that he is anti-British or anti-Russian.

Recently a man who has spent his life in the service of the United States was pilloried in some quarters because he publicly stated that the people of Russia were not fully aware of the assistance given them by this country. Russian Armies and Russian people have won the undying gratitude of the American people for the heroism and spirit of sacrifice with which they have met the onslaught of the brutal hordes of Nazi Germany. Too much praise cannot be given their heroism, and with rare exceptions that praise has been spread with lavish hand in every public forum in the United States and through press and pulpit. It does not detract one jot or tittle from the valor of the Russian Armies or the sacrifices of the Russian people to mention in public the fact that the United States, and, for that matter, Great Britain, as well, have made a stupendous effort to furnish equipment to those armies, and that the equipment given must have contributed in some measure to the victories won.

The American people have before them each day the achievements of the Russian Armies. The Russian Government has not hesitated to complain frequently and publicly of our failure to open a second front when and where Russia wants it instead of when and where our own military experts think advisable. The American people have expressed no resentment of this criticism, and it is inexplicable to me that a suggestion that the masses of the Russian people should have knowledge of our efforts to aid them is likely to cause disunity between comrades in a fight involving the fate and freedom of both the people of the United States and of Russia.

I yield to no one in the fervor of my desire for the closest unity between the Allied Nations to achieve the victory over our common enemies. I am as anxious as any man for the United States to cooperate with Russia, England, China, and the other Allied Powers in maintaining peace in the years to follow that victory. I believe any lasting world peace must have as its keystone a complete understanding between the United States and the British Empire. But, Mr. President, this cooperation and understanding cannot be had except upon a basis of equality and frank and fair dealings. If such matters as I have touched upon in this report cannot be publicly discussed by a Senator of the United States even in time of war, it certainly does not augur well for the harmonious relations the American people so earnestly desire in the post-war period, because victory over our enemies will far from settle all world problems.

For my own part, I have too great a faith in the common sense and inherent fairness of the average citizen of all the United Nations, wherever he may live, to believe that harm can result from fully publicizing the true facts as to the contribution of every nation engaged in this great common enterprise, whether it be military operations on land and sea or in the operations of lend-lease, either direct or reverse. Frank discussion will always dissipate the clouds of suspicion. It will promote a better understanding between all the Allied Nations in the trying days ahead of us after the victory is won. It will pave the way for the necessary sense of appreciation of sacrifices in a common cause which begets good will between peoples. On such good will and understanding any permanent peace for this stricken world must depend.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to support the committee measure, Senate Resolution 192, largely because I believe the third paragraph of the resolution goes as far as the Senate should go at this time toward commitments by the United States as to what foreign policies it shall pursue in a post-war world of which we do not, and cannot, see the pattern at this time.

I cannot support the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on behalf of himself and other Senators, which has been so ably espoused by himself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. My reason for opposing the substitute I shall state later in these brief remarks.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind, nor, I believe, in yours, that 90 percent of all the peoples in all the nations of the world want peace, an enduring and, if possible, a perpetual peace, when this cruel war is over. We and they are willing to make considerable sacrifices in the hope of attaining that goal. From a reading of history, I think that has been true in every major world conflict. Always there has been held out to the people by their leaders that once the war is won, the leaders will so arrange the world that there will be no more wars. The "war to end war" has been a very potent slogan. I, myself, would like to believe that is the kind of war we are fighting today.

This high ambition, this most laudable ideal, inspired Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations in 1919, though its high purpose was somewhat warped by those who wrote the Treaty of Versailles.

There are those who believe that if the United States Senate had approved the League covenant following World War No. 1, and guaranteed the boundary lines therein established, there would not have been a World War No. 2. I shall not go into that argument. Those who make it follow a very simple line of reasoning. The Senate did not ratify the League covenant. We are in the midst of World War No. 2. Whether these two incontrovertible facts prove that if the Senate had approved the League covenant we would not have had World War No. 2 I leave for others to argue, and to reach their own decisions.

At any rate, it is up to the United States—and I would stress that it also is up to the British Government, and to Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union, and General Chiang Kai-shek of China—to work out some basis for a program for the post-war world which will at least minimize the chances for another world war in the near future.

The pending resolution realizes, accepts, and would implement by action, that we, and other nations of the world, particularly the leading nations of the world, must cooperate and organize for peace, for a just peace, and the maintenance of that peace to the maximum degree possible.

The pending resolution also realizes, and accepts and proclaims to the world as well as to our own people, that such post-war cooperation should and will have to be brought about without impairing the essential independence and sovereignty of our own United States of America. It is neither desirable nor necessary, thank God, that the United States become a dominion in a superstate or a satellite nation to some other nation or group of nations, in order to obtain cooperation, collaboration, or participation in the interest of world peace.

The resolution also recognizes, and accepts as fundamental to our participation in any post-war program, that the final determination of such participation must be made in accordance with our constitutional processes. I agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] most emphatically that—

> We owe it to candor to make this necessity and this intention plain to our own people, and to the world, which especially needs to understand.

Mr. President, the pending resolution also realizes—and in that it is realistic—that the Senate cannot and ought not to attempt to forestall the unknown future by commiting itself and the people of the United States to a blue-print of our future participation in some form of world organization, when it is beyond the limits of human knowledge to know what kind of a planners' blue-print will meet the situations that will exist and follow each other in the world after this war is won.

The resolution states, in general terms, but not in vague language which would conceal or pervert, the principles it sets forth, that the United States will, in good faith and to the limits of reason, participate with other free and sovereign nations and will do its full part in establishing and maintaining a just peace after the war is over.

The resolution also makes plain that no one is authorized to commit the United States to the exact form of post-war cooperation and participation; that any program negotiated will be subject to United States acceptance by constitutional processes, that is, Senate ratification, before such a program will be binding upon the United States and the people of the United States.

The resolution gives notice to the world that we will go the limit for world peace; it also gives notice that the Government of the United States, and the people of the United States, through our constitutional processes, reserve the right to pass on the program itself before finally accepting it.

Mr. President, I must admit that certain arguments made in support of amendments to the resolution are not conclusive to me.

For instance, it has been stated on the floor, as an argument why the Senate should not inform the world frankly and aboveboard that the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, has the responsibility of passing on official agreements with other nations before the agreements become binding, and that it intends to exercise that responsibility, first, that through his position as head of the Cabinet of the Parliament of Great Britain, Prime Minister Churchill can speak finally for Britain in the peace conference; second, that General Chiang Kai-shek can speak with authority for China; third, that certainly Premier Stalin can speak with authority for what Russia will do. And as a corollary, I quote from one of the arguments made on the Senate floor:

> But can the President of the United States speak with any real authority as to what obligations the United States will undertake, as to the kind of institution or organization or authority in which it will participate, or how much power may be delegated to such authority today? He cannot do so today. He can speak with that authority only if he has clear, strong advice from the Senate.

Mr. President, to my mind objections voiced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the pending resolution indicate that he, and other supporters of the Pepper amendment, want the President empowered by the Senate to speak with final authority at the peace conferences as to what obligations the United States will undertake, as to the kind of institution or organization or authority in which the United States will participate, and how much power will be delegated to such authority.

I will be perfectly frank. I do not want such broad, such blank-check powers delegated by the Senate to the President of the United States. This is no reflection upon the man who now holds that high office. I would not be willing to vote for extending such powers to any President.

I earnestly believe that the wise thing for the Senate to do, the patriotic thing for the Senate to do—and I still believe in patriotic support of my own country, despite the slurs cast upon nationalism and national patriotism—and the right thing for the Senate to do, is to approve the resolution recommended by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, without amendment and by an overwhelming majority. I hope that will be done. It represents a sound program and I believe the country will approve it.

Mr. President, last night I had the pleasure of listening to an inspirational—but realistic, rather than romantic—address by Mr. Eric A. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the annual Navy Day dinner of the Navy League, at the Mayflower Hotel, in this city.

Because I believe that every Senator would do well to read and study Mr. Johnston's address—it would be a good thing if every American citizen could read it—I am going to ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

While I have the floor, I desire also to direct special attention to one or two of the statements made by Mr. Johnston. He said:

> After this war we will still be living in a most imperfect world, as far as ever from the millenium, and under these circumstances our chief reliance must be upon our own strength—upon our common horse sense, and upon our cooperation with the United Nations.
>
> We fought in World War No. 1 to save democracy. But when we saw democracy evaporating in Europe in the thirties we felt a good deal like the mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse. We thought we were going to give the world a new conception of Thomas Jefferson, but we got an Austrian paperhanger and an Italian jackal instead.
>
> This time we must preserve the peace. And the men out there realize it, too. I am talking about the men that are exchanging slugs all over the world. They are asking questions, and the questions make sense.
>
> If I know anything about these young men from my personal contacts with them overseas, it is that they will insist upon the preservation of opportunity in America. The spirit of enterprise is very much alive in our country today.
>
> Our young men in uniform when they come back from all over the world will want an America that is open—open to them to get jobs—open to the opportunity for a plumber's son to become a doctor, or a doctor's son to become a plumber, if that is what he wishes.
>
> After this war we may find ourselves an island of free enterprise, just as after the Revolutionary War we found ourselves an island of democracy. After this war, if we are an island of free enterprise and make it work here, then again by precept and example much of the rest of the world may follow us. For a strong and prosperous America can be of unlimited value in assisting other countries of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Eric Johnston be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> As a Marine, I presume that the Corps expects me this evening to go all the way from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli. But even with all the means of modern communication you couldn't cover that distance in one night, nor tell about the exploits of the Marine Corps in a thousand and one nights of constant recitation. And so I have chosen the easy and less arduous course by talking about the smaller and less conspicuous portion of our service—the Navy.
>
> America should never cease to be proud of our Navy. Some of our oldest traditions, our most magnificent records, our most memorable acts of heroism, are the Navy's contribution to American life. When John Paul Jones said, "I have not yet begun to fight," he spoke for struggling colonies that had not yet begun to fight, not only for their independence, but for political democracy, and economic opportunity, and rugged individualism. When Lawrence said, "Don't give up the ship," it was symbolic of a new nation which was struggling into manhood against innumerable adversities—a new America that was not going to give up the ship. That Nation's greatness and strength still lay ahead.
>
> The spirit of the Navy has been the spirit of America. Realizing the Navy was the first line of American defense, understanding the apathy of many of our countrymen at a time when national danger seemed far removed, the Navy League was formed in 1902 and incorporated January 2, 1903. In 1922 the Navy League instituted Navy Day, on the birthday of President Theodore Roosevelt, October the 27th. A nonpartisan organization of patriotic citizens, its only objective is to strengthen, improve, and perfect the national defense of the United States.
>
> But this Navy Day meeting in the midst of another great World War has a far more significant, a far deeper, meaning. Once more America is pouring its blood and its treasure in unstinted fashion to preserve America's chosen way of life. Once more a new generation is being tested in the fires of battle. All over the world, on the land and in the air as well as on the sea, once again young Americans are making of their bodies and their incorrigible spirit a wall to dam the flood of barbarism that threatened to overrun the planet. Everything that we do or say this evening must be measured by that supreme fact. But our pride in the courage and patriotism of our American manhood is

not unmingled with a gnawing sense of guilt. Deep in our heart of hearts we know that this new generation is finishing a job which some way, some how, we failed to carry to its ultimate conclusion. We recognize that these boys are shedding their blood at least in part to make good our mistakes, to compensate for our shortcomings, to atone for our national apathy.

The fact is that having won a glorious victory in 1918 we failed dismally in the years that followed to preserve that victory. The grass had hardly sprouted on the graves of our illustrious dead until we allowed aggressors to disrupt the unity with which we had faced the crisis of war. Worse than that, in a sort of weariness of spirit we sought escape from national responsibilities in a world of delusions. Having just won a war across the Atlantic, we preferred to believe that the Atlantic and the Pacific were impregnable ramparts, and that therefore events in other parts of the world were no concern of ours.

Although we were the cradle of modern aviation, we allowed others, particularly the European dictators, to develop true air power. Although we were the most highly industrialized nation on the face of the planet, we allowed others to translate technological progress into modern mechanized military might. If we had exercised a fraction of the power which our size, our economic potentialities, our stake in world affairs demanded, we would have been a check on the ambitions of would-be aggressors. Undoubtedly our lack of naval and air preparation was a contributing factor to the Japanese aggressions in Manchuria, the German depredations in Europe, and finally to the global explosion that has now engulfed us all.

If there is one objective in American life that we should underscore it is that never again shall America be caught with her defenses down, that we shall never again allow the illusions of distance, or indifference to the rest of the world, to strip us of an army, an air force, and a navy adequate for our protection in a contracting and shrinking world. It seems to me that theorists should have a great weight upon their conscience. Forgetting the enormous waste caused by unpreparedness in World War No. 1, they preferred to bask in the sunlight of noble theories and completely shut their eyes to ignoble facts. While dictatorships of every color piled up armaments, we allowed our defenses to crumble. It used to be popular to blame wars upon the munitions manufacturers, the financiers, and the producers of raw materials. World War No. 2 can more nearly be laid to the door of the delusions of the pacifists and the panaceas of the prophets. Their influence helped disarm the democracies and paved the highways for the aggressions of the predatory totalitarians. It was this that gave the Axis a head start.

Oh, it is true that we have closed the gap—it is true we have proven that a free society can out-produce a slave economy. In spite of our late start, we are going to win this war—make no mistake about that. But those who want to drench the globe in blood should understand that the democracies have learned their lesson—that never again will they contribute to the ambitions of the aggressors by their lack of preparedness. In the two decades between the two world wars we became disarmed not only in the physical but in the moral and spiritual sense as well. We refused to assume the responsibilities that go with national greatness. We chose the easier, more comfortable, way out by believing that crimes and horrors committed in countries as far away as China and Czechoslovakia were no affairs of ours.

We have fought two world wars to prove the contrary, and we should make it perfectly clear to ourselves, and therefore to the rest of the world, that America has an enormous stake in law and order, in peace and prosperity all over the globe. The mere fact that America is no longer smugly indifferent, the mere fact that we are willing to assume our share of the responsibility for world order, will be a stabilizing and pacifying force. This seems to me to be the irreducible minimum of the responsibility which our Nation must accept.

That does not mean, however, the unabridged and reckless commitments which some of our prophets are now demanding. I assume that it is characteristic of American impulsiveness that we tend to swing all the way from entangling alliances to the pyramiding of entanglements and alliances, that we swing all the way from total indifference as to the problems of the rest of the world to wanting to part the hair and brush the teeth of the so-called backward peoples. I speak a word tonight for moderation, for common sense, for American self-interest. I believe that I speak the opinion of the vast majority of Americans when I say that I think we can be good neighbors in the world of tomorrow without moving into our neighbor's house.

My travels around the world have brought me convincing evidence of the great complexity of international relations, of the multitudinous unsolved international problems, of the divergence in points of view and interests between nations. This world isn't a jigsaw puzzle that you can take apart and put together again at will. If we are to steer a safe and sane course through the seas of tomorrow's confusion, we can only do so in a sturdy ship of state, with a strong hand on the steering wheel, and, above all, we must not mistake shallow for deep waters or shimmering mirages for safe harbors. After this war, we will still be living in a most imperfect world, as far as ever from the millenium, and under these circumstances our chief reliance should be upon our own strength—upon our own common horse sense and upon our cooperation with the United Nations.

We fought in World War No. 1 to save democracy. But when we saw democracy evaporating in Europe in the thirties we felt a good deal like the mountain that labored and brought forth a mouse. We thought we were going to give the world a new conception of Thomas Jefferson, but we got an Austrian paperhanger and an Italian jackal instead. It is little wonder that we see victory approaching with the apprehensions and dread that were born of the twenties.

This time we must preserve the peace. And the men out there realize this too. I am talking about the men that are exchanging slugs with the enemy all over the world. They are asking questions, and their questions make sense. They want to know what's the pay off in this show. They are pretty keen about the kind of a world they are going to live in—about the kind of a country they are coming back to. And most of all they want to come back to an America they will recognize—the same honeysuckle growing over the same back fence—the same chance to take a chance in a business of their own. However, there is one thing that's sure, and that is the inevitability of change. And there will be change in the United States after this war—make no mistake about that. But if the United States is going to be modernized and streamlined with all improvements, let's be sure that the streamlining is done according to the wishes of and the just deserts of the men who are out doing the fighting. They will want jobs—security against old age and sickness—of course. But they will be just as anxious for the retention of the freedom to work or not to work for whom they please—to be their own masters.

If I know anything about those young men from my personal contacts with them overseas, it is that they will insist upon the preservation of opportunity in America. The spirit of enterprise is very much alive in our country today. That spirit lives here as nowhere else in the world. Give it a chance. Our young men in uniform when they come back from all over the world will want an America that is open—open to them to get jobs—open to them to be employers of labor or leaders of labor—open to the opportunity for a plumber's son to become a doctor or a doctor's son to become a plumber if that is what he wishes. Those men out there—they have their eyes on the bombsights and the gunsights, but they have their bead on the future, too. You don't rub shoulders day after day with death without measuring with accurate precision the things you want to live for. I saw this evidenced time after time and again in the great air bases in England from which the bombers and fighters take off to spread devastation and destruction to the Nazi heart land, and incidentally to bring modern war to the very front door of the German people for the first time. Sitting in a chart room of air base X, I was discussing the future of this home front with an intelligence officer who was assisting in briefing the crews. "See those boys out there," he said, "they are going on the bombing raid tonight—they are going to have something to say about the kind of a world they are going to live in after this war," and you can bet your bottom dollar that that's true.

These boys know, just as we know, that war isn't newspaper headlines or news reels or poems written in Flanders fields. There is nothing romantic about dust and mud and blood. We all know war for the grim, dirty business that it really is. These boys are going to be tremendously interested, just like we are, in preserving the peace. Their voices will be heard from one end of the land to the other—reverberating in the Halls of Congress and echoing around the world. "We want peace," they will say—not a flimsy peace of the moment, but a sound and durable peace—a peace we can rely upon and build upon—a peace which will assure us that our children and our children's children will not be needlessly sacrificed again.

And these boys will know that there are no global roads to peace that do not lead through the United States; that whether we like it or not ours is to be the major part in the great drama of post-war development, and we cannot play our part with vigor unless we are prosperous at home. And I intensely believe that America is on the threshold of her greatest development; that what we have seen in the past is merely a foretaste of the things to come; that the frontiers of science and invention and business are only beginning to be explored; that the frontiers of technological progress created by war are only beginning to be understood; that we are just beginning to build the base of a dynamic America. But to utilize these new frontiers we must preserve and strengthen those things that made America great—the things for which John Paul Jones and Lawrence fought—political democracy, economic opportunity for all, American individualism.

After this war we may find ourselves an island of free enterprise just as after the Revolutionary War we found ourselves an island of democracy, when precept and example prompted much of the rest of the world to follow us. After this war, if we are an island of free enterprise and make it work here, then again by precept and example much of the rest of the world may follow us. For a strong and prosperous America can be of unlimited value in assisting other countries of the world.

For instance, there are many men in America who realize that you can't sell more sewing machines to the Bolivians unless Bolivia has a thriving economy of its own. And

many of us are interested not only in selling sewing machines to Bolivia but in stimulating Bolivian development by Bolivian energy.

For the name of Bolivia you could substitute at least 30 other countries in our modern-day world. They all need an inward impetus upward. Please note that I am not talking about philanthropy. I am not talking about gratuitous expenditures. In country after country that I visited in South America they said, "We want American capital and technological advice, but we have a little capital of our own. We would like your capital and ours to intermingle—to lift us up from economic colonies to countries with economic independencies." I do not fear that kind of talk; I welcome it. The more a country progresses from economic backwardness to economic forwardness, the more it will help. More and better customers all over the world—that's what I want. People who are raising their standard of living by industrialization; people who are trading with other countries; people who are getting more and more prosperous. The American businessman understands this kind of language.

It's only a jump from a bigger and better home town in America to a bigger and better Chungking or Guatemala City, or any other city that can become bigger and better with more people owning their own homes and buying more and more radios and washing machines and refrigerators, and riding around at night in automobiles under bigger and better neon signs.

And does this have nothing to do with peace? I say that it has everything to do with peace. For behind the idea of a bigger and better home town is the vision of a better nation and, somehow, some way, a good world, a good world based upon good localities, a wholesome whole based upon wholesome parts. This will relieve to the skeptical and weary human eye the basis of the saneness of human aspirations everywhere, which is the brotherhood of man.

And thus an America that is strong, prosperous, economically free—an America where economic opportunity is available for all—an America that works for the greater exchange of goods and services with the world—such an America will be the bastion of tomorrow's peace. Upon us there rests tremendous responsibilities—responsibilities for preserving in America those elements that have made us great and strong. For this our Navy throughout its existence has struggled and fought and died. It's the thing for which our Navy today is struggling and fighting and dying. May God give us the strength and the courage and the wisdom to play our part with traditional naval valor in the future.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is now in the Chamber, I desire to propound a request for a unanimous-consent agreement, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that after tomorrow the debate on the pending resolution and amendment be limited, so that no Senator shall speak more than once or more than 15 minutes on the resolution, or 15 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, let me ask whether the Senator from Oregon desires to say something at this time?

Mr. McNARY. I wish to determine whether I definitely understand the request. Is the request that after tomorrow, beginning at 12 o'clock tomorrow—at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. After the conclusion of the session tomorrow, after the Senate adjourns or recesses tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. After the adjournment or recess of the session of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that it is the purpose to have the Senate take a recess or adjourn over until Monday after tomorrow's session.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; until Monday.

Mr. McNARY. Because we do not intend to have a session on Saturday. So the unanimous-consent agreement would apply beginning Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct; beginning Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, am I to understand, then, that beginning Monday at 12 o'clock no Senator would be permitted to speak longer than 15 minutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. Fifteen minutes on the resolution or 15 minutes on any amendment pending.

Mr. McNARY. Fifteen minutes on each?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Which would make 30 minutes on the amendment and on the resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. I have been necessarily detained on some other business, in an adjoining room. Am I to understand that a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate has been suggested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an agreement has been suggested, and is pending at the present moment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I would object to consideration at this time of a unanimous-consent agreement which would operate to limit my explanation of the pending question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say in all kindness that the Senator from Connecticut cannot explain it very well if he is going to stay in an adjoining room. I do not press the matter, if the Senator is going to object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the Senator from New Mexico stated whether the requested unanimous-consent agreement is agreeable to him?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I know of several other Senators who desire to speak on the pending question.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I was about to request their presence. I think a quorum should be present, so as to have in the Chamber the Senators who may desire to speak on the pending question.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. Let me inquire how the Senator personally feels about the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HATCH. Personally, I do not feel there should be a limitation of debate at this particular time. Later I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Texas, but I doubt the wisdom of such limitation at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Then, the Senator would not permit the acceptance of the proposal?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly not, without having a quorum present, so that I could consult with other Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not see any sense in having a quorum present at this time if the Senator is going to object, anyway.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Has objection been heard to the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. From two sources.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not objected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. President, I did not expect to obtain unanimous consent at this time, but I simply desire to say to Senators that I expect to renew the request at a later date.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate proceed to consider the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon have anything to submit? Is there anything further?

Mr. McNARY. That is all.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 28 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

PENNSYLVANIA

Marjorie Lowery, Boston.
Amidee T. Seese, Markleysburg.
Emma J. Roof, Monroeton.
Harry C. Mickle, New Paris.
Esther Smith, Renton.
Alice B. Smith, Shawnee on Delaware.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend George H. Moore, pastor of the Main Street Baptist Church, Greenwood, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we come to Thee because Thou hast invited us to come boldly to a throne of grace and find grace to help in time of need. We are ever in need of Thee. We come now asking for wisdom from above. We would not lean upon our own understanding, but lean upon the One who is omnipotent, omniscient, who knows the end from the beginning.

We pray that Thou wilt bless this Nation. May the leaders look to Thee and follow Thee—may all Thy people humble themselves, pray, turn from wicked ways and seek Thy face, so that Thou canst bless. Make us a truly Christian nation, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Make us an instrument through which Thou canst bless the world.

In this world of strife, bloodshed, and hatred, may the nations come to know that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Turn the hearts of the people to Thee, that there may be peace.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include an address given by Mrs. R. M. Kiefer, secretary-manager, National Association of Retail Grocers at the National Food Conference, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LET US INVESTIGATE BEFORE WE TAX

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, let us investigate our Federal Bureaus, find out which are needed, and which are not needed—how many people can be removed from the Federal pay roll, without hindering our war effort—determine how much money is absolutely needed, before we burden the people with additional taxes, and pour more money into the Federal Treasury. Experience has proven to me, that if you give Federal bureaus and departments the money, they will spend it. So, let us see if they actually need any more money and if so, how much. A few months ago, the President said, we had to have $16,000,000,000 more revenue—a few weeks ago, $12,000,000,000—a few days ago, his spokesman, Secretary Morgenthau said, $10,500,000,000. So let us wait a few more weeks, and investigate, and probably we will not need any more. I believe that reduction in our expenditures, without hindering our war effort, can be made and should be made. May I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to just a few of our expenditures. Travel cost for the executive branch alone—not including the War and Navy Departments—for 1943 will exceed $100,000,000.

The O. W. I.—Office of War Information—will require better than $50,000,000 this year to maintain their program—for what—hindering the press—suppressing one of our freedoms? The functions of this Bureau can be handled by our military departments, who would see to it, that nothing of military value to our enemy would be made public. The American people do not need the O. W. I. propaganda program.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government spent approximately $30,000,000—excluding War and Navy Departments—for communication, almost $8,000,000 was spent for telephone calls alone.

We have 12 regional credit corporations, whose duties duplicate wholly or in part the lending activities of 19 other Federal lending agencies. Why cannot a large part of these agencies be merged to cut out overhead, stop duplication, and save manpower.

One Federal loaning agency alone has 47 State offices, 275 district offices, 2,315 county offices; it employs 15,960 people with an annual pay roll of $30,000,000. Despite its widespread central offices, this agency alone spent $28,000,000 in traveling expenses. In other words, this one agency spent enough in traveling expenses to pay coach fare from Washington to San Francisco and return for every one of its employees 18 times a year. This one agency's cost was $1 for every three it loaned.

The Office of O. P. A. alone issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, excluding rationing forms and instructions. One company estimated such forms and instructions required 132,560 man-hours and $192,500 to prepare Government-required information.

A conservative estimate would be that 188,000 persons prepare data for the Government, excluding of course, rationing work. I believe that at least 60 percent of these required reports can be eliminated.

The Civil Service Commission frequently sends "experts" to my district, recruiting more employees for the Government's already overcrowded pay roll. These representatives or experts are paid their salaries, plus $6 a day expenses, plus railroad—Pullman—transportation.

One manufacturer who has just recently signed a contract with the Government, found that in order to fulfill the contract legally, he would have to make out more than 22,000 separate invoices and billings, and that each of those forms would have to be made out with 23 carbon copies, 1 carbon copy to be filed in each of the 23 different Government agencies. That means that 23 different file clerks must file the same invoice in 23 duplicate files; 23 Government clerks must go through the same duplicating procedure of reading and digesting the information thereon. All that, at a time when the newspapers of the Nation are being cut down in the size of the newspapers they are allowed to print because of a paper shortage, and all that at a time when we are hearing from every side about the critical manpower shortage.

It is not my desire to prevent the necessary departments from having everything they need to carry on the war; but inefficiency and waste has never yet won a war. There definitely is a tremendous amount of waste and unnecessary expenditure, and the production and purchase of unnecessary goods, and the hiring of thousands of totally unnecessary people in our Government agencies. Why is it that the United States is spending more money on this war than all of our allies combined? Why this swarm of Federal employees, these unnecessary rules and expenditures which are increasing our taxes, while we preach economy and sacrifice?

The people are willing to pay for every gun, every bullet, every plane, bomb, tank, cargo vessel, and warship, and all the food needed to supply our troops, and anything else that is needed, and to provide our share of the supplies to our allies. We are ready to spend any amount of money actually needed to save a single life or shorten the war one minute, but we want these expenditures to be based upon actual needs, and not upon mere unfounded recommendations.

I agree with the President, when he said that "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man, woman, and child who labors." But, we as a people, should not be made victims of such extravagance as we now have, which calls for unnecessary taxation. I, therefore, call upon the President, the leaders of this administration, and every Member of Congress, to exert every conscientious effort to save the requested $10,500,000,000, instead of directing energies toward plans calling for additional tax burdens to be placed upon our American citizenry. Let us again reflect the thrift and common sense of our forefathers who founded this country. Let us all be champions of economy and good judgment, and enemies of extravagance and waste.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had today to address the House for 10 minutes may be extended to 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a resolution of the Mississippi Valley Association on the subject of aviation and in the other to include an article which appeared in the local papers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix on two subjects, to include in one an editorial that appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on Monday, October 25, 1943, and in the other to include a resolution submitted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission adopted at the annual meeting held at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 23 and 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by me on October 4.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent address by the Honorable Sumner Welles before a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, since obtaining unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which I prepared on the work of Carlos Finlay, I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer advising me that it would make three and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $157.50. I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include therein a letter and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders previously entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes, and following that, that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and, another request, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by David Lawrence under date of October 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, if the House is in session, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OIL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, oil is the lifeblood of the whole military machine of this country and every other country.

Oil is an exhaustible resource.

Possession of oil reserves and oil resources on the one hand—or the lack of them on the other—may fundamentally influence the course of history and the position of the nations in the future. Control of the petroleum industry within this Nation constitutes something mighty close to supreme economic power.

Yet no natural resource has ever been more effectively controlled by powerful monopolistic interests than the oil of our own country. Those interests have through the years largely "written their own ticket" so far as their relationship to the Government and people of the United States has been concerned. Times have not changed.

ELK HILLS

Five months ago some of us spoke out in protest against the contract entered into the previous November between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California with regard to the Elk Hills naval oil reserve. Under the terms of that contract the Navy could have obtained not one drop of its own oil from its own reserve as long as the war lasted—or for 5 years, whichever was longer—without buying it from the Standard Oil Co. It is not my purpose today to review the arguments or the events which led to the cancelation of that contract only a few days after the first public protest against it was made here in the House on May 21, 1943. Suffice it to say the contract was canceled. For the reasons for that cancelation I refer you to the unrefuted testimony of Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell before the Public Lands Committee.

But the fundamental issue and question of policy with regard to Elk Hills reserve has not been decided. Standard Oil of California is still operating the field under an interim agreement with the Navy Department. That agreement became effective September 8 and runs for 90 days, which means that before December 7 the permanent policy with regard to this, the greatest oil reserve on earth, save only one, must be decided.

Standard Oil owns about one-third of the Elk Hills field. That third has been heavily drilled and exploited. The people of the United States, and specifically the Navy, own the other two-thirds of the field, including the portion least exploited. The problem has been to conserve the Navy's oil so as to assure, so far as possible, the supply for future defense of our country. But this has been impossible so long as Standard's wells drilled along the borders of Navy's section continued to draw the oil from those sections.

Two general courses can be followed. Either the whole Elk Hills reserve can be turned over to the Standard Oil Co. which owns one-third of it, to be operated under the terms of some sort of contract, or else the one-third holdings of the Standard Oil Co. can be purchased by the Navy which owns the two-thirds, and the whole field made into the real oil reserve which it ought to be and which Congress intended it to be.

This is the greatest oil reserve, so far as we know, that our Navy has or ever can have. It ought to be managed as a true reserve. That simply cannot be done unless it belongs to the Navy—the whole of it.

The signing of a contract giving Standard Oil a monopoly of exploitation and development and operation of this field is apparently the only other alternative. If such a contract were anything like the original one, the advantages to the oil company and the possible loss to the American people would be enormous. And the whole reserve would be subject to the chance that a long succession of Secretaries of the Navy would be wise, resourceful, and incorruptible enough to keep abreast of one of the two or three tightest, most powerful organizations of any sort—political, military, religious, or industrial—that the world has ever seen.

Never in my discussion of this question have I suggested that there was any lack of honor or honesty or good faith on anyone's part. I do not do so now.

But I cannot fail to warn the Congress and the Nation that the danger is not past of another contract being made which will pass the test of technical legality—which the original one did not—but which will deliver Elk Hills over to the Standard Oil's operation and control just the same.

Oil in the ground is a gift of God to the American people—to the whole people. Elk Hills ought to belong, in toto, to the American people. The Navy ought to purchase, by condemnation if necessary, the holdings of Standard Oil in that field. For that is the only way it can protect the oil it already owns under its own land. No other solution is fair to the American people. None other can protect their future. This Congress ought to require such a policy to be followed.

Our Navy Department has acquired close to a million acres of land since the war began. I do not criticise these acquisitions, believing them to have been made due to the necessity of the war program in the defense of our country. It appears, however, that the largest amount of land acquired in any single State has been in California. A considerable portion of the water front in the city of Oakland was acquired by the Navy Department, and other pieces of land, in some cases very large ones, have been acquired for such purposes as ship facilities, naval air stations, housing, the construction of roads, the building of ammunition depots, sewage disposal, water supply, and access rail and power lines. My only question is, If it was fitting and proper, as I believe it was, for our Navy to acquire these holdings of land, why should we hesitate when we are confronted by that admittedly formidable organization, the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Only when the whole Elk Hills field belongs to the American people through their Navy will the Navy's one greatest reserve of its lifeblood—oil—be secure.

DIRECTIVE NO. 70

I now come to a discussion of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued by the Petroleum Administration for War under date of September 24, 1943, and published in the Federal Register for Wednesday, October 13, on page 13983.

Very little public discussion has been had of this directive. I do not believe it has been mentioned at all in the Congress and only one newspaper so far as I am aware has carried any considerable discussion of it.

The O. W. I., for example, made only the following brief mention of Directive No. 70:

> Foreign operations of American oil companies during the war emergency will be more completely coordinated under the terms of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued today by Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes.

The many important considerations to the future of the American oil industry and, indeed, the American people as a whole which were omitted by this O. W. I. announcement will be clear as I go along.

Under the terms of this directive, the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War is given the power to investigate and determine the petroleum requirements of each foreign country or area to be supplied and to prepare and submit to the Director allocation schedules for each such country or area. This committee is also empowered to allocate the foreign supply among the suppliers and importers in each area or country to be served. The committee is likewise empowered to prepare "adequate and detailed supply and import-allocation schedules covering the importation of petroleum into the United States and shall submit such schedules to the Director."

This committee can adjust among suppliers or importers differences between estimates and actual supplies of petroleum allocated and shipped. It can arrange with the War Shipping Administration for vessel tonnage to carry out its schedules of the movement of petroleum. The committee is directed to coordinate its activities with the British Overseas Supply Committee and such other committees or agencies as may be established by the Government of the United States or any of its Allies or friendly nations.

In short, this committee is empowered to determine how much oil each country will get and through exactly what companies it will receive it. It is also empowered to determine just how much oil this country is to import and through what companies we can import it.

Any person who is affected by any of the action of this committee or who thinks that he will be injured by complying with any of its schedules or plans can appeal to the Director of the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War and from that Director can appeal to the Petroleum Administrator for War. But that is as far as he can go, the decision of the Petroleum Administrator being absolutely final.

It is provided in this directive that plans or schedules developed by this committee shall become effective upon approval by the chief counsel of the Petroleum Administration for War and upon being issued either by the Petroleum Administrator or the Deputy Petroleum Administrator.

Now, it is obvious that the most sweeping powers have been granted to this committee. Their plans and schedules will be approved either by Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator, or by his Deputy Administrator, who happens to be Mr. Davies, the vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

As a practical matter, of course, the Petroleum Administrator, Mr. Ickes, the only bona fide governmental official in this whole picture that I can discover, is also Secretary of the Interior and has many other extremely important duties which, by the way, he has discharged with efficiency and faithfulness through the years. In the very nature of the case, however, it is obvious that what will practically happen is that the plans and schedules of the Foreign Operations Committee will be approved by his deputy, Mr. Davies, of the Standard Oil Co. of California, in most instances.

The chief counsel of the Petroleum Administration for War, who also has to give approval of such plans and schedules, is Mr. Howard Marshall. Mr. Marshall, like Mr. Davies, has been for years an official of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

It will be interesting to note here the names of the men who compose this Foreign Operations Committee, and I submit them herewith:

Orville Harden, Standard Oil of New Jersey, chairman.

J. A. Brown, of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.

Robert H. Colley, Atlantic Refining Co.

H. M. Herron, California-Texas Oil Co.

H. D. Collier, Standard Oil of California.

J. F. Drake, Gulf Oil Corporation.

Ralph W. Gallagher, Standard Oil of New Jersey.

W. F. Humphrey, Tidewater Associated Oil Co.

W. Alton Jones, Cities Service Co.

P. W. Parker, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.

W. S. S. Rodgers, Texas Corporation.

H. F. Sinclair, Consolidated Oil Corporation.

W. L. Stewart, Jr., Union Oil Co. of California.

I am not questioning at all the patriotism or good faith of these gentlemen, but it is perfectly obvious that the major oil companies completely and wholly dominate this committee.

It will be seen that the major oil companies completely and wholly dominate

this committee. With one possible exception there is not a man on it who can by any stretch of the imagination be considered to represent any other interest than the major oil companies.

Another paragraph from the directive reads as follows:

> The Foreign Operations Committee and its committees shall maintain such staff and appoint such persons as may be necessary or requisite to discharge the responsibilities, duties, and functions under this directive. Operation expenses of all such committees shall be made from a fund to which voluntary contribution may be made by persons engaged in the petroleum industry and such funds may be solicited by the Foreign Operations Committee.

In other words, Congress is effectively bypassed in this whole proposition. There will be no necessity of coming to Congress for any money to support the operations of this committee and hence no opportunity for review of its work whatsoever here on Capitol Hill. This committee can control the movement of oil all over the world, make arrangements and agreements with companies in other countries, and even apparently with their governments. It can control all shipments into the United States. And there is no way provided at all whereby public knowledge can be had of what it does or why it does it.

Most important of all, it seems to me, provision has been made in this directive for the invoking of section 12 of Public Law 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, whereby with the approval of the head of the War Production Board all antitrust laws can be set aside with regard to any action taken by this committee. Here we have the greatest charter of power, in my opinion, ever given to a group of essentially private citizens, directly connected with the most powerful natural-resource monopoly the world has ever known, over the most vital single resource that there is.

I might be somewhat less concerned about Petroleum Directive No. 70 were it not for what has happened heretofore in connection with petroleum directives and their operation. Under Directive No. 59 it was provided that, as to District No. 1, comprising the bulk of the Atlantic seaboard, all importations of petroleum products should be made by "primary suppliers," meaning the major oil companies, in exact proportion to their importations in 1941. This was supposed merely to maintain the same ratio of business between the various oil companies as existed in the past, which is, of course, an understandable thing. However, there is a substantial body of testimony from independent oil companies to the effect that the way this directive has actually worked out has been to prevent them from getting any petroleum products at all.

The question I want to ask with all of the earnestness at my command is this: Are we not witnessing here without any substantial protest on our part the complete cartelization of the oil industry of America under governmental sanction? And does not Directive No. 70 lay a perfect groundwork for the extension of this process into the international field so that there is being developed a perfect framework for an international oil cartel more powerful than anything we have ever known before?

Mr. Speaker, I have not the slightest intention of putting preservation of the antitrust laws ahead of any consideration which is necessary to the winning of the war, but I cannot help wondering, especially in view of other events that have taken place in recent years in this particular industry, whether it is really necessary to suspend the antitrust laws in this instance or whether it is only a change fondly to be desired by the major oil companies. Neither do I question the patriotism or integrity of the men composing this committee or the officials of the Office of the Petroleum Administration for War. But I do know that habits of thought developed through long years of business experience are hard to change. I know that the whole philosophy of those who have fought to control production and price of things vital to our economy, is to reduce competition to a minimum if not to eliminate it completely.

In war, coordination of our economic efforts is, of course, essential, but what safeguards are included in this directive or anywhere else against the perpetuity of the inevitable monopolistic control which it has created into the post-war period? What chance will there be that the American Government itself can cope with the colossus of industrial power that will be here represented, and more especially what chance will there be for the protection of the public interest by means of any effective competition from truly independent concerns whatsoever?

Already a corporation named "War Emergency Tankers Incorporated" has been formed which controls the operation of all of the oil tankers available to our country so far as I know. All the stock of this corporation is held by the major oil companies. They are operating these tankers already, but have made, I am informed, verbal agreement with the Government that they will not profiteer as a result of this monopolistic control over the entire fleet of tankers.

As to the operation of these tankers by the major oil companies under this interesting arrangement, there is provision also for suspension of the antitrust laws. And Mr. Wilson, as acting head of the War Production Board, is officially recorded in the Federal Register as having agreed to suspension of the antitrust laws in order to allow the operation of War Emergency Tankers, Inc., to proceed unimpeded by any such consideration. And it is important to observe, I think, that as a practical matter, the War Production Board officials are far too busy to call in question requests on the part of the Petroleum Administration for suspension of the antitrust laws. Nor contrary to a widely held opinion in Congress, is the approval of the Department of Justice required. All that is required under the language of Public Law 603 is that the Attorney General shall have seen the order for suspension of the antitrust laws before it is issued. He does not, however, have to approve it in order for it to go into effect.

Perhaps some such committee as this was necessary, Mr. Speaker. I do not know. But off hand it would seem to me that the War Shipping Administration has ample power to direct the movement of all types of ships throughout the world and to make them available wherever needed.

Even granting, Mr. Speaker, that this extreme concentration of control over the oil industry of the world is necessary as a war measure, we are certainly justified in bringing up the question as to what agencies and persons shall be entrusted with bringing it about. Why, for example, are not the independent oil companies given some real representation on these boards and commissions? Why, in the second place, is there not at least one representative of the public without any other arduous duties on his shoulders placed on every one of these committees in order that the people may at least be informed of what is going on? Why indeed is not Congress asked to pass legislation specifically defining the powers of these groups of major oil company representatives who are being clothed so rapidly with supergovernmental powers? And finally, why, if Congress is not asked to do this, does it not on its own motion insist upon doing it?

In any case it is my firm conviction that the Congress should inquire very profoundly and I would add continuously into the activities not only of the Foreign Operations Committee, but of this entire interlocking directorate of major oil-company executives who now hold in their hands the key to the industrial and military future of our country—namely, petroleum.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. The Pan-American and California Standard Oil Co., I understand, has a concession from Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, that comprises 250,000 square miles in that country. Has the gentleman made any exploration and inquiry as to what the conditions were that our Government, our State Department, or any officials of our Government, gave in Saudi Arabia, for those concessions, with reference particularly to Palestine? I understand that Ibn Saud has denied the purposes of the Balfour Declaration and resolutions adopted by this Congress. He has sought to have the British Colonial Office violate solemn treaties entered into with this Government with reference to immigration into Palestine. Has the gentleman any knowledge as to whether or not there is any connection between these cartels of which he speaks with reference to oil in the Levant and what these Arabs are trying to do with reference to the destiny of Palestine?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. I may say to the gentleman that I know something about that huge amount of oil that is in Arabia, but I did not speak about it today for the reason that I do

not feel that I know enough about it, and I did not feel prepared at this time to do it. I would rather not comment on it for that reason.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Northwest Farm News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with sugar, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article on farm friends and friends of the farmer by A. G. Pace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICE ON COTTON

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are two special orders outstanding for later today. If these gentlemen will yield to me, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of either of the gentlemen who have special orders following the one just finished, the gentleman may proceed for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisana. Mr. Speaker, I have just left my bewildered constituents—I have just hurried here from a State faced with a needless agricultural catastrophe.

When I left here a few weeks ago to return home to start my campaign for the Governorship of Louisiana this body was hard at work expediting the successful prosecution of war, and the people of Louisiana were backing up our armed efforts to the limit of their wealth and productive ability. Our farmers working short-handed and with patched-up equipment were bringing in cotton and other crops and responding to the Nation's demands for their fullest possible production. There is this year little money in the farm homes of America that is not divided between War bond commitments and the bare necessities for life and farming. The farm income is something that we now are studying, and the necessity of raising it we view with such importance that the granting of subsidies is under serious consideration. And yet in the face of this fact, in the midst of the most perilous times, like a bolt from the sky without warning, comes an act against the farmers of the South.

A little handful of men in New York City, who probably never saw a bale of cotton or a single one of the millions of acres of cotton land of the South, have decided to put a ceiling on the price the farmer can get for his cotton. A fixed price on a farm commodity that has no fixed cost. This by and from a special clique of men who own no cotton and grow not one b le of cotton and probably would not be able to tell the difference between a bale of cotton and a bale of hay. Yet these are the men who have decided and so decreed that whatever the tides and fortunes of war, if loss is to be incurred in the commodity market it will be by the farmers and not by a special group of gamblers and speculators of the New York Cotton Exchange.

A Congress in this very Chamber enacted into law measures designed to protect the people of this Nation against such acts as has been committed by the willful, vicious, self-centered small group of large interests that control the New York Cotton Exchange. What happened seems to be quite clear. These men obviously misjudged the market and rather than take the losses of their gambling choose to welch on their contract to the detriment and loss of thousands of hard-working cotton farmers of the South. As the eminent Tom Linder, of Georgia, says, "The Government is holding the farmer while the gamblers skin him."

Already, Mr. Speaker, the far-reaching implications of this act have brought a storm of protest. In fact so adverse has been the criticism that the president of the New York Cotton Exchange has found it necessary to issue a series of bulletins and letters attempting to support and justify their position. It is hard to believe that the all-highest board of managers of the New York Cotton Exchange have heard the anguished cries of thousands of farmers, but something has provoked a hurried alibi and a makeshift defense for their nefarious act and they have begun to cry, "The war did it, not us."

In a confidential letter to his members dated October 23, Mr. Eric Alliot outlines the position whereby 15 men have taken a stand against the thousands of cotton farmers of the South. A stand that was devised behind closed doors, planned in secrecy, and delivered as one of the most effective blows against the morale of a sizable portion of the people of this Nation yet delivered in this war. Cotton ceiling day, October 13, may well be another Pearl Harbor for the farmers of the South if swift action is not taken against these 15 men.

There is much of interest in this letter from Mr. Eric Alliot, leader of the 15 men, that will warrant close scrutiny. For instance, they elected to welch on the October contracts and cited contracts of September 13 as "a day of congestion," and many will ask "what was the matter with that particular day, were not those contracts just as good as the ones made on the previous trading day, September 11, or the day after, September 14? Or is the better question whose contracts caused the congestion—who bought and who sold these contracts and who is protecting who?"

In this same letter Mr. Alliot says that it was done to prevent price distortion—what he must mean by price distortion is no price movement that would be favorable to the farmers and cost his gambling friends money. Again Mr. Alliot says the act followed "careful consideration of all the facts," and, I might add, a quick look at their own bank balances. Again Mr. Alliot said, "the action was taken with due regard for the rights of all concerned." I question this and defy him to name a single farmer or merchant whom he consulted.

Reduced to terms of money, the ceiling price arbitrarily placed 75 cents a bale below the prevailing market price meant a loss of 75 cents a bale for the farmers and an immediate profit of 75 cents a bale for the gamblers—a profit for the gamblers on something they did not own against the farmer's loss on something he did own.

Ultimately this action—the placing of a ceiling on cotton—rolling onward like a wave of economic destruction, broke the market an additional $2 a bale—making the total loss by this action $2.75 per bale, a total of $55,000,000 loss in the value of the visible supply of cotton. For those of you not from the South, let me tell you that the visible supply of cotton in the country is approximately 20,000,000 bales. Therefore this original "ceiling day" 75 cents a bale taken away from the farmer meant a loss to the working people of the South of approximately $15,000,000. Add this to the depreciation of the market caused by this demoralizing action and you have the simple fact that 15 men have reduced the value of the Nation's cotton by $55,000,000, not one cent of which they could or can spare.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, Who are these 15 men who take into their own hands the Bill of Rights and dare to destroy the property value of the most important commodity produced in this country? This, Mr. Speaker, is an action far beyond any that Congress has seen fit to take. Who is this ring leader, this willful gambler, this captain of the band of 15 men who have visited such catastrophe upon our people? Is it possible to get him before a committee of our members for explanations of his acts? The results are so clear and so visibly a violation of the best interests of the Nation that he already stands condemned and found guilty. Or is this leader an untouchable—and is the remedy the simple clean out and the removal of the gambling casino in New York known as the New York Cotton Exchange?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short editorial, and in the other to include a poem on the question of saving human lives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a communication I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FARM PRICES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with no desire of criticizing any individual that I rise to point out the erroneous implications that are contained in the letter of October 19, addressed by Hon. Prentiss Brown, the recently resigned Director of the Office of Price Administration, to the President, which letter was inserted on page 8776 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my able and outstanding colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. My concern in this regard grows out of the fact that the statements I refer to are all calculated to encourage the widespread misconception that farmers as a class are enjoying a disproportionately large share of the increased national income, and that unconscionably high farm prices are contributing materially to an unduly high level of food prices.

Mr. Speaker, too many people in more or less responsible positions have encouraged this misleading belief. I cannot, therefore, sit idly by and allow the figures in Mr. Brown's letter to go unchallenged. No matter how innocent he may be of any conscious effort to mislead, his statement does in fact mislead, and does create an unfair and unjust resentment against farmers in the minds of those who read it and accept it as true. I realize full well that my remarks will not receive the widespread publicity accorded those of Mr. Brown. I realize that it is perfectly natural for those who read Mr. Brown's statement and my statement, to say to themselves and, indeed, to their associates, "Mr. Brown was in a better position to know the facts than that country Congressman from Texas." I have, therefore, brought with me and today hold in my hand the very publication from which Mr. Brown quoted that at least those of my colleagues who are here can see for themselves that I am correctly stating the facts.

Mr. Brown took proper credit for checking the upward trend in the cost of living, but he erroneously tried to show that the selfishness of farmers was the greatest obstacle to his efforts. Specifically his letter says:

> The upward trend in the cost of living has been definitely arrested.

He then cites figures for different dates. Then he continues—I again quote:

> It is interesting to note the comparison of the wholesale prices of 1 year ago and those of today as contained in the New York Times commodity price index. The October 17 issue shows that the increases are mainly in those items such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley, where either we did not have authority to act by reason of the parity limitations or the commodity had only recently reached parity. A few outstanding examples of the solidity of price control are as follows.

Here follows a tabulation of various commodities such as iron, steel, copper, cotton print cloth, gas, and crude oil, all of which are shown to be selling at the same price on October 16, 1943, as on October 17, 1942. The only items listed in this tabulation which were included in the above paragraph from which I have quoted are wheat and corn, both of which are shown, in keeping with the idea that the farmer is causing inflation, to have advanced in price very materially. Mr. Brown's letter lists the price of wheat as of October 16, 1943, at $1.93¾ per bushel and of corn on the same date at $1.21⅛ per bushel.

Now, I have no objection to Mr. Brown stating that the price of wheat has advanced. It has. It was woefully low—far below parity a year ago. But I do object most strenuously when Mr. Brown or Mr. White or Mr. Black leads the people of the United States to believe that any farmer in the United States can get $1.90 for his wheat. The prices he quoted are alleged to be the New York City prices. Unfortunately for both farmers and producers, the yield of wheat on Times Square has been notoriously low for many years. No farmer gets any such price as Mr. Brown has mentioned, and that there may be no charge that I am not willing to back my words with my acts, I have a little wheat in Texas. I here and now offer it to Mr. Brown or anyone else who has tried to place the odium of excessive food prices on the farmer at $1.64¾ per bushel. That is considerably more than I can get for it, but it is 30 cents per bushel less than Mr. Brown says it is worth.

Now, do not all of you run up here with your certified checks to take my wheat.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas. I hope he wants to take my wheat at 30 cents less than Mr. Brown says it is worth.

Mr. HOPE. I call the attention of the gentleman also to the fact that at the time those farmers sold their wheat in his country and in mine the price was at least 25 cents a bushel less than it is today.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We sold wheat for just about a dollar in my country. We harvested a little before you did.

The truth is that wheat is generally quoted at one of the terminal markets and all of these terminal markets are higher than the price the farmer gets, but let us see just what the very issue of the New York Times, which Mr. Brown quotes, says. I have the business and financial section of that issue of the New York Times in my hand. On page 12 of section 5 of the issue of October 17, 1943, we find an article headed "Commodity index study." The article bears a Washington date line of October 16. It quotes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It says:

> The following table shows specific commodities by actual selling price.

It lists Kansas City wheat at $1.51⁹⁄₁₀ and Minneapolis wheat at $1.46⁹⁄₁₀—a little discrepancy of between .40 and .50 as compared with Mr. Brown's figures. The same article gives the price of corn at $1.06, not $1.21 as listed in Mr. Brown's article. And these figures are admittedly terminal market prices, not farm prices. I submit that the use of such misleading figures could only be intended to give an unfair picture of farm income.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and I am glad that he is giving this valuable information to the House. I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Brown's O. P. A. organization has placed a ceiling of $1.07 on corn at Chicago which means from 90 to 95 cents on the farm. Apparently he does not have much confidence in the ability of his own ceilings to hold.

Mr. POAGE. Apparently his ceilings have been working better in the farmers' areas than they have in the consumers' areas, because we have been getting only below the ceiling price.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the gentleman does not want to do Mr. Brown an injustice. I had understood that this was perhaps a typographical error in Mr. Brown's statement. I wonder if the gentleman has called Mr. Brown's office to see if that is not the case.

Mr. POAGE. No; because regardless of whether or not it is a typographical error—and I do not know that it is an error—I certainly would not suggest that these may not be the prices that Mr. Brown found in some bank in New York. I do not mean to suggest that Mr. Brown has made any misstatement, but he has misled the public. Doubtless these are the prices on Times Square. I do not know what wheat is selling for on Times Square. I do not know what corn is bringing on the Battery. Doubtless these are the prices in New York City. I am not going to discuss that. I am not questioning the truthfulness of Mr. Brown's statement, but I am pointing out that the figures are not the prices that farmers receive. I am pointing out the fact that they are far away from the actual prices the producer gets.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I state that within the last few days I sold some corn from my farm in Minnesota for 91 cents, which is the ceiling in my community.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Brown said it was worth $1.21 plus. Even the figures I have quoted from the New York Times of the

date Mr. Brown quotes are admittedly the terminal market prices and not the prices on the farm. They obviously are higher than any farmer is receiving. So I submit again that, admitting that Mr. Brown's figures are correct for New York City, they are misleading as giving an untrue picture of what the farmers of this country are receiving.

Now, the vitally important thing is that these or similarly inaccurate figures have undoubtedly been taken as a basis of further calculations whereby Mr. Brown and others connected with the O. P. A. have undertaken to convince the public that the farmer is to blame for most of the increase in the cost of living. In the very next column of his letter Mr. Brown quotes some figures to show that food and raw materials have advanced in price much faster than have manufactured articles. Of course, if you are willing to assume that the farmer can get $1.90 for $1.40 wheat, then you can undoubtedly prove that he has received an undue share of national income; but the facts are, as so ably demonstrated by my good friend the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. STEVE PACE, that if we use a fair yardstick, the total income of 29,084,000 farm people last year was but $15,600,000,000 out of a total national income of $117,000,000,000. In fact, there is no other large group of our society which receives so small a per capita income even today.

Nor has the price of things farmers sell gone up with anything like the rapidity with which industrial wages have advanced. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the average of all farm prices is today 1.93 percent of the average of these prices during the base period of 1909–14. This is, however, based on all products, not simply 58 selected items which Mr. Brown uses to show that farm prices have advanced more rapidly in this war than in the First World War. As a matter of fact, there can be little doubt that the inclusive calculations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are actually unfair to farmers in that they give too much weight to certain relatively unimportant crops as compared with the prices of the three great basic crops which make up more than two-thirds of the value of all field crops of the Nation—corn, cotton, and wheat. As a matter of fact, the price of cotton is only 171 percent and the price of grain is only 158 percent of price during the base period. But how much worse—how deliberately unfair—it is when a high official of the O. P. A. picks out 58 unknown crops and uses them as a yardstick to prove that the farmer is getting too much.

Let us get this thing out in the open. Let us call our shots and name our crops. Let us take the big three—the three crops that make up the bulk of the farm income of America. During the base period 1909–14 the average price of corn, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, was 64.2 cents per bushel. Last month, according to the same source, it was $1.09 per bushel. The price of cotton was 12.4 cents per pound during the base period. Now the price of cotton is 20.2 cents per pound. The price of wheat was 88.01 cents per bushel during the base period. Now the price of wheat is $1.30 per bushel. During the same period the average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries advanced, according to the same source, from 21.16 cents per hour in the base period to 85.3 cents per hour last year. Of course, the actual increase in earnings is considerably larger, as these figures use only the basic hourly wage and take no account of overtime. On the other hand, all the farmer's overtime is included in his price.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. PACE. It so happens that yesterday I checked the average wage of all of the manufacturing establishments of the United States and find that the average now is 96.4 cents per hour.

Mr. POAGE. And that is an increase of 7 cents over what it was a month ago.

Mr. PACE. Ninety-six and four-tenths cents per hour.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

The truth is that everybody's income has been going up faster than the farmer's and the result has been that today the laboring man working in our American factories is actually spending a smaller percent of his weekly income for food than ever before in the history of the country. Let us consider the bituminous coal miners. We have been told that they were in about as bad shape as any group of workers. During the base period they earned 31.26 cents per hour. Last year they earned $1.059 per hour plus overtime. But the miner is interested in the amount of food he can buy with his labor and this is, we must all agree, the final test of the justice of any wage scale or farm price level. What are the facts? From what the miners' union has said, and from what the O. P. A. has intimated, one would naturally suppose that the miner was today working many more hours to earn enough to buy the same scanty diet for himself and family that he earned with fewer hours' work in the past. Such is not the fact. The O. P. A. has singled out butter as a product that has reached such a price level that it has become necessary for the Government to pay a subsidy rather than to let it rise any further. The truth is that just before the subsidy was placed on butter, the bituminous coal miner could buy 3 pounds of butter for 1 hour's work while in the base period he could only buy 1.2 pounds of butter with the proceeds of 1 hour's work. So it is all down the line. Those engaged in industrial work are almost without exception able to buy more of the products of the farm in exchange for fewer hours of labor than ever before.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the colleague of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is in favor of increasing the price of crude oil in order to have more oil produced. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in that regard, and I believe also that the Speaker of the House agrees with him.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with that part of Mr. PATMAN's philosophy, but not with that false part of his position which would deny to the farmer a fair price for his products, and try to make it up out of subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Mr. MUNDT. Correct. I am also in disagreement with the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in that particular. I rose simply to say that if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would apply the same formula to the farmer that he wants to apply to the oil producer, we could have sufficient oil and proper prices for the farmer's products.

Mr. POAGE. Unquestionably, and I would apply the same formula to the oil producer and the farmer, and that is the formula that we have applied to those engaged in war work and those who have received war contracts, but we have not been able to get any such thing for the farmer or the oil producer. That would simply apply the American doctrine of fair play and equal treatment all along the line.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the laborer's toil to buy less than the farmer's, but neither do I think it just to ask the farmer to continue to toil to earn an unduly small share of the national income. It seems to me to be clear. The thing we should determine is: Does the farmer demand of the industrial worker and the city dweller, and does the farmer require that the laborer and the city dweller pay the wage earned from an unreasonably large number of units of labor in exchange for the farm products he buys. And in this determination, we should not assume, as does Mr. Brown, that the farmer gets $1.94 for wheat. Let it be remembered that the farmer only gets the farm price—not the delivered price. Let it be remembered that in many cases, if not in most cases, the labor, transportation, and processing costs of the farm products that the consumer buys greatly exceed the prices the farmer receives. The shirt I am wearing cost $2.50. It does not have 12½ cents' worth of cotton in it and yet most consumers attribute the increase in the cost of clothes to the alleged avarice of the cotton farmer and the sheep grower. Even the loaf of bread that you buy has less than 2 cents' worth of wheat figured at Mr. Brown's figures.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer is not responsible for the increase in the cost of living. He has received a relatively small increase in his prices when compared with the very groups that still come before our people and arrogantly threaten to strike and do strike when their wages are not increased. The farmer's costs of production have advanced very rapidly. He must have higher prices, or he cannot produce. Note, Mr. Speaker, I did not say "will not" produce. I said "cannot." There is a vast difference. Farming is an operation that requires equipment. That equipment is not going to be forthcoming from the factories unless the farmer can pay. He has nothing with which to pay except with the sale price of his farm products.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert three tables prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and by the Bureau of Labor Statistics very shortly before the so-called roll-back subsidies broke the market for some of the farmers' most important products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Estimated amount of respective farm products that could be purchased with average earnings from 1 hour's labor in selected industries, 1909–13 average and 1942

Industry	Cotton, pounds		Wheat, pounds		Corn, pounds		Dry edible beans, pounds		Potatoes, pounds		Peanuts, pounds		Rice, pounds	
	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942
All manufacturing	1.7	4.5	14.4	47.9	18.4	53.0	6.3	16.4	18.2	44.2	4.4	14.3	11.7	23.8
Cotton manufacturing	1.2	2.9	9.8	30.3	12.5	33.5	4.3	10.4	12.4	28.0	3.0	9.0	7.9	15.1
Iron and steel	2.3	5.0	19.4	52.8	24.9	58.3	8.5	18.0	24.6	48.7	6.0	15.7	15.8	26.2
Woolen	1.4	3.9	11.6	41.9	14.9	46.3	5.1	14.3	14.8	38.7	3.6	12.5	9.5	20.8
Bituminous coal	2.5	5.6	21.3	59.5	27.2	65.8	9.3	20.3	26.9	64.9	6.5	17.7	17.3	29.6
Clothing	1.8	3.5	15.5	37.0	19.8	40.9	6.8	12.6	19.6	34.1	4.7	11.0	12.6	18.4
Slaughtering and meat packing	1.6	4.3	13.1	45.3	16.8	50.1	5.7	15.5	16.6	41.8	4.0	13.5	10.7	22.5
Boots and shoes	1.9	3.5	15.6	36.9	20.0	40.7	6.8	12.6	19.8	34.0	4.8	11.0	12.7	18.3
Lumber (sawmills)	1.6	3.4	13.1	35.7	16.7	39.4	5.7	12.2	16.6	32.9	4.0	10.6	10.6	17.7
Hosiery and knit goods	1.3	3.1	10.7	33.1	13.6	36.6	4.6	11.3	13.5	30.6	3.3	9.9	8.7	16.5

Industry	Tobacco, pounds		Hogs, pounds		Beef cattle, pounds		Butter, pounds		Milk, pounds		Eggs, dozens		Chickens, pounds	
	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942
All manufacturing	2.1	2.4	2.9	6.5	3.9	8.0	0.8	2.4	13.2	33.2	1.0	2.9	1.9	4.5
Cotton manufacturing	1.4	1.5	2.0	4.1	2.6	5.1	.6	1.5	9.0	21.0	.7	1.8	1.3	2.9
Iron and steel	2.9	2.6	3.9	7.2	5.3	8.8	1.1	2.7	17.9	36.5	1.3	3.1	2.5	5.0
Woolens	1.7	2.1	2.4	5.7	3.2	7.0	.7	2.1	10.7	29.0	.8	2.5	1.5	3.9
Bituminous coal	3.1	2.9	4.3	8.1	5.8	10.0	1.2	3.0	19.5	41.2	1.5	3.5	2.7	5.6
Clothing	2.3	1.8	3.1	5.1	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.2	25.6	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Slaughtering and meat-packing	1.9	2.2	2.7	6.2	3.6	7.6	.8	2.3	12.0	31.4	.9	2.7	1.7	4.3
Boots and shoes	2.3	1.8	3.2	5.0	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.4	25.5	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Lumber (sawmills)	1.9	1.8	2.6	4.9	3.5	6.0	.8	1.8	12.0	24.7	.9	2.1	1.7	3.4
Hosiery and knit goods	1.6	1.6	2.2	4.5	2.9	5.6	.6	1.7	9.8	23.0	.7	2.0	1.4	3.1

Source: The computations are based on (1) prices received by farmers as published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; (2) hourly earnings as reported in Real Wages in the United States, 1890–1926, by Paul Douglas, for the 1909–14 average (with some series adjusted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics level); and (3) 1942 hourly earnings as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Farm prices are those received by farmers for the period August 1909 to July 1914 and the season average for 1942. The 5-year average for hourly earnings is the calendar years 1910–14.

Quantities of farm products required to purchase specified commodities, United States, 1910–14 and 1942

Commodity	Unit	1910–14	1942
Grain binder, 7-foot	Bushel of wheat	156.1	280.9
Corn planter, 2-row	Bushel of corn	66.0	118.4
Cream separator [1]	Pound of butterfat	263.1	239.0
Overalls	Pound of cotton	7.1	9.5
Cultivator, 1-horse	do	38.5	49.7
Shoes, work [2]	Pound of beef cattle.	40.2	31.0
Hoe, 7-inch blade [3]	Pound of cotton	3.9	5.2

[1] 250-quart capacity, 1910–14; 500-pound capacity, 1942.
[2] Shoes brogans, 1910–14; shoes, work, 1942.
[3] Hoes, each, 1910–14; hoes, 7-inch blade, 1942.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have previously presented these figures to the Congress. As I pointed out at that time, I did not make these tables. I am not responsible for the conditions that created these figures; neither are the farms of this country. We did not even collect the figures. We do not claim to be economists, but I know, and the farmers of this country know, and I believe that every fair-minded man and woman knows that these actual figures refute the implied slurs on the patriotism of our farmers. They do more than that, Mr. Speaker. They show very clearly that if America is going to continue to eat as we want to eat that some of the Government agencies are going to have to try to find some way of letting the farmer get a fair price, a price that will enable him to continue to produce, rather than to try to find ways and means whereby other groups can get their food for an ever decreasing percentage of their income. I am not asking for $3 wheat or 40-cent cotton, although we had these prices during the last war. I am asking simply that the farmer be given a fair share of whatever the national income may be. Unless that is done, it is no answer to say that the farmers' prices have increased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] for 15 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

DISUNITY THRIVES IN TEXAS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to express my appreciation of the splendid address we have listened to from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. He has presented a very lucid statement about the farmer's problem. It is in sharp contrast with the rather curious and circuitous line of reasoning that the gentleman's colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been giving us from the standpoint of farm subsidies, and I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on his factual statement and his courageous analysis of the agricultural situation.

The farmers of this country must not have fastened on them the stigma of asking the returned soldiers from this war to assume the costs of living in this country at a time when our national income is at an all-time high. This fantastic scheme comes not from the farmers, but from a small coterie of politicians who are more interested in farm votes than they are in farm income.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes along the same line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel, as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has just stated, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] should be complimented on the facts he has brought out here today. I would like to add this one thing to the subject in connection with corn: In October 1936 we were receiving $1.02 for corn in southwestern Minnesota, whereas today we receive 91 and 92 cents per bushel. If the farmer can be accused of receiving too much today under present conditions, when he pays twice as much for labor as he paid in 1936 and when everything else is out of proportion accordingly, there is something entirely wrong with the figures of those who decide what farm commodities are now worth. In order to produce the necessary food, the farmer must be given the prices for his products which will enable him to feed our Nation; otherwise he cannot do his best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in what my colleagues have just said concerning the very splendid discussion of agricultural prices which our distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just given the House.

I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the O. P. A. price ceiling on beef cattle went into effect yesterday. On Tuesday the Committee on Agriculture of the House was assured by officials from the O. P. A. that the ceiling would work, and they stated they felt sure that it would not in any way disturb the normal flow of cattle to market. I just want to say at this time that reliable reports which I have from the market centers of the country indicate that there was confusion and disorder in every great cattle market in the country yesterday, and that as a result of this confusion there were 3,500 fat cattle which were carried over on the market at Kansas City yesterday. It is almost an unprecedented situation to have 3,500 fat cattle carried over on the Kansas City market on Wednesday. Reports from other markets are similar.

The only reason for the failure of the markets to function is the confusing and incomprehensible order which has been issued by O. P. A.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it not also true that the four gentlemen who testified before the committee did not even inform us that they were going to put this in, and is it not also a fact that none of them has had any experience on the farm, and is it not a fact that three of the four are Harvard graduates, according to their own statements?

Mr. HOPE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. That is my recollection of the statements made by those gentlemen before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including a statement made by Mr. R. M. Evans, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, of course, everybody knows that in all that is good Iowa affords the best. There is a little village in about the center of the northwest quarter of Iowa named Laurens. Like Goldsmith's village it is the fairest village of the plain. It is also my home town. We produced there a young man named R. M. Evans, who is now one of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board. He recently gave a statement to one of the Iowa papers, in which he discussed plans for international currency stabilization, which I think is informative, concise, and valuable. Most of these money experts talk in such scientific and cabalistic language that ordinary folks cannot understand them. I place this in the record, as it is a very concise and clear statement of what is proposed by way of international currency stabilization.

It is as follows:

PLANS FOR INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

A great deal of study has been given to a program for creating an international currency stabilization fund in the post-war period. A currency stabilization fund would be important and useful but we should not lose sight of the fact that the mechanism of such a fund cannot, by itself, bring universal prosperity.

When all is said and done, it is simply a machine for doing a job, and unless the conditions in the respective countries are carefully watched and are favorable to agriculture, industry, and commerce the machinery of a fund would not work at all and the fund by itself could not change these conditions.

True, recommendations might be made to countries but the countries themselves have their own legislative and administrative machinery for making these changes and they are not going to act in accordance with the desires of other countries unless they are certain such a course would be in their own best interests.

EFFECT UPON THE TARIFF

Several of these programs were disussed at a recent meeting and one of those present asked whether or not the stabilization fund would operate to deprive industry of tariff protection. Such a question indicates that some people are expecting this machinery to undertake things that are far beyond its scope.

The answer, of course, to this question is that the proposal has nothing whatsoever to do with raising or lowering tariffs. Tariffs are adjusted by Congress or by trade agreements in this country.

With a view to presenting a simplified picture of the main functions performed by a fund of this kind, I am setting forth a few of the main features of such a fund and leaving the details to those who are expert in this particular field.

FROM WAR TO PEACE

When the war ends Great Britain, Germany, Russia, and other countries will try to reconvert their wartime industries to the commerce of peace as rapidly as possible.

They will need foodstuffs and industrial raw materials (cotton, oil, metals, etc.) as well as machinery and other things for which they will not be able to pay by exporting their own goods and services because their factories will not be equipped for peacetime production.

Many of them will be short of gold with which to make payment and they may not find it feasible to arrange private credits in financial centers.

Some of the most acute situations will have to be met by direct relief measures, and a United Nations organization is in the making to handle this big job.

LONG-TERM CREDITS

In other cases which are not so severe the problem will be to extend credit to bridge over the period until the countries concerned can pay their own way again by exporting to the rest of the world. It is to be hoped that such credits can be arranged mostly on a long-term basis, since it will take many of the devastated countries some time to develop production to the point where they can start repayment by exporting more than they import.

Such long-term credits will have to be negotiated on a specific basis with countries like the United States, which will have a surplus of goods and services, although it may be possible to work out a plan whereby the various creditor countries can coordinate their lending activities through some international institution.

A CUSHION FUND

Finally, however, it would seem desirable to let foreign countries have a "cushion" of short-term credit with which they could operate during the transitional period. This is one of the initial purposes of the fund, and one which can be served only by having some sort of fund set up as soon as the war ends.

For example, if England wanted to buy cotton and there were no dollars available in the market because they had all been used in the purchase of other American products, she would give the fund English pounds sterling equal to the number of American dollars needed to pay for the cotton. The rate of exchange would be fixed within relatively narrow limits. The English manufacturers would weave the cotton into goods to be sold, let us say, to America for dollars and to Brazil for cruzeiros. The dollars could then be returned to the fund and the English would receive their pounds back.

COFFEE FROM BRAZIL

The United States might want to buy some coffee from Brazil so we would trade American dollars to England for Brazilian cruzeiros, which the English received from Brazil in payment for cotton goods sold by England to Brazil. We would then use the Brazilian cruzeiros to pay for the coffee. The rate of exchange in each case would be the rate set by the fund. The English would again receive their pounds back and the fund, as far as England is concerned, would be in relative balance.

It is important to understand that the fund would not in any way interfere with ordinary exchange transactions in the market. It would only handle such uncleared transactions as might develop after all dealings in the market will have been effected. It will enter into the picture at the point where gold used to enter in the gold standard days.

If the conditions in the world are favorable to agriculture, commerce, and industry, and if people are willing to trade with each other without being too nationalistic in their viewpoint, the fund will balance over a period of years and prove to be a simple and effective device for facilitating trade.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" FOR ALL

In this country we are vitally interested in seeing that people return to their peacetime pursuits as quickly as possible after hostilities cease.

World conditions will still be chaotic, and if mass unemployment, unrest, and starvation were long continued, conditions would again be ripe for a revolution—and revolutions bring dictators.

If democracy is to thrive as the future type of government, it will have to provide a steadily rising standard of living. The "four freedoms" will have to be visible to all.

A SAFETY MEASURE

When making loans from the fund to the war-torn countries in order to permit them to purchase raw materials and equipment, short-term credit should be given—and of course it would be necessary, not only for the safety of the fund itself but for the well-being of the borrower, to see that the volume of such loans is in keeping with the commerce of the country involved. Long-term loans for capital investments, such as building airways and factories and developing water

power, should be outside the field covered by the machinery of the fund.

The effect of such loans on the future ability of the country to pay or of our country to receive payments in goods and services would have to be carefully considered.

NOT AS IN THE TWENTIES

Maybe American investors will become more internationally minded as time goes on, but the point I want to emphasize is that we should not mix long-term financing with the short-time commercial operations of the fund.

It would be folly to repeat the error of the twenties and loan money that could not be repaid, and yet we must take a modest risk in order to achieve an over-all good.

You may well ask the question, "How will England sell enough goods and services to pay back the amount of money she takes from the fund at the beginning?"

We might just as well face the fact now that England, or any other country for that matter, cannot pay us unless the people in America are prepared to accept goods and services in return for the material and equipment we sell. This would hold equally true for all the other members of the fund.

There was a time prior to the First World War when it was unnecessary to give much thought to this particular question because the United States was in debt to the countries of the Old World, and day by day the interest and amortization payments fell due in American dollars and were accumulated by the British, French, and other peoples. These dollars were used to purchase our cotton, wheat, automobiles, and other products. However, conditions have changed. British and other foreign investments in this country have been largely liquidated. We are now out of debt to foreign countries and, instead, they are heavily indebted to us.

FOUR COURSES OF ACTION

Assuming we want to continue in the export business there are four courses of action to follow:

First, we could accept gold in payment for the difference between what we buy and what we sell. At the present time we have more gold than we need for commercial uses and backing for our currency. More gold would be quite useless unless we were prepared to use it in purchasing goods and services from the rest of the world.

W. P. A. PROJECT

Second. We could give away our surplus commodities and services to the rest of the world, considering such a move a W. P. A. project to create work and employment in this country.

But this would be philanthropy—not trade—and the question would naturally be raised, "Why wouldn't it be better to use the surplus material and labor to build houses or something that would increase the standard of living for the people in this country?"

Living standards can be improved in all countries, and they must be improved if trade is to flourish. Business people in America cannot trade in a worth-while way with bankrupt people in other lands.

The third course of action would be to make long-term loans. These loans would furnish countries with money to purchase materials they could not otherwise pay for. Long-term loans would simply postpone the day of settlement to some future time when we might be willing to accept payment in goods and services.

BUYING FROM ABROAD

Our fourth course of action, which is the one we must adopt if a mechanism of this kind is to become really useful, would be to purchase sufficient goods and services from abroad to pay for what we sell.

Now, transactions of this kind are not quite as complicated as one might believe. Suppose England buys some cotton, wheat, pork, machinery, and automobiles from this country—it does not necessarily follow that we must purchase directly from England in order to secure payment. We might buy coffee from Brazil and rubber from the Orient, and the money Brazil and the Orient, for instance, owe to Great Britain for goods and services purchased could be used by Great Britain to pay for its purchases from us through the fund at relatively constant rates of exchange.

One of the genuine aids to business would be the relative stability of exchange rates. Future plans could be made with greater safety if these exchange rates were not subject to speculative changes from time to time.

IMPORTS NECESSARY

The main point to keep in mind is that if we are going to export in a businesslike way it will be necessary to import, and if we import as much as we export, a fund can furnish the machinery to make the operation efficient and economical.

But if we are unprepared to accept imports in a volume equivalent to our exports, we might just as well face reality and forget the fund because no fund of this kind could operate successfully over a period of time unless we follow the fourth course of action outlined above.

In order to accomplish this result, it is not necessary to import products that would create such competition as to ruin American industry. Trading in many articles and services (in such a way that American agriculture and industry would not be injured) with other countries would help to increase employment and raise our standard of living.

ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS

Foreign trade is very similar to business between individuals.

If you go downtown and buy a suit of clothes or some groceries from the corner store, you ordinarily use money to pay for them. You earned the money by selling your own goods or services to someone else. As long as you do that, you are all right and the economy is all right, but if you lose your job or your crops are a failure and you do not have money to pay for the things you want, someone will have to give the money to you or you will have to borrow.

If the money is given to you, that closes the transaction, but if you borrow to pay for these things you will have to sell your goods, crops, or services sometime in the future to pay off the loan—and so it is between nations.

The currency stabilization fund, by itself, is merely machinery for the smooth operation of international trade. True, it has certain supervisory functions. One function is to keep exchange rates from fluctuating too widely in order to prevent the retarding of commerce. You know how it is in your own business—when prices fluctuate wildly, you cannot operate efficiently or economically. Stabilization of exchanges within relatively narrow limits helps to promote trade.

WILL IT WORK?

The basic fact we must face at this time is not so much the particular kind of stabilization fund we are going to set up, but rather the all-important question of whether our Nation and the other nations of the world are going to create an atmosphere and condition in which agriculture, industry, and commerce can thrive.

If we do this, we will have peace and prosperity for generations to come. If not, we might just as well oil our guns and keep our ammunition dry.

If, after the war, the inhabitants of countries participating in the fund are enabled to have a good standard of living, then they will be in a frame of mind to retain a peaceful and democratic type of government.

If, on the other hand, agriculture, industry, and commerce are throttled and retarded by unwise national policies and the selfish interests of individuals and countries, these favorable conditions will not exist and an economic stabilization fund would be just one more piece of useless machinery that started out to achieve a very desirable result but could not accomplish that purpose because conditions were against it.

American agriculture and industry cannot maintain maximum production unless a reasonable percentage of their products are exported. Surpluses of farm products and surpluses of labor will hold down our national income.

POST-WAR TASKS

Just stop and think for a moment about the national income of the post-war period.

We will have to service our debt.

We will have to maintain a large Army and Navy.

We will have to pay the expenses of expanded social services that have been created and have proved their worth.

All of this can be done and we can have a far better standard of living than we have ever enjoyed if we do sufficient business to keep our American economy operating in high gear.

You hear some people say, "Well, we will live within ourselves and if others want to buy our products, let them come and get them."

They might more accurately say, "Let us have unemployment and a low standard of living." But no one would publicly advocate the latter, though too often we unwittingly do things that have this bad result.

I have purposely omitted consideration of the necessary and important administrative details that will have to be worked out in order to put a stabilization fund into successful operation. I believe our Government should lay down certain general guides and leave to some capable agency the working out of the plan. Congress should demand a full and complete report each year so it can alter the course as it deems best in the interests of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members of the House that they are invited to the ceremony which will take place at 1:15 this afternoon in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building where a number of women will be sworn in as WAC's. It will be a very impressive ceremony and I know the Members will be interested.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent

requests: One, that I may revise and extend my own remarks and include a letter from a group of dairymen from Menden, Okla., and in another extension of remarks to include a resolution from a group of dairymen in Holgate, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, November 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 11 a. m. on Friday, October 29, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled, "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3564. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles, in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3565. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, for 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H R. 3566. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3567. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Res. 336. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to certain action contemplated by the United States in connection with post-war relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3310. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of August Meier and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3311. Also, petition of Philip Drzwiecke and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3312. Also, petition of Edw. C. Schmid and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3313. Also, petition of William Metzger and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3314. Also, petition of the Sligo Iron Store Co. and signed by 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3315. Also, petition of Edward M. Lohse, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3316. Also, petition of Clare L. Garrity, of Washington, D. C., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3317. Also, petition of Arthur Davis, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3318. Also, petition of Morris J. Taney, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3319. Also, petition of the Trocadero Cafe, of Washington, D. C., signed by 20 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3320. Also, petition of David E. Barry, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3321. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petitions of Andrew Easdale and 30 other citizens of Hunnewell, Mrs. R. L. McClain and 19 other citizens of Laredo, Mrs. H. R. Foroner and 21 other citizens of Memphis, and Mrs. Russell Atkins and 19 other citizens of Livingston County, all of the State of Missouri, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3322. Also, petitions of D. J. Van Desander and 75 other citizens of Hannibal, Mrs. Lillie Green and 40 signers from La Belle, Mrs. Bertha Luker and 50 other citizens of Knox City, L. O. VanNostrand and 40 other citizens of Milan, all of the State of Missouri, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3323. By Mr. SCRIVENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Iola, Allen County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3324. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of C. A. Schafer and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, whose light is truth, whose warmth is love, we thank Thee for the miracle of dawn which calls to holy dedication of renewed powers, for noontide with its summons to play the man in a solemn day that demands our best, and for the quiet of twilight, like bells at evening pealing, which brings whispers of that realm where beyond these voices there is peace. In the busy hours of life's midday so teach us to think and act and toil that we may justify the lofty pedestal of our privilege. Desiring nothing for ourselves that we do not hope for all mankind, may we strive to open for each human being the gates of an equal opportunity and an equal chance to become the best it is in him to be. Our eyes having seen the glory of a government of law bring peace and prosper-

ity to many States and to men of all colors, creeds, and races within our own Nation, give us a steadfast faith that a lawful order can be established for the whole world. In this faith steel our hearts to march forward toward the clean world our hands can make.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 28, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 425) authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of J. C. Munn.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Eastland	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably absent from the city.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

USE OF GRAIN IN MANUFACTURE OF LIQUOR—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition which I have received from L. W. Myers, of Mankato, Kans., urging the Congress to curb the liquor traffic in wartime.

There being no objection, the letter in the nature of a petition, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANKATO, KANS., *Oct. 7, 1943.*

Senator CAPPER,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been a native of this great State many years. I have always admired your stand on political and moral issues. So I write you concerning the liquor interests asking for grain to make liquor for the future. Please use your influence and vote against using up grain for this sinful stuff when people all over the world are starving to death for bread. I have two sons in the Army fighting for freedom and the right to worship God as we choose. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a curse to any people."

* * * * *

Please cast your vote and voice against the issue.

Yours for good government by soberminded people.

L. W. MYERS.

MILK SHORTAGE IN CONNECTICUT—RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by officers and directors of the Connecticut Dairymen's Association at its fourth quarterly meeting on October 20, 1943, regarding the milk shortage of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNECTICUT DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Storrs, Conn., October 23, 1943.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: The following resolution was unanimously passed by the officers and directors of the Connecticut Dairymen's Association at the fourth quarterly meeting on Wednesday, October 20, 1943:

The milk shortage of Connecticut has become very much greater than had been previously anticipated. Unless obstacles to production are removed at once the milk supply for 1943–44 is likely to amount to only 70 percent of the 1942–43 supply.

Dairymen are unanimous in the conviction that an inadequate ration is the principal reason for low production and only an adequate ration will make possible the necessary milk supply.

Dairymen are opposed to subsidies and believe that higher prices to consumers are not only in accordance with sound economic policy but will also bring greatest production.

H. L. GARRIGUS,
Secretary.

BARN BUYING OF TOBACCO: FREEZING OF TOBACCO PRICES—RESOLUTION OF ROBERTSON COUNTY (TENN.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. STEWART presented a resolution adopted by the directors of the Robertson County Farm Bureau, Springfield, Tenn., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the farmers of Robertson County favor the barn selling of tobacco, we, the directors of the Robertson County Farm Bureau, Springfield, Tenn., on this Saturday, October 23, 1943, adopt the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, That the Farm Bureau of Robertson County opposes any attempt of the O. P. A. and War Food Administration or any other agency to prevent farmers from selling tobacco in the barn as this custom is as old as tobacco production itself and we feel that it would be both unwise and unjust to take away this privilege for which there is no justifiable reason. We feel that barn buying stimulates competition, reduces cost of handling, and eliminates cost of selling; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Robertson County Farm Bureau expresses itself as being opposed to freezing of prices of tobaccos as the tobacco farmers have been selling tobacco below the cost of production and we feel that a further increase in the price of tobacco is necessary to carry on in the face of higher cost of production; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to all Tennessee Senators and Representatives in Congress."

Adopted:

R. W. BENSON, *President.*

Attest:

MILDRED MEAKLEY, *Secretary.*

GASOLINE RATIONING—RESOLUTION OF UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA, HOLDREGE, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD copy of a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Holdrege Council, No. 213, United Commercial Travelers of America, at Holdrege, Nebr., on October 20, 1943, setting forth the complaint the council has in reference to gasoline rationing and a suggestion as to a change which, in the spirit of fairness, should be made.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas traveling salesmen are engaged in performing essential work in explaining rationing regulations, ceiling prices, coupon

values, periods of validity, helping small merchants in the preparation of reports required by rationing and many other services made necessary by regulations brought on by the war; and

Whereas the territories served by traveling salesmen in this section of the United States are large, the towns are far apart, and public transportation is not available; and

Whereas the existing regulations fail to provide opportunity for traveling salesmen to explain their work, its essential character, the distances involved, the lack of public transportation; and

Whereas the local war price and rationing boards do not have the power to use discretion in the allocation of mileage coupons but are required to follow the arbitrary rules laid down by officials who are unacquainted with the needs and problems of traveling salesmen in sparsely settled areas; and

Whereas some local war price and rationing boards are following the rules and others are not, which leads to different rules in different communities; and

Whereas all traveling salesmen are aware of the necessity of preserving their automobiles, tires, and gasoline in order to further the war effort and are in accord with the purposes of rationing in all its phases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Holdrege Council, No. 213, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Holdrege, Nebr., That we are in accord with rationing insofar as it benefits the war effort; that new regulation be adopted by the Office of Price Administration with regard to mileage rationing to traveling salesmen so that their essential work, the territories they cover, and the lack of public transportation, may be considered by each local war price and rationing board and that the issuance of mileage coupons be equalized so that traveling salesmen in each locality will be on an equal footing; and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the local war price and rationing board, the District O. P. A. office at North Platte, the Governor of the State of Nebraska, and to all Congressmen and Senators from Nebraska.

Adopted at a regular meeting of Holdrege Council, No. 213, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Holdrege, Nebr., on October 20 A. D. 1943.

F. W. FOLK,
Senior Counselor.
JOHN W. BERRY,
Secretary.

MEMORIAL REMONSTRATING AGAINST ENACTMENT OF PROHIBITION LEGISLATION

Mr. DANAHER. I have received a memorial remonstrating against the enactment of certain proposed prohibition legislation and ask unanimous consent to present it and also that the body of the memorial be printed in the RECORD as the memorialists request. The memorial is submitted in the name of G. F. Heublein & Bro., of Hartford, Conn., and is signed by more than 130 citizens who ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the body thereof was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the professional prohibition organizations are attempting to force the consideration and passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war;

Whereas these same prohibitionists are also sponsoring legislation which would bring back prohibition by banning the sale of beer to our fighting forces in and near military camps, as well as to civilians in zones around such camps;

Whereas the object of all such legislation is to reestablish complete national prohibition in the United States during the absence from their homes of more than 8,000,000 citizens in the military service of their country;

Whereas any such legislation is opposed by the War and Navy Departments as well as by the great majority of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and civilians;

Whereas national prohibition during a test of 13 years, from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speak-easy and the bootlegger, the degradation of teen-age girls and boys, Nation-wide home manufacture of illegal liquor, widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law, all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes;

Whereas the enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than $1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of $500,000,000 a year, without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation: Therefore,

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, protest against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and herewith request our Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all such proposed legislation. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1457. A bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 502).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior; with an amendment (Rept. No. 503).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1488. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1489. A bill to establish additional standards and to declare the policy of the Congress with respect to the abandonment of railroad lines; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1490. A bill to extend the excess-profits tax exemption relating to strategic minerals to income attributable to the mining of fluorspar and the production of hydrofluoric acid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1491. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1492. A bill to amend section 6 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that the established railroad freight rates cover the receipt and delivery of loaded cars at the points of loading and unloading; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 1493. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 1494. A bill for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) introduced Senate bill 1495, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

ADJUSTED-SERVICE COMPENSATION AND FURLOUGH WITH PAY FOR WAR VETERANS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill in behalf of myself and of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance. The bill carries out a resolution adopted by the American Legion of the Department of Arizona at its annual convention at Phoenix, Ariz., in August of this year.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to incorporate in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, a speech which I delivered on August 13, 1943, before the Phoenix convention in which my reasons for the bill are set forth. The convention adopted a resolution following the recommendations which I made at that time. The bill I now introduce provides for adjusted compensation for World War No. 2 veterans, and makes definite provisions for the use of the money for education; for use as a down payment or purchase of a home, a farm or farm equipment, or small business.

It was the thought of the Arizona American Legion that equal benefits should be provided for all veterans, and that such benefits should be given to the men discharged from the service at a time when they would receive the greatest benefit.

Upon my return to Washington, I found that my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] had also given much thought to legislation of this type and he has therefore joined me in the introduction of the bill.

Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate to discuss the bill in detail at a time when the post-war resolution is being considered, but I feel it is appropriate that we start to give serious consideration to the post-war problems of our boys who are fighting in order that this Nation may continue as the leading democracy of the world. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance and will also be printed in the RECORD, and,

without objection, the request of the Senator from Arizona that the address heretofore delivered by him be printed in the RECORD will be complied with.

The bill (S. 1495, introduced by Mr. MCFARLAND (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK)) to provide adjusted-service compensation and to provide a 3-month furlough with pay prior to discharge for persons who serve in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Adjusted Compensation Act of 1943."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "active military service" means active service in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including their respective reserve components, or the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and service of an officer of the Public Health Service while detailed by proper authority for duty either with the Army or the Navy.

(b) The term "period of hostilities in the present war" means the period beginning with December 8, 1941, and ending with the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President.

(c) The term "oversea service" means service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

(d) The term "home service" means any service not oversea service.

(e) The term "Department concerned" means the War Department or the Navy Department, whichever may be the appropriate one in the particular case.

(f) The term "veteran" means any person who performs or has performed any active military service during the period of hostilities in the present war, whether or not such service shall have terminated.

ADJUSTED SERVICE CREDIT

SEC. 3. (a) An adjusted-service credit shall be computed by the Secretary of the Department concerned for each veteran. The amount of the adjusted-service credit of any such veteran shall be computed by allowing the following sums for each day of active military service performed by such veteran during the period of hostilities in the present war and during the 6 months immediately following such period: $2.50 for each day of oversea service, and $2 for each day of home service; but not more than 500 days of service shall be allowed in the case of any veteran. If a part of the active military service of any veteran is oversea and part is home service, the oversea service shall first be used in computing his adjusted-service credit.

(b) In computing the adjusted-service credit no allowance shall be made—

(1) For service as a commissioned officer above the grade of captain the Army or above the corresponding grade in any of the other services;

(2) For service under a permanent commission or permanent warrant in any of the services, or (while holding such a commission or warrant) service under a temporary commission in a higher grade;

(3) For service as a civilian officer or employee of any branch of the military or naval forces, contract surgeon, cadet or midshipman of the United States Military Academy, Naval Academy, or Coast Guard Academy, or member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for service while attending or stationed at an educational institution and undergoing a course of instruction prescribed to last longer than 6 months, or for service as a member of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular forces of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps;

(4) In the case of the persons entering upon active military service after the end of the period of hostilities in the present war, for service performed after so entering upon active military service;

(5) For service as a commissioned or warrant officer performing home service not with troops and receiving commutation of quarters or of subsistence, except that an allowance for such service may be included in the case of any person if and to the extent that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy jointly find that such service subjected such person to exceptional hazard;

(6) For the period of any furlough granted under section 9 of this act, or for any period with respect to which the person concerned is not entitled to active-duty pay;

(7) In the case of any person discharged or released from active duty at his own request during the period of hostilities in the present war in order to engage in a civil occupation or employment; or

(8) In the case of any individual whose period of active military service is terminated under other than honorable conditions after the beginning of the period of hostilities in the present war.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS

SEC. 4. (a) The amount of the adjusted-service credit of any person shall be paid by the Secretary of the Department concerned in bonds of the United States in denominations having an issuance price of $18.75 or multiples thereof and a maturity value of $25 or multiples thereof. Such bonds shall be in an amount having an issuance price up to the highest multiple of $18.75 in the amount of the adjusted-service credit of the veteran, and the difference between the amount of such credit and the issuance price of such bonds shall be paid by the Secretary of the Department concerned out of such sums as may be appropriated for that purpose.

(b) The Secretary of the Department concerned shall permit any veteran, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this act and at any time thereafter prior to the payment of the adjusted-service credit of such veteran under subsection (a), to designate a beneficiary to whom such payment shall be made in event of the prior death of the veteran, or to whom any bond issued in making such payment shall be payable if such bond is issued to the veteran and he dies prior to its redemption. Payment under subsection (a) shall be made to the veteran if he is living at the time such payment is made, or, if he be incompetent, to the representative of his estate. If the veteran is deceased at the time such payment is made, payment shall be made to the beneficiary, if any, designated under this subsection, and if there be no such beneficiary, payment shall be made to the estate of the veteran: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the department concerned may make payment to the person or persons determined by such Secretary to be lawfully entitled thereto, without the necessity of appointment by judicial proceedings or otherwise of a legal representative of the estate of the veteran or of any other person, or of compliance with State law in respect of the administration of estates: *Provided further*, That the amount of any such payment which, under the law of the State or country pursuant to which the estate of the deceased veteran would be distributed would otherwise escheat to such State or country, shall escheat to the United States and shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

(c) (1) In the case of any veteran who has been discharged or otherwise released from active military service, or who has died, prior to the date of enactment of this act, (A) payment under subsection (a) shall be made as soon as practicable after such date of enactment, (B) bonds issued in making such payment shall be issued as of the beginning of the month in which such date of enactment occurs, (C) payment under subsection (a) shall be made only upon application filed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned, and (D) the Secretary of the Department concerned shall, as soon as practicable, mail to the last known address of the veteran, or the representative of his estate or such other person as may be determined by such secretary to be appropriate, a notice of their right to apply for the benefits of this section.

(2) In the case of any veteran who is discharged or otherwise released from active military service, or who dies, upon or after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the expiration of 6 months after the period of hostilities in the present war, payment under subsection (a) shall be made upon or as soon as practicable after the date of discharge or release from active military service or death, or, if a furlough is granted to the veteran under section 9 of this act, upon or as soon as practicable after the beginning of such furlough, and the bonds issued in making such payment shall be issued as of the beginning of the month in which such discharge, release, or death occurs or such furlough begins.

(3) In the case of any veteran who is in the active military service upon the expiration of 6 months after the period of hostilities in the present war, payment under subsection (a) shall be made upon or as soon as practicable after the expiration of such 6 months, and bonds issued in making such payment shall be issued as of the beginning of the month in which such 6 months expires.

(d) The bonds issued under this section—

(1) shall be issued under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended;

(2) shall not be transferable or assignable except as otherwise specifically provided in this act;

(3) shall mature 10 years after the date of issuance and shall be redeemable by the Secretary of the Treasury at any time after the expiration of 3 years from the date of issuance, but shall not be redeemable prior to the expiration of such 3 years except as otherwise specifically provided in this act;

(4) shall bear interest at the same rates as War Savings bonds of series E issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and shall be similar to and subject to the same terms and conditions as such bonds of series E in other respects insofar as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be feasible and in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to provide for the issuance and redemption of bonds under this section in order to carry out the purposes of this act; but insofar as such regulations relate to functions to be performed by any other department or agency of the Government, they shall be subject to the approval of the head of such other department or agency.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

SEC. 5. (a) Any veteran to whom any bond has been issued under section 4 and who desires to use the proceeds of such bond prior to the expiration of 3 years after its date of issuance in order to pursue a course of instruction at any high school, vocational school, college, or other educational institution, may apply to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the benefits of this section. If the Administrator finds that such

veteran is in need of and qualified for such course of instruction and that it is likely to be of substantial benefit to him, the Administrator shall approve the veteran's application and the veteran may assign and deliver such bond to the Administrator. The Administrator shall present such bond to the Secretary of the Treasury who shall redeem it by paying to the Administrator its then current redemption value. The amount so paid to the Administrator shall be placed by him in an account, to be known as the educational account, to the credit of the veteran.

(b) The Administrator shall pay to the veteran the amount to his credit in the educational account at the rate of $100 a month for the time found by the Administrator to have been spent by the veteran in pursuing the approved course of instruction, in accordance with rules and regulations of the Administrator, prior to the expiration of 3 years after the date of issuance of the veteran's bond. The Administrator shall also pay, from funds appropriated for that purpose, the charges for tuition and the cost of books required by the veteran for pursuing the approved course of instruction, except that the Administrator shall pay only so much of such charges for tuition and cost of books as he determines to be properly attributable to the time for which the veteran is entitled to be paid at the rate of $100 a month from the amount to his credit in the educational account, and the total amounts so paid with respect to tuition and books for any veteran shall not exceed $500.

(c) Upon the expiration of 3 years after the date of issuance of any bond assigned to the Administrator by any veteran under this section, the Administrator shall pay any amount remaining to the credit of the veteran in the educational account—

(1) to the veteran if he is living, or, if he be incompetent, to the representative of his estate; or

(2) if the veteran is deceased, to the beneficiary, if any, designated for that purpose by the veteran in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, or, if there be no such beneficiary, to the estate of the veteran.

(d) The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct, cooperation, and the bona fide pursuit of the approved courses of instruction by veterans receiving benefits under this section. For violations of such rules and regulations the Administrator may withhold or postpone the payment of any amounts otherwise payable under this section, but no amount to the credit of a veteran in the educational account shall be withheld beyond the time when such amounts to his credit are payable under subsection (c). The Administrator is authorized to cooperate with and enter into and carry out agreements with public and private educational institutions in order to facilitate the administration of this section.

(e) All provisions of law and regulations applicable with respect to laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be applicable with respect to this section to the same extent and in the same manner as if this section were a part of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended. No veteran shall be entitled to receive any benefits under this section for any period of time during which he is receiving rehabilitation or training under part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

PURCHASE OF HOMES

SEC. 6. (a) Any veteran to whom any bond has been issued under section 4 and who desires to use the proceeds of such bond prior to the expiration of 3 years after its date of issuance in order to purchase real estate, may apply to the Federal Housing Administrator for approval by the Administrator of the assignment of such bond in connection with the purchase of such real estate. The Administrator shall approve the assignment of such bond if he finds—

(1) that such assignment is in payment or part payment for real estate purchased or to be purchased by the veteran;

(2) that such real estate is approved for, or is eligible for approval for, mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act, as amended;

(3) that the mortgage, if any, made or to be made in connection with the purchase of such real estate by the veteran is insured or eligible for insurance under such title II, as amended; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such real estate does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) Any bond assigned with the approval of the Administrator under this section shall be redeemable from the assignee at any time after such approval, upon presentation for redemption in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bond shall be redeemed by paying the redemption value as of the date of such approval by the Administrator, and no interest or increase in redemption value shall be allowed for any period after such date of approval.

PURCHASE OF FARMS AND FARM EQUIPMENT

SEC. 7. (a) Any veteran to whom any bond has been issued under section 4 and who desires to use the proceeds of such bond prior to the expiration of 3 years after its date of issuance in order to purchase any land, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, or implements, to be used in farming operations conducted by him, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval by the Secretary of the assignment of such bond in connection with such purchase. The Secretary shall approve the assignment of such bond if he finds—

(1) that such assignment is in payment or part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used in bona fide farming operations conducted by him;

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

(3) that the character, ability, and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

(b) Any bond assigned with the approval of the Secretary under this section shall be redeemable from the assignee at any time after such approval, upon presentation for redemption in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bond shall be redeemed by paying the redemption value as of the date of such approval by the Secretary of Agriculture, and no interest or increase in redemption value shall be allowed for any period after such date of approval.

(c) Any veteran to whom any bond has been issued under section 4 and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his character, ability, and experience to be likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

PURCHASE OF BUSINESS PROPERTY

SEC. 8. (a) Any veteran to whom any bond has been issued under section 4 and who desires to use the proceeds of such bond prior to the expiration of 3 years after its date of issuance in order to purchase any business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools, to be used by him in pursuing a gainful occupation (other than farming), may apply to the Secretary of Commerce for approval by the Secretary of the assignment of such bond in connection with such purchase. The Secretary shall approve the assignment of such bond if he finds—

(1) that such assignment is in payment or part payment for real or personal property purchased or to be purchased by the veteran and used by him in the bona fide pursuit of a gainful occupation (other than farming);

(2) that such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such occupation;

(3) that the character, ability, and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such occupation; and

(4) that the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed a reasonable appraised value therefor as determined by the Secretary.

FURLOUGH WITH PAY

SEC. 9. (a) When any person who has performed active military service during the period of hostilities in the present war is to be discharged or otherwise released from active military service after the date of enactment of this act, unless the active military service of such person is to be terminated under other than honorable conditions, such person shall, upon his own request, be granted a furlough of 3 months immediately prior to the termination of his active military service; except that the period of such furlough shall in no case exceed the period of the active military service performed by such person during the period of hostilities in the present war and during the 6 months immediately following such period, and no person shall be granted more than one furlough under this section.

(b) For the period of the furlough granted to any person under this section, such person shall be paid so much of his regular base pay as a member of the military or naval forces as does not exceed a rate of $100 a month; and, in addition thereto, such person and his dependents shall be paid the same allowances for such period as they would be paid if such person were in the active military service during such period.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The benefits provided by this act shall be in addition to any other benefits provided by law with respect to persons who have performed active military service or their dependents.

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall, as soon as practicable, prepare and publish a pamphlet or pamphlets containing an explanation of the provisions of this act; and shall from time to time thereafter prepare and publish such additional or supplementary information as may be found necessary. The publications provided for in this section shall be distributed in such manner as the Administrator determines to be most effective to inform veterans and their beneficiaries and estates of their rights under this act.

SEC. 11. (a) No amount payable under this act to a veteran or his beneficiary or estate, no bond issued under this act, and no proceeds of any such bond shall be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process, or be regarded as income for the purposes of National or State taxation, except that interest upon such bonds shall be subject to taxation as in the case of War Savings bonds of series E issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

(b) No deduction on account of any indebtedness of a veteran or his beneficiary or

estate to the United States shall be made from the adjusted-service credit of any veteran or from any amounts payable under this act to any veteran or his beneficiary or estate.

SEC. 12. (a) Any officer charged with any function under this act shall make such regulations, not inconsistent with this act, as may be necessary for the efficient administration of such function.

(b) Any officer charged with any function under this act may delegate and provide for the delegation of such function to any other officer or employee of the United States. No such delegation shall be made by an officer in any department or agency to an officer or employee in any other department or agency, except with the consent of the head of such other department or agency.

SEC. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 14. (a) Any person who knowingly makes any false or fraudulent statement of a material fact in any application or other document made under the provisions of this act, or made in order to secure any of the benefits of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Any person who charges or collects, or attempts to charge or collect, either directly or indirectly, any fee or other compensation for assisting in any manner a veteran or his beneficiary in obtaining any of the benefits of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

The address, ordered to be printed in the RECORD on request of Mr. MCFARLAND, is as follows:

SPEECH OF HON. ERNEST W. M'FARLAND DELIVERED BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, AUGUST 13, 1943

I am glad that I again have the honor and privilege to appear at a department convention of the American Legion in Arizona. I have looked forward to this occasion with a great deal of pleasure. While it is true that our conventions are no longer the affairs of a few years ago when the war was still something we were only reading about, these gatherings still represent the Legion and the things for which it stands. We can now state without fear of contradiction that the American Legion has become an American institution and that there is no other large group in our country who can boast a better record for patriotic service to the community and the Nation. The history of the past 25 years is my authority.

We can well be proud of the sound Legion legislative program. Some of the measures we advocated were enacted into law, but it is with regret that we now realize that Congress and the Nation turned a deaf ear to parts of our program. This is particularly true of our preparedness program. We now know that when our Government was scrapping ships our enemies were planning our destruction. Had our Government heeded the warning of the Legion, we would have been so well prepared that our enemies would have recognized our might and would not have dared to attack us.

The Legion proved its greatness by pressing its demands for preparedness in the face of a public opinion that appeared to be almost universally against a program of armament which would have afforded us the proper protection and placed us in a position to back up our pleas for world order. We all recall how the epithet, "War monger," was hurled at our organization, how the Legion was castigated for its fight against the inner enemies of our country who had burrowed their way into the many so-called peace societies which were riding high in the saddle at that time. These parasites did not want peace at any price, but, instead, sought to perpetrate their own particular "ism" upon our people in one guise or another. And so the voice of the Legion was likened to that earlier voice crying in the wilderness, and like the other voice, it fell upon dull ears for long. Finally we heard it, almost too late.

The Legion is still great today. It holds a high place in the councils of the Nation. It will be greater tomorrow. The fact is, it bids fair to become the largest and most powerful organization of its kind that has ever existed in the history of the civilized world. Already many of our soldiers of the present war, discharged for medical or wound disabilities, have joined up with their comrades of the last war. That millions of their fellows will affiliate with the American Legion when the war is ended, now seems to be an assured fact. The voice of such a combined group will and should yield great influence in the destiny of our Nation. Who, I ask, will have a better right to speak and to be heard?

We can be thankful that the warnings of the President and the Legion were heard in time for us to be at least partially prepared. You will recall that at the last convention, a year ago, I told you that, in my opinion, the turning point in this war would come in the year of 1943. I think you will agree with me that my prediction has come true. I based my prediction on what I had seen in the production of implements of war and the training of men. We have now taken the offensive and will march on until those demons who struck us in the back at Pearl Harbor pay in blood and in the ashes of their cities for their treachery. No nation ever perpetrated a more cowardly act upon another. The rejoicing in their country at this cowardly stab in the back while their envoys were still in Washington mouthing assurances of peace and good will is now being turned into fear and before the war is over will be turned into a cry of anguish, for we will destroy their power and grind them under our heel. We have already captured islands and whipped them on the sea, but this is only the beginning.

As the smoke clouds rise and drift from the shifting war scene, we find the United States fighting man and his allies back on the soil of continental Europe. Call Sicily an island if you will, the fact remains that it is considered a part of Europe. Even as I speak, our invasion fleets may be striking at the mainland. Certainly our invading planes have ranged all over the Continent. The occupation of Sicily brought back old memories, old long-forgotten scenes. Out of the dim misty past float the names of the old battlefields, such as Chateau Thierry, Belleau Wood, Soissons, St. Mihiel, Champagne, Montfaucon, and the Argonne. It is possible that some of the decisive battles of this war will be fought on those fields. And some of the men of the Legion, grayer, stouter, but still fighting men, may lead those assaults over old familiar ground.

The challenge of the so-called supermen who have caused such terror and destruction in nation after nation, is being met. Like the beasts they are, snapping and biting at their wounds, they drag themselves back to the foul lairs from which they came. Supermen. Ask the boys who fought them in Tunisia about this myth; ask their fathers who fought them on the battlefields which we have just mentioned, and they will tell you that when the odds are all in their favor, then and only then are they the formidable warriors which they picture themselves to be. We whipped them before, and we will whip them again. This time we will not stop until we have marched into Berlin. This time we will not show the leniency of 1918 to Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo and their cohorts. They must be punished for the suffering and anguish they have given the world.

Most of us will be there only in spirit. Like the Nords of old, we have hung our spears and our shields upon the wall. But we are not out of this war. There are many things that we have been doing and still can do to help insure that victory. That they will be done is assured.

There is much talk and many plans of action regarding the peace and the participation of this country therein. I have no fault to find with those who seek to work out plans for a just peace and hope to do so in a manner that will be acceptable to all nations and make the world a better place in which to live. I do, however, agree with the President who just the other night has said: "Let us first win the war." And when we have won the war, I feel sure that we will be able to sit down with the other nations and decide on what must be done.

However, there is a job for the Legion to do now. When the last shot is fired, of the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, approximately 9,000,000 will be discharged and will be hunting for positions in private employment. No one is better able to understand this problem than the Legion. There will be unrest among our boys returning from fox holes, swamps, and deserts; our boys who have given up school and jobs to fight for loved ones at home, to fight that we might continue this Nation of freedom and justice, are entitled to help, that they may return to school and to jobs where they may take their place in life. It is for us, the Legion, to give thought and study to this problem. We must not let them wander over the United States without jobs as many of our men did after the last war. You well know that a man cannot put himself on the level of the beasts we are fighting on the other side, in desert and in the jungle, and under various conditions, and then come back and take up exactly where he left off.

Two years ago I asked your assistance in helping me secure the passage of a bill giving free postage to the armed forces. Senator ED JOHNSON of Colorado and I secured the passage of this bill in the form of an amendment to another bill. I know that you are proud that you had a part in seeing to it that our boys have free postage. I was glad to receive your assistance. I have given thought to legislation to assist our boys on their return, but have waited to introduce the legislation until I could get your counsel and advice. May I suggest that this convention give consideration to legislation providing for adjusted pay similar to that adopted for World War No. 1 veterans. I suggest the bases be at least double the amount, which as you know, was $1.00 for each day of service on this side and $1.25 for each day of foreign service with a $500 limitation for veterans without foreign service, and $625 limitation for veterans with foreign service. I suggest a provision for payment by the month to any veteran wanting to return to high school or college, or attend an occupational school; also, certain conditions under which this payment might be made available for a down payment on a home, purchased under F. H. A. or Government approval. This could also be extended to payment on a farm or business. This could be done by issuance of a certificate or bond payable for these purposes on proper approval; otherwise, to be paid under similar conditions provided for in the original bonus act. I am glad to know that the President has made definite suggestions in regard to schooling, social security, and unemployment insurance, but feel that we should in the same act provide the benefits all are to receive. There will be an adjustment of pay. Why not now? It will cost money, but this should be looked upon as a necessary cost of war, just as much as payment for implements of war. It would not be right to provide schooling for some and not give a similar compensation to the boy already prepared for his job. We must treat all

of our men equally. The purchase of a home, or assistance in business, will be just as important to some as schooling and social security benefits may be to others.

Time will not permit me to outline this in detail, but I shall be glad to work with you and sponsor the legislation agreed upon. We must also set up machinery to help secure employment for the boys returning. That is the most important of all, not only for the who come back uninjured, but for the man who has lost a leg or an arm, or has been injured in some other manner. He will not want to remain always in a Government hospital or live upon a pension. He will want a job and want to take his place in life. The Legion could well assist in making a survey of industry and finding out just how many men with handicaps could be used. There is much for us to do on the home front. I have confidence that the Legion, the organization which understands the viewpoint of these boys, will, upon their return home, help see to it that they get the treatment which they have earned.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as coauthor of the bill to provide adjusted-service compensation and to provide a 3-month furlough with pay prior to discharge for persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, let me say that for many months the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and I have been working and discussing with many the necessity of introducing legislation pertaining to those serving so faithfully and valiantly the people of our country.

Three weeks ago today, after lengthy discussions and study, we started with the legislative counsel to draft into proper form the legislation necessary to cover and protect our servicemen when they are discharged from the armed forces. Last week the drafting of the proposed legislation was completed and it is a pleasure for me today to join the Senator from Arizona in its introduction.

I sincerely hope that the bill will be referred to the Finance Committee, which in the past has handled veterans' legislation, and I trust that the committee and all Senators will give every consideration to the enactment of this legislation and that they will also suggest any changes they believe necessary to insure full protection and every consideration to the veterans of World War No. 2.

In conclusion, let me add that some changes perhaps may be necessary, and it is also our thought that inadvertently some details may have been left out. Any suggestions for the improvement of the measure will be particularly welcomed by us, and we also realize there should be much discussion and thought given to certain sections, particularly that pertaining to education and the one having to do with the 3-month furlough period. It might be better, perhaps, if the period were increased.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 199), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That there is hereby established—

(a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Agricultural Policies (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

(b) The special committee shall be composed of 15 Members of the Senate, 9 from the majority and 6 from the minority, appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to agricultural policies and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war agricultural policies and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable agricultural economy. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

HEARINGS; SUBPENAS; DISBURSEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. The special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable, not exceeding the sum of $50,000. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed by the chairman.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION

SEC. 3. The special committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation fixed under sections 661–663, 664–673, and 674 of title 5 of the United States Code for comparable duties. Officers and employees of the Government shall be detailed to the service of the special committee on its request, without additional compensation, and such officers and employees shall be paid from the appropriations regularly available for their salaries.

CRUSADE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator BALL before the Christian Mission for World Order, at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NAVY AND INDIANA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Navy and Indiana," delivered by him at Peru, Ind., on Navy Day, October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF THE SOYBEAN INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY J. E. JOHNSON

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Problems of the Soybean Industry," delivered by J. E. Johnson, president of the American Soybean Association, at the National Food Conference in Chicago on September 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFLICT OF RIVAL YUGOSLAV FACTIONS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch under the heading "Rival Yugoslav units of Mihailovich and Tito reported battling," published in the Washington Evening Star of October 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACTIVITIES IN THE FAR EAST—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning activities in Burma and the Far East, written by Constantine Brown in his column This Changing World, and published in the Washington Evening Star of October 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] proposing to add a new section after line 9.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I rise at this time with no idea that anything I may say will result in the defeat of the pending resolution. I know that the minds of most Senators are made up. Some Senators are going to vote for the resolution because some other Senators are against it. Some are going to vote for it because they believe it is innocuous. I do not believe the resolution is innocuous, and I do not intend to vote for it or against it because I think someone else is opposed to it or desires to amend it.

At the outset let me make it clear that this Nation hopes for better understanding among all the peoples of the world. We crave the possessions of no other people. We envy no race of men. We have no deep hatreds, and few animosities. Our fondest desire is that the Russian people, the Chinese, the British, and the French; yes, and even the enemy nations, shall go their various ways in peace and in amity toward each other and toward us. America is sick at heart over power politics. She wants no part of it. She recognizes in the course of human history the development and growth of distinct nations—each after its own type. She realizes that differing customs, ambitions, religions, and historical background make nations different. She understands that each nation contributes in its own way, through these cultural differences, to what may be called, in a general way, modern civilization. We believe in better understanding among all the nations of the world, and think that the road to such understanding lies in liberty and justice for all peoples. Toward the consummation of this aim we are willing to help.

Undoubtedly concerted common action will have to be taken to place the nations on a solid peace basis after the war is won. When that is accomplished we shall help to establish a family of nations on the basis of equity, liberty, equality, and fraternity, and in the spirit

of reciprocity, fair play, and mutual aid, as distinguished from coercion on the one hand and excessive and harmful unilateral liberality on the other. But this is something that cannot be worked out overnight, and it should be emphasized that machinery alone will not establish peace. There must be a desire for peace among the different countries. Yet some internationalists would have us believe that the mere setting up of a league of nations, with an international police force, would automatically bring world peace and prosperity.

Mr. Walter Lippmann believes that there should be a military alliance between the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. Others, including the Governor of New York, believe in a military alliance between the United States and Great Britain. Hitler and Stalin had a nonaggression security alliance in August 1939, through which Russia got half of Poland and furnished Germany with material; but 22 months later they were at war, in June 1941. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902–22 is not so old as to be forgotten. Yet, Britain and Japan are now at war.

Poland had an alliance with Britain and France at the outset of the present war, a pact which pledged both to protect Polish borders. Likewise England and France had a pact with Czechoslovakia. History is strewn with more black pages than white on the subject of alliances, running all the way back to the Triple Alliance of 1688, and even the Holy Alliance of 1815; yet the world periodically came to war.

The distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has said that isolationism has failed. Yet every country in the world has had, in some form or other, alliances with other countries. We ourselves joined the Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war forever. That was not isolationism. This country has not been isolationist, either economically, politically, socially, or in any other way.

Mr. President, I do not now object, nor have I ever objected, to cooperating with other countries for world peace. I am, however, opposed to military alliances, which are backed up by force. They never have and never will bring about lasting peace. They are essentially instruments of war.

Incidentally, I noticed in this morning's press reference to a speech by Mr. Herbert Hoover. I read from the article:

> Observing that never has a military alliance produced peace although many have produced war, Hoover said:
>
> "One of the suggestions which has been advanced is some sort of legal ties between the United States and Britain. The proposals include common citizenship, common currency, free trade, and military alliance.
>
> "Would not such an act at once raise the fears of all other nations that this is a step to world mastery by the English-speaking people and thus generate organized opposition among the other 90 percent of the human race?"

The second paragraph of the pending resolution says that the United States will "cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace." Does this language contemplate the formation of a dual alliance between the United States and Britain? Does it contemplate a triple alliance between the United States, Great Britain, and Russia? I think it contemplates either or both. Certainly it is a blank check for either or both. Once the deal is made, the President is also permitted to pledge our military forces to back up such an alliance. I realize that other Senators have placed an entirely different construction upon the resolution, and each Senator will vote on it on the basis of what he believes its meaning to be.

The third paragraph uses the phrase, "international authority with power." In spite of the phraseology here used, it seems to me the words "international authority with power" mean one thing—military alliances. This is particularly so when the Foreign Relations Committee informs us that the word "an" before the words "international authority" was purposely deleted by the committee before the resolution was reported to the Senate. It would seem to me that we are then voting at this time for military alliances. Is that what the Senate wants?

If we put our faith in alliances with other countries and not in our own strength, if we are thus deceived into a false sense of security, we start repeating the history of the disarmament conference of 1922.

George Sokolsky, a well-known authority on the Far East and a student of international relations, in the New York Sun recently stated:

> A military alliance is always aimed at an objective enemy. It is always the precursor of war. It is a design for war.

Obviously, an Anglo-American alliance could only be aimed at Soviet Russia, the only other power which at the end of this war will be capable of defending itself and making its will felt.

There are those who say we must cooperate after the war as we have during the war. Let us examine into how well we have cooperated during the war. The differences between Soviet Russia and Great Britain over the future of Iran and the Persian oil fields is nothing to laugh away. If we were a military ally, we should be required to support the British against the Russians willy-nilly. But why? How are we involved? Without an alliance we might arbitrate and help maintain peace; with an alliance we are partisans and can back up only one party.

Or, in respect to Hong Kong and Singapore and the Dutch East Indies, are we to support the British against China in her claims for Hong Kong, and are we going to support the Netherlands against the countries of Asia which may desire independence from European domination? A military alliance with Britain would require us even to fight China for Hong Kong.

While the resolution is plain so far as it is directed toward the making of military alliances, it is capable of several constructions in other respects.

It is generally conceded that lack of knowledge of how and when the war may end and of the state of affairs which will then exist precludes definite commitments at this time. The same seems to me to be true of general commitments.

The question in my mind is whether the resolution does not commit us to a general proposition which, under the rulings made by the Department of State, would be advice and consent to a treaty which the President may make and which he does not need to submit to the Senate thereafter. That is clearly the holding by the Solicitor of the Department of State. Someone has said that not much attention was paid to what the Solicitor said. The Solicitor of the Department of State, Mr. Hackworth, is a very able gentleman, who is as well versed and probably better versed in international law than any Senator. Whether Senators like him or disagree with what he has said, he is the Solicitor of the Department of State, and the one who will interpret a treaty, and if he interprets a treay which is entered into by the President of the United States, and the President follows his interpretation, what can the Senate do about it?

It has been said that Congress can pass a law to nullify the treaty. That is true. The treaty could be abrogated by the Congress, but that could be accomplished only by passing a law through both branches of Congress. The President could veto the measure and then both Houses would have to pass it over the President's veto by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it the Senator's theory that under no circumstances would it be safe for the Senate to proceed under the advice clause?

Mr. WHEELER. I think it is dangerous to proceed under the advice clause in advance of the making of the treaty.

Let me call attention to Prime Minister Churchill's broadcast to the British people on March 21 of this year:

> First of all, we must beware of attempts to overpersuade or even to coerce His Majesty's Government to bind themselves or their unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee and which may be years ahead.

Let me ask Senators, to whom do they think the Prime Minister was directing that language? He was not directing it to the British people. He was directing it to the American people and to the American Government. Prime Minister Churchill continued:

> And to make them pledge themselves to particular schemes without relation to other extremely important aspects of our post-war needs.

Mr. Churchill continued:

> Nothing would be easier for me than to make any number of promises to get the immediate response of cheap cheers and glowing leading articles.

Why was the pending resolution reported by the committee? It was reported, we are told, because of the clamor of the press of the country for a resolution. Why should we pay any attention to the press of the country which wants some resolution adopted now because it

fears one could not be adopted after the war is over?

I repeat Mr. Churchill's words:

> Nothing would be easier for me than to make any number of promises to get the immediate response of cheap cheers and glowing leading articles.

But, Mr. President, is that not exactly what is being done here now? I continue to read from Mr. Churchill's statement:

> However, it is our duty to peer through the mists of the future to the end of the war and to try our utmost to be prepared by ceaseless effort and forethought for the kind of situations which are likely to occur. Speaking under every reserve and not attempting to prophesy, I can imagine that sometime next year—but it may well be the year after—we might beat Hitler. By which I mean beat him and his powers of evil into death, dust, and ashes. * * * the moment when Hitler is beaten and Germany and Italy are prostrate will mark the grand climax of war and that will be the time to make a new declaration upon the task before us.

Mr. President, I find myself in complete agreement with Mr. Churchill's statement. It sets out what seems to me to be the only sensible course for the Congress of the United States to take. If this is good policy for Great Britain to follow, why is it not equally good policy for the United States to follow?

We have been told in recent days that we must do anything that Great Britain does. Well, let us follow Great Britain when she is right. Certainly the Parliament of Great Britain is not adopting any resolution of the kind now before the Senate, and certainly the British Cabinet is not proposing any such resolution.

That being so, it is difficult to see how a broad commitment, capable of several constructions, not only by this Nation but by foreign nations, should be adopted at this time.

On the contrary, it would seem that such a commitment, by reason of its very breadth, will increase the likelihood of confusion and national embarrassment from all sides at the war's end.

Furthermore, it is doubtful that any present commitment will materially affect the international complexion of things to come. It is the state of things existing at the conclusion of the war that should, and I am sure will, determine the course of action to be taken by the United States of America if the representatives of the people of this country are given a voice in passing upon it. But already we are told, and we hear the stories, that there will be no peace after the war, that there are to be only general agreements, and no peace treaties signed after the war. It would seem to follow that the passage of the present resolution would be more likely to prove harmful than helpful in the ultimate solution of the post-war problems.

Nor does the fact that this resolution is unilateral improve matters. On the contrary, it would only add to our ultimate discomfiture—and to ours alone.

Let us now examine this resolution further:

In the first paragraph we speak of waging war against "all our enemies until complete victory is achieved." In this particular war it has been difficult at times to determine who is who. Russia was our enemy. She is now our friend. Finland was our friend. She is now considered by many as our enemy. Italy, until a short time ago, was an ally of Germany. Now she is a cobelligerent of ours. Does this paragraph, then, refer to the past, the present, or the future?

And what if Russia should make a separate peace with Germany? Would this resolution automatically involve us then in war with Russia?

The second paragraph refers to our "comrades in arms." Again let me ask, "When?" A few weeks ago there was a meeting in Ottawa between Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt, at which Russia was excluded because, as was truthfully stated at the time, Russia was not a cobelligerent against Japan. At the present time there is a meeting between the secretaries of state of Russia, England, and the United States, at which China is excluded. Suppose the war against Germany ends first, and Russia chooses to continue her present relations with Japan? What then?

The third paragraph speaks of "International authority with power to prevent aggression." Aggression when? Would we be obligated under this resolution to go to war with Russia should she intervene in the affairs of the eastern nations of Europe, absorb Finland, or take over control of the Bosporus? And what about Outer Mongolia? Are we to go to war over that? And who determines the aggressor?

These are merely some of the difficulties I have encountered in considering this resolution. Because it is susceptible of so many interpretations, it will be used at the war's end by the proponents of every varying viewpoint to sustain their ideas with respect to the method of achieving peace. How can the result be other than to add to the confusion, to hamper our representatives, and to produce the very thing it is claimed to avoid—the ultimate disillusionment of our people and a return to a form of isolationism that will make me look like an internationalist? I cannot escape the conviction, then, that this resolution, if adopted, will rise up again and again to plague us. Again I ask, "What then, is its purpose?"

I have heard Senators say on the floor of the Senate "I am not an isolationist." I do not know just what they mean; because, as I said a few moments ago, this country has never been isolationist, either economically, socially, morally, or politically. Have we not always done everything we could do to help every nation which was in trouble? Have we not gone to war twice in Europe? Have we not signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact?

Speaking commercially, do we not have our representatives all over the world, trading with every other country on the face of the globe? Do those who speak of isolationism mean by "isolationism" that one whom they call an isolationist is in favor of a tariff to protect the interests of our industries and the working people and the farmers of America? Is that what they mean by "isolationism"? What do they mean by it? Do they mean that anyone who wanted to keep this country out of war was an isolationist? If that is what they mean, then let me say that I am proud to be called an isolationist.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The same people who call us isolationists because of certain tariffs do not mention the fact that the British Empire has an empire tariff of approximately 25 percent in order to have its trade protected.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. So, according to that method of reasoning, the British Empire is also isolationist.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the British Empire has always been isolationist, if one desires to apply that term. I admire the British Empire and I greatly if one desires to apply that term. I adwherever one goes, whether to China or to Japan or to Singapore or to Bombay or to Egypt or to Germany or to Russia or anywhere else on the face of the globe, wherever one meets an Englishman one finds that he is for Great Britain first. I admire the English for it.

Is Russia isolationist? Mr. President, today Russia is the greatest isolationist country upon the face of the globe, and has been for years.

Mr. President, socially we in the United States certainly have not been isolationists. I say that because of the fact that a number of our rich young women have gone abroad and have married all kinds of cheap dukes and broken-down princes; so socially we are not isolationists. [Laughter.]

The British Prime Minister is opposed to a resolution of this kind for Britain. Certainly the Russian Government is taking no such action, nor is the Chinese Government. Why then, I ask, single out America for special treatment?

Why is it that those who were the loudest in denouncing Stalin now are cuddling him to their bosoms? Of course, Mr. President, Senators know that I went to Russia in 1923, and spent several months there. When I returned to this country I said that the United States should recognize Russia. I did not say that because I believed in the Russian form of government, but because I felt that if the Russian people wanted to try that experiment it was none of our business, that they had a right to determine their own form of government and to have communism if they wanted it. If this country should undertake to tell every other country on the face of the globe what kind of government it should have and what kind of religion it should have, we would be constantly and continually involved in one war after another.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. First let me say that the same press, the same Tory press, that was denouncing me because of my attitude in wanting to have Russia recognized by our country, is now cuddling Mr. Stalin and taking him to its breast, and

is holding him out as the greatest man in the world.

Now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Montana is discussing the point of communism with reference to the language in the resolution. Does the Senator regard the words in Senate Resolution 192 "free and sovereign nations" as differentiating or excluding from their scope a Communist country?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator should contend that the Russian people are free, in the sense of being free to say what they want to do with their Government, of course I would say they are not free; because the Russian Government is, not a dictatorship of the proletariat, but a dictatorship by a very small group of individuals, who impose their will upon the rest of the people, just as completely as Mr. Hitler imposed his will upon the German people, and probably to a greater extent than Mussolini was able to impose his will upon the Italian people.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that as the premise of this question, does the Senator interpret the words "free and sovereign nations," appearing in Senate Resolution 192—and I understand the same language appears in the amendment suggested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators—as excluding countries that, according to his suggestion, are not internally free?

Mr. WHEELER. I would not want to place that interpretation upon the term used. I should say that such an interpretation could be placed upon it. Certainly it would apply to countries such as Australia, and some of the other countries under the British, which are not free. It would certainly exclude them.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad to have the RECORD show the Senator's position on that point. I believe this is the first time that any Senator has given that interpretation to that language. I am quite anxious to know what interpretation the Senator places upon the language "free and sovereign nations."

Mr. WHEELER. I think that language should be interpreted by those who are sponsoring the resolution, rather than by me.

Why are people now saying that Mr. Stalin is the wisest diplomat and ruler today? It is because he has been, and is now, for Russia first; because he has made no promises to feed the world or to rule the world or to reform the world; and because he has no outstanding bank notes which are going to be called at the peace table.

Let me read a recent article by John Kieran which appeared in the New York Sun. As Senators know, John Kieran is one of the ablest writers in this country. This article appeared on October 11, 1943, under the title "Great Advantage of Saying Nothing":

There may be some difference of opinion as to whether President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill is the more sparkling speaker—the jury is still out—but there is a growing feeling that Uncle Joe Stalin may walk off with the prize for silence. Though their forceful phrases and stirring statements have won for Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill a whirlwind of applause in civilized countries, there must be moments when they grit their teeth and envy Uncle Joe, the man who has said practically nothing.

We are warned that victory is still far off and there is much bitter fighting ahead, but that doesn't prevent chatter about the post-war world and myriad methods for preserving the peace when we get it. What about the "four freedoms"? What about Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania? What about Poland and Czecho-Slovakia? What about the freedom of the air and the future ownership of all those airfields that our men and money have built in far countries? What shall be done about Germany and Japan? Is there to be a new League of Nations on improved lines and with a stronger foundation? What about India in the post-war world?

These are just some of the problems that come up for discussion these days. Some ready speakers and writers have touched on all of them. Already speakers and writers have touched on some of them. But Uncle Joe Stalin hasn't been caught sounding off on any of them. When hecklers bring up these topics and try to pin him down by tossing at him the diplomatic equivalent of "What d'ya know, Joe?" Uncle Joe merely grins, puffs on his pipe, and says nothing.

UNGRUDGING ADMIRATION

It may be horrifying to some staid citizens—possibly it will be considered treason in some furious quarters—but this observer has reached a state of awe-stricken admiration for the Sphinx of the Kremlin. Not that there is any fondness in this corner for the system of government that he represents. This moss-covered conservative shudders at the thought of communism coming any closer to this country than it is now.

But that is beside the point. Uncle Joe is a man who has a job on his hands, and he's sawing wood and saying nothing. He's a Russian and he's sawing wood for Russia. He hasn't said anything about sawing wood for anybody else when the Soviet wood box is filled. He hasn't promised to give away wood to the Eskimos in case it gets cold up there in the post-war world. He hasn't announced that he will lend-lease the saw to the Chinese when he finishes work on his own wood pile. No foreign nation has a written claim on his sawdust. He's bagging it for Russia.

Uncle Joe is a man who is concentrating and no neighbor can disturb him by shouting, "Hey! Remember what you promised me!" He hasn't promised anybody anything. He doesn't have to pull the followers of Giraud and De Gaulle apart when they begin squabbling. He never had anything to do with either of them. If there is trouble between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine, Uncle Joe doesn't even look up from his job. He keeps on sawing wood. India is no problem for Uncle Joe. He never said aye, yes, or no when others were howling about India. His duty is to protect and promote Russia—and what a job he is doing in that direction!

UNHAMPERED AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE

Wait until the delegates gather at the peace conference after this war is won. Then the fun will begin. The representatives of the United States and Great Britain will be beset and besieged by representatives from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Finland, Greece, Italy, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Denmark, Palestine, India, Burma, Siam, and points east. There will be loud claims for a share in the "four freedoms." There will be pointed references to the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Several days ago I received a little booklet from the press division of the Latvian organization in Washington. I read it last night with a great deal of interest and extreme inspiration. This little booklet is entitled "What Latvia Wishes From This War." Latvia wishes freedom. In the fore part of the little booklet it is stated that Latvia wishes its freedom back, the free Riga University reopened, the destroyed churches of Riga rebuilt; that she wishes security behind her ramparts assured, parliament reelected, the stock exchange revived, the art gallery reestablished, and the foreign office and castle of the President back in Latvian hands. In other words, the people of Latvia, whom the Senator has mentioned, and those of Estonia and the other countries in that section of the world are looking to us and our allies to provide them with the freedom which they enjoyed prior to this war.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course; and so is every other nation in Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. So is every other nation in Europe. I recommend this booklet without hesitation to the Members of this body.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

I continue to quote from the article by Mr. Kieran:

Copies of the speeches of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill will be produced by protesting parties and there will be bitter debates as to what certain paragraphs meant or did not mean. There may even arise the vulgar cry of the prize ring: "We was robbed."

And there will be Uncle Joe sitting back at ease, smoking his pipe, and enjoying himself hugely. He will not have to eat any words or live up to any awkward commitments. He hasn't said anything and he hasn't put anything in writing. No promissory notes will fall due at his parking place around the table. Uncle Joe's cool and comfortable seat will be the proper reward for a man who worked hard and never missed a good opportunity to say nothing at all.

If the reading of that article, and bringing it home to the Senate now, does not cause Senators to hesitate to commit themselves in advance, then surely nothing in the world will.

Why are we proposing to adopt a resolution at this time, when no other nation on the face of the globe is doing so? It is said, "We are doing it because we want to show the other countries that we intend to do certain things, and we want to cooperate." Have we not been cooperating? Are not our boys dying all over the world? Have we not lend-leased our property to almost every other country on the face of the globe which has asked for it? Do not those actions speak louder than words? And yet it is desired that we commit ourselves to a program.

The reasons for not committing ourselves to any program are simply and bluntly stated by Mr. Kieran in the New York Sun. Those reasons would impel almost anyone to vote against this resolution, or any similar resolution, until

such time as we can see more clearly into the future.

A short time ago a very distinguished gentleman came to my office to see me. I asked him to sit down. He said, "No, Senator; I do not agree with you. I do not want to get into an argument with you." I said, "What do you not agree with me about?" He said, "I just do not agree with you." I said, "Tell me what do you not agree with me about. Do you mean you do not agree with what I think about the post-war situation?" He said, "That is right." I said, "You tell me what I think, because I do not now know what I think. But if you will tell me what part Russia is going to play, what part England is going to play, and what part some other country is going to play, then I will tell you what I think about it. You smart boys of New York have all the answers. You tell me." Of course, he could not tell me.

Mr. President, I do not know of any Senator who can tell me; I do not know of any man in the State Department who can tell me; I do not know of any man in the United States or anywhere else who can tell me what is going to happen. Yet we are asked to commit ourselves to something which later will be used against us and plague us.

I may be in favor of a three-power pact, which has been talked about, between Russia, England, and the United States; I may be in favor of some form of pact, but I certainly am not going to put myself on record as favoring something which will later give someone the opportunity to say, "You voted for it; you authorized the President to do it. You advised and consented to it. He has done it, and now you are reneging on it."

What would Russia say, what would England say, and what would the other countries say if a treaty should come to the United States Senate for ratification and the Senate refused to ratify it because it provided for giving to Russia a large part of Poland?

Why did England go to war? She said she went to war for the independence of Poland. We have said we want the "four freedoms" for all the countries in the world. In the face of our pledges, and in the face of our statements in the Atlantic Charter, are we going to approve a treaty which would give Russia all of Poland, and control over Europe? I do not believe we should do it. I may be wrong.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I have seen the Senate swayed so many times that it is hard to predict what it may do in the future. But certainly we should not be pledged to something which will come back and slap us in the face, and subject Members of the Senate to the accusation, "You went back on the promises which you made while we were in the war."

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator has already answered the question which I had in mind.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Montana. I desire to get his reaction to one idea because he sees both of these resolutions in a different light than I see them. He sees in them what he calls a commitment. I see them as indicating an expression of opinion with no legal authority back of them. Certainly there can be no legal authority in this resolution to affect the constitutional power of the "treaty negotiator" of the Nation, namely, the President. He is the negotiator under the Constitution. I see these resolutions as simply indicating to the people of this country and to the people of the world that we are ready to "play ball" with other nations if they are ready to "play ball" with us. It is merely an expression of an opinion that we are willing to cooperate. I agree with the Senator's statement that we are going to have difficulty. But America has time and time again demonstrated its ability to meet, and its wisdom in meeting, difficulties. The Senator did not mention Greece and her civil war.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall come to that subject.

Mr. WILEY. Yugoslavia also has a civil war of her own. When we think of the days before the Constitution became the supreme law of the land, the various Colonies had a problem similar to the present world problem. They met and found the solution to war on this continent. It seems to me that all we are doing is to hunt for an antidote to war on the way to peace. Will the Senator tell me how this is a direct commitment of the Senate to anything except that the Senate should attempt to find the way to peace?

Mr. WHEELER. If the resolution is what the Senator has said it is; if it is merely innocuous——

Mr. WILEY. The resolution is innocous in one sense, that it and the amendment have no effect accept to express a desire to cooperate with other nations. It is not even binding in any way upon this Senate or a subsequent Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. Then why is the Senate of the United States taking 2 weeks to pass something which is innocuous, and does not amount to anything? The Senate of the United States, looked upon as the greatest parliamentary body in the world, is debating over nothing. The Senator says it is nothing. Some other Senator says it is nothing; and nothing plus nothing equals nothing. Yet, we are debating as to whether we should approve something which means nothing. In the first place, I do not subscribe to that idea.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Please allow me to finish.

I do not subscribe to the idea that the Senate of the United States is willing to have its great Foreign Relations Committee—for the members of which I have the highest regard, as well as for its chairman—report a resolution and say that it does not mean anything. I cannot conceive of such an idea. What good would it do to pass a resolution and then say to the world: "We are passing it, but it does not mean anything"?

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has read on the floor of the Senate from the Digest of International Law by Hackworth, to which I intend later to refer. In his book Mr. Hackworth says that when the Senate passes in advance a general resolution authorizing the President to enter into a treaty, he can then proceed to negotiate the treaty, conforming in general principle to the resolution which has been passed, and he is not required to submit the treaty to the Senate, because it has already consented and advised with respect to it.

As I suggested a moment ago, some Senators have said to me, "I have no respect for him." It makes no difference whether Senators have any respect for him or whether I have any respect for him. He is in that position, and he is the man who will advise. In addition, we have the precedent of that very thing having been done in the past.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to make myself clear. The other day the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] stated that he was quoting the language of another Senator in which it was said that the resolution "did not amount to anything," which meant that it had no legislative effect. In my opinion, the resolution gives expression to the hope, or faith, that nations may learn to live together in peace. In that sense it is not innocuous.

The resolution, if adopted, as I see it, will mean that it does not delegate to the President any authority because he has the authority already as the constitutional negotiator. There is no definite plan or suggestion in either the resolution or the amendment, as I see them. The resolution merely amounts to an expression of the people of this country, through their Senate, to the world that we are willing to try to accomplish peace in the world.

On that subject, if the Senator will yield further, I want to say there is a hunger in America, there is a hunger in the world for an expression of faith that we in the Senate will not sit here and let the rest of the world think that we are not willing to attempt to find a solution to war.

Therefore, I say the passage of this resolution would not be innocuous in that respect. I think the resolution amounts to considerable. It says that the Senate of the United States believes, first, that we must wage war to victory—that is a definite expression by the Senate—second, that we should attempt cooperation, and, third, that we will join with nations of like mind in trying to find an answer to the problem of war. However, let us ever bear in mind that the Constitution uses the word "advice" and the word "concur" in relation to treaties.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Where does the Senator from Wisconsin find any language in the resolution that we will cooperate?

Mr. WILEY. I ask the Senator from Montana if I may answer the question.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. In paragraph 2 it is provided:

> That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

Mr. HATCH. The cooperation ends with the securing of peace.

Mr. WILEY. Are we to keep on arguing about mere words? Words are vehicles sometimes for trickery, sometimes for great spiritual thought, and sometimes for common sense. We talk about securing "a just and honorable peace." Peace means something definite. It does not mean continuous fighting in the world. The resolution says "That the United States cooperate." I say again that is an expression of faith to the people of the earth. We in the Senate thus express the voice of the people of the United States in saying that we want to join with other nations in trying to find a way out; we want to find a way that will lead to peace. I see in this resolution the hope, that high hope, of people everywhere, that there will, at least, be an attempt to do something, so that there may not be a return to such a condition as prevailed in the days of the inception of this country when the Thirteen Colonies were almost at each other's throats.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not mind an interruption, but I fear the Senator is making a speech.

Mr. WILEY. Let me carry on for a moment. The representatives of the Colonies met in their various assemblies, and sent their delegates to a convention. They resolved to try to do something, and they did do something, and we got the Constitution.

Mr. WHEELER. But that was among the various States themselves; they acted among themselves. What we are doing is passing a unilateral resolution. The Senator says we ought to pass a resolution telling the rest of the world that we want to win the war, that we are for winning the war, and are willing to cooperate. Is the Senator willing to enter into an alliance with Great Britain and then have the armed forces of the United States back up such an alliance? Is the Senator willing to do that?

Mr. WILEY. May I answer the Senator's question?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that is what I asked it for.

Mr. WILEY. My concept of the pending resolution is that we say to Great Britain, to Russia, to China, and to the other countries of the earth, "We are ready to sit around the table with you and try to formulate some plan, try to ascertain some 'way' which will enable us to solve the problem of war; we are realists, and we have got to play ball together, otherwise the world may perish." That, to me, is all the resolution means.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Churchill says that the thing we ought to do is to wait and see what the situation is before we do anything. I admit that the Senator's judgment may be better than that of Mr. Churchill, but I happen to agree with Mr. Churchill's viewpoint.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. There are two parts of the pending resolution. One is that we want a just and honorable peace. There can be no objection to that. I think the most important part of the resolution is that there shall be a just and honorable peace, but nothing has been said in the discussion here to indicate how we are going to get it and what a just and honorable peace is. If we have a just and honorable peace there is not much need for police power, and if we have an unjust peace no police power can enforce it. In that case it seems to me we will be a balance-of-power-alliance combination to fight the next war.

I think someone should discuss the most important part of this resolution, which is, how are we going to get "a just and honorable peace" and what will be "a just and honorable peace." That is the most important part of post-war work, so far as I am concerned.

I have never seen in history "a just and honorable peace" except the peace made at Appomattox by General Grant with the Southern States. He gave the defeated troops their horses with which to go home and plow. But we had a police power in the Southern States, with the carpetbaggers, and if that is what we are going to do, if those who propose the substitute amendment intend to put a carpetbagger army in every country in the world when peace comes, we know the peace is going to be an unjust one.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In particular reference to the suggestions made by the Senator from Minnesota, can there be a just and honorable peace under the Atlantic Charter unless we liberate and free and guarantee the freedom of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, and that portion of Finland and that portion of Rumania that have been taken away? Can it be a just peace or a lasting peace unless we guarantee the liberation of the people of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia as well as the people of Hungary and Greece and Albania and every other country in the world that has been subjugated under the heel of the Axis? Can it be a just peace unless the people of the different sections of the world who are crying out for peace are guaranteed the peace that is mentioned in the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. WHEELER. That is exactly my position, and I had intended to explain it in a few minutes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment further?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to make an observation relative to the statement made by the able Senator from Wisconsin. I listened to him yesterday when he questioned the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and said that it was his understanding of this resolution insofar as its objectives were concerned, that we were desirous of "playing ball" with the other nations of the world. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin made this statement:

> America is willing to do her part in negotiating and in collaborating, but that we recognize that that, as we have said is a two-way street in which all must function harmoniously; we say to the world, that we are ready to "play ball" with you if you are willing to "play ball" with us? Is not that the sum and substance of it?

To that, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], one of the authors of the substitute for the committee resolution, replied:

> I agree to that but, in addition to what the Senator has said along that line, I think there is an obligation to make our position clear to the people, as he says, and to the President, and to the Allies. Each of the three are definitely concerned to know our policy, which will be vitally affected by the clearness with which we act and with which they react.

Great Britain and Russia are anxious to know what is in our minds, but we are also anxious to know what is in their minds before we commit ourselves. I say that by adopting this resolution now, before knowing what is in the minds of our colleagues across the seas and our allies, Russia and Great Britain, we would be putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his remarks, and I entirely agree with him. We have been willing to cooperate with Russia; we have been sending them lend-lease supplies; we have been willing to cooperate with Great Britain; we cooperated with Great Britain before we were in the war; we sent them lend-lease materials and did everything else, and we have likewise aided China.

It is said that we, the United States of America, must tell other nations that we are willing to cooperate. We do not ask Russia what she will do, and Russia has not told us one single thing. Let me say that to me it seems perfectly asinine for the Senate of the United States to adopt a resolution of this kind. If we do, we will be the laughingstock of the world when we get to the peace conference. I say that without any reflection at all upon those who disagree with me.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have followed the debate, and I have been impressed with the fact that the debate has centered almost preponderantly on the necessity of having police after the war rather than a just and honorable peace. No one has discussed what is considered to be necessary in order to have peace after the war shall have ended and the peace treaty shall have been made. To me it seems important that the after-the-war policy shall not be to have police, but

to have such a treaty of peace that there can be peace in the world. An unjust treaty of peace would be absolutely inconsistent with permanent peace. Injustice and peace are incompatible terms; they cannot inhabit the same sphere, and I have been very much disappointed in the debate because emphasis has been placed upon police instead of on a just and honorable peace.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that the reason why that has not been discussed is that no one in the Senate expects that there will be a just and honorable peace. No one expects that Russia will not contend that she is entitled to half of Poland and Lithuania. No one contends that Russia is not going to have what she demands, and in my judgment the people of this country will not look upon that as a just and honorable peace. The Poles will not look upon it as a just and honorable peace, and certainly the Czechoslovaks and all the other conquered peoples are going to say, "This is not a just and honorable peace."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. One would almost think that men who advocate police power without discussing an outline of a just and honorable peace expect there will be no just and honorable peace, and therefore we will have an international army to jam the peace down the throats of those who are exploited all over the world by the great powers.

Mr. WHEELER. There are those, of course, who see no real difficulty, once America is fully committed to internationalism, in reaching a simple solution of the world's ills, even though the commitment is all one-sided.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to call the Senator's attention, and particularly the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], to a point in regard to the pending resolution which he seems to have overlooked. According to the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the resolution is very definitely a directive to the President under article 2 of the Constitution, whereby the Senate gives advice and consent. The Senator from Texas said:

> It is under this constitutional sanction that the Senate is asked by the passage of this resolution to express to the President the attitude of the Senate of the United States.

In the speech of the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] he stated:

> Whatever we write in a resolution is in the nature of authority to the President in his conduct of our foreign relations so far as the Senate can give it, and it is equally, in its definite terms, a limitation upon the President's freedom of action. And not only will it partake of the nature of a directive to the President, but it will as well inform other nations of what we expect of our representatives at the peace table.

On being questioned by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Maine replied:

> I think that the constitutional invitation which comes to us, and I assume that the resolution is in response to the constitutional suggestion, although I did say—and I think it is true—that the President has not asked us for advice. * * *
>
> Mr. HATCH. The Senator then said that the resolution was in the nature of a grant of authority, or advice to the President.
>
> Mr. WHITE. I assume the President will take notice of the resolution.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much. Of course, if it is in the nature of a grant to the President of the United States, it is exactly what the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] pointed out a few days ago. It will be held as in the nature of a grant and advice and consent prior to the signing of the treaty, and then the President can work out the treaty and promulgate it without ever sending it to the Senate.

As I was saying a moment ago, there are those who see no real difficulty, once America is fully committed to internationalism, to a simple solution of the world's ills even though the commitment is all one-sided.

In view of the facts previously stated, this notion seems wholly mistaken. The truth is that unless we can effect cooperation in war we are unlikely to get cooperation in peace. We are aware that there has been no cooperation between Russia and England in the Balkans, and that a gulf, to say the least, has existed between Washington and Moscow.

Now let us examine the question of cooperation we are getting in the war. In the Washington Star of April 20, Mr. David Lawrence had this to say:

> Nowhere in the world perhaps is there greater hope for a successful conference at Moscow between the foreign secretaries of the United States, Britain, and Russia than here in the National Capital.

I subscribe completely to that statement.

> For many months the position of America toward Russia has been gravely misrepresented, and the gulf between Moscow and Washington has been unfortunately widened by circumstances that should never be permitted to exist between partners in a major war.
>
> For some reasons not explained here the Russian Government has remained aloof from the United States. There has not been that frank and intimate interchange of information between the two governments that the American people would like to see prevail among allies. American military observers have long been denied an opportunity to see German troops in action against the Russians, and it was Admiral Standley, American Ambassador to Russia, who complained publicly that news of what America was supplying Russia by lease-lend was being withheld from the Russian people.

Yet it is said we have to go further and tell Russia and England and the other peoples of the world what we are willing to do, though Russia not only refuses even to let us use the Siberian bases, but she will not tell us how many troops are fighting against her on the eastern front.

Mr. Lawrence continued:

> A few days ago President Roosevelt had occasion to defend the Russian policy of neutrality as between the United Nations and Japan. He pointed out that Siberian bases could not be furnished now without involving Russia in war with Japan and that it was not to the advantage of the Allies to see Russia embroiled on two fronts.
>
> ALLIES BELITTLED
>
> This is a forthright defense of the Russian attitude, but no such frankness has come out of Russia with respect to the equally good reasons why there has been a delay in opening the so-called second front in western Europe. One would suspect from the officially controlled Russian press that the United Nations did not want to open a second front and that Russia had to appeal to the public opinion of the world to bring about that step.
>
> All this comment has been continued even after President Roosevelt announced in a public speech that the landings for the major invasions of Europe had been decided upon but that the time, of course, would not be prematurely announced. If Russia and Britain and the United States were intimate friends and trusted each other there would be in the hands of the Russian military staff today exact knowledge concerning Allied plans for the second front. Likewise, if there were an intimate exchange the Russians would be aware of the enormous damage being done to Nazi factories and production by American bombers.
>
> There has been instead in Russian quarters a tendency to belittle the Allied achievements in north Africa and the Mediterranean and to harp on the familiar theme that the Russians are fighting the war alone. This is not conducive to friendship or mutual understanding.
>
> Only a few days ago, moreover, American airmen abroad were quoted as wondering where the Russian Air Force was when the Americans were in need of support in their bombardment of Baltic ports. It is precisely points like these which produce embarrassments, and they never would arise if the Russian and Anglo-American commanders were permitted to have complete confidence in each other.

So much for Mr. David Lawrence. Certainly no one would accuse Mr. Lawrence of being an isolationist. Yet there are those in this body who, in spite of the situation he depicts, would commit this Nation to a policy so general as to mean anything.

All is not sweetness and light among our allies even in war. Anne O'Hare McCormick, who before we got into the war was one of the loudest to proclaim internationalism, tells us in the New York Times of October 20 of the disunity existing among the forces fighting the Axis:

> The foreign secretaries cannot be unaware that Europe is stirring as they talk. As the Russian armies push west and the Allied armies open the road to Rome we catch the first glimpses of the hidden tensions, open struggles, and new alinements that have been developing behind the curtain.
>
> Until recently the confused battle in Yugoslavia, for instance, went on unseen and dimly understood. But as the Italian garrisons dissolved in the Balkans and the Partisan forces of the general known as Tito, reinforced with arms and even men from the Italian Army, began to wage war on a serious scale it became apparent that Tito is leading a rebellion against General Mikhailovitch and the exiled Government of which he is a part. Inspired by Moscow in the first place, the Partisans have drawn into their ranks many desperate elements.
>
> Despite the efforts of King Peter to bring the fighting factions together, there is civil war in Yugoslavia. There is civil war in Greece, where three rival factions are organizing guerilla warfare against one another. There is civil war in Albania. As soon as the

lid is lifted there will be civil war in Rumania, in Hungary, in Bulgaria. All over Europe, in fact, the liberators, besides delivering nations from Nazi rule, are bound to liberate also the inner conflicts that were latent before the war started.

That article, Mr. President, should give a partial picture of what we will confront at the peace conference and the various conflicting views that will arise. Claims will be made by representatives of various factions that under the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter they should be the ones to be recognized. In face of all this, why should we, before we know all the facts, commit the United States in advance? No Senator and no other reasonable person would wish to sign an agreement or contract before he knew what its terms were to be. No one would wish simply to give a blank check. Again we learn from an article in the New York Sun of October 18 that there are wide differences between the United States and Russia. I read from the article:

And so we come to the question of Soviet Russia. That country speaks to the American people more clearly than the American Government speaks to its own people. In fact, when our President makes every effort to give the impression that differences of policy between this country and its allies do not exist, the Russians go to unusual trouble to make the differences clear to us.

Why should Pravda—official organ of the Soviet Government—publish a story and have it sent through the Moscow censors, to this effect:

"It should be known to everyone that the borders of the Soviet Union could no more serve as a subject of discussion than, for instance, the borders of the United States or the status of California."

These border discussions involve Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, the Rumanian frontier, and northern Persia. They may also affect the Dardanelles and ultimately must include both Turkestan and Mongolia. It is not possible to deprive Soviet Russia of all this territory if she decides to take all or any of it. Nor need we today settle these boundary problems. But to suggest that these areas are an integral part of Soviet Russia and that their status is identical with that of California is utterly dishonest. Certainly no part of Finland or Poland can, by any stretching of historical truth, be part of Soviet Russia, nor can the two northern provinces of Persia. Nor, as a matter of fact, can any of these areas.

We have then a situation of this nature: Russia says in effect that an entire range of public discussion is closed and settled and that if the United States and Great Britain do not like it, they will have to lump it—which is probably what they will have to do. But Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill have stated other terms in the Atlantic Charter, which says:

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial, or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The declaration by the United Nations dated Washington, January 1, 1942, which includes the signatures of Maxim Litvinov for Soviet Russia and Jan Ciechanowski for Poland subscribes to the Atlantic Charter but does not restate it. At any rate, none of these documents possesses the value of a treaty as none has been formally ratified. Therefore, legalistically and technically no country is bound by them even if treaties were binding. And besides, the old adage will hold good in this war as in all wars: To the victor belong the spoils.

And so there we are. The United States and Great Britain will not go to war with Soviet Russia over any of these countries, but no lasting peace can come to this world if Russia takes and holds them. Certainly Finland and Poland are dynamite, even if the other areas are so broken in spirit that they will submit to conquest. It is beginning to look as though Soviet Russia will expand her territory even beyond the wildest Czarist dreams.

And all that we can talk about, according to Pravda, is when and where the second front is to be. That obviously is not a task for Cordell Hull and Anthony Eden. It is the function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mr. Hull may find Moscow colder than he thinks.

Mr. President, have we not said before that we were willing to cooperate? Has not the President, in the Atlantic Charter, stated what we were willing to do so?

The Atlantic Charter is not simply the expression of a pious thought. It represents the hopes and aspirations of a great people, not only for themselves, but for all mankind. It forms the moral basis on which a better world must of necessity be founded. But the treatment this has already received from some of our allies is reminiscent of the treatment that was accorded Mr. Wilson's 14 points following the last war.

The fact is there has been a growing propaganda in this Nation by the internationalist press and others which is intended to convey the impression that the real cause of the present war lay in our failure to join the League of Nations and the rejection of Mr. Wilson's 14 points, and that, somehow or other, the people of this country were responsible for their rejection. Nothing could be farther from the truth. To all of us here present, it must be common knowledge that no sooner was the armistice signed than Messrs. Lloyd George and Clemenceau torpedoed Mr. Wilson's program.

Let me quote from the book Problems of Lasting Peace, by Messrs. Hoover and Gibson, at pages 90, 91, 104, and 105:

During the year before the armistice, Mr. Wilson had enumerated these aims in his 14 points and later extended them to 25 points in the subsequent addresses covering the basis of peace, which we give at the end of the chapter. The moral, economic, and military strength of the United States had swung the balance over to victory. The Allies, bled white by their efforts, had arrived at a stalemate. But for the United States, the Allies could not have attained victory. The American people never organized, cooperated, or sacrificed more efficiently in their national history, nor did their sons ever rise to greater heights of discipline and valor. Nor did American military leadership ever rise to greater heights than under General Pershing and Admirals Benson, Pratt, and Sims.

During the month of October 1918, upon Germany's request, Mr. Wilson negotiated the basis of the armistice on behalf of all the Allies. That basis was Germany's specific acceptance of the 14 points and the "subsequent addresses." But before closing the agreement with Germany, the President submitted the entire proposals to the Allied Powers and received their formal acceptance except for one point, the freedom of the seas.

With these ideas and ideals established, the war was won and the armistice signed. It provided for the complete surrender of the arms of Germany and her retreat into her own borders. A peace was to be negotiated later, and the armistice promised that food would be provided in the meantime.

After the armistice, the American peace argosy, with President Wilson on board, sailed from America, confident that victory had now brought the opportunity to build a new order of "freedom to mankind," "based upon the broad and universal principles of justice" in which "reason and justice and the common interest of mankind shall prevail," a "lasting peace"—not "a mere peace of shreds and patches," in which economic wrong, selfish nationality, imperialism, militarism, hate, revenge, and fear should be forever buried in the new order. * * *

Our European allies lived in a grimly practical world in which they believed the tried principles of old power diplomacy afforded the only way to deal adequately with the forces of economic nationalism, economic necessity, imperialism, age-old hates, punishment, revenge, and general disorder. * * *

To handle this new phenomenon from the western world, they summoned the skilled hands of the old diplomacy. Their representatives belonged to classes and schools which had been born to this profession. They practiced the art with skill that comes from centuries of inheritance and training. Their formulae were seasoned in the history of Europe. The shades of Machiavelli, Marlborough, Pitt, Castlereagh, Talleyrand were all about in their spiritual descendants. To them, this was simply another crisis and no crusade of idealists. They were not impressed—below the skin at least.

Does anyone think for one moment that the same thing will not happen when the present war is over?

Who says that history does not repeat itself? Already Mr. Churchill has denied the validity of the Atlantic Charter as binding on the British Government. It does not apply to India, it does not apply to Burma, it does not apply to the Dutch East Indies, it does not apply to Hong Kong.

Is there anyone here who thinks that Mr. Churchill represents anything else than the British Empire and the Tory class of the British Empire, just as Castlereagh represented it at the Congress of Vienna, and as Lloyd George represented it at the Peace Conference at Versailles? Is there anyone who believes that Stalin represents anyone or anything other than the interests of Soviet Russia? Is there anyone so naive as to believe that the "four freedoms" will not be thrown out the window, as were Mr. Wilson's 14 points, and that we shall again be called "Uncle Shylock," and told that we contributed nothing toward victory—as we were after the last war by almost every European nation?

Let us, then, before we make commitments find out whether the good intentions expressed by our allies during the war extend to the post-war period, or whether selfishness and greed and power politics are going to rule their actions at the coming peace conference, as they did at the last one.

As a sample of what we may expect, let me read excerpts from an article by Constantine Brown, appearing in the Washington Star of October 23:

> • • • The violent verbal lashing given the United States by the French Committee of National Liberation • • • has now subsided. • • • General de Gaulle and his administration are awaiting the results of the talks in the Soviet capital. Should a solid basis for a future understanding between America, Russia, and Britain be established we may look forward to a distinct improvement of the north African situation. On the other hand, if the results of the conference are negative further trouble can be expected. • • • De Gaulle is now in control of the armed forces. • • • Giraud is a mere figurehead. • • • The anti-American feelings of General de Gaulle have not changed. He continues to regard the Americans as selfish, uncouth, and greedy and does not attempt to conceal his views. The British do not stand much higher in his estimation. • • •

Again, I repeat, before we pass any such resolution as is here presented we ought, it seems to me, to know what are the aims of our allies. We should know what Russia's position is going to be. We should know what England's position is and is going to be. We should know where China stands.

Speaking of Russia's aims in Europe, there is an interesting article, in the October issue of the American Mercury, by David J. Dallin, a Russian. Let me quote:

> Consider the excitement churned up by the publication recently of a manifesto of a self-styled National Committee of Free Germany in Moscow. As astute an observer as Dorothy Thompson set it down as a sudden Russian gesture, saying, "Stalin has lost his patience and taken up the program we should have launched." Yet there is nothing in the manifesto not clearly outlined in previous statements from Soviet sources and by German exiles under Soviet influence. The manifesto of July 21 was little more than the expression of a policy for Germany long and openly prepared.
>
> The Kremlin has been no less outspoken on most other aspects of the European reshuffling. On February 23, 1942, Stalin listed Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia (which he had acquired during the life of the Berlin-Moscow pact) as "Soviet land." Thereafter his officials and newspapers specifically and repeatedly assumed that the line of June 22, 1941—the westernmost line on the day Hitler struck at the U. S. S. R.—represents the country's European border. Outright annexation of the Baltic countries, eastern Poland and portions of Finland and Rumania is thus indicated.
>
> Beyond this stretches a belt, from East Prussia to the Adriatic, populated chiefly by Slav peoples, which the Kremlin has no less candidly designated as its security sphere.
>
> Finally, there is the program for a resuscitated Germany without Hitler, militarily and industrially vigorous, but geared to the old Bismarckian principle of a Russo-German bloc as a counterweight to the West.
>
> There is little novelty in this general outline. Much of it follows accurately the claims advanced by the Czar's government in the First World War. And even more is a throwback to the program of Russo-German cooperation promoted by Lenin and after him by Stalin until it was interrupted by the Nazi regime • • •.
>
> Refusal to face these realities would amount to an admission that the picture is hopeless. Diagnosis is the first step toward cure. • • • The Kremlin is deeply pessimistic about the prospects of durable peace. • • • Where Americans and Britishers look for the war to end, Soviet leaders expect it merely to subside in greater or lesser measure. • • • Its long struggle with capitalist encirclement has made Russia what Americans call isolationist and Russia-first in temper.

The valor of the Russian people has, of course, given certain rights to the Soviet—but the boundary of those rights is the point beyond which injury would result to Russia's neighbors. What happens to Poland, then, may determine whether the peace conference is to insure the welfare of the world or merely to present a scene of disorder and intrigue—an ignoble contest for power at the expense of principles.

Are we now prepared to guarantee a peace which gives to Russia a far larger share of Poland than even Hitler had demanded for Germany? This resolution could be and will be interpreted by some to mean just that.

Dr. Dallin, whose analysis of Russia's policy I have heretofore referred to, says:

> London and Washington hope to prepare European nations for a free choice of governments after the liberation, but Russia favors revolutionary political action now, in advance of liberation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have obtained the impression that one of the things for which we are fighting, and one of the things for which the boys of American mothers are dying, is to liberate the peoples of various sections of the world upon whom Hitler has had his heel. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I had understood from the speeches made by President Roosevelt, from the so-called international press of the country, and from the speeches made by Mr. Churchill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I go further and say that the American people believe that one of the things for which they are fighting is the freedom of those peoples upon whose neck the yoke of nazi-ism has been placed. I gather that for this reason, which is directly in line with what the Senator is now saying: Yesterday the Washington Evening Star carried an editorial entitled "Czechoslovakian Brothers." The editorial congratulated the people of Czechoslovakia. I wish to read the first paragraph of the editorial:

> It was 25 years ago today that the National Committee at Prague proclaimed the independence of Czechoslovakia. The declaration brought to fulfillment the hopes of nationalists who for centuries had longed for freedom. It was made possible by the defeat of Austria and the collapse of Germany already taken for granted by the Czechs and the Slovaks if not by the western Allies.

I now read the last paragraph of the editorial:

> The Czechs and Slovaks are more than neighbors to Americans. In the ordeal of battle they are brothers, and when peace has been won and Czechoslovakia has been restored that sacred relation will continue.

I judge from the temper of that editorial that the American people believe that we are fighting and dying for the liberation of those people.

I wish to bring out one other matter in line with the Senator's remarks. Mr. William Philip Simms, who writes for the Washington Daily News, said on October 26:

> But if the American people get the impression that peoples and provinces are to be bartered from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were pawns in a game, they will rebel against any such peace, however strong a pledge the Senate may vote in advance.

I further get the impression that American mothers believe that one reason their sons are bleeding and dying is to liberate the unfortunate peoples of the world. On October 29, Mr. Constantine Brown, of the Evening Star, stated, in part, as follows:

> Russia has definite ideas about peace, the post-war world, and the reorganization of Europe

As the Senator has just stated.

The heading of the next paragraph in Mr. Brown's article is, "Cannot betray pledges"—impliedly meaning the United States and Great Britain—

> Various committees of the downtrodden European nations which have been formed in Moscow are regarded by the Soviet Government as their real representatives. Some of the governments in exile are viewed by the Soviet leaders as no longer representing the actual trends in their own country, and are mere figureheads of a world which no longer exists.
>
> The Moscow Government may be correct in its assumption. But the American and British Governments have pledged themselves to reestablish the sovereignty of these countries after the war is won. Until free elections have taken place in the liberated territories the acceptance of the Russian viewpoint would mean betraying our pledges. This the Washington administration cannot do.

If our ally Russia has in her mind—and I contend that we have a right to inquire as to what she has in her mind—demanding and actually taking Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, Bessarabia, and Rumania, what are we of the United States, and our ally across the sea, Great Britain, going to do about it?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, of course we are not going to be able to do anything about it; but if we adopt this resolution, there will be those who will contend, if Russia carries out her present claims, that that is a just and fair peace.

That will, of course, be the claim of Russia, just as it is now. If we say that we entered into an agreement with Russia then we will be told, "You have to back up Russia in her claim to this territory, and see that Russia is allowed to keep it." That is what will be said. But in my judgment, under such conditions the American people will say to the Senate of the United States, and in no unmistakable terms, "You should not have approved any peace treaty of that kind."

Let me also say that if Russia takes control of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, a part of Finland, and also takes the Bosporus, she will dominate

all of Europe with the possible exception of a few of the states such as Holland, Belgium, and possibly France. The chances are, however, that she will dominate France, and the chances also are that when the war is over Russia will dominate Europe, and communism will probably sweep the greater part of Europe. Let us make no mistake about it.

Someone said to me the other night, "Well, if she does dominate Europe it may mean for peace in Europe." It may mean for peace in Europe so far as the United States is concerned, but certainly Great Britain will not stand for it, and if Great Britain should go to war with Russia over Iran or Iraq we would again be told that we must be drawn into the war in order to save the British Empire, or to save civilization.

Continuing the quotation from Dr. Dallin:

We have always maintained that a strong Germany was the condition for a durable peace.

That is what Foreign Commissar Molotoff said on October 31, 1939.

I continue quoting from Dr. Dallin:

A German Communist Party broadcast from Moscow on July 21, 1941, a month after the Germans invaded the Soviet Union, still called for the restoration of the inviolable alliance between the German people and the U. S. S. R.

In a magazine article reporting his visit with Stalin (American magazine, December 1941), Harry Hopkins——

I am still quoting from Dr. Dallin—

made an observation which few people took the trouble to understand at the time.

Stalin, said Mr. Hopkins, directed his passionate hatred against Hitler, not against the German people—or the German general staff.

On November 6, 1942, Stalin repeated previous assurances in stronger terms:

It is not our aim to destroy all military force in Germany, the destruction of all German military force is inadvisable from the point of view of the victor.

This approach, obviously, is out of tune with speeches by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. It is out of tune with Anglo-American propaganda.

But the more dire the American threats against Germany culminating in the unconditional-surrender formula, the more outspoken have been Russia's counterproposals.

I am not criticizing Mr. Stalin. He is doing what he believes is best for Russia. Nor am I criticizing Mr. Churchill. He is doing what he believes is best for England. What I want to know is what do we propose to do for the United States of America. When we speak of the the United States and the protection of her interests, we are immediately accused by many in this country of something almost akin to treason against the country.

Are we going back to Russia in her demands for a large slice of Poland, the Bosporus, the Balkans, and the Baltic States? If so, we are going to give her practical control over Europe. And are we then going to join an international organization to maintain the status quo thus erected—in other words, insure her control over Europe? Will that be best for the United States? Again I say this resolution can be and will be construed by many—certainly by Russia—to mean just that and nothing else.

In his radio address on June 23, 1941, the day following the attack by Hitler on Russia, Mr. Churchill had the following to say about communism:

The Nazi regime is indistinguishable from the worst features of communism. It is devoid of all theme and principle except appetite and racial domination. It excels in all forms of human weaknesses, in the efficiency of its cruelty and ferocious aggression. No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have for the last 25 years. I will unsay no words that I have spoken about it.

I will repeat that last sentence.

I will unsay no words that I have spoken about it.

Was there ever a stronger statement denouncing a government than that made by Mr. Churchill? Yet, today we are asked to sign a blank check and say to the President of the United States, "You may work out the details and you may enter into an alliance with Great Britain and Russia," and we are asked to say to him, "If you think it is a just peace which gives to Russia half of Poland, a piece of Finland, and a piece of Estonia, you may enter into it." And then we are asked to say to him, "Because you have carried out the consent and advice which was given to you by the Senate of the United States, you do not have to bring the treaty back to be passed upon by the Senate."

In a statement by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, at a press conference on the same day, June 23, 1941, he said:

This Government has often stated, and in many of his public statements the President has declared, that the United States maintains that freedom to worship God as their consciences dictate is the great and fundamental right of all peoples. This right has been denied to their peoples by both the Nazi and the Soviet Governments. To the people of the United States this and other principles and doctrines of communistic dictatorship are as intolerable and as alien to their own beliefs as are the principles and doctrines of Nazi dictatorship. Neither kind of imposed overlordship can have or will have any support or any sway in the mode of life or in the system of government of the American people.

I repeat:

Neither kind of imposed overlordship can have or will have any support or any sway in the mode of life or in the system of government of the American people.

Mr. President, are we going to enter into an agreement which says to Russia, "You may have the overlordship of Poland, you may have the overlordship of Finland, you may have the overlordship of Estonia, and Latvia, and all of Europe"?

Can it be that today Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt are willing to turn over the destinies of Europe to the Russian dictator? Is that what Senators wish to do?

I am told by some that the Russian domination of Europe will make for permanent peace. If it would prevent our being drawn into the bloody conflicts of Europe every 20 years, that would be something. But the question is, Would it?

The American people want neither fascism, communism, nor nazi-ism. They want to see Europe settle its own problems by democratic processes. What we ought to be working for in this country is to free Europe from domination by Germany, domination by Russia, domination by England, or domination by any other great power. We ought to be working for some form of an organization in Europe so that Europe will curb itself, police itself, and deal out justice for all of its many contending races.

It is my humble opinion that in order to have peace there must of necessity be established an economic union of Europe, followed, I hope, by a federation of European states. Without this there can be no lasting peace in Europe or in the world.

We went to war with the passage of lend-lease to save western civilization from its own destruction. Western civilization is what Mr. Churchill was talking about, and the saving of western civilization is what all the proponents of lend-lease and all the proponents of our becoming involved in war had in mind. Are we now going to make a three-power pact placing the people of Europe under another tyranny which will of necessity ultimately destroy that civilization, or are we going to make a peace that will strengthen and maintain it?

This must be our first and great decision. On it will depend the future of America and the well-being of the world. For unless we intend to perpetuate that civilization there can be no hope for a just and lasting peace and a better world to come.

Mr. President, I desire to read from the Progressive of the issue of October 18 a statement with which I agree. It is as follows:

For Progressives, the path ahead is clearly marked:

1. We must fight every effort to commit the United States to police and enforce a treaty which has not been written.

2. We must resist every effort to make the peace treaty a vehicle for the restoration of pre-war dynasties, imperialisms, and inequalities.

3. We must work affirmatively for world cooperation if there can be world agreement on peace terms consistent with our principles of political and economic democracy.

4. We must put our own economic house in order and make our own democracy a model for all mankind before embarking on any global assignment to reform the rest of the world.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in pursuance of what the distinguished and able Senator from Montana has just said, and with particular reference to the hope and the aspiration of the Baltic

countries, I wish to read into the record one paragraph from a little booklet entitled "What Latvia Wishes From This War":

To our understanding the peoples of Europe, also of eastern Europe, will not submit to Bolshevik rule or preponderance. Only the restitution of the frontiers of Europe before the occupation of Austria by Germany presents a real solution to the post-war situation in Europe, which has to be conditioned by a complete disarmament of Germany and the actual neutralization of the Kiel Canal in order to make the Baltic free again. The Baltic States as the natural guardians of the freedom of the Baltic Sea must also be reestablished. Their independence is necessary equilibrium in northern Europe, much as is independence of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. In the same way Poland's independence is the condition of an equilibrium in central Europe. Poland should have restored to her the Polish inhabited territories of East Prussia on the Vistula estuary and southwest Prussia.

Mr. President, in pursuance of the very able argument presented by the distinguished Senator from Montana, I ask that two newspaper articles relative to the core of his subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

FRONTIER AIMS OF RUSSIANS ARE DISCLOSED

(By P. E. Briquet)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, October 26.—Objectives of Soviet foreign policy have been disclosed indirectly by the Russian press, thus stirring up widespread misgivings among the best informed of non-German observers over the results of the Moscow conference.

The Russians "are not willing to discuss our own boundaries," according to Pravda, Communist party organ, on the eve of the conference on October 13.

TERRITORY CLAIM INDICATED

This indicated that Russia claims not only all territory annexed up to 1941 including the Baltic States, eastern Poland, Romanian Bessarabia and Finland's western Karelia, but that she refuses to parley over her other European boundaries.

On October 17 Izvestia, official organ of the supreme council of the Soviets, stressed that "the fact of the small nations is a much less interesting problem and should be tackled much later."

The Stockholm newspaper, Dagens Nyheter, has disclosed that the Russians still claim bases in Finland today as they did in 1939, while the Tribune de Genève added a link in an editorial in which it commented on the recent statement by a Russian spokesman that "the Kremlin now enjoys a unique opportunity to reintegrate the whole of Poland withyin Slavism."

SLAVISM DEFINED

What Slavism actually means is clearly defined, the article went on, as "internal alinement with the Soviet system."

Moscow's treatment of the German problem is significant. The Courrier de Genève stated: "The Kremlin is much more favorable to Germany than to other eastern states." The newspaper stressed that Stalin's order of the day of June 11, 1942, declared that he "did not want the destruction of the German nation" and induced General Von Seydlitz' support for the Moscow inspired "Free German Committee."

Russia's conditions to Germany are far more favorable than are the Allied terms. They are: Leave Austria, Alsace-Lorraine and East Prussia to form a new German state, which is nearly tantamount to the present greater Germany.

MAY ACT SOON

Similar advantages are offered Bulgaria at the expense of Romania and Greece, Russia's aim is the eventual enlistment of Germany and her satellites to exert pressure against the British and Americans at this or another conference.

Stalin's plan, according to the best informed of neutral observers, consists of an act by which he will now carefully and outwardly accept temporarily American and British suggestions that do not encroach upon Russia's 1941 boundaries.

At the same time he would prepare the basis for sweeping action on the Continent after the war when the United States and Britain have withdrawn their forces from Europe. It is even possible that he might act in the near future before the British and Americans have at their disposal adequate forces with which to take advantage of a German collapse.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 27, 1943]

INDIA FREEDOM RALLY ASKS USE OF UNITED STATES PRESTIGE

American, Chinese, and Indian leaders of a freedom-for-India movement warned last night that the United Nations no longer can ignore India's right to independence lest they play into the hands of Japanese propagandists, weaken the Allied war effort, and sow the seeds of another war.

They said the deadlock between the British Government and Indian leaders must be ended to clarify the independence issue in accordance with principles of the Atlantic Charter and called upon the United States to exert its influence on Britain.

WARN OF MOCKERY

This is necessary, they said, if the Atlantic Charter is not to be a mockery; if the United States is not to become the laughingstock of 1,000,000,000 Asiatics, and if India is to put her full weight in the war against the Axis, particularly Japan. They said the issue cannot be sidetracked indefinitely.

They spoke at a rally sponsored by the National Committee for India's Freedom and included Dr. Syud Hossain, chairman; Dr. Y. C. Wei of United China Relief; Upton Close, historian and radio commentator; Dr. Anup Singh, editor of India Today; and Sirdar J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America.

OTHER OBJECTIVES

They also—

1. Called on Britain to make a "clear and unambiguous concession of independence" to India in keeping with the enlightened example of the United States in dealing with the Philippines.

2. Said such a concession would "enormously enhance the morale of India, make her war effort a hundredfold more effective, and spike the guns of Japanese propaganda."

3. Warned that India is becoming ripe for revolution—for bloodshed on vast scale—in her desire to win freedom and said that this "tragedy can be averted, but no one is acting to avert it."

4. Said India and China have had enough of foreign exploitation, and that they "must clasp hands again" because they cannot allow their destiny "to be determined by other people."

5. Charged that "lack of foresight, lethargy, inaction, and inefficiency on the part of the British Government in India" is responsible for widespread famine in India.

Mr. BUSHFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator begins his remarks, will he yield to me for a moment? I desire to make a brief comment upon the address of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have listened to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], as usual, with the deepest interest. He always presents a courageous point of view which comes from the depths of his heart. The thing that impressed me about his address is the same thing that has constantly been creeping into this debate for several days, namely, the apparent fear that when the Senate gives advice under the Constitution it has in some fashion also given advance consent to what may happen if the advice is followed.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] made it very clear the other day that, so far as he is concerned, when he supports this general statement of objectives he is emphatically declining to be bound to any subsequent particularization which does not suit him. I desire to make it perfectly plan, so far as I am concerned, that advice and consent under the Constitution are two totally different operations; that they are unrelated in their obligations. Furthermore, I want to make it plain that when I am subscribing to advice in respect to a general objective I am not at any time to be considered to have given consent to some interpretation of that objective which subsequently I do not approve.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the very learned Senator from Michigan if, in his judgment, there is anything in the resolution which has been reported that would authorize the President or anyone else to make a treaty without the consent of the Senate, as provided by the Constitution? I should like to have the Senator make that statement as strong as he knows how.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is absolutely and totally nothing in the resolution which, in my opinion—and I am confident in the unanimous opinion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—authorizes any treaty or any treaty commitment without the due constitutional process which the resolution itself textually asserts must be followed before the final commitment is made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy the Senator has made the statement he has just made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me a further word—I apologize to him for this intrusion, but I think it is important that this point should be made plain—the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has presented some very early precedents in the life of the Republic which would indicate that once upon a time advice was construed subsequently as advance consent. I

have just asserted, and I want to assert again, that, in my opinion, advice and consent are two totally different operations; and I want to assert again that, in my opinion, when the Senate advises under the resolution reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee it has consented in advance to nothing by way of implementing the advice. The advice is simply the definition of an objective and an aspiration.

I now desire to ask the able Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whether, in his view, I am not correct in that interpretation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Michigan and to other Senators, Mr. President, that in the remarks which I made opening the debate I undertook to make the point very clear that the present Senate should not undertake to commit any future Senator who may be here at the time the treaty of peace may be submitted. I quite agree that there is nothing in the resolution which we propose which undertakes to ratify in advance any kind of a treaty.

Let me say, while I am on my feet, with the permission of the distinguished Senator who has the floor, that, of course, advice and consent are two different things. If they had not been, those words would not have been used in the Constitution by the framers. The committee on style which approved the Constitution, combed over the whole text with meticulous care, and they used the best and the simplest language. If they had not thought consent and advice were two separate things, they would have used but one word. Of course, they are two separate processes. We advise, and then, if we agree, later on we consent.

Commenting on the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, I quite readily agree that if the Senate now or at any time should set forth in a resolution specific terms, and quote the exact language of a treaty, and say to the President, "You are authorized to negotiate this treaty," that would be consent, and consent in advance. The Senate could, however, withdraw the consent up to the time of the completion of the treaty by the President. At any time during the negotiations the Senate could reconsider and cancel the consent. But that is the only instance in which the Senate could agree in advance.

In our action we make a studious effort not to undertake to do that very thing. We are not authorizing anything. The resolution is an expression of opinion and attitude of mind, and every Senator who follows us will be free, when a definitive treaty shall come before the Senate, to vote and voice his convictions as he then entertains them.

If I have not made my position clear, I hope some Senator will interrogate me further. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his indulgence.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Eastland	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, we have before us Senate Resolution 192 adopted after careful, lengthy, and complete consideration by the distinguished and able Committee on Foreign Relations.

I desire to speak for a few moments upon that resolution and pending amendments. On September 7, 1943, at Mackinac Island a group of distinguished and able American public officials stated in forthright language an American policy for this war and after. In that statement it was said:

> First, a prosecution of the war by United Nations to conclusive victory over all our enemies.
>
> Second, responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organizations among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

For the first time during this war a definite forward-looking policy of action was placed before the American people for consideration. That policy has been well and completely restated by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

For nearly a year schemes, plans, and blueprints for the future world have flowed across my desk in a seemingly endless stream. These contributions come from all parts of the country. Many of the ideas submitted contain sound suggestions. For that reason, I read them all. If Americans are willing to write me their views upon the war and post-war activities, I hold it a part of my job, as a United States Senator, to read them. This expression of the people's opinion upon public matters is a healthy sign. I hope that nothing will ever occur to curtail it.

Some of these contributions propose to remake the world. Some of them go to the other extreme and insist that we do nothing. In my opinion, we will do neither. The solution is somewhere in between these two extremes.

In every manuscript that comes to my desk, and in every argument one hears over the air or reads in American publications, is the thought that we cannot permit war to recur every few years and that any scheme which will end war is worth considering. With this idea all Americans agree and Congress stands ready to consider and study every worthwhile proposal.

In this study, however, we must endeavor to reach a decision through our intellects rather than our emotions. We are today under an extraordinary emotional strain. Under the stress of these emotions, we become a fertile field for the sowing of unsound ideas—ideas which, upon being thought through, are not always what they seem.

Our most serious danger at present lies in the fact that no one speaks out plainly for America. I maintain that our first and most important job in this body is to protect America, and to that end I propose to direct my remarks today.

Russia has not felt the necessity of publishing its war or peace plans; neither has Great Britain, nor any of our allies. But here in America—as it should be in a people's government—general discussion has been had and it now seems advisable for the Senate to state our war aims. The resolution now pending is the result of this wide discussion. Does this resolution state those aims and does it protect America?

Despite many proposals to the contrary, there is no evidence that our people have any desire to abandon their traditional American form of government or our way of life. By that yardstick we must measure our course, and by it we must determine the effect of this proposal upon America.

Ever since the beginning of time men have dreamed of a permanent peace—a way of life which would insure them and their families freedom of movement—freedom from fear. The desire for that security was the cause of men joining together to form tribes and, later, nations. As man increased his ability for offensive battle, it became necessary for larger and larger units to form for self-defense. Occasionally, in history, as the reel unrolled, some outstanding leader overrode all opposition and became master of the world. Alexander the Great conquered the world of his day before he was 35 years of age by using the Macedonian phalanx.

Caesar's Roman legions were unbeatable and he became master of the world in his day.

Napoleon rode roughshod across the continent of Europe by a superior knowledge and use of artillery.

Today we have a counterpart of Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon in the person of Adolf Hitler. His offensive is mechanized warfare.

Because of man's desire to prevent such recurrences of conquest and bloodshed, thinking people of many generations have suggested the possibility of a

world government in the hope of outlawing war. Tennyson proposed a parliament of man two generations before the advent of the airplane.

Today we are again in a world conflict, the most tragic, the most all consuming of any struggle since the beginning of time. Naturally, our thoughts and hopes turn to some plan that will prevent its recurrence.

History is replete with wrecks of such plans. We have tried several of them during the last 50 years. Today a world government with a president or a king and a parliament supported by a world police force is suggested.

Under it, control of money, banking, food and all necessities of life would follow. Farm land would be allocated by this supergovernment under a world-wide triple-A. The amount of grain, the number of acres, and the kind of crops to be raised by each country would be determined by the world government. Our raw materials would be placed in a common stock pile to be distributed as the world government dictates. A system of international airports, controlled by the superstate, would be established. An army, a fleet of planes, and a navy would be maintained by this superstate.

The inevitable result of such surrender of national sovereignty would be that speech, religion, and freedom would be controlled by the supergovernment.

Whoever succeeds in ascending the throne of this world empire will, by the usual steps of progression and dictation, become master of the world. He will have realized the ambition of Alexander, of Caesar, of Napoleon, and of Hitler, without fighting a single battle and without the loss of a single man.

This is a much simpler plan than war, and far more effective—for the dictator.

We Americans are a mixture of many racial strains, fused together by the common ideal of liberty and free enterprise. Certain national characteristics, social beliefs and ideals, which differ from those of other nations, have been developed in us. Our people are distinctly American, just as the people of Great Britain are distinctly English. Legislation will not fuse these varying and conflicting characteristics, nor change them. There was a time when we talked proudly of the melting pot in America. We now realize it was a mistake, and we have wisely called a halt on undesirable immigrants who once poured across our borders. From the American viewpoint it is neither possible nor desirable that there be a fusion of the nationalities of the world.

Like a silver thread, however, the desire for freedom runs through all humanity. For 5,000 years man has been fighting for freedom of the individual. Our progress has been slow at times. Occasionally, we have lost in a year or two all we gained in a century; but after every setback, after each seeming gain by tyranny, individual liberty has slowly, but inexorably, pressed forward and upward to new heights.

On this virgin continent, free from the hatreds and jealousies and class consciousness of Europe, our ancestors determined for the first time in history to set up a people's government. They built a new nation with a new form of government in which they declared that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

For 150 years our people have been fashioning a nation upon the framework of a constitution, the like of which had never been seen before. In that brief century and a half we have progressed further toward liberty and individual opportunity than has been accomplished by all other nations of the world combined, in all recorded time; and we have done it because under our form of government we are free to work, to accumulate, to initiate, to possess, without interference from the Government.

Because we have enjoyed them so long without challenge, the right of free speech, religion, press, and assembly have seemed to many to be natural rights, but they are rights granted us under the Constitution. They will continue to exist for us only so long as the American people insist upon maintaining them. Constant vigilance and determination are the price of liberty. Human freedom is not a flesh and blood creation. It has no life of its own, no heart, no lungs, no soul, no body. It is an abstract thing that requires the bone and sinew and heart and will of a people to maintain it. That will comes from the desire for freedom. Our incentive in America is the knowledge that the fruits of our labor belong to us. If we ever destroy that incentive by surrendering our sovereignty to some form of superpower, liberty in America is dead. For the purpose of discussion, let us pursue the idea of one world.

A world government or superstate, if we are true to our assertions that the people rule, will have to be a representative government. A small group of leaders cannot arbitrarily assume that power, nor can they decide who will constitute this world government, or what its powers are to be. The people of the participating nations must of necessity decide these questions.

If then, we create such a government, made up of representatives chosen by the people of the participating nations, those people must have the power to select the members of this world government to represent their respective nations. China has a population of 400,000,000 people. Russia has about 200,000,000. The British Commonwealth has about 500,000,000, and the United States of America has 130,000,000. If the members of the parliament of this world government are to be chosen on a representative basis, how would America fare?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is talking about a one-world, superstate government, as I understand him.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me inquire who in the United States Senate is advocating that?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There are in America a number of persons who are advocating it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate now has under consideration the so-called Connally resolution, and Senators are discussing it. I am wondering what a statement with reference to a world government has to do with the resolution now pending before the Senate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It has to do with the very things to which the resolution relates, namely, the "four freedoms," and things such as those.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my sole purpose is to seek information. Let me inquire whether the Senator believes there is in the pending resolution known as the Connally resolution anything which would lead to a world state.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If it is applied throughout to its ultimate conclusion it is bound to lead to a world state.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me inquire whether the Senator from South Dakota is for or against the pending resolution.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I will tell the Senator before I conclude.

Mr. President, obviously we would be greatly outnumbered. Russia, China, and Great Britain would have the larger number of delegates or members of parliament by reason of their larger population. They, or some combination of them, would control this new world government. They would, likewise, control the world parliament and make the laws, and would in the end control the selection of the world president.

Those who advocate a superstate contend that these larger nations would have to be limited in their representation. If so, we would then have to abandon the pattern of representative government for which we stand. If there are limitations upon these larger nations, who will prescribe and enforce such limitations? A poker player holding four aces or a royal flush is not going to permit the holder of two pair to change the rules of the game. Nor will we be permitted to change the rules in this international poker game. America would be in the minority in any such combination. We would simply be outvoted.

We must not forget that Winston Churchill has already made clear his position. He said:

> I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

Russia has the largest army in the world today. For a thousand years Russians have dreamed of a warm-water seaport. Peter the Great endeavored to establish one upon the Baltic Sea, but that sea is frozen most of the year. Suppose Russia demands a strip of territory leading down to the Mediterranean or some other warm-water sea. Suppose she demands territorial gains along her western boundary. Are we going to say

to Russia that she cannot have the seaport or this territory? Are we going to dictate to her the number of planes or ships or soldiers she shall have? And if we do, who is going to enforce that order?

Are we going to dictate to China, with three times as many people, the part she can play in this superstate?

Are we going to decree that the British Commonwealth of Nations relinquish their claims to India, Egypt, Malaya, or any other territorial holdings? We, the smallest of the four Allies, with a world parliament loaded against us, would be helpless. Certainly we have no desire for American boys to be thrown into a continuous warfare to enforce such orders. America would be helpless. We will furnish the men and carry the burden of the decrees of this superstate, but it will pass the laws and dictate the policies. It will control the army. It will control the planes, the air bases, and the navy, and the United States, being the richest Nation of the world, will be expected to pay the bills.

The president of this new superstate would eventually be the dictator of the world. Adolf Hitler would love that sort of world control. Just as long as human nature remains as it is other men in other generations will endeavor to satisfy their ambition for world leadership in this new world government, but the United States will be nothing more than a participating state.

I doubt whether America will ever consent to enter such a compact. The risk to us is too great, the possibility of complete loss too intense. But even though we would not favor such a course, is there a path we can follow which will not lead us to destruction and will insure reasonable permanency of peace? How can we bring about cooperation among nations which will reduce the probability of recurring war? Woodrow Wilson tried it with the League of Nations and failed, not because there was anything wrong with his plan, but because of the ambitions, selfishness, and covetousness of the leaders of Europe. Even though he failed, we are bound to try again. I have faith that there are men in America with ability and courage who can, if given the opportunity, sit down at the peace table, and with the record of that failure before them as a guide, plus the knowledge of the productive capacity and wealth of our Nation, force a peace treaty that will eliminate most of the causes of war. Have we the courage to demand the kind of a peace conference in which we will be for America first? Have we the fortitude to demand that kind of a treaty? Dare our conferees brutally and frankly designate the terms upon which we will deal, remembering all the while that we hold the cards and practically all the chips in this coming international poker game—chips represented by matériel, money, goods, and productive capacity? Will Congress, possessing the veto power as it does, insist upon the right to participate in the selection of the right kind of men to represent us at the peace conference?

The tremendous importance of America's future requires constant vigilance by Congress lest we be committed by means of secret conferences before we know anything about it. If ever in our national life secret diplomacy should be banned, it is now.

Open covenants openly arrived at were demanded by Woodrow Wilson at Versailles. Smarter men than he at world diplomacy defeated him. Let us hope that his unfortunate experience be not repeated this time by failure to make public to Congress and the people every step contemplated before it is taken. With that kind of cooperation, and the right men as delegates to the peace conference, we cannot fail.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] has raised the most significant point brought out in this debate when he inquires whether or not the Senate can ratify a treaty before it is made.

I call the attention of Senators to the second paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution. It provides—

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties.

Nothing in the Constitution instructs us as to whether that advice shall be given before or after making of the treaty. The Legal Division of the State Department has already indicated the course of the executive branch of this Government. They hald that this advice and consent may be given before the making of the treaty, as is clearly shown in the memorandum of the Solicitor for the Department of State.

Senate Resolution 192 standing alone asks us to direct the President to make whatever treaty he sees fit without further advice or consent of the Senate to accomplish the things stated in the resolution.

In the third paragraph of the resolution the President is instructed to establish and maintain international authority. There is no designation as to what kind of authority. It may be an alliance. It may be an association of nations such as now exists for the prosecution of the war. It may be a world state or a world empire with a president and parliament and all the implications which such a course would involve.

Unless qualified by this body, Senate Resolution 192 would permit just that. As the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] so pointedly stated in his very able address upon this resolution, "The Senate must regard itself as morally bound by its advice."

I sincerely believe that every Member of this body is in favor of cooperation and association among the peace-loving nations for the preservation of future peace.

The addition of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] would give us the complete protection which many Senators feel should be given. Before this Nation is committed to a course of action, unknown at the present moment, the chart of that proposed course must be submitted to this body for confirmation.

There are not many Senators, I feel sure, who would be willing to place the power to declare war and conscript boys of America for world service in the hands of some superstate located in and controlled by other nations of this world. Therefore, I urgently urge that Senate Resolution 192 be amended by the incorporation in its terms of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS]. With it included in the resolution, I feel that nearly every Senator can support it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator from Michigan in response to a question propounded by some other Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Eastland	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know that nothing I shall say this afternoon will change the opinion of any Senator on Senate Resolution 192. I feel that each and every Senator has made up his mind as to how he will vote on the resolution. I shall vote for the resolution, and I shall do so with the best of intentions, but, because my vote will be cast for it, I do not want any one to labor under the impression that I, at least, am giving my consent to the treaty that may be brought here in the future. I shall decide how I will vote on the peace treaty at the time it is presented to this body and not before; but I feel that the Senate can, with justification, make its position known as to the objectives of the peace.

Mr. President, to me, Senate Resolution 192 is so simple and clear that anyone can understand it. In my humble opinion, it contains the objective for the making of the peace so far as the United States is concerned.

I feel that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has done a marvelous piece of work, and that the committee has not evaded its duties or its responsibilities to the Nation.

The first paragraph of the resolution reads:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

Is there anything dubious about that? No matter how illiterate a person may be, surely that language is understandable. It is the solemn purpose of Americans to wage war until victory is achieved, regardless of the front, or of the help received from others.

The second paragraph reads:

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

Certainly there is nothing vague about that language, and the people of the United States, I am positive, are favorable to that provision of the resolution.

The last clause reads:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Would any Senator amend that with technical language and high-sounding phrases so as to confuse the people of the United States?

As far as I am concerned, and, I believe, as far as the people of the United States are concerned, that language is most appealing:

Acting through its constitutional processes.

I ask in all sincerity, Who would want it different? And let there be no mistake, only in that way, and in that manner, will the Senate act, or will the people of the country approve of any treaty irrespective of the desires and ambitions of others.

What will the United States do in "acting through its constitutional processes"? It will "join with free and sovereign nations." Does anyone here, or do the people of the United States, want to join with any other class of nation?

As for myself, I want to join with free and sovereign nations. I want to join with China, because I feel that its objective is to be a free and sovereign nation. It is needless to tell the American people about China, of its patience and suffering, of its misery and loss of life, of its starvation and agony, of the moral courage of its people who dared to resist an aggressor when Japan attacked, and long before we were engaged in war. We know only too well the answers to the pleadings of Secretary of State Stimson from other nations which should have been interested. We know what China has gone through and what she is going through now. We recognize the fine morale of the Chinese people.

Hence, I am certainly willing to join with such a free and sovereign nation as China. Let us only hope that at any time and at any place when and where post-war problems shall be discussed by those who represent America they will ever have in mind the welfare of and the desire for justice to the Chinese people, and this irrespective of the colonizing desires of commercial governments which do not abide by the political philosophy of our country, a philosophy which is sustained by our political, social, and economic progress.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this country can join with China in any effort "to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," as provided in Senate Resolution 192.

Another nation which I believe we could join under the provisions of the resolution, because it is a free and sovereign nation, is Greece, the Greece which desired so much to be free and sovereign, and which dared to resist aggression. The Greeks desired only peace, and to be allowed to follow their way of life, and to live their allotted time as a free people. Greece very easily could have submitted to the power of might, as did Rumania and Bulgaria, but loved freedom so much, and possessed such high moral courage, that she defied both Germany and Italy.

Yes, Mr. President, I would join with Greece, and the resolution makes it clear that we can join with China and Greece or with any other free and sovereign nation.

In order that there be no misunderstanding, allow me to say that in dealing with the winning of the war, it is my considered opinion that the people of Greece are anxious to cooperate with us and our allies in order to bring about those conditions which are necessary for a complete victory by the Allied Powers, and the unconditional surrender of the Axis forces. But I feel that nothing must be done, or should be done, by the Allied forces which would indicate that we, of America, are willing to take in and suddenly become friendly with those Axis Powers responsible for the horrible suffering, misery, and death, brought to Greece, and which almost destroyed civilization.

It is only fitting and proper that combinations be made with any force or power which might bring about the weakening of the enemy; but because we do that, on the strategic demands of the moment, there is no reason to forget good morals, and justice. We should forever hold to account those who are responsible for the destruction of life and property in a free and sovereign nation.

The action proposed by Senate Resolution 192 is:

That the United States acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations—

For what purpose?—

in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

To me, Mr. President, the steps proposed in this instance are simple and readily understandable. If we had joined with free and sovereign nations, or if other so-called free and sovereign nations had joined with us, when Secretary Stimson pleaded for China, we would have saved many lives in this war.

Because the resolution contains all the commitments which should be made by the Senate of the United States at this time, because it represents, in my opinion, the sentiment of the people of the United States, I am for it. I would not change one word of it. I would not go beyond its purports and objectives, and, let me add, the Lord only knows whether even this simple resolution of sincere objectives will fit the desires of some other countries.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire to comment very briefly on the address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] this morning. He dwelt at considerable length on the reported territorial claims of the Russian Government, and expressed his own conviction that the people and the Government of the United States would never underwrite a peace in the writing of which great slices of territory changed sovereignty.

I agree with the Senator in that conclusion. I think that Americans generally recognize that Russia perhaps does have some legitimate claims for boundary revision, for instance, access to a warm-water port, but I do not believe the American people or the American Congress will ever abandon the definite policy we have had of not recognizing sovereignty over a territory seized by force. I think that will be our attitude toward Russia, and also toward Great Britain, if some elements in Britain have ambitions to increase their colonial domain. I think that we in America must recognize that if we take that position we cannot then consistently ourselves grab bases and territory all over the world.

The Senator from Montana dwelt at length on the fact that we do not know what the peace aims of our two great allies, Russia and Britain are, and that therefore we ourselves should not speak up. I think he overlooks some of the statements of both Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Minister Eden, when they announced the broad British objectives, and that he also overlooks the record of Russia in the League of Nations in support of collective security, when it was perhaps too late to avert the war in Europe, then already in the stages of preparation.

In my opinion, there are two reasons why the Senate of the United States should express, as clearly as it can—and there is a division of opinion here as to how clearly and how specifically we should state our objectives—what we believe should be the objectives of the foreign policy of the United States. The Senator from Montana overlooked those two reasons. One of them is that the United States Government alone among the Big Four—China, Russia, Britain, and the United States—and we recognize that any lasting peace must stem from agreement of those four powers—the United States Government alone has, so to speak, a split personality in foreign relations. Our Executive cannot commit this Nation to a course of action in the international field without the consent

of two-thirds of the United States Senate. In some way this democracy of ours must find a method of keeping that provision in our Constitution from hamstringing and weakening our foreign policy. I think it is clear from the report made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] yesterday that we and our Nation's interests do suffer today because there is not a clear-cut agreement between the executive and the legislative branches with respect to what should be the objectives of our foreign policy.

The second reason, which ties in with the first, and makes, I believe, a good case for a declaration of purposes by the Senate, is the fact that the great powers engaged in the war are not going to wait until the end of the war to determine their basic post-war foreign policy. If there is a chance of setting up a collective-security system, there must be some agreement to that effect before the shooting stops. Russia is not going to wait until the end of the war to decide what her policy will be, and neither is Britain. Because of the split personality of the American Government in the foreign-relations field, the governments of our allies cannot be sure whether we can commit our Government to a collective-security system unless there is an expression by the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I desire to read to the Senate a letter addressed to me from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, dated October 28, 1943. I believe all Senators received a similar letter. It reads:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D. C., October 28, 1943.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Executive Board of the C. I. O. unanimously adopted the attached resolution at its meeting of October 28. I am taking this opportunity to call the resolution to your attention and to suggest that you give it careful consideration in the light of the grave decisions which are yours.

It is possible to win the war and lose the peace. It is possible for us to repeat the mistakes which led to World War No. 2. Those of us who are interested in the welfare of our country and who are desirious that the lives of our sons and brothers are not sacrificed in vain have a responsibility to them and to our Nation. Let us meet that responsibility, and plan now for the organization of a world based on law and not force.

Sincerely,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President.

The resolution adopted by the C. I. O. executive board on October 28, 1943, is as follows:

Whereas (1) the United States Senate is expected to choose tomorrow between the vague Connally resolution on international cooperation and the more positive amendment introduced by Senator PEPPER;

(2) International machinery to settle disputes between nations, to prevent the use of force is essential for the maintenance of peace;

(3) After the last war the refusal of the United States Senate to cooperate in the League of Nations helped pave the way for the present war;

(4) The United States should allay the fears of other nations that we may, through isolationist policies, weaken efforts at international cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) the C. I. O. is as deeply concerned with the establishment of a lasting peace as with winning this war;

(2) We believe the United States Senate should adopt the stronger statement embodied in the Pepper amendment and agreed to by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, HILL and others;

(3) We urge our members and other forward-looking Americans to inform Congress immediately of their support of the Pepper amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In view of the letter which the Senator from Minnesota has just read, I desire to read into the RECORD a telegram received by me this morning, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
October 29, 1943.

Senator HATCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Post-War Commission of American Federation of Teachers, an affiliate of American Federation of Labor, endorses efforts the Senators who are seeking strengthen and clarify the resolution on foreign policy. We should make clear and definite our readiness to cooperate in an international authority designed to resist aggression and promote security.

JOHN L. CHILDS, *Chairman.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], proposing to add a new section after line 9.

Does the Senator from Texas desire recognition?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not desire the floor, Mr. President. I desire a vote on the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Wallgren
Eastland	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on the March of Time program on October 28, relative to Senate Resolution 192.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What more can be asked than the pending resolution which declares that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved. There can be no quarrel with that pronouncement.

Second, that the United States should cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace. There can be no complaint against that objective.

Third, that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. There should be no quarrel or complaint against that provision. The words "international authority" authorize the use of existing peace agencies, such as the World Court, the Hague Tribunal, and the League of Nations, if practicable, and the creation of any other international organization that may prove necessary.

An authority "with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world" possesses all forms of authority, mental, moral, or military. If mental or moral force cannot preserve the peace, military and naval power can be employed.

The resolution does not particularize the exact terms of a treaty which may be formulated. It is merely the framework or broad authorization within which the treaty makers may set up the particular powers and limitations which they may incorporate in the treaty.

What more can be asked? Secretary Hull at Moscow needs this resolution and needs it now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Under the precedents of the Senate, does a Senate resolution have legislative effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the question to be, Under the precedents of the Senate, does a resolution of the kind now pending before the Senate have legislative effect?

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair the answer is "No."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Is such a resolution, if adopted, binding upon a succeeding Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, the answer is the same as the answer to the previous question—"Absolutely no."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Does a Senate resolution, if adopted, have a greater effect than to reflect the views of the largest number of Senators agreeing thereto, who are present and voting for it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that is not a parliamentary inquiry; neither were the two preceding questions parliamentary inquiries. They both involve legal questions, and are not properly parliamentary questions to be decided by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is certainly late with the point of order so far as the first two questions are concerned. With respect to the last question, the Chair will overrule the point of order and permit the Senator from Connecticut again to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, does a Senate resolution, if adopted, have greater effect than to reflect the views of the largest number of Senators agreeing thereto, who are present and voting for it?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the ruling of the Chair would have no binding effect whatever upon the Senate, nor would it have any effect upon the legal question involved. It is clearly a legal question. As I pointed out, the legal adviser of the State Department has said that if we pass a general resolution and the President makes a treaty in accordance with that general resolution, it does not have to be submitted again to the Senate. That may not be the correct rule, but nevertheless that is the ruling of the Solicitor for the State Department; and he will be the one who will advise the State Department, and I presume he will advise the President. After he has made that ruling, and the President has proclaimed it, I do not know what the Senate can do about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that under the universal practice a resolution of this kind is not binding on anyone. It is merely a statement of the opinion of the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in response to the comment of the Senator from Montana, let me say that with very considerable diligence I made inquiry into the Senate precedents with reference to the status and effect of a Senate resolution of this character. I have taken the matter up with the parliamentarian of the Senate and with others in a position to give me the benefit of their advice and experience. I have been informed—and I think reliably—by the parliamentarian himself that he has made a search of the precedents at my request. I respectfully ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a definition of the effect of a Senate resolution, as prepared for me by the Senate parliamentarian.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does not the Senator intend to read it, or have it read?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. I ask that the memorandum be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the memorandum.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Under the uniform practice of this body, Senate (or simple) resolutions are used in dealing with nonlegislative matters exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Senate, such as expressing opinions or facts, creating and appointing committees of the body, calling on departments for information, reports, etc. They have no legal effect, their passage being attested only by the Secretary of the Senate, and require no action by the House of Representatives. Containing no legislative provisions, they are not presented to the President of the United States for his approval, as in the case of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to express my very real gratitude for the expert advice and assistance rendered to me, in this behalf, by Mr. Watkins, our parliamentarian.

Above all, Mr. President, it seems to me that we should approach the question before the Senate in the light of the exposé contained in the colloquy between the present occupant of the chair and the Senator from Connecticut, and the definition of the effect of a Senate resolution as revealed by a search of the precedents of this body.

About the 14th of October I picked up the Washington Post and discovered, at the bottom of page 14 or 15, or somewhere far back in the newspaper, an item entitled "Finland Will Boost Payments to United States by $42,000 a year." I read the item:

FINLAND WILL BOOST PAYMENTS TO UNITED STATES BY $42,000 A YEAR

Finland agreed yesterday to increase its war-debt payments to this country by more than $42,000 a year for 20 years in order to overtake a 2-year lapse caused by the Russo-Finnish War.

An agreement announced jointly by Finnish Minister Hjalmar J. Procope and Under Secretary of the Treasury Daniel W. Bell said the payments would be made semiannually, June 15 and December 15.

Those are the dates for Finland's regular debt payments, resumed last June with a check for $168,945.56. First payment under yesterday's agreement, however, will not fall due until June 1945.

Finland, only country still making war-debt payments, still owes the United States about $9,000,000.

Mr. President, it is not difficult for most of us to recall, in the not too distant past, when that item would have been on the front page of the Washington Post and every other newspaper in the United States, in type two inches high. I recall having had the pleasure of attending a Gridiron Club dinner back in December of 1939, when the Finnish Minister, Mr. Procope, to whom the news item refers, made his appearance as a guest of the Gridiron Club. To a man, the hundreds of men from all over the United States who were present at that Gridiron dinner arose as one, and with acclaim greeted him, out of recognition, Mr. President, of the stand Finland had taken in November and December 1939, notably; and the persons there present looked upon Mr. Procope as a symbol of Finland then fighting for her life.

I recall that the Senate convened in January 1940, and the news items of our daily press were replete with accounts of the facts with reference to our shipping of supplies to Russia. We were told that there were not wharfage facilities at Vladivostok sufficient to accommodate the tankers which were being sent from the United States to that port, that all the railroad facilities from Vladivostok across Siberia were overladen with the burden of wartime implements and the materials necessary for the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and the other implements of war.

I remember that here in the Senate only a few short weeks previously there had been thoroughly debated the effect, upon our conduct of American affairs, of the Neutrality Act which had been lauded so highly throughout the country as a piece of domestic legislation which was to constitute a guide for the American people and for the American Nation in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

When, Mr. President, I saw and heard those things as of that day, I came into the Senate on the 16th of January, 1940, and submitted a resolution. It was in the nature of a concurrent resolution. The resolution called upon the United States, as had been provided in the Neutrality Act, to issue a proclamation of neutrality, that our country might be guided in accordance with the speech of the President of the United States to this body, meeting in joint session on September 21, 1939, and otherwise as the law provided.

I obtained the floor, I recall, at approximately 5 minutes after 12. The Senate had but shortly before convened. When I read from my desk the resolution in which I called upon our country to act in accordance with its own law—well, Mr. President, through some vigilant, alert, and acute representative of the interests of the majority at the time—the identity of the exact person being to me unknown—the White House was notified of the pendency of the resolution. In about 2 hours we saw the doors to the Senate Chamber open, and the Presiding Officer said to whoever had the floor at the time, "Will the Senator suspend while the Senate receives a message from the President of the United States?" Then we heard read a message from the President of the United States, dated January 16, 1940. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 360.

In that message the President of the United States said:

There is without doubt in the United States a great desire for some action to assist Finland to finance the purchase of agricultural surpluses and manufactured products, not including implements of war. There is at the same time undoubted opposition to the creation of precedents which might lead to large credits to nations in Europe, either belligerents or neutrals. No one desires a return to such a status.

The facts in regard to Finland are just as fully in the possession of every Member of the Congress as they are in the executive branch of the Government. There is no hidden information; and the matter of credits to that Republic is wholly within the jurisdiction of the Congress.

This Government will have early occasion to consider a number of applications for loans to citizens and small countries abroad; especially in Scandinavia and South America. That raises the question for the determination of the Congress as to whether my recommendation made to the Congress some months ago, for enlarging the revolving fund in a relatively small sum, for relatively small loans, should be considered. It goes without saying that if the applications for loans can be acted upon favorably by the Congress, this matter will be kept within the realm of our neutrality laws and our neutrality policies.

An extension of credit at this time does not in any way constitute or threaten any so-called involvement in European wars. That much can be taken for granted.

It seems to me that the most reasonable approach would be action by the Congress authorizing an increase in the revolving credit fund of the Export-Import Bank and authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase loans and securities from the Export-Import Bank to enable it to finance exportation of agricul*ural surpluses and manufactured products, not including implements of war.

At that point I suspend my quotation of the President's message.

Within a few short weeks, Mr. President, the facts disclosed that, instead of our being given a bill to consider aid to Finland and loans to Finland, we, in fact, were being asked to enlarge the borrowing ..uthority of the Export-Import Bank. It further developed that in connection with that plea which recognized the attitude of the American people toward giving aid to Finland—which, incidentally, Mr. President, it will be noted, was to be the beneficiary of agricultural surpluses—in the Banking and Currency Committee during the hearings on the bill to enlarge the borrowing authority of the Export-Import Bank, we found that weeks before—on December 13, 1939, to be exact—Mr. Jesse Jones had already made available to the Republic of Finland the sum of $10,000,000, through the facilities of the Export-Import Bank; and as of the date of that message, and as of the date when we were acting in the Banking and Currency Committee, with reference to a bill to enlarge the borrowing power of the Export-Import Bank, Finland already had had a $10,000,000 loan, and Finland had drawn up to the date of the hearings, approximately $800,000 of the $10,000,000.

Finland did not want Idaho potatoes. She was not looking for apples from Oregon, or tomatoes from New Jersey or Delaware. She wanted arms, ammunition, and other implements of war. And, Mr. President, our exports via Vladivostok of the matériel of war to Russia had become so great—I will refresh the recollection of Senators in case their minds may have permitted the fact to escape—that Mr. Louis Johnson, as Assistant or Acting Secretary of War, and Mr. Charles Edison, now Governor of New Jersey, joined in a statement in the spring of 1940 calling upon the United States not to export more tin or more rubber to Russia, on the ground, said they in their joint statement, that reserve stocks of those so critical commodities were being reduced at such a rate that there was less than 6 weeks' supply of those critical materials in this country at that time, and they were going to Russia.

Mr. President, at or about that time, and taking cognizance of the view to which the President adverted, that there was abroad in this country such deep, underlying sympathy and sentiment for Finland, the late distinguished Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, on February 8, submitted a resolution which I shall read. It was Senate Resolution 234:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Securities and Exchange Commission should provide for and expedite the registration of any bonds, securities, or other obligations issued by the Republic of Finland or any of its political subdivisions, upon application made to such Commission for such purpose by the Republic of Finland, or by any representative committee of citizens of the United States hereafter organized and duly authorized to act on behalf of the Republic of Finland for the purpose of obtaining funds through the sale of such bonds, securities, or other obligations.

It was the sense of the Senate, Mr. President, for, as I recall, the resolution was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 70 to 3. We were perfectly willing to adopt a resolution that did not bind any Senator, that did not bind the Senate, that did not bind any succeeding Senate, and to go through the duplicity of representing to the American people that we were extending aid to Finland, when the fact was that neither then nor since has the Republic of Finland ever filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission for registration of its securities, and it had never filed an application through any representative committee or otherwise to obtain funds through the sale of its bonds, securities, or obligations.

Mr. President, that is the sort of inane vacuity that is involved in the pending Senate resolution. With esolutions tested against the fact and found completely wanting, but finding overwhelming majorities of 70 to 3, representing what the President called "without doubt in the United States a great desire for some action to assist Finland," in that case, to act otherwise in the pending case, it seems reasonable, does it not, Mr. President, that we make some inquiry as to the nature and scope of the action we are being asked to take. If, in the light of that action and in the light of whatever commitment may be made—whatever legal effect the word "commitment" may have—we are to express some majority sentiment, at the very least we ought to know what sentiment we are expressing, what possible effect the sentiment so expressed can have, and what will be the effect upon the people of the United States in their international dealings.

We might, Mr. President, in an attempt to make at least a preliminary analysis of the questions posed, ask ourselves, What will the President of the United States say we have told him he may do? He is going to read Senate Resolution 192, and he is going to say, "Well, I see the Senate has resolved—that is, at least, a majority of the Senate—and expressed the sentiment and declared the purpose 'that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.'"

I cannot believe, Mr. President, that there is a citizen of the United States who does not feel that very properly the war against all our enemies should be waged until complete victory is achieved; but how will we know when we have achieved that complete victory? Does it mean, Mr. President, that, if some other of our comrades in arms should achieve victory over one of the nations in one of the wars in which we are engaged, we no longer are to pursue our declaration of purpose; or will we be satisfied that since one of our comrades in arms, let us say, has achieved a complete victory, that will suffice? Will it meet the test of the declaration of sentiment of Senators who support the resolution? We might, of course, in such a circumstance devote our attention for the time being thereafter to the other war in which we are engaged and prosecute it with due diligence until complete victory be achieved.

The President is going to read that the Senators say:

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

Who are our comrades in arms? Are they those nations that are actually engaged and actually ranged alongside of us in physical combat with the enemy? Are we to limit the definition of comrades in arms who are to join with and cooperate with us in securing a just and honorable peace to include Italy, which, I am informed, and I believe reliably, is said to have the status of a cobelligerent, as well as Great Britain and Russia and China? Are we, Mr. President, going to exclude all the South American countries that have ranged themselves alongside us? Will we ask Sweden and Spain and Portugal to join in an agreement for a peace which they, too, shall deem to be just and honorable and in the maintenance of which they, too, will agree to be bound?

Mr. President, the President of the United States will go on and read:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the peace of the world that we are to preserve under this declaration is, I take it, to be the just and honorable peace which our comrades in arms will cooperate in securing. It is entirely possible that the peace to which our actual comrades in arms—actually fighting in physical combat against the enemy—may agree will contain terms and conditions and stipulations which will not meet the approval of the nations of the world other than those who,

becoming signatories to an agreement for peace, are willing to terminate active participation further in the war through the cooperation for which the Senate would declare.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that when Great Britain and France made their agreement with Poland they agreed to protect Poland from aggression, not only as against Germany but as against any other country. So let us assume, for instance, that Russia should want to take a part of Poland, and the Poles should resist such action; under the agreement which has been entered into between Poland and France and Great Britain, then Great Britain would be compelled to go to war with Russia, if Russia took a part of the territory of Poland. What would we do about that? Certainly England would be compelled to go to war with Russia if the Poles resisted.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that such questions as those raised by me earlier and that posed by him now led me to the belief that the President of the United States, if he were to reflect our will, ought to have from us an expression of what we really mean in this resolution. With that thought in mind, and with some care, I prepared and proposed an amendment, which is now the pending question. In it I sought to define the term "peace"; I sought to define the term "just" as meaning righteous or equitable in effect; and the term "honorable" as directed to a proper end, for if there be an agreement for a peace arrived at among our comrades in arms, it follows that at any such peace talk, and before an agreement be reached, the question raised by the Senator from Montana would have to be disposed of, under my definition, to the complete accord of all parties signatory, or there would not be any agreement for peace. That is why the resolution, in the language stated, as reported by the committee, will give rise to the question raised by the Senator from Montana; but if amended to reflect the essentialities for an agreement for a peace under terms as defined in my amendment, it, in my judgment, would find a complete answer to any such question.

Let me make that the more emphatic by suggesting that if the comrades in arms actually be contriving an agreement for peace in which they find themselves in complete accord, they will have, under this resolution, cooperated with us in securing or bringing about that agreement for a peace, which peace is one designed to result in a state of tranquillity to be enjoyed by political society, marked internally within the several nations by the good order which prevails among their peoples, and externally by a good understanding with all other nations. Such an agreement shall include provisions: First, that no signatory nation shall seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise; second, that no territorial changes shall be permitted which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the distinguished Senator about to discuss in some detail the numbered provisions which he is now mentioning seriatim?

Mr. DANAHER. It had been my hope that ultimately I would do so, but for the present I was devoting myself solely to the question raised by the able Senator from Montana, who had sought very definitely, as I understood him, to point out the serious omission, even in our thinking, of the use of the term "peace" in the resolution, unless it be defined.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I had it in mind to address a few inquiries to the Senator on those numbered provisions, but I wish to do it at a more appropriate time, when the Senator reaches the point when he is expanding on them.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. I resume by remarking that if we have an agreement for peace which is founded upon the predicates thus stated, and so far mentioned by me, including, further "(3) that all peoples shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they shall live, particularly to the end that self-government may be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived thereof," we will be doing no more than the President and Mr. Churchill have already said they intend to accomplish, within the objectives stated ir the Atlantic Charter. Moreover, such an agreement for peace would mean that our comrades in arms agree with us "that they will grant to all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished, access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

At that very point I break off the reading to call to mind the case of Italy at this very minute. Assume that, without further loss of life and without further conflict, we could indeed invest Italy to its northernmost boundary. We would find on our hands a country roughly the size of California, with a population of 48,000,000, with little disparity, both as to size of territory or as to the numbers of the peoples, between that and the British Isles; a people who have inadequate territory on which, through agricultural development, to sustain themselves. Through the war they have lost Eritrea, however they gained it. Through the war they have lost Libya, however they gained it. Their commerce is off the seas, their shipping is in our control.

What, in the light of what all of us would like to see done, would Senators say we should do with reference to the people of Italy and their continued sustenance? To whose markets would we give them, as an industrial nation, access? Would we let their industrial commodities come into our country? Would we demand that they meet the requirements of the Wages and Hours Act, the Walsh-Healy Act, the Minimum Wage Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the social security and unemployment compensation, and that the cost thereof might be added to their products, to the end that they may compete fairly in our markets? Are we willing to do that? Should we not inquire whether Great Britain is willing that Italy take over any part of her markets, and, if so, for what commodities and on what terms?

Unless we are going to declare to our President as a matter of advice that, if he later shall seek an accord from us, he must reflect what we are willing to do, then, Mr. President, in the absence of definition, he will go to any meeting in which he might undertake to rely upon the resolution as offered, without limitation, without authority, without definition, of the point of view of the Senate and the degree to which we were willing that the people of the United States should be bound.

There is one further fact which we must not omit from our thinking. If the amendment which I have offered shall be rejected, anyone in the State Department or in the office of the President of the United States attempting to construe the resolution is going to find that the Senate has rejected the definitions of the very terms and the very bases upon which the President's and our negotiations might or should proceed. Do we want that?

If the President were to offer to his comrades in arms, in return for concessions from them of an economic nature to all the peoples of the world, the fact that the Senate has said that the Senate, speaking through the majority voting for it, will permit the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, to "join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority," and so forth, he most assuredly is going to be met, it would seem to me, by any negotiator among the comrades in arms, with the statement, "Mr. President of the United States, you are making us no concession, you are not granting us anything. The Senate has already told you what you are to do and the terms and the limitations within which you are to act."

But if, Mr. President, we mean by "peace" an agreement to include some of the nations which have been overrun and which we ultimately hope to have freed from the Nazi yoke, then there is a basis on which he can act and with appropriate authority.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Connecticut in what respect the provisions of his amendment differ from the principles enunciated by the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. DANAHER. In very scant degree. In fact clauses 1, 2, and 3, are almost word for word taken from the Atlantic

Charter, as I recall. I do not have the Atlantic Charter before me. The substance of clause 4 and the substance of clause 5 also are drawn from the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Connecticut anticipate that the advocates of international cooperation will object to the provisions of the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Vermont in this way, that if the Senate rejects the amendment which I have offered, and the resolution should pass unamended, who in the State Department thereafter will be in position to say, "By this we meant to include the provisions of the Atlantic Charter"? That cannot be said, because if the Senate rejects my amendment that definition no longer is available.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that rejection of his amendment would be a demonstration of inconsistency on the part of those who advocate genuine international cooperation.

Mr. DANAHER. I think what I had earlier suggested constitutes a present reply to the Senator's concluding observation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. What impact does this language have on the question of the United States securing for itself the necessary air and sea bases for its own protection after the war?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if the amendment, as I suggested, be agreed to, there will be no limitation whatever upon our achieving sea or any other type of bases in foreign countries in the post-war period for the simple reason that the word "peace" means an agreement for peace, and an agreement obviously is predicated upon a meeting of the minds and a mutuality of understanding, and consequently Britain can very properly say the same thing to us, that we can say to her, which is, "We are willing that you use our bases A, B, C, and D, in return for the United States being given the permission to use bases E, F, G, and H."

Mr. LODGE. The Senator would not think, would he, that the language on page 2 of his amendment, beginning in line 8, clause (1), and running through line 9 and the first part of line 10 could be construed as in any way preventing us from getting the necessary smaller areas?

Mr. DANAHER. Not in any way whatever, for the simple reason that an accord would have to be arrived at before any such bases could be allocated to us, and I do not understand that necessarily we would be obliged to have either title to the bases, or jurisdiction over them, or, as has been said, sovereignty. Not a bit of it. We would have the right to use them on whatever basis and whatever terms we make the subject of our agreement.

Mr. President, I notice that various Senators who have preceded me at one time or another have talked about our lack of collaboration and our failure to cooperate, that we are not among the collaborators, and as the result that some degree of opprobrium is attached to the people of the United States and the American Nation with respect to the responsibilities for the pending war. We have all heard that sort of thing. We have heard it right in this Chamber. It has certainly been said all over the United States, over the air, and has appeared in the news and magazine articles and otherwise. It seems to me appropriate that I quote briefly to the Senate from a well-known author in dealing with this particular subject:

In May 1935 Herr Hitler, having already outstripped Great Britain in the air, repudiated the clauses of the Versailles Treaty which limited the size of the German Army to 100,000 long-service soldiers, and instituted universal compulsory military service. The ministers of Great Britain, France, and Italy met at Stresa and discussed common action to prevent the further one-sided denunciation of treaties. The Council of the League of Nations was invited to protest, and did so by formal resolution. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald yielded the Premiership to Mr. Baldwin, and Sir Samuel Hoare succeeded Sir John Simon as Foreign Secretary. On June 18 the Anglo-German naval agreement was signed which liberated Germany from the naval stipulations of Versailles. This had the effect of condoning the breach of the military clauses and was thus inconsistent with the action newly taken by Great Britain both at the Stresa conference and at Geneva. All attempt to bring collective pressure upon Germany to prevent her rearmament was abandoned, and when, later in the year, a quarrel developed between Great Britain and Italy over the invasion of Abyssinia, the so-called Stresa front was dissolved and the foundation of the Berlin-Rome Axis laid.

In November Mr. Baldwin appealed to the country upon the policy of sanctions against Italy in order to compel Signor Mussolini to relinquish his Abyssinian campaign. The result of the general election confirmed Mr. Baldwin in power by an overwhelming majority.

On March 7, 1936, Herr Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland, denouncing the treaties of Versailles and Locarno, but indicating that the occupation was purely symbolic. No steps were taken by the parties to the treaty of Locarno to join in requiring the military evacuation of the Rhineland; nor was any attempt made to secure that it should not be fortified. The very great dangers resulting from the German occupation and fortification of the Rhineland were partially realized; and Mr. Eden, who had succeeded Sir Samuel Hoare as Foreign Secretary, announced to Parliament that staff conversations with France would begin in order if necessary to carry out British obligations under the Treaty of Locarno. This step constituted in principle a military alliance between Great Britain and France; but for a long time very little was done to implement it. It is at this point that the story in these pages begins.

Mr. President, I have read the foreword of a volume compiled by one of the best-known English writers, Mr. Winston Churchill, when he published his book entitled "Step by Step," covering his essays on British foreign policy from 1936 to 1939, inclusive, out of which Mr. Winston Churchill emerged to the point where Great Britain, in June of 1940, after Dunkerque, turned to him who had seen all along what could have been done. But Britain did not do it. And, incidentally, the British people "changed horses in the middle of the stream," to borrow an American expression. They though it advisable to turn to Mr. Churchill and make him Premier of Great Britain at that critical moment in their history, in the midst of a war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. Churchill fails to state that at Stresa, MacDonald and the representative of France gave Mussolini to understand that he could proceed to take Ethiopia. That contract lasted until political trouble arose in England through agitation in the liberal newspapers and by the Liberal Party, which made Hoare change his position, because an election was coming. That situation was well known at the time and was generally publicized. So then it was announced that sanctions would be invoked, but I understand history to show that the policy of sanctions was not carried through. The Premier of France at that time accused the Prime Minister of Britain of having double-crossed him in connection with the Stresa agreement they had entered into with Mussolini.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. The Anglo-German naval agreement, signed on June 18, 1935, having already permitted Germany to build up her Navy to 35 percent of its former strength, Britain and France, not to mention other countries involved in the Locarno pact could have moved when Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland, could they not? They could have moved when the Ruhr was reoccupied and the Treaty of Versailles was denounced? But they did not. What I should like to know from the Senator from Minnesota, who has followed these events with such great diligence for so many years, is: Wherein as of that period was the United States under any obligation whatever to collaborate with those nations who had it within their power to act, but did not?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I may also add that after the incident to which I referred took place, the Secretary of State for Belgium announced the withdrawal of Belgium from the Locarno agreement, saying that he could not trust the safety of his nation to that agreement and preferred to have Belgium withdraw from it.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Many things have been said here, Mr. President, which suggest, as I see it, that the pending resolution should be amended, that as it has come from the Committee on Foreign Affairs it is utterly unreliable, that it can mean all things to all people. We can go before the country again, as we did in expressing the sense of the Senate that we were going to the aid of Finland—to revert to my opening comments—and can say that we are in favor of international post-war collaboration, that we are in favor of joining with certain nations, to the exclusion of others, in favor, Mr. President, of the creation of one balance-of-power

authority, to the exclusion of all others. In this very Senate all week long there have been sharp disagreements and there has been serious debate among earnest Senators who find themselves in complete disagreement as to the meaning and intendment of the language of the resolution as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the light of what we know is here happening, Mr. President, how can we say that we are giving the President advice, or how can we say that we are responding to the will of the American people—to do what? That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Along the same line as that of the expression the Senator has just made, let me point out that a number of Senators have said, "I am going to vote for this resolution, but I am going to state what my conclusion regarding it is, and the reasons why I shall vote for it." In other words, they are going to put on it the interpretation they wish to put on it, and they are going to state what it means to them. Another Senator says, "I am going to state the interpretation I place upon it." So if anything happens, he can come back, and can say, "That is not the interpretation I placed on the resolution."

Mr. President, why should the Senate agree to a resolution on which a great many Senators place different interpretations?

Mr. DANAHER. Because, Mr. President, just as the President told us when we were voting for a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with reference to Finland, "There is without doubt in the United States a great desire for some action," we can tell all the people, "You wanted us to do it, so we did it." That is why. A Senator can be very popular if he finds that, in fact, the sentiment of the people of the United States is in favor of a resolution that they do not know anything about, that they have not read, that they could not interpret if they did read, and that the Senators here have not understood. So, Mr. President, it is easy to go on record in favor of the resolution in the form it came from the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The present situation is exactly like that which Mr. Churchill described in his speech to the British people. He said he could get "cheap cheers and glowing leading articles" in the newspapers if he made certain promises, but that he felt they should wait until the outcome, so that England could peer through the mists of the future before committing itself to a program of post-war affairs.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is interesting that the Senator from Montana should turn to that point, because when the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] concluded the other day, I asked him if the subcommittee in drafting the resolution or the full committee in considering it had given any attention to the pronouncements of Mr. Churchill in that respect; and he answered me that they had not. I asked if the expressions of Mr. Churchill on that point had come to the attention of the committee. He said, "No."

Mr. President, I shall now read from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A1366, where we find Mr. Churchill's speech to Parliament—a speech he made the previous day, as I recall. I shall read one paragraph in particular. Mr. Churchill was giving Parliament advice. It was not a case of Parliament giving Mr. Churchill advice. He said:

> First of all, we must beware of attempts to overpersuade or even to coerce His Majesty's Government to bind themselves or their unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee and which may be years ahead, to impose great new expenditures on the state without any relation to the circumstances which might prevail at that time, and to make them pledge themselves to particular schemes without relation to other extremely important aspects of our post-war needs.

Mr. Eden went before Parliament less than a month ago and reiterated the very same principles.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, of course, when Mr. Churchill made that address he was not directing to the British Parliament the statement about coercion. That statement, as it seems to me, was being directed to the Government of the United States, so that we would not try to coerce them into some kind of an agreement in advance.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator to say that I had never drawn that particular conclusion from it, but in view of the ambiguities of language I can understand how the Senator from Montana could so conclude.

Mr. WHEELER. For instance, Mr. President, Mr. Churchill said that the British Government must not be coerced. Certainly he would not have been saying that the Parliament was attempting to coerce the British Government into such a position. He was talking then about someone else who was endeavoring to coerce them into a position which they would not take. Then he went on to say, in the same speech that, of course, he could have the acclaim and the "cheap cheers and glowing leading articles" in newspapers if he wanted to have them, but of course they should wait until "the mists of the future" cleared and until they could see what would happen; and then he said that the time to do that was when Hitler and Mussolini were defeated.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. As I recall the circumstances under which that speech was made, it probably was directed at the clamor for a second front which existed in England, in the United States, and in Russia.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I think it was directed entirely to that. I think the Senator is correct. It was directed to the clamor in the United States, the clamor in Russia, and to some extent the clamor in England, among certain groups—among the Communists in England. In my judgment Mr. Churchill has never been for a second front across the Channel; but the clamor for it has to a large extent come from Russia and likewise from the United States.

I think it is generally recognized that our people and our Government have been much more in favor of a second front across the Channel than Mr. Churchill has been. Mr. Churchill has never, according to my understanding, been particularly in favor of a second front across the Channel. On the contrary, he took us down to north Africa, and wanted to go across the desert and up into that portion of the world, so as to get in back of the Germans, and in between Germany and Russia.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I shall respectfully call attention to the colloquy between my respected colleagues, and I shall say that both of them have completely misinterpreted my reading of the quotation from Mr. Churchill's speech. I see now that I must have read too rapidly. There is no second front involved in the quotation. There is no reference whatever to any second front. Mr. Churchill was talking about schemes of international nature which would have post-war or long-time effects which the people of the sitting government could not then possibly foresee. Lest there be any doubt about the statement, I shall reread it:

> First of all, we must beware of attempts to overpersuade or even to coerce His Majesty's Government to bind themselves or their unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee and which may be years ahead, to impose great new expenditures on the state without any relation to the circumstances which might prevail at that time, and to make them pledge themselves to particular schemes without relation to other extremely important aspects of our post-war needs.

Mr. President, clearly he is talking about schemes to commit the present government in Great Britain to One World, to Union Now, or to projects of that character, all of which are being urged as vehemently in Great Britain as they are here.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. Just a moment. We are all familiar with the fact that there is in this country a United Nations committee. It has propagandized up and down the Nation, with full-page newspaper advertisements, and has sent a company of touring Senators and Representatives all over the United States to argue for the cause, which it has a perfect right to do, and I am willing that it shall do it. But we cannot ignore the fact, or blind ourselves to its existence, when we are considering the subject at a time such as this.

Incidentally, while I am on the point, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the other day he said that there seems to be great acclaim for this sort of thing without telling us what "this sort of thing" is. He pointed to the American Legion convention, and meet-

ings of other organizations of that character which have gone on record in favor of some form of international collaboration.

I wish to point out that no one is going up and down the United States telling the American people what the commitments are, what the liabilities are, or how many million men we shall have to maintain in this "international authority with power." No one is telling us whether or not in 2 more years, with a national debt at $300,000,000,000, the American people will be able to tax themselves even enough to pay the carrying charge on it, much less all the other economic obligations involved in the post-war derangement. No one is telling the American people about that. If they had the other side of this question presented to them, I rather fancy that even now a different viewpoint would be expressed here and there.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to correct what I said a moment ago. I think the Senator is entirely accurate. I read that portion of Mr. Churchill's address this morning as a part of my speech, and I made the statement to which the Senator has referred. I was temporarily misled by the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota. Mr. Churchill was clearly speaking, not of present commitments, not of something which the British Government should do, but with reference to future commitments of a post-war character.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to compliment the Senator. Certain Members of the Senate have been denounced because of the fact that they believe we should look after the interests of America first. They have not gone out over the country and met the arguments of some of those who have been telling the American people what we should do about post-war affairs. If we had done so, we would have been accused of trying to stir up disunity in the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] was on his feet a few moments ago. I yield first to him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator has long passed the point about which I rose to interrogate him. He said something—I am not quite sure what it was—about Union Now, and perhaps world government. Immediately thereafter he referred to certain Senators having toured the country this summer. I hope the Senator did not mean to imply that those of us who made speeches throughout the country were advocating Union Now, world government, or anything of that sort.

Mr. DANAHER. I most assuredly absolve the Senator from New Mexico and his comrades in arms from any such involvement. I never thought he was in it.

Mr. HATCH. I wished the Senator to be clear about that. He said that no one has been putting before the people the other side of the question. I am afraid the Senator has not read the newspapers. I am afraid he has not listened to the radio. I recall quite well the very eloquent debate between the Senator from Minnesota and Mr. John Flynn on the Town Hall program one night, in which all sides of the question were explored. Other debates have been held in various places in the country. When the Senator says that the other side has not been presented, he is not being quite fair.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I must confess that I did not hear the Senator from Minnesota debate with Mr. Flynn on the Town Hall program. I did not know that he had debated. Certainly to the extent to which my attention is called to any inaccuracies, I gladly retract. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. However, I want him to know—and he will surely concede—that there is no great organization with unlimited funds, such as the United Nations Association, which changed its name from the League of Nations Association, going up and down the country, sending Senators and Representatives all over, and paying their expenses, hiring halls, time on the radio, and all that sort of thing, and making it possible for the other side of the question to be presented. Certainly no one has such access to the American people in terms of free public debate, so far as available finances make it possible.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, I will say to him that I know of organizations which have been financed, and which have been sending speakers throughout the Nation, not for months, but for years.

Mr. DANAHER. Let us not talk about years. I agree with the Senator that before the war there was a great deal of activity of that kind. I am talking about the post-Pearl Harbor period. I am talking about those who would now take us into what Mr. Churchill calls "attempts * * * to bind themselves and their unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee."

Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I concede his complete right to go about the country making speeches. I certainly am happy to see that in the United States in time of war it is possible for people to debate these great public questions. What I decry is the limited scope of the canvass of the questions to the end that all phases of the problem shall be brought home to the American people.

Lest there be any misapprehension in the mind of the Senator from New Mexico as to my own position, let me say further that I wish to repeat what I said to him when he asked me a question the other day. If my amendment to the resolution is adopted, I shall vote for the resolution. The Senator and I are not too far apart. We should all have an understanding of what we are talking about, and the nature of the commitments which would involve our Nation.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BALL. If the Senator could have been at some of the meetings to which he refers as having been addressed by the touring teams last summer, I think he might have been surprised at the full discussion. At most of those meetings the very brief talks were followed by question periods, and while the questioners were not quite so expert at cross-examination as is the Senator from Connecticut, I can assure him that the American people can think of plenty of questions to ask, and they asked them.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell me whether or not in any of those question periods the matter of an international police force was discussed?

Mr. BALL. The question arose at every meeting.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. That was one question that was always asked. It was asked at every meeting.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I assumed as much. What I had in mind to mention in that connection was that if we are to make a contribution to the international police force roughly in the ratio in which we have contributed fighting forces to the war, it is reasonable to think that if we were to have a force, let us say, of 500,000 from Great Britain, 1,000,000 from the United States, and 1,500,000 from Russia, we would have roughly—though there might be some disparity—an approximation of the respective contributions of the countries named to the armed forces now engaged with our comrades in arms.

Mr. President, I should like to know, if the Senator from New Mexico will tell me, if anyone asked in any of those questions periods what 1,000,000 men of the United States would be kept overseas. Should we keep members of the National Guard over there, on the ground that they volunteered for the service, and therefore should continue because they are thoroughly trained men? Should we keep only those who volunteered as enlisted men in the service of their country in time of war? Should we keep overseas the men who were drafted from schools and colleges, from their businesses and occupations, and away from their wives and children? What 1,000,000 men would be kept over there? Those are the questions which I should like to hear discussed up and down the country. I should like to know if we are to have 1,000,000 men in such an armed force for present purposes.

We know very well that from 730,000 to 800,000 boys, who are physically and mentally capable of joining the armed forces, become of age every year. Are we going to foist upon the American people in perpetuity a militaristic system which will take every such boy when he reaches the age of 18 and give him 1 year of training and another year of service in the police force which it is proposed to create? Those are the questions which I assumed the Senator from New Mexico had been asked in those

public meetings; and if he has an answer now, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I arose because the Senator from Connecticut asked me if those questions were propounded. Some of those questions were propounded at the meetings.

Mr. DANAHER. What did the Senator say?

Mr. HATCH. In every place where I went there was a vast interest manifested by the people in the question of the post-war world and in the question of military establishments. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that nowhere in the country did I find the fear of the things about which he now speaks that I find in the Senate of the United States. I found the people of America fully conscious of the fact that today millions of American boys are fighting in foreign lands; and they remember full well that, 25 years ago, millions of American boys were fighting. They do not have the coherent and clear ideas which the Senator from Connecticut has, but they are definitely convinced that this country must take a proper place in the post-war world; and if it is necessary to make a contribution from a military standpoint in order to preserve the peace of the world, the people of America are ready to make such a contribution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have not said that they are not ready to do so. Every word I have said belies such an interpretation. Quite the contrary, I asked the Senator from New Mexico what he told the people when they asked such questions, and I ask him now what force or what units we should put into this international police force if we all agree that there should be one. Shall we take our boys as they become of age each year and impress them into conscripted service in perpetuity? Are we to take 2 years out of the life of each one of them for military service?

Mr. HATCH. In answer to the Senator's question, I say "No."

Mr. DANAHER. How many of them would the Senator take? I do not know that the Senator can answer the question. None of us can possibly tell. Why can we not tell? Because we have never canvassed the situation. We do not know how large a force will be needed. We do not know how we will occupy any foreign country. We do not even know that we could occupy Berlin if Russia should move in first.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot find in the Senator's amendment the particular word I have in mind. It is probably there. The Senator can tell us. Does the Senator define the military power, or authority, or whatever it is, as a police force?

Mr. DANAHER. No; I do not. Quite the contrary. I define the word "power" as meaning capacity for action, whatever that capacity may be. Really, I am not in the least concerned about the numbers of men or how we will do it, so long as we canvass the question and understand what we are talking about. The American people—and the Senator from New Mexico purports to reflect their sentiment—have a right to say to us that they are willing to do this or do that. I also assert that we in the Senate, in their behalf, have a right to say that we will commit our Nation to this or that course. In fact, in many instances it is our duty to do things which the people do not want us to do, simply because they do not know what the involvements are. We have done such things time and again.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. In the definition which I find in line 17 on page 3 of the Senator's amendment, the word "power" means capacity for action. Does the Senator comprehend and include the military power to which he has referred?

Mr. DANAHER. Not necessarily. Mr. President, if I could cause the amendment to be adopted—and I certainly hope it will prevail—I would cause the term "international authority" to mean more than merely the aura of force which attaches to a legal and constitutional enactment by the Congress, which would be said to speak by authority of our Constitution and our legislative process. I go all that distance. I go to whatever length may be necessary to implement "international authority" by calling it a form of government. The Board of Police Commissioners of the City of New York is a form of government. The League of Nations could be. Certainly a court of international justice could be; and were we, in terms of definition in an agreement for peace, so to create a court of international justice with a definition of its jurisdiction, there is no question whatever in my mind that it would constitute "an" international authority, if I may borrow a word from the Senator from New Mexico, who has been arguing the effect of the article "an." It would also constitute international authority in the sense of sponsorship and force to sustain the action. So Mr. President, I would implement the judgments of such a court by my definition of power with a capacity for action.

Do I in that way give the Senator at least the direction of my thinking on that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, indeed. But, Mr. President, the precise aspect of my question was the military one. I wish the Senator to understand that I asked the question with this background of opinion at the present moment: I cannot favor the idea of an integrated force consisting of troops from the United States, troops from Russia, and troops from Great Britain. I have never been able mentally to assent to it.

Mr. DANAHER. I concur in that view.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is the ground upon which I presently stand. I may change my mind. I always reserve that right.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator that if we pass this resolution we most clearly will have such a situation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am following the Senator very closely; I am interested in his amendment. As he uses the word "power," in connection with the other definitions, I interpret his answer to mean that he comprehends an obligation by this country and its vis-à-vis to contribute military power whenever necessary.

Mr. DANAHER. But not in an integrated action or integrated units. Within our sphere of influence we have preserved the peace in Central American countries, without any such resolution, by virtue of our position and our claimed authority—and I regard it as valid—under the Monroe Doctrine. We acted under that authority, which has had international recognition. We had capacity for action and had the power.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I know the Senator is preparing to suspend, but before he concludes this afternoon I wish to call his attention to the fact that in the resolution which other Senators and I have sponsored we have never talked about an international police force. We have contended for a military force which would be limited to the suppression of aggression. That is the point we have always presented and argued to the people.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee spoke to me a moment ago and intimated that this is an appropriate hour to interrupt the proceedings. That accords with my plans.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the list for Monday as given me indicates there will be two other speakers. I assume that inasmuch as the Senator from Connecticut is in the midst of his remarks he should be recognized first after the call of the roll on Monday. Is that agreeable?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; it is quite agreeable.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not because of any feeling of curiosity, but in order to govern other Senators, can the Senator from Connecticut tell how much time he will probably desire?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall not exceed an hour, and probably will take less than that.

Mr. CONNALLY. On Monday?

Mr. DANAHER. On Monday.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is agreeable.

Mr. McNARY. It not only is agreeable, but the Senator from Connecticut is entitled to that, if he resigns the floor at this hour, 5 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean the time element is agreeable to me. I was just making the inquiry for the convenience of other Senators. I think the Senator from Connecticut will be entitled to the floor on Monday.

Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that beginning on Monday

no Senator shall speak more than 15 minutes on the resolution and 15 minutes on any amendment; excluding, of course, the Senator from Connecticut, because he is in the midst of his speech now, and I should not want the agreement to apply to him. I ask that after the conclusion of the address by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] no Senator shall speak more than 15 minutes on the resolution and 15 minutes on any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Texas expect the Senate to have a session Tuesday?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is our present plan to have one on Tuesday. There may be difficulty in obtaining a quorum. Several Senators have hinted that there might be such difficulty.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in that feature because it might affect our plans. I may say to the Senator from Texas that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and I and several others are very anxious to cooperate with the Senator, and do not wish to delay the vote. I happen to know, however, of at least a dozen Senators, though I do not see them on the floor at the moment, who wish to speak on the resolution. I know that some of them will wish to speak 30 minutes or an hour. I understand there will be no session tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not anticipate one.

Mr. HATCH. We hope we can work out a program by which we can shorten the discussion, and have a vote not later than Thursday or Friday of next week. At any rate, at the present time I wish the Senator would not press his unanimous-consent request until we can have a conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean to intimate that he and the Senator from Minnesota will permit us to vote not later than Thursday?

Mr. HATCH. No; I did not mean to say that we would have a vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said not later than Thursday.

Mr. HATCH. I said that so far as the speeches were concerned they would all be finished. Of course, the Senator can adopt his own plan of procedure.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator spoke about it. I suppose the Chair has a list of those who wish to speak, and Mr. Biffle has a list, and if any Senator wishes to speak on the resolution, he can make it known. We do not wish to cut off any one, but we do want to hurry on.

Mr. HATCH. As one Senator, although I have asked several questions, I myself have not spoken on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I shall speak not more than 30 minutes, I am quite sure, some time next week. That is one, certainly. The Senator from Alabama also will speak.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the Senator means to convey the impression that he and his group will have a meeting soon and try to arrange matters so that we can make a little progress.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. And get an early vote?

Mr. HATCH. I said we wanted to cooperate.

Mr. CONNALLY. In view of those circumstances, Mr. President, I should not care to press the request at this time, having those assurances. I wish to say, however, that I am not foreclosing myself from renewing the request from time to time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I was about to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there are very few Senators present, and for that reason I would suggest that he not press his request.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not press it. However, Senators who are not present but who wish to speak cannot very well speak unless they are here.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE COL. W. SUMPTER SMITH

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of yesterday carried the story of the posthumous award of the Distinguished Service Medal to the late Col. W. Sumpter Smith, of Alabama, and of the receipt of the award by Mrs. Smith.

As many Members of the Senate will recall, Colonel Smith was at one time the chairman of the safety board of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In that position he rendered outstanding service. He resigned the chairmanship of this board at the personal request of the President of the United States in order that he might serve as the chairman of the commission for the construction of the Washington Municipal Airport. As chairman of that commission, Colonel Smith contributed mightily to the building of that great project. I think it can well be said that more of the brain, of the heart, and of the hands of Colonel Smith than of any other man went into the construction of the Washington Airport, which will stand through the years a monument to the fine ability and the unflagging zeal of Colonel Smith.

As soon as the blow came at Pearl Harbor, Colonel Smith donned his uniform and went into the Army. Through the days of peace he had been the commanding officer of the National Guard air unit at Birmingham. He had built this unit of the National Guard into one of the best and most effective and efficient units in the whole country.

Last January, while in the Army, Colonel Smith lost his life in the Caribbean area in the service of his country, in line of duty. Before the loss of his life, as the citation of the Army Air Forces declares, Colonel Smith made notable contribution to the winning of the war.

There was no finer, manlier man than Sumpter Smith. There was no truer, more devoted patriot than Sumpter Smith. He was one of the bravest of the brave. I pay tribute today to the memory of this valiant soldier.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Montgomery Advertiser be printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. SUMPTER SMITH RECEIVES DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL ON HUSBAND'S BEHALF

Mrs. Sumpter Smith, whose husband, a colonel in the Army Air Forces, has been missing since he set out on a secret mission in January, will receive on his behalf the Distinguished Service Medal at a luncheon in Birmingham today under the auspices of the Birmingham Aero Club. The occasion will be observed as Sumpter Smith Day in Birmingham, and Brig. Gen. A. D. McDaniel, commanding officer, Second Air Support Command, with headquarters in that city, will make the presentation.

A native of Birmingham, Colonel Smith joined the Air Corps in 1917 as a cadet. In April of 1918 he was commissioned a second lieutenant and served with the Air Corps as an instructor until January 1919.

Called on active duty as air officer with the Thirty-first Division in November of 1940, he received his command pilot rating in 1941 and was sent to Washington as assistant air officer at the Army War College. Promoted to full colonel in 1942, he was made Chief of Transport and Facilities Division, Directorate of Air Support, Headquarters of the A. A. F., from March of that year until January 1943, when he was sent on a special secret mission, destination unknown, from which he never returned.

Colonel Smith became a member of the Alabama National Guard in 1921 and served as a pilot, squadron commander, division air officer, corps chief of aviation. His squadron (May 15, 1925, to August 11, 1932) was the One Hundred and Sixth Observation Squadron.

A graduate of the Command and General Staff School (National Guard officers' course) with the class of 1935, Colonel Smith became director of airports for the W. P. A. in the same year. In 1938, on July 7, he was appointed chairman of the Air Safety Board of the C. A. A.

At the President's request, he resigned November 21, 1939, to become chairman of the Interdepartmental Commission to build the Washington National Airport.

In February 1940 he was awarded the Air Trophy by the Washington Air Derby Association as the person having done the most for aviation in the capital in 1939.

The citation for the posthumous award of the Distinguished Service Medal to Colonel Smith, dated July 17, 1943, says, in part:

"For exceptionally meritorious service in the performance of duties of great responsibility from March 9, 1942, to January 24, 1943 * * * Colonel Smith supervised the activation, organization, and development of the first Troop Carrier Command which is today one of the most efficient weapons with the Army Air Forces. His example, his ability, leadership, resourcefulness, persistence, and unswerving devotion to duty were all in the highest tradition of the Army Air Forces of the United States."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Navy and the Marine

Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and at (5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 29 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Ralph E. Davison, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 17th day of November 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. Henry L. Larsen to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September 1942.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest prayer, to whom all flesh shall come, the inmost soul of us cries out for the Living God. The hurrying pace of our fleeting years frightens and awes us. So teach us to number our days that we may fill swift hours with mighty deeds and lay up treasures beyond the reach of moth and rust. If the glowing vision that once lighted our horizon has faded to somber shadows, if the flame of faith in Thee and in our fellow man has flickered low, even standing on the debris of our dearest dreams, may we be stabbed by a strengthening glimpse of divine resources, heights above heights, loftiness beyond loftiness, vista beyond vista, glory reaching out to further glory.

Out of the terrifying perplexities of these days we turn to Thee, drawn by the hints of our highest hours that there is a way of life vastly richer and deeper than all this hurried existence, so drab and unheroic, which fills our days with fretful stress and strain. In Thee alone we find serenity and peace and power. Take Thou our trembling hands in Thine. Lead us on, o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent, till the night is gone and the day dawns. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McNary	Tunnell
Caraway	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wallgren
Connally	Murdock	Wheeler
Danaher	Murray	Wherry
Downey	Nye	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson
Gerry	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent on the business of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the bureaus and offices of the Interior Department for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; also a letter from the Director of the Office of War Information, submitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for that Office for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Navy (5), and Interior (2); Tennessee Valley Authority, and War Manpower Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

TAXATION PROPOSALS OF DISTRICT COUNCIL NO. 8, UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri presented a resolution adopted by District Council No. 8, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to raise personal income-tax exemptions, to increase tax rates in the upper brackets, to limit net income after taxes for any individual to $25,000, to raise the corporate tax rates, and to place a 100-percent tax on all excess profits resulting from the war, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

WAGE STABILIZATION: ROLL-BACK OF PRICES—RESOLUTION FROM IOLA, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter of transmittal, together with a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 104, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers, of Iola, Kans., urging the roll-back of prices to the September 15, 1942, level.

There being no objection, the letter, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOLA, KANS., *October 23, 1943.*

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by our Local Union No. 104 some time ago. We urge that you give it, along with others, your sincere consideration.

Clothing, considering quality, has almost doubled in price. Our food prices have advanced 50 to 100 percent; some 300 percent; lard from 7 to 17 cents; honey from 25 to 75

cents a quart; potatoes doubled. The flour we use in our house advanced 25 cents at one time—(48 pounds). Congress is considering further flour advances. More taxes, more bonds, more charities, and labor is asked to get along on 15 percent. Make no mistake, sir, prices are continuously advancing and the handwriting is on the wall—a crisis is not distant.

UNITED CEMENT, LIME AND GYPSUM WORKERS,
LOCAL UNION NO. 104,
Iola, Kans.

At a meeting held at Union Hall October 1 a large crowd discussed the present status of the consumer-worker in the present price-control situation. The decision of the group was to write Kansas Senators and Congressmen urging them to support a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, level, grade labeling of all products, continued rent control, and a stronger organization of the Office of Price Administration.

Several speakers stressed the immediate necessity of rolling back prices to a comparable position with the wage-stabilization program if inflation is to be prevented. "We cannot subscribe to the 15-percent wage-stabilization program any longer if prices are permitted to continue on an upward spiral," said one speaker. "We are trying to cooperate in a system of complete stabilization, but food prices are already over 50 percent higher during the period in which we have permitted only 15-percent increase in wages."

"Every Congressman and Senator should be held responsible if inflation is permitted to continue," said another speaker, "and if an immediate roll-back of prices is not forthcoming we must protect ourselves by crashing the line of wage stabilization."

The meeting was sponsored by Local Union No. 104, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union.

C. O. LIND,
Recording Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum; with an amendment (Rept. No. 504).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1202. A bill to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 505);

H. R. 1206. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 506); and

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska, at Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 507).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3363. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; with amendments (Rept. No. 508).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert E. Clark, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California; and

George Vice, of California, to be United States marshal for the northern district of California.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1496. A bill to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1497. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Council of Negro Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. STEWART introduced Senate bill 1498, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 1499. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U. S. C. 1000-1029), by making it possible for war veterans to obtain loans and insured mortgages, by reserving lands for sale to war veterans and to other persons eligible under this act as amended, by providing for insurance of farm tenant mortgages, by increasing the responsibilities of county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution directing the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress on various matters with respect to natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

SUPPLEMENT TO FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT OF 1916—CONSTRUCTION OF LOCAL RURAL ROADS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill upon which I hope to have something to say at length later on. I content myself at this time by saying that the bill supplements the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916 so as to provide for the creation of a new administration within the Federal Works Agency to administer the provisions of that act for the building of local rural roads.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1498) to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed rural local roads, to provide for the creation within the Federal Works Agency of a new administration to administer the provisions of this act, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. I submit an amendment to the pending resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which I shall desire to offer at the proper time. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that the amendment is a substitute for the last paragraph of the pending Senate resolution. The amendment embodies the text of the Fulbright resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, and at the proper time I shall offer it as an amendment to the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment, being a proposed preamble, together with an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

VISIT BY FIVE SENATORS TO WAR FRONTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BREWSTER (S. DOC. NO. 109)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], together with a narrative statement of the round-the-world trip taken by him and four other Senators.

I also ask unanimous consent that the statement made to the Senate on Thursday, October 28, by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the narrative statement by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] may be printed as a document.

There being no objection, the statements by Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. BREWSTER were ordered to be printed as a Senate document, and the statement by Mr. BREWSTER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 29, 1943.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: In accordance with our conversation it seems best to submit a somewhat detailed individual story of our trip in narrative form without encroaching upon the investigation of various matters that came to our attention and are in the process of exploration with the various departments here in accordance with the usual practice of the committee.

I understand these matters may be covered by a report of the Truman committee in the usual form and will represent the detailed examination and conclusions that will be of value to the Senate and others interested.

The report herein enclosed meanwhile may furnish some background material as time goes on for an understanding of the trip around the world to the various battle fronts and its various implications.

The experience which came to me as a result of your assignment was a most unusual one and I trust as time goes on may justify your expectations in the dividends it will pay for the investment that was involved.

Cordially yours,

RALPH O. BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS

Men in Motion came happily to hand as we were leaving Washington on our global tour and became the book of the trip in the little library we accumulated for the hours we spent aloft. Young America is probably in no way surprised at our traveling around the earth in 65 days. An older generation, however, brought up on the fantastic tale of Around the World in Eighty Days may well ponder how much time we spent with our feet upon the ground.

Nine days of actual flying time left us with 56 days for first-hand contact with some of the realities of global war.

To those of our critics who have thought our experiences may have left us still somewhat in the air, it will be reassuring to know how our necessarily limited time was actually distributed.

ROUTINE OPERATIONS

One emerges with a profound impression of the way in which aviation has annihilated space. A thousand miles between breakfast and lunch was an ordinary morning's run with opportunity en route to compile and dictate a report on the observations of the preceding day and to go over the very full memoranda with which we were supplied by the various executive departments on the American installations and personnel at our next landing.

The afternoons were then available for inspections on the ground and the evenings for conferences with the various officials and civilian agencies with whom we were in contact.

Complete and cordial cooperation in all the areas visited was the order of the day, and advance notice of our arrival made possible the designation of informed officials to expedite our inspections without interruption of their activities.

Any concern as to distraction of those immediately responsible for the war effort in the various theaters was always obviated by the insistence of Senator RUSSELL as the very competent and personable chairman of the committee that our time with the commander in chief and his immediate associates should be limited to a minimum.

PURPOSES OF TRIP

With hundreds of thousands of American boys overseas and more thousands spreading out to every quarter of the globe with every passing day, and with American installations and equipment overseas running into billions of dollars and constantly increasing, there very naturally developed in Washington the idea that some Members of the Senate associated with the committees concerned with the war effort might prudently see things at first hand as civilian observers of the progress of the winning of the war.

The desirability of adequate information for the American people on the course of the war and of American activities overseas had been long since recognized in the very generous allocation of American press correspondents to every quarter of the globe. Their observations and reports, however, must necessarily be of a somewhat different character and approach than may be the case with a senatorial committee.

The pros and cons of such a trip and its possible values to the Senate and the country were discussed for many months, both among the Members of the Senate and with the executive departments immediately concerned and the majority and minority leaders in the Senate were finally asked to designate a committee to make the trip.

TRUMAN COMMITTEE

Senator MEAD, of New York, and myself were nominated by Senator TRUMAN as a subcommittee of the so-called Truman committee created by the Senate to investigate defense expenditures.

From the inception of this committee its membership under the leadership of its chairman have been constantly conscious of the peril of conceiving of our committee as concerned with the conduct of the war in the field of strategy or tactics.

Congressional experience with such a committee in 1863 has been repeatedly cited in the committee discussions as furnishing an example to be avoided under a proper appreciation of our constitutional processes and responsibilities.

Senator TRUMAN, as chairman of the committee, has thoroughly although tactfully disciplined his associates as to our lack of concern or responsibility for global strategy or any other kind of strategy, planned or otherwise.

Before leaving Washington, Senator MEAD and myself were furnished by Senator TRUMAN, as chairman, with an outline of matters to which he wished us to give particular attention.

At the end of this report there is attached a copy of the statements of Senator HARRY TRUMAN and Senator JAMES M. MEAD during the month of July before our departure.

PREPARATION FOR THE TRIP

In order to be properly prepared for the trip Senator MEAD, as chairman of the subcommittee, in cooperation with the staff of the Truman committee, arranged executive sessions with all the various agencies concerned securing comprehensive data on activities overseas with which we should be concerned.

The War and Navy Departments and the State Department cooperated in the arrangement of the itinerary and all the various civilian agencies concerned with the war effort overseas were consulted both as to the policies that were current and in contemplation as to the methods of handling the problems of both personnel and material.

DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY

The Truman committee has also never had any illusions as to its exclusive responsibility for an investigation. Various legislative and appropriation committees of the Congress have primary responsibility in these fields and very great care has always been taken to avoid overlapping or duplication. Comity has been the order of the day and still continues to be the firm concern of the committee in order that Congress shall exemplify that coordination in its functioning that it seeks constantly to inculcate in its contacts with executive departments.

This practice of division of responsibility was of very great assistance in the functioning of the subcommittee of five members from the Senate in the very limited time at our disposal with Senator CHANDLER and Senator LODGE giving primary concern to the military activities in various areas, while Senator RUSSELL gave primary attention to naval and appropriation matters and Senator MEAD and myself were concentrated particularly upon the vast variety of civilian activities which have necessarily developed in this global war.

The full committee, however, always attended all major conferences in the various theaters and all the members concurred in the report summarized in the 10 paragraphs representing our conclusions from the trip.

The sharp differentiation between the legislative and executive function under our form of government has been kept constantly in mind, although with $300,000,000,000 made available to the executive department for the war effort, legislative accounting is inevitable and of infinitely greater value to all concerned insofar as it can be kept current.

The legislative branch in time of war serves rather necessarily as a safety valve for the vast volume of complaints that pour in from all sources as to irregularities or inefficiencies in the war effort. In a democracy sympathetic interest in these reports is essential to the development and maintenance of a united front.

The staff of the Truman committee has been constantly occupied with winnowing the wheat from the chaff in these various complaints and has kept in constant contact with the executive departments concerned in most friendly collaboration and in seeking to evolve the technique that may keep at a minimum the distraction of those in authority from the war effort.

WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The War and Navy Departments have long since found the importance of most careful inspection and review of their vast and varied activities and our inquiries simply serve as a supplement of the careful self-scrutiny that they constantly carry on.

Flying over the Pyramids, however, we were again forcibly reminded that bureaucracy always tends to atrophy and this tends to hold true even under the stimulus of war.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

As compared with Great Britain our activities in the field of foreign relations have been extremely limited as a result of our concentration in the past century upon the development of a continent and our necessary preoccupation with internal affairs.

The most significant fact impressed itself very deeply upon us as we journeyed around the globe since three-quarters of our journey was within the vast extent of the British Empire and this gave us opportunity and occasion to observe its implications in the conduct of world affairs.

In addition to reviewing the world picture with representatives of our own State Department before leaving Washington Senator MEAD and I asked for and were accorded the courtesy of an extended interview with Lord Halifax, British Ambassador in Washington. This expert in the field of foreign relations very courteously made available to us a rather comprehensive picture of the evolution of British diplomatic and trade organizations around the world. This information was supplemented by conferences with Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden and Minister of Information Brenden Bracken in London where we were again most courteously received and accorded every consideration by these very busy men and their associates.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Our procedure on tour very quickly fell into rather definite grooves as soon as the formalities and brief courtesies incident to our arrival were disposed of. The program prepared by the local authority would be considered covering the various installations and activities to be examined. If a great deal of territory was to be covered in a very limited time, the committee would subdivide in accordance with its various interests and functions. Otherwise general inspection would go forward as a group. Meanwhile arrangements would be made by the American diplomatic representative in the area for all the civilian agencies to meet with Senator MEAD and myself with one or two other members of the committee sitting in if they so desired.

Stenographers were furnished in the local area and a detailed picture was secured from the various civilian agencies as to their policies and practices and the degree of coordination which had been achieved in the rapidly evolving activities incident to the war.

Usually all of the agencies concerned were examined at one time for reasons of convenience and expedition as it was then possible to check immediately on any misunderstandings or conflicts of authority or policy or purpose.

Each day transcripts of these records were forwarded to Washington together with a report from the subcommittee on our observations and suggestions as to further inquiries which should be pursued in Washington in clearing up any misunderstandings or confusion that seemed to prevail in the various areas.

Since our return the regular practice of the Truman committee in calling in all the various departments and bureaus concerned for an executive session on matters which seemed to us appropriate for further inquiry have been pursued and the sessions are still in progress.

As promptly as possible complete reports will be formulated for the full committee with such suggestions as to action as may be deemed appropriate. It is the unvarying practice of the committee before issuing a report of this character to submit it to the department concerned for final checking in order to avoid any possibility of inaccuracy or misunderstanding as to the various matters involved. Any statements meanwhile represent simply the observations and views of the particular individual committee member involved.

NATURE OF THIS REPORT

This general commentary is accordingly prepared with all the foregoing limitations in mind with the approval of Senator TRUMAN as to our action but without commitment of him or other members of the committee to any of our inferences or conclusions. The degree of public interest in this global tour and the public investment involved seemed to warrant this individual narrative in addition to the Truman committee report that will follow in due course.

MOTHERS OF AMERICA

The mothers of America may well be proud of their sons and reassured as to the thought that is being given to their welfare. Never perhaps in history has more attention been lavished upon the well-being of those in the service of their country. The record of recovery from wounds and of protection from the difficulties incident to operations in every quarter of the globe from the Arctic to the Tropics is a sufficient indication of the progress that has been made in this field ever since the last Great War. Whether viewed from a humanitarian standpoint or from the simple significance and value of these highly trained boys to their country, there is great reason for gratification over the progress that has been made in this field.

Their moral as well as physical well-being has also been a matter of most intimate and unprecedented concern. With boys far younger than usual being taken from their various communities and sent to the far corners of the globe where conditions are often very different from those in their home towns in America, those in authority have properly recognized that they must see to it that these boys are given every possible protection against conditions with which they were not formerly familiar.

As members of the armed forces of our country in our own youth in time of war some of us were somewhat familiar with the problems that are faced and we took occasion in all the places we visited to see as to conditions prevailing when the boys were off duty in places where there were afforded any opportunities for relaxation. The American Army is doing more fighting with less liquor than any other army in the history of the world. The same statement may be made regarding all other forms of dissipation.

Wherever possible provision has been made for leave under conditions that will give the boys an opportunity to learn something of the country where they find themselves and to have every opportunity for healthful recreation.

RED CROSS

The Red Cross has been doing a wonderful work in this field with the centers which it has provided contiguous to the camps and in the various areas and communities behind the front. Several thousand splendid American girls have been sent out to look after these clubrooms. Everywhere these fine girls were furnishing a touch of home and inspiration to these boys who were so far away from home. The atmosphere was all that could be desired and too high praise cannot be given to those who have planned this program and spread these activities entirely around the world.

HOSPITALS

Everywhere American troops were found there were splendidly equipped hospitals to care for their well-being with trained nurses in attendance who have volunteered for service anywhere. We saw these girls carrying on under all manner of conditions, from the quonset huts of Iceland where 2 feet of rocks were piled beside their rounded metal roofs to anchor the buildings from being blown away by the terrific gales, on down to the bamboo huts of the Tropics, where the temperature outside was 160° above zero. Always the atmosphere was cheerful, and every comfort humanly possible was being afforded to the boys in their care. These nurses have now become literally "Angels of Light" as we saw them flying to the combat areas to bring back boys who needed immediate attention. We saw these boys on the operating table 200 miles behind the front within 5 hours after they were wounded.

These observations may come with some measure of reassurance to the mothers of America that every human care is being taken to look out for their sons.

Never were there less indications of the dissipation that is sometimes supposed to be associated with armies far from home. The boys are kept busy in modern war with all of the intricate paraphernalia that is incident to the streamlined military machine of today. Clear heads are imperatively required. The crew of a modern bomber desire and demand that every member be in the pink of condition. The lives of all depend upon the alertness of each one.

When opportunity came for relaxation they found rich rewards in the short time which they might have off duty in seeing something of the strange lands in which they find themselves. These boys will return with a new appreciation of the blessings of America and enriched by a knowledge of how and under what difficult conditions so many other peoples are compelled to carry on.

WAC'S

In many areas we found the WAC's carrying on most effectively and rendering yeoman service. These well-trained girls were filling various positions with great credit to themselves and to their training. Everyone was taking a place that would otherwise require a father to fill.

Their living conditions were all that could be desired and no mother need have any concern as to environment in which her daughter will live as a member of the WAC's.

The commanding officers all spoke in the highest terms of their service and were all without exception desirous of receiving increased increments because of their efficient service.

CHAPELS AND CHAPLAINS

On several Sundays we were privileged to attend chapel services in various quarters of the globe and were many times in contact with the chaplains who carry on day in and day out looking after the welfare of the boys under their charge.

One of the most inspiring memories of the trip is the beautiful chapel erected from bamboo and native woods and grass at Guadalcanal by the natives of this island in tribute to the Americans who delivered them from the Japanese occupation. At this spot we saw natives assembled to join in tribute to the Americans who had sacrificed so much in their behalf, and in their simple service we saw a symbol of what America has come to mean to so many peoples of the earth.

MORALE OF AMERICAN TROOPS

All the members of the committee are in accord on the remarkable progress which has been made in sending American personnel and material to the far corners of the earth and also on the high morale that was almost everywhere evident.

In only two places did we find particular cause for concern. One was in Iceland, where some of the boys had been kept for nearly 2 years under conditions that do not have the stimulus of action and in a volcanic country without the trees and fields to which they are accustomed in their home country. In addition, during much of the year there is a very limited period of daylight only extending for a few hours, and the committee were all in agreement, and the military authorities as well, that as rapidly as transportation conditions should permit the boys should be moved to other stations where conditions are more tolerable, and that as far as practicable boys would not be kept in an area such as this beyond the period of 1 year.

This does not mean that the boys in any numbers are likely to come home, and this was not the thought expressed by the boys, but simply a desire to move to some area that would perhaps afford more activity or be more in accordance with some of the conditions to which they were accustomed.

The other spot where a problem of morale was faced was in India, where the boys were rather remote from the scene of Japanese activity and were not particularly clear as to why they were there.

While the living conditions were all that could be expected and the Red Cross "dugout," as it was called, was a most admirable institution, the boys did not have a strong and present sense of their contribution to the war effort and were somewhat immersed in the lethargy of India and their thoughts would naturally turn to home. It is to be hoped that the coming of Lord Mountbatten, as commander in chief of this area, may breathe some of his abundant vitality into this area and give the boys a new lease on the realities.

Here the committee members held two forums with the boys on their problems during two successive evenings and developed very interesting reactions as to their attitude toward the post-war problems and America's relation to the world. The boys did not conceal their desire to return home but also recognized the expanding responsibilities of America.

LEADERSHIP

With the leadership of our services overseas the committee were all much impressed. The caliber of the commanders is of the highest and any failures on the part of any subordinate officers are apparently certain to receive the most instant attention. There

came to our notice instances in which changes had been very promptly made as the necessity was found. This is, of course, the test of whether any machine is functioning as it should.

Incompetency or inefficiency is treated with the utmost rigor as should be the case in time of war. No consideration appears to affect the operation other than the successful prosecution of the war and the welfare of the personnel involved. Mistakes are bound to occur but they receive prompt attention and correction and are not likely to recur.

Operations were in progress in the Mediterranean during our visit and tremendous reserves of both men and matériel were evident on every hand and the results of their activities have become increasingly evident as the weeks passed. The visit to the various ports in north Africa where supplies are being brought in and stores accumulated brought home with most impressive force the stupendous requirements in transport of modern mechanized war.

When one moves from the marvelous ports and facilities developed in New York and other ports along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts and realizes that at the other end of the line in Africa or Asia or the South Pacific there are no comparable facilities to handle this enormous quantity of cargo, one realizes something of the miracles that have been performed in unloading these ships in record time and classifying and storing the matériel involved for the various units that may require to be serviced. Too high praise cannot be accorded those responsible for these operations. Without their successful and efficient functioning with the constant necessity of improvisation the whole military effort would bog down.

PERSIAN GULF

Particularly impressive was the work being done in the Persian Gulf where so much of the matériel must be landed for the supply of the Russian front. Here under climatic conditions that are simply indescribable American boys are carrying on under the inspiring leadership of Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connolly and matériel of all kinds is being unloaded and dispatched with incredible rapidity. While we were there the temperature ranged around 150° above zero on the airports where much of these operations must be carried on and this is apparently typical for the region during the greater portion of the year.

AVIATION

The most impressive lesson of the trip is the revolution in the world brought about by air transport. Hopping the "hump" of the Himalayas at 22,000 feet between two layers of clouds we had opportunity to ponder the implications of air transport by which alone China can now be served.

Going north to the Arctic Circle and south nearly to the Antarctic Circle our trip covered approximately 45,000 miles within 9 days of flying time. This would mean that flying straight around the earth at the Equator the trip could have been completed in the plane assigned to us by General Marshall in approximately 5 days. Planes are, however, rapidly coming into production for transport purposes that would make the trip in 3 days with appropriate relays.

What lies just beyond upon the rising horizon of the world of tomorrow, it is hardly safe to speak as one contemplates the implications of these modern marvels in their impact on our lives.

America has built and is operating hundreds of airfields all around the world costing hundreds of millions of American dollars. We have no right of access at the present time to any of these airports built by our money outside the Western Hemisphere 6 months after the war comes to an end. This seems to be a situation that invites early attention in view of the certain significance of air transport in the world that is to be.

SEA POWER

Sea power has hitherto been the only means of stabilizing conditions around the globe. The lessons of this war make it entirely evident that air power has now come as a supplement to sea power and that the future peace of the world must depend in substantial measure upon aggressor nations not being able to develop air power that shall once again threaten peace-loving peoples. The ultimate winning of the war by the United Nations does not seem to any of us to be a matter that admits to doubt. Whether or not we shall win the peace is quite another matter and by the winning of the peace we mean the keeping of the peace as that is the ideal that liberty-loving Americans have most definitely in mind.

KEEPING THE PEACE

America is primarily concerned with the keeping of the peace. Twice within our own generation we have been plunged into these world-wide wars without provocation upon our part or any assertion of selfish ambition to invite such a holocaust.

Our sons are now paying the price of our fond but delusive hope that aggressors would not again threaten our security. At Pearl Harbor we learned our hope was vain. In the fires of this new sacrifice our resolve is being hardened that aggressor nations shall not again be able to threaten the peace of all the world.

Every lesson of every war theater where we visited brings home the profound fact that no nation will ever again dare to array itself against the world without adequate aerial preparation.

This means the factories to produce planes and the facilities and personnel for them to function.

The world has long recognized the intimate connection between sea power and the merchant marine. The relationship is far more intimate between military and commercial aviation. The production facilities are far more readily convertible than in the case of marine construction and the speed of the transition corresponds to the speed of the plane.

The bomber plants of today are the transport plane plants of tomorrow—and the reverse will also be the case.

America must realize the implications of these lessons before it is too late.

THE BRITISH EXAMPLE

Considerable consternation has been expressed at the strong and unanimous report of the five members of our senatorial committee concerning the future of America in the air. The language of our unanimous report to the Senate and the country upon this point is as follows:

"The United States has constructed huge airfields all over the world at tremendous cost to our people. The use of some of these fields in the future may be just as essential to our security as battleships or divisions. We have no post-war rights of access to these fields outside the Western Hemisphere at the present time. These rights of access are also indispensable to the vitally important growth of commercial aviation."

The surprise which has been expressed on both sides of the Atlantic at our conclusions on this score are extremely revealing as to the lack of realization in the United States as to what is here involved.

This situation was first brought to my attention in December 1942 as a result of heated debates upon the subject in the British Parliament. In these discussions very great concern was expressed as to the position of America and as to the necessity of Britain taking action to insure their position in commercial aeronautics in the post-war world. Assurance was given that the matter was being carefully considered and explored and accumulating evidence is at hand as to the customary thoroughness with which the British have approached this global problem.

Their consideration culminated in the holding of an Empire conference this past month in London at which their program for meeting this situation was carefully considered and the announcements at the conclusion indicated that agreement had been reached regarding the part which all parts of the British Empire would play in developing post-war commercial aviation.

Certainly it is proper that America should similarly give attention to the determination of its policy in order that our people may be fully informed and that Congress in collaboration with the administration may determine the form of our policy in this highly important field.

MILITARY AIR BASES

Some current discussions in the press have proceeded upon the hypothesis that the only question involved was that of military air bases. This is very far from being the case. As has been pointed out the problems of military aviation will undoubtedly be worked out in conjunction with the others concerned in the United Nations and appropriate decisions reached regarding the allocation of responsibility in the keeping of the peace and the use of the various facilities that are necessarily involved in the girdling of the globe.

This, however, is very far from reaching the root of the problem since military aviation and expansion must necessarily progress with a commercial base.

The facilities to build planes in a constantly evolving art with almost undreamed of possibilities in the decades immediately ahead must rest in substantial measure upon the progress and development of commercial aviation.

In this field America has a tremendous start as a result of the extent to which commercial air travel had developed before the war. In the field of transoceanic aviation one American company had been a leader in the world with operating rights in more than 60 foreign countries and coping successfully with the keen competition of the far more closely supported governmental monopolies of overseas air lines in other countries.

BRITISH POLICY

Britain is continuing the policy of monopoly in overseas aviation with the great British Overseas Airways amply financed from government funds and placing at its head one of the ablest administrators and keenest minds in the British Empire in the person of Lord Knollys, formerly Governor of Bermuda and now devoting his great talent to the future of Britain in commercial aviation around the world.

AMERICAN POLICY

Since when is it treason for America to take thought as to its position in this field? Is it improper or un-American to suggest that the hundreds of millions of dollars invested by America in airfields in all parts of the world may perhaps be permitted to serve in some measure the interests of America in the air argosies of peace?

This at any rate is the very gentle suggestion of the senatorial committee that has just returned from a trip around the world. Their position is not likely to be altered by abuse or ridicule or by anything other than persuasive arguments as to why America should abandon its position in the produc-

tion and operation of planes in commercial overseas air transport in the post-war world.

Aeronautics must inevitably be an instrument of national policy. If America is to maintain an interest in the affairs of the world, America must be able in the field of communications and transportation to sit at least as an equal at the table of the nations.

Every day of delay in approaching this problem increases the hazards that American interests will suffer in the years that are to come.

When this subject was first mentioned by the senatorial committee and also the matter of the more equitable distribution of the burden of supplying petroleum for the prosecution of the war, there was considerable consternation expressed on both sides of the Atlantic as to the very surprising character of our proposal.

On Monday, October 11, 1943, there appeared in the New York Times a dispatch from the New York Times correspondent in London, with every indication of being officially inspired, stating that the only reason that America had not received rights of access to the airfields constructed around the world was because America had not thus far asked for these rights and if increased quantities of petroleum were not being received from the British or other sources it was because increased quantities had not been asked for. It would seem imperative that as promptly as possible this failure to request rights should be remedied.

Because of its significance in the current discussion, there is included here the dispatch referred to from the New York Times of October 11, 1943:

"Outwardly Britain's reaction to the ex parte testimony of the five itinerant United States Senators has been polite, moderate, and misleading. But, while officials are not saying much about it publicly, privately they make it clear that they resent the more violent criticism, fear the whole recent trend toward economic nationalism in the United States, and do not see why this particular time—just before the tri-power conference—was chosen to demonstrate differences between the United States and Britain.

"Resentment on the part of British officials available to this correspondent is based on the salient assumption by the Senators that the United States had asked for more oil from Persia and this had been refused; that we had asked for unlimited use of air bases we have built on British territory and this had been refused, and had requested the right to establish bases after the war on British territory and had been turned down.

"But, so far as one can discover in this capital, none of these things has happened. Mr. Churchill was not simply being rhetorical when he said that he did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. At the same time there is not only very little basis for charging the British with holding out on us, but there is good reason for saying that if the United States ever makes it unmistakably clear that it is prepared to take its place in establishing a real world authority in collaboration with Great Britain and Russia there is not a single base in the British Empire from Scapa Flow to Singapore that will not be open to us."

* * * * *

TWO FACTORS IN PROBLEM

"There are two ways to assure that the question of post-war bases in the British Empire becomes a critical problem between the United States and the British Commonwealth. The first is to make it clear that the United States again intends to retreat from any responsibility for keeping the peace of the world, and the second is to challenge Britain and Russia to a world-wide grab for trade and territory after the war.

"The report of the Senators distressed a great many people here not alone because it gave ammunition to that part of the United States community which opposes all United States commitments to foreign powers and not alone because it tended to suggest just before the tri-power conference that the United States and Britain were at loggerheads on several basic points, but because the report seemed here to be part of a trend, a part of what the Economist called this week end the recent 'explosion of economic nationalism in the United States.'

"In recent days dispatches from Washington have seemed to justify this phrase. Admiral Howard L. Vickery's statement that the United States intended to become a maritime nation with or without the cooperation of Britain, the reported suggestion by W. A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, that all our air and sea lines be lumped together to give the United States 'maximum strength for competition with other powers,' the United States Chamber of Commerce proposal that American businessmen be allowed to go into war zones to recruit business before peace came and the appointments of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Leo G. Crowley, and W. Averell Harriman have all led to the conclusion here that for domestic reasons the Yankee horse trader was being revived as the ideal in United States foreign affairs.

COMMENTS ON TRENDS HERE

"'In political matters,' the Economist remarked, 'the tide (in the United States) is flowing toward Wilson; but in those questions of economic cooperation which are the lifeblood of an enduring settlement there are signs of a return to the big stick and the ideology of McKinley * * *. The prospects of any dramatic and immediate reversal of American economic policy are poor at the moment—poorer perhaps than they have ever been.'

"It is worth noting that British opinion does not oppose the United States getting its full share of trade that will inevitably follow the new communications which are now being strung round the world. What is being suggested is that the United States should not ask for privileges which especially in the realm of trade it is not prepared to grant to others.

"'That they (the five Senators) have come back with highly exaggerated notions of the way wherein British interests are pushing in front of American, is not the real point', remarked the Manchester Guardian.

"'What matters is that they see that the United States is tied up with many things outside her borders and that she must begin to realize that her interests and her policy are related. * * * Similarly when Admiral Vickery tells how he "shocked" a British audience with his blunt words about the United States as a maritime nation we need not take his further misleading comments seriously. We would only ask the corollary of a vast American fleet—a sane economic policy which will fill those ships with imports as well as exports.'

"In summary, the British are a little leery of our Yankee horsetrader. They have done a little horsetrading with him in the past and, if they are forced into it, they will do some more in the future. But frankly they have more confidence in his ability to win the election than in his ability to win the peace."

BERLE COMMITTEE

An interdepartmental committee to consider post-war aviation policy was created some time since under the chairmanship of Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr., and has since been functioning. It is understood a report has been prepared and placed in the hands of the Secretary of State for the President.

Meanwhile the Committee on Commerce of the Senate has created a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, and hearings have been held and are continuing to explore this situation.

The House of Representatives is also giving consideration to this problem through the medium of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It seems obvious that legislative action will be required for the implementation of such policy regarding American overseas aviation as is finally agreed upon and for the appropriations which may be required.

Here is one of the most pressing fields for the determination of American foreign policy and one that brooks no delay.

If the observations of our committee in our trip around the world and the reports which we have made on our return result in expediting consideration of this matter, the trip will have been abundantly worth while. Meanwhile it may be well to suggest to our critics that they direct attention to the substance of our suggestions and our comments rather than to the questioning of our motives. The American people are perfectly capable of determining the issues in this matter if they can be presented with the facts and the seeking and securing of the facts, the determination of policy is the only object of present legislative consideration.

As promptly as possible Senator MEAD and myself will make available to the Truman committee and presumably then to the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce whatever facts we have been able to develop in our observations and conferences and with that legislative committee of the Senate will rest the consideration of the policy that is involved so far as the Senate is concerned.

PETROLEUM SUPPLIES

Somewhat the same situation presents itself in considering petroleum supplies. The committee of five Senators referred to this in their summary report as follows:

"A great deal more oil should be provided from the deposits of the Middle East. Existing sources of crude rubber in the Orient, now held by the United Nations, could be increased. Too much American gasoline is made available to civilians in north Africa."

Here considerable sensitivity seems to have developed. Certainly the statement is as moderate in tone as anyone could desire, but it has invited seemingly both explanation and excoriation.

Let us first be very clear that a modern army moves on petroleum. Over 50 percent of the supplies for the African invasion were petroleum products.

This means that petroleum may determine the issue of the war—and of any future wars.

Germany has long dreamed of the route from Berlin to Bagdad as the axis that might control the world. The German plunge for the oil fields of Russia very plainly told the tale of what was their greatest need.

Current comment on the prospect that United States oil reserves are only sufficient to supply us for 12 to 15 years at the present rate of consumption do not seem to occasion particular concern.

Other countries are far more prudent in husbanding their petroleum reserves.

While Britain has oil reserves at least equal to the United States, the British reserves at the present rate of consumption will last 100 years.

Only 8 percent of the oil consumption of the United Nations is at present coming from British sources, while nearly 80 percent is coming from United States reserves.

In addition, the largest supply from any country outside the United States comes from a country bordering on the Caribbean where 80 percent of the reserves are owned by an American corporation and a 30-percent increase in production is contemplated for this area this coming year, while practically no increase in production is contemplated for the great British reserves in the Persian Gulf.

Consideration of this situation is imperatively required if America is to be able to face the world on an equality at the end of the next decade.

No product is more vital to national defense than petroleum, and the United States must rapidly move to preserve so far as practicable its rapidly diminishing reserves.

Here again challenge has been raised as to the wisdom or propriety of legislative inquiry in this field. Certainly the American people are entitled to facts that so vitally concern their welfare.

Without gasoline, all the planes and tanks and trucks of the modern war machine are completely paralyzed. Without petroleum, a modern navy cannot move a mile.

A gallon of gasoline will carry a modern bomber or transport plane approximately a mile. This constitutes an impressive demonstration of the power hidden in this colorless fluid.

But conceive of our military and naval and air forces cut off from petroleum. We talk about maintenance of our military might after the war is ended in order to preserve the peace.

Yet every movement of that military machine upon the chess table of international affairs must be conditioned by adequate supplies of petroleum.

Before another generation comes on the stage America will be a mendicant for petroleum at the council tables of the world. This generation must then bear the responsibility for dissipating this most precious heritage.

Equitable distribution of available supplies to meet the military needs of the United Nations is all that is desired. Is this treason?

In any event, these questions will continue to be pressed before the proper authorities, and reports on the situation will in due course be forthcoming.

LEND-LEASE

The operation of lend-lease and of lend-lease in reverse seems also an appropriate subject of legislative inquiry. Billions have been provided in this field and distributed with a prodigal hand.

Certainly the recipients cannot object if those who must pay for the bounty shall have some idea of its nature and extent.

Question was raised in Australia as to how much it could be possible for Australia to do this coming year in reverse lend-lease. In the discussion of this matter it seemed clear to all that proper inquiry might well be made as to the extent to which the economy of Australia could contribute to the war effort.

While lend-lease was conceived primarily from the standpoint of contributing without delay or hesitation to nations in their most critical hour it now becomes necessary as time passes to examine somewhat the equities that are involved and the relative possibilities in the various countries for supplying the needs of the United Nations in the prosecution of the war.

Various aspects of this matter came to our attention during our trip and are being explored with the various authorities concerned.

The rather resolute resistance to the idea of any accounting for lend-lease in reverse on the ground of its impracticability and perhaps undesirability did not impress one at first blush as well-founded.

The importance of a possible accounting became more significant as we found places where there was an impression abroad that lend-lease and lend-lease-in-reverse were approximately in balance. In some instances this seemed to have a somewhat official origin, although it was widely at variance with the facts.

Balancing accounts is certainly not one of the primary considerations at this time, but it is of importance that there shall not be erroneous impressions abroad to complicate the post-war situation. It is also important that accounts shall not become so tangled that no proper understanding can ever be obtained as to just what happened.

CONCLUSION

Much, if not most, of what we found was good. The military, naval, and air forces of America are magnificent and all their component parts.

The procurement program is now functioning with increasing efficiency, although many precious months were lost in the failure to adopt at the start the well-developed plan for industrial mobilization that was a result of the studies of 20 years since the last war and was revised and approved as late as 1937 by Louis Johnson as Assistant Secretary of War.

COOPERATION

Cooperation of the various services of the United Nations is proceeding excellently. Whatever defects exist in our own civilian organizations behind the fighting fronts invite the most careful and immediate exploration and are a matter of primarily American concern into which it would be well for interests outside our country not to venture.

America has a right and duty to consider problems of its own civilian personnel and policies without outside interference, and this will become increasingly apparent as time goes on.

The members of the Senate committee appointed to visit the war theaters present the following conclusions:

1. Our men in all branches of the service are satisfied with the weapons and airplanes they have received. The food, on the whole, is as adequate as the tactical situation permits. Medical care is excellent. The high command functions effectively. Mistakes which are probably inevitable in a war of this size and novelty are not being repeated. We are learning fast from experience.

2. A great deal more oil should be provided from the deposits of the Middle East. Existing sources of crude rubber in the Orient, now held by the United Nations, could be increased. Too much American gasoline is made available to civilians in north Africa.

3. The mission assigned to the Office of War Information of conducting propaganda activities in friendly foreign countries raises many doubts. While the personnel is sincere and capable, this whole policy should be carefully reexamined.

4. The men who are bearing the brunt of battle do not feel that the true picture of their hardships is being given to the public. They have a realistic viewpoint regarding war which they would like to have shared by our public-relations officials and the public, insofar as military security permits.

5. Close integration of our land, sea, and air forces has been accomplished in most theaters and works extremely well. It points the way toward a sound post-war military policy. Our military effort is well coordinated with that of our allies in the areas visited.

6. The United States has constructed huge airfields all over the world at tremendous cost to our people. The use of some of these fields in the future may be just as essential to our security as battleships or divisions. We have no post-war rights of access to these fields outside the Western Hemisphere at the present time. These rights of access are also indispensable to the vitally important growth of commercial aviation.

7. The need for parity in international communications is stressed in every theater. Equality in these cable and wireless communications would seem to be a fitting subject for consideration and possible reverse lend-lease.

8. A policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time would be in the interest of efficiency as well as conducive to physical and mental welfare. The committee is aware of the shipping problems which have created this situation. It believes that the shipping situation is now improving. A definite promise to a man that after a certain length of time he will be replaced is a big morale factor.

9. The need of a clear national policy is strikingly apparent. With such a policy should go an American representation abroad in which our military, diplomatic, and business personnel work as a team, with appropriate international rank. We owe this to ourselves and to the world.

10. The committee returns inspired by the bravery of our American fighting men and impressed with the obstacles which they have overcome. They are the products of a free system of government and their sacrifices are a justification of our democratic way of life. Their courage should inspire us to leave no stone unturned to be worthy of their sacrifice.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HARRY S. TRUMAN ON JULY 4, 1943

The special Senate committee investigating the national defense program was charged by the Senate with the duty of checking on all phases of war production, for the purpose of making certain that we get to the fighting fronts as soon and as economically as possible the weapons, supplies, and facilities needed by our armed forces.

The Congress has a clear duty, for which the people will hold it responsible, to see that results are obtained from the billions of dollars appropriated for the war effort.

To fulfill these obligations, the committee has conducted numerous investigations in this country. Much time and effort were expended by its individual members, outside of their other duties as Senators, in holding interviews, conferences with officials representing industry, labor, and governmental agencies, and hearings, both public and private, and in making on-the-ground inspection of plants. Much valuable evidence has been accumulated in this way, and forms the basis for many of the reports which have been filed with the Senate.

The committee is gratified that its efforts and achievements have been accepted by the public as beneficial to the effective prosecution of the war.

This work will be continued but the committee believes that it is not enough just to follow the goods to the country's borders. There must also be assurance that such goods reach the fighting fronts quickly and in good condition, and that they are, in fact, what the fighting forces have asked for and need. Also there must be assurances that the vast sums which are being expended abroad for airfields, harbor and rail facilities, and the like are economically spent to the end that the initial cost be kept to a minimum and that this country obtain therefrom the maximum possible post-war benefit and international good will.

Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, and Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, of Maine, are going abroad with a group of other Senators during the period when Congress expects to be in recess and most of its Members are enjoying the first chance in several years to

attend to their personal affairs. The committee has directed Senators MEAD and BREWSTER to obtain information—and, upon their return, to report to the committee—on the foreign aspects of the various questions which have been the subject of study by the committee, including particularly:

1. Transportation and supply by sea, air, highway, and rail;

2. Landing facilities in foreign areas developed by the United States and the rights of this country in those facilities now and in the post-war period;

3. Administration activities in foreign fields outside military lines and particularly any confusion of function thereto;

4. Arrangements for the distribution of American supplies among civilian populations.

5. Quality and condition of repair and replacement parts, including engines received from the United States, and quantity or percentage found unusable by reason of faulty manufactures.

6. The function of the Office of War Information.

It is especially important that the Congress acquaint itself now with the arrangements which are being made abroad in the name of the United States by the numerous representatives of the many special agencies authorized to expend funds and to distribute American property. The time to correct mistakes is at their inception. The time to obtain equitable settlements of our post-war rights to use airfields and other properties built and paid for by us is now. We must do our utmost to win the war speedily and also to contribute our full share to a post-war atmosphere that will be conducive to an endurable peace. The committee desires to make certain that proper attention is being given to these matters by those charged with the responsibility for them.

The committee has no jurisdiction over military strategy or tactics and has never addressed inquiries into this field. This practice will be continued.

Upon their return they will render a full report to the committee as to the facts ascertained by them.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD ON JULY 22, 1943

Senator MEAD declared that he and Senator BREWSTER had completed their preliminary studies in advance of their leaving for an inspection of American facilities abroad.

Senator MEAD said that he and Senator BREWSTER, the two members of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program who will go abroad with a group of other Senators during the congressional recess had made an extended investigation to obtain background information on the subjects which the committee directed them to study abroad.

These include:

1. Transportation and supply by sea, air, highway, and rail;

2. Landing facilities for airplanes in foreign areas developed by the United States and the rights of this country in those facilities now and in the post-war period;

3. Administrative activities in foreign fields (not relating to military strategy), and particularly any confusion of functions;

4. Arrangements for the distribution of American supplies among civilian populations;

5. The committee also instructed the Senators to obtain assurance that the goods which are now being produced in an ever-increasing flow reach the fighting fronts quickly and in good condition and are what the fighting forces asked for and need.

"The committee has been collecting and studying data along these lines for many months," Senator MEAD said, "and in recent weeks Senator BREWSTER and I have conferred with officials of the State Department, the Army, the Navy, Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Economic Warfare, the Office of War Administration, and other agencies for the purpose of obtaining information about activities and conditions abroad. We have also conferred at length with Gov. Herbert Lehman, Director of Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations. The conferences have indicated that much can be accomplished by integrating and correlating the activities of the various agencies in each foreign field.

"The Truman committee understands the need for solidarity among the United Nations at the present time as well as after the war has been won. Although many of the details concerning distribution of goods abroad and arrangements for post-war activities are not now pertinent to the conduct of the war by the United Nations, responsible agencies must now be mastering these details so that we will be ready to cope with the intricate problems that are already in the making and which must be solved after the war has ended.

"The Congress will have great responsibility at that time. Now is the time for the Congress to obtain this information. This must be accomplished thoroughly and diplomatically with no relaxation of effort. The functions to be performed abroad, therefore, are expected to be difficult. It is our intention to perform them in a spirit of cooperation with the American forces and the executive departments. Our interviews and conferences to date have been marked by the splendid and wholehearted cooperation of all persons from whom we have sought information and assistance.

"We hope that the study and analysis of conditions abroad by our committee will result in improvements and efficiencies in the administration of activities abroad.

"It is our desire to work now for the lasting benefits which all nations must derive from the holocaust of pain, bloodshed, and sacrifice in which we are now enveloped. We must always remember that the American contribution in men, in goods, and in diplomacy is intended to bring into reality throughout the world the 'four freedoms' and the principles of the Atlantic Charter. These things will not just happen. Careful planning and hard work alone can make them possible.

"Throughout its existence the Truman Committee has been striving toward these ends. As Senator Truman said in his announcement on the subject, 'The committee believes that it is not enough to just follow the goods to the country's borders.

" 'It is especially important that the Congress acquaint itself now with the arrangements which are being made abroad in the name of the United States by numerous representatives of the many special agencies authorized to expend funds, and to distribute American goods and material. The time to correct mistakes is at their inception. The time to obtain equitable settlements of our post-war rights to use airfields and other properties built and paid for by us is now. The committee desires to make certain that proper attention is being given to these matters by those charged with the responsibility for them.'

"The work which Senator BREWSTER and I expect to carry on abroad," said Senator MEAD, "is simply a phase of the extended investigations along these lines conducted by the Truman Committee for the purpose of informing the Senate of the facts."

THE FIRST IMPERATIVE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The First Imperative," broadcast by him over the Wisconsin radio stations, October 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT ENCROACHMENT UPON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Government Encroachment Upon Private Enterprise Threatens the Destruction of American Democracy," delivered by him on October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GLORY THAT IS GREECE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled, "The Glory That Is Greece," made by him to the National Herald, Greek daily of New York City, and published in the issue of October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio statement on the Connally resolution, made by him on October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC—ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL GEORGE D. MURRAY

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Rear Admiral George D. Murray, commandant of the Pensacola Naval Base, before the Grand Lodge of Missouri, Free and Accepted Masons, September 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM TO LISTEN—ADDRESS BY JAMES L. FLY

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Freedom to Listen—A Universal Principle," delivered by James L. Fly, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at Boston, Mass., on September 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECISION OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD IN ILLINOIS COAL MINE CASE

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the dissenting opinion of the labor members of the National War Labor Board in the matter of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association and United Mine Workers of America, et al., and an article from the United States News entitled "Miners versus W. L. B.," which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NEW CATTLE ORDER—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY DROVERS JOURNAL

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Cattle Order," published in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN ON SENATE FLOOR

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: Equal Rights on Senate Floor While Calendar Carries Equal Rights Amendment," by Hope Ridings Miller, from the Washington Post of October 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PAST TO GUIDE US—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE VISITOR

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Past To Guide Us," published in the Providence (R. I.) Visitor of October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD PROGRAM: PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD (H. DOC. NO. 347)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying schedules, which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See p. 8955 of the House proceedings for President's message.)

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the message has been read by the Secretary. Is it intended that schedules A and B, found on pages 20, 21, 22, and 23, shall be read, or placed in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They will be printed as a part of the message.

Mr. McNARY. In the RECORD of today?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, printed in the RECORD, and the message will be printed as a document.

Mr. McNARY. The schedules are an important part of the message of the President. I am not making any objection, but some disposition should be made of the schedules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Hitherto it has not been customary to read schedules accompanying a message from the President. If the Senator wishes to have them read, they will be read.

Mr. McNARY. I am not asking that that be done; I merely desire to know whether the schedules are to follow the message in the RECORD, after the reading by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The schedules will appear following the message.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, immediately following the schedules which are found on pages 20 to 23, I should like to have consent to have inserted the recent directive of the Office of Economic Stabilization with reference to the arrangement they have with the packers as to meat purchases, and that immediately following the order there be printed the O. W. I. release relating thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the directive and order were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This directive is issued pursuant to the authority vested in me by the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in preventing inflation and for other purposes," and by Executive Order No. 9250, October 3, 1942, and Executive Order No. 9328, April 8, 1943.

1. The purposes of this directive are to insure:

(a) That the livestock slaughter payments made with respect to cattle under Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock slaughter payments) inure to the benefit of cattle producers;

(b) That such payments are made only to the extent necessary to maintain live cattle prices within a range consistent with the purposes of the stabilization and production programs;

(c) That such prices do not impose undue hardship upon any group of slaughterers whose output is needed to obtain the maximum necessary production; and

(d) That the available supplies of live cattle are equitably distributed among slaughterers and feeders.

2. It is hereby determined that the stabilization and production programs require the maintenance of live cattle prices within the following ranges:

Grade and price (per hundredweight) at Chicago:

Choice	$15.00 to $16.00
Good	14.25 to 15.25
Medium	12.00 to 13.00
Common	10.00 to 11.00
Cutter and canner	7.45 to 8.45
Bologna bulls.	

The Price Administrator and the War Food Administrator are directed to determine and publish and to certify to Defense Supplies Corporation, live cattle prices at points other than Chicago which are in line with the foregoing Chicago prices.

3. There shall be deducted from the livestock slaughter payments hereafter made to any slaughterer under Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock slaughterer payments) the net amount, if any by which the total of the prices paid by such slaughterer for all live cattle purchased during the month for which the payments are made either fell short of the total amount he would have paid at the lower of the applicable prices, or exceeded the total amount he would have paid at the higher of the applicable prices, set forth or provided for in paragraph 2 above.

The grade of live animals purchased by a slaughterer shall be determined on the basis of the carcass grade. The Price Administrator and the War Food Administrator are directed to determine and publish, and to certify to Defense Supplies Corporation, conversion factors for determining the dressed weight equivalents of live weights.

In the case of slaughterers who operate more than one plant, the amount of the payments and deductions to be made shall be determined separately for each plant.

4. The livestock slaughter payments hereafter made with respect to cattle under regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock slaughter payments) to any slaughterer whose beef carcasses are graded by an official grader of the Food Distribution Administration shall be revised and computed on a grade basis as follows:

Grade and payments per live hundredweight:

Choice	$1.00
Good	1.45
Medium	.90
Common	.50
Cutter and canner	.50
Bologna bull	.50

Livestock slaughter payments made to slaughterers whose beef carcasses are not graded by an official grader of the Food Distribution Administration shall remain unchanged.

5. Slaughterers who during the year 1942, or a representative portion thereof, sold and who currently sell 98 percent or more of the total dressed carcass weight of cattle slaughtered by them in the form of carcasses, wholesale cuts, frozen boneless beef (Army specifications) (carcass equivalent) or ground beef, shall be paid in addition to the payments authorized by Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock slaughter payments), the amount of $0.80 per hundredweight of cattle slaughtered during the month for which such payments are made.

6. Defense Supplies Corporation is directed to amend regulation No. 3 (livestock slaughter payments) in accordance with this directive.

7. The War Food Administrator is directed as soon as practicable to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

8. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to determine on the basis of facts certified by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration whether the effectuation of the expressed purposes of this directive require adjustments in, or addition to, the payments contemplated by this directive because of inequities resulting from differences in transportation costs.

9. This directive shall become effective immediately, except that paragraphs 3 and 4 shall become effective on December 1, 1943, and payments under paragraph 5 shall be made with respect to cattle slaughtered on and after November 1, 1943.

Issued this 25th day of October 1943.

FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization.

Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson today announced that he has directed a series of important changes in the present plan under which payments are made by the Defense Supplies Corporation to slaughterers of live cattle. These modifications, which will not involve any increase in the original estimates for financing the slaughter payment program, are designed to accomplish the following purposes:

1. To enable slaughterers who do not engage in the processing of beef—a group, made up principally of small enterprises, whose margins have been adversely affected under existing regulations—to continue in business.

2. To maintain prices of live cattle within a stated range approximating the present price levels, thus affording a support price to livestock producers and at the same time discouraging unwarranted advances in the live market.

3. To provide a more economical and effective allocation of present payments to all slaughterers by increasing the amounts paid for certain grades of live cattle and reducing them for others.

The new directive provides for a special payment of 80 cents per hundredweight live to nonprocessing slaughterers, who are defined as "slaughterers who during the year 1942 * * * sold and who currently sell 98 percent or more of the total dressed carcass weight of cattle slaughtered by them in the form of carcasses, wholesale cuts, frozen boneless beef * * * or ground beef." This sum will be in addition to the amounts paid all slaughterers. The funds for these special payments will be provided as a result of economies effected in the general payments.

Since May 1942 beef prices have been subject to control at wholesale and retail. On December 16, 1942, uniform dollars-and-cents prices were established by zones throughout the country for beef carcasses and wholesale cuts. Based upon these regionally uniform wholesale prices, uniform dollars-and-cents retail prices were established in May 1943.

As part of the Government's program for reducing the cost of living to the general level of September 15, 1942, the wholesale and retail prices of beef were reduced by approximately 10 percent in June of 1943. In order that this reduction might not threaten production of livestock by unduly reducing the return to the producer, the price reduction was accompanied by the institution of an equalizing payment to slaughterers, enabling them to continue to pay the same prices for live cattle. The amount of this payment, which is readjusted by the directive issued today, has heretofore been $1.10 per hundredweight on all grades of live cattle slaughtered.

There is, and has been, no direct control on the prices at which live cattle may be bought or sold. Price control of meat has been predicated on the assumption that the level of livestock prices would continue to

be determined, as it was in the past, by the price which could be secured for meat and meat products. In fact, however, cattle prices during the past year have remained at levels consistently higher than past relationships would have indicated.

Despite the fact that the spread between live cattle prices and carcass meat prices has diminished, by far the greater part of the industry has experienced a substantial increase in profits above peacetime levels. A study made by the Office of Price Administration shows that the industry's profit on sales was 2.4 percent in 1942, compared with 1 percent during the period 1936 to 1939, while the return on invested capital increased from 4 percent to 14 percent. The peak level of 1942 profits has continued into 1943. Since the packing industry is a highly integrated industry on the whole, it is evident that the relative increase in the production of the more profitable items has permitted the industry to support a higher level of cattle prices than was anticipated when the dollars-and-cents wholesale beef prices were instituted.

Despite the generally integrated character of the meat-packing industry, there is a substantial number of slaughterers, responsible for approximately 15 percent of the total beef supply, who perform no processing operations. This group has suffered under the existing wholesale ceilings. For the industry as a whole, the average value of beef carcasses and unprocessed by-products has historically been less than the cost of purchasing and slaughtering cattle. This historical relationship is reflected in present wholesale ceilings, and has been accentuated by the rise in live-cattle prices. Nonprocessing slaughterers have operated profitably in the past by various means, notably skill in buying and selling and ability to command premium prices in particular markets. Increased wartime demand for beef, pressing hard against the supply, and the establishment of uniform ceiling prices for all sellers, have tended to eliminate the conditions under which these slaughterers could operate profitably. Returns from processing operations, which have increased the earnings of the great bulk of the industry, have not been open to them.

The present directive, affording relief to nonprocessing slaughterers by means of a special additional payment, has been issued after exhaustive study of alternative possibilities. A higher selling price for these slaughterers alone would have destroyed the structure of uniform dollars-and-cents prices which experience has shown to be essential for effective control of meat prices. Higher selling prices for the industry generally would have caused a major break in the Government's hold-the-line program and would have nullified the gains from the subsidy payments already made, while at the same time adding unnecessarily to the peak profits now being enjoyed by the greater part of the packing industry. A reduction in live cattle prices sufficient to permit the nonprocessing slaughterers to stay in business would likewise have added unnecessarily to the profits of the bulk of the packing industry. This would have been done at the expense of cattle producers, and would have nullified another major purpose of the present subsidy program to insure the maintenance of a level of livestock prices sufficiently high to encourage maximum production. The alternative of permitting the greater part of the nonprocessing slaughterers to be forced out of business would not only have been contrary to the national policy in favor of protecting small enterprises, but would have deprived the Nation of slaughtering facilities which are needed to assure the full utilization of existing meat supplies.

The directive has a second major purpose: to stabilize the prices of live cattle within a range corresponding approximately to current levels.

A substantial increase in present live cattle prices would nullify the relief which the directive affords to nonprocessing slaughterers. It would also threaten the position of the industry as a whole. A decline in live cattle prices, on the other hand, would defeat the purposes of the general subsidy program by discouraging production, and would be detrimental to the interests of livestock producers.

The Director has considered the possibility of establishing both price ceilings and support prices for live cattle. The present directive, while avoiding the disadvantages of a formal price regulation or support price program, seeks to accomplish the purposes of both. This it does by requiring deductions from subsidy payments in the case of any slaughterer whose monthly payments for live cattle are either above or below the range of prices provided for in the directive.

The directive states both high and low market prices for each of the various grades of live cattle at Chicago. A spread of $1 per hundredweight separates the high and low price for each grade. Similar high and low prices at points other than Chicago, which are in line with Chicago prices, will be determined and published by the Price Administrator and the War Food Administrator. Recipients of livestock slaughter payments will be required to report each month the aggregate amount paid for live cattle and the dressed-carcass weights of each grade slaughtered. The maximum and minimum amounts which should have been paid for live cattle will be computed on the basis of the dressed-carcass weights. The amount, if any, by which the aggregate prices actually paid either exceeded the maximum or fall short of the minimum which should have been paid will then be deducted from the regular slaughter payment. The method of varying subsidy payments will thus be used to assure that cattle prices are neither unduly depressed nor bid up to a point, beyond that required for production, which threatens the stabilization program.

A primary objection to a live cattle ceiling has been the difficulty of grading live cattle on the hoof and, in particular, of determining the grade of carcass beef which any individual steer will produce. The industry has customarily bought cattle at varying prices depending on expert estimation of the quantity and quality of meat which will be obtained. The appraisal which cannot be made with certainty on an individual basis can be and normally has been made on the basis of aggregate purchases over an extended period. The directive recognizes this normal method of buying. It measures prices paid on the basis of average monthly payments. Individual purchases are thus uncontrolled. A range of $1 per hundredweight, moreover, is permitted between the high and the low prices. Deduction from subsidy payments is the only penalty for falling outside this range.

The subsidy payment heretofore made has been in the amount of $1.10 per hundredweight of live cattle, irrespective of grade. The new directive provides for modified payments varying according to grade. The payment for choice will be $1 per hundredweight; for good $1.45; for medium 90 cents; and for the lowest grades 50 cents.

The prices set forth in the directive have been determined so as to return to cattle producers approximately current prices. At these prices, and at prices prevailing in recent months, the relationship between the live cattle price and the value of the carcass and its unprocessed byproducts has varied materially for different grades. These prices in some respects increase this variance. They have been calculated so as to assure the continuance of essential feeding. Hence a spread of $3 per hundredweight has been provided between the top prices for medium and choice cattle and of $4.25 between common and good. For certain grades these spreads increase the negative margin between the live cattle price and the value of the carcass and unprocessed byproducts. Thus, the present flat payment of $1.10 per hundredweight is more than is needed for certain grades and less than is needed for others.

To remove these variations by altering the present wholesale and retail price structure would impose a substantial burden on the industry and upset the stability of beef prices which has only recently been established. The directive accomplishes the same result by varying the subsidy payment for the different grades. This will benefit slaughterers of all types who slaughter in the main those grades of live cattle with respect to which the negative margin has been greatest. Included in this group are many nonprocessing slaughterers.

The savings effected by reducing subsidy payments on grades for which the payment has been excessive are estimated to be sufficient to cover the cost of the additional payment of 80 cents per hundredweight which is provided for nonprocessing slaughterers.

The directive also requires the War Food Administration to develop a system of allocation "as soon as practicable."

It is recognized that the success of this program in keeping cattle prices within the desired range will tend at certain times to create intense demand among slaughterers for the available supply. To prevent either a break-down of the program or maladjustments in the movement of cattle to individual slaughterers or feeders or to various regions of the country, a method for directing the flow must be ready for immediate use. Accordingly this directive directs the War Food Administration to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], inserting a new section after line 9.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Gillette
Andrews	Capper	Green
Austin	Caraway	Gurney
Ball	Chavez	Hatch
Bankhead	Clark, Idaho	Hayden
Bilbo	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Brewster	Connally	Holman
Bridges	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.
Brooks	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Eastland	Kilgore
Burton	Ellender	Langer
Bushfield	George	Lodge
Butler	Gerry	Lucas

McClellan	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	Radcliffe	Truman
McNary	Reed	Tunnell
Maloney	Revercomb	Tydings
Maybank	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Millikin	Robertson	Van Nuys
Moore	Russell	Wallgren
Murdock	Scrugham	Wheeler
Murray	Shipstead	Wherry
Nye	Smith	White
O'Daniel	Stewart	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Taft	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MOSCOW AGREEMENT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the texts of the declarations issued as the result of the Moscow meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT FOUR-NATION DECLARATION

The Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, united in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender; conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression; recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments; jointly declare:

1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

TEXT OF JOINT COMMUNIQUÉ OF TRIPARTITE CONFERENCE AT MOSCOW

The conference of foreign secretaries of the United States of America, Mr. Cordell Hull; of the United Kingdom, Mr. Anthony Eden; and of the Soviet Union, Mr. V. M. Molotov; took place at Moscow from the 19th to 30th of October 1943. There were 12 meetings. In addition to the foreign secretaries, the following took part in the conference:

For the United States of America: Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador of the United States; Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army; Mr. H. Hackworth, Mr. James C. Dunn, and experts.

For the United Kingdom: Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, Ambassador; Mr. William Strang; Lt. Gen. Sir Hastings Ismay; and experts.

For the Soviet Union: Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Marshal of the Soviet Union; Mr. A. Y. Vyshinski, Mr. M. M. Litvinov, Deputy People's Commissars for Foreign Affairs; Mr. V. A. Sergeyev, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Trade; Maj. Gen. A. A. Gryziov, of the general staff; Mr. G. F. Saksin, senior official for People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs; and experts.

The agenda included all questions submitted for discussion by the three governments. Some of the questions called for final decisions, and these were taken. On other questions, after discussion, decisions of principle were taken: These questions were referred for detailed consideration to commissions specially set up for the purpose, or reserved for treatment through diplomatic channels. Other questions again were disposed of by an exchange of views. The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have been in close cooperation in all matters concerning the common war effort, but this is the first time that the foreign secretaries of the three governments have been able to meet together in conference.

In the first place there were frank and exhaustive discussions of the measures to be taken to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe. Advantage was taken of the presence of military advisers representing the respective chiefs of staff in order to discuss definite military operations with regard to which decisions had been taken and which are already being prepared in order to create a basis for the closest military cooperation in the future between the three countries.

Second only to the importance of hastening the end of the war was the recognition by the three governments that it was essential in their own national interests and in the interest of all peace-loving nations to continue the present close collaboration and cooperation in the conduct of the war into the period following the end of hostilities, and that only in this way could peace be maintained and the political, economic, and social welfare of their peoples fully promoted.

This conviction is expressed in a declaration in which the Chinese Government joined during the conference and which was signed by the three foreign secretaries and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow on behalf of their governments. This declaration published today provides for even closer collaboration in the prosecution of the war and in all matters pertaining to the surrender and disarmament of the enemies with which the four countries are respectively at war. It set forth the principles upon which the four governments agree that a broad system of international cooperation and security should be based. Provision is made for the inclusion of all other peace-loving nations, great and small, in this system.

The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops. For this purpose the conference decided to establish in London a European advisory commission to study these questions and to make joint recommendations to the three governments.

Provision was made for continuing, when necessary, the tripartite consultations of representatives of the three governments in the respective capitals through the existing diplomatic channels.

The conference also agreed to establish an advisory council for matters relating to Italy to be composed in the first instance of representatives of their three governments and of the French Committee of National Liberation. Provision is made for addition to this council of representatives of Greece and Yugoslavia in view of their special interests arising out of aggressions of Fascist Italy upon their territory during the present war. This council will deal with day to day questions other than military preparations and will make recommendations designed to coordinate Allied policy with regard to Italy.

The three foreign secretaries considered it appropriate to reaffirm by a declaration published today the attitude of the Allied Governments in favor of the restoration of democracy in Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries declared it to be the purpose of their governments to restore the independence of Austria. At the same time they reminded Austria that in the final settlement, account will be taken of efforts that Austria may make toward its own liberation. The Declaration on Austria is published today.

The Foreign Secretaries issued at the conference a declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin containing a solemn warning that at the time of granting any armistice to any German Government, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have had any connection with atrocities and executions in countries overrun by German forces, will be taken back to the countries in which their abominable crimes were committed to be charged and punished according to the laws of those countries.

In an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding which characterized all the work of the conference, consideration was also given to other important questions. These included not only questions of a current nature but also questions concerning treatment of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, economic cooperation and assurance of general peace.

STATEMENT SIGNED BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, AND PREMIER STALIN REGARDING ATROCITIES

The United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union have received from many quarters evidence of atrocities, massacres, and cold-blooded mass executions which are being perpetrated by Hitlerite forces in many of the countries they have overrun and from which they are now being steadily expelled. The brutalities of Nazi domination are no new thing and all peoples or territories in their grip have suffered from the worst form of government by terror. What is new is that many of these territories are now being redeemed by the advancing armies of the liberating powers and that in their desperation, the recoiling Hitlerites and Huns are redoubling their ruthless cruelties. This is now evidenced with particular clearness by monstrous crimes on the territory of the Soviet Union which is being liberated from Hitlerites, and on French and Italian territory.

Accordingly the aforesaid 3 Allied Powers, speaking in the interests of the 33 United Nations, hereby solemnly declare and give full warning of their declaration as follows: At the time of granting of any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany, those German officers and men

and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres, and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free governments which will be erected therein. Lists will be compiled in all possible detail from all these countries, having regard especially to invaded parts of the Soviet Union, to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to Yugoslavia, and Greece, including Crete and other islands, to Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Italy.

Thus, Germans who take part in wholesale shooting of Polish officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian, or Norwegian hostages or of Cretan peasants, or who have shared in slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in territories of the Soviet Union which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged. Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied Powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.

The above declaraton is without prejudice to the case of German criminals, whose offenses have no particuar geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the governments of the Allies.

DECLARATION REGARDING ITALY

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influence and configuration shall be completely destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States and United Kingdom declare that the action of their Governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted, has been based upon this policy.

In furtherance of this policy in the future, the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:

1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by inclusion of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.

2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press, and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.

3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.

4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from institutions and organizations of a public character.

5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded full amnesty.

6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.

7. Fascist chiefs and Army generals known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.

In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles stated above will be determined by the Commander in Chief on the basis of instructions received through the combined Chiefs of Staff.

The three Governments parties to this declaration will, at the request of any one of them, consult on this matter. It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people, ultimately to choose their own form of government.

DECLARATION ON AUSTRIA

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination.

They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.

Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut indulge me one further moment?

Mr. DANAHER. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely desire to observe that it seems to me the Moscow agreement in general comports with our war aims, and with our post-war peace aims. The sentiments therein expressed are, I believe, in substantial conformity with the terms of the pending resolution, and in addition, of course, they set forth a determined effort to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the purpose of inserting a statement in the RECORD with reference to the subject touched upon by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to read a very brief statement on the Moscow declaration issued by the 14 authors of the Pepper amendment to Senate Resolution 192. The statement is as follows:

The joint four-nation declaration issued at Moscow is a tremendous step forward on the road to lasting peace. It is a great beacon of hope to a war-weary world and will hearten all who have sought a just and durable peace after this war.

Those of us who have long advocated that the United Nations, and especially the Big Four meet during the war to discuss the common problems of peace regard the Moscow agreement as complete justification of the principles we have espoused.

We are especially gratified and encouraged at the forthright declarations in the agreement, specifically mentioning the United Nations, reiterating the Atlantic Charter, and calling for "a general international organization" to maintain peace after the war. These are the kind of clear declarations of principle which we have sought to write into the Connally resolution with our amendment. We hope that the Senate now will be at least as clear and forthright in its expression as the agreement signed at Moscow.

The 14 Senators are C. PEPPER, C. A. HATCH, S. DOWNEY, J. F. GUFFEY, H. M. KILGORE, J. H. BALL, LISTER HILL, H. FERGUSON, B. MAYBANK, J. E. MURRAY, H .H. BURTON, S. BRIDGES, T. F. GREEN, H. S. TRUMAN.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut again yield to me?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following the statement read by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], a short statement dealing with the same subject matter. I hope the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues will aid us in obtaining prompt action along the lines of the sentiments expressed in the Moscow declaration, and not consume too much time in iteration and reiteration, so that the countries of the earth may know our position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The momentous agreements of the foreign ministers are along the general line of our war purposes. They pledge unity of action on the conduct of the war and the surrender and disarmament of our enemies. They comprehend the establishment of international authority to maintain peace and security. This is the purpose of the pending Connally resolution.

The declaration respecting Italy is in harmony with our purpose to extirpate fascism in Italy and nazi-ism in Germany. They caused the present war and their continuance would be a constant threat to the peace of the world. There will be no quarrel with the declaration respecting Italy.

All in all the agreements express our war policies and the broad foreign policy of the United States respecting post-war peace and security from aggression of all peaceful and law-abiding states. They will meet with the hearty approval of the people of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. The joint four-nation declaration by the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China indicates that the conference was a success. This announcement is strong evidence of the value of conference before hostilities cease. In my opinion, the policies agreed on and therein declared give much assurance of the fulfillment of the consolidation in the peace treaty of the victory for which our sons and their Allies fight. Finally it is my opinion that it fully justifies the adoption by the Senate of the Connally resolution, as proposed to be amended by the proposal of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In view of the statement of the Senator from Texas, that he hoped we might join in prompt action on the resolution, speaking for myself alone, I want to say that if the Connally resolution, with amendments clearly expressed, or if there should be presented to the Senate any other resolution which would clearly express the sentiments set forth in the Moscow agreement which has just been placed in the RECORD, I for one would be ready to vote for such a resolution. There has never been any too great difference between the committee and the rest of us. I think in principle we have pretty well agreed. The only point is, Has that principle been clearly expressed?

If it is, whenever that is done, we will be ready to vote. There will be no delay.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very enlightening statement by Mr. Ernest Lindley, published in the Washington Post of yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNALLY RESOLUTION HAS ITS FAULTS BUT IT CERTAINLY HAS MEANING

(By Ernest Lindley)

If the President regarded the Connally resolution as seriously defective, he certainly would not have said what he did at his press conference Friday. He would either have kept silent or indicated in some way that he thought it inadequate. He did not specifically approve it or any other resolution. He made only the point that he hoped the resolution adopted would be in general terms. Under all circumstances, this must be regarded as a substantial endorsement of the Connally resolution.

Certainly this resolution is not all that might be desired, even in the form of a general statement. It contains clauses which might permit isolationists to vote for it with their tongues in their cheeks. But they also make it easier for some of the former isolationists to take their stand in favor of international collaboration.

In other words, the clauses are two-way bridges. They may be used to advance or to escape.

The trend of opinion throughout the Nation is unmistakable. It is toward the use of the power of the United States to enforce the peace. There are differences of view as to methods, but as to purpose the word "trend" may be too weak. There are many indications that a resolve to keep this war won has crystallized in the minds of an overwhelming majority of the people.

One sign is the fact that after months of procrastination, the Senate is debating a resolution on post-war policy.

CALLED SIGNIFICANT

Under these circumstances it is doubtful if the Senators who are fighting for a stronger and more specific declaration are serving the cause in which they believe. It has been asserted that the Connally resolution will have no effect abroad because seasoned correspondents in Washington know that it is too weak, that is a trap or double talk.

This column has not surveyed the views of all the foreign correspondents, but it knows one important foreign correspondent, with long experience as an observer of American affairs, who decided and wrote that the Connally resolution was significant, and still thinks so, but is having difficulty in explaining to his public why Senators PEPPER and BALL and others seem to regard it as meaningless.

Of course, if enough people proclaim that the Connally resolution is meaningless, that it is double talk, its passage will accomplish nothing.

But clearly it is not meaningless.

By no stretch of the imagination or of lawyers' logic could it be called an isolationist resolution. WHEELER and HIRAM JOHNSON are against it. It commands the support of many ex-isolationists and perhaps some who are still isolationists. But its intent is plain, and if some who are isolationists vote for it, it will be for reasons of political expediency, further evidence of the pressure of public opinion. If they crawl back later, it will be up to their constituents to deal with them accordingly.

NEGOTIATIONS NEEDED

The alternative wording proposed by Senator PEPPER and the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill group is open to objection on its own account. It proposes "an international authority" as a sort of separate institution. This particular phrase revives all the questions raised by the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill proposal for an international police force. A small international police force of the type urged by Senator BALL may or may not be desirable.

But it cannot maintain the peace of the world generally.

The central question is whether the armed victors are determined and will remain determined to keep the peace. If they are, the means will be found. If they are not, there is not much use in talking about "an international authority," or a world court, or any other methods.

IT IS MEANINGFUL

The Senate is in no position to work out detailed methods of enforcing the peace. This must be done by negotiation with the other United Nations. Schemes favored by individual Senators—or even by a majority of the Senate—may not be acceptable to some of the other United Nations, especially to Britain, Russia, and China, whose views must be reckoned with.

What our allies want to know is whether the United States will use its force in collaboration with them to enforce the peace.

A declaration by the Senate is valuable now only because of the Senate's rejection of the League. To carry weight it should be passed by at least two-thirds of the members of each party. Since it is not a treaty or a precise contract of any sort, the resolution does not need to be examined with a microscope. Its value already may have been depreciated somewhat by this attention to minutiae.

A precise directive probably would hamper the President in working out arrangements with our allies. The President indicated at his press conference that he felt so. He would rather have a general statement. The Connally resolution is not the most concise and convincing statement which could have been drafted, but, if taken at face value, it should be adequate for its purpose.

It was drafted and submitted to the Senate in response to popular demand for a declaration of the intention of the United States to use its armed forces, in collaboration with other nations, to enforce the peace. That fact, itself, is evidence that it is meaningful.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the question is not which of us takes comfort from the Moscow declaration in respect to the proposals pending in the Senate. The question is now, and has been all along, What is the correct thing for the United States Senate to say; what is the correct thing for the United States to do; and what is in accord with the sentiments of the other United Nations and the peace-loving peoples of the world?

Therefore, I wish it were possible—I believe it would meet the cordial approval of the group with which I have been associated—for the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to take the initiative in inviting further consultation, probably in the Committee on Foreign Relations, about the form of the resolution which the Senate will be asked to adopt, by a recommittal of the resolution for a brief time. So far as we are concerned, it might be merely a matter of hours, because we do not wish to delay. The group considering the resolution might be an informal group which the able chairman of the committee might be willing to call together to represent a cross section of the Senate.

I believe there are certain sentiments expressed in the agreement reached, we are all heartened to say, at Moscow which go further than the Connally resolution goes, and I am sure it is the desire of our group and of those who want to strengthen the Connally resolution merely to have the pending resolution say the things which we think are necessary to be said at this time. It might be appropriate, therefore, for the whole subject to be reconsidered and the whole resolution to be reframed, in view of the declaration which has come out of Moscow, and which has heartened all of us who want a better post-war world, and do not want again a futile peace.

I do not mean to be presumptuous in the suggestion I have made. I know that I, for one, would like very much to see that course followed, and I think the thing which would immeasurably hearten the powers signatory to the Moscow declaration would be to have it said that within a few hours of the announcement of the declaration the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution which echoed its hearty accord with the sentiments of that declaration. If I am not presumptuous in mentioning it, I should like to have an expression of the thought on that matter, for whatever consideration the able chairman of the committee and other interested Senators may choose to give.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be inaccurate to have the impression go out that the Moscow declaration is more like the pending amendment than it is like the pending resolution. It seems to me perfectly obvious that the Moscow declaration is far more like the Connally resolution than it is like the proposed amendment. It says nothing whatever about force or the use of military force. It is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and

emphasizes the sovereignty of the states as it is not emphasized by the proposed amendment to the Connally resolution. In fact, it seems to me that on the whole the Moscow declaration is far more like the Mackinac resolution endorsed by the Republican Party than it is like either the resolution or the proposed amendment to it, now pending before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator from Florida that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations is one which I do not think any other member of the Committee on Foreign Relations except the Senator from Florida would propose or agree to. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Florida is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee had the benefit of his views and his advice in the committee, and I know of no other Senator who is a member of that committee, who has changed his attitude, unless it be the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], who was not present in the committee when the final vote was taken. But I do not think any useful purpose could be served by recommitting the resolution to the committee.

Here is what the declaration at Moscow says about peace. It is subparagraph (4) of the first statement entitled "Joint Four-Nation Declaration":

> 4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there? I desire to ask a question.

Mr. DANAHER. I am quite willing to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able senior Senator from Texas whether he believes that the Moscow declaration goes further than the pending resolution goes. Does the able senior Senator from Texas believe that the pronouncement by the Moscow conference in reality goes further than what is contemplated in connection with the Connally resolution?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know. I think it is entirely in harmony with it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am happy to hear the Senator say that, because, as I understood from the newspapers this morning, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], proposed to offer a resolution or an amendment to the effect that small nations have the very right which is expressed in the portion of the Moscow conference declaration the Senator from Texas has just read.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from North Carolina has already submitted his amendment, which is much more comprehensive than what the Senator says about small nations. He particularizes small nations all over the world, and provides that they must have their independence and freedom guaranteed.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but is not that the fundamental principle involved in the very declaration the Senator has just read?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator refer to the statement "sovereign equality of all peace-loving states"?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I refer to the statement "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, all Senators will observe that the foreign ministers seem to know what they are doing without too much instruction as to details, by the Senate or anyone else. That is what I have been contending for here, that the so-called Connally resolution is merely a broad, comprehensive authorization within which could be constructed proper peace agencies. The pending amendment—I do not want to debate it—declines to accept that sort of a policy, and wants to particularize, and to tell them what they can do and when they can do it. I think it much wiser to take the position—and the work of the conference at Moscow justifies the belief—that they know what they are doing and know what they are about, and I think it would be very unwise to attempt to dictate to them the details of any machinery or organization which they may undertake to set up.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: I wish to digress here, Mr. President, to express my appreciation of our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, that patient and devoted man, that unflagging and indefatigable servant of the people, who has again won a notable success for our country and for the peace of the world. I pay my tribute to our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just paid a notable tribute to our great Secretary of State in connection with the results achieved at the Moscow conference. Earlier in the day the joint declaration was placed in the RECORD by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator from Alabama is agreeable, that the remarks he has just made about that conference and about the Secretary of State be printed in the RECORD immediately following the remarks made earlier in the day by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee when he asked and obtained consent to have the Moscow conference declaration printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects to Cordell Hull, that old mountaineer from Tennessee, who probably is as much or more responsible for what has come out of Moscow in the way of a conference agreement than any other one person. The declaration of the conference is a total refutation of some of the stories which originated some 6 or 8 weeks ago as to what this great statesman from Tennessee thought of the people of Russia as well as her integrity and her honesty toward the final peace of the world. Secretary Hull is entitled to the commendation of all the American people who believe in peace on earth and good will toward men so far as the future is concerned.

When I think of this man of 72 years of age, this cool and unruffled statesman, as he is, from the southern section of our country, taking off on an 11,000-mile airplane journey, his first trip in a plane, to go to Moscow to serve his country in probably the greatest crisis he has ever encountered, there is not too much that I as a Member of the Senate could say in praise of the patriotism, the integrity, and the loyalty to country of that great man. I wish to God more people of America had in them what Cordell Hull has in him with respect to devotion to his country.

I think the Senate of the United States should respect Secretary Hull for what he has done in obtaining more than anyone ever believed he could obtain from the deliberations of this conference, and I believe that we should close this debate as soon as possible, for perhaps if we "fool around" another week debating a stalemate, so to speak, in the Senate, we will begin to look ridiculous in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. GEORGE subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the very interesting address of the Senator from Alabama, but I desire to join, as indeed I have already joined, in the statement made by the Senator from Illinois with reference to our own Secretary of State.

The Moscow conference traveled a great deal further than most informed people believed it could go in the first meeting of the distinguished representatives of the four governments, known, as we think of them, as the original United Nations, if I may use that phrase, although they number 33 at this time.

The accomplishments of the conference must be credited in large measure, I believe, to the patience, persistence, and wisdom of our Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. I think he has demonstrated his sterling worth and value as a public servant, attributes so sadly and so seriously needed at this time of crisis in our history, and the history of the world.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Georgia for their tributes to Mr. Hull, our Secretary of State. As I have said, I had earlier tried in my inadequate way to pay my tribute to him. He has once again confirmed the faith and the confidence of the American people in him, and today our people can

well say to him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish first to add the highest possible commendation which I may speak to what has already been said by other Senators in appreciation of the magnificent task accomplished by our distinguished Secretary of State at Moscow. I do not believe Secretary Hull would count it a breach of confidence if, in order to add a little force to the public understanding of his determination to take part in this conference, I should say that at the time when some were saying that because of his years the trip to Moscow might be too hazardous a physical journey, Secretary Hull, in that quiet, determined way of his, when I asked if there were some prospect of a conference, and whether he might, as many of us hoped, go, said, "Why, certainly, I am going. Whether it be held in London or in Moscow, or in a penthouse on top of the Himalaya Mountains, I will be in my place."

As has been said, in his first trip in an airplane, he took this perilous air journey with the same courage and the same thoughtlessness of self which have characterized his entire public career. While full of years and full of honors he has added yet greater luster to his name. Great as have been his previous achievements in international affairs, he has today laid a stone in the edifice of a new world order which for all time shall bear, among others, his own illustrious name and his own peculiar craftsman's mark.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have already made a public statement of my great satisfaction with respect to the Moscow conference. I wish, however, to add a word of congratulations and praise for the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, for the monumental accomplishment which he was able to bring about at Moscow.

Mr. Hull is a man of fine judgment and balance. He has pursued his duties in the State Department without seeking to interfere with the activities of other branches of the Government, and has thereby obtained a very wide and very great influence in his particular field of action.

I wish to say with reference to all these matters relating to post-war peace, that the Foreign Relations Committee has been in frequent contact with the Secretary of State. He knows their views and they know his views. Without undertaking to go into details, I may say that the draft of the pending resolution was cabled to Mr. Hull while he was in Moscow. He knew its general outlines and general terms before he left for Moscow. I feel that there is no difference whatever between the principles of the pending resolution and those set forth in the Moscow conference declaration. In fact I regard the Moscow conference as a complete confirmation and approval of the principles embodied in the pending resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a moment?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it was my purpose, let me say to the Senator from New Mexico, to express what I would call a thought of my own on this subject. [Laughter.] But I am perfectly willing to have the Senator from New Mexico contribute to the discussion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has been very kind in yielding, but there have been some other interpretations which I think should be discussed. I shall not ask the Senator to yield now, but later in my own time I shall discuss the question more fully. I must always disagree with any interpretation of our proposed amendment which attempts to say that we are endeavoring to particularize or dictate the method and details of any agreement, for such is not the proper interpretation of the language or intent of the amendment.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the New York Times for October 30, in a dispatch by Mr. John H. Crider, I find the following, under a Washington date line:

> President Roosevelt said today that the Moscow Conference had been a tremendous success, and indicated that about all that remained for the conferring Foreign Ministers was to sign the documents that have been agreed upon. The contents of the agreements would be announced from Moscow when they have been signed, he said.

I skip some nonessential matter.

> He replied to a question at his press conference as to whether or not his praise of the Moscow meeting meant that he now believed Russia would cooperate with the United States after the war, by stating that he had always believed she would cooperate, and that this event merely reenforced his belief. It was clear, the President said, that the main objectives of the conferences were to obtain world peace and to end aggression.

Mr. President, when we read that in the New York Times of last Saturday, those of us who gave it any thought at all must have asked, What did the President mean by ending aggression? What did he mean, even, by the term? Of course, were he to pick up the resolution pending before the Senate and find that the United States is to join with other nations in an international organization with power to suppress aggression, he necessarily would be bound to inquire in his own mind as to just exactly what acts or facts could be said to constitute aggression.

Today, Mr. President, within the past half hour, there has been released to us news of the Moscow conference. I note that among the items released are two declarations in particular, one dealing with Austria and the other dealing with Italy. I read, with reference to Austria, the declaration released by the Department of State:

> The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination. They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria, and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves as well as those neighboring States which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.
>
> Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility which she cannot evade for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

Mr. President, apparently the three governments named have declared that some entity named Austria—its territorial, economic, and population lines not delimited—is to be given a degree or status of liberation. I assume that means independence. They say that a free and independent Austria is to be reestablished. This Austria apparently is to be told that she will not be quite as independent if she fails to take account of the warning that is given to her and persists in any degree of collaboration with Hitlerite Germany; but the point I am seeking to emphasize is that representatives of this Government, sitting in a Moscow meeting with representatives of certain other governments, similarly deputized, are purporting to decide the independence of a country, and in turn to maintain, or to agree to maintain, that independence.

Mr. President, suppose that some other nation in Europe should disagree with the result so arrived at in Moscow? Are we by passing the pending resolution to decide that any nation which does so disagree, or which shall resist any effort to create and carve out the new Austria, is an aggressor? Would that become such aggression as to involve us in the maintenance of the Austria so liberated and so created? In other words, in the future, will we be bound to enter the war on the first day, instead of 2 years afterward? Is that to be the degree of commitment which the so-called maintenance of the independence of Austria is to wring from Mr. Hull and the representatives of the other nations at Moscow?

These are perfectly legitimate questions, Mr. President, when we are thinking about the degree of authorization which we are to give the President and when we talk about the free hand which it is said he must have.

Last week we were told that unless we passed this resolution as it came from the Foreign Relations Committee, without amendment, we would not implement Mr. Hull in his discussions in Moscow. We were told that if we would pass this resolution promptly, without amendment, he would have an immense force at his control with which to wring concessions to bring about agreement among the representatives of the participating nations. However, it develops that the agreement is fait accompli, and that the Senate is still debating the resolution as it came from the Foreign Relations Committee, and the interpretation to be given to it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was interested in the remarks of the able Senator about our going to war in the event Austria should

not comply with the declaration with respect to Austria which has just been released by the Moscow conference. I do not quite follow the Senator. I should like to have him further elaborate as to why we should have to go to war.

Mr. DANAHER. Are we to maintain the peace of all the nations of the world? That is what the resolution would say we would join or cooperate with other nations in bringing about through international authority. Are we, through "international authority," to have the power to suppress aggression? I borrow the words from the pending resolution. If any nation does not like the carving out of Austria in this new entity, and revolts against or refuses to concur in the Moscow agreement and marches in to protect what it deems to be its own interest, will we say that such an act constitutes an act of aggression? If the people of Austria themselves should revolt against the declaration in Moscow that Austria is to be an independent state, and if a state of insurrection and civil strife should arise, would that be considered aggression which would authorize us to move into the new and independent Austria?

I am emphasizing that an attempt to understand the term "aggression," which the League of Nations itself, through its Council, for years and years has sought to define, becomes more poignant in perspective when we consider that the representatives of this country are setting about the creation of an independent Austria.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will carefully examine paragraphs 1 and 2 of that release, he will find that there is nothing in those two paragraphs which is detrimental to the position which the Senator takes. I know that the Senator from Connecticut is not in favor of Hitlerism in the ideas he is now expressing——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I challenge the Senator in that respect.

Mr. LUCAS. I am complimenting the Senator. I say that the Senator from Connecticut is not in favor of any Hitleristic ideas or anything that he is attempting to accomplish at the present time.

Mr. DANAHER. When the Senator says "he" does he mean Hitler?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator and I have agreed with respect to Hitler since December 7, 1941. Long before that I was against Hitler. The last paragraph of the declaration on Austria states in part as follows:

> Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany.

Will the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator to make his own statement——

Mr. LUCAS. Do not ask me any questions. I asked the Senator to yield only in order to ask him a question. I ask the Senator to answer my question. Does he agree with the statement which I have read?

Mr. DANAHER. No, I do not at the moment have it clearly in mind, I will say frankly to him, because I had in mind calling the attention of the Senator to the declaration in the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has yielded to a question.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator cannot call anything to my mind. I am merely asking him a question.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please restate the question?

Mr. LUCAS. The last paragraph of the declaration on Austria, to which I have referred, in part states as follows:

> Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany.

I am asking the Senator whether or not he agrees with that statement.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. That is fine. The paragraph continues as follows:

> and that in the final settlement, account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

In other words, that simply means that if the people of Austria, who are now carrying on in behalf of Hitler and his policies, show a real intention to throw off the yoke of Hitlerism they may expect what is presented in paragraphs 1 or 2. But in the event they continue after the war is over and victory has been achieved by the Allied forces, to go along and play the conspiracy type of nazi-ism that may exist is Austria at that particular time, to the end that Hitler may be the beneficiary, or those who succeed him may be benefited, then they cannot expect anything from the Allied Nations in the way of what is expressed in paragraphs 1 and 2. That is what I wanted to say. In the event they do not comply, but continue to follow Hitler and his policies, then, insofar as I am concerned, I agree exactly with what is expressed in paragraph 3 of the declaration on Austria.

Mr. DANAHER. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator answered the question a long time ago. He did not answer it at first, but he finally answered it, and I am merely expressing my thought in respect to the matter. The Senator was discussing the question of our going to war in the event Austria did not comply, and I say that in the event the Austrian people, as a result of what is expressed in paragraph 3 of the declaration, do not comply with what we agree to in connection with the final treaty, if it is based upon what is expressed here, then some military force will see that they do comply, and I am in favor of that being done.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me make plain one thing, namely, that the representatives of three governments, speaking with respect to Austria, have issued a formal declaration in which they say that it is their intention to liberate Austria. They say that they regard the annexation imposed upon Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, was null and void. They say they consider themselves in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria, and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which may be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economical security which is the only basis for everlasting peace. Why did they make that declaration? Clearly because they believe it is to the interests of the governments involved that such a declaration be agreed upon. They agree, therefore, upon the necessity of there being a free and independent Austria, or they would not have made such a declaration. Moreover, they say nothing with respect to the neighboring states. They do not define them. They do not say, for example, whether or not Bavaria will be taken from Germany and added to the new Austria, or whether the northern part of Italy will be carved out of Italy and annexed to the new Austria. There is no definition, in other words, of the territorial basis of the new Austria. I am not saying anything as to the future. All I am saying is that in the interests of the declaring powers there has been achieved an agreement that there shall be a free and independent Austria. Thereafter to say that Austria shall be given only a degree of independence to which the agreeing powers have committed themselves in the declaration, measured solely by the test of whether from now on Austria does or does not cooperate, is completely to beg the question, and disregards that which was found to be the fact, and the necessary fact, which led to the declaration in the first place.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have any further questions. The only point I raised was in respect to the Senator's statement that in the event that Austria did not comply, a military force would intervene. In other words, the Senator said that probably war would be declared on Austria in the event she did not comply with what is expressed in paragraph 3. The only thing I said was that in the event the Austrian people continued after we achieve victory in this war—assuming we shall achieve it, as I am sure everyone believes we will—to attempt to follow the policies of Hitler and his Nazi philosophy, they can expect what is expressed in paragraph 3, and I think that is all there is to it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator has obviously missed the point which I was trying to make with respect to the term "aggression."

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota who has been on his feet. I know he has been very patient.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a problem I shall now mention. We talk about freeing Austria. We can only discuss that matter in the light of history.

At the Versailles Treaty, in punishment for having joined in the war with Germany, and in order to keep her at peace,

and from becoming an aggressive nation, Austria was carved into many different segments and divided among various other neighboring countries in order to establish a number of new countries, leaving only a very small agricultural territory around the great industrial city of Vienna, an economic unit that was absolutely impossible of maintaining its economic self-sufficiency and independence. As a result there was and is an economic condition there, bringing on political upheaval, a political condition which was so bad that Hitler took advantage of it and Austria lost its sovereignty, and came under the domination of Hitler simply as a result of the status of Austria as an economic unit, resulting from the Treaty of Versailles.

If Austria is to be freed with its present boundaries it will be politically and economically impossible for Austria to remain an independent state. It might be possible to make Austria free, but she cannot maintain her freedom because she cannot maintain a free sovereign political government on the foundation left her after the Treaty of Versailles.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very valuable contribution.

Let me reiterate that if any nation neighboring to Austria once created as a free, independent, and liberated state with new entity as declared by the representatives meeting at Moscow, should attack Austria, should say that the powers that be, the comrades-in-arms, if you please, who have created this state, have invaded what we think is a fair delineation, and there should be an attack upon Austria we apparently are to be committed to maintaining the status quo, and we would be asked to maintain an entity that is to be created pursuant to the declaration. I ask at that point, if any other nation should attack the new and liberated Austria, would that be construed to be aggression? That is the first thing. If it should be construed to be aggression, which we say we intend to suppress and to join with other nations in suppressing, then obviously we will have agreed to go to war the first day, as I say, rather than 2 years after the act of aggression commences.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield further to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Again I want to quote a little bit of history to show how the members who were in control of the League of Nations treated Austria at a time when she was trying to adjust her economic machinery so she could continue as an independent nation. When Austria made the Anschluss, economic or tariff agreement with Germany, in 1931, which would possibly have meant the salvation and independence of Austria, other nations of Europe who were signatories of the League of Nations objected to that economic tariff agreement. It was taken to the World Court for settlement, and the World Court decided against the agreement on the part of Germany and Austria. They were playing politics. It was stated in the newspapers that it was a political decision, based on politics, and not to restore some kind of an economic lifesaver to Austria. As a matter of fact, Judge Loder—and I shall quote him now, because we can only discuss the future in the light of the history of the past—Judge Loder wrote the constitutions for the League of Nations court, the so-called World Court. He told me so. He was its first president. He served for some years and then resigned. Here was the organization responsible for the Treaty of Versailles and maintaining the peace of Europe. I asked him why he resigned. He said:

> I tried for years to get a judicial tribunal to settle judicial matters between nations. I tried to make it a judicial tribunal. I came to the conclusion that I could not do it.

He said:

> We have not a judicial court; it is a political court. They have taken jurisdiction of the German Anschluss question. That is a political matter. The Court should not have taken jurisdiction of political matters.

When the decision was made the Court held against the request of Austria. It was referred to in the newspapers quite freely, and it was intimated that there was very strong circumstantial evidence of bribery of some of the judges.

I call this to the attention of the Senator to show the position in which Austria was put when, in her struggle for economic existence, upon which is based political existence, the strong powers that had an opportunity to assist Austria, for political reasons, refused to do so. That had really a great deal to do with bringing on the present World War and driving us into the war against Hitler.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator before he yielded had just made a point which goes straight to the heart of the prospect of World War No. 3, when he asked whether once a free and independent Austria was set up the United States, along with its allies, was prepared to step in and attempt by force to maintain the independence of the Austria created by the peace agreement. I think if we and our allies are not prepared to do that, we are fooling ourselves and the people and telling them we are going to present the opportunity for another world war.

The Senator said in that case we would have gotten into this war the first day it started instead of 2 years later. I would beg to remind him that this war started, not in 1939 but in 1931, when Japan launched the first aggression against China in Manchuria. For my own part, I think we and the other peace-loving nations should make up our minds that we are going to put out the fires of aggression while they are small, before they grow into conflagrations and sweep the whole world.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's point, for example, that the aggression which he says commenced in 1931 was similarly in evidence when Russia took a part of Poland in 1939?

Mr. BALL. I would not defend Russia's act of aggression against Poland in the slightest degree, nor would I defend Poland's seizure of a part of Czechoslovakia when Hitler marched into Prague. But I would remind the Senator from Connecticut that in his own pending amendment he would provide for exactly what I am proposing when he defines aggression to mean "a breach of the agreement for peace, as above defined by any nation signatory thereto, as well as the first act by any other nation of injury leading to a war." I take it that means that the Senator feels that once an overall peace agreement is made, then we are prepared to back it up with force, and say, "Settle your disputes by peaceful means."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. BALL. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to know from the Senator, Mr. President, whether or not he feels that if, as a result of declarations similar to the Moscow agreement, which applies at the moment only to Austria and Italy, which shall be made with reference to Poland and Belgium and Holland and France, there will have been developed a series of entities the maintenance of which in accordance with the decisions taken by our representatives, such as those at Moscow we intend to support.

Mr. BALL. I do not think the Executive by himself can make such a commitment for this Government. I hope that the United States Senate, on behalf of this Government, eventually will get a chance to ratify such a commitment applying not to sections of Europe but to the whole world.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's point of view that, once these entities have been created and their maintenance guaranteed, the status quo is to be preserved by an international authority with power to act from then on?

Mr. BALL. No; that is not the Senator's contention. We are trying to insert in this amendment a clause providing for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means in order to get away from exactly the question the Senator from Connecticut has raised. We do not want international authority with power set up simply to preserve the status quo. This is a changing world. So let us provide the peaceful machinery to make necessary changes, but let us not permit such changes to be made by force, because, then, we are drifting right down the road of minor aggressions which may grow until they become major aggressions and result in World War No. 3.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If we had gone to war to stop Hitler entering Austria, that would not have settled Austria's question,

because it is quite apparent—and I am so informed—that Austria permitted Hitler to come in peacefully, that is, without resistance, because of the fact that the conditions in Austria were so bad politically and socially, as a result of the economic situation, that there was not any will to resist anything. I remember very well at the time we saw pictures in the American newspapers of Hitler going into Vienna standing in an open automobile with one driver, and apparently thousands of people standing "heiling Hitler." I could not understand it, I could not really believe it. But a statesman of Europe of whom I asked whether it could be true said, "Yes." I said, "How could that happen? Why did not somebody shoot him?" He said, "I will tell you. It was because conditions in Austria, socially and politically, were so bad, because of the economic situation after the Treaty of Versailles. I do not think the people had any particular love or regard for Hitler," he said, "but they were so oppressed under the economic conditions in which they existed that they were ready to jump either from the frying pan into the fire or from the fire into the frying pan." He said, "They just wanted to get rid of what they had because of the conditions existing in Austria."

I do not think Austria should be blamed for it. Those who wrote the Treaty of Versailles should be blamed for making conditions so impossible that governments could not be sustained so as to supply the people with work and means of sustenance. The court created to settle such cases by peaceful means became a political court whose decisions based on political grounds furnished no remedy.

Mr. President, I call that to the attention of the Senate to show how difficult it is, in writing a treaty of peace, to see that justice is done, and that it is made possible for people to earn a living, in order to allay discord and discontent, to prevent revolution, and to prevent conditions such as those which existed in Austria, under which it was possible for Hitler to take over the sovereignty of Austria without any military or other opposition.

Unless we have a treaty of peace which will establish justice, and make it possible for the people of the various countries to make a living and to exist, I do not see how we will ever be able to establish peace. Permanent peace can be based only on justice. I think we should discuss these matters now, because if we are merely going to have a few large nations maintaining a police force to keep in subjugation peoples whom they can exploit, or if a treaty of peace is so written that any country will be left in a condition of economic poverty so the people cannot continue to live and make a decent living without disorder and revolution, our efforts will be in vain. We will merely be repeating the tragedies of the past and lay the foundation for the next war.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. Now I shall ask my colleagues to grant me the indugence of about a half hour without interruption, simply that I may develop item by item the few points I wish to make with reference to the pending resolution on the one hand, and my proposed amendment on the other.

I had earlier noted that at Moscow our Nation's representative, joining with others, has agreed that Austria is to be reestablished as a free and independent nation. At the same conference the same parties agreed in a declaration regarding Italy. They said:

> The foreign secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influence and configuration shall be completely destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.
>
> The foreign secretaries of the United States and United Kingdom declare that the action of their Governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted, has been based upon this policy.
>
> In furtherance of this policy in the future, the foreign secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:
>
> 1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by inclusion of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.
>
> 2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press, and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people, who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.
>
> 3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.
>
> 4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from institutions and organizations of a pubic character.
>
> 5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded full amnesty.
>
> 6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.
>
> 7. Fascist chiefs and Army generals known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.
>
> In making this declaration the three foreign secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles stated above will be determined by the commander in chief on the basis of instructions received through the combined chiefs of staff.
>
> The three Governments, parties to this declaration, will, at the request of any one of them, consult on this matter. It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people ultimately to choose their own form of government.

Mr. President, we have on the one hand undertaken, it would appear, to declare that we wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria, without specifications, and on the other hand to grant unto the peoples of Italy a declaration of the form of government under which they shall live, to the end that self-government ultimately be restored to them because they have been forcibly deprived thereof.

To the extent that on the one hand we superimpose our will on the peoples of Austria, or those who will comprise the ultimate Austria, and on the other hand grant to the peoples of Italy an independent form of government, democratic in nature, we have apparently taken two inconsistent stands, insofar as the declarations of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt in the past have gone.

I refer, of course, to the Atlantic Charter. It is my thought, it is my firm belief, that if we are to authorize our President, by virtue of the advice, so-called, contained in the pending resolution, to negotiate with reference to the reestablishment of nations all over this earth, on the ground that some particular set of circumstances makes one condition expedient at one place and another set of circumstances seems to make something else expedient at another place, we have undertaken to project the long arm of our Chief Executive, the exponent of our external sovereignty, far beyond the bounds of the American principles, and far beyond any constitutional authority which the President has.

Mr. President, it seems to me it becomes important that we understand the nature and the possibility of the commitments to be made and that we understand the basis on which the President would be authorized to act, for if there be commitments, and they are later brought back to us in the form of treaties, or, if not brought in the form of treaties, are made the subject of Executive agreement, the extent to which our Nation may be bound on the one hand or the other becomes of utmost and fundamental importance to the future of this country.

For my first reference I turn to a decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1936, which appears in 299 United States Reports, at page 304. The Court at that time consisted of Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Vandevanter, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Butler, Mr. Justice Roberts, and Mr. Justice Cardozo, who concurred in the opinion to which I direct the attention of the Senate, Mr. Justice Reynolds, dissenting without opinion, and Mr. Justice Stone taking no part in the decision. I read from page 319, where the Court said:

> Not only, as we have shown, is the Federal power over external affairs in origin and essential character different from that over internal affairs, but participation in the exercise of the power is significantly limited. In this vast external realm, with its important, complicated, delicate, and manifold problems, the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation. He makes treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate; but he alone negotiates. Into the field of negotiation the Senate cannot intrude; and Congress itself is powerless to invade it. As Marshall said in his great argument of March 7, 1800, in the House of Representatives: "The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations."

Mr. President, I digress at that point to emphasize that as of the date and from the time that the President was accorded a practically unanimous decision of the eminent Court to which I have made reference, we have found the Chief Executive directing entirely the foreign policy

of this Nation and in the day to day decisions without reference to the Congress or to the United States Senate.

I asked the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the other day how long it was since the Foreign Relations Committee had been consulted by the President, and the Senator said that, speaking for himself alone, there had been no contact with the President since 1933; that insofar as the committee had any information from the Executive, it came through Mr. Hull, the Secretary of State, and, of course, only to the extent that Mr. Hull himself either knew or was permitted to tell the committee what the course and objectives ultimately might be.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator, but I do so for a question only.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not intend to trespass too much on the Senator's time. It has been charged that the decision of the Court in the Curtiss-Wright case gave to the Executive full control of foreign policy.

Mr. DANAHER. That is the case from which I am reading.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But the Court said that whatever the President does must be done within constitutional limitations. Does not the Senator think that means that the President must come to the Senate for ratification of an international agreement which he may have negotiated?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; if ratification is sought the President must come back to the Senate, but let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that if it be the claimed prerogative of the President under an opinion, let us say, from the Attorney General of the United States, to enter into an executive agreement which he does not refer to the United States Senate, how will it be challenged? In what court will you seek your injunction to restrain its operations?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, there must be a remedy against usurpation of power.

Mr. DANAHER. Well, we have it every 4 years for one thing, Mr. President, and we have a chance also through the medium of impeachment by the House of Representatives. Those two protections the Constitution has set up.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We evidently have been drifting away from the constitutional limitations of the President's power in foreign affairs as well as in legislative.

Mr. DANAHER. I will say that if the power existed in the beginning it exists now. If it were there but never was exercised in the beginning but is only being exercised now, that is no argument against the validity of its existence. What I am getting at is this: Whether the power exists or is only claimed to exist, there is the greater need in view of the resolution for us to exercise in every way within our ability whatever constitutional restraints constitute our prerogatives in that respect; and I would point out to the Senator from Minnesota that when the Attorney General of the United States was called upon to decide with reference to the 50-destroyer deal what the President's prerogatives were in that particular, he turned promptly to the Curtiss-Wright decision as the basis for the Presidential exercise of authority.

I continue to read from page 319 another paragraph:

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations at a very early day in our history (February 15, 1816) reported to the Senate, among other things, as follows:

"The President is the constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations. He manages our concerns with foreign nations and must necessarily be most competent to determine when, how, and upon what subjects negotiation may be urged with the greatest prospect of success. For his conduct he is responsible to the Constitution. The committee consider this responsibility the surest pledge for the faithful discharge of his duty. They think the interference of the Senate in the direction of foreign negotiations calculated to diminish that responsibility and thereby to impair the best security for the national safety. The nature of transactions with foreign nations, moreover, requires caution and unity of design, and their success frequently depends on secrecy and dispatch.

"It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power but with such an authority plus the very delicate plenary and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution."

Mr. President, with those thoughts in mind, the definition which appears in my amendment would give vitality to the language of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on line 5. I read from line 5 of the committee resolution:

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority."

What are those constitutional processes, Mr. President? What are the authorizations or the grants of power to the Congress itself on the one hand and the President on the other with respect to this type of situation? If we turn to article I, section 8, we find that—

The Congress shall have power to * * * provide for the common defence; * * *
To declare war; * * *
To raise and support armies;
To provide and maintain a navy;
To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions;
To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States;
To provide for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful buildings; and
To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

I have read only such portions of article I, section 8, as touch upon the matters affecting war and belligerent conduct, and defense of the United States, Mr. President. But turning to article II, section 2, we find that—

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States.

I break off reading at that point, Mr. President, to observe that great controversy exists as to whether or not the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States has any power beyond that mentioned, over the civilian population in time of war. We constantly hear uttered, and from one source or another, the suggestion, at least, that the President is the Commander in Chief over the whole population in time of war. A reading of the Constitution denies that utterance which apparently is very sedulously being inserted into the American mind.

I read further from section 2, that—

He—

Meaning the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

But, Mr. President, there are so many fields in which we have already carved into our power, and from our storehouse, so to speak, turned over to the President the authority to act, that the greatest possible circumspection in the light of the constitutional grants and limitations, must prevail. For example, in the act approved March 11, 1941, commonly called the Lend-Lease Act, in section 3 (b) we find:

The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Mr. President, we have in addition given to him certain powers under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the powers granted by the Second War Powers Act, and other acts, all of which are subject to being exercised in the direction of achieving by executive agreement a result which very definitely may be contrary to the objectives claimed for the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Resolution 192. It is because there is in the resolution no definition of the powers to be exercised pursuant to the Senate's advice, or no limitation upon the authority stated, that I have offered the amendment which is now the pending question.

For example, in the second clause we find that the committee suggests "that the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace."

Mr. President, who are our comrades-in-arms? If the Moscow conference is to be taken as a criterion, except for the joint statement which declared the overall policy, China, for one, was not a party to it. Clearly, Mr. President, Italy was not. Therefore, it becomes apparent that Great Britain—designated in the Moscow release as "the United Kingdom," with the narrower limitation that "the United Kingdom" as a designation carries with it—and the United States and Russia are the three moving powers who would comprise the "comrades-in-arms." They are said by the resolution to have the objective of cooperating in securing a just and honorable peace. Mr. President, what is a just and honorable peace? We certainly need an agreement for peace, I am sure. If we mean an agreement for peace, it seems to me that the Senate should at least inform the President of the basic fundamentals upon which the Senate will insist before it will consider that a just and honorable peace has been achieved.

Recognizing the points made by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] a few minutes ago and the fundamental, disturbing economic disorders within nations, it follows that if we can bring about an agreement which will minimize the causes of economic disorder and which will limit the opportunity for conflicts and international jealousies in that field, we shall have gone a very long way toward eradicating the causes for war and toward establishing a just and honorable peace which can be maintained.

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt told the country and the world, as a result of their meeting off the Newfoundland coast in August 1941, what they had in mind in reference to an international peace and the objectives of the war, their declarations being set forth in what we have commonly come to call the Atlantic Charter. Therefore, in my amendment, I take their very own words; I take them right from the Atlantic Charter. I say that if that is what the world was told is the basis for our fighting, if that is what our men in almost all lands and over all the seven seas are seeking to achieve, the very least we should demand is that the President bring back to us an agreement for the peace which will include an outline of the declared objectives.

Consequently, the agreement, I suggest, should include provisions that no signatory nation shall seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise; second, that no territorial changes shall be permitted which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; third, that all peoples shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they shall live, particularly to the end that self-government may be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived thereof.

Mr. President, I stop there, to point out that while at Moscow there was agreement on what is to be done with reference to Italy and Austria, nothing was said with reference to Poland, for example. In a State like the State of Connecticut, there are literally thousands upon thousands of boys of Polish extraction who have gone into the armed services of the United States, and who are fighting all over the world in the firm belief that they are going to help restore the pre-war borders of the homeland of their parents and to restore Poland, the source of the family line of which they are a part; and yet not a word is even so much as suggested as to what is to be done with reference to Poland. It seems to me that any agreement for peace that is to have any foundation in security, justice, and honor, is bound necessarily to take into account the situation with reference to Poland.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator's argument, if he prefers not to be interrupted. If he will yield to me, let me say that I believe Britain went to war with Germany because Britain had guaranteed Poland's territorial integrity. I assume that agreement is still in effect. If the agreement is still in effect, and if Russia wants to keep what she took from Poland when she went into Poland at the same time Germany went there, will it then be up to Great Britain and the other Allied powers to go to war against Russia in order to restore to Poland what Russia took from her?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, that it is certainly my hope that there will be an agreement for peace, and that that agreement will represent a mutuality of understanding and a mutuality of accord. In fact, there cannot legally be an agreement unless there is a meeting of the minds. If Russia, for example, can see that in fact there is to be no cause for war, she would not need the Baltic states of Esthonia, Lithuania and Latvia and Poland as buttresses for her defense, as it has been represented was her claim. Whether that representation be true, I do not know; but certainly it is the fact that if we are willing to go forth as the President and Mr. Churchill said, and "grant to all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished, access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity," then the economic basis for the achievement of a possible peace will have been stated; and if there be an agreement on that point, then the relaxation of claims to boundaries can follow, and, indeed, there can be autonomy granted to the peoples in accordance with their own right to choose their own form of government under which they shall live, those being the objectives for which the President and Mr. Churchill spoke when they proclaimed the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator's proposition and statements remind me of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points which were supported by the Government of the United States. If a treaty is made based on the Four Freedoms, which to a large extent incorporates the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson, when such a proposition is taken up by our comrades in arms, I hope they will give it better treatment than they gave Woodrow Wilson's 14 points because, of course, they threw them out the window.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, Mr. President, the answer is that if we cannot obtain an agreement on that point there will not be an accord or an agreement on which a peace can be made. There must be agreement and give-and-take, but it must be done with reference to the economic causes for war, and it must be done with reference to the wishes of the people involved. Those two factors are primary, not secondary. The matter of political achievement should be third in mind, it seems to me, rather than a primary objective. What good does it do us or anyone else to say to the President, "Go over there and tell them we will have a United States of the World," if you like, and give him a constitution to take along with him when he goes? If people still have within their hearts the seeds of discord, if they still are oppressed, if they still are confronted by all sorts of economic injustices, there simply will not be any political peace; that is all.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As a result the Senate could not in good conscience ratify such a peace.

Mr. DANAHER. There would be no such agreement brought back, because there would be no accord.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. With particular reference to Poland, I should like to ask the Senator a question in the form of a statement which I shall now make. As I understand, the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which was drafted and signed by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill in the Atlantic on August 21, 1941, were accepted by Russia, China, and 27 other countries on January 1, 1942. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DANAHER. I am not sure whether or not all those principles were in fact agreed to by the nations mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The declaration by the United Nations was agreed to by all of the United Nations.

Mr. DANAHER. The declaration of the United Nations in January 1942 was at least predicated upon the Atlantic Charter. I believe that to be the fact. I assume, of course, that the expressions therein are and have been the objectives of the United Nations, because they said they were.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wished to have this opportunity, with the Senator's permission, to express surprise that in the Moscow conference our representatives and the conferees, instead of merely mentioning Italy and Austria, did not likewise guarantee the freedom and political integrity of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and every other country which has been subjugated. I cannot understand why the conferees merely made mention of those two countries.

Mr. DANAHER. I am willing to have the Secretary of State deal with reference to those countries, one at a time. I believe he has unquestionably made a long step forward in getting as much of an accord as he did. I hope that the

principles we believe in will prevail, and be extended to all the countries mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should like to add Finland to the enumeration by the Senator from North Carolina.

I wish to compliment the Senator on the magnificent explanation he is making of the difficulties which confront us. I am very proud that we have a man in the United States Senate who can say these things, because he enlightens me, and I am sure he enlightens other Members of the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Let us come back to my reference to the decision in United States against Curtiss-Wright Corporation. If the President has such vast powers and he is willing to exercise them—as we know he is—and if in fact the Attorney General will authenticate, by a departmental opinion, the exercise of such powers, by all means, it seems to me, our colleagues here should insist that we define the outer limits, at the very least, within which we will say that we are willing the President should act.

Mr. President, this is not fantasy. There is nothing chimerical about the belief that the President will have from the Attorney General an opinion that his powers will be equal to the demand for their use.

I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 3, 1940, page 11355, and read from the opinion of the Attorney General, Robert Jackson, now Mr. Justice Jackson:

> The second power to be considered is that of control of foreign relations which the Constitution vests in the President as a part of the Executive function. The nature and extent of this power has recently been explicitly and authoritatively defined by Mr. Justice Sutherland, writing for the Supreme Court. In 1936, in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation et al* (299 U. S. 304), he said:

This is the language upon which the Attorney General expressly relies when he denotes this power to be explicit and authoritative:

> "It is important to bear in mind that we are here dealing not alone with an authority vested in the President by an exertion of legislative power, but with such an authority plus the very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution."

I shall not read the remaining portion of the quotation, but I invite the attention of my colleagues to the remainder of the opinion of the then Attorney General with reference to the transfer of the 50 destroyers in return for jurisdiction over bases which we were to be permitted to develop in certain foreign lands.

Mr. President, it was in pursuance of this very same assertion of authority that in the spring of 1941 the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had before it the lend-lease bill. That bill was reported to the Senate with a report dated February 13. On page 4 of the report the committee told the Senate:

> The doctrine of mutuality prevails in international law as in equity and clearly proscribes the attempt by any sovereign to sin with the one hand and admonish with the other. In line with that doctrine, the Kellogg-Briand Pact is recognized by eminent scholars of international law to give any signatory the power, where the pact's provisions are violated by another nation, to cease to abide by the neutrality laws which govern in normal times, and to "supply the state attacked with financial or material assistance, including munitions of war; * * *." Italy, Japan, and Germany are signatories of the pact, as are Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Ethiopia, The Netherlands, Belgium, China, Albania, and Greece. So also is the United States.

There was enunciated to the Senate a doctrine which had never previously found a place in the annals of this body. From that date on we find the President acting pursuant to his powers as asserted by the Attorney General, in furtherance of the doctrine thus stated, to the point where the United States, so far as I know, among all the nations of the earth, stands alone in insisting that that doctrine shall prevail. Not even the beneficiary nations under our lend-lease program have agreed to the doctrine upon which our actions have rested. That is why it seems to me we should insist, if we are to authorize the President to act under this resolution, that he bring back to us in due course whatever agreement is arrived at, and that he bring to us whatever treaty is negotiated. Against the possibility that some President might be unwilling to abide by our advice or to bring back to us whatever agreement he makes, we should say explicitly that his power shall be limited by defining what his authority shall be.

Mr. President, there may be Senators present who have not taken the pains, perhaps, to read the opinion of Robert Jackson as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A1534, volume 87, part XI. Mr. Jackson declared an outline of the policy which our Government is following when he went to the inter-American bar conference on March 27, 1941. The majority leader of the Senate [Mr. BARKLEY] caused to be inserted in the RECORD the address which Attorney General Jackson delivered at that time. I quote from it. After narrating a series of events leading up to the conference, Mr. Justice Jackson said:

> These events have ushered into international law a basis upon which the United States may legally give aid to the Allies in the present situation. No longer can it be argued that the civilized world must behave with rigid impartiality toward both an aggressor in violation of the treaty and the victims of unprovoked attack. We need not now be indifferent as between the worse and the better cause, nor deal with the just and the unjust alike.
>
> To me such an interpretation of international law is not only proper but necessary if it is not to be a boon to the lawless and the aggressive. A system of international law which can impose no penalty on a lawbreaker and also forbids other states to aid the victim would be self-defeating and would not help even a little to realize mankind's hope for enduring peace.
>
> The principle that war as an instrument of national policy is outlawed must be the starting point in any plan of international reconstruction. And one of the promising directions for legal development is to supply whatever we may of sanction to make renunciation of war a living principle of our society.

That doctrine as announced by Mr. Jackson in elaboration of what our own Foreign Relations Committee has brought to us, and what the Senate in the Lend-Lease Act voted, is a doctrine which is at present unilateral, and which, in my judgment, is unsafely so. The best interests of our country demand that it be otherwise. Even the basis upon which our President has guided his foreign policy over the past 3 years is left without predicate unless we insist that he bring about an accord with other nations which will validate the actions and the theory upon which he has proceeded.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is irrefutable that we should insist upon validation of the actions of our country in these particulars. We can do it by adopting my amendment. And we should demand that any agreement be brought back to us to be passed upon by us through constitutional processes known to us, so that we may implement the agreement by which we are to cooperate with "international authority." If we define the term "aggression" to have some relation to the maintenance of the status quo, to the end that we will know to what end our Nation is being committed, then we can have our ultimate action exemplified through our constitutional processes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it the contention of the Senator from Connecticut that if the rule laid down by Attorney General Jackson is followed, the treaty will not come back to the Senate?

Mr. DANAHER. I say that it is my very real fear—let me use the word advisedly—that if we adopt the pending resolution without the amendment which I have suggested, it will be regarded as an authorization by what has been designated as the chief organ of our Government in the field of external sovereignty, pursuant to which it will be claimed that the President has been advised to do whatever can be read into the particular resolution as a declaration of purpose. That is what I believe.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offered the amendment, which would give some definition to and yet allow scope for the intendment of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In addition to the controls that have been mentioned which we have over the abuse of the treaty-making power, I suggest that there are only three things in the Constitution which become the supreme law of the land: First, the provisions of the Constitution itself; second, the laws of Congress; and third, treaties.

Mr. DANAHER. I assume the Senator means treaties when ratified by the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. They do not become a part of the supreme law of the land until they have been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Allow me to say to the Senator from Colorado that we have in our hands this very day the text of the joint communique of the tripartite conference at Moscow; a statement signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin, regarding atrocities; and declarations of agreements arrived at among representatives of the three nations there participating. Does the Senator doubt that those agreements have international character, or that they represent expressions of Mr. Hull, the authorized representative of our country?

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as they have been explained here today, it seems to me very clear that aside from the purely military provisions mentioned in the various releases, the remainder would be proper subjects for treaties. If the treaty provisions of the Constitution are respected, these matters, together with all the incidental documents, will be brought here for advice and consent in due course.

The point which I rose to make went to the question which was raised in a discussion between the Senator and the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota as to what can we do about it if these subjects do not come back as treaties. Our remedy is not as perfect or as clear as I would like to see it, but we have appropriation control. As the Senator himself pointed out, we have impeachment power. What is done does not become a part of the supreme law of the land until it comes here, and we cannot rest upon any international agreement to preserve the future peace of the world because it does not enter into the supreme law of the land.

Mr. DANAHER. Allow me to ask the Senator, whose opinion I very greatly value, what he thinks would be the situation if the President should bring back to us a treaty not embodying even the terms of the pending resolution?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That situation would be as offensive to me, sir, as is the situation which arises from the Executive agreements with which we have been confronted lately. I say that we have some control, but I wish it were a better control.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was just asked a question by the distinguished Senator from Colorado relative to the declaration of principles by the three parties to the pact in Moscow. He did not refer to Confidential Release No. 460, which I think should be incorporated in the RECORD as a joint four-nation declaration, which certainly involves all the necessary details and provisions of a treaty. I refer particularly to paragraph 1, which, referring to the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, reads as follows:

> That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Then, omitting paragraph 5 and going to paragraph 6, we find the following language:

> That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut that what has been signed in Moscow by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia would require ratification by the Senate?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the subject matter of any such binding agreement most assuredly should be submitted to the Senate; but my opinion is, as I earlier stated, that if the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, pursuing his function as a military executive, so to speak, with reference to conquered territories, orders an army of occupation to stay in there and says, with the Field Marshal of Russia and the Field Marshal of Britain, whoever they may be, "We are going to occupy these lands jointly with you," then sooner or later the Senate will be confronted with the question of whether or not it would be willing to appropriate funds to keep an army there for that purpose. Otherwise, there would be no remedy open to us to thwart any such arrangement if we wanted to do so. I am not saying we would want it; it might even be that we would be delighted to have that result. As a matter of fact, I wish the American armies were occupying Berlin this afternoon; nothing would suit me better. But that is not the point. Executive agreements calling for subsequent action cause the concern, particularly where the President might commit our Nation to a course of action from which, in all honor, there would be no retreat.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In outlining a moment ago the rather tenuous controls the Congress has over abuse by the President of the treaty-making power, I neglected to speak of a control which was mentioned by the Attorney General of President Washington, who said, "We must confide much to the honor of the President."

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am rather puzzled about the suggestions which are being made here. Is anybody raising a question of the honor of the President of the United States?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not raise it.

Mr. HATCH. Does anyone raise a question that, in the exercise of his constitutional power, the President of the United States, through the Secretary of State, does not have the right to initiate, to negotiate, a treaty, if you please, with all the details in it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator is addressing his question to me, I have never heard that question raised on this floor.

I agree with the decision in the Curtiss-Wright case, that the President does have the power of negotiation; he does have control over our foreign relations, subject to our right of advice and consent; and that raises the point whether we should interfere with such control by prematurely acting on such matters.

Mr. HATCH. I just came onto the floor and could not understand the implications which were being made, or seemed to be made, by the debate going on.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So that there may be no possible gap in the RECORD, then, let me say that, as the result of a colloquy going on here, we have been discussing the various controls the Senate and the Congress might have over an abuse of the Executive's power in connection with treaties. We mentioned certain appropriations control; we mentioned the power of impeachment; we mentioned the fact that only laws passed by Congress, constitutional provisions and treaties, become a part of the supreme law of the land. This raised the question, What is the exact status of an Executive agreement? That will give the Senator the gist of what he missed. Then, I added, in addition to that, there was a very fine statement on the subject made by General Washington's Attorney General, to the effect that "we must confide much to the honor of the President."

I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for yielding.

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado, and I now ask the Senator from New Mexico if he has any doubt on that point?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. We who keep our seats on this side of the Chamber are missing much of what I am sure is a very interesting discussion, and I think Senators might speak a little louder so that we may hear what they have to say.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator, and will do my best to make myself heard by him.

Mr. President, briefly, by way of conclusion, I will state that when the Senate had before it in 1929 the matter of the ratification of the Kellogg-Briand Pact the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY],

commenting on the obligation and nature of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, said:

Mr. President, I am unable to read into this treaty, or into any of the correspondence preliminary to it or into any possible interpretation of the treaty, any obligation on the part of the United States or any other nation that is signatory to this treaty to interfere with the internal affairs of any other nation in the world. If all the colonies of Great Britain should on the day following the universal ratification of this treaty rise in revolt and seek to establish their own independence as independent nations of the world, there is not only nothing in this treaty which obligates the United States to interfere with those colonies or nations in their efforts, but, on the contrary, I think the plain implication of the treaty is that we would not have any right to interfere in any such conditions or circumstances.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in arguing the adoption of the Lend-Lease Act seemed to take a different view, it seems to me to be imperative that if our advice is to be given effect, if, indeed, international authority is to have the power to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world, there must be definition of the obligation; there must be the assertion of a basis upon which we can properly act. That basis can be established under the definition contained in the amendment I have submitted. Moreover, Mr. President, the obligation with reference to the use of the term "aggression" will be definite and certain; and, in view of the fact that commitment to any agreement which may be arrived at will be achieved through constitutional processes as defined, there will be no question, ultimately, that the good faith and integrity of the United States will be lent to the maintenance of the peace of the world.

That is an objective for which we all strive, and in which we are all interested; and, Mr. President, it is my belief the committee resolution, if my amendment shall prevail, will help to achieve that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the resolution. On the amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on July 24, 1941, I introduced a resolution which provided for the study by the Senate of terms and conditions to be placed in the peace treaty following this war. This resolution was in the following words:

Resolved, That a committee composed of 10 members be appointed by the President of the Senate to study, recommend, and report terms and conditions to be placed in any treaty of peace which results from a victory by Great Britain and her allies in the present conflict; also, if said committee shall find it advisable to study, recommend, and report whether an agreement to accept such terms and conditions should be made a condition of aid by the United States to any of the warring nations, and whether the United States should withhold aid against any nation which accepts and agrees to such terms and conditions.

This resolution was the first proposed in the Senate which called for a study of this subject. At that time I felt that the United States, not being in the war herself, but giving aid to other nations in the war, was in a position to help work out a just and equitable peace. I not only thought we were in a position to take the leadership in working out such a peace, but having passed legislation adopting a policy of aiding Great Britain and her allies, felt it our duty to do so. It would have been an easier task before we became involved in the war; however, this does not mean we should not do so now. Our duty becomes even greater since our boys are giving their lives in order that we may continue as a nation of liberty and justice.

It is our duty to do everything possible to see that there is not a recurrence of this war, which was started by those who recognize might only, and who have shown an utter disregard for the rights of other nations.

I wish to read at this time a small portion of the statement I made at the time I submitted the resolution which I have just read:

Mr. President, a short time ago we celebrated the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Our forefathers thought it necessary to declare certain fundamental principles at that time. Those principles were an inspiration to the people of this country to fight for liberty and justice. They became a part of the fundamentals of our Government, a part of the Constitution, which has lived throughout all this time. I say that it is fitting and proper that we again declare some fundamental principles, and that we ask those nations to which we are giving aid to agree to those principles in order that the nations which have been crushed by the Axis Powers may have an inspiration to rise up at the proper time and throw off the yoke of Hitler which has been placed upon them.

It was about a month after this statement that Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt met and agreed upon the Atlantic Charter. On August 21, 1941, the President transmitted to the Senate that charter, which was a clear-cut declaration of rights and principles. I think it well for us to examine again this declaration while we are considering the important question before us, and I ask the Senators' indulgence while I quote it:

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Arizona is one of the able lawyers of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it that he is familiar with the Connally resolution, as well as the Pepper amendment, and the statement which has just come from the conference in Moscow. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have hurriedly read the statement which has just come from Moscow, which was released only this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that the principles which are announced in the Atlantic Charter can also be found in the Connally resolution, or the Pepper amendment, or the announcement from the conference at Moscow, either in one of them or all three of them?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I have not had time to analyze the statement which has come from Moscow. For that reason I would not care to comment upon it at this time, but I shall answer the rest of the Senator's question.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is in favor of the declarations which are announced in the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I personally feel that those principles are good, and if used as a basis for a peace treaty we may be assured a just and equitable peace.

The United States and Britain, and other nations agreeing to these principles, nations who we believe can be trusted and who, with the United States and Britain, would form a group of nations strong enough to succeed in the

enterprise, should ally themselves together by treaty to carry out these principles. The United States and Britain, and other nations thus allied with them, should keep sufficiently armed for this purpose; and all forces furnished by any one of such nations should be under its own command unless otherwise agreed upon.

The United States and Britain and the other allies, by themselves and with each other, should keep vigilant watch upon known or potentially aggressive nations in order to prevent or to stop any aggressions.

The United States should not form or countenance the formation of anything more in the nature of a superstate than the heretofore outlined simple alliance, as any such separate entity to be effective would have to possess powers of taxation and other controls of individual persons somewhat in the nature of those held by our own Federal Government, and such powers, in the present state of the world, it would be unwise and impractical to give to any such paramount sovereignty.

While the welfare of individual persons is now, and will be in the time to come, the aim of all our efforts along this line, we must realize that we cannot promise a group of people organized into a nation the right to govern themselves as a nation, and at the same time assure to the individuals of that group that under such government of their own they will enjoy specific benefits. We cannot, for example, let them make their own laws and have their own bill of rights, or no bill of rights, and at the same time assure them the benefits of ours.

The way for us to bring happiness to the world, as best we may, in things other than that of international peace and matters such as monetary stabilization and the like, on which we can agree from time to time and make treaties about, is to try to solve the problems of civilization ourselves, and when and as we think we have found solutions of them, to give such solutions to the rest of the world by example and kindly precept.

The United States, in keeping with its power and relative disinterestedness in Europe's troubles, either alone or with Britain, and, if possible, with Russia and China, should take the initiative in this enterprise. A continuation of our long-standing virtual alliance with Britain must necessarily be the cornerstone of the structure here suggested. If anyone thinks this unfortunate, let him ponder as to what other power could take her place, or how we could get on with the task alone.

Our chief danger in the future, as it has been in the past, is in our reluctance as a people to believe that danger exists and in our toleration of officials who neglect for other things this most important duty to find out and tell the people when predatory nations are getting ready for new depredations.

Senate Resolution 192 provides only for machinery to carry out these principles. While I favor such international machinery, within the limitations I have suggested, as may be necessary to carry out these peace plans, let me say now that such machinery without a just peace will accomplish little. We must remove the cause of war. The people of our Nation, in my opinion, are more interested in a just peace than the wording of this resolution. If we secure a just treaty, then our people, and we who are the representatives of the people, will be willing to take steps to carry out that peace and see to it that it is a lasting peace.

Mr. President, although I am more interested in the principles as enunciated in the Atlantic Charter being agreed to by the Senate, I shall vote for the Connally resolution with the hope that a peace treaty will be adopted which will carry out those principles. We will then have less difficulty in agreeing upon means of protecting and preserving these same principles which will give to us the better assurance of a peace that will endure.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is my practice to yield for questions whenever I am addressing the Senate. It so happens, however, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in charge of the pending resolution, has sought limitation of debate on the resolution and amendments to the resolution. In view of that fact I shall ask that I be permitted to make my statement, and at the conclusion of my statement I will, of course, be glad to submit myself to the Senate for any questions.

Mr. President, at Omaha, Nebr., only a few weeks before paralysis struck him down, Woodrow Wilson, on his tour of the country to win support for the League of Nations, declared—

> I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war, if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it.

At New York City, on March 4, 1919, less than 4 months after the armistice, William Howard Taft declared—

> Were the United States to withdraw, the League (of Nations) would be nothing but a return to the system of alliances and the balance of power. We would witness a speedy recurrence of war, in which the United States would be as certainly involved as it was in this war.

We failed to heed the words of warning of these two great American leaders, one a Democrat, the other a Republican, and for nearly 2 years now the United States has been engaged in another world war. We have seen our young men and women go from peaceful scenes to bloody battlefields all over the world, from the steaming jungles and the burning deserts to the frozen Arctic wastes. To save our Nation, these young men and women have had to forget themselves and their personal fortunes, and turn their backs upon all their loved ones and all domestic joys.

We brought this fate upon them by our own mistakes. It is not enough for us to resolve in our hearts that we shall sustain and support them to the limit of our strength. We must resolve, and we must see to it, that never again shall a whole generation go forth to travail and sorrow, to suffering, mutilation, and death.

Our immediate duty is to win the war in the shortest possible time and with the least possible loss of life. Our lasting obligation is to make sure that peace, the fruit of victory, is not lost. It cannot be endured that all in vain our finest and our bravest shall moulder in the jungle or lie buried beneath the burning sands.

The victories of war will be barren if we fail to win the peace. Last time, our failure to win the peace brought tragedy to us and to millions. This time, such a failure might well prove the end of our civilization and the death of all our race.

In George Washington's day the Atlantic Ocean on one side and the Pacific Ocean on the other were constant and unremitting guardians of our country. Even in the days of Woodrow Wilson these two wide oceans were effective barriers against our enemies.

Today the airplane has terribly diminished the effectiveness of those barriers. The development of the planes of tomorrow will make the oceans of no account. Greater and mightier planes, with their death-dealing bombs and lethal weapons, will bring death and destruction to the United States even as they now burn and destroy Germany by day and by night.

We cannot isolate ourselves. The world is too small. There is no remote place to which we can withdraw. The airplane and the radio, rapid transportation, and instantaneous communication dealt a death blow to isolationism.

Isolationism can no longer afford us protection, but the idea of isolationism can and will bring us many dangers. It has already brought them. Because of our isolationism, we had no part in the events that led up to First World War; we had no part in the events that led up to the present World War. We missed our opportunity to prevent these wars. If we had realized that isolationism is an illusion, we would have taken our part in world affairs and shaped a peaceful world.

Economically, the airplane and the radio, rapid transportation and instantaneous communication have made the world one common neighborhood. Politically, however, the world is not one, but consists of many separate units. Disputes between such units are inevitable. Those disputes must be settled by law rather than by violence, by peaceful procedure rather than by war, if our children are to escape World War No. 3.

Professor Keller, of Yale, a distinguished authority on social science, tells us that the growth of civilization consists in the enlargement of the peace group. He reminds us that the earliest peace group was the family. The head of the family laid down the law and enforced it, thus keeping peace within the family group. This form of family government is exemplified in the patriarchs

of the Old Testament. Then came the village community, composed of a number of families, with its government and its court of justice. Afterward came the state, composed of a number of communities, and then the nation, composed of states.

As Professor Keller says:

> These names—family, village, state, nation—are, of course, merely symbols of the various successive increases in the size of the peace group, typical of most historical developments.

When we had no larger peace group than the family, we had family fighting against family. Even in our time, we have seen family feuds in the mountains of Kentucky, because there was not effective government to prevent interfamily fighting. Likewise, when there has been no larger peace group than the village or municipality we have had wars between cities. There were interurban wars in ancient Greece, and the cities of mediaeval Italy often were at war. In the same way, when the largest peace group is the state or province, we have wars between these units. Finally, when the largest group is the nation, we have international war.

We have reached the point where we have only international war. And international war can be abolished by precisely the same processes by which the wars between smaller peace groups were abolished. International wars will be abolished through the establishment of machinery that will provide procedure for the settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

If there is to be peace, there must be a collective-world security system, with an organization of the peace-loving nations with power to adjudicate and enforce its decrees. There must be an organization with machinery for the settlement of international disputes without resort to war, and with power, including military force, for the immediate suppression of any future attempt at military aggression by any nation. It is because I firmly believe that there must be such an organization, if there is to be hope of peace, that I have joined with the other 13 Senators in offering the amendment presented by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The resolution reported by the Foreign Relations Committee may mean such an organization, and then again it may mean something entirely different. In speaking on this floor in behalf of the resolution, one of its authors, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] candidly said:

> It has been said, Mr. President, that this resolution is vague—that it can be subjected to varying interpretations respecting the peace methods it envisions. That is true.

The Senator from Michigan was entirely frank when he said that the resolution was vague and that it was subject to varying interpretations. Under the language of the resolution, it might well be subject to as many different interpretations as there are Members of this body. Under it, each Senator might well envision whatever his individual, personal idea or method might be with reference to our post-war foreign policy. The resolution fails to invoke a true test of the sentiment of the Senate of the United States.

Under the language of the resolution, our post-war foreign policy might well take the form of some kind of an alliance. As I stated before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the resolution there might be another Congress of Vienna or another Holy Alliance. There might be such an alliance based solely on military might. This interpretation was confirmed by Mr. Arthur Krock, writing in the New York Times under date of October 22, when he said:

> The Connally resolution, which the Senate has agreed to bring up for consideration next Monday, urges that "the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority, with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." To continue the division of responsibility that now exists between the American and British Navies (air forces included, of course) into the provisional post-war period would be merely to establish that international authority and that "power," as specified in the resolution.
>
> The directive text that refers to "free and sovereign nations" would be met by the proposed invitation to Russia and China, and to others thereafter, to take an appropriate share in the naval policing establishment. And the qualifications, "acting through its constitutional processes," is met by the fact that the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy at all times, and they are at all times subject to his orders. If he should choose to have these continue temporarily to issue through the Combined Chiefs of Staff, little doubt exists here that he has the right to do so under constitutional process.

In fact, under Mr. Krock's interpretation of the resolution, the President could negotiate and form an alliance with Great Britain, Russia, and China without consulting Congress or without any reference of the matter to Congress.

One argument advanced in favor of the resolution by Mr. Walter Lippmann, the distinguished writer on foreign affairs, is that under its terms an alliance between the United States and Britain, which he so strongly advocates, would be possible.

I do not believe there are many, if any, Members of the Senate who wish our post-war foreign policy to take the form of an alliance or alliances. I do not believe there are many, if any, Members of the Senate who wish to see the United States enter into any kind of an alliance.

Alliances, with their balance of power diplomacy, have been tried again and again and always have failed. They have failed for many reasons, but the prime reason for their failure has been that they could not settle disputes, or else could not enforce settlements when they had been made. If the Senate does not favor an alliance or alliances as a part of our post-war policy, why should not the Senate say so now, by making its declaration clear and unequivocal?

We are told that the resolution should not be amended, that it should not be amended even by the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Why should it not be amended? Why should it not be strengthened, if it can be made more definite and certain in voicing the wish and the will of the American people? Why should it not be fortified, if by so doing the resolution can contribute the more surely to the building of a peaceful world? The resolution studiously avoids any reference to cooperation among the nations or to the peaceful adjudication and settlement of disputes.

In fairness to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I think I should say that I believe that fundamentally his views and mine are very much in accord. Certainly, judging his views by his speech delivered over the radio in Texas last summer, as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14 last, there seems to be no basic difference between his views and mine.

I also wish to say that I recognize the difficulties which confronted him in his committee. Knowing the personality and the set-up of that committee as I do, I doubt if there is any other committee in the Senate in which it would have been more difficult to secure a forthright and adequate resolution on this matter of foreign policy than in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The trouble, I fear, is that the resolution was agreed upon and reported by the committee with too much unanimity, that it means too many different things to too many different men, that in the effort to get everybody for it the resolution comes before the Senate with too little meaning.

The Washington Post said on Wednesday morning:

> Obviously the Connally resolution is not designed to be a platform upon which this Nation can stand. It is a Maypole around which isolationists and internationalists alike can dance in fraternal abandon before the gaze of a world vitally interested in knowing where we stand.

If it was necessary to strip the resolution, to take from it much of its heart and purpose, in order to get dyed-in-the-wool isolationists to support it, in order to get such isolationists to vote for it while they hold themselves free from any commitment under it, I think it would have been better and wiser to have left these isolationists by the side of the road.

I appreciate the necessity for any resolution dealing with our foreign policy to pass this body by at least a two-thirds vote, but I also believe that we could have left behind the dyed-in-the-wool isolationists and passed a much more definite and much stronger resolution by the necessary two-thirds vote.

I realize that at this time we can make no blueprint of our after-war foreign policy, and that we would not be wise at this time even to attempt to go into the details of that policy. I do believe, however, that we owe it to the Senate, to the Chief Executive, to the people of the country, to those nations who fight the war as our allies, and to all the freedom-

loving peoples of the world to lay down in the resolution broad and basic principles for that policy.

The men who drafted and signed our Declaration of Independence did not attempt to fashion the outline of our Government, but they did have the courage, the purpose, and the will to proclaim broad and basic principles which became at a later day the foundation stones of our Government.

I believe that in this momentous hour in the affairs of our country we of the Senate should act with that same high degree of courage, purpose, and will that so marked the signers of the Declaration.

Those of us who wish to strengthen the committee resolution recognize that as it stands not only does it leave the creatures of isolationism concealed but our own people and the peoples of the world are also left in the dark. We who would blow the breath of truth on this feeble flame have heard the cry of those peoples. And whether or not we prevail here in the United States Senate at this time, the cry will ring on until isolationism is exposed and its deadly devices thwarted, wherever they may be.

The amendment offered by the 14 Members of this body and presented by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] declares broad and basic principles. It declares for an organization of the nations to promote cooperation among nations, to settle international disputes peacefully and to use power, including military force, to suppress military aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world. It lays down basic principles and envisions an organization with procedures, machinery, and power to take the steps and do the things necessary for an orderly world. It lays down the basic principles for a world-security system for a peaceful world. It envisions a world organization strong enough to administer justice and enforce order among the nations.

To those who ask what of the sovereignty of the United States in such an organization, I would recall the words and the judgment of the former President of the United States and former Chief Justice of the United States, William Howard Taft, in his memorable address of March 4, 1919, in which he said:

> The covenant takes away the sovereignty of the United States only as any contract curtails the freedom of action of an individual which he has voluntarily surrendered for the purpose of the contract and to obtain the benefit of it; the covenant creates no supersovereignty. It merely creates contract obligations. It binds nations to stand together to secure compliance with those obligations. That is all. This is no different from a contract that we make with one nation. * * *
>
> The assertion that we are giving up our sovereignty carries us logically and necessarily to the absurd result that we cannot make a contract to do anything with another nation because it limits our freedom of action as a sovereign.
>
> Sovereignty is freedom of action of nations. It is exactly analogous to the liberty of the individual regulated by law. The sovereignty that we should insist upon and the only sovereignty we have a right to insist upon is a sovereignty regulated by international law, international morality, and international justice, a sovereignty enjoying the sacred rights which sovereignties of other nations may enjoy.

As Chief Justice Taft said, the sovereignty that we should insist upon, and the only sovereignty we have a right to insist upon, is a sovereignty regulated by international law, international morality, and international justice; a sovereignty enjoying the sacred rights which sovereignties of other nations may enjoy. Unless we and the other nations shall enjoy such a sovereignty there will be no peace in the world.

It has been well said that "the supreme task of world politics is not the prevention of war but a satisfactory organization of mankind. Peace will follow from that. That is, in fact, what peace is." Wars are the products of conditions. To prevent these conditions from coming to pass is to prevent war. These conditions can be prevented only by a proper system, or a proper organization of mankind. The world has never had such a system. The amendment would declare the basic principles for such a system, even as our Declaration of Independence declared the basic principles for our American Government.

The Republican platform of 1920 declared:

> The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice, and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference, whenever peace shall be threatened, by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

We know the forthright position of the Democratic Party in 1920 for world organization. Why should we today hesitate to go at least as far as the Republican Party went in 1920? The Republican Party in 1920 declared for basic principles. Why should we now hesitate to declare for them?

I see that one of the most distinguished members of the Republican Party, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, is honoring me with his presence. I refer to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. On June 5 last the senior Senator from Vermont well declared our aim and our purpose when he said:

> Victory connotes the establishment of powerful institutions to guard nations from aggression, and to insure their integrity. Therefore, we fight for a more perfect union, though not uniformity, of the United Nations.
>
> To make this union real, there must be international organization for strategic security, comprising council, court, and military power.
>
> Let us start with a council, or similar body, the name does not matter, to perform the political function of republican government. Representation in such council should be the right of every nation that is willing and competent to collaborate in the development of a code of world conduct.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for this very fine crystallization of what is in the minds and the hearts of so many of us, and of millions of his fellow American citizens.

During the present debate, Mr. President, we have heard a good deal about the other nations of the world and what they are going to think. So far as the other nations of the world are concerned, we may know that whatever resolution is passed by the Senate will be carefully studied and scanned and scrutinized by them in the light of its background and of the whole history of the United States Senate. They will weigh it particularly in the light of the defeat of our entry into the World Court and of the defeat of our entry into the League of Nations. They will fully understand the meaning of such a resolution, they will well and carefully appraise what such a resolution says and, most important, what it omits to say. So far as the other nations are concerned, it is compelling that we speak in strong language, with forthrightness and with definite meaning.

I remain convinced, Mr. President, that a resolution, and a stronger one than that which we now have before us, is needed. It is my considered judgment that a firm and unqualified declaration that we will not be divided from the other United Nations, that we will join an international organization to promote cooperation and to maintain the peace, will strengthen our unity of action both now and later. In my opinion, such a strong resolution is a war measure, Mr. President, because it will contribute to our immediate unity of action. It will help to strengthen the ties that bind us for the final, all-out blows that will smash our enemy, the Axis.

Mr. President, last week we heard a good deal on this floor about the effect on the Moscow conference of our action in adopting the pending resolution. It was strongly emphasized that we should adopt the resolution because it was thought that it would have such a wholesome effect on the Moscow conference, that it would do so much to strengthen the hands of our representatives at the conference, and of all those who were seeking to bring together the nations gathered at that conference, and to mold and shape unity by them, looking not only to the successful prosecution of the war but to the building of a peaceful world after the war.

As we examine the declaration of the Moscow conference, we find that the declaration goes a great deal further than the resolution. It is far stronger, much more robust, to use the language of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], than the committee resolution. I shall not speculate about the past, but I really wonder what would have happened at Moscow if we had adopted the committee resolution before the declaration of Moscow had been agreed upon. Senators who have read the document know that first declaration is—

> That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

Mr. President, when I dictated the words uttered by me a few moments ago with reference to the organization of peace, and said that we ought to have an organization of peace, I had not seen the declaration of Moscow and had no idea or intimation whatever what would be in the declaration. Yet it conforms exactly to what we who have offered the amendment presented by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] have been fighting for during the last 8 months and what now standing on this floor we are fighting for.

What is the fourth declaration of the Moscow conference?

That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date—

That means as soon as possible, does it not, Senators? What are they going to establish?

A general international organization.

Is not that what the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida provides? Is not that exactly what the amendment contemplates and envisions and states in so many words?

A general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I have said that I would not yield, but I will yield to my friend from Illinois, because I find I am nearly through.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding. On the point he has just raised with respect to international organization, I wanted to interrogate him and ask him this very simple question: Does the Senator believe that what is included in the so-called Pepper amendment is covered by the Moscow conference agreement?

Mr. HILL. I do, indeed, sir; that is the burden of everything I am trying to state to the Senate at this moment. As I indicated to the Senate, before I ever saw the declaration of the Moscow conference—and the Senator knows that declaration was not available until 1 o'clock today—before I ever had intimation of it or even knew that the conferees at Moscow had agreed upon anything at all, I had previously prepared my remarks for today; but had I had the Moscow conference declaration before me at the time I prepared my remarks I do not think I would have changed the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t", because the Moscow conference declaration is, in sum and substance, the declaration for which we are fighting and contending in offering this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have not talked to any other Senator who has not applauded the Moscow conference declaration. I think that those who have been following what has been transpiring in Russia during the conference feel that what has been accomplished there is really an outstanding piece of international work, so far as the future condition of this country is concerned, as well as of the world.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator before he was able to come to the floor I sought in my very inadequate way to pay a word of tribute to our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, for the magnificent achievement of that conference.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make a further suggestion. It strikes me that whatever we do here is more or less negative from now on, if I understand the sentiment of the Senate with respect to the Moscow conference declaration.

Mr. HILL. Certainly I will say to the Senator, not to interrupt him, that in view of the agreement of the Moscow conference, we certainly ought not to act in weakness. After this peace declaration, we certainly hope to support and affirm and sustain the Moscow conference declaration.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I was going to make. I do not think the Senate can do less than to support the declaration that has come out of the Moscow conference. How that is going to be done, I do not know, but it seems to me it could be done by a very simple parliamentary procedure. I doubt that there would be very many Members of the United States Senate against it. Either it can be done through a substitute for the Connally resolution or it can be done by an amendment to the resolution. As one United States Senator who has been for the Connally amendment all the way through, believing all the time that, with the Connally amendment, this country could do and should do all the things contemplated by the Pepper amendment, and much more, I was willing to go along with it. But certainly, in view of what has transpired at Moscow, it seems to me that the Senate of the United States can do no less than adopt the identical words which were passed upon there by the nations participating in that conference.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, declaration No. 5 of the Moscow conference is—

That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and, as occasion requires, with other members of the United Nations, with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

I emphasize the words, "the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security." Earlier in my remarks, as I have stated, before I had any idea of what the Moscow declaration contained, or that it was to be issued at this time, I had sought to argue for the establishment of a system of general security based on a general international organization such as that for which the Moscow agreement declares.

I again ask, Is the Senate now to lag behind this declaration? Are we unwilling to go as far as the declaration goes? When today the world and all freedom-loving peoples outside the Axis Nations are doubtless rejoicing over this declaration; when they are doubtless experiencing new hope from the declaration, are we of the Senate now to speak with such a weak voice as to negative, or to impair, or in any way to question the full import and effect of the Moscow declaration? Surely the Senate can do no less than step up as squarely to the line in its declaration as does the Moscow statement. We can do no less than to subscribe fully to the Moscow declaration, unhesitatingly approve it, and wholeheartedly sustain and support it; and that is exactly what the amendment offered by the 14 Senators, and presented by the Senator from Florida, would do.

Mr. President, the adoption of the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Relations in its present form invites the danger of causing the American people to think that the Senate having resolved that the United States join with the other nations in an organization for the building up of a peaceful world, the question of our post-war policy is settled, and that they no longer should be diligent in their efforts to make certain that the United States assume its place of leadership and meet its responsibility in helping to build such a world. The adoption of the resolution with all its vagueness could not possibly justify such a feeling on the part of the people; yet its adoption might well encourage such a feeling.

It behooves the Senate to let the people know that the Senate stands squarely behind the Moscow declaration, so that no one will have the idea, because a resolution has been adopted here, that we have spoken as we should speak, or that we have in any way resolved, in definite and adequate fashion, that the United States should take its place of leadership toward building a peaceful world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator has been speaking I have been wondering about the agreement that was reached in Moscow, which he says is far stronger and more definite in its terms, in his opinion, than the pending resolution. Did I correctly understand him?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct.

Mr. HATCH. Probably it might be construed as being stronger and more definite in its terms if the pending resolution should not be adopted.

Mr. HILL. It might be. The Moscow agreement covers, of course, some matters which the Senator will recall are covered in Senate Resolution 114, the original resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and myself. It embraces some matters which we covered in that resolution, but which are not covered in the pending resolution, as the Senator knows.

Mr. HATCH. That is all true. Assuming for the purpose of the question that the Moscow declaration is far stronger; suppose the Senate of the United States, right on the heels of the adoption of that declaration, should adopt a weaker resolution.

Mr. HILL. That would defeat the Moscow conference declaration.

Mr. HATCH. Would it have the possible effect of the Senate of the United States—and I do not want the Senator to answer this question too positively until he can think about it—repudiating the Moscow agreement?

Mr. HILL. It would in my judgment have the effect of repudiating the Moscow conference agreement, and I think the other nations of the world would so interpret and so accept such action by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. If there is any possibility of action of the Senate being interpreted to that effect, it occurs to me that we ought to be most careful in our consideration whether the resolution should not be strengthened at least to the point where it will equal the Moscow declaration.

Mr. HILL. I agree fully with the Senator from New Mexico. I think the strongest possible compulsion is upon the Senate today to do nothing which would in any way lag behind or weaken or impair the import and the effect of the Moscow declaration. The least the Senate can do is to stand squarely behind the Moscow declaration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In view of the statement just made by the Senator from Alabama in response to a question by the Senator from New Mexico, I should like to ask the Senator to point out any language in the pending resolution which would not permit the carrying out of every principle that has been announced in the Moscow conference declaration.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator—and I wish to be perfectly candid with him—that there is no language which would of itself inhibit the carrying out of the Moscow declaration. If the Senate simply said, "We will cooperate for world peace," and stop there, that would not in any way inhibit the carrying out of the Moscow conference declaration. But the Moscow declaration is a declaration to the world, and now the Senate is getting ready to make a declaration to the world, and surely the declaration of the Senate ought not to be weaker, ought not to be less definite or less adequate or robust than the Moscow declaration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator admits that all the principles enunciated under the Moscow conference declaration can be carried out under the pending resolution, I cannot understand why he should tell the world that the adoption of the pending measure would repudiate the Moscow conference declaration.

Mr. HILL. I will tell the Senator from Louisiana why. If we were passing a joint resolution to be signed by the President, to have the effect of law, to give to the President certain power, we could make it broad and general without specific declaration. But the purpose of the pending resolution is not to give anyone any power. It is not legislation. It is not treaty making, really, that is, in the sense that we are making any kind of definite or specific treaty. What we are doing is to declare to the world the views, the policy of the Senate, and if we adopt the language of the pending resolution our declaration will be so much weaker, so much behind the declaration of the Moscow conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has just indicated, the purpose of the pending resolution is simply and solely to declare to the people of the United States, to the people of the world, that the United States will join other nations in creating international authority to prevent future wars. That is all there is to it. I cannot understand why it is proposed to bring in extraneous matters.

Mr. HILL. With all due respect and deference to my good friend the Senator from Louisiana, if he does not understand I cannot give him understanding, but the Senate is going to make a declaration. That is the purpose of the resolution. The Senate should not make a weaker declaration than the Moscow declaration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yet the Senator admits, as he has just indicated, that the pending resolution makes a definite policy and declares that the United States will join other nations to prevent future wars.

Mr. HILL. So far as action is concerned, surely. In fact the Senate can make any kind of declaration in this matter, and forgetting for the moment any moral obligation that might be involved, the Senate should do what it saw fit in the days to come, of course.

The amendment presented by the Senator from Florida for the 14 Members of this body should be adopted. The American people have a right to know and must know the intent and purposes of the Senate as to the broad and basic principles of our post-war foreign policy. If we declare these principles at this time it will be far easier to have a meeting of the minds of the nations upon whose cooperation the success of the peace must depend, than if we delay making such a declaration.

Conditions are now far more favorable for agreement among the nations than they will be after the war is finished. Today, kindred forces and identity of interest draw the United Nations together. These forces include our common cause of freedom and our common enemies, and the urgent necessity of effective mobilization of our combined resources to win the war.

Once the war ends some of the forces which make for unity and cooperation will disappear and others will lose much of their potency. If the past be a guide for the future, the forces which make for division rather than for unity will become ascendant. Economic rivalry, nationalistic feeling, and pressing domestic problems will inevitably come to the front, and they will divide the nations.

The United States should now assume the leadership which is ours and to which all the other peace-loving nations of the world are looking. If that leadership is to win peace for the world, it must be forthright, courageous, and of high purpose. It must be strong in the strength of basic principles and not lost in the shifting sands of vague generality. It must be a leadership worthy of the leadership of the men who signed the Declaration of Independence. To hesitate now, to falter in that leadership, is to invite defeat for the great cause of world peace.

The stage is set for the United States to play her part in the establishment of a new world. We have the power and we have the vision. We have proved it in the past by building a mighty land of freedom and of opportunity, not with any one race but with peoples gathered from all the races of the earth. If we could build this Nation from all these peoples, surely we can build upon a larger scale and lead the peoples of the world out of anarchy and away from death, into a world where all people may live in peace, under law and justice. The responsibility is primarily yours and mine, the responsibility of the Senate of the United States. It is the responsibility to make certain that the youth of America may not again be forced to journey to the far ends of the earth and give up their lives.

Let us act now. Let us act with courage, with forthrightness and with high purpose, that we may have a peace so ordered and established that our children and generations yet to come be not compelled to cower in darkness, but may walk upright in a world of freedom and of light.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well. I have the floor, but I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama commenced speaking earlier today he asked that he be not interrupted. Because of that request I did not ask him the question I now wish to propound. During the course of the Senator's discussion he quoted at length from a column written by Mr. Arthur Krock, to the effect that if the pending resolution were adopted it would give to a few powerful nations the right to form an alliance and——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Krock did not say that the pending resolution would necessarily lead to an alliance. He did not say that an alliance would necessarily be the outgrowth of the adoption of such a resolution. He did say that under the resolution an alliance might well be made, that an alliance might well come out of the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question I desire to ask the Senator is this: If the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] for himself and other Senators is

adopted, how will it change that situation?

Mr. HILL. Because the amendment of the Senator from Florida prescribes and looks definitely toward a world organization including all nations who could qualify, not simply an alliance between three or four or a number of nations. It looks forward to an organization with machinery and procedure for cooperation among nations for the adjudication of disputes, for peaceful settlement of disputes, for the suppression of aggression, and for the enforcement of decisions rendered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator point to any language in the pending resolution which would not permit all free and sovereign nations to join in such an organization as he has described and dedicated to the high purposes outlined by him?

Mr. HILL. No; I would say to the Senator that I stated in my remarks, if the Senator heard me——

Mr. ELLENDER. I did hear the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I stated very frankly that such an organization would be entirely possible under the language of the committee resolution. It would be possible; there is no question about that.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I insist that there is nothing in the resolution which would prevent any free and sovereign nation from joining other nations to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. HILL. Yes; certainly. If there is an alliance of three or four nations, they would not have to admit any other nation at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I cannot agree because the Senator is assuming that only three or four nations could join together.

Mr. HILL. Under the language of the pending resolution I would say it is entirely correct and possible that only three or four nations could join together.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not agree with the distinguished Senator for the simple reason that three or four nations would not join together merely to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. In order to accomplish such high ideals, it would be necessary to encompass and take in all nations.

Let us bear in mind that the primary purpose of any organization, whether created under the pending resolution or along the suggestions made in the so-called Pepper amendment, would have as its object the prevention of aggression and the preservation of the peace of the world. I am unable to envision any other object or purpose in either the resolution or the amendment, since the object and purpose are couched in identical language, in both the pending resolution and the proposed Pepper amendment.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; but the Senator knows that when the Congress of Vienna was held, Castlereagh and others who were gathered there gave out the highest, most holy pronunciamento about their gathering together—for what? They did not say they were there to grab something for themselves, to hold what they had already grabbed, or to serve their own selfish ends. Oh, no. They said, "We have gathered together and have formed this alliance for the peace of the world."

Mr. ELLENDER. That is entirely what the object of the Pepper amendment is for, the preservation of the peace of the world.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no. That is entirely what the Pepper amendment does not state.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why, Mr President, as I have just indicated, the purpose of the Pepper amendment is to form an association of nations to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. It is to be composed of our Nation with other nations and such other free nations as the organization desires to take in.

Mr. HILL. Not that, Mr. President; the language is "and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted."

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true, but the object and purpose of such a combination of nations, whether under the pending resolution of the Pepper amendment is for the purpose of suppressing military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world, and nothing else.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That being true, Mr. President, I am wondering what all the argument is about. I much prefer the broad language incorporated in the Connally resolution, than the somewhat limited language contained in the so-called Pepper amendment. Since it is admitted that the Connally resolution covers all that is incorporated in the Pepper amendment, then why all the argument. Why not retain the broad language of the Connally amendment so as to take care of all future eventualities. The Pepper amendment provides for an international organization. We might need two or more to accomplish our purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield, if the Senator from Louisiana has concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. I merely desire to say to the Senator from Louisiana that he used the argument that we used in the committee. We begged the committee to use the words "other nations." The Senator has inserted a great deal that we tried to have inserted, and he was speaking very forcefully for the language we wanted. I wish the language he had quoted was in the resolution. I do not think there would be any disagreement then. We asked and urged that the language be incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator understands that the resolution is a mere declaration of policy.

Mr. HATCH. But the Senator saw fit to interpret it and explain it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but since the resolution is merely a declaration of policy, it strikes me as being very plain that when we say that the United States will join with free and sovereign nations that does not exclude anybody. It means everybody.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator had attended the debate, he would have heard distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee saying that it did exclude nations.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Iowa——

Mr. GEORGE. I am surprised that the Senator would make that statement.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement, I was about to say that the Senator from Iowa distinctly said that under the Senate resolution, according to his personal opinion, the Dominion of Canada, for instance, was not excluded; but according to his personal opinion it could be construed to exclude it.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but the Senator was making a statement about something that occurred in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HATCH. I meant the debate on the floor. Perhaps the Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. GEORGE. Well, anyone has a right to his own personal opinion.

Mr. HATCH. That was the statement of the Senator from Iowa, on the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator does not deny that the resolution would give the right to all free and sovereign nations to join with the United States in creating and maintaining international authority in order to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world, does he?

Mr. HATCH. It would depend altogether upon the kind of international authority that was set up.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why that? What difference does it make as to the kind of international authority created for the purpose of carrying out the objects I have just indicated?

Mr. HATCH. Because if an alliance were formed among four nations, and four nations alone—which I take it under the resolution could be done—it could exclude other nations.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the resolution does not contemplate an alliance. It does not remotely refer to the creation of an alliance. The purpose of the resolution is simply and solely, as I said a while ago, a declaration of the United States Senate to the people of the United States and to the peoples of the world that the United States will join free nations—all free nations—in the creation of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. No nation is excluded if it is free and sovereign.

Mr. HATCH. Again, we have another interpretation. The Senator from Louisiana says that under no circumstances does the pending resolution contemplate an alliance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it does not. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] brought up that question, in quoting from some of the writings of Mr. Arthur Krock. That is what prompted my question to him. As I read the reso-

lution it does not contemplate an alliance. An alliance for what? If an alliance is contemplated and the alliance is to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world, is there anything wrong with that? Would that not fulfill the purpose of the pending resolution as well as the so-called Pepper amendment? I am not advocating an alliance, but I can envision one that could be made in the open so as to carry out the purposes of the pending resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I do not believe in alliances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Nor do I, Senator. When we use the word "alliance" in dealing with nations it has somewhat of a sinister meaning. It contemplates secrecy. It means the combination of a few nations to throttle the rights of other nations. The creation of powerful alliances among nations has in many instances brought about wars. But war is not contemplated in the resolution. The purpose of the resolution as I have indicated, is simply a declaration of policy that we as a nation will join all other free nations in forming international authority which will have as its purpose the prevention of aggression and the preservation of peace. That is all.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield once more, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. He has given us one more interpretation of the resolution, which I hope will be helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, however unacceptable my own views may be to Americans who cringe from facing the realities of the post-war world, the critical nature of the whole nasty mess compels me to outline and record them. For months I have been toying with the drafting of a resolution that would set forth minimum basic commitments which in my opinion the Senate should insist upon when peace is negotiated.

The first political speech I ever made in my life was in support of the ratification of the League of Nations in the Presidential campaign of 1920. I refer to it now for no other reason than to identify my long interest in the subject of an orderly world and my desire for collective security.

I have been tremendously interested in the efforts of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to develop an acceptable resolution. The very nature of the parliamentary situation, since a two-thirds vote of approval is essential, requires that such a resolution be a composite of both ends of the extreme views, modified by the middle-of-the-road views of 96 Senators. The large array of amendments offered on the floor to the committee's resolution, and the many contrary speeches and statements made by Members of the Senate in reference to it, prove my point that the Connally resolution is a compromise, stated in the most general terms and subject to the widest interpretation.

I must confess that when I take inventory of the complex mass of obstacles to hurdle when the Nazis and the Japs finally collapse, I despair that any resolution lacking forthrightness will be helpful. Therefore I expect to support some of the amendments to clarify it. If they are voted down, I shall vote for the Connally resolution on the theory that a display of Senate unity respecting our foreign policy may possibly help the war effort of the United Nations. I see no other virtue in the Connally resolution.

It starts out bravely, and in the first paragraph we find this splendid resolve: "That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved." The next resolve is also acceptable, although trite. Had the resolution stopped there, I would have much more enthusiasm for it. But it did not stop there; and so from that point on I find myself in disagreement. The mental reservations and interpretations placed upon it and recorded by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] a few days ago go for me, too.

At this point I desire to read into the RECORD a substitute for Senate Resolution 192, which I now submit to the Senate:

Whereas the Senate of the United States of America is endowed by the Constitution with specific duties and grave responsibilities respecting foreign relations; and

Whereas at this particular time the people of the United States and the world in general seem desirous of an expression on this Nation's foreign policy by the Senate of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved;

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace in accord with the terms of the Atlantic Charter; and

Provided, The establishment of the principles of justice and equity among all the states and nations of the earth be the common objective: *And provided further, as a basis for negotiations,* That the independence and the pre-war territorial integrity of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia be respected; that Germany be completely disarmed and placed under the joint military control of Britain and Russia, that Japan be completely disarmed and placed under the joint military control of China and the United States; that Palestine be established as a refuge for such homeless and stateless Jews of the world as desire to go there, and that Arabs and other inhabitants be compensated fully and satisfactorily if dislocations be found advisable; that all nations withdraw from the occupation of Chinese territory; that Manchuria and Manchukuo be restored to the Republic of China; that Korea and the Philippine Islands be given immediate freedom; that dominion status be extended to India; and that Italy and France and all of the other nations of the earth be encouraged to establish stable governments of their own choosing, then the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, will join with such free and sovereign nations as desire to collaborate in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to preserve the peace of the world and to suppress military aggression and prevent the subjugation and oppression of weak states and peoples.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in the dark days preceding the adoption of the Constitution, when trade between the Thirteen Colonies virtually ceased because of trade barriers and extreme "localitis," a convention of five Colonies met at Annapolis to find a way out. Unable to agree, they called a convention to meet at Philadelphia the next year. Twelve of the Colonies sent delegates. Washington was selected to be chairman. Still unable to agree on anything specific, a resolution was offered full of meaningless platitudes in an attempt to satisfy the people, but which solved nothing and committed no one to anything—precisely the course we are pursuing in the Senate today. But Washington would have none of it. He spoke up with all the vigor of his mighty voice:

It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God.

A catastrophe was averted by one courageous statesman, and a nation was born. This time it is world collaboration rather than a nation whose future hangs in the balance; and I ask, in the sublime words of Washington, "If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work?" I give Washington's answer to his own question, which is the answer we, too, should give: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God."

If the Atlantic Charter means what it says, and if our ideals of justice and freedom, which on every occasion we exploit and proclaim in loud voice, are not pure flim flam, then my resolution is in order and timely.

The people of the United States and the world will be bewildered and confused by the clever and adroit language of the Connally resolution. They will not know any more about what it means and what its effect will be than do the 96 Senators assembled here, and they will interpret it to suit themselves, as we do now.

This is no time to hedge or indulge in double talk and platitudes and threadbare generalities. This is a time to be forthright. This is a time to say what we mean and mean what we say. We ought now to put our cards on the table face up, or remain discreetly silent. My resolution puts the ideals of the Atlantic Charter into concrete and definite form. It is a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

I realize that many will shrink from its blunt provisions respecting the basic problems facing the world. Many will say it will offend Churchill, it will offend Stalin, and it will cause endless and bitter controversy at a time when we need unity to destroy the common enemy. If that be so, the United States has no business in this war. If that be so, we ought

to keep our mouths shut forever about freedom, aggression, imperialism, and exploitation and subjugation of weaker peoples. If that be so, we ought to keep our signature off such documents as the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the Atlantic Charter.

There being no objection, a copy of the Atlantic Charter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live in; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As will be noted in the charter, and as we all realize, the Atlantic Charter was signed by Prime Minister Churchill and by President Roosevelt on the 14th day of August 1941.

At St. James's Palace in London on September 24, 1941, the Government of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, and representatives of General de Gaulle, the leader of Free Frenchmen, expressed adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

On January 1, 1942, a declaration was signed by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, and Yugoslavia. Later other nations joined in the declaration.

By May 5, 1943, a total of 32 governments, exclusive of the Fighting French, had joined.

Today we have heard much about the declarations recently issued at Moscow and about them being stronger in their terms than the resolutions pending before the Senate at the present time. I should like to make the suggestion that the terms of the Atlantic Charter, which has been approved by so many of the nations of the world, including Russia, China, the United States, and the United Kingdom are much stronger than those contained in the declarations made at Moscow, and are infinitely stronger than those contained in the resolutions which are now pending in the Senate of the United States.

I think that we are far too modest about our own powerful influence in world affairs, and that we have the wrong slant on Churchill and Stalin. These two great statesmen and world leaders are not thin-skinned sissies. They are hard, rough, rugged warriors with determination to take and to hold what they want from a prostrate world if we help them get away with it, and blindly and supinely approve their course of action. If we insist upon the recognition of our ideals, the justice of our cause and the strength of our position will convince the determined Churchill and the iron-willed Stalin, and we will accomplish something worth while.

America is carrying a heavy load in this war and will be expected to carry a heavy load in the post-war world. What I seek is to put a fair price on America's participation and America's generous contribution—not the selfish price of territory and goods, but the price of freedom and justice in accordance with the spirit and the terms of the Atlantic Charter.

I am insistent, as a matter of good common sense, that we look after all of the interests of America before we move into the wider fields of world society and economy, but I am also insistent that the United States of America either withdraw them or remain true to the ideals which she has proclaimed to the world for the world. I do not want my country preaching one thing and practicing another.

After World War No. 1 America distributed 30,000,000 tons of food to the helpless Europeans and saved hundreds of millions of them from starvation, cold, and disease. If Churchill and Stalin want help from us after this war they should be prepared to make the concessions to us which will insure collective security for Europe. We cannot continue to rescue Europe from her political sins every 25 years.

After the Thirty Years' War one-third of the people in Europe died. There was no America then to bail them out of their sorrow. If the Western Hemisphere does not feed Europe after the present war a third of the people of Europe will then also die. Why should not the Western Hemisphere assert its demands for justice and equity in world affairs without apology?

The United States is not a helpless, cringing nation of cowards. If we accept the role of appeasers, compromisers, beggars, and star-gazers, it will be from free choice, not necessity. We have the mightiest Navy on the seven seas, the strongest air power playing hide and seek in the blue canopy of heaven, the greatest Army ever mobilized by any nation at any time, and the largest productive capacity and array of food and munitions ever witnessed on this earth. There is no excuse for our inferiority complex in this crisis. If we have anything on our minds or in our hearts, we ought to speak up like men, not grovel like whimpering stooges. This is the time for strong men and strong nations to stand for something besides plunder.

At this pont I quote from the Problem of Lasting Peace, by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, page 118, as to what the Allies got out of World War No. 1:

Under the mandate system, set up in the peace treaty, the British Empire grew by 1,607,053 square miles, with 35,000,000 inhabitants; the French Empire gained 402,392 square miles, with 4,000,000 inhabitants; the Belgian Empire got 53,000 square miles, with 3,387,000 inhabitants; the Japanese Empire was awarded 833 square miles of islands, with 113,154 inhabitants. Italy got no mandates. America got nothing—and wanted nothing.

These areas contained valuable raw materials and markets. They gave valuable outposts for land, air, and naval forces. They certainly stripped Germany from a world empire down to a local state, but they sowed more dragon's teeth. For one thing, they practically gave to Japan the strategic Pacific islands north of the Equator that had belonged to Germany. The use made of these islands since was hardly that envisaged by the mandate, for instead of keeping them unarmed, as the mandates required, they were equipped to serve as the naval and air bases from which America is now being attacked.

When we declared war on Adolf Hitler we launched this happy, peace-loving Nation on a bloody but magnificent crusade. Hitler gave us no physical cause for war. He was very careful not to violate our physical neutrality. But Hitler grievously did violate our ideals of justice, humanity, and decency in his treatment of his innocent neighbors, and for that reason, and that reason alone, we pledged our lives, our property, and our sacred honor to destroy him. We sought no selfish advantage and we seek none now. Our sole objective is the establishment of a just peace in a war-mad world.

Now, when this great conflict is entering its final stages shall we abandon our ideals and supinely witness the spoils of war divided among the victors, on the basis of strength of arms, with

no regard for the freedom and rights of the weaker states, or shall we stand where we stood when we declared war? Are we to condemn aggression by Hitler and Tojo and acquiesce in it when it is practiced by others? Is it enough to deny imperialism for ourselves and at that very moment by the strength of our military might make it possible for others? That would be aggravated hypocrisy, a repudiation of the Atlantic Charter, a miserable and shameful abandonment of our vaunted ideals and our well-established foreign policy of good neighborliness.

Slaves have peace. Hitler and Tojo talk long and loud to a world hungry for peace about peace—the peace of a well-regulated penitentiary. Peace is not the prime object. Righteousness, justice, equity, and freedom are the objects. A world without them, regardless of the strength of its police force, will not have a durable peace. Peace is the gift of the God of Love to those who deserve it. Our job is to improvise a world that deserves peace.

Our object is an orderly world where humanity may attain the dignity that comes with freedom, and where controversies between nations are settled through arbitration. Our object is a world filled with good-neighbor nations who respect law and the dignity of man, and who conduct their foreign relations with circumspection and absolute honesty. It is blasphemy to talk about a peaceable world on any other basis.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think it entirely agreeable to our sentiments of cordiality toward one of the powers which took a full and honorable part in the Moscow conference to say that we appreciate the attitude manifested not only by the United Kingdom and China, but that exhibited by Russia. I thought Senators would not regard it as inappropriate if I asked unanimous consent to incorporate at this point in my remarks a report which appeared in the New York Times of September 22, 1938, of the text of the address, I think a remarkable address, delivered before the Assembly of the League of Nations by Mr. Maxim Litvinoff upon the crisis which then impended, during Munich week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we are discussing now the annual report of the secretary general of the League's work during the past 12 months. Quite naturally and rightly, however, the speakers so far have dealt not with what the League has done during the year but what it has not done this year or in previous years. Evidently, everyone recognizes that the League of Nations was not set up for the activities recorded in the report presented by the secretary general of the League.

One does not forget that the League was created as a reaction to the World War. Its object was to make that the last war, to safeguard all nations against aggression, and to replace the system of military alliances by the collective organizations of assistance to the victims of aggression. In this field the League has done nothing.

VICTIMS OF AGGRESSION

Two states, Ethiopia and Austria, have lost their independent existence in consequence of violent aggression. A third state, China, is now a victim of aggression and foreign invasion for the second time in 7 years; and a fourth state, Spain, is in the third year of a sanguinary war, owing to the armed intervention of two aggressors in its internal affairs. The League of Nations has not carried out its obligations to these states.

At the present time, a fifth state, Czechoslovakia, is suffering interference in its internal affairs at the hands of a neighboring state and is publicly and loudly menaced with attack. One of the oldest, most cultured, most hard working of European peoples, which acquired its independence as a state after centuries of oppression, today or tomorrow may decide to take up arms in defense of that independence.

I am sure, ladies and gentlemen, that the sympathies, if not of all governments, at any rate of all the peoples in this representative assembly, go out to the Czechoslovak people in this its terrible hour of trial.

We all remember the most active part played by Czechoslovakia and its present President, M. Benes, in the organization of the League of Nations, and all our thoughts are so occupied with the events in Czechoslovakia and around it that we delegates find it difficult to give necessary attention to the Assembly's agenda, in which Czechoslovakia is not mentioned.

TRY TO LEGALIZE BLUNDERS

There is nothing surprising therefore in the fact that the general discussion has centered on what the League of Nations ought to have done but did not do. Unfortunately, it has not been limited to the recording and explanation of the League's blunders and mistakes, but has included attempts to justify them and even legalize them for the future.

Various arguments have been used, among them the most favored being a reference to the absence of universality. The fallacy of this argument has been pointed out more than once. The League of Nations has never been more universal during the first 12 years of its existence. From the outset it lacked three of the largest powers and a multitude of small states. Furthermore, some states left it, others joined it, and after the first case of aggression it never crossed anyone's mind, at all events no one expressed such views in the League, that the League could not fulfill its principal functions and therefore that its constitution should be altered, and those functions, the functions of guardianship of peace, be eliminated.

Moreover, no one has yet proved and no one can prove that the League of Nations refused to apply sanctions to the aggressor in this or that case because some countries were absent from its ranks and that this was the reason why sanctions applied in one case were prematurely brought to an end.

LEAGUE STILL STRONG

Even today the League of Nations is still strong enough by its collective action to avert or arrest aggression. All that is necessary is that the obligatory character of such actions be confirmed and that the machinery of the League of Nations be at least once brought into action in conformity with its covenant. This would require only the good will of the states that are members. For there are no objective reasons of such a character as to prevent the normal functioning of the League; at any rate, no such reason as could not be foreseen by the founders of the League and by those states which later joined it. If the complaints of lack of universality be carefully examined they will be found to reveal considerations of quite a different nature.

One may reason this way: When the League was being set up or when it was receiving new adherents, no one seriously anticipated that any state would defy articles X and XVI and undertake aggression and that there would arise the necessity of applying those articles in practice, thereby disturbing one's own tranquillity as a state and sacrificing one's immediate interest.

But now that aggression has become a reality, it is apparently necessary to eliminate collective methods of combating aggression, in order to avert it from one's self. A fire brigade was set up in the innocent hope that by some lucky chance there would be no fire. Things turned out rather differently. Fires have broken out in defiance of our hopes.

JOINED FOR MUTUAL ATTACK

The case presented by the opponents of sanctions will reveal yet another argument. Aggression has raised its head too high. Its forces have been multiplied and are growing daily. The exponents of aggression today are several and fairly powerful. Moreover, they have joined forces in mutual defense, or rather for mutual attack, and they have gone far, principally with the help of printer's ink and the radio.

These facts cannot be contested. The aggressor states have grown immensely during the last 3 years. They have formed a bloc in order to defend the principle of aggression and will defend and justify one another even when one of them is infringing upon the rights and interests of another. There are cases, too, of joint aggression.

The responsibility, ladies and gentlemen, for these regrettable facts lies with those states who restrained the League from resistance to the aggressors when they were still weak and divided. They have since attempted to break the peace, and, thanks to the impunity with which they have been allowed to break one international treaty after another, to the propaganda for aggression, thanks to the policy of concession, negotiation, and backstate intrigue with them, they have since grown strong.

There is no room for bargaining or compromising. They can be restrained from carrying their evil designs into effect if at the least attempt to carry out aggression in practice there will be an appropriate measure of retaliation, according to the capacity of each member of the League for collective action provided by article XVI.

FOR RESOLUTE ACTION

In other words, the aggressor should be met with the program laid down by the League Covenant, resolutely, persistently, and without hesitation. Then the aggressor himself will not be led into temptation.

There is, however, another conception, which recommends as the height of human wisdom, under the cover of pacifism, that the aggressor be treated with consideration and his vanity be not wounded. It recommends conversations and negotiations to be carried on with him, that he be assured that no collective action will ever be taken against him, and, even though he enters into collusion with other aggressors, that compromise agreements be concluded with him and his breaches of former agreements be overlooked and that his demands, even the most illegal, be fulfilled. And that one state after another be sacrificed to him and that, if possible, no question of his activity be raised at the League of Nations because the aggressor does not like it, he takes offense and sulks.

Unfortunately, this is just the policy that has been pursued toward the aggressor. Three wars have threatened to bring down on us a fourth. Four nations have already been sacrificed and a fifth is next on the list.

In view of such lamentable results of this policy, we have the right to expect that there should be recognition of the mistaken character of this policy and of the necessity of replacing it by some other policy. Instead we hear proposals here to make the old policy permanent.

REASSURANCE IN ADVANCE

The aggressor previously reckoned with the possible reaction of the League of Nations. He showed a certain hesitation in preparing his aggressions, carrying them out gradually and in proportion to his growing certainty that there would be no reaction at all. But now we are asked to reassure him beforehand that he need not fear anything under the League and that the League henceforth will not apply to him military or economic or financial sanctions. At the very worst, he is threatened with moral condemnation, and that, in all probability, will be couched in appropriately cultured diplomatic forms.

I have already had occasion in another place to point out that articles X and XVI, with the latent threat of international sanctions contained in the latter, constitute a powerful potential for peace. It is now suggested that we destroy that potential because, in spite of the paralyzing of the League, in spite of its failure to carry out its obligations in many cases, the aggressor still might fear that the moment would come when the League would nevertheless do its duty. The aggressor nations, therefore, carry on a tireless campaign against article XVI through their friends inside the League. They need fear no obstacle as far as Geneva is concerned.

If anyone should wish to realize the importance to aggressor countries of the proposed nullification of article XVI, let him study the comments of the press of a certain country on the speeches made in this assembly on the subject and the praise lavished on the speakers.

PRESSURE ON SMALL COUNTRIES

Furthermore, we know what certain small countries have been subjected to direct pressure by one aggressive state, which by threats and promises was endeavoring to persuade them to join the movement for the abolition of article XVII.

I shall probably hear the reply that no one has any designs on article XVI or even on sanctions, and that all that is proposed is to eliminate their obligatory and automatic character. I hope my colleagues will forgive me if I tell them that such a reply can only be taken seriously by very naive people.

Is it not obvious that the whole value of article XVI lies in its obligatory character, that is, in the objective character of sanctions which enable every member of the League to rely on universal aid if he is attacked? But if such aid is to depend on a separate decision in each individual case, if assistance is to be granted to some states and not to others, there can be no question of a feeling of security. Who will agree to make sacrifices and to grant altruistic aid to another state if the latter declares beforehand that it is under no obligation of reciprocity?

Will anyone pay premiums to an insurance company if he is not guaranteed the automatic payment of benefits in cases provided for and if that payment depends on the quite arbitrary decision of the management of that company? Yet we are flatly told that every member of the League is to judge for himself whether his participation in the sanctions coincides with his own interests.

PRIVATE AID BEFORE LEAGUE

But to grant aid to another state in one's own interests requires no League of Nations. It was the practice long before the League existed. Did not 25 states combat the Central Powers during the World War because their interests coincided? Did not private alliances serve the same end of the joint defense of their common interests by groups of states? But we were told the League of Nations was to put an end to the system of private alliances and agreements and to replace them by the principles of collective security based on the common interests of all people in the maintenance of peace.

We are also put off with assurances that the measures proposed will be of a purely temporary character, that in some indeterminate future it will be possible once again to return to the obligatory and automatic character of sanctions. No indication is given of what conditions will be necessary for such a change.

If the reason for the modus operandi now proposed is the absence of universality, why must we think that the League of Nations, completely withered away as to its contents and retaining a mere shell outside, will present any attraction to new members or that those states which remain outside the League on account of the compulsory character of sanctions will enter it in order to restore that compulsory character once it has been abolished?

A CASE OF RETROGRESSION

If, on the other hand, the obligatory application of sanctions is considered impossible because aggression has appeared on the political horizon, what grounds have we for believing that the phenomenon will disappear? If it does disappear there will be no need of sanctions. Isn't it true that the present masters of world destiny cannot yet rise to the heights of international solidarity, but that in the future they themselves or their successors will reach that elevated level?

We know, however, that those heights were reached by founders and first leaders of the League of Nations and that the people who have replaced them are trying to bring about a revision of the original intentions of those who founded the League. Here, too, consequently, it is rather a case of retrogression. I fear we must draw the conclusion that it is not a question of a moratorium for the League but of a logical change in its character.

The bitter taste of the remedy we are offered seems to be realized by the doctors themselves, since they propose to dilute it with sirup in the shape of a suggestion that the unanimity rule be abolished in respect of the paragraph of article XI dealing with what the League must do in the event of war or threat of war. Such a suggestion might have been welcomed if article XVI were maintained with its list of practical measures which the League can take. Now when we are asked to nullify article XVI, the aggressor will not be frightened by article XI, which makes it possible only morally to condemn him.

ARTICLE X THREATENED

One of those who spoke here against article XVI had the courage to tell us that his statement applied equally to article X. That position seems to me perfectly logical. After all, if we are to renounce collective measures or combatting aggressors, article X, which speaks of the undertaking to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League is, therefore, deprived of all practical significance.

Supporters of what amounts to the abolition of article XVI, in various speeches from this tribunal, assured us of their loyalty and continued devotion to League principles. I may be permitted to ask: If the principles of collective security and joint struggle against attacks on the territorial integrity and political independence of the League members are eliminated from the League, to what other principle is the League pledging its loyalty?

Is it possible for the League to exist just to make decisions regarding the drug traffic, assistance to refugees, establishing an international system of signaling at railroad crossings, or the results of statistical and other researches of various commissions? But what have all these questions, important as they are in themselves, in common with the maintenance of peace; with that main object for which the League was set up?

Could not these be considered by some organization of more modest and less pretentious title? Is it for these things that the taxpayers of various countries have to spend large sums totaling 30,000,000 Swiss francs a year? Now, if we are to be realists and declare the idea of the League of Nations to be ready for dissolution, then there is no need to create new illusions because that will deceive governments who have adopted decisions.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not saying this at all because I am trying to convince those governments and statesmen who have adopted decisions reflected in some of the speeches we have listened to in this assembly. The mistakenness and harmfulness of those decisions for the whole of humanity, and, first and foremost, for those states which have attempted to defend them, will be shown by history.

But at the moment when mines are being laid to blow up the organization in which were fixed the great hopes of our generation and which stamps a definite character on the international relations of our epoch—at the moment when, by no accidental coincidence, decisions are being taken outside the League which recall to us the international transactions of pre-war days which are bound to overturn all present conceptions of international morality and treaty obligations—at the moment when there is being drawn up a further list of sacrifices to the god of aggression and the line is being drawn under the annals of all post-war international history with the sole conclusion that nothing succeeds like aggression—at such a moment, every state must define its moral responsibility before its contemporaries and before history.

That is why I must plainly declare here that the Soviet Government bears no responsibility whatsoever for the events now taking place and for the fatal consequences which may inevitably ensue.

ENTERED LEAGUE FOR PEACE

After long doubts and hesitations, the Soviet Union joined the League in order to add the strength of its 170,000,000 people to the forces of peace. In the present hour of bitter disillusionment, the Soviet Union is far from regretting this decision, if only because there would undoubtedly have otherwise been attempts to attribute the alleged impotence and collapse of the League to its absence.

But having entered the League, it has been unfailingly loyal to the League obligations which it undertook and has faithfully performed and will endeavor to continue to carry out all the decisions and recommendations of the League directed to preserving peace and combating aggression, irrespective of whether those decisions coincided with its immediate interests as a state.

That was its attitude during the attack on Ethiopia.

The Soviet Nation invariably insisted that the League should do its duty to Spain, and it is not the fault of the Soviet Government that the Spanish problem was withdrawn from the League of Nations and transferred to the so-called London Nonintervention Committee, which has, we all know, considered its object to be to avoid intervening in the intervention of the aggressor countries in Spanish affairs. The activity of the Soviet Government in relation to the Spanish events, both in the London committee and outside it, has been penetrated with the spirit of the League of Nations, its principles, and the established standard of international law.

SUPPORT FOR CHINA

The same can be said likewise of the Chinese question. The Soviet delegation always insisted that the League of Nations should afford the maximum support to the victim of Japanese aggression, and those modest recommendations which the League of Nations adopted are being fulfilled more than loyally by the Soviet Government.

Such an event as the disappearance of Austria passed unnoticed by the League of Nations. Realizing the significance of this event for the fate of the whole of Europe and particularly Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Government, immediately after the "Anschluss," officially approached the other European great powers with a proposal for an immediate collective deliberation on the possible consequences of that event in order to adopt collective preventive measures.

To our regret, this proposal which, if carried out, could have saved us from the alarm which all the world now fears for the fate of Czechoslovakia, did not receive its just appreciation.

Bound to Czechoslovakia by a pact of mutual assistance, the Soviet Union abstained from any intervention in the negotiations of the Czechoslovak Government with the Sudeten Germans, considering this to be the internal business of the Czechoslovak State.

NO ADVICE OFFERED TO CZECHS

We have refrained from all advice to the Czechoslovak Government, considering it quite inadmissible that it should be asked to make concessions to the Germans to the detriment of its interests as a state, in order that we should be set free from the necessity of fulfilling our obligations under the treaty bearing our signature. Neither did we offer any advice in the contrary direction.

We value very highly the fact that the Czechoslovak Government up to the last few days did not even inquire of us whether we would fulfill our obligations on the pact, since obviously it had no doubt of this. It had no grounds for doubt. But, when a few days before I left for Geneva, the French Government for the first time inquired of my Government as to its attitude in the event of an attack on Czechoslovakia, I gave the French representative in Moscow, in the name of my Government, the following perfectly clear and unambiguous reply:

"We intend to fulfill our obligations under the pact, together with France, to afford assistance to Czechoslovakia by the way open to us; our War Department is ready immediately to participate in a conference with representatives of the French and Czechoslovak War Departments in order to discuss measures appropriate to the moment. In an event like this, we shall consider desirable that the question be raised in the League of Nations, if only as yet under article XI, with the object first, of mobilizing public opinion, and, secondly, ascertaining the position of certain other states whose passive aid might be extremely valuable."

FOR COLLECTIVE DEMARCHE

We said further that it was necessary to exert all means of avoiding an armed conflict and we considered one such method to be immediate consultation between the great powers of Europe and other interested states, in order, if possible, to decide on the terms for a collective demarche. This is how our reply was framed.

It was only 2 days ago that the Czechoslovak Government for the first time addressed a formal inquiry to my government, whether the U. S. S. R. is prepared, in accordance with the Soviet-Czech pact, to render to Czechoslovakia immediate and effective aid if France remains loyal to her obligation and renders similar assistance, and to this inquiry my government gave a clear answer in the affirmative. I believe it will be admitted by you ladies and gentlemen that that was both the reply of a loyal world signatory to an international agreement and of a faithful servant of the League.

It is not our fault if no effect was given to our proposal, which I am convinced could have produced the desired results. It was in the interest of Czechoslovakia and the interests of all Europe and general peace.

DISASTROUS CONSEQUENCES

Unfortunately, other steps were taken which have led, and which could not but lead, to such a capitulation, as is bound sooner or later to have quite incalculable and disastrous consequences. To avoid a problematic war today and make certain of one tomorrow is the price which the insatiable aggressors ask.

The destruction or mutilation of several states is certainly not to act in accordance with the Covenant of the League of Nations. To grant bonuses for saber-rattling and resort to arms for the solution of national problems, in other words, to reward and encourage aggressive super-imperialism, is not to act in the spirit of the Briand-Kellogg Pact.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet Government takes pride in the fact that it has not acceded to such a policy and has invariably pursued the principles set forth by the League of Nations, which were approved by almost every nation in the world; nor has it any intention of abandoning them for the future, being convinced that in the present conditions it is impossible otherwise to safeguard a genuine peace and genuine international justice. It calls upon other governments likewise to return to this policy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as early as 1938 Mr. Litvinoff, who was one of the participants in the Moscow conference as deputy commissar for foreign affairs, who was Russia's esteemed ambassador of late date to this country, reported and recited what Russia had done in respect to the Hitler aggression against Austria and against Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Litvinov pointed out in this address that just 2 days, as I recall, before he spoke, the Czechoslovakian Government had made inquiry of the Russian Government to know whether or not, if France honored her obligation to protect the security of Czechoslovakia, Russia would honor her obligation, and Mr. Litvinov told the Assembly of the League of Nations on September 22, prior to Munich, that the Russian Government had given unqualified assurance that it would honor the obligation it had assumed toward Czechoslovakia. He pleaded for the principle of collective security. He spoke of Russia's history of fidelity to the League of Nations and of her determination to remain a faithful member of the League.

Now, Mr. President, we are all gratified, when some were pointing the finger of doubt and question and suspicion at the conduct of Russia, to find that her conduct, her official action at Moscow, with Mr. Litvinov, the deputy commissar of foreign affairs, participating, has been consistent with the utterances of fidelity, to the principle of collective international security so ably enunciated by Mr. Litvinov before the Assembly of the League on the 22d of September 1938.

I have felt all the time that if Britain and the United States would extend the hand of honorable friendship to Russia, and would say, "We are willing to do our honorable part with you in maintaining world peace and promoting world welfare," we would find Russia ready to grasp our hands in friendship, and to perform her honorable part in international collaboration.

I believe, therefore, all of us have reason to see the bright rays of new hope coming from the Moscow conference, that we have at last come to understand one another better than we ever have before, and all of us, forgetting our mistakes of the past, have entered into a general accord of world peace, which, if we all do our part, I hope will save the earth from the further scourge of war.

VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE AND THE SOUTH

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is very seldom I pay attention to the ravings of some of the columnists of this Nation. Most of them always hit below the belt. I have never taken occasion to make corrections in respect to misstatements made about myself. I prefer to let them have a free hand, so long as they do not overlook me.

I hold in my hand a column written by Raymond Moley in which he states, in part:

> The President, no doubt moved by the realistic Byrnes-Hopkins influence, is determined to ditch Mr. WALLACE in 1944. Mr. Roosevelt would have a hard job flying over some of the Southern States in the 1944 election with Mr. WALLACE as his co-pilot. Mr. WALLACE knows this, and hence his bitter attacks upon southern Democrats.

I have never heard of Mr. WALLACE attacking any of the southern Democrats, as indicated in this statement. On the contrary, he has been a true friend of the South. He has taken a deep interest in our problems and has always been willing to cooperate to the fullest extent. I think Mr. Moley was laboring under a mistake of identity, because just before he wrote this column there appeared in the New York Times of Friday, October 22, a speech in which Mr. Willkie said:

> Just consider the situation. Most of the powerful offices in Washington, from the State Department down, are now administered or controlled, whether directly or indirectly, by the southern Democratic bloc. These Southern Democrats, who describe themselves as conservatives, but whose votes in many instances prove them reactionaries, wield enormous power, both in the Government and in the Democratic Party.
>
> They remain in office because millions of the people in their States are unable to exercise the right of franchise and they filibuster indefinitely against any attempt that is made to recognize the free right of all Americans to vote.

There is no question in my mind that, as I have just indicated, there is a mistake in identity on the part of Mr. Moley—and I believe it intentional—to give credence to a statement which was made by Mr. Willkie and attribute it to Mr. WALLACE. I may say to my fellow Senators that the only similarity between our distinguished Vice President and presiding officer and Mr. Willkie, the defeated Republican candidate of 1940

and the prospective Republican candidate for 1944, is that their names begin with a "W."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The truth is that Mr. WALLACE has just returned from the State of Texas where he made a plea for the removal of the discrimination in the matter of freight rates against the South. Instead of being there attacking the southern leaders or attacking the South, he was down there making a plea for fairness and for justice and for more equal treatment to the South.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, that I was about to bring that to the attention of the Senate. In the first paragraph of Mr. Moley's column he refers to the rate question, and I now quote:

> The economic arguments of such a man as the new HENRY WALLACE cannot be effectively answered in economic terms. So while the railroads are providing the economic counterblows to the Vice President's attack upon them, it is profitable to speculate a bit on what lies behind these political activities of Mr. WALLACE.

There is no doubt that the column of Mr. Moley was inspired by the fact that Mr. WALLACE had the courage to take the side of southern Senators in their fight for equal freight rates with the preferred States of the Union located east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio Rivers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to propound a request for unanimous consent. I see present the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

I make a unanimous-consent request that on Wednesday when the session convenes the debate be limited, and that no Senator speak more than 15 minutes on the resolution or on any amendment thereof.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say that several Senators not in our group desire to speak. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] I believe has a speech which would take him longer than the 15 minutes provided by the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CONNALLY. He would obtain 30 minutes under the request I have made.

Mr. BALL. But several other Senators have advised me that they wanted to speak on this issue and that they were not sure they could finish in half an hour. I do not believe the Senator from Texas should make such a request unless there is a fuller attendance of Senators on the floor at the time it is made.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is not responsible for the fact that other Senators are not present. The debate has been going along with empty benches for days. I have no power to compel Senators to attend; that can only be done by vote of the Senate. I have not felt warranted in undertaking to invoke that authority. In my request I exempt tomorrow. The agreement would not become effective until Wednesday. I think we have been very liberal with respect to the debate. I have not received any such requests as those the Senator from Minnesota indicates have come to him, which do not come from his group. I naturally would suppose that his group would be the ones who would confer with him as to desire to speak and the time they would consume. I have received a few requests which we are undertaking to care for.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not authorized or requested by other Senators to make any request in their names, but I know, for example, that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and possibly the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], desire to speak. I know that the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from West Virginia have prepared speeches and have definitely said they wanted to be given an opportunity to speak.

Mr. CONNALLY. The proposed agreement would not cut them off from making their speeches. Each Senator could make a 30-minute speech, and then when an amendment is acted upon and another amendment comes up for consideration, 15 minutes more could be consumed on that amendment, and so on.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I make the suggestion that the unanimous consent request be propounded say at noon Wednesday when other Senators who desire to speak are present.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am propounding the request now. Senators may object if they desire to do so. I shall repropound it Tuesday, and Wednesday, and Thursday, and Friday, and right along.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are only 12 Senators on the floor at present and that we know that there are many Senators who desire to speak, who are not now present, I must object to the request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is objection made? Does the Senator from Minnesota object?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

POSTMASTERS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the nominations of the two postmasters whose names appear on the Executive Calendar be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say for the benefit of Senators who are absent as well as those present that I do not wish to cut off any Senator who desires to make a speech. Senators should be present on the floor if they desire to speak. So all may be advised, I now state that I shall renew my unanimous-consent request tomorrow when the Senate convenes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. With the Senator's permission, I should like to give notice at this time that tomorrow I shall request recognition from the Chair in order that I may make some observations pertaining to an amendment which I submitted today and also to a substitute resolution which I sent to the desk today. I have requested that both of them may be printed and lie on the table. They will be on the desks of Senators tomorrow. I merely take advantage of this opportunity to give notice that tomorrow at noon I shall request such recognition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no disposition to interfere with the Senator's plan; but in all fairness it should be said that three Senators have already been given assurance that they may speak tomorrow. I think recognition should be given to that fact.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me inquire who those Senators are.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to give notice now that immediately after those Senators have spoken I should like to have an opportunity to speak, since I have made preparation to speak on the all-important question now before the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make one comment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Tomorrow the newspapers will be filled with interpretations of the pending resolution and the amendment of the group of which I am a member, in relation to the Moscow agreement. I desire to point out at this time that it will be observed by those who carefully note the seven points of the Moscow four-power declaration that two stages of collaboration are contemplated by that agreement. The first stage is the four-power concert, the agreement by the four powers participating in the declaration to do certain things. But, Mr. President, the four powers contemplate a future stage of international cooperation and collaboration, and that the character of that subsequent cooperation and collaboration shall be entirely different from, and distinguished from, that of the four powers.

The point I desire to emphasize, Mr. President, is that the first thing the Moscow declaration says is that they jointly declare:

1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

The fourth paragraph says:

That they—

Meaning the four powers—

recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date—

What, Mr. President?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me at that point, I should like the Senator to emphasize the words "at the earliest practicable date." Nothing is said about awaiting the end of the war.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I appreciate his giving emphasis to that point.

The fourth paragraph of the declaration says:

the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date—

By the way, the four powers use the word "necessity." I repeat the fourth point:

That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date—

That means instituting at the earliest practicable date, Mr. President. What is it they would establish? Not a four-power pact, not a three-power alliance, not merely an agreement among free and sovereign nations to do a certain thing, but something which will constitute a new stage in the process of international cooperation and collaboration.

What is it that they envisage, Mr. President? It is this:

a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We have been saying in our proposed amendment that an international authority is what should be set up by the United Nations and by those who would join with them in the creation of the proposed institution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator about how long he intends to speak.

Mr. PEPPER. Not long; merely a minute or so.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say that we have always insisted on the use of the word "organization."

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly, and for good reason; and I have risen to say this only because editorials appearing in the newspapers and Senators on the floor have stated that in the Senate we were squabbling over the use of the article "an."

Mr. President, we have never squabbled over the use of the article "an." We have never quibbled over a word which is only technical in its significance. We have used the article "an" only for the same reason that the Four Power Conference at Moscow used the article "a"—to point out an international organization. If they had left out the word "general," so that the next word after the article would have been a word beginning with a vowel, instead of one beginning with a consonant, I think I am grammatically correct in saying that the Four Power Conference would have said "an international organization." However, since they inserted the descriptive word "general," the first letter of which is a consonant, not a vowel, it was proper grammar to say "a general international organization," instead of "an general international organization."

Mr. President, what we have been doing our best to assert to the Senate and to the country is the necessity for just what the Four Power Conference recognized; we are striving to set up and create a single, over-all organization the purpose of which should be to permit cooperation among nations, so as to furnish a means of justiciably settling international disputes and enforcing peace against aggressors who might disturb the peace of the world.

So the essential difference between the Connally resolution and the amendment offered by the group of 14 Senators is that although it might by inference be deduced or inferred that what the Connally resolution envisages in the future is an international organization, we wished to leave no doubt about that. We wished to say that the something which should be set up was, as described by the four-power conference, "a general international organization," which we called "an international organization"; for we know that unless there can be set up machinery the operations of which will gain momentum with the passage of time, unless the nations erect a structure which will be a clearing house for the settlement of controversies, success cannot be achieved. Any international structure based upon a flimsy foundation, not a firm one, will collapse and fall asunder.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 2, 1943, at 12 oclock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

PROMOTION, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of October 1942.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

James A. Bruce, Garfield, Ark., in place of L. A. Wert. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Mae M. Bunyard, Lost Hills, Calif., in place of C. R. Mason, resigned.

Harland G. Cox, South Laguna, Calif., in place of M. F. Shuler, resigned.

Berenice Wilson, Tehachapi, Calif., in place of W. C. Brite, resigned.

FLORIDA

Julia S. Wheeler, Ormond Beach, Fla., in place of J. S. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

John P. Mack, Elwood, Ind., in place of J. A. Donohue, deceased.

Pearl J. Lockhart, Fowler, Ind., in place of Leo McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

IOWA

Edward Van Zante, Pella, Iowa, in place of Edward Van Zante. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KANSAS

Theodore F. Stuckman, Kirwin, Kans., in place of H. P. Landes, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Lou E. Holder, Calhoun, Ky., in place of L. E. Holder. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nathaniel M. Elliott, Corbin, Ky., in place of N. M. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.

MAINE

Herman W. Crockett, North Haven, Maine, in place of L. E. Crockett, deceased.

Aubrey E. Kenney, Sebago Lake, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Margaret B. Tierney, Kensington, Md., in place of A. B. Bowie, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Margaret R. Brewster, Randolph, Mass., in place of C. H. McGrath, resigned.

Jennie A. Consoni, Sagamore, Mass., in place of E. A. Norris, resigned.

MICHIGAN

John S. Dunsford, Marlette, Mich., in place of F. J. Erwin, resigned.

Byron O. Gillies, Prescott, Mich., in place of B. O. Gillies. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lawrence D. Larke, Rogers City, Mich., in place of C. A. Vogelheim, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Henry E. Hunter, Stephen, Minn., in place of M. A. Lovestrom, removed.

Delbert I. Bjorklund, Winthrop, Minn., in place of J. R. Schisler, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Ruby M. Summers, Saucier, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSOURI

Amos A. Ponder, Cardwell, Mo., in place of R. V. Davis, resigned.

Jonathan N. Carter, Linneus, Mo., in place of G. W. Wood, transferred.

Virginia L. Rutledge, Osage Beach, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MONTANA

Delta J. O'Neil, Glendive, Mont., in place of E. F. O'Neil, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Vera B. Baugh, Oakland, Nebr., in place of William Vogt, Jr., removed.

William Stuart Campbell, Waterloo, Nebr., in place of W. S. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

Emery C. Smith, Wells, Nev., in place of C. A. Leach, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Harry Marvin Riddle, Jr., Asbury, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW MEXICO

Melvin O. Shockey, Mountainair, N. Mex., in place of B. C. Melton, resigned.

NEW YORK

Willis R. Holt, Black River, N. Y., in place of L. E. Burns, resigned.

Louis R. Mann, Cobleskill, N. Y., in place of C. F. Boughton, resigned.

Hans C. Hansen, Fishers Island, N. Y., in place of H. C. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

Albert J. Griffiths, Keuka Park, N. Y., in place of A. J. Griffiths. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clyde S. Edmister, Lisle, N. Y., in place of C. S. Edmister. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

Rosabelle Harris, Lyons Falls, N. Y., in place of C. R. S. Mastin, deceased.

Ruth E. Perrin, Potsdam, N. Y., in place of R. E. Perrin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lawrence Mahoney, Winthrop, N. Y., in place of D. F. Sullivan, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie A. Hanson, Aneta, N. Dak., in place of L. A. Hanson, resigned.

Elizabeth B. Scott, Arthur, N. Dak., in place of C. F. Ross, deceased.

Alvin N. Anderson, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugga. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

William T. Wakefield, Mott, N. Dak., in place of W. T. Wakefield. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Garfield J. Mauritson, Park River, N. Dak., in place of Emeline Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

OHIO

Walter E. Cole, Andover, Ohio, in place of W. E. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eugene D. Morris, Clarksburg, Ohio, in place of F. W. Taylor, transferred.

Sarah Griffith, Pedro, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Janet M. Wilson, Ridgeway, Ohio, in place of G. C. Kreinbihl, transferred.

Tressie U. Kerr, Sullivan Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Louis M. Pace, Wilburton, Okla., in place of W. C. Ray, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph A. Barnes, Ardmore, Pa., in place of D. J. McDonough, removed.

Laura C. Blatt, West Leesport, Pa., in place of H. F. Rieser, resigned.

Millie E. Moore, Westover, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William B. Snyder, Windsor, Pa., in place of S. H. Tschop, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ella Skorr, Colman, S. Dak., in place of A. M. Kaufmann, transferred.

Anna Mellinger, Olivet, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Langer, resigned.

TEXAS

Ora D. Morgan, Bronson, Tex., in place of C. A. Howard, retired.

Audria W. Sheffield, Daisetta, Tex., in place of O. F. Roberson, resigned.

Lillian G. Sherrieb, Higgins, Tex., in place of A. M. Winsett, deceased.

Lawrence E. Charlesworth, South Houston, Tex., in place of Cora Anderson, removed.

VIRGINIA

Joseph B. Murden, Londonbridge, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William G. Gwinn, Rich Creek, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Lena A. Voreis, Richmond Beach, Wash., in place of Frank Williams, removed.

Walter W. Lindley, St. John, Wash., in place of W. W. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Helen G. Anderson, Union, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cora Fisher, Sabraton, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WISCONSIN

George S. Allen, Lyndon Station, Wis., in place of J. F. Trainer, transferred.

Viola Klassy, New Glarus, Wis., in place of F. J. Marty, retired.

Howard J. Merryfield, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of T. A. Wiora, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 1 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

MISSOURI

Kathryn Q. Brown, Hallsville.

WEST VIRGINIA

Harry E. Riddleberger, St. Albans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who ever hearest, we praise Thee that we have the sacred privilege of coming to Thee through the sanctuary of prayer. In these days, so fraught with peril and travail of our country's soul, we know that the Lord He is God; it is He who hath made us and not we ourselves. We are His people and the sheep of His pasture. O Lord, Thou hast searched me and known me; Thou understandest my thought afar off and art acquainted with all my ways. Whither shall I go from Thy spirit or whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me and Thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me; the darkness and the light are both alike unto Thee. Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my thought and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting. We give thanks unto Thee, O Saviour, whose mercy endureth forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 28, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 27, 1943:

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Leiberschal;

H. R. 3145. An act to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1937; and

H. R. 3223. An act to provide for reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others, in the naval service of the United States for property lost, damaged, or destroyed in such service.

On October 28, 1943:

H. R. 2152. An act for the relief of Rafael Torres;

H. R. 3225. An act to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3381. An act relating to credits against the Victory tax.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk tomorrow and at the conclusion of any previous special orders, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders previously entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include quotations from proceedings of the Chinese Fourth of July.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGN ADVERTISING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that anyone can accuse me of being partisan. It is very infrequent that I take the floor here to criticize, but on Friday, October 29, the Washington News contained an article and the picture of a billboard which reads like this: "There are many roads to Tokyo; we will neglect none of them." Signed, President Roosevelt.

This appears on a billboard in Guadalcanal for the soldiers to see, a billboard made out of American lumber sent over there together with paint and involving American workmen to put this up thousands of miles from home. It seems to me that instead of just saying "President Roosevelt," it could have added "Candidate for President in 1944."

I do not like to see the taxpayers' money used for the purpose of putting up billboards in Guadalcanal and those swamps over there advertising someone who is running for President next year. It seems to me that the Governor of any State running for office could, just as justifiably, put up a sign reading "There are many roads to Tokyo. We will neglect none of them," and spread them out through the world at State taxpayers' expense with their names attached. It seems to me that with General MacArthur needing munitions and equipment that implements of war should take up the much-needed space on our ships instead of campaign material which is not needed. I feel that General MacArthur is competent enough to give all orders over there, including the order about going to Tokyo. We do not need to worry about those boys over there neglecting anything. I am fearful that Candidate Roosevelt is not nearly so worried about those boys neglecting the roads to Tokyo but is fearful they will neglect to vote New Deal in 1944.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore agreed to, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

DRAFT DEFERMENT OF ABE FORTAS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been comments in the press and elsewhere concerning the draft deferment of Hon. Abe Fortas, the Under Secretary of the Interior. Some of these comments have been critical of those responsible for his deferment, and, unfortunately, although I am sure unintentionally, some have, by implication at least, reflected upon Mr. Fortas' patriotism. While deferment was never sought by Mr. Fortas and was definitely against his wishes, he previously acquiesced and continued his important administrative work upon the insistence of his official superiors. But recently, when his deferment was about to expire, he finally refused to accept any further draft deferment and requested immediate induction, and on October 22 he was inducted into the Navy as an apprentice seaman in accordance with his wishes. Mr. Fortas has been granted a leave of absence from the Navy to head the Petroleum Reserves Corporation mission in the Middle East, and he will enter active service as an apprentice seaman when the mission returns to this country. This assignment is one of greatest importance. The mission will survey foreign petroleum supplies in the Middle East and facilities available in that area to supply the fighting forces.

The course followed by Mr. Fortas, a married man without children, is commendable, and, in my opinion, any criticism of him or of those responsible for his previous deferment is unwarranted. Anyone who is informed as to the work that was being done by him as Under Secretary of the Interior must know that he, in that capacity, was making a much greater contribution to the war effort than would have been possible in the armed forces. I shall not undertake to even summarize the various important and vital functions being performed by him. It should suffice to say that he was the keyman of the Secretary of the Interior in his administration of such agencies as Solid Fuels Administration for War, the Coal Mines Administration, and the National Power Policy Committee, as well as the Petroleum Conservation Division and other essential war activities of the Department itself. He was irreplaceable in this vital work at the time. I do not say he was indispensable only for the reason that I do not believe any man is indispensable to the Government.

When one consideres the type of man Abe Fortas is, his intellectual attainments, his superior qualities of character, and peculiar qualifications for the important work he was doing, it is little wonder that those responsible for the administration of the agencies involved sought his deferment. He studied at Southwestern College, of Memphis, Tenn., where he graduated with highest honors and was the first Peres scholar at that institution. From there he went to the Yale Law School where he graduated at the head of his class. By reason of his scholastic attainments at Yale he was made a member of the Order of the Coif; became editor-in-chief of the Yale Law Journal; and, upon graduation, was made a member of the faculty.

Directly from the Yale faculty he came into Government service. First as an attorney in the solicitor's office of the Department of Agriculture and then on the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission where he came to be recognized by the industry as well as the commission as a man of outstanding ability and unusual aptitude for Government service. Later he served as general counsel of the Bituminous Coal Division of the Interior Department, a most difficult assignment, until he was appointed director of the Power Division of this Department and general counsel of the National Power Policy Committee. Upon resignation of the Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, he was called to that position. All these positions were attained solely on merit and, in each, he served with distinction. He has a rare practical working knowledge of our Government as well as a profound understanding of the law.

In fairness I bring these facts to the attention of the Members, and to Mr. Fortas I pay my respects and express the hope that good fortune may attend him wherever duty may call.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests for extension of remarks. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Galveston News on the importance of highway construction in the post-war period. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Hon. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, on the subject of America's stake in world trade, delivered at the national foreign trade convention in New York on October 25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written by Mr. C. Bedell Monroe, president of the Pennsylvania Central Air Lines, to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Judge Harley Langdale, president of the American Turpentine Farmers Association Cooperative, of Valdosta, Ga., made before the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with timber valuation and taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Mr. William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, at the sixty-third annual convention of the American Federation of Labor on October 8, 1943, in response to an address delivered by the commander of the American Legion on the same day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two news articles relating to the unlawful activities of O. P. A. investigators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MAJ. JACK L. JERSTAD MISSING IN ACTION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American people will long remember the spectacular air raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania last August. The lead plane in that flight was piloted by Maj. Jack L. Jerstad, 25, of Racine, Wis. Today that young hero is missing in action, but a grateful Government is about to present to his father, A. H. Jerstad, the Congressional Medal of Honor, in recognition of an outstanding achievement by his son. Major Jerstad's participation in that raid was wholly voluntary and his high devotion to duty inspired other men under his command to follow him eagerly, whatever the mission.

Mr. Speaker, at this time our thoughts and our prayers are directed to this young man in the hope that he still lives and will be returned to duty soon. We cannot afford to lose young men of his caliber. We pray, too, for his parents, who constantly await definite word from him or his Government.

Mr. Speaker, so that the official record may contain a more detailed statement about this young hero and his exploits, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks an article that appeared in the Racine Journal-Times of October 29, 1943:

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this article is as follows:

A personal representative of President Roosevelt will come to Racine November 14 or 21 to present the Congressional Medal of Honor—highest award of the United States—to A. H. Jerstad, 1725 Park Avenue, for his son, Maj. Jack L. Jerstad, 25, who has been missing in action since he led a successful bombing mission over Rumanian oil fields August 1.

Capt. Walter L. Haight, who compiled a history of Racine County in World War No. 1, said that in his knowledge Major Jerstad is the first Racine man ever to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor.

SELECT OWN TIME, PLACE

In two communications from the Army Air Forces the major's father was informed that the place and date for the presentation could be determined by him. Jerstad said that he may ask that presentation be at Holy Communion Church, which his family attends.

The Congressional Medal of Honor is awarded to persons who, while in the Army, distinguish themselves at the risk of life by gallantry and courage above and beyond the call of duty in an action involving actual contact with the armed enemy. The first such award was made in 1862.

Jerstad said the award is being made to his son for the flight over the Rumanian oil fields on August 1. The major was reported missing in action on August 12, since which time his parents have received no further word from him. They are still hoping that he is being held in prison. Little information has come out of Rumania since collapse of the Italian Government, but it is known that many of the United States airmen in this flight landed safely and were taken prisoners.

TARGET WAS DESTROYED

Major Jerstad, one of the youngest flyers to hold that rank, was chief of staff and operations officer of a new combat wing and volunteered to participate in the raid on the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania last August. He chose to fly the lead plane in that spectacular mission.

From photographic evidence, the assigned target was completely destroyed, but as Jerstad's plane left the target the crew of the second plane saw an antiaircraft shell explode nearby. The plane swerved, but the rest of the flight could not determine if it made a safe landing because of their great flying speed.

In a letter written to the major's parents, Col. Edward J. Timberlake, commander of the bomber group, said, "I am firmly convinced that Jack's being in the lead plane of that force played a very important part in the eagerness that was so apparent in the rest of the crews—they always liked to follow Jack."

HAS OTHER DECORATIONS

Paying tribute to Major Jerstad, Colonel Timberlake added, "Jack had one desire and that was to do everything humanly possible to aid in the defeat of the enemy. I know that no one man has done more than your son and my very close friend."

Major Jerstad, who enlisted in the Air Corps in July 1941, saw considerable action in the European theater. He has the Air Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Silver Star (for sinking a German submarine at Bordeaux, France), and four Oak Leaf Clusters for the star.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised at the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, just now. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois does not know that the President of the United States is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States. I am wondering if that is all the criticism the gentleman from Illinois can have. If so, then I would say to you, sir, that he has a very, very small criticism. The gentleman from Illinois has only seen a picture in a newspaper, and from that he takes it that the President is doing this. He does not know that things like this happen in every army. Even in the last war the soldiers of the United States in France, not thinking of any politics, posted signs similar to this, reading "On to Berlin," and put Woodrow Wilson's name to them. Let us not get to these little trifling things.

HUNGRY HORSE DAM, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana, Congressman O'CONNOR, and I are today introducing a bill authorizing the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in northwestern Montana. We wish at this time to thank the House, Mr. Speaker, for the real consideration it has shown to the people of our State and to assure them that we appreciate their authorization of a committee to study the problems and the possibilities of our region. That committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] and comprising such outstanding individuals as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], knows our problems in western Montana. We owe them and the entire membership of the House a debt of gratitude for the assistance given us in saving Flathead Lake and our thanks knows no bounds. This bill to authorize the construction of the Hungry Horse is the alternative to the

raising of Flathead Lake and we of Montana feel that if this measure passes the Congress—and we sincerely hope it will—that all future danger pertaining to our lake will be done away with. I know I speak for all the people of Montana when I ask your continued assistance in this vital matter and I want you to know, again, how deeply grateful we are for all that you have done thus far to help us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on October 25 my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] obtained permission for me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address. I have been informed by the Public Printer that the material exceeds the prescribed 2 pages and will cost $112.50. I ask unanimous consent that this address may be printed notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a condensation of an article written by my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut, the Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an answer to the question of what the East is to do about Midwest corn, prepared by Pirkell-Daniel, consulting price analysts of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, WISCONSIN

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, Pure Milk Products Cooperative, a pure cooperative of milk producers in the State of Wisconsin, has a membership of approximately 12,000 members. They produced 1,105,340,375 pounds of milk last year, at a market value of $30,363,700.79. The members have a total investment of $150,711,000 for milk production alone and require an acreage of land amounting to 1,163,514 acres devoted strictly to dairying. The central office is located at Fond du Lac, Wis., in the district I have the honor to represent. At their annual convention, held on October 26, a series of resolutions were adopted which should challenge the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include these resolutions as part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are as follows:

Whereas we, the delegated representatives of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, are today here convened in a legally called annual convention; and

Whereas we recognize the tremendous task allotted to the farm people of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, in appreciation of the chaos with which our country is confronted today, reaffirm and repledge a determined will to prosecute every effort within our scope to the end that we may maintain, and wherever possible increase, the production of milk, so that our efforts will contribute to the rapid acceleration of the war effort, and to the final and victorious conclusion of this war; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Members of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress.

Whereas we, the duly elected representatives of the membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, here now convened in legal annual convention; and

Whereas we desire to bring to the attention of the national administration the desperate plight in which the milk producers of Wisconsin find themselves entangled in these dark days of war; and

Whereas we recognize our tremendous responsibility in the prosecution of this war; and

Whereas we have a keen desire to be of aid and assistance to our Members in Congress in helping to bring about a balance between the price of milk and competing agricultural products, to the end that the production of milk may be encouraged; and, if possible, an increase in the total production for the year 1944: Now therefore

In view of these keen responsibilities and desires, we pray that the Congress will take cognizance of the wide disparity between milk prices and other agricultural products, and bring about the proper legislation that will serve to readjust and properly locate the milk market which has been so dislocated during the past several months, and in so resolving, we believe it would be expedient to immediately increase the price of milk in all sections of the country in an amount not less than 46 cents per hundredweight for milk testing 3.5 percent butterfat; and, further,

That the Office of Price Administration no longer have final jurisdiction over milk prices, and that in lieu of their jurisdiction, that the War Food Administration, in conjunction with the Dairy and Poultry Division, be authorized as the agency to determine the proper status of milk prices for the Nation, and that any participation on the part of the Office of Price Administration should come through recommendations based upon the findings made by the Dairy and Poultry Division of the War Food Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of Congress from Wisconsin, and such other Congressmen and such governmental agencies as may be deemed advisable.

Whereas the membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, representing over 12,000 farmers and producing approximately 1,105,340,375 pounds of milk, have in the past strenuously voiced their opposition to the payment of milk subsidies, on the ground that milk subsidies are wrong in principle and are entirely inadequate to stimulate an increase in milk production so necessary and vital to the war effort; and

Whereas the average dairy farmer in Wisconsin is entirely out of sympathy with the subsidy program for milk; and

Whereas we recognize the valued services rendered in the past by the Commodity Credit Corporation to various branches of industry and other agricultural enterprises; and

Whereas there is at the present time a bill before Congress known as the Steagall bill (H. R. 3458) which extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation but abolishes its power and the power of all other Federal agencies to pay food subsidies after December 31, 1943, except in the case of perishable vegetables: Therefore be it

Resolved by Pure Milk Products Cooperative in convention assembled, That we express our hearty support of the Steagall bill; and further,

That we urge each and every member of Pure Milk Products Cooperative to write their Congressman urging its passage; and further,

That a copy of this resolution be mailed to all Wisconsin Members of Congress, and our two Senators, and to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the two Houses of Congress.

Whereas Pure Milk Products, a cooperative of milk producers in the State of Wisconsin, consisting of approximately 12,000 members, producing 1,105,340,375 pounds of milk last year at a market value of $30,363,700.79, requiring a total investment of $150,711,000 for milk production alone, and requiring an acreage of land totaling 1,163,514 acres, devoted strictly to dairying, feel that they have a large financial stake, and are entitled to a voice in any bill respecting dairying which has been introduced, or which will be introduced in Congress; and

Whereas there is a bill at the present time before the House Committee on Agriculture known as the Fulmer bill (H. R. 2400), which will drastically change regulations of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Pure Milk Products Cooperative in convention legally and duly assembled, That we are unalterably opposed to bill H. R. 2400; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Committee on Agriculture, to Congressman REID F. MURRAY, to all Wisconsin Congressmen and the two Senators, to Congressman ANDRESEN, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa.

Whereas the membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative realizes that an adequate supply of dairy products is essential to protect the health of our armed forces and our home people, as well as to provide for lend-lease commitments; and

Whereas we realize the advisability of rationing dairy products at the present time as the best method of controlling the supply and distribution of dairy products; and

Whereas we feel that the rationing authorities have made some grave mistakes especially in storage, distribution, and rationing of butter; and

Whereas we feel that 16 ration points for a pound of butter is very high in its relationship to butter substitutes and other spreads: Therefore be it

Resolved by Pure Milk Products Cooperative in convention legally assembled, That we respectfully petition the Federal authorities to lower the 16 ration points on butter just as soon as supplies become adequate to warrant such action; and further,

That we suggest that butter and meat in the future be rationed on separate and unrelated ration cards; and further,

That a copy of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress, and to the Office of Price Administration.

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war and the achievement of a stable and permanent peace after the war is won appears to hinge on the ability of the American farmer to produce the required food and fibre; and

Whereas of all food products, milk is admittedly the most critical; and

Whereas the surplus of domestic feed grains accumulated in past years has been consumed and current production is insufficient to maintain production, and threatens a reduction in dairy cow population; and

Whereas the Canadian grain crop is reported to be the largest in that country's history: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative in annual convention assembled strongly support the House Joint Resolution 171 and House Joint Resolution 155 introduced in Congress by Hon. REID F. MURRAY, seeking a temporary lifting of the tariff on Canadian grain to the end that additional feed supplies may become available to the American farmer.

Whereas the price of high protein feeds, which are a necessity to the dairy farmer, are pegged at the present time by the Federal Government, for protection of the feeder; and

Whereas a large proportion of proteins at the present time are utilized by commercial feed companies in producing feeds which are not pegged; and

Whereas such practices, result in a shortage of proteins on the market, and the sale of commercial feeds at higher prices than are justifiable; and

Whereas this practice results in the higher cost of feeds than our Government contemplated, and creates an injustice to the dairy farmer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Pure Milk Products Co-operative in convention duly and legally assembled, That the authorities at Washington reserve for the dairy farmer a sufficient supply of proteins to be sold at ceiling prices; and further

That a ceiling and floor be placed on all prices of commercial feeds; and further

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Wisconsin delegation in Congress, and to the Office of Price Administration.

Whereas we recognize the scarceness of the present-day milk and dairy products, and the tremendous inconvenience and burden under which the consuming public find themselves with respect to procurement of dairy products; and

Whereas we are confronted with the necessity of putting forth a maximum amount of effort to produce more and more dairy products to the extent that we feel we have practically reached our limits of production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we make public here and now that we have no intention of depriving the consuming public of Wisconsin or the rest of the Nation, of a so-called substitute for butter: *Provided, however*, That any so-called substitute which may be sold or offered for sale in lieu of butter should be so labeled, and not permitted to be sold or offered for sale as an imitation of butter;

Provided further, That we stanchly and unalterably oppose any revision in the present State or Federal laws regarding oleomargarine, or other so-called substitutes for butter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to both Houses of Congress from Wisconsin and to such other Members of Congress as may be deemed advisable, and to the National Co-operative Milk Producers' Federation.

Whereas the so-called daylight-saving law has worked a hardship and caused great inconvenience to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin; and

Whereas it is conducive to no good, and results in great harm to agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Pure Milk Products in convention duly assembled, That we petition Congress and the State Legislature to repeal the so-called daylight-saving law as it operates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter sent to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD LABOR

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, it is quite ironical that in the same mail this morning each Member received a 15-page closely printed brief purporting to justify the pending threat of a strike by the railroad organizations, and also a reprint of a famous advertisement entitled "Missing," showing a picture of a little boy, whose father was killed in action, climbing the stairway to an empty bedroom.

Most members of the railroad labor organizations are high-class, good American citizens. I cannot believe they seriously entertain the threat of a strike. No man with a heart could read this advertisement "Missing," and contemplate American casualty lists, and then strike against the country for which our finest young men die.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of all good Americans will agree that any man who will now deliberately and wilfully strike in a vital war industry not only insults every man in uniform, but is a traitor to his country.

THE LATE THOMAS ERBY KILBY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Anniston Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Alabama mourns today the death of Thomas Erby Kilby, who served as Governor of Alabama from 1919 to 1923, therein demonstrating the same executive capacity he had shown as mayor of Anniston and as Lieutenant Governor of Alabama. At the age of 75 this pioneer steel maker of Anniston again turned his energies to serving the war need of America, and devoted the remaining days of his life to the service of Uncle Sam in the production of steel shells, hand grenades, and many other implements of war, until stricken the other night, at the age of 78.

I am inserting as an extension of these remarks an editorial from his home paper appraising this man. We have many great men in this Nation. Every State not only boasts, but boasts with justification, of the exploits of many of its people. That is the glory of America. This is one of them; and Alabama asks you Representatives of all the States to bow in respect and do honor to a son she delighted to honor, and proved worthy of her trust.

THOMAS ERBY KILBY: A TRULY GREAT MAN

(By Harry M. Ayers)

"The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution, who resists the sorest temptations from within and without, who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully, who is calmest in storms and most fearless under menace and frowns, whose reliance on truth, on virtue, on God, is most unfaltering."—Channing.

When I sat down at my typewriter Saturday morning to attempt this tribute to my devoted friend who is no more, there rose before my tear-dimmed eyes such a flood of precious memories of long association that I could not feel satisfied with the cold, detached anonymity of the customary editorial "We." To appraise his great career adequately I felt that I had to speak of him personally as I knew him, and hence this editorial appears in the first person singular under my name.

Governor Kilby first challenged my admiration when he was mayor of Anniston. It was my job as a reporter in those days to "cover" the weekly meetings of the city council, and during the hectic days of the so-called bucket-shop battles in that body and during his long and successful battle to rid Anniston of the "blind-tiger" nuisance I became impressed with the keenness of his mind, the genuineness of his character, and the stoutness of his heart—that brave heart that faltered only in his old age in the stress and strain of war when he was giving of his all to the service of his country in a capacity for which he was best fitted.

I followed him later in his successful races for the State senate, for Lieutenant Governor, and finally for the office of chief executive of the State. And during all those years of strenuous battle I never knew him to run from a fight when righteousness was at stake, to lose his sense of humor, to compromise with a principle, or to place his personal interest above the interest of the people whom he had sworn to serve. He exemplified in every essential detail William Ellery Channing's fine definition of true greatness as set forth at the top of this column. He had shortcomings, as do we all; but as Dr. Edwin A. Alderman said of Woodrow Wilson, "Posterity is incurious about the minor faults of its heroes."

Possibly Governor Kilby's outstanding virtue was his courage. It was largely this virtue that endowed him with his quality for leadership. It was shown time after time in the earlier days of Anniston. For when our founding fathers had passed from the scene he became one of the keymen in civic development, and whenever the subscription lists

were passed his name usually was at the top. Possibly no other man in the city did more for Anniston industrially than he. His plant, along with the old mill, always ran in good times and bad; and many were the young men whom in his capacity as a private citizen or as a banker he helped along the road to success. The Alabama Pipe Co., which is today one of the world's largest manufacturers of cast-iron soil pipe, and of which he was still board chairman, was founded when he called Tobe Hamilton and Frank Johnston into the Anniston National Bank one day to start a small pipe plant in an old abandoned stove foundry in the northern part of the city. He also was one of the principal backers of Luther Liles in the building of what is now known as the Wilson Building, Anniston's largest office structure.

But possibly his most courageous step was taken when he abandoned the processes of the Kilby Car & Foundry Co. and entered a highly competitive field with a completely retooled plant as the Kilby Steel Co. This was on the very eve of the depression. The going became tough as the depression deepened, but he never lost his nerve; and when the war clouds began to gather he was ready once more, as he had been in 1918, to come to the defense of his country, his being one of the first plants in the Nation to begin the manufacture of shells. This he did without waiting to quibble over terms or to count eventual profits. He saw a big job to be done, and he was there to do his part in the winning of the war. Twice he was awarded the highly coveted Army-Navy E for efficiency in production. Even when subjected to calumny, he took it with a smile, conscious at all times of his innate righteousness; and only a day before his death he was vindidated in his contention by an act of the Federal court.

Yet it is as Governor of Alabama that the name of Thomas E. Kilby will live in history, because in that office he established a record that is probably un'que in the annals of the Nation. For during the several split sessions of the legislature and two extra sessions of his 4-year term of office every major measure that he advocated was enacted into law and every bill that he opposed was defeated. And this was done without even once using the patronage of his office to secure the passage or the defeat of any bill. Former Governor Cox of Ohio termed his first message to the legislature "the most constructive state paper that has come out of the South since the Civil War," and when he had retired he had placed the State on a sound budget system and had set up a tax system that has continued with minor modifications to this day. He pitched the thinking of the people of Alabama on a so much higher plane than ever before that they have never turned backward in their material progress, although it did remain for Frank M. Dixon, whom Governor Kilby supported, in later years to uproot the spoils system that had begun to entrench itself around the State capitol.

Before he entered office, Alabama was sunk deep in mud. But before he left office the financial machinery had been set up to convert those muddy roads into ribbons of concrete, although it required a hard fight in a regular session and one special session, plus two elections, to amend the constitution so that this might be done. Moreover, when he took his seat the city of Mobile, Alabama's only seaport, was just another ante bellum town, immured in history and complacent in the enjoyment of its traditions. Kilby, however, saw for that port a larger destiny; so he put across a $10,000,000 bond issue for new docks, saw the amendment providing for this improvement defeated, called the legislature back, resubmitted the measure to the people and forced its overwhelming adoption. The result has been that Mobile today is one of the finest ports in the country and one of the South's most thriving cities.

Also, when Kilby became Governor, Alabama owed a floating debt amounting to $2,000,000. He paid that off and for the first time since reconstruction days paid $500,000 on the State's bonded debt. In formulating his revenue measures to make this possible it was inevitable that he should have occasionally incurred the displeasure of some of his industrial friends. Among the bills they opposed most vigorously was a severance tax on some of the State's natural resources, principally coal. So one day when they sent a very imposing delegation down to his office from Birmingham, insisting that he was about to ruin their businesses, he listened to them very attentively, then replied:

"Gentlemen, you, of course, know that I also am a banker and a manufacturer, and that the last thing in the world that I would want to do would be to ruin any legitimate business. I suggest, therefore, that you go back home and bring me a statement of your last year's income-tax returns. If you are then borne out by the facts, I shall be pleased to give favorable consideration to your petition." They did not return and the money received from that tax helped to erect a new building at each of the State's schools of higher learning, to appropriate $4,500,000 for common-school buildings, and practically to double the appropriation for the public schools as a whole.

But while the history books have written Governor Kilby down as a great business executive in office, I prefer to remember him as a great humanitarian. When he was inaugurated the State was leasing its convicts to operators of mines and turpentine camps and the conditions under which these unfortunate wards of the State were compelled to live was revolting in the extreme. He set about, therefore, to abolish a State scandal by providing better working, eating, and sleeping accommodations for the men under lease. This was done with astonishing results, and several times I went with him down into the bowels of the earth to see how the miners were faring under the new regulations he had established. His many visits were always without warning and before he left office he had not only bettered the living conditions of the men but he had abolished the lash as a form of punishment and had erected a $2,000,000 State penitentiary as a prerequisite step toward abolishing the lease system.

And what he did for the convicts he did likewise for the underprivileged boys and girls of the State and for those of our citizens who had become mentally sick. His portrait hangs in the home for feeble-minded which he built at Tuscaloosa, and now that his death removes a legal inhibition the building in question will be named in his memory. Another step that also should be mentioned in connection with his humanitarian work was the 500-percent increase that he made in funds for public health, thereby enlarging the State's work in this respect to such a fine standard that even the League of Nations sent delegates here to investigate our progress along this line.

One of the secrets of Governor Kilby's success as Governor was the fact that he would never allow anyone outside his immediate family to contribute to his campaign funds. This rule applied to all of the political races he made from the time he was elected to the city council of Anniston to the two contests he made for United States Senator. He even made me return $100 that former Governor Comer had sent me while Kilby was in Europe previous to his gubernatorial race, although he and Comer were intimate friends, he having formerly been a member of Comer's Sunday School class and a member of his official staff as governor and whom he afterward appointed to the United States Senate. His idea in adopting this policy was that he wanted to be at all times captain of his own soul and under obligation to no person or selfish interest.

Neither would Kilby allow the State to deposit any money in his bank as long as he was in office, nor would he allow any business with which he was connected to enter a bid for any contract the State was letting. And being meticulously honest himself, he insisted upon the same rule for all those who worked for the State under his control. He even required, with the consent and approval of the legislature, that all employees and officials of the State reside in Montgomery, unless the nature of their work required them to live elsewhere.

Still another instance of his high sense of honor occurred after he left office. He had promised Frank Dixon to do anything in his power to make the Dixon administration a success, but when he was offered a place on the State personnel board he declined. Yet before his letter reached Montgomery, recalling his promise to Dixon, he telephoned his acceptance. He was still chairman of this board under Governor Sparks at the time of his death, although it cost him money every time he attended a meeting. John Quincy Adams, who went to the Lower House of Congress after having been President, is one of the few men in history who have shown such a high sense of public service as did Kilby in this instance.

Governor Kilby did not have the advantage of a college education, but he was one of the best-read men in Alabama, and if this paper ever made a slip in a historical allusion he was among the first to take us to task. He had traveled to the far corners of the world, he had companioned with many of the world's great public figures and was in every sense a highly cultivated gentleman. He was also an intensely religious man; and although he never paraded his religion, the night never came but that he knelt by his bedside and sought communion with his Maker. Moreover, he told me once on one of our many trips together, in one of those lonesome midnight rides by motor when men are wont to become confidential, that as long as he was Governor the first thing he did every morning was to retire to himself and ask divine guidance in his work of the day. His pew at Grace Episcopal Church was never vacant when he was in the city and not indisposed, and it is by no means improbable that his attendance at the recent general convention of his church at Cleveland, where he was accorded a high honor by that body, may have superinduced his fatal stroke, as he returned home greatly fatigued as a result of the rigors of wartime travel. Be this as it may, however, let it be said of him that he was faithful in his duty to his God to the very last; and the word duty to him, as to Robert E. Lee, was "the noblest word in the English language."

Yes, even though the golden bowl of our association together may be broken and the spirit of my dear friend flown forever, there still are memories of a thousand and one little intimacies that are more precious than gold; a sort of "plaintive, pleasant melancholy" that will linger with me down through the years to sweeten and ennoble my own life as I contemplate a great friendship. He lived adventurously and victoriously; he fought the good fight, he finished his course, and now he wears his crown.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Capt. R. D. Kirkpatrick, commanding officer of

the United States Naval Mine Depot, at Yorktown, Va., on the anniversary of Yorktown Day, Tuesday, October 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PETROLEUM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks by including a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I addressed the House on the subject of oil and discussed fully Petroleum Directive No. 70. I expressed my concern lest the operation of this directive, as well as others issued by the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War, was leading to a more extreme monopoly situation in our oil industry than any we have ever known before. More than a week before I made my speech I had written the following letter to the Petroleum Administrator:

The Honorable HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ICKES: I have just discovered from the Federal Register that Petroleum Directive No. 70 provides for the handling of shipments of oil in all parts of the world by the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Coordinator's Office and that it also provides for the setting aside, under permission of the Chairman of the War Production Board, of the antitrust laws of the United States for the period of the war.

All of us are, of course, agreed that any measures actually necessary to assure the winning of the war must be taken. But I am writing to ask you to write me frankly as to what reasons may have been assigned for the necessity of suspending the operation of the antitrust laws with regard to the petroleum industry during the war and what safeguards have been provided to prevent such suspension from resulting in very great advantages to the major oil companies in the post-war period.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

I was in hopes that I would receive a reply to this letter before I made my speech in order that I might insert the reply in the RECORD along with what I had to say. It did not, however, arrive until the day after I spoke in the House, and in order that the reply of the Petroleum Administrator for War may be a part of the RECORD. I am asking to include it with my remarks herewith:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., October 28, 1943.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: The Petroleum Administrator for War has requested that I respond to your letter of October 15 with respect to Petroleum Directive 70.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of this directive and of the press release issued in connection therewith which sets forth the reasons which made the issuance of the directive necessary for the prosecution of the war.

It is extremely questionable whether the directive contains any provisions which in any way violate the antitrust laws of the United States. Almost all of the actions directed to be taken by companies under American control operating in the foreign petroleum field are to take place outside of the United States and its Territories and possessions. However, there will be meetings in the United States of committees and the presentation of suggested plans to meet emergencies and to accomplish the efficient and effective utilization of available petroleum supplies and petroleum distribution facilities outside of the United States. It was felt desirable that the Department of Justice and the War Production Board be apprised of these procedures and their approval obtained through the medium of the issuance of a certificate. It was, moreover, believed that, inasmuch as the companies were undertaking to carry out the direction of the Petroleum Administrator for War, such protection as might be necessary should be assured in order that action taken at the direction and under the supervision of a governmental agency could not be construed as a violation of the antitrust laws of the United States.

Petroleum Directive 70 is purely a war measure and it will be revoked as soon as the Petroleum Administration for War or the War Production Board no longer finds it necessary for the prosecution of the war. In any event, under present statutes, it cannot remain in effect more than 6 months beyond the duration of the war.

I do not believe that there will be any advantages to the major oil companies in the post-war period stemming from any action directed under Petroleum Directive 70. The reasons which made the directive particularly necessary as a wartime measure were stated by the Petroleum Administrator in the attached press release, in which he stated that:

"In order to hold, to the absolute minimum required for the prosecution of the war, the export of petroleum facilities and products which are scarce in the United States, it is the obvious duty of the governmental agencies concerned to make certain that the most efficient use is made of all American facilities and products available abroad for the supply and distribution of petroleum to meet the military and other essential needs of the United Nations.

"In the case of petroleum, if these imperative requirements are to be met with a minimum expenditure of facilities and products, maximum operating efficiency and the avoidance of wasteful duplication must be achieved by the joint use of facilities and the pooling of supplies of petroleum products. The new directive is designed specifically to accomplish these objectives."

Sincerely yours,

J. HOWARD MARSHALL,
Chief Counsel.

[Enclosures.]

Along with his letter, Mr. Marshall, chief counsel, sent me a copy of Certificate No. 150 issued by the office of the Petroleum Administrator for War. This Certificate No. 150 is copy of a letter from the acting chairman of the War Production Board to the Attorney General, which I should like to quote here:

To the ATTORNEY GENERAL:

Certificate No. 150.

I submit herewith Petroleum Directive 70 of the Petroleum Administration for War.

For the purposes of section 12 of Public Law No. 603, Seventy-seventh Congress (56 Stat. 357), I approve said directive; and after consultation with you I hereby find and so certify to you that the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, by any person in compliance with Directive 70 is requisite to the prosecution of the war.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Acting Chairman, War Production Board.
OCTOBER 7, 1943.

In my speech of last Thursday I pointed out that Petroleum Directive 70 made possible suspension with the antitrust laws with regard to the decisions program and actions of the foreign operations committee, a committee composed entirely of representatives of the major oil companies. The matter, however, has gone much further than I stated. For Certificate No. 150 is all that was needed to make complete suspension of the antitrust laws an accomplished fact. Such suspension has by that certificate been approved in blanket fashion by the Chairman of the War Production Board and henceforth anything whatsoever which the foreign operations committee may decide or wish to do now or in the future is exempt from any antitrust law on the statute books. I think the House and the Nation should be apprised of the exact situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article by Vincente Villamin, in reference to a Siberian air base.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESULTS OF MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include in my remarks certain releases by the State Department by the Moscow conference, at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has today released to the American public five statements setting forth the accomplishments and results of the Moscow conference.

The report of the conference is most gratifying and should be accepted by all of the United Nations as a means of hastening the end of the war and assuring the maintenance of their present close relationship and collaboration in the conduct of the war and the maintenance of the peace.

The joint communique of the tripartite conference at Moscow shows that current problems were frankly met in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding which characterized all the work of the conference.

In accordance with my unanimous consent request, I insert in the RECORD at this point, the texts of the five statements released at 1 p. m. today by the Department of State regarding the Moscow conference:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
November 1, 1943.

TEXT OF JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF TRIPARTITE CONFERENCE AT MOSCOW

The Conference of Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, Mr. Cordell Hull; of the United Kingdom, Mr. Anthony Eden; and of the Soviet Union, Mr. V. M. Molotov; took place at Moscow from the 19th to 30th of October 1943. There were 12 meetings. In addition to the Foreign Secretaries, the following took part in the conference:

For the United States of America: Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador of the United States; Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United

States Army; Mr. H. Hackworth, Mr. James C. Dunn, and experts.

For the United Kingdom: Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, Ambassador; Mr. William Strang; Lt. Gen. Sir Hastings Ismay, and experts.

For the Soviet Union: Marshall K. E. Voroshilov, Marshal of the Soviet Union, Mr. A. Y. Vyshinski; Mr. M. M. Litvinov, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs; Mr. V. A. Sergeyev, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Trade; Maj. Gen. A. A. Gryzlov, of the General Staff; Mr. G. F. Saksin, Senior Official for People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, and experts.

The agenda included all questions submitted for discussion by the three governments. Some of the questions called for final decisions, and these were taken. On other questions, after discussion, decisions of principle were taken: These questions were referred for detailed consideration to commissions specially set up for the purpose, or reserved for treatment through diplomatic channels. Other questions again were disposed of by an exchange of views. The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have been in close cooperation in all matters concerning the common war effort, but this is the first time that the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments have been able to meet together in conference.

In the first place there were frank and exhaustive discussions of the measures to be taken to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe. Advantage was taken of the presence of military advisers representing the respective Chiefs of Staff in order to discuss definite military operations with regard to which decisions had been taken and which are already being prepared in order to create a basis for the closest military cooperation in the future between the three countries.

Second only to the importance of hastening the end of the war was the recognition by the three governments that it was essential in their own national interests and in the interest of all peace-loving nations to continue the present close collaboration and cooperation in the conduct of the war into the period following the end of hostilities, and that only in this way could peace be maintained and the political, economic, and social welfare of their peoples fully promoted.

This conviction is expressed in a declaration in which the Chinese Government joined during the conference and which was signed by the three Foreign Secretaries and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow on behalf of their governments. This declaration published today provides for even closer collaboration in the prosecution of the war and in all matters pertaining to the surrender and disarmament of the enemies with which the four countries are respectively at war. It set forth the principles upon which the four governments agree that a broad system of international cooperation and security should be based. Provision is made for the inclusion of all other peace-loving nations, great and small, in this system.

The Conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops. For this purpose the Conference decided to establish in London a European Advisory Commission to study these questions and to make joint recommendations to the three governments.

Provision was made for continuing when necessary the tripartite consultations of representatives of the three governments in the respective capitals through the existing diplomatic channels.

The Conference also agreed to establish an Advisory Council for matters relating to Italy to be composed in the first instance of representatives of their three governments and of the French Committee of National Liberation. Provision is made for addition to this council of representatives of Greece and Yugoslavia in view of their special interests arising out of aggressions of Fascist Italy upon their territory during the present war. This council will deal with day-to-day questions other than military preparations and will make recommendations designed to coordinate Allied policy with regard to Italy. The three Foreign Secretaries considered it appropriate to reaffirm by a declaration published today, the attitude of the Allied Governments in favor of the restoration of democracy in Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries declared it to be the purpose of their governments to restore the independence of Austria. At the same time they reminded Austria that in the final settlement, account will be taken of efforts that Austria may make toward its own liberation. The Declaration on Austria is published today.

The Foreign Secretaries issued at the Conference a declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin containing a solemn warning that at the time of granting any armistice to any German government, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have had any connection with atrocities and executions in countries overrun by German forces, will be taken back to the countries in which their abominable crimes were committed to be charged and punished according to the laws of those countries.

In an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding which characterized all the work of the Conference, consideration was also given to other important questions. These included not only questions of a current nature but also questions concerning treatment of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, economic cooperation, and assurance of general peace.

DECLARATION ON AUSTRIA

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination.

They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.

Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

JOINT FOUR-NATION DECLARATION

The Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China: United in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender; conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression; recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments; jointly declare:

1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another, and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations, with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

STATEMENT SIGNED BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, AND PREMIER STALIN REGARDING ATROCITIES

The United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union have received from many quarters evidence of atrocities, massacres, and cold-blooded mass executions which are being perpetrated by Hitlerite forces in many of the countries they have overrun and from which they are now being steadily expelled. The brutalities of Nazi domination are no new thing and all peoples or territories in their grip have suffered from the worst form of government by terror. What is new is that many of these territories are now being redeemed by the advancing armies of the liberating powers and that in their desperation the recoiling Hitlerites and Huns are redoubling their ruthless cruelties. This is now evidenced with particular clearness by monstrous crimes on the territory of the Soviet Union, which is being liberated from Hitlerites, and on French and Italian territory.

Accordingly, the aforesaid Allied Powers, speaking in the interests of the 32 United Nations, hereby solemnly declare and give full warning of their declaration as follows: At the time of granting of any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres, and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free governments which will be erected therein. Lists will be compiled in all possible detail from all these countries, having regard especially to invaded parts of the Soviet Union, to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to Yugoslavia and Greece, including

Crete and other islands, to Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Italy.

Thus, Germans who take part in wholesale shooting of Polish officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian, or Norwegian hostages or of Cretan peasants, or who have shared in slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in territories of the Soviet Union, which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged. Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied Powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.

The above declaration is without prejudice to the case of German criminals whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the governments of the Allies.

DECLARATION REGARDING ITALY

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influence and configuration shall be completely destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States and United Kingdom declare that the action of their Governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted, has been based upon this policy.

In furtherance of this policy in the future the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:

1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by inclusion of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.

2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.

3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.

4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from institutions and organizations of a public character.

5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded full amnesty.

6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.

7. Fascist chiefs and army generals known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.

In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles stated above will be determined by the commander in chief on the basis of instructions received through the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

The three Governments, parties to this declaration, will, at the request of any one of them, consult on this matter. It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people ultimately to choose their own form of government.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of business today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTORTING THE RECORD OF CHRISTOPHER RANKIN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Eric A. Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, was as inaccurate in his statements to the people of England on his recent trip as he is in his article appearing in the current issue of the Readers Digest, he must have left the impression on the British people that we are still killing buffaloes in Illinois, or fighting the Indians around Kansas City.

In his article which appears in the Readers Digest for November, in speaking of "gloomy viewpoints," he makes this statement:

> 1839—Congressman RANKIN, Mississippi: "Our system is finished. Monopoly swallows all. Opportunity has already disappeared from among us."

He is attempting to attribute that statement, not to me, but to that illustrious Mississippian whose name I happen to bear, Christopher Rankin, of Mississippi, who served in this House from March 4, 1819, until his death on March 14, 1826, and for whom Rankin County, Miss., was named.

Nowhere in the record of Christopher Rankin have I been able to find such a statement; and besides he had been dead 13 years at the time the statement is alleged to have been made. So far as I know, Christopher Rankin was no relative of mine, but he was a great Mississippian and I do not want to see his record distorted in this way.

If that is a sample of Mr. Johnston's accuracy, it might be a good idea to keep him at home from now on where the American people know how to discount anything he says or writes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRUK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his remarks in two instances, in the first instance to include an editorial, and in the second instance to include an editorial and pertinent excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Atlantic Monthly, which discusses the growing tendency to practice the tenets of yellow journalism on the air, and also suggestions and safeguards for the freedom of speech on the air.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHEART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Charles D. Vickrey, president of the Golden Rule Foundation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, within the last 2 weeks I must have received over 100 various expensive pamphlets from corporations, chambers of commerce, bankers, and so on, asking for free enterprise. To me it resembles the form of propaganda conducted by the utilities companies against the so-called death sentence and propaganda by the appeasers and isolationists under the guidance of George Sylvester Viereck against the amending of the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of munitions to the United Nations. The only difference was that the Axis propaganda was paid for by the bund and Fascist and Nazi organizations while, in this instance, it is indirectly borne by our own Government because the cost is deducted from the excess profits and income taxes of the corporations.

The booklets and literature are printed on expensive paper and invariably the words "free enterprise" are carried in the headlines. A few years ago the catch phrase was "rugged individualism," and they now resort to "free enterprise," which may catch a few unsuspecting Members, but surely any intelligent Member who is familiar with the propaganda of the manufacturers and commerce association members must look upon this effort as most ridiculous because every intelligent and informed man knows that industry and business has enjoyed greater prosperity and nearly complete freedom, especially in the last 4 or 5 years, than ever before. Everyone with an ounce of intellect is aware that all of our corporations have not only increased their business but also their profits, and this after payment of increased taxes. Besides, they have already set aside reserves for post-war reconversion in the sum of $42,000,000,000, which amount is much more than the physical valuation of the properties of these corporations when the present administration came into power.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that many of the industries were requested from time to time to make reports to some of the departments and agencies when applying for contracts and strategic materials, and such requests were made because it

was believed that many of them had large quantities of materials on hand. Investigations later on disclosed that they were hoarding and that they profited later by selling at advanced prices to the smaller manufacturers.

Of course, not all corporations were guilty of this practice, but a large number were and it was because of their avariciousness that regulations were adopted and steps taken to enforce them to prevent a continuation of their unfair practice. Yes, I agree as to free enterprise—enterprise should be released from the cartels and the combinations which have been formed in violation of the antitrust laws, all of which is detrimental to the small producer. I feel that an effort should be made to free the small fellow from the clutches of these monopolistic combinations and trusts, which, due to war conditions, carry on and mulct the Government and the American people. Glancing over some of these shrewdly prepared booklets, letters, and pamphlets, I observe that the greatest objection is raised against the Renegotiation Act which we passed in the interest of the taxpayers in the last Congress which, to date, has enabled the Government to recover over $6,000,000,000 which, otherwise, would have remained in the coffers of these corporations and war profiteers. They represent the same group that is attempting to impose a sales tax upon the masses of our people in order to escape payment of their just contribution to the prosecution of the war.

We all know that a corporation is a being without a soul, but it seems to me that the officers of these many corporations have neither a soul nor feeling and, instead of being willing to sacrifice a small part of their profits, they, in their avariciousness, endeavor to extract from the Treasury every dollar they possibly can. Oh, many of them feel that they are aiding the Government. Yes, they are through their lobbyists and agents acquiring Government contracts which they cannot fill in a year, a year and a half and 2 years, notwithstanding that we have many smaller manufacturers who have sought the help of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to obtain prime contracts or subcontracts. Not only have they hoarded materials but they have also hoarded labor, as the evidence in many instances has disclosed. It is the same group with the same point of view who are sending out these contemptible articles which leaves the unfair inference that the administration is responsible for restricting their business and retarding their activities.

Mr. Speaker, I know that a large majority of the Members feel as I do and resent this cheap, contemptible political propaganda to create disunity and dissatisfaction at a time when complete cooperation is necessary to win this cruel war. Aside from this unnecessary advertising and publicity, millions of dollars are being expended by many of these corporations for the purpose of rehabilitating their plants and is being unfairly charged to the cost of production and deducted from the excess profits and income taxes. I shall demand that the law or the regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shall be so amended as to disallow the charging of such expenditures to the cost of production.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Would the gentleman deny those gentlemen the right to petition Congress even for changes or amendments?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no; but I want them to be truthful. I do not want them to lie and state things that are not so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PROHIBIT PROOF OF ACTS DONE BY AN INVENTOR

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3130) to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand from the gentleman from Texas that this is a unanimous report from the Committee and is in no wise controversial. If this is a controversial measure, then I would be compelled to object. I will ask the gentleman from Texas to explain the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. I can say to the gentleman from Michigan that this is a unanimous report from the Committee on patents and I do not see how it could possibly be in any way controversial.

The Supreme Court in the case of *Electric Storage Battery Company* v. *Shimadzu* (307 U. S. 5), pointed out clearly that there are two provisions in the revised statutes, provisions Nos. 4886 and 4923, relating to patents, which are conflicting and which can easily lead to conflicting opinions. One of them prohibits proof of acts done by inventors in foreign countries, and another permits it. Consequently the decisions would be varying. This bill simply corrects that conflict in those two statutes according to the interpretation of the Supreme Court, and makes the provisions uniform, and which is exactly the same provision that foreign countries have with refernce to the United States.

I do not see that there can possibly be any controversy and none has been submitted in any way to the Committee on patents. It simply corrects a conflict of interpretation between two provisions in the statutes relating to patents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4886 of the Revised Statutes (35 U. S. C. 31) be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In proceedings in the Patent Office and in the courts of the United States, an applicant for a patent, or patentee, shall not be permitted to establish his date of invention or discovery by reference to knowledge or use thereof, or other activity with respect thereto, in a country foreign to the United States, other than the filing in a foreign country of an application for a patent for the same invention or discovery which, in accordance with the provisions of section 4887 of the Revised Statutes, is entitled to have the same force and effect as it would have had if filed in this country on the date on which it was filed in such foreign country: *Provided*, That the phrase 'country foreign to the United States' shall not be construed to include any territory or area under the control or jurisdiction or in the possession of the United States acquired by lease, or otherwise, for military, naval, national defense, or other purpose from any foreign country."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately and apply to all pending applications for patents and existing patents, except that its provisions shall not be effective to nullify any judicial finding of the validity of a patent heretofore made by a court of competent jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD PRODUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 347)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Food is as important as any other weapon in the successful prosecution of the war. It will be equally important in rehabilitation and relief in the liberated areas, and in the shaping of the peace that is to come.

THE OBJECTIVES OF OUR FOOD PROGRAM

The first major objective of our food program is to raise in the most efficient manner enough food and the right kinds of foods to meet our needs. That includes: First, the needs of our armed forces; second, the needs of our civilians at home; and, third, the amount required for our shipments abroad for the essential needs of our fighting allies.

The second major objective is to see that the food for our civilians at home is divided as fairly as possible among all of the people in all sections of the country, and that it is obtainable at reasonable prices.

I have not been content merely with a program for 1944 crops. I am thinking also about the balance of this year, and about the earlier months of 1944 before the crops are harvested. While the question of production for 1944 is an essential one, we must not lose sight of the necessity for keeping the prices of our present food supply at reasonable levels. We must see to it not only that the prices of food do not go up any further, but that the prices of those foods which have gotten out of the line are actually reduced.

One of the great difficulties is that the steps necessary to attain these two major objectives sometimes become inconsistent with each other. For example, one of the inducements for increased production of food by farmers is to see that they get an adequate price for their products. Such a price is necessary in

order to get production. However, if these prices are too high the result will be that by the time the food reaches the grocery store or butcher shop, the housewife will have to pay too high a price for it. This in turn may force a rise in wages and an increase in the prices which farmers have to pay for what they buy. On the other hand, if the butcher shop or grocery store gets an insufficient price from the consumer for meat or groceries, then the farmer in turn will get too low a price to encourage him to raise as much food as we need. In both of these cases our production and price objectives are not likely to be achieved unless the Government assists with equalization payments or other aid.

The efforts of this administration have consistently been directed at this double target of raising as much food as possible without placing too great a burden on the American housewife in her efforts to feed her family.

In the main our efforts have been successful. In the case of some foods, however, the objectives have not yet been attained. New measures are being taken in an effort to attain them.

FOOD PRODUCTION, 1943

The increase of food production during this war has been far greater than the comparable increase in production during the last war. If, for example, we take the 1935-39 average as the base of 100, the production in 1939 was 106, in 1942 it was 126, and in 1943 it will be 132. If we use the same base of 100, the production in 1914 was 81, in 1918 it was 90, and in 1919 it was also 90.

In other words, by the fourth year of this war—1942—our food production has increased more than twice as much as it did in the same period of the last war.

The 1942 crop was the largest in the history of the United States. But food production for the current year 1943, in spite of less-favorable weather, will exceed the 1942 production.

Crops will be slightly lower this year than in 1942, but livestock will be so much higher than in 1942 that the total of all food is expected to exceed the 1942 record output by about 5 percent. This will mean that our total farm production—crops and livestock—will be more than 30 percent larger than the average annual production for the 5 years preceding the outbreak of the war in 1939.

Most of us do not realize how much food actually is being raised in 1943. Here are some illustrative figures:

Fifty-five billion quarts of milk, an increase of 14 percent over the 1935–39 average.

Ten billion pounds of beef and veal (dressed weight), an increase of 27 percent.

One billion pounds of lamb and mutton (dressed weight), an increase of 13 percent.

Sixty billion eggs (including nonfarm), an increase of 50 percent.

Four billion pounds of chicken (dressed weight), an increase of 63 percent.

Thirteen billion pounds of pork (dressed weight), an increase of 78 percent.

Three billion pounds of lard, an increase of 73 percent.

Three billion pounds of peanuts, an increase of 125 percent.

This record was established in the face of three major handicaps: Shortage of manpower, shortage of farm machinery, and shortage of fertilizer. This record production for 1943 is an amazing tribute to the patriotism, resourcefulness, and ability of the American farmer.

Much credit is also due to the patriotic men and women who spent so much time and energy in planting 20,000,000 Victory gardens in the United States and helped to meet the food requirements. It is estimated that about 8,000,000 tons of food were produced in 1943 in these Victory gardens.

The increase in our farm output since Pearl Harbor has been the largest of any similar period in history. It called for hard work, ingenuity, cooperation, and teamwork on the part of farmers, processors, and distributors, as well as all the State and Federal officials concerned with the food problem. They all deserve the thanks of the American people.

Due to the shortage of regular farm labor, heroic and successful efforts have been made to obtain help from the adult residents of villages and cities—both men and women, on a part-time as well as a full-time basis. High-school boys and girls have also been enrolled to help in critical areas during the vacation period and after school hours. They, too, deserve our thanks.

The record for 1943 in getting additional farm help in places where it was needed is very impressive. For example, during May, June, July, and August of this year 900,000 workers registered for farm work. Forty-eight thousand five hundred workers were brought in this year from Mexico, 4,700 from the Bahamas, and 8,800 from Jamaica. This additional help was used on farms in shortage areas all over the United States. Altogether, 1,750,000 placements on farms were made.

We have also made use of prisoners of war for the raising and harvesting of crops. Essential farm labor has been deferred from the draft. Where emergencies have developed, the Army has assigned soldiers to assist in saving crops that otherwise would be lost.

One of the great difficulties—the shortage of farm machinery and of spare parts—developed, of course, because of the imperative need for steel for the war program. There was only a fixed amount of steel available, and it had to be divided as efficiently as possible among the critical needs for war—ships, big guns and small weapons, tanks, new war factories and new additions to war factories, railroad cars, and a number of other vital products. It was necessary to use our best judgment in determining just where we should use the available supply of steel.

The allotment of steel for farm machinery for use in 1944 has been increased by doubling the amount available for use this year. Furthermore, no limit has been placed on the production of repair parts.

This new farm equipment, however, while it will be available for the 1944 production, was not available for 1943. However, the farmers kept their own machinery in better order. They clubbed together in the making of repairs. They joined hands in the use of farm machinery by more than one farm family. The ingenious and resourceful farmers of America, by this cooperative use of machinery, were able to turn out this record crop of 1943.

DEMANDS ON OUR FOOD SUPPLY

Even with this all-time-high food production for 1943, there were still shortages in certain parts of the country in our food supply. This was not due to lack of production but rather to the extraordinary demands for food—demands never before made in history.

The increased demands for food came from three principal sources. The largest increase in demand has come from our own civilians here at home. Many of our workers in war factories, in the mines, on the farms, and in other essential pursuits are eating more and better food than they ate before the war began. Many of them for the first time are approaching an adequate diet—so essential to the well-being of our people and to maximum war production. Even after making allowances for the rise in the cost of food since 1939, the average American family is not only spending more for food but eating more food than before the outbreak of the war. This has been one of the predominant factors in the greatly increased demand on our food supply.

The second increased demand for food has come from our 9,000,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines, who had, and, of course, always will have first call on all articles of food. These servicemen naturally consume much more food in the Army and Navy on the average than they did in civilian life and they are getting better food.

The third great demand was for our lend-lease shipments of food to our allies.

There has been a lot of loose talk about impending meat famine and meat shortages for the coming winter.

During the October-March period, this winter's estimated total meat production, excluding poultry, will amount to 14,400,000,000 pounds, dressed weight, as compared with 12,500,000,000 pounds during the same period last year, and 11,400,000,000 pounds 2 years ago. As a matter of fact, this winter's estimated meat production will be by far the largest on record.

Estimated poultry production during the October-March period this winter will amount to 2,300,000,000 pounds, as compared with 1,900,000,000 pounds last winter and 1,700,000,000 pounds 2 years ago. The production of poultry has increased about 60 percent since 1939.

During the next 6 months we will also produce an estimated 2,200,000,000 dozens of eggs, as compared with 2,100,000,000 dozens a year ago and 1,800,000,000 dozens 2 years ago. Egg production has increased about 40 percent since 1939.

Also, even though our animal numbers will be at an all-time high this winter, the 1943–44 total supply of feed grains will, except for last year, be the largest supply on record and approximately 20 percent above the 1937–41 average. On a per-animal basis, the feed supply will not be as large as in the last several years, but it will be about equal to the average of the 10 years ending in 1932.

From the standpoint both of increased production and of price control, the food effort in this war is a far greater success than that of the First World War. Facts bear out this statement, but I suppose that facts are not going to deter those who want to create dissatisfaction or those who spread scares such as food shortage and meat famine.

FOOD PRODUCTION 1944

Our food plans for the future are, of course, predicated on the assumption that we must not only continue our shipments overseas but actually increase them. The war is by no means won, and the global effort must be continued and accelerated. The requirements for our armed forces will be increased, not only because they will have a larger number of men and women than in 1943, but because more of them will be stationed in distant parts of the world.

The average soldier or sailor eats approximately 5¼ pounds of food per day—almost half as much again as the average civilian who eats only 3¾ pounds per day. The greater the number of men in the armed forces, the larger are the demands on our food supply.

In the last war we fed 4,000,000 people in uniform—largely concentrated in the United States and in France. In this war by the end of 1943 we will have almost 11,000,000 men in uniform, and they will be scattered in all parts of the world. At the beginning of this year our armed forces totaled about 7,000,000; at the end of this year the estimated strength will be 50 percent higher. That is the reason why in 1942 approximately only 7½ percent of our food production was allotted to our armed forces whereas in 1943 the figure will be about 14 percent. As our Army grows, as more men are sent overseas, larger food reserves will have to be accumulated, and civilian belts will have to be tightened. Furthermore, our armed forces require more of the so-called protective foods, such as meat, fats and oils, milk, and canned goods—foods which are, therefore, bound to run short for the increased civilian demands.

Our armed forces are now eating in each month 328,000,000 pounds of meat, 34,000,000 dozens of eggs, 28,000,000 pounds of butter, 221,000,000 pounds of potatoes—and staggering amounts of other foodstuffs. And the quality of this food is the best that we can give them.

The armed forces of our allies will also increase in 1944, and they will have to receive food assistance from us.

The amount of food going to lend-lease is gradually increasing. In 1941 it was 2 percent of our food production; in 1942 approximately 6 percent. This year, because of increasing Russian shortages and other needs, it will probably reach 10 percent. In 1941 and 1942 England was the largest recipient of lend-lease food, but owing to the German invasion of the Ukraine in 1942 more food has had to be sent since then to the Soviet Union. In fact Russia, in the first 6 months of 1943, received one-third of all our lend-lease food shipments.

All these war uses will require about one-fourth of our total food supply for the year beginning October 1, 1943, leaving about three-fourths for our civilian population. This three-fourths, however, because of our increased production, will amount approximately to as much, per capita, as was used during the 1935–39 period.

I am sure that the American people realize that every pound of food which we send to our fighting allies is helping our own soldiers in their battles and is speeding the day when all our fighting men and women will come home.

The food that is sent to Russia is almost all for the use of the Russian Army.

Although British farmers, by strenuous efforts, have succeeded in increasing their production from 40 percent of Britain's needs to 60 percent, she still has to rely upon imports in order to avoid starvation. American food provides only 10 percent of the entire British food supply—and yet it has been a great help in feeding Montgomery's army and the R. A. F. and in sustaining the millions of workers in vital British factories, shipyards, and mines. I think it is safe to say that England could not have continued in the war without the help she received in American and Canadian food.

When Russia was invaded, 40 percent of her usual food production was lost. Emergency food shipments were sent from Great Britain and the Middle East, but we also had to step up our own shipments. I am sure that no one will disagree with the wisdom—to say nothing of the need and obligation—of sustaining the gallant Russian fighters with American food.

The fact is that with all our shipments, civilian diets in England and in Russia—particularly in Russia—are far below our worst shortage periods. In fact, in Russia food for civilians has been cut to the barest minimum.

Through lend-lease, the United States seeks to put a share of its food resources to the most effective use against the enemy. Conversely, through reverse lend-lease, the striking power of our own armed forces abroad has been greatly augmented by substantial quantities of food provided by our allies. The United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand have provided the largest amount of food, but we have also received food under reverse lend-lease from other parts of the British Empire and are receiving increasing quantities of foodstuffs from the French in north Africa.

Some illustrative figures may indicate the importance to our war effort and to our national economy of the food which we obtain from our allies as reverse lend-lease aid without payment.

Although we did not start receiving food under reverse lend-lease from Australia and New Zealand until a year or more after our lend-lease program started, the amounts received—in comparison to what we have lend-leased—are relatively large.

Thus, for example, through August of this year, the United States has received from Australia and New Zealand more than 90,000,000 pounds of beef and veal compared to a total of 99,000,000 pounds of beef and veal which the United States has provided under outgoing lend-lease to all lend-lease countries combined. In July and August 1943, Australia and New Zealand supplied us roughly the same amount of beef and veal under reverse lend-lease as we lend-leased to all countries.

We have received from Australia and New Zealand alone, 55 percent of the amount of butter and 16 percent of the amount of lamb and mutton which we have exported under lend-lease to all countries.

During the year 1943, the United Kingdom is providing under reverse lend-lease substantial quantities of many foodstuffs—such as flour, bread, potatoes sugar, vegetables, coffee, and cocoa—in order to supplement the food our forces receive from the United States. The foodstuffs received from the United Kingdom under reverse lend-lease save valuable shipping space, and include such commodities as fresh vegetables which cannot readily be shipped from the United States.

The United States is supplying much of the pork that England consumes. The delivery of beef to our Army from the Southern Dominions and the shipment of pork to England from the United States is a good example of sharing among the United Nations, on the basis of what each has to contribute to total war.

Most of the food for the American armed forces in the South and Southwest Pacific comes from the land and factories of that area. In order to provide for our troops, Australia and New Zealand have expanded their food production and processing facilities. Despite this, however, the large food requirements of our forces have caused shortages of many foods for the Australians and New Zealanders. Nevertheless, these two countries continue to supply our food requirements as reverse lend-lease without payment by us.

A certain small percentage of food will have to be used as the United Nations liberate presently occupied countries, until such time as the populations of these countries can have a chance to become self-supporting.

For example, a very small percentage of our food now goes to feed the liberated people of north Africa and Sicily and Italy. This includes only the bare necessities of life. Feeding people in this area is not only a military necessity, it provides strength for the hard work that has to be

done by them in order to produce new supplies of food and other goods. Already the people of French Africa, with some assistance from us in expanding their agricultural production, have been able to produce a sufficiently good harvest in 1943 so that they can now even supply food to our forces there. This not only saves shipping but augments our own food supply. The people of French Africa, without payment, and under reverse lend-lease arrangements have also supplied the Allied forces with substantial quantities of flour for use in the Italian campaign. This, too, has helped our food, as well as our shipping situation.

Agreements have just been concluded to provide the United Nations with more than 100,000 tons of fruit and vegetables. The 1944 harvests in north Africa, aided by American agricultural supplies and a year of peaceful cultivation, should ease the strain on the food supply of the United States still further. In north Africa, we and the other United Nations, have truly beaten our swords into plowshares.

Food supplied to the liberated peoples also pays other dividends. It prevents epidemics. It is a potent psychological and morale weapon for those starving people whose countries are still overrun by the Axis. While starvation has been the weapon used by the Axis resulting in disease, misery, and death, the United Nations are using food as one of their most potent weapons to shorten the war and win a lasting peace.

The War Food Administration has accordingly raised its sights for 1944. A preliminary calculation calls for the planting of 380,000,000 acres of crops, as compared with 364,000,000 acres in 1943. That will be the largest farm planting in history and should result in the breaking of food production records for the eighth successive year.

The War Food Administration, with my approval, has requested the Congress to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to furnish additional funds. I regard this as vital to the War Food Program. It will also enable us to carry out our pledge to the farmers, that we will assure them against a price collapse for the 2 years following the war.

Of course the goals set by the War Food Administration will be meaningless unless the farmers themselves are willing to adopt them as their own goals, and are able to fulfill them. Therefore, the War Food Administration is discussing the national needs with the State War Board of each State, and with representative farmer groups and leaders and public officials in each State interested in agriculture. In this way determination will be made by consultation with the farmers themselves and with Federal and State officials as to what parts of the national requirements can be contributed by each State.

The county war boards and local committees of farmers will also be consulted as to how the State quotas should be apportioned among the various counties of the respective States.

The State and local people will also be consulted about the extent of Government support prices and Government loans and Government purchases that will be necessary to attain the goals of production set. In other words, the farm program of production and prices for 1944 is going to be formulated finally, only after consultation with the farmers of the Nation and those who are interested in farming. Upon the basis of this collective judgment, the final goals for the year's production will be formulated well in advance of the production season, so that each farmer may know what to count upon.

In order to obtain the great production level of 1943, it was necessary to assure the farmers that their return would be sufficiently high to encourage them to plant and at the same time it was necessary to insure the consumer against prices for food which would be too high for him to purchase. This could be done only with the use of Government funds, and in order to bring about the proposed increased production for 1944 it will be necessary to use additional Government funds.

All of the restrictions on acreage which were imposed by the A. A. A. program in former years have been removed for 1944, as they were for 1943, with few exceptions. Only tobacco-marketing quotas will be maintained—in order to encourage tobacco farmers to put more of their land into food products.

There are some people, who for political reasons, now maintain that these early acreage restrictions which were put into effect in 1933 and subsequent years are partially responsible for the present shortage. Of course, the facts are otherwise. When these restrictions were imposed the farmers' income had dwindled away to practically nothing; they were unable to get decent prices for their crops because they raised so much more than people were able to buy, and also because the foreign market for their products had practically disappeared. As a result of this glut, this stifling excess of supply over demand, farm prices faded away to almost nothing; and it was necessary to restrict production by taking inferior land out of production in order to save agriculture from the complete bankruptcy which was threatening it in 1932.

The farmers themselves voted to do this, because of conditions which consumers well understood and appreciated, for they knew that that was the only road to salvation for agriculture and for the country as a whole.

Since the present war began, however, and the demand for food has outstripped the supply, these restrictions have been lifted and there are now no limitations on the production of food.

Another fact which is often overlooked by the critics of our acreage-adjustment program is that more acres were put into soil-improving crops and legumes, and that many conservation practices were instituted—such as terracing, cover cropping, and contour farming—which actually improved the soil so much that although less acreage was in production, more food per acre was produced. In fact the great improvement in our soil which resulted from our agricultural programs has made possible the record food production of recent years.

In planting for 1944, we are determined not to repeat the blunder of the First World War—plowing, and planting crops without regard to the fitness of the land, and without regard to proper soil conservation. The Dust Bowl which was created by these practices has caused too much sorrow and suffering and financial loss in recent years to let us forget the lesson.

The increased production goals for 1944 involve not only an increase in the total food production but also shifting production from one kind of food to other kinds which are more necessary. The plan calls for the right amount of the right things in the right places—and the objective will be to stretch our food supply as far as possible. Accordingly, the largest increases in production will be for those crops which furnish food for direct human consumption.

Plans are also under way to increase our food supply by the development and procurement of food abroad. I have already mentioned how our assistance in developing food production in north Africa has made and will make available food for our armed forces abroad under reverse lend-lease. Other sources of foreign food may be available to us. The functions of handling foreign food development are being centralized in the Foreign Economic Administration so that our food supply can be augmented in the most effective way.

SUPPORT PRICES AND EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS

In order to induce farmers to increase production to these new goals and at the same time keep the cost of food down, it will be necessary to increase the amount of Government funds which were used for these purposes in 1943.

Government funds have been used in various different ways in order to see that the farmer got a fair price for his product—a price high enough to encourage him to raise more crops—without raising the price to the consumer. All of these administrative methods of guaranteeing a minium price to the farmer for his products—whether they take the form of nonrecourse loans, or guaranteed prices, or subsidy payments, or actual purchase and resale—are generically called price supports, and are included in the price-support programs. The purpose of the price-support program is primarily to encourage the farmer to grow a crop with the assurance that, no matter what happens, he is going to get a certain definite return for it. If the price which the ultimate consumer pays as fixed by the price regulations is less than an amount which will pay the farmer this return, then the Government absorbs the loss and sees to it that the farmer gets what was guaranteed to him. The farmer also enjoys this guaranty when prices in the market fall below the support level. If the price which the consumer has to pay as fixed by the price regulations is high enough to pay the

farmer his support price, then of course there is no loss to the Government.

In certain commodities the War Food Administration knows in advance that it will have to bear part of the cost. Nevertheless, the charge will be a necessary part of the program to produce enough food, without having the consumer pay too much for it.

We cannot and should not expect the farmers of the Nation to increase their production all over the United States if they face the definite risk of loss by reason of such production. We do not expect industrial war plants to take such risks and there is no reason why the farmers should.

I am attaching herewith a statement of the commodities for which Commodity Credit Corporation support prices were in effect during 1943—Schedule A. The Congress will notice that in some of the commodities such as cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice these support prices have been in effect for several years.

I am also attaching a statement showing the cost to the Government of this support price program for 1943—schedule B. The Congress will notice that production of only a fraction of the commodities required any outlay by the Government. In other words, in the majority of the products, the price which the consumer paid was high enough to cover the support price; whereas in a small percentage of the crops the price which the consumer paid was not high enough to pay the farmer the price which was promised. For these items the Commodity Credit program for 1943 cost the Government $350,000,000. The administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation in carrying out the program were less than 3 percent.

This cost does not include the Reconstruction Finance Corporation program for reducing the prices of meat and butter, which will amount to an additional $450,000,000 per year.

I am sure that the Congress and the people feel that this expenditure of $800,000,000 per year is a moderate sum to pay in order to help accomplish the objectives which we have in mind—greater production and lower consumer prices—for a whole year. In fact, it is about equal to the cost to us of waging this war for 3 days.

We are only applying here the same principle which has proved so effective in the production of other war materials, such as copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, and others.

Every nation now in the war has used some form of Government equalization payments in order to hold down the cost of living and at the same time to allow a fair return to the farmers. A good part of the great success of the stabilization program in both Canada and Britain is due to the effective use of Government funds in this way.

Although this program cannot hold the line without the enforcement of a firm price control and without an adequate tax and savings program to absorb excess purchasing power, nevertheless it is equally true that the firmest price control and the wisest fiscal policy cannot do the job themselves without the use of price supports.

When properly used, they have three important advantages: First, they stimulate production of certain necessary and select crops. Second, by preventing price increases, they eliminate inflationary tendencies. Third, they encourage the distribution of food through normal legitimate channels instead of black-market operators who are willing to pay higher prices to farmers with the expectation of selling above ceiling prices.

When effectively used, this program not only performs this necessary function in stabilization of the cost of living, but it also results in great savings to the Government and to consumers. The expenditure of very small sums makes it possible to avoid pyramiding price increases all down the line, from the producer through the processors, wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers, the cost of which runs to extremely large amounts.

In the case of copper, for example, it has been estimated that every dollar paid by the Government to subsidize and increase production has saved the Government $28.

In the case of the coal and oil transportation subsidy, very moderate payments have avoided major increases in prices. If there had been increases in the prices of these basic items, they would have increased the cost of producing practically every commodity manufactured on the east coast.

In the case of food, the money spent by the Government has not only assured us increased production, but, directly and indirectly, has saved the Government and consumers billions of dollars.

The agencies charged with responsibility for stabilizing the cost of living will, from time to time, place before the Congress the programs necessary to hold the line. These will require money. I strongly urge the Congress to give serious consideration to their requests. I am confident that the executive and legislative branches of the Government can pull in harness to get the job done.

FARMERS' INCOME

The administration of the food program has certainly resulted in a great benefit to farmers. Farm income last year reached an all-time peak—and this year it will be higher still. The increase in the prices that farmers pay for the commodities they buy, on the other hand, has been held to very much less than the increase in the prices they receive for their farm products.

In consequence, the net income of farm operators—income after all expenses—has risen to the highest level ever enjoyed by farmers. The average annual realized net income of the farm operators of the Nation during the 5 pre-war years, 1935 to 1939, was $4,668,000,000. The realized net income for 1939 was $4,430,000,000. In 1942, it was $9,500,000,000. The estimate for 1943 is $12,475,000,000.

We cannot, however, look at the total income of farm operators by itself. We must also look at the income of the farmer in relation to the income of the rest of the country.

The average income per farmer since the outbreak of the war in 1939 has risen more than the average income of the other parts of the population. This was also true between 1910 and 1914, which is the primary base period for parity calculation. In 1942 the increase in the average income per farmer over the parity base period was 38 percent greater than the increase in the average income of the other people in the country. In 1943 it was 50 percent greater.

In plain language, the farmer this year is not only better off in relation to others in the population than he was before the war broke out; he is better off than he was in the base period 1910 to 1914, and better off than he has been in any year since that time.

This is just and desirable.

All through the twenties, and through the early years of the thirties, per capita farm incomes were far below fair levels. The Nation has profited from the fact that this injustice has been corrected.

It has been argued that the farm population has been receiving a decreased proportion of the national income. This is true. But it does not deny the fact that the average individual farmer is more prosperous today, as compared with the rest of the population, than he has been in 30 years. Any seeming contradiction is resolved by the fact that the nonfarm population has increased during this 30-year period by more than 50 percent, while the farm population has remained virtually unchanged.

While, therefore, the proportion of the national income going to the farm population as a whole has declined, the income per farmer has increased more than the per capita income of the rest of the country.

The present program of management of farm prices—prices received and prices paid—had not injured the American farmer in the past. I am sure that it will not in the future.

In addition to these favorable prices and incomes, the farmer has been guaranteed Government support of the prices he receives for war crops, not only during the war but for 2 years afterward—a guaranty against post-war disaster afforded to no other group. The farmer has been assured that the bottom will not fall out of his market, as it did after the last war. This guaranty has made it possible for him to increase his investment in plant and equipment with the certainty that the investment would continue to pay dividends. It has also assured to the Nation a farm production large enough to meet our war requirements.

The support-price program, coupled with the program to meet special farming costs without raising prices to consumers, is an essential part of winning the war. The subsidies that are used cannot properly be called producer subsidies or consumer subsidies. They are war subsidies. The costs which they cover are war costs. On the farm as in industry the war has pushed costs above

the levels that prevailed before the outbreak of war and above the levels that will prevail when victory has been won. These are costs of war, and it is entirely appropriate that they should be met out of the Public Treasury, just as are the costs of producing tanks and planes and ships and guns. There is no valid reason why the present stabilization subsidies should not be continued as well as the support prices to farmers, so long as they are clearly in our national interest—as they are in stabilizing the cost of living in time of war.

CONSUMER FOOD PRICES

In the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, the Congress directed that the cost of living be stabilized as far as practicable at the level of September 15, 1942. Between that date and May 15, 1943, however, the cost of living rose 6.2 percent. This was a serious increase, constituting a grave threat to the entire stabilization program. It was particularly serious because the cost of living, since January 1941, had risen considerably more than the Little Steel formula had permitted wages to rise.

Obviously, wages cannot be stabilized at a certain level unless there is also a stable cost of living. Obviously, too, the millions of people with incomes fixed long before the war—salaried white-collar workers, clergymen, school teachers, other State, county, and city officials, policemen, firemen, clerks, old-age pensioners, those living on insurance policies, dependents of men at the front—all had to be protected against the rise in the cost of living which was eating steadily into the buying power of their unchanged incomes. So much public attention has been directed at the increased income of workers in war plants, that it has been diverted from this great mass of our population many of whose incomes have remained fixed all during the war.

It is essential that we keep prices down also in order to prevent the spiral of inflation from beginning. As soon as the price of food goes up materially, workers naturally demand higher wages in order to meet those prices. Higher wages will, in turn, boost all production costs—for civilian and military items both. This in turn will cause farmers' costs to rise, and will result in even higher prices for food. No one can tell where the end will be. A higher cost of food can increase the total cost of the war in geometrical progression.

In the face of this situation, I issued an order in April 1943 to hold the line; and, at the time it was issued, I said:

> To hold the line we cannot tolerate further increases in prices affecting the cost of living or further increases in general wage or salary rates. * * * The only way to hold the line is to stop trying to find justifications for not holding it here or not holding it there.

Although last May, the cost of living did stand 6.2 percent above the September 1942 level, not all the items in the family budget showed this increase—or anything like it. On the contrary, the greater part of the budget was firmly stabilized. Thus, rent had increased not at all over the 8-month period; house furnishings had increased by only a little over 1 percent; clothing by 1.7 percent; fuel, electricity, and ice by 1.3 percent; and miscellaneous items, such as laundry services and drug supplies, by 3.5 percent.

The major portion of the increase in the cost of living—to be precise, three-fourths—was attributable to the failure to stabilize one sector of the economy—food prices. These prices rose by 13 percent. Even with regard to the foods themselves, however, the record was not all so black. Most of the family food budget—in fact the whole range of foods except only fresh fruits and vegetables—was held to an increase of less than 4 percent. It was the remainder of the food budget—the fresh fruits and vegetables—that did the real damage. Fresh fruits and vegetables rose 58 percent between September 1942 and May 1943, and accounted for over three-fifths of the increase in the entire cost of living during that period.

To put this somewhat differently, 90 percent of the cost of living had been largely stabilized. Ten percent of the cost of living had been permitted to get out of hand. That was the situation which confronted us last May.

The easy way out of this situation would have been to let wages rise above the date level in the same degree that the cost of living has risen. That is what some did urge. That would have been a serious blunder. For if the line had been relaxed on the wage front, we may rest assured that the resulting pressure of costs would have forced prices and the cost of living up once more, thus calling for still another rise of wages. Just as the Stabilization Act is to the everlasting credit of the Congress, so the wholehearted support which responsible organized labor gave to the "hold the line" policy stands to the everlasting credit of labor in the United States. The responsible labor leadership saw that the easy way out was no way out at all, and they rejected it. Instead they threw their full energies into making effective the program to reduce the cost of living, the program to bring the cost of living back into balance with wages.

The "hold the line" order was designed to undo the damage that had been done, and to prevent any further damage. The rise in the cost of living having resulted almost entirely from the increase in certain food prices, the program was quite properly designed to bring those food prices back to their September levels as far as possible.

Reductions in cabbage and lettuce resulted from squeezing the water out of the price structure by reducing excessive margins of distributors wherever they were found to exist.

The retail prices of meat and butter were reduced by 10 percent. In these instances, the prices received by farmers and distributors did not permit reduction without bringing returns to unreasonably low levels. Accordingly, an equalization payment was paid by the Government to the processor to enable him to reduce the price of these products without loss to himself and without reducing the price he paid the farmer. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation undertook to make these payments to processors of meat and butter so that retail costs of these foods might be held down while the producers received large enough returns to encourage output.

The Public Treasury has been using, as food production aids, other forms of payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and so-called section 32 operations for supporting prices.

Additional or subsidy payments have been made to industry in order to secure wartime production of many essentials, including copper, zinc, aluminum, and other critical materials. We have paid premiums to speed up construction of ships and other war materials.

In consequence of these programs, the rise in the cost of living, which had proceeded without interruption from the early months of 1941, was brought to an abrupt halt. In June 1943, the cost of living fell to 5.9 percent above the September 1942 level, in July to 5.2 percent, and in August to 4.8 percent. It is true that in September 1943, the cost of living rose by nearly one-half percent. It was not due to food but mainly to the cost of clothing.

There is now being put into effect a program, recently announced, to reduce the retail prices to consumers of other items—apples, onions, potatoes and sweetpotatoes, peanut butter, lard, and vegetable shortening.

Furthermore, preparations are being made to establish ceilings at levels substantially below current retail prices on other winter vegetables.

A major part of these decreases will be made possible without the use of subsidies and by means of a reduction of margins and returns which are excessively high. In some cases, however, it will be necessary, in order to hold the retail price at reasonable levels, for the Government to absorb part of the cost of transportation, to take a moderate loss on purchase operations, and to make direct payments.

In addition we intend to assure to the consumer that part of the savings in price to which he is entitled and to prevent it from being dissipated by ceiling violations.

This program is intended substantially to effectuate the directive of the Congress. We are confronted, however, by acute pressures elsewhere, which threaten to break through the line. There are two situations which require immediate action. These are milk and bread, basic items in every family's diet. In the case of milk, increases in feed costs and other costs have brought the dairyman's returns down to a level far below that of producers of other farm commodities. Adequate production of this vitally important food is threatened. A program has just been announced by the War Food Administration to help meet the milk situation. This is discussed hereafter in connection with the problem of supplying feed to dairy farmers. A program to prevent an increase in the price of bread is now being developed.

In the 4 years following July 1914, the advance in food prices was 67 percent, as compared with a rise of 47 percent in the last 4 years. In the 4 years of the last war the greatest rise in the costs of the average family occurred in prices for clothing and house furnishings. House furnishings rose 82 percent and clothing 90 percent. The general maximum price regulation of May 1942 prevented such an extreme increase in this war. From August 1939 to September 1943 the increase in clothing and house furnishings were only one-third as much as in the same period of the last war.

Since August 1939, the month before the war broke out in Europe, the total cost of living in the United States has increased not quite 26 percent, as compared with an advance of 53 percent in the same period in the last war.

FEED FOR DAIRY CATTLE

The price of grains used as feed for cattle has also advanced to a greater degree than the price of dairy products. Grain prices have advanced more than 60 percent since 1941, while the price of dairy products has advanced only about 40 percent.

To those who recognize the importance of milk, butter, and cheese in maintaining a healthy, vigorous civilian population, this increased cost has given real concern about the supply of dairy products.

In order to enable dairy producers to obtain feed for their cattle without raising the price of their milk and other dairy products to the consumer, the War Food Administration has adopted a program of making payments to dairy farmers based on the increased cost of their purchased feed since September 1942. The payments will be made directly to the dairy farmer, except in those cases where it may be desirable to make the payment to him through a cooperative association or other marketing agency.

While the program as announced is for a 3-month period, some form of equalization payment will probably be necessary as long as the margin between feed costs and dairy prices remains unfavorable.

In order to relieve the pressure on our feed supply, the War Food Administration has announced a reduction in the support price for hogs effective on October 1, 1944, and has removed certain slaughter quotas. The purpose of this is to encourage hog raisers to market their hogs earlier and at lighter weights.

In addition to this program, the War Food Administration is bringing in large quantities of grain from Canada for feeding purposes. This movement has been hampered by a series of transportation difficulties, including the late blocking of Buffalo Harbor with ice and the unusual fog during this summer on the Great Lakes.

In spite of these difficulties, there have been shipped from Canada to the United States, during 1943 up to date, approximately 125,000,000 bushels of feed of all kinds. As much additional grain will be brought in as transportation facilities will permit.

Furthermore, every effort will be made to see that the supply of feeds is distributed equitably throughout the country, the War Food Administration taking such steps and absorbing such transportation costs as may be necessary to secure this objective.

RATIONING AND DISTRIBUTION

The greatest difficulty in the food program has been to bring about a fair and equitable distribution of the available food supplies. It is obvious that there is not enough to furnish all civilians with all the food they want. As I have said, this is the result, to a great extent, of the fact that so many civilians have so much more money to spend than there are civilian supplies of all kinds, including food, to go around.

There are some who advocate taking off all restrictions on food because of the vast food production which the American farmers have raised. But with the great excess of purchasing power now in the pockets of the American people, the supply would never last. We might have a feast for a few months, but then there would be a real shortage—not only for civilians at home but for our own fighting men and those of our allies.

I am confident that the civilian population of the United States is ready to give up certain eating habits and accept certain shortages. They know that they must, if the war is to be won. A sharp line will have to be drawn between the luxuries of life and the necessities of life. A shortage in sirloin steaks or in choice fruits does not mean that the war food program has failed.

In view of the fact that more food is wanted than actually exists, it is necessary to have regulations and rationing, which are sometimes very burdensome. But they are the only way to insure that everybody gets a fair share irrespective of his economic or social or political standing.

Some of them are needed to hold back from commercial channels a portion of the supply which was produced during months of high production so that the civilian supply can be kept on a fairly even keel month in and month out. This is particularly true of perishable foods and vegetables where the supply conditions change sharply from season to season. For example, last year there was a good crop of potatoes, but the American people ate up the entire year's supply in 10 months, so that in the last 2 months there were few potatoes available in many parts of the country. This kind of situation must be avoided. We cannot afford to eat up a year's supply in 10 months, and do without for the balance of the year. We must find a way to husband all of these supplies spacing consumption evenly through the year. Fortunately we have an abundant supply of potatoes this year.

One of the difficulties has been the uneven geographical distribution of food supplies. Certain parts of the country have had abundance, while others have gone without. Part of this is caused by transportation difficulties; part is caused by the fact that excessive demand has made it profitable to sell within the area in which the crops are grown rather than to ship to other markets. This makes it necessary for the Government to develop programs to insure orderly geographic distribution of all important foods. National interest requires that every part of the country obtain a fair share.

More equal geographic distribution and a more even distribution through the year could be accomplished by the extension of rationing to some of the important foods which are not today rationed. However, for the perishable items, this would entail especially serious administrative difficulties. Therefore it is planned that the Government itself either purchase or otherwise control certain foods or absorb the transportation costs—in order to stretch consumption through the year, and to insure distribution that is fair to all parts of the country. Such operations would also go a long way toward stamping out black markets. These devices will be used selectively and only to the extent necessary to achieve the objective of year-round orderly distribution.

Control and distribution by rationing has involved many difficult administrative problems, most of which have been solved by experience. No one would contend that mistakes were not made. Nevertheless, there has been steady improvement. A recent survey has shown that 93 percent of American housewives agree that a good job—a job fair to all—has been done.

Unfortunately, the 7 percent who are not satisfied are more vocal than the 93 percent who are. Many reasons explain this.

Although civilians with their greatly increased purchasing power will not be able to purchase all the food for which they have the money, there will be a sufficient amount of good wholesome food for the people of the United States.

From a nutrition standpoint the civilian per capita food supply during this year of 1943 will compare favorably with the average for the pre-war period 1935 to 1939.

There have been inconveniences to the American dining table—even shortages of certain foods. But no American has gone hungry—in fact, the American people as a whole are eating more now than they did before Pearl Harbor.

The American people realize that unless every farmer does his share to get full production and unless every civilian plays fair and does not seek to get more than his proper share of the limited supply, they may be depriving some of our soldiers or fighting allies of needed food to sustain them in their struggle.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FOOD PROGRAM

There has been loose talk in some quarters about the need for a food "czar" to have full control of food—including not only production and distribution but prices, rationing, and transportation. The fact is that the production and allocation and distribution of food of all kinds are all now under the control of one man—the War Food Administrator.

The War Food Administration is the agency which allocates available supply of food to civilian, military, and lend-lease needs.

That part of the food supply which is allocated to civilians, insofar as rationing and ceiling prices are concerned, comes under the supervision of the Office of Price Administration. The Office of Price Administration does not ration food on its own initiative, but only on the recommendation of the War Food Administration. In other words, the War Food Administration determines when the demand for food of a certain kind so exceeds the supply of that food that rationing is required. When such determination is made, the Office of Price Administration takes charge of the actual mechanics of rationing.

This is the most logical procedure, because it places the actual administration of rationing—the ration coupons, the ration boards, the ration regulations—in the same body of citizens that rations gasoline, fuel oil, shoes, and the other products, and it leaves the determination of the necessity for rationing food in the War Food Administration. There can be no reason, in logic or necessity, for setting up a new ration board in all the localities in the United States for each different product.

With respect to prices, it is true that the War Food Administration should be concerned with the fixing of price ceilings. It is. No price ceiling on agricultural commodities is fixed by the Office of Price Administration without the concurrence of the War Food Administration. In other words, the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration either agree on a price or any disagreement is settled by the Director of Economic Stabilization. In this way the Food Administrator has a great deal to say about the price of food—but not all. For the price of food should be kept in proper relationship to the prices of other commodities; and therefore it has been deemed advisable to put all price fixing and enforcement in one agency. There is no reason why the War Food Administration should have its own corps of price-enforcement officials to duplicate the work of the other price-enforcement officials in the Office of Price Administration.

With respect to transportation it would be impossible to give the War Food Administrator complete control over the transportation of food because every car used to transport food is a car which is also greatly in demand for the transportation of other war products. Obviously there must be an agency which apportions the transportation facilities among the various war needs and it would disrupt prosecution of the war and result in chaos if the War Food Administrator were able to take a car needed for steel or weapons or chemicals or equipment and use it for food transportation.

The case is exactly the same for prices as for transportation. We cannot permit any part of the program, food or rubber, or any other, to have a free hand in bidding materials and manpower away from other equally essential parts of the war effort. If in transportation chaos would result, how shall we characterize the consequences on the price front where the relationships are even more complex and delicate than in transportation?

The fact is that the administration of food is now properly centered in one man and one agency, except only where such administration might encroach upon other war agencies which deal with such separate but relevant subjects as price control, transportation, and so forth.

There have been many complaints about the existence of black markets in food. It is an unfortunate fact that many persons who complain of black markets are themselves individually encouraging them by their patronage. Some black markets exist in all nations which have rationing. The operators of these black markets are unpatriotic—and as they are caught, they will be punished. But we should all attach as much blame to those of our citizens who hurt their neighbors and their Nation by paying exorbitant prices in black markets. Vigorous efforts are being made by the appropriate Government agencies to stamp out black markets.

* * * * *

The objectives of our food program will, as in the past, be to grow and raise as much foodstuffs as is humanly possible.

We shall maintain our fighting men as the best fed in all the world.

We shall guarantee that every individual of our civilian population will have an ample and healthful diet. Everyone may be assured that there will be enough food to go around. No one need fear that only a comparatively few people will be able to afford an adequate and varied diet.

We shall assist in fulfilling the requirements of our fighting allies for food and shall also assist in assuring that the liberated peoples will be given sufficient food to regain their physical and economic strength.

Our farmers will receive a return over and above their costs of production that will compensate them decently and adequately for their long and arduous work. At the same time, the consumers of the Nation will be protected against rising costs which are properly chargeable to the war effort itself.

The price support program is proving reasonably successful on both fronts, increasing production and maintaining fair food prices for the consumer. I am convinced that to abandon our present policy would increase the costs of living, bring about demands for increased wages which would then be justifiable, and might well start a serious and dangerous cycle of inflation—without any net benefit to anyone.

Some people say "a little inflation will not hurt anyone." They are like the man who takes the first shot of opium for the sensation he thinks it will give him. He likes it, although he swears that he will not make it a habit. Soon he is taking two—and then more and more—and then he loses all control of himself.

Inflation is like that. A little leads to more. I am unalterably opposed to taking the first shot by congressional, or any other, action. The Nation cannot afford to acquire the habit. We have children to think of.

Those who are advocating an inflation course will have to be ready to accept responsibility for the results. We have so far been following a tried path, and are getting along fairly well. This is no time to start wandering into an untried field of uncontrolled and uncontrollable prices and wages.

With the same determination that has led our fighting men to conquer their military objectives, we at home shall reach the objectives of our food program. We will get the production that we have set as our goal. We will see that the supplies of food are distributed fairly and equitably and at stable prices that are fair to the consumer. To do this we shall have to draw upon that basic characteristic of a democracy—a characteristic that has its roots in the American farm community. We shall draw on our teamwork, teamwork of the farmer, and the consumer, and the distributor, and the Government in both its legislative and executive branches.

The accomplishments of the past year have been great. We shall demonstrate to the Axis how the teamwork of a free people can make even those records fall. We shall demonstrate that freedom and teamwork make the people of a democracy the most efficient producers in the world—whether it be of battleships, tanks, planes, guns, or of the produce of the soil.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 1, 1943.*

SCHEDULE A

CURRENT SUPPORT PRICES OF THE WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Commodity and price support

Hogs: Average for good-to-choice butcher hogs at Chicago: $13.75 per hundredweight for hogs weighing 200–270 pounds, through September 30, 1944; $12.50 per hundredweight for hogs weighing 200–240 pounds, October 1, 1944 to March 31, 1945.

Eggs: Purchased on offer-and-acceptance basis equivalent to not less than 30 cents per dozen in spring and early summer, and an annual average price of 34 cents, basis United States average farm price, effective through June 30, 1944.

Butter: 46 cents per pound for 92 score, Chicago basis, effective through June 30, 1944.

Cheese: Equivalent of 27 cents per pound, including subsidy for United States No. 1 American cheese, Plymouth basis, effective through June 30, 1944.

Dry skim and evaporated milk: 12.5 cents per pound for roller and 14.5 cents for spray process, extra grade, f. o. b. plant, Midwest basis, with support prices for evaporated milk about in line with prices for butter and dry skim milk, effective through June 30, 1944.

Chickens: 90 percent of parity, excluding broilers or chickens weighing less than 3 pounds, effective through June 30, 1944.

Turkeys: 90 percent of parity, effective through June 30, 1944.

Soybeans for oil: For 1943 crop: $1.67–$1.86 per bushel, United States average farm price, for yellow or green soybeans of high oil con-

tent, with price of $1.80 for No. 2 yellow, 14 percent moisture content, and storage allowance of 7 cents per bushel, on farm-stored seed under C. C. C. loan.

Flaxseed for oil: For 1943 crop: $2.85 per bushel, basis No. 1 at Minneapolis, with storage allowance of 7 cents per bushel on farm-stored seed under C. C. C. loan.

Cottonseed: For 1943 crop: $55 per ton, f. o. b. shipping point, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico; $56, other States.

Peanuts: For 1943 crop: Support prices Virginia and Spanish types all uses average $140 per ton; runner type, $150. Adjustments for grade. Uniform price to all farmers for peanuts of like grade or grade within each area or region.

Dry beans: (designated classes: pea; medium white; great northern; small and flat small white; pink; pinto; cranberry; small red; light, dark, and western red kidney; lima, and baby lima): For 1943 crop: $6.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1; $6.35, U. S. No. 2, in bags, f. o. b. country shipping points, except $7.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1 and $7.35 for U. S. No. 2 lima, baby lima, light, dark, and western red kidney. Loan on thresher-run dry edible beans, all classes except tepary and mixed, at $5.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1; $5.35, U. S. No. 2, and $5.10, U. S. No. 3.

Dry peas:

Smooth types (designated classes: Alaska, Scotch green, first and best, marrow-fat, white Canada): For 1943 crop: $5.65 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1 and $5.40 for U. S. No. 2 in bags, f. o. b. carrier at country shipping points. Loan on thresher-run smooth dry edible peas of $4.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1 and $4.25 for U. S. No. 2.

Wrinkled types (designated classes: alterman, perfection, profusion, surprise, Thomas Laxton): For 1943 crop: $4.25 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1; $4 for U. S. No. 2, in bags, f. o. b. carrier at country shipping points, for peas grown for canning purposes under contracts approved by State War Boards but which, for various reasons, will not be canned.

Blackeye (South): For 1943 crop: $5.75 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1, cleaned, bagged, and delivered to designated points; $5.60, U. S. No. 2; and $5.35, U. S. No. 3.

American-Egyptian and Sea Island cotton: For 1943 crop: American-Egyptian, 48 cents per pound net weight for No. 2 1⅛-inch cotton. (U. S. Department of Agriculture 1290–43) Sea Island 56–70 cents per pound (Puerto Rican) and 48–59 cents (mainland).

Cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice: Farmers cooperating in the agricultural conservation program will be eligible for loans equivalent to 90 percent of parity (or 85 percent in the case of corn and wheat) as of the 15th of the month preceding the beginning of the marketing year as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended. U. S. Department of Agriculture unnumbered release, Nov. 27, 1942). Loan rate for 1943 cotton, 19.26 cents per pound for Middling $\frac{15}{16}$-inch, gross weight. (U. S. Department of Agriculture 272–44.) Loan rate for 1943 wheat, average of $1.23 per bushel at the farm.

White potatoes: For 1943 crop: 90 percent of parity as calculated at the beginning of the marketing year, but not less than specified prices for certain grades of potatoes in specified commercial areas, and 50 cents per bushel on normal yield of acreage planted to potatoes in excess of 90 percent of the farm goal, up to 110 percent of the goal, effective on acreage planted after February 1, 1943.

Sweetpotatoes: For 1943 crop: $1.15 per bushel, August-November; $1.30, December-January; $1.45, February-April; for U. S. No. 1 packed in bushel crates, baskets or hampers, U. S. No. 2 containing at least 75 percent U. S. No. 1, 15 cents under price for U. S. No 1. For U. S. No. 1 or better, cured, properly packed in bushel crates, baskets or hampers, $1.50 during January 1944; $1.65, February.

Vegetables for fresh consumption: For 1943 crop: $50 per acre for each acre over 90 percent of the farm goal (for carrots, snap beans, lima beans, beets, tomatoes, cabbage, onions, and green peas as a group) up to 110 percent of goal.

Canning crops: For 1943 crop: Minimum support prices will be paid on acreage contracted with certified canners at following levels (prices on national basis; will vary by States): tomatoes, $24.25 per ton; green peas $81.50; sweet corn, $18; snap beans, $91; lima beans, $90–$115; beets, $19–$21; carrots, $20–$22; cabbage for kraut, $12.

Canned vegetables—for 1943 pack: 95 percent of canners' net ceiling prices until mid-1944 for canned tomatoes, tomato juice, tomato pulp, tomato paste, sweet corn, snap beans, green peas, lima beans, beets, and carrots.

Apples, for processing: For 1943 crop: Apple products will be purchased from certified processors paying the following prices per hundred pounds for apples: U. S. No. 1 cannery grade, 2¼-inch and up (and C grade, Washington and Oregon), $3.10 for class A and $2.50 for class B; U. S. No. 2 cannery grade, 2¼inch and up, $1.65 for class A and $1.50 for class B; ciders, $1.00.

Apricots, for canning: For 1943 crop: $95 per ton, roadside.

Figs, for processing: For 1943 crop: For canning: Kadotas, $125 per ton. For drying: Calimyrnas (basis 75-percent test), $380 per ton; Adriatic (basis 80-percent test), $250; Kadotas, tree-picked (basis 90-percent test), $240; Kadotas, natural (basis 85-percent test), $230; Black Mission (basis 85-percent test), $200.

Dried fruits

Apricots: Natural-condition, 1943 crop: Average of 32 cents per pound.

Peaches: Natural-condition, 1943 crop: Freestone, $440 per ton; clingstone, $330.

Pears: For 1943 crop: Lake County quality, $360 per ton; others, $330.

Prunes: Natural-condition, 1943 crop: California, 3-district, 8½ cents per pound basis (80 prunes a pound); California "outside" district, Washington, and Oregon, 8¼ cents.

Raisins: Natural-condition, 1943 crop: Thompson seedless, $155 per ton; Muscats, $165; Sultanas, $150. (U. S. Department Agriculture 243–44.) Dehydrated: golden-bleached, sulphur-bleached, and soda-dipped Thompson seedless, $195 per ton; Valencia or dehydrated Muscats, $205; so-called Zante currants, $215; tray slip Muscats, $180.

Grain sorghums: For 1943 crop: U. S. No. 2 or better, 85 cents per bushel; U. S. No. 3, 80 cents; U. S. No. 4, 70 cents; except Arizona and California, 5 cents higher.

Hemp: Prices will be supported for hemp and hemp seed grown under contract, 1943 crop.

Castor beans: For a small acreage: 6 cents per pound for beans in the hull that shell 70 percent, 1943 crop.

Wool: 1943 clip will be purchased at ceiling prices.

Barley: For 1943 crop: From 60 cents per bushel for U. S. No. 5 to 75 cents for U. S. No. 1, with rates 5 cents higher on Pacific coast.

Sugar beets: For 1943 crop: Producers assured $1.50 per ton more than they received for 1942 beets of standard quality (16.5 percent sucrose). Returns should average around $11 per ton.

Gum naval stores: For 1943 season: Loan and purchase rates for turpentine, 64 and 68 cents per gallon, respectively. For rosin, loan rates from $3.70 per hundredweight net for X grade to $3.25 for G grade, average $3.50; purchase rates same grades, $4.04–$3.59 with an average of $3.84.

Hay and pasture seeds: For 1943 crop, support loans or purchases are offered for 30 hay and pasture seeds, including alfalfa; several varieties of clover and lespedeza; timothy; smooth bromegrass; crested, western, and slender wheatgrass; blue and side oats grama; orchard, buffalo, bermuda, dallis, and behia grass, meadow fescue; blue lupine; and wild winter peas.

SCHEDULE B

Estimated cost of price support program

[In million dollars]

Program	Period covered	Estimated loss (in millions)
Dry beans	1943 crop	8
Potatoes	do	20
Prunes	do	7
Raisins	do	7
Canning vegetables	do	30
Sugar	do	50
Cheddar cheese	1943	25
Fluid milk	1943	3
Oilseeds and products	1943 crops	60
Feed wheat	Fiscal year 1944	70
Dairy feed payments	1943	60
Miscellaneous	1943	8
Total		350

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therewith a speech made by Hon. Herbert Hoover at Kansas City, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a certain resolution adopted by the Greater St. Louis Council of American War Dads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it may adjourn to meet on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JAMES L. BAITY

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. That period is passed, but, without objection, the gentleman will be recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while we are giving credit where credit is due to those who are serving heroically on the battle front, we cannot forget those who are serving faithfully on the home front. Today marks the close of the service of a loyal Missourian, James L. Baity, retiring as executive officer of the General Accounting Office.

Entering the service of the Government as Auditor for War in May 1913, he was appointed executive officer of G. A. O. on its organization in 1921 and continued in that responsible position until through October 31, 1943, serving a total of more than 30 years.

He had a large part in the establishment of routine in the early days of the G. A. O. and has contributed largely to the development and maintenance of its high standards of efficiency and service.

I am certain the Members of the House join with me in appreciation of his long and distinguished service and in best wishes for many years of continued health and prosperity in which to enjoy his well-earned vacation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in reference to everything he says concerning James L. Baity.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Baity for a great many years. While he became an official of the executive branch of the Government 30 years ago, he was an employee of the legislative branch of the Government for many years prior to that time. He came to Washington and was the secretary of Hon. James T. Lloyd, of Missouri, and I am also quite sure served as secretary to the Democratic National Committee. Later he became the secretary of Senator James A. Reed and in 1913 became auditor for the War Department.

This was prior to the time that the Budget and Accounting Act was passed. During the period that he was auditor for the War Department he handled the expenditures of that Department while we were engaged in the First World War setting up an office in France and remaining there for quite a period. When the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921 the office of auditors for the various Government departments was abolished and all auditing and accounting came under the supervision of the Comptroller General.

When Mr. McCarl was appointed Comptroller General he offered a very responsible position to Mr. Baity which he accepted and he served in that capacity until he retired today.

Jim Baity, as everyone knew him, was a very popular official. He appeared before many committees of Congress, especially in connection with the Budget for the Comptroller General's Office and the General Accouting Office.

The Government can ill afford to lose a man of Jim Baity's capacity at this period and I am sure I speak for the many friends he has in the legislative branch of the Government when I extend our best wishes to him for a long life and a well deserved rest.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include therein certain materials bearing upon them, and a bibliography showing the references that are made in this address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRANGER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRITISH PLOT TO SEIZE CONTROL OF UNITED STATES GOLD

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a study of the Keynes-Morgenthau plan, now being promoted in Washington, to establish what is called a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund, has led me to the inescapable conclusion that the whole thing is nothing less than a plot to give Great Britain control of our gold stock and unload upon the United States an immense volume of debts owed by Britain to other countries. I am convinced that either administration officials are being misled by the designers of the scheme, or they are deliberately aiding in its promotion.

There are not two plans, the British plan, called an International Clearing Union, and another plan supposedly formulated by the administration, called a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund. There is only one plan, namely, the British plan. The proof of this is so clear-cut and conclusive as to leave no possible room for doubt. The British furnished the materials for this scheme. Our Treasury officials, referred to by Mr. Morgenthau as experts, worked those materials up into legislative draft form, but there is strong evidence they even had the assistance of the British in doing this.

Benjamin M. Anderson,[1] in his analysis of the two proposals, has stated:

> Both the plans are British plans, in my opinion. Both of them grow out of long trends in Keynesian thinking and in British monetary policy. I believe that both plans grow out of long discussions by the British financial experts and the representatives of the United States Treasury, that the ideas came from England and that our Treasury has accepted them in major part, though not entirely.

Since Anderson made this statement the administration has revised its original draft and has made additional changes in its revised draft which eliminate any substantive difference between its present provisions and those contained in the British White Paper.[2]

At the end of this discussion will be found a large amount of supporting evidence that this is wholly a British scheme. This is in the form of comparisons of corresponding provisions in the British White Paper and the administration's drafts. The material is so arranged as to permit easy and rapid comparison.

In order to grasp its full import it is necessary that we know something of the background of this scheme and the factors that motivated it. Britain is in serious monetary and financial difficulties. Her situation is ably stated by Palyi:[3]

> Britain is a small island with a large population (47,000,000) of comparatively high living standards, with not enough food for better than half the year, and no natural resources to speak of, except coal. Her existence depends on imports which amount to 25 to 30 percent of her total output. But her merchandise exports are always—for some 120 years—less than the imports, and they have to be less in view of the basic position. Britain used to pay for these excess imports by a substantial excess in invisible trade, and by an even larger surplus of interest and dividend income from investments abroad, which also permitted adding in good years to her foreign assets.
>
> This situation has changed in a fundamental fashion, which constitutes one of the great economic conclusions brought about by two world wars. Britain will have more difficulty than ever in selling her own products, due to the forced industrialization in many countries. Her shipping trade will meet foreign competition as perhaps not since the days of Cromwell; her financial leadership is gone, and so are largely her commercial profits as Europe's entrepôt. The worst is that most of her income from overseas investments is lost.

[1] Anderson, Benjamin M., Post-war Stabilization of Foreign Exchange; The Keynes-Morgenthau Plan Condemned; Outline of a Fundamental Solution, in the Economic Bulletin (Capital Research Co., Los Angeles, Calif., May 11, 1943). For many years economic adviser to the Chase National Bank in New York, Dr. Anderson is now professor of economics, University of California at Los Angeles.

[2] Text of a paper containing proposals by British experts for an international clearing union. British Information Services, April 8, 1943.

[3] Palyi, Dr. Melchior, Some Implications of the Keynes-Morgenthau International Clearing Pool, an address delivered at Union League Club, Chicago, April 28, 1943, and reprinted from the Great Lakes Banker, July 1943.

On top of this Britain owes a huge amount of debts to her colonies, dominions, the Scandinavian, as well as many South American countries, which will become a serious problem to her after the war. This is freely admitted in London as the following shows:

It would be dangerously complacent of Great Britain to dismiss the problem of war debts as one of historical and academic interest, for this country has, since the beginning of the war, been in process of building up the largest external debt accumulated by any belligerent * * * the total of such sterling indebtedness easily exceeds the £1,000,000,000 mark * * *. But even when liberal allowance is made for the fact that some of this sterling debt is of more or less permanent character, enough of it is potentially mobile and straining at leash to create a serious problem—one which cannot be left out of account in considering the question of post-war exchange stabilization. * * * The task which Great Britain will face in settling the debt represented by the accumulation of abnormal sterling balances will be no light one. (Source, The Economist, London, August 7, 1943.)

THE HEART OF THE SCHEME

Lord John Maynard Keynes, adviser to the British Exchequer and a governor of the Bank of England, is credited with having formally drawn up the British White Paper. He is unquestionably the spearhead of the movement, but it is the British Government that the United States must hold responsible for its promotion, just as the Roosevelt administration must be held responsible for the part our Treasury officials are taking in it.

Section 26 of the British White Paper reads as follows:

Gold still possesses great psychological value which is not being diminished by current events; and the desire to possess a gold reserve against unforeseen contingencies is likely to remain. Gold also has the merit of providing in point of form (whatever the underlying realities may be) an uncontroversial standard of value for international purposes, for which it would not yet be easy to find a serviceable substitute. Moreover, by supplying an automatic means for settling some part of the favorable balances of the creditor countries, the current gold production of the world and the remnant of gold reserves held outside the United States may still have a useful part to play. Nor is it reasonable to ask the United States to demonetize the stock of gold which is the basis of its impregnable liquidity. What, in the long run, the world may decide to do with gold is another matter. The purpose of the clearing Union is to supplant gold as a governing factor, but not to dispense with it.

Let us try to unravel some of the lines in this sophisticated language and see what they mean. This is a deliberate attempt to deceive the American people. Here is a subtle, sly suggestion that we must not place too much confidence in the future monetary usefulness of our gold; that it might, even in the not too distant future, become altogether worthless to us.

Just what is meant by saying "gold still possesses great psychological value"? Is the term "psychological" used here in the sense of subjective without any corresponding reality? If so, who and where are the people who are thus mentally afflicted? Surely the British Government, and particularly Lord Keynes, cannot be among those who just imagine gold has value. Indeed not, for just a moment's reflection should convince us that they must believe with all their hearts and souls that the store of yellow metal buried in the caves of Kentucky does have real and ponderable value. As we shall see, this is at the very bottom of the scheme. The British are well aware it is not necessarily our gold hoard that is altogether our impregnable liquidity. Our strong creditor position also has something to do with our impregnable international liquidity. It has very much to do with it.

The purpose of the clearing union is to supplant gold as a governing factor, but not to dispense with it.

Gold must be supplanted as a governing factor because Britain's monetary and financial condition is such as to make it impossible for her to meet her international obligations in gold. She cannot discharge them in goods because she imports more goods than she exports. She cannot pay them in sterling for that might cause sterling to break in exchange value, which she naturally seeks to avoid. Hence the necessity on Britain's part to devise a scheme to supplant gold as the medium for settling international balances and substitute for it irredeemable paper money.

At the same time, gold must not be entirely dispensed with because—

Gold also has the merit of providing in point of form—

"Whatever the underlying realities may be"—

an uncontroversial standard of value for international purposes, for which it would not yet be easy to find a serviceable substitute,

That is, nations do not trust each other enough to risk exchanging their goods with each other for irredeemable paper money.

So gold must be brought into the picture somehow. How is the big question. The United States has gold—plenty of it. Britain cannot take it away from us with goods. The administration would not dare make an outright gift of our gold stock to her—at least, not yet. Consequently, a grandiose scheme must be devised which would hold out the illusory promise of saving the world from postwar monetary chaos and then sold to the Congress and the American public.

A scheme to achieve the purposes sought by the British would require, above everything else, an arrangement which would provide a high degree of political manipulability of gold and paper currencies.

Let us trace out some of the steps in the scheme and see how this is provided. Section 4 of the British plan provides, in part, as follows:

The proposal is to establish a currency union, here designated an International Clearing Union, based on international bank money, called (let us say) bancor, fixed (but not unalterably) in terms of gold and accepted as the equivalent of gold by the British Commonwealth and the United States and all the other members of the union for the purpose of settling international balances.

Note that "bancor" is not gold itself, but something else whose value is fixed in terms of gold, "but not unalterably." That is, the value of bancor could be arbitrarily altered by the will of those operating the scheme. Bancor is indefinable, which disqualifies it as being a standard of any kind or in any sense. Then the plan provides that the currency of each country shall be valued in terms of bancor, but also not unalterably. Bancor would be tied to gold, but not so tightly but what it could be conveniently loosened in an emergency. Then the currency of each member country would in turn be tied to bancor, but not so tightly but what it too could be conveniently loosened in an emergency. The main characteristic of this artifice would be its high degree of variability, which would give it the desired political manipulability. But with it all, bancor and paper currency, the British White Paper tells us, "would each have a defined gold content."

It will be interesting to see where the next step leads us. Section IV–1 of the administration's first draft contained the following provision:

The monetary unit of the fund shall be the unitas, consisting of 137½ grains of fine gold (equivalent to $10 United States).

Thus, the unitas in the administration's first draft was a specified weight of gold, exactly 137½ grains, today, tomorrow, and for all time to come. It was not like the bancor, which was alterable and could represent 100 grains of gold today, 50 tomorrow, or 10 the next day. The administration's first unitas possessed the qualities of a true standard and was definable.

Furthermore, the administration's first draft, under section IV–2, provided for valuing member countries' currencies in terms of gold or unitas, and, as shown by the following in section IV–3, provided for full redeemability:

Deposits in terms of unitas may be accepted by the fund from member countries upon the delivery of gold to the fund and shall be transferable and redeemable in gold or in the currency of any member country at the rate established by the fund. The fund shall maintain a 100-percent reserve in gold against all unitas deposits.

Under those provisions in the administration's first draft the true international gold standard would have prevailed, subject, of course, to the degree of political manipulation that would be involved in the monopolization of the world's gold supply by the treasuries, central banks, stabilization funds, and the scheme itself.

But now observe what happened to that unitas which was proposed in the administration's first draft. Section III–1 of the administration's revised draft changed everything, and provides, in part, as follows:

The monetary unit of the fund shall be the unitas equal in value to 137½ grains of fine gold (equivalent to $10, United States). No change in the gold value of the unitas shall be made except with the approval of 85 percent of the member votes.

What have we here now? Not the definable thing provided for in the first

draft, 137½ grains of fine gold, no more and no less, now or in the future. No; something serious has happened to that unitas. In fact, it has disappeared altogether. A hand reached in, lifted it out, and slipped bancor into its place. Like bancor, revised unitas would not be gold itself, but something whose value would be fixed in terms of gold, but also not unalterably. Just like bancor, the value of revised unitas could be arbitrarily altered by the will of those operating the scheme. Just like bancor, revised unitas would be indefinable, which would also disqualify it as being a standard of value of any kind or in any sense. Just like bancor, member countries' currencies would be fixed in terms of revised unitas, but not unalterably. In short, just like bancor, the main characteristic of revised unitas would be its high degree of variability, which would give it the desired political manipulability.

The redeemability and 100-percent reserve provisions contained in the administration's first draft were stricken out in their entirety in the administration's revised draft.

The most important difference between the British plan and the administration's first draft related to the former's proposal for an international currency called bancor, which was alterable, and the latter's proposal for making the international currency an unalterable specified number of grains of gold and full redeemability. But we see that difference completely obliterated in the administration's revised draft. The fact that the votes of 85 percent of the member countries would be needed to effect an alteration in the exchange value of revised unitas does not differentiate it in the least from bancor. Thus we should see substituted for the international gold standard an arbitrary paper unit of exchange, variable in value and subject to political manipulation by those who operate the scheme.

Having thus prescribed the monetary unit to be used in the scheme, we are naturally interested to learn how the capital for its operation is to be provided. We shall see, and the revelation should be thought-provoking to the American people, for it is here that America plays her major role.

COMPOSITION OF THE CAPITAL STRUCTURE—VOTING STRENGTH, ETC.

Insufficient data is available to make a complete analysis of the composition of the capital structure the scheme projects. However, enough material is at hand to give us some idea of what it would consist. We are dealing here with an exceedingly complicated and unpredictable process.

Each member country would be given a quota, as shown for some of the countries in table 1 below, which would represent the amount of its contribution to the scheme. Table 2 shows the factors which form the basis for computing the quotas. Table 3 shows the percent of basic votes each country would have in a limited number of countries. These tables were furnished me by the Treasury.

TABLE 1.—*Percent of aggregate quotas for various countries as determined by a tentative formula (before adjustment)*

	Percent
Australia	1.5
Brazil	1.2
Canada	2.8
China	4.0
India	3.2
Mexico	.8
New Zealand	.5
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	7.7
Union of South Africa	1.8
United Kingdom (including colonies)	12.8
United States	29.3

Combined quotas of 31 other proposed participating countries approximates 34 plus.

TABLE 2.—*Factors which would form the basis for computing each quota stated in quantitative terms (not definitive)*

(a) Two percent of the national income of 1940;

(b) Five percent of the holdings of gold and free foreign exchange as of July 1, 1943;

(c) Ten percent of average annual imports, 1934–38;

(d) Ten percent of maximum variation in annual exports, 1934–38;

(e) The sum of the above to be increased for each country by the percentage ratio of its average annual exports (1934–38) to its national income (1940).

TABLE 3.—*Percent of basic votes each country would have (approximately)*

Country:	Percent of basic votes
Australia	1.7
Brazil	1.4
Canada	2.6
China	3.4
India	2.7
Mexico	1.2
New Zealand	1.0
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	6.0
Union of South Africa	1.8
United Kingdom (including colonies)	9.2
United States	20.0

The capital would consist of gold, paper currencies, and government securities of member countries. The aggregate of the quotas would be set at the equivalent of $5,000,000,000. Each member country would be required to meet its quota contribution to the fund in full prior to the beginning of the operation of the plan.

Member countries would meet their quotas not by contributing the same proportionate amount of gold and paper, but in widely differing proportions. The following, according to section II-3-a of the revised draft, shows the varying proportionate amounts of gold and paper that would be subscribed:

A country shall pay in gold not less than an amount determined as follows. If its gold and free foreign exchange holdings are:

(i) In excess of three times its quota, it shall pay in gold 50 percent of its quota.

(ii) More than two but less than three times its quota, it shall pay in gold 40 percent of its quota plus 10 percent of its holdings in excess of twice its quota.

(iii) More than its quota but less than twice its quota, it shall pay in gold 30 percent of its quota plus 10 percent of its holdings in excess of its quota.

(iv) Less than its quota, it shall pay in gold 30 percent of its holdings.

The gold payment required of a member country substantial parts of whose home areas have been wholly or partly occupied by the enemy, shall be only three-fourths of the above.

Thus one country would be required to contribute 50 percent of its quota in gold, the next something in excess of 40 percent of its quota, the next somewhat in excess of 30 percent of its quota, the next 30 percent of its gold holdings, and the last only three-fourths of the above. The Treasury furnished me with a statement that—

It is estimated that the average contribution in gold will be slightly more than 30 percent.

But this computation can be, as I shall show, dangerously misleading. We are dealing here with something extremely uncertain and variable.

The quality of the paper that would be contributed would vary all the way from the poorest to the best. Some of it would be very poor and only that which would be redeemable internationally in gold on demand could be considered the best. An examination of the gold and creditor position of the United States will show how important it is that we understand the full significance of the quality of the paper issues that would be contributed to the fund.

As shown in table 1 above, the United States would contribute 29.3 percent of the aggregate of all quotas. Although the formula provides for a contribution by the United States of 50 percent in gold and a like amount of paper, the fact is the United States would in any event contribute 100 percent gold, or $1,465,000,000. The reason for this is that the paper we would contribute would always be, from an international standpoint, the equivalent of gold. This is because of our strong international creditor position and gold holding.

But the same thing cannot be said of much of the paper that would be contributed by many of the other countries. A great portion of the paper outside of what the United States would contribute would not be the equivalent of gold.

Inasmuch as the gold liability of the United States would be 100 percent of her contribution or $1,465,000,000, and the gold contributed by all the other nations, according to the Treasury estimate, only $767,500,000, the actual gold liability of the United States would be 65 percent of the total gold liability of the fund. (From a study of the amount of face gold holdings of member countries, exclusive of the United States, it would appear that the amount of free gold in those countries that would be available for contributions to the fund, is less than $767,500,000.)

Great Britain is given a quota of $640,000,000 with approximately 30 percent payable in gold, or $192,000,000. Since British paper is not redeemable in gold, the $192,000,000 would be her full gold liability. Thus her gold liability would be 8.6 percent of the total gold liability of the fund.

Now, looking at table 3 we see that whereas the gold liability of the United States would be 65 percent of the total gold liability of the fund and it would be given 20 percent of the votes, the gold liability of Great Britain would be 8.6 percent of the total gold liability of the

fund and she would have 9.2 percent of the votes.

The gold liability of the United States would be nearly four times that of the whole British Empire, yet the United States would have only 20 percent of the votes while the Empire would have 19 percent.[4]

Little more need be said about that portion of paper which would be contributed to the fund and which would not be redeemable in gold, except to point out its main characteristic, namely, to sink in value.

The currencies and government securities that would be contributed would represent political promises to pay, but to pay what? Lord Keynes in the British White Paper says:

> Since the national currencies of member states are given a defined exchange value in terms of bancor, it follows that they would each have a defined gold content.

Has Lord Keynes forgotten what the defined gold content of the German currency was when the German Government had used up all the paper in the Reich in printing roundly four hundred and ninety-six quintillion marks?

> One mark at that time was defined as about 5½ grains of pure gold. The total amount of gold, therefore, that the German Government promised to pay in these issued promises was about six million million million ounces. The total amount of gold in all the central banks in the world at the time was only a tiny portion of this. Actually, the German Government had promised to pay about 15,000,000,000 times as much gold as there was in the banks of the whole world at the moment.[5]

If the paper currencies and government securities to be paid into the fund are not promises to pay gold, then what do they promise to pay?

There are numerous other involvements which would add to our gold liability. Some countries make only confidential reports of their gold holdings to the United States Treasury. Some besides Germany fail to include all of their gold holdings in their regular reports, while others have transferred to or have been independently accumulated by special government agencies, the existence of which is known but which operate in greater or less degree of secrecy.[6]

It is my understanding that Russia makes no reports whatever to the United States Treasury of her gold holding. Notwithstanding, Russia is given a contributory quota as noted in table 1 of 7.7 percent. One cannot help but wonder how it was possible to establish that quota without knowing her gold holding because one of the factors upon which the quota of a member country would be based is the amount of gold it holds.

Nothing is said in the administration's draft as to whether the gold that would be contributed to the fund would be free gold or gold pledged as security for paper issues. Unknown complications could surely develop from this situation. Of the more than $22,000,000,000 of gold owned by the United States all but roundly $9,000,000,000 is held as security for Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank deposits. The Federal Reserve is required by law to hold 35 percent gold reserves against its deposits, and 40 percent gold against Federal Reserve notes. The gold of a country could not actually secure its paper currency and at the same time be a liability in the proposed scheme.

It is impossible at present to secure complete data showing the requirements and availability of gold for covering notes and central bank deposits in other countries. Enough data is at hand, however, to show that if the coverage were the same in other countries as is required in the United States, they would have no gold to spare for any contributions to the scheme. We also know that the percentage of gold security for paper issues now provided in the other countries is very small compared with that of the United States. This situation would vitally affect not only the quality of the paper that would be contributed by the other countries but the position of their gold contributions as well. The following relating to the gold contribution Great Britain would be called upon to make may give some idea as to how important this can be:

> This country [Great Britain] in particular, which might be required to deposit $500,000,000 or more, had by September 1941, already disposed of all but 4,000,000 ounces of its pre-war holding of close on 80,000,000 ounces. Since that date, presumably, the reserve has been depleted further. It is hardly to be supposed that this country will be willing in the difficult post-war transition phase, when its exports will have to bear the strain of meeting the gap in the current balance of payments and possibly of effecting some repayment of overseas sterling holdings, to export goods to the value of, say £125,000,000 simply to acquire a gold reserve. (Source, The Economist, London, August 28, 1943.)

The administration's draft gives no idea of the method by which the Board of Directors would acquire physical possession of the gold and paper to be contributed to the fund by the member countries. They do not say where this international fund would be established, where or how the assets would be housed. We are left in doubt as to whether or not the board of directors would actually have physical possession of the assets or if the whole proceedings would merely be a bookkeeping transaction, with each country retaining possession of its own contributions. This latter arrangement might indeed prove a convenience for a nation with an overdrawn account.

A number of countries are loath or refuse to give out any information regarding their gold holdings. Certainly they would be even more reluctant to export a large percent of their gold to some point within the physical boundary of another country. Also, since the scheme does not specify that the gold pledged to the fund shall be free gold, there is the possibility that some of the gold pledged to the fund might also be a reserve for the country's currency.

In any case, every nation is bound to feel that it would lose control of its gold once the actual physical possession was outside its own territory.

For instance, if it should be decided to make London the depository of the gold of the fund, how would the American people react to the knowledge that a billion and a half or more of our gold was being shipped to London? We can hardly expect that other nations would feel any differently if Washington or New York were made the depository.

When questioned on this point, Treasury officials seemed rather uncertain. Let us hope that we shall not wake up some morning and learn that the gold held at Fort Knox has been shipped to some foreign country, as we did in the case of the 50 destroyers and the 200 Liberty ships.

BLOCKED WAR BALANCES

The very first sentence under the title "Objects of the Plan," in the British White Paper, points to an adroitly concealed purpose. It reads:

> We need an instrument of international currency having general acceptability between nations, so that blocked balances * * * are unnecessary.

Section 34 of the British White Paper elaborates those balances and refers to them as "abnormal balances in overseas ownership held in various countries." The administration's revised draft refers to "blocked foreign balances."

Just what are these blocked foreign balances which seem to be of such great concern to the British? In plain English they are simply debts owed by one nation to another, but it so happens that Britain is the one country that is seriously concerned with these balances. She owes a large amount of debts in the form of sterling balances to her colonies, dominions, the Scandinavian as well as many South American countries.

These debts, or blocked balances, which Britain owes to Canada, India, and so forth, were created through purchases of goods by Britain from those countries, some before the war and some since the war began. The word "blocked" simply means that Britain told the countries to whom she owed the debts that she was unable to pay them at the present time. It was impossible for her to pay them in either gold or goods.

How would the "fund," as they call the scheme, buy those blocked balances? The technique of handling those blocked balances is so involved and complicated as to be almost uncanny. It can hardly be otherwise but that Lord Keynes wrote every word in sections III–9 and V–8 in the administration's first and revised drafts, respectively. Like the remainder of the proposals of the scheme, the matter of blocked war balances is wholly a British problem. The United States

[4] It should be noted that the above computations are based on a $5,000,000,000 fund. Should the figure be raised to $8,000,000,000 with a gold contribution by the United States of $2,500,000,000, as is now being suggested by Treasury officials, our gold liability would be increased.

[5] The Promises Men Live By, by Harry Sherman, p. 351.

[6] Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1940.

holds no blocked foreign balances.[1] Britain holds such balances in an amount of $4,000,000,000, with prospects of its reaching in excess of $5,000,000,000 by the end of the war.

This is the way the scheme would operate: First the fund would buy the blocked balances from the countries owning them, Canada, India, and so forth. Since under this scheme the fund could purchase $500,000,000 of blocked balances in the first 2 years of its operation, we will assume that the fund purchases the full amount, paying the creditor countries in unitas—which unitas has been given general acceptability among member countries mainly by the gold contributed to the fund by the United States. Thus the creditor countries would receive the $500,000,000 in unitas credits or foreign exchange, as they may desire. For this service the fund would make a service charge of 1 percent, or $5,000,000.

Next, the creditor countries agree to repurchase from the fund, after the expiration of 3 years, annually 2 percent of the blocked balances sold to the fund, for a period of 20 years. That would mean $10,000,000 per year for 20 years. In addition, the creditor countries also agree to pay annually 1 percent interest on the blocked balances still remaining to be repurchased by them.

At the same time the debtor nation makes a like agreement to repurchase from the fund, after the expiration of 3 years, 2 percent annually of the blocked balances bought by the fund for a period of 20 years; also agreeing to pay 1 percent annual interest on the amount of blocked balances remaining to be purchased by it.

Thus it will be seen in the case of the fund purchasing $500,000,000 of blocked balances that only 80 percent or $400,000,000 will have been repurchased by the debtor and creditor countries by the end of 23 years, also that the 1-percent interest charge would apply only to the $400,000,000. Little is said regarding the $100,000,000 of blocked balances still in the fund and on which no interest is charged. In this way, the fund would take over $500,000,000 of British debts, making available to British creditors a like amount. Four hundred million dollars would be paid back to the fund by Britain and her creditors over a period of 23 years, at the phenomenally low interest rate of 1 percent, plus the $5,000,000 service charge mentioned.

When Treasury officials were questioned as to what would be done with the $100,000,000 of blocked balances still owned by the fund, they said those remaining balances could be invested. Section V–8–i provides that—

> The fund agrees not to sell the blocked balances acquired under the above authority, except with the permission or at the request of the country in which the balances are being held. The fund may invest these balances in the ordinary or special government securities of that country.

[1] "The United States does not hold blocked foreign balances of the type referred to in provision V–8." (Information furnished me in a letter from the Treasury Department dated October 2, 1943.)

The administration's revised draft, section V–8–j, provides:

> That during the first 2 years of its operation, blocked balances purchased by the fund shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 percent of the quotas of all member countries. At the end of 2 years of operation, the fund shall propose a plan for the gradual further liquidation of blocked balances still outstanding indicating the proportion of the blocked balances which the Board considers the fund can appropriately purchase.

Thus, except for the first 2 years of its operation, there is no limit placed on the amount of blocked balances the fund may purchase. Regardless of the fact that the United States would contribute by far the greatest amount of gold to the fund she would not be able to exercise any control or veto as to the liability that might be assumed. Only a majority vote would be required to indicate "the proportion of the blocked balances which the Board considers the fund can appropriately purchase." In a world of reality, it is not hard to envision how the debtor and creditor countries involved in the blocked balances would vote—how, in fact, it would be to their interests to vote.

If the amount of the fund initially subscribed would be $8,000,000,000 instead of the $5,000,000,000 originally contemplated, the amount available for the purchase of blocked balances would be proportionately greater. But even should it eventuate that the fund recommended the purchase of an amount of blocked balances in excess of its available capital, that would not necessarily prevent the transaction from taking place. If the proposal under VII–8 in the revised draft were adopted, the United States would be morally and perhaps legally bound to contribute additional gold to the fund for the purchase of whatever amount of blocked balances it had decided to acquire. The section here referred to, "to adopt appropriate legislation or decrees to carry out its undertakings to the fund," places, in my opinion, an unlimited liability upon the United States to carry out whatever the fund might undertake to do.

But it would not necessarily be a matter of the statutes alone that would determine the amount of liability against the United States. Other and perhaps more powerful forces in the way of diplomacy, propaganda, and so forth, would play a big role.

INTEREST FREE—NONMATURING LOANS

Member countries could borrow from the scheme an amount up to 50 percent of their quota contributions the first year, and thereafter 100 percent. Under certain conditions they could exceed their permissible borrowing quota. No interest is paid on loans, except a 1-percent charge on sums borrowed in excess of their permissible quota. Nothing is said about the length of time loans could run.

It is supposed member countries would borrow against their currencies, government obligations, and the gold which constitute their quota contributions. The fact is they borrow against the total assets of the scheme. Currency and government obligations are merely instruments of government debt, which may be had by the operation of government printing presses.

The amount of loans the scheme would be authorized to make could run into the billions. It would be dollars that would be mostly in demand.

POWER TO REGULATE EXCHANGE RATES OF MEMBER COUNTRIES' CURRENCIES

In addition to taking over the blocked balances of Great Britain, it is further proposed under "Purposes of the fund," page 2 of the administration's revised draft:

> Therefore it is proposed that there be established an international stabilization fund to stabilize the foreign exchange rates of the currencies of the United Nations and the countries associated with them.

To implement the broad powers comprehended in the scheme, according to the administration's revised draft, section VII–8, each country is—

> To adopt appropriate legislation or decrees to carry out its undertakings to the fund.

Such undertakings, among other things, would include altering the exchange value of unitas and the currencies of member countries and to fix the price of gold as the following sections, III–1, 2, and IV–5, would indicate:

> No change in the gold value of the unitas shall be made except with the approval of 85 percent of the member votes. * * *
>
> Changes in the exchange value of the currency of a member country shall be considered only when essential to the correction of fundamental disequilibrium in its balance of payments, and shall be made only with the approval of three-fourths of the member votes, including the representative of the country concerned. * * * A member country may change the established rate for its currency by not more than 10 percent, provided that the member country shall notify the fund of its intention and shall consult with the fund on the advisability of its action.
>
> * * * No member country shall purchase or acquire gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of its national currency in excess of the parity which corresponds to the value of its currency in terms of unitas and to the value of unitas in terms of gold; nor shall any member country sell or dispose of gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of its national currency below the parity which corresponds to the value of its currency in terms of unitas and to the value of unitas in terms of gold.

Clearly, there is implied here the power to regulate the value of our money, which the Constitution specifically vests in the Congress.

To control the price of gold, alter the exchange rates, and fix the values of currencies of practically the whole world is a sweep of power perhaps never before even imagined, must less contemplated. The power to regulate the exchange rate of the currency of a country is the power to control the amount of all its media of exchange. Ricardo recognized this more than a century and a quarter ago, when, in the classical debate on the gold bullion report in the House of Commons, he said:

> One principle was clear, it was of the utmost importance in the consideration of this subject; it was this, that those who had the

power of regulating the quantity of the circulating medium of the country had the power of regulating the rate of exchanges, and the price of every commodity.

Suppose this scheme had been in operation following World War No. 1. The circulation of Russian rubles increased from 17,577,900,000 in 1917, to 9,845,194,900,000 by 1921. In 1914 the exchange rate of the ruble with sterling was 9.5 rubles to the pound. By 1920 the exchange rate stood 10,000 rubles to the pound. The paper money circulation in Germany increased from 78,500,000,000 marks in 1921, to 496,000,000,000,000,000,000 marks in 1923. The exchange rate of the German mark reached a low in November 1923, when at Cologne it stood at 4,000,000,000,000 to the dollar. Will the promoters of this scheme tell us how it would have been possible to regulate the exchange rates of the Russian ruble and the German mark during that period without having taken over the printing presses of the governments of those countries?

They should also inform us how they would expect to handle the overflowing ocean of paper issues the government printing presses all over the world have been creating in the last decade. The note circulation in England increased from £371,200,000 in 1932 to £923,400,000 in 1942, an increase of 600 percent. The note circulation in Canada increased from $99,700,000 in 1932 to $693,600,000 in 1942, an incrase of 600 percent. The note circulation in France increased from 85,028,000,000 francs in 1932, to 382,774,000,000 francs in 1942, an increase of 350 percent. The note circulation in the Reichsbank increased from 3,560,000,000 marks in 1932, to 24,375,000,000 marks in 1942, an increase of 580 percent.

Paper currency in the United States—exclusive of gold certificates—increased from $4,205,000,000 in 1932, to $17,994,000,000 at the present time, an increase of more than 325 percent. Nor does this take into account the enormous volume of inflationary credit money that has been created through bank financing of government deficits, which in the United States alone amounts to $65,000,000,000.

Figures taken from the United States 1932 annual mint report show that the total amount of paper money—stated in the monetary unit of the issuing country—was 180,748,631,000. By 1941 this figure had reached the total of 516,060,336,000.

Stabilization of exchange rates comprehends the end of deficit financing, and encompasses balanced budgets. Every country, either by persuasion or by force, would be compelled to balance its budget. Would the Roosevelt administration stand for this?

The power sought by this scheme is the power to make the price of every day's labor, service, and commodity. It is the power to reduce the value of every dollar in circulation, in the banks, in War bonds, in insurance policies, in social security, and every pension dollar, and to make it worth 50 cents, 25 cents, or 5 cents.

It is the power to redistribute the wealth of the Nation to a degree equaling anything Russia ever experienced. Not only is it the power to redistribute the wealth of a country among its own people, but that of the world as well. It was stated with apparent approval by a Senator during the debate on the Thomas inflation amendment, which provided for devaluing the dollar, that this could cause a redistribution of wealth in the United States in the amount of $200,000,000,000.

The power to regulate the exchange rates is the power to destroy thrift, incentive, and all other social values.

Why should this administration try to involve the United States in a program which would hand over to an international body power to tinker with the value of our money? There is every reason why the United States should shy away completely from any further debasement of our money. Can it be that we have not suffered enough in the past 10 years by the experience we have already had in the devaluation of our currency? Is it possible the price we are paying in the Pacific Ocean is not yet great enough to bring us to our senses and make us realize the mistake that was made? Who can say by how much the hand of Japan was strengthened by the gratuitous benefit of our gold purchase program? Certain it is, the scrap steel, copper, oil, and so forth, which we shipped to her for her greatly overvalued gold, added effectively to her military might. Great Britain, with her colonies and dominions, unloaded more than $10,000,000,000 of gold onto the United States at a premium of $14.33 an ounce, from which they will suffer for a long time. The act of devaluing the dollar and setting a fixed price for gold, at which the Treasury purchased it, has, as all must know, brought about a great disequilibrium in the distribution among the nations of the gold supply, and along with it a plague upon the whole world.

Why in the face of all this harrowing experience, the administration should be thinking of vesting in an international body the power to further tinker with our money is difficult to understand. Now, especially, when our people are putting their money into War bonds, they certainly want no reduction in their value by any more foolery with the dollar, either by the Congress, or above all, by any international body. The Congress has just recently taken away from the President the power that had been given him to reduce the gold content of the dollar. Would Congress think of turning around and giving this power to an international body which would be responsible to nobody but itself?

POWER TO CONTROL THE PRICE OF GOLD

Section III–2 of the original draft shows unmistakable evidence of intent by the promoters of this scheme to acquire the power to control the price of gold, as shown by the following:

> To fix the rates at which it will buy and sell one member's currency for another, and the rates in local currencies at which it will buy and sell gold. * * * Changes in these rates shall be considered only when essential to correction of a fundamental disequilibrium and be permitted only with the approval of four-fifths of member votes.

Here is conclusive evidence of intent to acquire control of the price of gold.

The four-fifths vote requirement for changing the price of gold has no relation whatever to the intent. This section was stricken out in the administration's revised draft.

Next, the monetary unit, called unitas, which in the original draft consisted of a fixed and unalterable weight of gold, namely, 137½ grains, was changed in section III–1 of the revised draft. The change provides that the unitas shall be alterable. Here we see a reiteration of the intent to acquire the power to regulate the price of gold. To alter the value of unitas would change the price of gold in terms of local currency, since local currency would be valued in terms of unitas. Again the proviso requiring 85 percent of the member votes to alter the value of unitas has no effect on the intent.

Then we find in the revised draft some interesting language which has no counterpart in the administration's first draft but which seems to find its homologue in the British White Paper, as will be shown below. Section 6 (4), page 7, of the British White Paper, reads in part:

> Member states shall not purchase or acquire gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of their national currencies in excess of the parity which corresponds to the value of their currency in terms of bancor and to the value of bancor in terms of gold.

To which the British White Paper adds in the same paragraph these words:

> Their sales and purchases of gold shall not be otherwise restricted.

Section III–2 of the administration's revised draft reads in part:

> No member country shall purchase or acquire gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of its national currency in excess of the parity which corresponds to the value of its currency in terms of unitas and to the value of unitas in terms of gold.

Then in section 27 of the British White Paper we read some more lines which apparently our Treasury officials forgot to copy. The same read:

> The international bank-money which we have designated bancor is defined in terms of a weight of gold. Since the national currencies of the member states are given a defined exchange value in terms of bancor, it follows that they would each have a defined gold content which would be their official buying price for gold, above which they must not pay.

What does this all mean? It means that the operators of the scheme would have the power to control the world price of gold. This is denied by those promoting it. However, they freely admit the obvious that each nation would lose its control over the price of gold in its domestic economy, that, for example, the President would lose his authority to vary the price of gold which he now has under sections 8 and 9 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934.

Let it be noted that a specific provision prohibiting the scheme from altering the world price of gold is conspicuously absent.

Of course, we want to see the authority the President now has to manipulate

the price of gold taken from him, but we want that authority restored to its true depository—the Congress of the United States—and not handed over to an international body.

It seems very strange that President Roosevelt should be involved in a movement that would take from him that authority and hand it over to a foreign power.

THE SO-CALLED VETO POWER

When the scheme was announced last April, Mr. Morgenthau made much of what he called the veto power, which he said the United States would have over the other nations joining the plan. He took great pains to stress this point, told us we would have adequate voting strength, and solemnly assured us we would always be in full control. Much publicity was given to this statement of Mr. Morgenthau. Numerous writers on the subject were led to believe the United States would be in control of the project. But the public has been completely misled because an entirely false and distorted version of this so-called veto power has been given to it.

The administration's first draft contained six paragraphs relating to important parts of the scheme, each one of which required a four-fifths vote of member countries to make a decision. They related to capital transfers, borrowing in excess of permissible quotas, changes in contribution quotas, altering the value of member countries' currencies, fixing the rates of member countries' currencies at which the fund could buy and sell gold, and making provision for paying contributions. It contained another section limiting the percentage of basic votes any member country could have.

Apparently there had been a misunderstanding on the part of our officials—perhaps they had read Lord Keynes' blueprint wrong—so revision was necessary, which knocked just about all the pins from under this whole veto business. This was done in the first instance by changing the provision in section V–1 of the original draft which limited the votes any member country could have to 25 percent and making it 20 percent. Then it was done in the second instance by allotting to the United States 20 percent of the basic votes.

Two of the provisions referred to in the original draft were stricken out altogether. They were contained in section III–3–b, pertaining to exceeding borrowing quotas; and section II–5, making further provision toward meeting quota contributions.

Section III–2 in the original draft, relating particularly to the fixing of rates of member countries' currencies at which gold could be bought or sold, was changed in the revised draft by several greatly involved provisions—section III.

Section II–6 of the original draft was revised so as to require the consent of the country concerned before its quota could be raised, but it was left to a four-fifths vote to lower the quota of any member country.

The revised draft, section III–1, completely debauched the unitas provided for in section IV–1 in the original draft by substituting for it the British bancor, though retaining its name. The unitas was made alterable by a vote of 85 percent.

Section IV–2 in the original draft was changed from requiring a four-fifths vote to three-fourths, and a clause was added providing that no member country's currency could be altered except by the consent of the representative of the country concerned.

Since the Constitution vests in the Congress all power over our money, the provisions relating to making the unitas and the exchange value of our currency alterable are powers which could only be granted by an amendment to the Constitution.

Thus, we see only one provision left which has to do with this so-called veto power, namely, the one mentioned above relating to the increase or decrease of quotas.

We come now to an important part of this veto question. This relates to the assumption by the scheme of blocked war balances, that is, British debts.

Section V–8–j of the administration's revised draft reads as follows:

> The fund shall determine from time to time the maximum proportion of the blocked balances it will purchase under this provision, provided, however, that during the first 2 years of its operation, blocked balances purchased by the fund shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 percent of the quotas of all member countries. At the end of 2 years of operation the fund shall propose a plan for the gradual further liquidation of blocked balances still outstanding, indicating the proportion of the blocked balances which the board considers the fund can appropriately purchase.

As is seen no limit is placed on the amount of blocked balances that could be taken over at the expiration of the 2-year period. Why was this left to the discretion of the Board to be decided by a majority vote? As mentioned previously, $5,000,000,000 is involved in these balances. Why was not a veto provided here for the United States representative? Or was this a mere oversight?

INVISIBLE INCOME EXEMPTED FROM CONTROL

It is important to note that the scheme involves only trade in merchandise and excludes altogether invisible income. Here again the administration's draft adopts in toto, not expressly but by omitting to mention the subject, the suggestion made in the British White Paper, which is contained in section 38 and reads as follows:

> In any case it should be laid down that the members of the union would not allow or suffer among themselves any restrictions on the disposal of receipts arising out of current trade or invisible income.

Invisible income, receipts from shipping, foreign investments, insurance, and so forth, has for many years formed a large part of the foundation of Great Britain's economy. Why should this important part of her international transactions be exempted from the extensive economic controls the scheme would impose upon most of the other international transactions?

THE SUPERSTATE

Something should be said here about the other proposals contained in the scheme as embodied in the British White Paper. They comprehend far more than we have mentioned thus far. In the White Paper we read:

> The union might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world. * * *
>
> The union might set up a clearing account in favor of international bodies charged with post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. * * *
>
> The union might set up an account in favor of any supernational policing body which may be charged with the duty of preserving the peace and maintaining international order. * * * This would provide an excellent machinery for enforcing a financial blockade.
>
> The union might set up an account in favor of international bodies charged with the management of a commodity control.

And so forth. What really is proposed here is a world superstate, with Britain dominating. Lord Keynes has just left our shores for his home country after having been over here for several weeks holding many extended secret meetings with administration officials promoting this scheme and working out correlative proposals to perfect the world superstate projected in the British White Paper. While he was in Washington a proposal for another global lending agency was publicly announced by Mr. Morgenthau. The new proposal would set up an international bank with a capitalization of $10,000,000,000, the United States furnishing the capital, of course, with the borrowing countries in overwhelming control.

CONCLUSION

The formulation of the scheme has been a remarkable process. It would appear that the whole affair has been whimsically constructed on the most unpredictable, variable, and arbitrary factors imaginable. No part of it has any economic or historical basis.

First the quotas setting up the contributions were to be based on "a country's holdings of gold and foreign exchange, the magnitude of the fluctuations in its balance of international payments, and its national income."

Now that formula has been almost completely abandoned. A new and different one has been concocted which, so far as I can see, is a veritable hodgepodge. Under this latest model contribution quotas are to be based on national income, the holdings of gold and free foreign exchange, the average annual imports, the maximum variation in annual exports, and the sum of these is to be increased for each country by the percentage ratio of its average annual exports to its national income. Aside from the fact that this formula was developed in deference to the British, what possibly can be said in justification of any part of it?

The formula setting up the gold contributions is just as bizarre. Why one country should be required to contribute 50 percent of its quota in gold and others in varying amounts down to 22½ percent of their gold holdings would, it

seems to me, be unexplainable unless it were frankly admitted that the whole business is to be an eleemosynary affair.

No attempt is even made to establish a basis for determining the voting power of member countries. It is stated:

The distribution of basic voting power shall be closely related to the quotas of member countries, although not in precise proportion to the quotas. An appropriate distribution of basic voting power would seem to be the following: Each country shall have 100 votes plus 1 vote for the equivalent of each 100,000 unitas ($1,000,000 of its quota).

So the United States is given 20 percent of the votes. There is of course neither rhyme nor reason to this proposition. Why should the United States be required to contribute the bulk of the gold and have only 20 percent of the votes if this is not a plan to hand the control of our gold over to foreign countries?

How administration officials can contend that the United States would be given adequate protection in this scheme is difficult to understand. In asking the Congress to pass an act "to adopt appropriate legislation to carry out its undertakings to the fund" the promoters of this ingenious contrivance are simply asking for a free hand to bleed the United States white. It is idle to talk about writing safeguards into legislation that would protect our interests. An anomaly like this could not be controlled by statutory law.

But we are told that if it did not work we could withdraw from it. We are to believe it is something that could be started and stopped like a watch; tried out and if found ineffective abandoned to its own fate. But it just would not work that way. Once the scheme were in operation it would quickly generate forces that would make for self-perpetuation and expansion, as is the nature of all political machinery, and especially the political machinery that has been developing in the last 10 or 15 years. A whole congeries of "vested" international interests would quickly spring up and concurrently the protective mechanisms for maintaining them. The plan starts off with nonmaturing loans that could run into the billions, and other pecuniary contracts extending indefinitely into the future. Lend-lease started off with $7,000,000,000 and within 27 months reached the immeasurably high figure of more than $60,000,000,000.

It would not be our first contribution of gold per se that would impress the world, but, rather, who backs the program? It would be our total gold resources and our international record of integrity and trustworthiness that would, in the long run, be relied upon to make the scheme work. If it were known beforehand that the initial amount of gold contributed by the United States would be her only and last contribution, the united and associated nations' stabilization fund would get ready to close its doors on the same day it opened up for business, because if constituted as proposed, it would be wholly insolvent when it started, which every member country would know, and there would be a grand rush to divide up the dollars as quickly as possible. It is the stock pile of gold in reserve which the plan envisions that is the principal driving motive back of it. Should we ever become enmeshed in this scheme, we should be fully prepared to continue—to complete exhaustion—to pour our gold into the European bottomless pit of debt.

There should be no question in anyone's mind now why this scheme was born and reared in the darkest secrecy. It was conceived in the matrix of a British problem and is being nurtured and promoted to solve that problem. I can see in it no promise or hope for a single concrete good for our country. I see in it only a grave threat to our economy and to our national existence. I want to solemnly warn the Congress and my countrymen of this danger.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Did I understand the gentleman to say, in speaking of this bank, that the United States was to be asked to contribute its share in gold while the other nations were to be allowed to contribute their shares in some equivalent or on an equivalent value proportioned to the economy of the country and their internal resources?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I understand the gentleman's question to be with reference to the proportionate amounts of gold?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The amounts vary from 50 percent of the quotas contributed by the several countries down to 22½ percent of their gold holdings.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I shall be pleased to yield; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Vast powers have been delegated to the President by the Congress. The gentleman from Ohio did not vote for most of them—neither did I; nevertheless the President has them. Has the gentleman made a study to determine whether or not the President has powers delegated to him which would enable him to put this scheme into effect without the approval of the Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No. I know of no acts that have been passed which would make that possible.

TEXTUAL COMPARISONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S DRAFTS WITH THE SCHEME AS OUTLINED IN THE BRITISH WHITE PAPER

The following material has been so arranged as to show the similarity of the provisions in the administration's first and revised drafts as well as some changes that have been made in the revised draft with provisions contained in the British White Paper.

Note the similarity in language and substance of what the British plan calls the Objects of the Plan to what the Treasury experts call Purposes of the Fund, but note especially the reference made under each one of these headings to "blocked balances," as this relates to one of the main objectives of the scheme.

B–1. The British White Paper,[8] The Objects of the Plan, page 5, provides:

(a) We need an instrument of international currency having general acceptability between nations, so that blocked balances and bilateral clearings are unnecessary; * * *

(b) We need an orderly and agreed method of determining the relative exchange values of national currency units, so that unilateral action and competitive exchange depreciations are prevented.

(d) We need a system possessed of an internal stabilizing mechanism, by which pressure is exercised on any country whose balance of payments with the rest of the world is departing from equilibrium in either direction, so as to prevent movements which must create for its neighbours an equal but opposite want of balance.

A–1. Administration's revised draft,[9] Purposes of the Fund, page 2, provides:

1. To stabilize the foreign exchange rates of the currencies of the United Nations and the countries associated with them.

2. To shorten the periods and lessen the degree of disequilibrium in the international balance of payments of member countries.

3. To help create conditions under which the smooth flow of foreign trade and of productive capital among the member countries will be fostered.

4. To facilitate the effective utilization of the blocked foreign balances accumulating in some countries as a consequence of the war situation.

5. To reduce the use of such foreign exchange restrictions, bilateral clearing arrangements, multiple currency devices, and discriminatory foreign exchange practices as hamper world trade and the international flow of productive capital.

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY

British scheme for an international currency

B–2. British White Paper, section 4, provides:

The proposal is to establish a Currency Union, here designated an International Clearing Union, based on international bank-money, called (let us say) bancor, fixed (but not unalterably) in terms of gold and accepted as the equivalent of gold by the British Commonwealth and the United States and all the other members of the union for the purpose of settling international balances. The central banks of all member states (and also of nonmembers) would keep accounts with the International Clearing Union through which they would be entitled to settle their exchange balances with one another at their par value as defined in terms of bancor.

Administration's drafts for an international currency

A–2. Administration's first draft, section IV–1, provides:

The monetary unit of the fund shall be the unitas, consisting of 137½ grains of fine gold (equivalent to $10 United States). The accounts of the fund shall be kept and published in terms of unitas.

A–2–a. Administration's revised draft, section III–1, provides:

The monetary unit of the fund shall be the unitas equal in value to 137½ grains of fine gold (equivalent to $10 United States). No change in the gold value of the unitas

[8] For easy reference, the British White Paper excerpts on the following pages will be labeled with the initial "B."

[9] Excerpts from the administration's drafts will be labeled with the initial "A."

shall be made except with the approval of 85 percent of the member votes. * * *

The accounts of the fund shall be kept and published in terms of unitas.

A–2–b. Administration's first draft, section IV–2, provides:

The value of the currency of each member country shall be fixed by the fund in terms of gold or unitas and may not be altered by any member country without the approval of four-fifths of the member votes.

A–2–c. Administration's revised draft, sections III–2 and IV–5, provides:

The value of the currency of each member country shall be established in terms of unitas and may not be altered except as provided in IV–5, below. * * *

Changes in the exchange value of the currency of a member country shall be considered only when essential to the correction of fundamental disequilibrium in its balance of payments, and shall be made only with the approval of three-fourths of the member votes including the representative of the country concerned.

Because of the extreme uncertainties of the immediate post-war period, the following exceptional provisions may be used during the first 3 years of the fund's operations:

a. When the existing rate of exchange of a member country is clearly inconsistent with the maintenance of a balanced international payments position for that country, changes from the established rate may be made at the special request of that country and with the approval of a majority of the member votes.

b. A member country may change the established rate for its currency by not more than 10 percent provided that the member country shall notify the fund of its intention and shall consult with the fund on the advisability of its action.

It was here some writers cited what they believed to be a fundamental difference between the British monetary unit, the bancor, and the unitas proposed by the administration in its first draft. No doubt there was a basic difference. Under A–2 above, a unitas would actually have been the dollar by another name. But under A–2–a, unitas differs in kind from the first unitas, because of its alterableness. We see in this shift the adoption in whole by the administration of this sinister proposal.

CONTRIBUTORY QUOTAS

British scheme for determining quotas

B–3. British White Paper, section 6 (5), provides:

Each member state shall have assigned to it a quota, which shall determine the measure of its responsibility in the management of the union and of its right to enjoy the credit facilities provided by the union. The initial quotas might be fixed by reference to the sum of each country's exports and imports on the average of (say) the 3 pre-war years, and might be (say) 75 per cent. of this amount, a special assessment being substituted in cases (of which there might be several) where this formula would be, for any reason, inappropriate.

Administration's draft for determining quotas

A–3. Administration's first draft, section II–2, provides:

The quota for each member country shall be determined by an agreed-upon formula. The formula should give due weight to the important factors relevant to the determination of quotas, e. g., a country's holdings of gold and foreign exchange, the magnitude of the fluctuations in its balance of international payments, and its national income.

The administration's revised draft section II–4 is substantially the same as II–2 above, except that it says "free foreign exchange" instead of "foreign exchange," that it adds "etc." at the end of the paragraph, and also that it says "the magnitude and fluctuations of its balance of international payments" instead of "the magnitude of the fluctuations in its balance of international payments." Here was another place where writers claimed a difference existed between the British White Paper and the administration's draft. They claimed preponderance of control would go to Britain should its formula be adopted, and to the United States should the administration's proposal be adopted. But the changes made in the administration's revised draft opened the way to practically full adoption by the administration of a formula, as will be seen below, that substantially accomplishes the purpose of the British proposal, namely, less control for the United States and more for Britain.

In a letter written to me by the Treasury, dated October 2, 1943, in response to a request for the formula and factors forming the basis for computing the quotas of member countries, the following was furnished me:

(a) Two percent of the national income of 1940;

(b) Five percent of the holdings of gold and free foreign exchange as of July 1, 1943;

(c) Ten percent of average annual imports, 1934–38;

(d) Ten percent of maximum variation in annual exports, 1934–38;

(e) The sum of the above to be increased for each country by the percentage ratio of its average annual exports (1934–38) to its national income (1940).

ONE-WAY CONVERTIBILITY OF GOLD

B–4. British White Paper, section 6 (10), provides:

A member state shall be entitled to obtain a credit balance in terms of bancor by paying in gold to the clearing union for the credit of its clearing account. But no one is entitled to demand gold from the union against a balance of bancor, since such balance is available only for transfer to another clearing account.

A–4. Administration's first draft, section IV–3, provides:

Deposits in terms of unitas may be accepted by the fund from member countries upon the delivery of gold to the fund and shall be transferable and redeemable in gold or in the currency of any member country at the rate established by the fund. The fund shall maintain a 100-percent reserve in gold against all unitas deposits.

Here, also, writers saw a difference between the British White Paper and the administration's draft. Apparently two-way convertibility would have been compulsory under IV–3. But this section was stricken out in the administration's revised draft, and no provision was substituted for it. Thus, it would seem two-way convertibility would be optional with the scheme, which means, of course, there would be only one-way convertibility. So again we see the administration adopting in whole the British proposal.

PROVISIONS FOR LIMITING THE BORROWING CAPACITY OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

B–5. British White Paper, section 6 (8) (a), (b), and (c), provides:

A member state may not increase its debit balance by more than a quarter of its quota within a year without the permission of the governing board. * * *

Furthermore, the governing board may recommend to the government of the member state any internal measures affecting its domestic economy which may appear to be appropriate to restore the equilibrium of its international balance.

If a member state's debit balance has exceeded three-quarters of its quota on the average of at least a year and is excessive in the opinion of the governing board in relation to the total debit balances outstanding on the books of the clearing union, or is increasing at an excessive rate, it may, in addition, be asked by the governing board to take measures to improve its position, and, in the event of its failing to reduce its debit balance accordingly within 2 years, the governing board may declare that it is in default and no longer entitled to draw against its account except with the permission of the government board.

A–5. Administration's revised draft, section V–2–b, provides:

The fund's total holdings of the currency and securities of any member country shall not exceed the quota of such country by more than 50 percent during the first year of operation of the fund, and thereafter shall not exceed such quota by more than 100 percent (except as otherwise provided below). The total holdings thus permitted are termed the permissible quota of a country. When the fund's holdings of local currency and securities are equal to the permissible quota of a country, the fund may sell foreign exchange for such additional local currency only with the specific approval of the board of directors (see VI–3–a, below) and provided that at least one of the following two conditions is met:

i. In the judgment of the fund satisfactory measures are being or will be taken by the country whose currency is acquired by the fund, to correct the disequilibrium in the country's balance of payments; or

ii. It is believed that the balance of payments of the country whose currency is acquired by the fund will be such as to warrant the expectation that the excess currency holdings of the fund can be disposed of within a reasonable time.

GOLD COLLATERAL REQUIRED OF ANY MEMBER-COUNTRY WHOSE DEBIT BALANCE REACHES A CERTAIN SIZE

B–6. British White Paper, section 6 (8) (b), provides:

The governing board may require from a member state having a debit balance reaching a half of its quota the deposit of suitable collateral against its debit balance. Such collateral shall, at the discretion of the governing board, take the form of gold, foreign or domestic currency or government bonds, within the capacity of the member state.

A–6. Administration's revised draft, section V–2–c, provides:

When the fund's holdings of local currency and securities exceed the permissible quota of a country, the board may require the member country to deposit collateral in accordance with regulations prescribed by the board. Such collateral shall take the form

of gold, foreign or domestic currency or government bonds, or other suitable collateral within the capacity of the member country.

CONTROL OVER INTERNAL ECONOMIES

B–7. British White Paper, section 1 (d), The Objects of the Plan, provides:

We need a system possessed of an internal stabilizing mechanism, by which pressure is exercised on any country whose balance of payments with the rest of the world is departing from equilibrium in either direction, so as to prevent movements which must create for its neighbours an equal but opposite want of balance.

A–7. Administration's first draft, section III–8, provides:

In order to promote the most effective use of the available and accumulating supply of foreign exchange resources of member countries, each member country agrees that it will offer to sell to the fund, for its local currency or for foreign currencies which it needs, all foreign exchange and gold it acquires in excess of the amount it possessed immediately after joining the fund. For the purpose of this provision, including computations, only free foreign exchange and gold are considered. The fund may accept or reject the offer.

To help achieve this objective each member country agrees to discourage the unnecessary accumulation of foreign balances by its nationals. The fund shall inform any member country when, in its opinion, any further growth of privately-held foreign balances appears unwarranted.

A–7–a. Administration's revised draft, section V–2, provides the fund shall sell to—

the Treasury of any member country (or stabilization fund or central bank acting as its agent) at the accepted rate of exchange, currency of any member country which the fund holds, provided that * * *—

i. In the judgment of the fund satisfactory measures are being or will be taken by the country whose currency is acquired by the fund, to correct the disequilibrium in the country's balance of payments. * * *

A–7–b. Administration's revised draft, section V–2–d, provides:

When in the judgment of the fund a member country, whose currency and securities held by the fund exceed its quota, is exhausting its permissible quota more rapidly than is warranted, or is using its permissible quota in a manner that clearly has the effect of preventing or unduly delaying the establishment of a sound balance in its international accounts, the fund may place such conditions upon additional sales of foreign exchange to that country as it deems to be in the general interest of the fund.

A–7–c. Administration's revised draft, section V–6, provides:

In order to promote the most effective use of the available and accumulating supply of foreign exchange resources of member countries, each member country agrees that it will offer to sell to the fund, for its local currency or for foreign currencies which the member country needs, one-half of the foreign exchange resources and gold it acquires in excess of its official holdings at the time it became a member of the funds, but no country need sell gold or foreign exchange under this provision unless its official holdings (i. e., Treasury, Central Bank, Stabilization Fund, etc.) are in excess of 25 percent of its quota. For the purpose of this provision, only free and liquid foreign exchange resources and gold shall be considered. The fund may accept or reject the offer.

To help achieve this objective each member country agrees to discourage the excessive accumulation of foreign exchange resources and gold by its nationals. The fund shall inform any member country when, in its opinion, any further growth of privately held foreign exchange resources and gold appears unwarranted.

SURRENDER OF GOLD BY MEMBER COUNTRIES WHEN THEIR DEBIT BALANCES REACH A CERTAIN SIZE

B–8. British White Paper, section 6 (8) (b), provides:

The governing board may require from a member state having a debit balance reaching a half of its quota * * *

(iii) the outright surrender of a suitable proportion of any separate gold or other liquid reserve in reduction of its debit balance.

A–8. Administration's revised draft, section V–7, provides:

When the fund's holdings of the local currency and securities of a member country exceed the quota of that country the fund shall upon request of the member country, resell to the member country the fund's excess holdings of the currency of that country for gold or acceptable foreign exchange.

PROVIDING FOR THE ASSUMPTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF BRITISH DEBTS

B–9. British White Paper, The Objects of the Plan, (a), and section 34, provides:

We need an instrument of international currency having general acceptability between nations so that blocked balances and bilateral clearings are unnecessary: * * *

The position of abnormal balances in overseas ownership held in various countries at the end of the war presents a problem of considerable importance and special difficulty. A country in which a large volume of such balances is held could not, unless it is in a creditor position, afford the risk of having to redeem them in bancor on a substantial scale if this would have the effect of depleting its bancor resources at the outset. At the same time, it is very desirable that the countries owning these balances should be able to regard them as liquid, at any rate over and above the amounts which they can afford to lock up under an agreed programme of funding or long-term expenditure. Perhaps there should be some special over-riding provision for dealing with the transitional period only by which, through the aid of the clearing union, such balances would remain liquid and convertible into bancor by the creditor country whilst there would be no corresponding strain on the bancor resources of the debtor country, or, at any rate, the resulting strain would be spread over a period.

A–9. Administration's revised draft, section V–8, provides:

To buy from the governments of member countries, blocked foreign balances held in other member countries, provided all the following conditions are met:

a. The blocked balances are held in member countries and are reported as such (for the purpose of this provision) by the member governments and are verified by the fund.

b. The member country selling the blocked balances to the fund agrees to transfer these balances to the fund and to repurchase from the fund 40 percent of them (at the same price) with gold or such free currencies as the fund may wish to accept, at the rate of 2 percent of the transferred balances each year for 20 years beginning not later than 3 years after the date of transfer.

c. The country in which the blocked balances are held agrees to transfer to the fund the balances described in (b) above, and to repurchase from the fund 40 percent of them (at the same price) with gold or such free currencies as the fund may wish to accept, at the rate of 2 percent of the transferred balances each year for 20 years beginning not later than 3 years after the date of transfer.

d. A charge of 1 percent on the amount of blocked balances sold to the fund, payable in gold, shall be levied against the country selling its blocked balances and against the country in which the balances are held. In addition a charge of not less than 1 percent, payable in gold, shall be levied annually against each country on the amount of such balances remaining to be purchased by it.

e. If the country selling blocked balances to the fund asks for foreign exchange rather than local currency, the request will not be granted unless the country needs the foreign exchange for the purpose of meeting an adverse balance of payments not arising from the acquisition of gold, the accumulation of foreign balances, or other capital transactions.

f. Either country may, at its option, increase the amount it repurchases annually. But, in the case of the country selling blocked balances to the fund, not more than 2 percent per annum of the original sum taken over by the fund shall become free, and only after 3 years shall have elapsed since the sale of the balances to the fund.

g. The fund has the privilege of disposing of any of its holdings of blocked balances as free funds after the 23-year period is passed, or sooner under the following conditions:

i. its holdings of the free funds of the country in which the balances are held fall below 20 percent of its quota; or

ii. the approval is obtained of the country in which the balances are held.

h. The country in which the blocked balances are held agrees not to impose any restrictions on the use of the installments of the 40-percent portion gradually repurchased by the country which sold the balances to the fund.

i. The fund agrees not to sell the blocked balances acquired under the above authority, except with the permission or at the request of the country in which the balances are being held. The fund may invest these balances in the ordinary or special government securities of that country. The fund shall be free to sell such securities in any country under the provisions of V–11, below.

j. The fund shall determine from time to time the maximum proportion of the blocked balances it will purchase under this provision, provided, however, that during the first 2 years of its operation, blocked balances purchased by the fund shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 percent of the quotas of all member countries. At the end of 2 years of operation, the fund shall propose a plan for the gradual further liquidation of blocked balances still outstanding indicating the proportion of the blocked balances which the Board considers the fund can appropriately purchase.

Blocked balances acquired under this provision shall not be included either in computing the amount of foreign exchange available to member countries under their quotas (V–2, 3), or in computing charges on balances of local currency in excess of the quotas (V–14).

As noted heretofore, the United States has no blocked balances, and also as stated previously, Lord Keynes undoubtedly wrote every word in this section. The section is given in full because of its importance.

PENALTY ON EXCESS OF DEBIT BALANCE

B–10. British White Paper, section 6 (7), provides:

A member state shall pay to the reserve fund of the clearing union a charge of 1 per cent. per annum on the amount of its average balance in bancor, whether it is a credit or

a debit balance, in excess of a quarter of its quota; and a further charge of 1 per cent. on its average balance, whether credit or debit, in excess of half of its quota.

A–10. Administration's revised draft, section V–14, provides:

To make a service charge on all gold and exchange transactions.

To levy a charge uniform to all countries, at a rate not less than 1 percent per annum, payable in gold against any country on the amount of its currency held by the fund in excess of the quota of that country. An additional charge, payable in gold, shall be levied by the fund against any member country on the fund's holdings of its currency in excess of the permissible quota of that country.

It will be seen here the administration has not, at least, not yet, gone all the way with the British on this point. The British would penalize excessive credit balances as well as excessive debit balances. The administration would penalize excessive debit balances only. But the administration's revised draft, section V–6, quoted under A–7–c, above, shows the administration favors restricting the size of credit balances by indirect means.

PROVISION FOR OPERATING ONLY THROUGH POLITICAL OR SEMIPOLITICAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

B–11. British White Paper, under the objects of the plan, provides:

We need an instrument of international currency * * * operating through whatever national organ, such as a treasury or a central bank, is most appropriate, private individuals, businesses, and banks other than central banks, each continuing to use their own national currency as heretofore.

A–11. Administration's revised draft, section V–16, provides:

The fund shall deal only with or through—

a. The treasuries, stabilization funds, or central banks acting as fiscal agents of member governments;

b. Any international banks owned predominantly by member governments.

The fund may, nevertheless, with the approval of the representative of the government of the country concerned, sell its own securities, or securities it holds, directly to the public or to institutions of member countries.

CONTROL OVER EXCHANGE VALUE OF MEMBER COUNTRIES' CURRENCIES

B–12. British White Paper, section 6 (3), provides:

The member states will agree between themselves the initial values of their own currencies in terms of bancor. A member state may not subsequently alter the value of its currency in terms of bancor without the permission of the governing board except under the conditions stated below; but during the first 5 years after the inception of the system the governing board shall give special consideration to appeals for an adjustment in the exchange value of a national currency unit on the ground of unforeseen circumstances.

A–12. Administration's revised draft, section IV–5, provides:

Changes in the exchange value of the currency of a member country shall be considered only when essential to the correction of fundamental disequilibrium in its balance of payments, and shall be made only with the approval of three-fourths of the member votes including the representative of the country concerned.

POWER TO CONTROL PRICE OF GOLD

Note how the administration in its revised draft copies practically word for word the forepart of an important paragraph in the British White Paper.

B–13. British White Paper, section 6 (4), provides:

Member states shall not purchase or acquire gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of their national currencies in excess of the parity which corresponds to the value of their currency in terms of bancor and to the value of bancor in terms of gold. Their sales and purchases of gold shall not be otherwise restricted.

A–13. Administration's revised draft, section III–2, provides:

No member country shall purchase or acquire gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of its national currency in excess of the parity which corresponds to the value of its currency in term of unitas and to the value of unitas in terms of gold; nor shall any member country sell or dispose of gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of its national currency below the parity which corresponds to the value of its currency in terms of unitas and to the value of unitas in terms of gold.

This is one of the basic sections of the scheme since it involves control of the price of gold.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

B–14. British White Paper, section 6 (8) (c), provides:

If a member state's debit balance has exceeded three-quarters of its quota on the average of at least a year and is excessive in the opinion of the governing board in relation to the total debit balances outstanding on the books of the clearing union, or is increasing at an excessive rate, it may, in addition, be asked by the governing board to take measures to improve its position, and, in the event of its failing to reduce its debit balance accordingly within 2 years, the governing board may declare that it is in default and no longer entitled to draw against its account except with the permission of the governing board.

A–14. Administration's revised draft, section VI–11, provides:

A country failing to meet its obligations to the fund may be suspended provided a majority of the member countries so decides. While under suspension, the country shall be denied the privileges of membership but shall be subject to the same obligations as any other member of the fund. At the end of 1 year the country shall be automatically dropped from membership unless it has been restored to good standing by a majority of the member countries.

WITHDRAWAL PRIVILEGE

B–15. British White Paper, section 6 (16), provides:

Members shall be entitled to withdraw from the union on a year's notice, subject to their making satisfactory arrangements to discharge any debit balance. They would not, of course, be able to employ any credit balance except by making transfers from it, either before or after their withdrawal, to the clearing accounts of other central banks. Similarly, it should be within the power of the governing board to require the withdrawal of a member, subject to the same notice, if the latter is in breach of agreements relating to the clearing union.

A–15. Administration's revised draft, section VI–11, provides:

Any country may withdraw from the fund by giving notice, and its withdrawal will take effect 1 year from the date of such notice. During the interval between notice of withdrawal and the taking effect of the notice, such country shall be subject to the same obligations as any other member of the fund.

CONTROL OF CAPITAL TRANSFERS

B–16. British White Paper, section 6 (8) (b), provides:

As a condition of allowing a member state to increase its debit balance to a figure in excess of a half of its quota, the governing board may require all or any of the following measures: * * *

(ii) the control of outward capital transactions if not already in force.

A–16. Administrations' revised draft, section V–3, provides:

The fund may sell foreign exchange to a member country, under conditions prescribed by the fund, to facilitate a transfer of capital, or repayment or adjustment of foreign debts, when in the judgment of the board such a transfer is desirable from the point of view of the general international economic situation, provided the fund's holdings of the currency and securities of the member country do not exceed 150 percent of the quota of that country. When the fund's holdings of the local currency and securities of a member country exceed 150 percent of the quota of that country, the fund may, in exceptional circumstances, sell foreign exchange to the member country for the above purposes with the approval of three-fourths of the member votes.

PROVISION FOR LIMITING CONTROL BY ANY COUNTRY

B–17. British White Paper, section (3), preface, provides:

Management of the institution must be genuinely international, without preponderant power of veto or enforcement lying with any country or group. And the rights and privileges of smaller countries must be safeguarded.

A–17. Administration's first draft, section V–1, provides:

Notwithstanding the approved formula for distributing voting power, no country shall be entitled to cast more than one-fourth of the aggregate votes regardless of its quota. All decisions, except where specifically provided otherwise, shall be made by a majority of the member votes.

A–17–a. Administration's revised draft, section VI–2, provides:

No country shall be entitled to cast more than one-fifth of the aggregate basic votes, regardless of its quota.

Here, again, the administration substantially adopted the British proposal.

The following is a partial list of reference reading in connection with the analysis of the British scheme:

I. OFFICIAL TEXTS

Preliminary Draft Outline of a Proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund. Treasury Department release, April 6, 1943. Also published in full in Federal Reserve Bulletin, June 1943, pages 501–520.

Preliminary Draft Outline of a Proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund. Treasury Department release, revised draft, July 10, 1943.

International Clearing Union, Text of a Paper Containing Proposals by British Experts for an International Clearing Union. British Information Services, April 8, 1943.

II. ARTICLES

A Bank of International Cooperation: A World R. F. C. The Commercial and Finan-

cial Chronicle, July 22, 1943, volume 158, page 314.

A Commodity Reserve Currency. The Economist (London), September 11, 1943, pages 273–274.

Aldrich, Winthrop W. The Problem of Post-War Monetary Stabilization. Address before American Section, International Chamber of Commerce, New York, April 29, 1943. Reprinted.

Anderson, Benjamin M. Post-War Stabilization of Foreign Exchange—The Keynes-Morgenthau Plan Condemned—Outline of a Fundamental Solution. The Economic Bulletin (Los Angeles, Capital Research Co.), May 11, 1943, volume IV, No. 1.

Anderson, Thomas J., Post-war Currency Stabilization Propaganda. Conference Board Economic Record, May 1943, volume 5, pages 138–148.

Anderson, Thomas J., International Currency Proposals. Discussion and appraisal. Conference Board Economic Record, June 1943, volume 5, pages 165–172.

Britain's War Debts. The Economist (London), August 7, 1943, pages 180–181.

The British and American Proposals for Exchange Stabilization. Review of the River Plate, May 14–21, 1943, page 13.

The British Budget and War Finance. International Labour Review (Montreal), August 1942, volume 46, pages 179–181.

British Overseas Investments. The Economist (London), September 11, 1943, page 372.

Chicago Tribune, September 23, 1943.

Collingwood, G. B. Allies Shape World Recovery; Keynes and White Plans for Currency Stabilization Compared. Magazine of Wall Street, April 17, 1943, volume 72, page 21.

Comstock, A. V-Money Plans. Current History, June 1943, volume 4 (new series), pages 254–255.

Conflicts in World Currency Planning. Economic Notes, May 1943, pages 1–3.

Cox, George Clarke. Real Currencies in a Real World; American Dollar Likely to Serve as International Money After the War. Barron's, May 17, 1943, page 6.

Cripps, L. H. The Currency Plans. Great Britain and the East (London), April 17, 1943, volume 59.

Currency Alone. Statist (London), May 29, 1943, volume 140, pages 396–397.

The Currency Plans. The Economist (London), May 1, 1943, volume 144, pages 556–558.

de Bernales, C. Personal communication, April 20, 1943.

Dewey, Charles S. A Bank of International Cooperation: A World R. F. C. The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, June 24, 1943. Reprinted.

Drucker, Peter F. Keynes, White, and Postwar Currency.

Economic Equipoise: British and American Plans for Stability of Exchanges. The Economist (London), April 10, 1943, volume 144, pages 452–453.

Einzig, Paul. The American Plan: Proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund; the British Plan: Proposals for an International Clearing Union; Keynes Plan and White Plan: A Compromise. Banker (London), May 1943, volume 66, pp. 199–204.

Einzig, Paul. The Currency Controversy. Banker (London), June 1943, volume 66, pages 153–155.

Einzig, Paul. Multilateral Clearing. Banker (London), April 1943, volume 66, pages 9–12.

The Evening Sun, Baltimore, May 12, 1941.

Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1940; June, August, September, 1943.

Fisher, A. G. B. Some Reflections on International Monetary Organization. Institute of Bankers Journal, July 1943, volume 64, pages 112–126.

Gold Quotas Under White Scheme. The Economist (London), August 28, 1943, page 278.

Hays, Samuel. Post-War Currency Plans. Accountants Magazine, July 1943, volume 47, pages 244–249.

Inter-Allied Currency Talks. Banker (London), April 1943, volume 66, pages 6–8.

The International Currency Debate. Statist (London), May 15, 1943, volume 140, pages 350–351.

Jack, L. B. Proposals for International Exchange Stabilization. Analysis of British, Canadian, French, and United States Plans. International Labour Review (Montreal), volume 48, No. 2, pages 157–173, August 1943.

Johnston, J. H. C. The Concert of the Currencies. Statist (London), June 19, 1943, volume 140, pages 454–455.

Keynes Proposes International Currency Union, Based on Bancor. Commercial and Financial Chronicle, April 15, 1943, volume 157, pages 1388–1389.

Labor Research, London, June 1943.

Leon, Rene. On the Treasury's Plan for the Stabilization of Currencies. Commercial and Financial Chronicle, May 13, 1943, volume 157, page 1756.

Marget, Arthur W. Commentary on Dr. B. M. Anderson's Analysis of Keynes and Morgenthau Stabilization Plans. Commercial and Financial Chronicle, June 3, 1943, volume 157, page 2065.

Michell, H. Monetary Reconstruction. Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, volume 8, No. 3, August 1942.

New York Times, May 13, 1941.

New York World-Telegram, May 9, 1941.

Neylan, John Francis. A Study of Plan by Lord John Maynard Keynes for International Clearing Union. San Francisco, 1943.

Palyi, Dr. Melchior. A Tentative International Monetary Stabilization Plan. Reprinted from Commercial and Financial Chronicle, August 12, 1943.

Palyi, Dr. Melchior. Some Implications of the Keynes-Morgenthau International Clearing Pool. Reprinted from Great Lakes Banker, July 1943, pages 2–4.

Parliamentary Debates from the Year 1803 to the Present Time. (London, 1819), page 746.

Peace Bank; Five Billion Dollar Fund to Manipulate All Trade Balances. Business Week, April 19, 1943, page 100.

Place of the United States in the Post-War Economy. Report by the Economic Policy Commission. American Bankers Association, September 1, 1943.

Plans for World Currency Stabilization. Guaranty Survey, May 27, 1943, pages 1–4.

The Political Consequences of Lord Keynes. Fabian Quarterly (London), July 1943, pages 13–19.

Post-War Currency. The Economist (London), August 28, 1943, pages 261–262.

Post-War International Exchange. Accountant (London), April 17, 1943, volume 108, pages 193–195, 205–206 221–223.

Post-War International Finance. Statist (London) April 10, 1943, page 262.

Post-War International Finances—II. Statist (London) April 17, 1943, pages 283–284.

Post-War International Finances, Statist (London), March 20, 1943, pages 198–199.

Post-War Money. Nation, April 14, 1943, volume 158, pages 545–546.

The Problem of Stabilization. The Economist (London), September 11, 1943, page 374.

Revised United States Currency Plan. The Economist (London), September 4, 1943, page 343.

Riddle, J. H. British and American Plans for International Currency Stabilization, May 26, 1943. (Preliminary draft). Mimeographed.

Sherman, Harry. The Promises Men Live By, page 351. Random House, New York.

Soule, G. Bancor or Unitas? An International Currency, What Sort and Why. New Republic, May 3, 1943, volume 108, pages 588–590.

Taylor, Amos E. The Need for a "Settler" of Balances in International Payments. Monetary Standards Inquiry, New York.

Through a Glass, Darkly. Statist (London), April 9, 1943, pages 261–262.

Treasury Department letter to me dated October 2, 1943.

Treasury Plan for Stabilizing Currency of United Nations Outlined by Morgenthau. Commercial and Financial Chronicle, April 8, 1943, volume 157, pages 1300, 1303.

Tresckow, W. Von. Jobs at Stake in World Trade Plans; Difference Between American and British Proposals. Barron's, May 3, 1943, volume 23, page 3.

Two Plans for International Credit: The British Plan; The American Plan. Labour (London), May 1943, volume 5, pages 262–266.

Times-Herald, Washington, May 13, 1943.

Unitas and Bancor: Two Plans of International Payment. Round Table No. 131, June 1943, pages 225–228.

Unity Needs More than Unitas or Bancor. Business Week, April 17, 1943, page 120.

Viner, Jacob. Two Plans for International Monetary Stabilization. Reprinted from Yale Review by Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, New York (1943).

Washington Daily News, May 12, 14, 15, 1941.

The Washington Post, May 13, 1941.

War Debts. The Economist (London), September 11, 1943, pages 361–362.

Watson, Sir Alfred. White Paper and White Plan. Great Britain and the East. (London), April 17, 1943, volume 59, pages 11–13.

Whidden, H. P., Jr. United States and British Plan Currency Stabilization to Aid World Trade. Foreign Policy Bulletin, April 16, 1943, p. 1–2.

Williams, John H. Currency Stabilization, The Keynes and White Plans. Foreign Affairs, July 1943, volume 221, pages 645–658.

The World Bank Proposals: Bancor or Unitas. Fortune, August 1943, pages 138–139.

Wynne C. M. What a Practical Foreign Trader Thinks About a New International Currency. Export Trade and Shipper, April 26, 1943, pages 3–5.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may again speak for 20 minutes on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the President's message which this Congress has just heard is interesting and brings into focus the extremely important subject of subsidies. There were many things in the speech that perhaps should have comment, but, in my opinion, these should wait for formal comment, perhaps by a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and certainly until the Congress has had time to read the speech more carefully. I did notice at one point in the President's speech that he said the difficulties with which agriculture has been perplexed and by which it has been handicapped include lack of manpower, lack of machinery, and lack of fertilizer, but in spite of that

a very optimistic hope was held out for next year.

I would like to add to that, a lack of confidence on the part of the farmer, and a lack of simplicity in the regulations which have perplexed him. I do want to call attention to the fact that all these are things which have a cumulative effect. If the farmer does not have machinery this year, if he does not have fertilizer this year, then there is an increasing doubt as to his ability to produce in succeeding seasons. I also want to point out that we have had, as a result of the present administrative food program, black markets in connection with commodities for the first time in the history of those commodities.

The other things to which I want to refer, and I want it understood I say this jokingly because I have not read the speech, is the part of the message in which the President said that the farmer is making more money than he has ever made for 30 years, while at the same time the farm population had been reduced 50 percent. In other words, the farmer is making so much money today that the coming generation, in the rural areas, does not wish to stay on the farm.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explore a little further today this matter of subsidies, and in particular I want to explore the application of subsidies to the present food situation in the United States, and to draw from that some conclusion as to what might happen upon the collapse of the present war economy. Last Wednesday, in the very brief time for which I asked, I tried to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there was nothing new about subsidies, that they have been tried over and over, and that they have never been successful when applied as they are applied today; and I want it distinctly understood that no Member of Congress I know of, certainly no member of the Committee on Agriculture, has ever said that that Member, or that the Congress, does not approve of subsidies. The difficulty at the moment with those of us who are not in favor of the present administrative policy is that we do not approve of the technique of application, and we have history back of us to support us.

I am very glad to see that the gentleman from Texas is here and will follow me. On page 8818 of the RECORD of October 27 the gentleman said 10 times something to the effect, "Our Republican friends want to increase the cost of living," or "We are advocating inflation"—that is, those who oppose the subsidy program—or "You are advocating a race toward inflation; you are advocating increasing the cost of living." Statements like that, I submit, Mr. Speaker, would be injudicious in time of peace. In time of war, when we are in a very confused state of mind, I think they are reprehensible, and I think I should categorically answer them now so that they may be made a matter of record. I will state them as questions, Mr. Speaker; then I will give the answers:

Question: Are the Republican Members of Congress making an effort to increase the cost of living?

No; they are not; neither the Republican Members nor the Democratic Members, nor the members of the Committee on Agriculture nor the representatives of the agricultural areas.

Question: Is anyone, to my knowledge, "making a fight to increase the cost of living"?

I do not know of anyone, neither any individual nor any group, nor any party. I consider that a ridiculous question.

Question: Are the people who oppose the present subsidy idea trying to increase the cost of living and destroy the only guide we have to hold prices?

I do not know what the question means, but I do know that those Members of Congress with whom I have talked, and who are opposed to the present application of the subsidy idea, have no desire at all to remove control over prices at the present time. We have, however, a strong desire to substitute a simpler and more satisfactory method of control for the present confusion. There are people in the United States, some of whom support the President's subsidy program, perhaps mistakenly, who believe that because we have a very complicated situation in the United States we must of necessity have a very complicated solution. I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress who will say on this floor that the present regulatory methods, as applied to food today in the United States, are successful.

Question: Do the Republican Members of the House want inflation?

I know the Republican Members do not and I certainly would think the Democratic Members would not, with an election coming up in 1944. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that I think all of us who are opposed to subsidies under the present program, are opposed because we do understand inflation and because we fear inflation terribly. We do know that inflation will wipe out the middle class, to which most of us belong. It is the middle class, Mr. Speaker, which distinguishes the United States of America from every nation in the world. So I wish it could be possible on this floor that we might explore the problem sincerely, and I hope intelligently, and avoid all these extraneous comments and statements that have come into the discussion.

I want first of all to explode the idea that subsidies save anybody any money, whether the taxpayer or the consumer. Under the intelligent regulation of food in wartime the producer would be guaranteed the cost of production and with the fewest possible regulations. The flow of food and the cost of the food would then be controlled between the producer and the consumer, not necessarily item by item but in the same way it was controlled in the last war, by the bulk of consumption and the bulk of handling by these middlemen.

There are many of us who think that under an intelligent control, a substitute for the present immature, inefficient, highly theoretical, and somewhat prejudiced control, the consumer would pay less for the commodity than he or she is compelled to pay now, under a combination of O. P. A. and other regulations. I submit in defense of that statement that oranges, which you may say are a luxury item, would be less to the consumer if it were not for the O. P.A. than they are today. Potatoes would be less. I recited some time ago that the O. P. A. regulations on potatoes made the price 7.3 cents a pound. Had there been no O. P. A. regulations the price to the consumer would have been 5.5 cents a pound. I think that applies to meat, but I would prefer some of the gentlemen from the meat areas to say that instead of myself.

I do not think it applies to milk, because I do think it would be necessary, in some areas, to raise the price of milk perhaps a cent a quart; but which is better for the consumer, to go into the store and be able to get a quart of milk at a cent increase, or to go into the store and have the grocer tell her, "I am sorry, madam, we have been able to hold the line and keep down the price of milk, but I have no milk to sell you"?

It was said on this floor the other day that the only milkshed in which there is a supply of milk adequate for the demand is the Chicago milkshed, and that is the only milkshed in which the price of the milk to the consumer, so this statement in the RECORD reads, has been raised.

In California, where we have a great production of milk, we are 20,000 gallons short every day in the San Francisco market, 18,000 gallons short every day in the San Diego market, and approximately 12,000 gallons short every day in the Los Angeles market, and this does not include our inability to supply the troop ships which leave the harbors on the west coast and which would like to take with them fresh milk.

Let me ask you this question, and I ask it very sincerely: Where is there any saving when we may tell the consumer that we have saved a cent on a quart of milk and then turn around and charge him 90 cents for a melon, which is about three times what it ought to be? I suppose we are not to consider melons necessary, but if you like melons, then on one melon you have lost the savings on 60 quarts of milk. It just does not sound intelligent to me.

The subsidy is not a producer subsidy, it is a consumer subsidy. The President today called it, I observed, a "war subsidy," but it is a consumer subsidy, because the Government is saying hopefully to the consumer that the price is to be held down in spite of the marketing cost, in spite of the increasing wages to farm labor, in spite of the increasing wages to consumers, and in spite of O. P. A. requirements that give the processor more than he ever got and certainly more than he expected to get in wartime.

So, having placed the consumer in this somewhat dazed condition by the dazzling idea that the price of foodstuffs in the retail stores is not to be raised, then the Government says to the consumer in a very low voice, "We are going to take the money from you to pay for this sav-

ing we made to you. We are going to take it in taxes."

Mr. Speaker, who pays the taxes? Have we sat in this House all this year and listened to the arguments on the income tax and other taxes and not known by this time that the middle class pays the taxes, the very people to whom this dazzling mirage is being shown? Of course they pay for it. Furthermore, they not only pay for it, but they have to pay a commission in order to pay it; that is, they themselves must pay the commission. In the 5-cent subsidy on butter—and I wish it understood that I have not checked these figures—it has been said to me that it is costing the processor about a cent a pound in order to do the work required by the Government to keep the records. From experience, I certainly think it is going to cost the Government something, because I have found few things yet that the Government did that did not cost the taxpayer more than the taxpayer would have paid to do them for himself.

The very rich pay a share of the taxes. They can afford to pay it. The very poor pay comparatively little in taxes. The middle class carry the load.

Worse than that, Mr. Speaker, when the soldier comes back, having served his country, and perhaps when he goes upon a pension because of injuries which will keep him forever from productive labor, the supporters of the subsidy idea will be standing at his door saying, "We have a bill for the savings we made on food when you were away from the United States. We would like to collect it from you."

But, Mr. Speaker, we hear that we must control inflation. Of course, we must control inflation. The danger is inflation. We do not want inflation.

The difference in opinion lies, I think, in what causes inflation, and I say that inflation is caused by a lack of production.

My contention today is that the food administration program, applied as it is applied today in the United States, is the best invitation to inflation the United States has ever known. I do not say, and I do not want to imply, that the subsidy program alone will produce inflation. That is not true. But I do say that the subsidy program is one factor in a peculiar and unfortunate set of circumstances which represent a tragic invitation to inflation in the course of the next 3 or 4 years.

To illustrate what I mean, may I again, with the permission of the gentleman from Texas, quote from his article in the RECORD of October 27. Referring to the last war, he said:

> We paid 30 cents a pound for sugar instead of less than 7 cents a pounds as the price is today. The price of sugar has not increased 1 penny in this war. Furthermore, we paid more than 90 cents a pound for coffee during the First World War while we are paying less than 30 cents a pound today.

I do not know what kind of coffee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] likes. He may like some special brand of coffee, but certainly the Department of Labor has no knowledge of these figures as stated on the floor by the gentleman from Texas. In April 1917, when the United States entered the war, sugar was selling for 9.5 cents a pound, and during the period the United States was in the war, the price rose to 10.5 cents a pound. The average price for 1918 was 9.7 cents per pound, and the average price for 1919 was 11.5 cents. The average price for 1920 was 26.7 cents—27 cents. Keep that in mind, because I am coming back to it in a moment. That was the high time of inflationary trend in the United States. I am willing to admit that the price was high. I am not quarreling with the gentleman on that point. If the gentleman says it was 30 cents and I say the record shows 27 cents, I am not going to quarrel with him, and will say it was 30 cents.

Sugar is something that maintains a pretty equal price all over the United States. But take coffee; I drink very little coffee myself, and so long as tea stays down I can be perfectly happy. The base price of coffee was 30 cents, and the average price of coffee did not make much change. In the base month coffee was 30 cents a pound. In April 1917, it had risen one-tenth of a cent per pound.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Possibly we had better get our definitions straightened out. When was the last war over? The war was officially over July 2, 1921.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I shall come to that in a moment. The highest price recorded by the Bureau for coffee was in the summer of 1920, which I think is the gentleman's point, when it went up to 49 cents a pound. If there were 90-cent coffee and the average was 50, then somebody was buying coffee for a lot less than 50 cents a pound in order to produce that average. One of the difficulties we all have, and I admit it, is the difficulty that the gentleman points out. If we take 1913 as 100 percent as the Bureau does, and then take the end of the war as 1919 or 1921, whatever you wish, then we must be very careful when we take this war's comparable figures, because by the time we entered War No. 1 in 1917 the price index was up to 151, and if, as I contended, the comparable place for the end of the war was in 1920, we will say, then to make this brief, the actual increase in cost, in comparable figures, under the last war's type of administration, was 23 percent, and in this war, under comparable figures, was 40 percent. So I say that the worst thing that can be said about this dream food program from the other end of the Avenue is that it does not work.

There are two things that I would like to call attention to, and next Monday I intend to conclude this "serial" talk on the subject of subsidies, by presenting what I think should be the practical changes. It does not amount to very much when I say something is wrong with subsidies, or if the gentleman from Texas says something is right or wrong. The attempt ought to be in a crisis like this to correct what we believe to be the trouble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GRANGER). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As I figure it, Mr. Speaker, I have used only 16 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then I merely suggest that the clock does not agree with the official timepiece. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more, in which to finish this thought.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is very kind, because I was following that clock. If we who question the program are right, this is what we think, that when this war ends there will be a collapse of our present economy and that is when the people of the United States will say that they will no longer submit themselves to the very rigorous constraint under which they are now held, and that is when the danger of inflation will come. That being so, who will be short of food? Will it be the farmer, or will it be the consumer in the city who will be short? Is the farmer going to deliver nine and a half eggs out of a dozen to the city and keep two and a half eggs himself? Or is the farmer going to take what his family needs and deliver the rest to the consumer?

It would be better for the Members of Congress who sincerely consider this a dangerous situation, and for the representatives of the administrative agencies, instead of trying to stir up pressure groups and get possible votes in the 1944 election, or use a crystal ball, to try honestly to figure out what is going to happen when the war ends and what we can do about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the other special orders I may be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPUBLICANS ATTEMPT TO RAISE THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. PATMAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert as a separate part of my address today a statement about the country of Greece.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], I feel reasonably certain, was mistaken about what the President said regarding the farm population. The way I understood the message, and I am sure the message will bear me out, it stated that the farm population has remained stable; has not increased at all; has remained practically the same during the last 30 years. There are many things

I could say about the gentleman's speech, but I am not necessarily taking this time to answer the gentleman. I want to talk on the general subject of subsidies.

SUBSIDIES

When the Committee on Banking and Currency first met to pass upon this question—and it is an important one—I was opposed to subsidies. I felt that we could increase prices here and there and not have subsidies. It was a lot of trouble; it involved a lot of paper work; there were a lot of things connected with it that we do not like, so why not increase prices? I listened to testimony from day to day. I read everything I could find on the subject. In the course of a month I was convinced that subsidies was the only way—and I now ask any person to challenge this statement if it is not right—that subsidies is the only way that we can keep down the cost of living and at the same time give a sufficient price to the farmers to encourage production. So I repeat, that anyone in this particular case who advocates defeating subsidies is advocating, wittingly or unwittingly, not only runaway inflation but a higher cost of living. So they are advocating a higher cost of living.

WILL WE TAKE AWAY FROM THE FAMILIES OF OUR FIGHTING MEN THE RECENT INCREASES?

A few days ago we passed what was known as a bill to give servicemen's dependents a higher allowance. Now, does it not look strange that Congress passed a law for the purpose of helping the dependents of servicemen one week and the next week pass a bill which will increase the cost of living more than enough to wipe out entirely the increase that we have given them? It does not make very good sense to me. Not only will the servicemen and their families suffer by reason of it and lose more than we have given them, but other people who are living on fixed incomes and who have not had increases of wages and salaries during this war will suffer along with them.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I think the President's message today was a very comprehensive and convincing message, not only on subsidies but on rationing as well as on wage and price control.

The President coined the phrase "war subsidies" which, I think, is a correct phrase and really is a good definition for what these particular subsidies are.

If you will notice, the President again asked Congress for a little more teamwork and a little more unity in prosecuting this war and to prevent inflation. I hope that the Congress will grant that request and try to create a better feeling between the executive and legislative branches of this Government. Comity is just as necessary between the two branches of this Government, the legislative and the executive, in order to successfully work in the interest of the people as it is between the two Houses of Congress, the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. So I hope that the President's suggestion will be carried out.

OPEN REBELLION AGAINST GOVERNMENT

Under the guise of fighting the President on domestic issues many people, some of them in public life, are operating in open rebellion against our Government in this total war. They say more against our Government than they say against the Government of Japan or the Government of Germany, and they say more against our Commander in Chief than they do against Tojo or Hitler. So I wish some of those people who are saying so much against our Government—and would not the people from the outside just listening causally believe that we have the worst government on earth; that maybe the Japs had better take us over; that if the Germans would come and get us they would rescue us from a plight that we never could rescue ourselves from?—I wish they would say something now and then for the Commander in Chief who is doing a good job in this war. He is in charge of it. He is running it. He selects the generals. He selects the people who carry it on; and I just have a feeling that when we say so much against our own Commander in Chief and we say nothing against Tojo or Hitler, that perhaps we ought to say something for the Commander in Chief now and then.

ISOLATIONISTS CHANGED THEIR TACTICS, NOT THEIR VIEWS

Furthermore, I have noticed that isolationists, those who represent the backbone of the isolationist group in this country, are the worst offenders along that line. I have come to the conclusion that they have not changed their views at all—the isolationists have not. They have not changed their views. They have only changed their tactics. They are proceeding in a different way. You know one time they succeeded in stopping us from fortifying Guam. If we had fortified Guam, we probably would not be in a war with Japan today. Another time they said, "No; we cannot spend so much money for airplanes." That was the isolationist attitude. Another time, when our Army was being trained, and some of them had only been trained 11 months, by almost a tie vote—we won by only one vote—the Selective Training and Service Act was extended.

Isolationists stopping us. Talk about mistakes. We have made lots of mistakes, but the worst mistakes we have made were in following the isolationists, and the worst mistake of all was not in just going ahead and helping China about 5 or 6 years ago, for then we would not have had all this trouble with Japan. True, lots of mistakes were made, but the situation today is that we are in total war. Total war means that everyone must do his full duty, that we must sacrifice our own convictions and our views if necessary; that we must forget selfishness and greed; that we must be tolerant toward other people, and especially our Commander in Chief and leaders in this Congress, and try to win this war. That is our No. 1 problem.

Talk about reprehensible statements, the most reprehensible statements I have heard were the statements which would infer that we had the poorest Government on earth, that it is not worth saving, that we have the poorest leader in the present Commander in Chief that any country on earth has ever had during any country's history.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that the leader of the Republican Party, Wendell Willkie, does not disagree with the leadership of President Roosevelt, but undertakes to steal the results of the able leadership of the Commander in Chief and the head of the Democratic Party.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; and he will have lots of trouble from the isolationists in his party, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Plenty.

Mr. PATMAN. He will have lots of trouble.

ROCK THROWERS

It is often said that we can properly fight the President on domestic issues even during this awful war; yes, but when you throw rocks at him on a domestic issue you are throwing rocks at the same man who has to handle the foreign policy. You know, as someone brought out today—I think it was the distinguished majority leader—the President is also Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and these rock throwers might just as well make up their minds that they cannot throw rocks and hit the President to do him injury because of something he has done on the domestic front without also doing injury to the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States. If that rock hits the man as leader on the domestic front it hits the man who is leader on the war front.

I warn those people who are doing that that they are taking a great responsibility. If the President pays any attention to it and his mind is distracted—and he is the leader of our armed forces and the only leader of our armed forces—it is possible he may make a mistake on one of our 55 war fronts which would cause the casualty list to get longer; then the responsibility would be upon these rock throwers that caused that destruction, that caused those mistakes to be made. So in a time of war, regardless of party, regardless of who is in power, regardless of who is President, it is our duty to unify our efforts and do everything in our power to help win the war first.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. As one who cast that one vote to extend the Selective Service Act and as one who voted for all the bills to improve the harbor on Guam I think I can ask this question without exposing myself to the charge of being or having been an isolationist: As a matter of fact, is it not true that the President of the United States never asked this Congress to fortify Guam or even to improve its harbor? And, further, is it not a fact that he never asked this Congress to enact the Selective Service Act in the first instance? Both of those acts originated in the Congress, did they not?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that I appreciate his suggestion but I am really going to talk about subsidies today and I am afraid if I pay attention to his question I shall get so interested as to have no time left to talk on subsidies. So I hope he will pardon me; I will attempt to answer him sometime, or I am sure someone else will answer his questions.

Mr. GEARHART. I hope the gentleman will be so kind as to notify me when he intends to answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe the gentleman from California is one of 21 Members on his side who voted to extend the Selective Service Act. For that the country is indebted to him; but he is only one of 21 on that side as I remember—it may be 19, but not more than 21—who voted to extend the act.

On the question of Guam, the $5,000,000 was the first step. That $5,000,000 might have enabled those defending Guam to hold the Japanese fleet back 24 hours. That 24 hours might have meant the difference between ultimate victory and the success of our forces. That $5,000,000 item was defeated on two occasions. It was inserted in the bill under the guise of taking away some reefs in the harbor, but really it amounted to a fortification that would have enabled those defending Guam to hold back the Japanese fleet 24 hours.

These controversies do not do much good, but when they are constantly coming from the gentleman's side—and I am not addressing myself particularly to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]——

Mr. GEARHART. I know the gentleman would not do that, not too severely, anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I say that in all fairness; but when they are constantly coming from the gentleman's side it looks as though they were trying to whip up a hatred of the President of the United States. I can remember two Republican Presidents under whom I served. I liked them, I cooperated with them. I have served here under Republican Presidents, and they were my Presidents; they were elected as Republicans, but when they were in the White House they were my Presidents. The most dangerous thing in the world is to try to whip up in this country hatred of the man who occupies the office of the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not take my time on that subject.

Mr. GEARHART. The remarks of the distinguished majority leader were addressed to me and I ought to be permitted to make a comment.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. I want to reply in the same spirit of fairness as the majority leader has spoken.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman understands my point. I am talking about subsidies.

Mr. GEARHART. We should point out that there never was a bill before this Congress to fortify Guam. There were bills before the Congress successively—and I voted for every one of them—to improve the harbor by deepening it so as to receive larger ships. Let us say in justice to the President that he did not ask this Congress to do anything about fortifying Guam. In the disarmament treaty of 1922 we bound ourselves not to fortify Guam; a treaty, that was binding on all of us, upon everybody, I think, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman voted against that promise, I presume, if he voted to fortify it?

Mr. GEARHART. I said at the outset that there never was a bill before this Congress to fortify Guam.

Mr. PATMAN. There was an appropriation.

Mr. GEARHART. There were bills to improve the harbor. That was all.

Mr. PATMAN. That meant the same thing.

Mr. GEARHART. I voted for that, then, and I would vote for it again. But to fortify Guam we would have to relieve the country of the obligations we assumed under the disarmament treaty.

CONGRESS INFLATIONARY

Mr. PATMAN. Let us see who is wrong about this question of subsidies and holding down inflation. I repeat that to vote against subsidies—to vote for run-away inflation—is a deliberate vote for an increase in the cost of living. A high cost of living is being advocated. What is the reason for saying that? You know the President warned this Congress of inflation many, many times. He asked for the passage of the first Price Control Act and Congress, after many months of delay, finally passed the Price Control Act of January 1942. That Price Control Act fixed a price line and this Congress established that line. The line to hold was from October 1 to October 15, 1941. That is the line we fixed, and we said to the President, "You hold prices on that line." That is line No. 1.

ANOTHER PRICE LINE FIXED

The President came back and said, "I am not able to hold the prices. I want Congress to pass a law that fixes not only prices but wages, salaries, and everything that goes into the cost-of-living items." So the Congress passed a law on October 2, 1942, which not only authorized the President but actually directed him, and when you gentlemen are always speaking scornfully of directives you might well mention that Congress at one time in history—probably the only time—issued a directive to the President of the United States in which the Congress said, "Mr. Executive, you are directed by the Congress of the United States to fix prices, wages, salaries, and things that go into the cost of living on the basis of the levels that existed on September 15, 1942."

We told the President to do that. The President cannot do anything else if he carries out the directive that the Congress issued, the law that we passed. So the President issued orders to all the agencies in the executive branch of the Government saying: "Congress has passed this law directing me to hold this line as of that date and I am telling you not to find any excuses for it. You do it. You hold that line as of that date."

All right, the President is carrying out the will and the wishes of the United States Congress. Now, we come in here and we attempt to pass a bill in the form of a rider to the Commodity Credit Corportion Act extension bill, in which we say to the President: "We do not want your line, we do not want any line, we are destroying the line." That is what you say in section 3 of the proposed bill. You are not only destroying the first line we had and saying, "Do not hold it, and do not try to hold the second line because we are going to take the lid off of prices. You must fix any price that is necessary to give the producers a high price that will encourage them to produce, then you fix all other prices just as high as it is necessary for the consumers to pay."

LID TAKEN ENTIRELY OFF PRICES

How can you defend that? How can you say that is not an inflationary bill? How can you say that is not increasing the cost of living today? You cannot consistently say that because it is destroying the only line that we have fixed to keep down ruinous or run-away inflation.

NO ALTERNATIVE

I make the statement here and now that no Member of Congress can offer any alternative for subsidies without offering a plan that will increase the high cost of living. I make that statement here and now and challenge any person to successfully answer it. It cannot be done. So the only question is, Will subsidies keep down the high cost of living? It will keep the line like Congress said it must be kept. If you do not have subsidies the line will be destroyed and the cost of living will be increased still further.

How can you vote except in one way? I am asking you in all earnestness and in all sincerity. In wartime we have to do things we do not like to do. Sometimes we have to take something bad to keep from taking something worse. Maybe we do not like many things connected with subsidies. I do not, and you do not either, but there are other things we hate worse than that, and one of them is run-away inflation, the kind of inflation that will make it necessary for us to pay $1.25 for a loaf of bread or $400 for a suit of clothes, like in Russia, China, and some other countries in the world today. If this inflation gets out of hand the highest salaries that people are receiving will be insignificant and will not be sufficient to buy the barest necessities of life. That is what we will have and we will have wiped out the middle class.

So a vote against subsidies in this case is a vote to wipe out the middle class because it is the longest step in that direction that can possibly be taken. When Congress directs the President to hold that line and stabilize the cost of living, the President is attempting to do it and

he is attempting to do it by the only method that any person says it can be done with. Under those circumstances I do not see how one can consistently say that he is going to throw it to the winds and have no line, let the sky be the limit as to prices. Then when prices go up, of course wages will have to go up, because what is produced will get higher, and then as prices go up wages go up, and then prices go up again, then wages have to go up again. Then there is a run-away between wages and prices, and where are you? The middle class is wiped out.

The matter of greatest concern we have in this country today, second only to the winning of this war, is the question of inflation. We can win the war upon the 55 battle fronts of the world and at the same time lose the war on the domestic front through inflation. It would be just as bad. If anyone wants to take the responsibility for ruinous inflation, for increasing the cost of living that is already high today, that is his prerogative and I have no right to criticize him for it, and do not. I represent only the people who elected me. You represent those who elected you. It is not my province to criticize you nor is it your province to criticize me.

If we look at this matter solely from the standpoint of the country's being in a critical and serious situation, I do not see how you can come to any other conclusion, especially when you cannot say there is any alternative for it, and you cannot say it, and when you are bound to say that the cost of living will increase if you do not have these subsidies.

I have prepared here a statement on the farmer's situation compared with World War No. 1. I have official figures that I do not believe can be disputed. I am sure they cannot be.

I am not saying that the farmer is in the happiest situation in the world. He is not. I am not saying that everything is fine or satisfactory with him. It is not. But I am saying that the farmer in this war, with the prices he presently receives and the prices he pays, is better off than he was during World War No. 1. He is better off under price control than he was in World War No. 1 with no control whatever.

PROBLEM TO ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION AND STABILIZE COST OF LIVING

Lately there has come from some Members of Congress a strong demand that all methods used or suggested in our Government's dual effort to maintain and encourage production on one hand and to stabilize the cost of living on the other hand should be almost entirely abandoned. Certain exceptions to this abandonment are desired by these same Members in order to favor some minority against the majority.

IN NAME OF FARMER

And, sad to state, this cry is made in the name of the farmer. Farmers understand that they do not live and operate in a vacuum and that their prosperity or lack of it affects not only themselves but all the rest of our people. Farmers know that they are as important to the war and to our civilian life, both during and after the war, as anyone else. I yield to no one in my interest in farmers, individually or collectively. Congress and our Government must deal with the farmer's position as such and with their relation to the whole economic picture on the home front which will be in the interest of the farmer, since they buy as well as sell.

FARMERS' BETTER ECONOMIC POSITION THAN DURING FIRST WAR

Specifically, some of the Members of Congress are saying that farmers are not now in as good position economically as they were during the last war. These Members say that we should, for the sake of the farmer, go back to the program followed during the course of the First World War, that is, go back to no program at all. I strongly feel, in fact, I know, that such a do-nothing basis will be the worst thing that can happen to the farmer, and I intend to back up my position with facts.

Apart from the many grave aspects of a return to a no-control basis which would lead to a general inflation, and apart from a detailed discussion of the ultimate effects of such inflation on farmers and apart from complete analysis of what seeming advantages farmers might get from inflated prices for their products, let us consider the position of the American farmer today.

WAR NO. 2 POSITION OF FARMER COMPARED WITH WORLD WAR NO. 1

Let us compare what happened to him in World War No. 1 and during this war. I am sure that when we here in Congress face the facts we will all agree that we will not want to abandon our clear duty to farmers and the whole people; we will want to support sound plans of stabilization and rightful use of subsidies. I know that I personally, and I hope all of you, will not, under the guise of helping the farmer, want to be a party to a do-nothing plan which will roll back the farmer to the position he was in during and after the last war. I say to you as seriously as I ever said anything that neither farmers, businessmen, workers, or any of our citizens will stand for such a move. The country fundamentally supports the price control and stabilization legislation enacted by Congress. Our job is to improve this work and not to destroy it. We must legislate for the true long-term benefit of everyone and not just to benefit a few for the present only. We insult the good sense and patriotism of farmers if we do less. Sons of farmers are on the battle fronts, too, and farmers will want to look their sons in the eye with a clear conscience just as you and I.

And now to the facts.

INCOME OF FARMERS

If you look at the net income of farm operators today and compare the figures with those of the last war, you find little justification for any statement that farmers are suffering today a fate worse than was allotted to them in World War No. 1. Farm operators in 1914 received three and nine-tenths billions of dollars net income from the sale of their crops and in 1918 received eight and seven-tenths billion dollars, an increase of 121 percent. In 1939 they received four and five-tenths billion dollars, which was six hundred million more than they received in 1914. In 1943 farm operators are receiving twelve and eight-tenths billion dollars, an increase of 182 percent. During the World War No. 1 period—1914 to 1918, inclusive—they averaged five and seven-tenths billion dollars per year as against a figure of seven and eight-tenths billion dollars during this war—1939 to 1943, inclusive. This is an average increase of 37.5 percent in the net income of farm operators each year for a 5-year period. I am inserting a detailed statement of these figures below:

Net income of farm operators

	Billions of dollars		Billions of dollars
World War No. 1:		World War No. 2:	
1914	3.944	1939	4.537
1915	3.818	1940	4.655
1916	4.421	1941	6.623
1917	7.532	1942	10.180
1918	8.713	1943 [1]	12.800
Total	28.428	Total	38.795
Average	5.686	Average	7.759

INDEX

World War No. 1:		World War No. 2:	
1914	100	1939	100
1915	97	1940	105
1916	112	1941	146
1917	191	1942	229
1918	221	1943 [1]	282

[1] Estimated.

There has been considerable talk about the way in which farm prices went up during the last war as compared with this war. The most common assumption seems to have been that farm prices went up a great deal faster the last time. I have investigated this situation and bring to you the facts. While some crops, like cotton, showed large increases in the last war, there has been no over-all difference in the amount of increase between the two wars. The first 4 years of World War No. 1 saw an increase in prices received by farmers of 73 percent. The first 4 years of the present war saw an increase of 71 percent. I am inserting in the RECORD a tabulation made from the figures of the United States Department of Agriculture which bear this out.

Index of prices received by farmers

World War No. 1:		World War No. 2:	
1914	100	1939	100
1915	97	1940	107
1916	117	1941	133
1917	173	1942	171

From these figures it is evident that no one can seriously state that farm prices have not advanced as rapidly in the present war as they did in World War No. 1. However, that is not the significant thing, as I am certain you will agree. Prices received by farmers do not mean very much by themselves—you have to know what the prices he receives mean in terms of what he can buy for his money. It is here that we really find all the farmers better off than they were

during the last war. The facts are that prices paid by farmers rose 46 percent during the first 4 years of the last war and they have risen only 21 percent during the same length of time during this war. The figures of the Department of Agriculture show this.

Index of prices paid by farmers

World War No. 1:		World War No. 2:	
1914	100	1939	100
1915	106	1040	101
1916	123	1941	106
1917	146	1942	121

Under these circumstances there just is not any question about the relative position of farmers in this war and the last war. When you compare these figures which I have given you on prices paid and prices received by farmers the results speak for themselves. The ratio of prices paid and prices received during the last war shows a net improvement of 17 percent in the farmers' position, in this war his net position has improved by 41 percent.

Ratio prices paid–received by farmers

World War No. 1:		World War No. 2:	
1914	100	1939	100
1915	92	1940	105
1916	95	1941	124
1917	118	1942	141

We have been hearing so much about how badly the farm program is being managed in this war and how we should return to the system used in the last war. Of course one of the first indications of bad management is afforded by production figures and our bad management of the farm program in this war should show up there. Following this line of thought I have obtained the facts about production in the last war and in this war. In the period 1914–17 total farm production instead of increasing decreased by 1 percent. In a similar period in this war 1939–42, total farm production increased—not just a little—a great deal, 19 percent. I include at this point a break-down of these figures by major farm crops.

Increase in farm production

	World War No. 1 (1914–17)	World War No. 2 (1939–42)
Total farm production	−1	19
Grain production	8	30
Cotton-cottonseed	−24	12
Meat production	25	28
Dairy production	4	14
Chicken and egg production	0	20

These are obviously not the production figures of a mismanaged farm program. Production increases far surpass those of World War No. 1. I have already shown that farm prices have increased at a rate which compares with that of World War No. 1, and that net farm incomes are much higher during this war than they were during the last one with prices paid by farmers increasing much less than they did in World War No. 1. These are hardly the figures of a badly handled farm program that is badly handled from the standpoint of the farmer.

Have not I talked enough about this and the last war to show that by every standard use the farmer is much more fortunately situated now than he was during World War No. 1? Let us examine the position of the farmer under the present war conditions a little more closely.

In the period since 1939 he has not done badly at all. Wheat is up from $0.57 to $1.34 a bushel—average farmer price—and wheat is not a small item in the farm production figures. Corn, another major farm products, is up from $0.41 to $0.99 a bushel. Apples, not so important to the farmer perhaps but an intriguing item from the standpoint of the consumer, have increased 260 percent between August 1939 and September of this year—from $0.75 to $2.70 a bushel. Enough of these items however; for those who want more of the same I am including at this point a table giving actual prices of all of the major farm commodities, and let me emphasize the fact that these prices are what the farmer has gotten on the average.

Prices received by farmers, 1939 and 1943, seasonally adjusted

Commodity	Unit	Aug. 15, 1939	Sept. 15, 1943	Percentage change from Aug. 15, 1939
All farm products, index		88	190	115.9
Wheat	Bushel	$0.568	$1.34	135.9
Corn	Bushel	.409	.99	142.1
Oats	Bushel	.276	.743	169.2
Barley	Bushel	.355	.985	177.5
Rye	Bushel	.357	.972	172.3
Rice	Bushel	.601	1.70	182.9
Cotton	Pound	.0853	.199	133.3
Cottonseed	Ton	17.13	[1]4.29	216.9
Apples	Bushel	.75	2.70	260.0
Oranges, all	Box	.52	2.02	288.5
Lemons, California	Box	.96	1.57	63.5
Grapefruit, all	Box	.25	.84	236.0
Milk, wholesale	Hundredweight	1.71	1.89	82.5
Milk, retail	Quart	[1].102	[1].129	26.5
Butter	Pound	[1].242	[1].442	82.6
Butterfat	Pound	.236	.506	114.4
Chickens	Pound	.128	.249	94.5
Eggs	Dozen	.180	.365	102.8
Cattle	Hundredweight	6.44	12.08	87.6
Calves	Hundredweight	8.26	13.12	58.8
Sheep	Hundredweight	3.70	6.34	71.4
Lambs	Hundredweight	7.26	13.03	79.5
Hogs	Hundredweight	5.11	12.82	150.9
Potatoes	Bushel	.611	1.38	125.9
Sweetpotatoes	Bushel	.746	[1].18	192.2
Tobacco	Pound	.142	.326	129.6
Peanuts	Pound	.0326	.0699	114.4
Wool	Pound	.222	.410	84.7
Flaxseed	Bushel	1.39	2.93	110.8
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	2.53	5.57	120.2
Hay	Ton	7.01	13.23	88.7

[1] Unadjusted.

Since 1939 the index of per capita farm income has jumped from $128 to $370 estimated for 1943. This is an increase of 189 percent in farm income during the war to date. At the same time the index of nonfarm income has risen 91.3 percent. If you compare the farm income rise of 189 percent with the nonfarm increase of 91.3 percent you find that farm incomes have risen more than twice as much as have those of nonfarmers. This does not indicate that there has been much discrimination against the farmer during this war.

FARMER'S PART OF THE CONSUMER'S DOLLAR

There is another way of appraising the position of the farmer during this war. If you look at the consumer's retail food dollar, the dollar which you and I spend for food, we find that 39 cents of this dollar found their way to the farmer in 1939, but today the farmer gets 58 cents of the dollar according to the Department of Agriculture. And remember there are a lot more dollars. This is an increase of 48.7 percent and it means not only that the farmer is getting more but that all of the processors and distributors between the farmer and the consumer are getting less.

FARMERS' DEBTS

In spite of all the vaunted prosperity of the farmer during the last war, I find that he was going further and further into debt as the war progressed. The facts are that farm indebtedness was 24 percent higher by the end of 1917 than it was in 1914. A completely different trend is obvious during this war and, after 4 years of war, today farm indebtedness has declined and is actually 5 percent below the level of 1939 when war broke out. The index here derived from Department of Agriculture figures shows this:

Farm mortgage debt index

World War No. 1:		World War No. 2:	
1914	100	1939	100
1915	105.9	1940	97.7
1916	111.6	1941	96.5
1917	123.7	1942	94.9

I am not offering these figures in a spirit of criticism. I am only pointing out that no one can say that the farmer has been oppressed by what has been done under pressure of war—that pressure has apparently been applied on others and now it is building up behind retail prices. Something is bound to

happen. Either retail prices must break upward or the margins of processors and distributors must be further discriminated against or farm prices must be reduced. If we hold the line on prices against the threat of inflation, these are the only things which can happen.

The only other answer I know that anyone has ever suggested is properly to use subsidies.

CONGRESS GIVES PRESIDENT A DIRECTIVE

Remember, we are undertaking to guarantee farmers prices for 2 years after the war. How much easier that will be, and how much more benefit the farmer will derive, if we have preserved for him the value of his return from prices received in terms of what his money is worth.

Now, I would like to comment a little about the peculiar position in which we of the Congress find ourselves. We have passed legislation compelling the President and the Price Administrator to hold the level of retail prices. Then we have required that in so doing the Price Administrator and others must provide fair and equitable margins for all. If uncontrolled farm prices rise higher and higher, as some Members of Congress seem to desire, and if the administration holds down retail prices, it must be evident that Congress itself thus causes the Office of Price Administration and the President to break the law in respect to fair and equitable margins. No economy can stand such a strain entirely aside from the legal absurdity. Production, processing, and distribution will be chaotic. Black marketing and racketeering will flourish, just as an esteemed Senator said it should. We as businessmen will have cast ourselves into a black pit. The only way to maintain economic health is by the use of good sense, proven methods, an appreciation of balance, and the courage to legislate and administer for the most good for everyone.

SHOULD WE LET PRICES INCREASE?

I have heard on the floor of this House innumerable times the suggestion that retail prices should be allowed to increase. Let me show you why we should proceed very cautiously in that direction even though we look at the situation solely from the point of view of the farmer. A very large number of wage agreements are tied to the cost of living. Every time the cost of living moves up a point some labor group automatically begins negotiations for a wage increase. Every increase in the cost of living is accompanied by increasing demands from labor. Thus, if we cause retail prices to rise we shall also cause wages to rise. Higher wages mean higher selling prices for things the farmer buys. Higher wages in the city also mean higher wages on the farm. The present position of the farmer is so much better than it was when war broke out—even though it is not entirely satisfactory—that I believe those who profess to have the farmer's interest at heart should be the very first to insist that no action be taken which will start this price-wage-higher cost cycle in motion to the detriment of the farmer's position.

At the present time the farmer's real interest lies in maintaining the level of retail prices and holding down the cost of living.

In closing I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the Gallup poll reported in the Washington Post last Saturday, October 30. According to the Gallup poll, the two principal questions on the minds of the American people today are whether there will be another depression with its consequent post-war unemployment and secondly, how much higher the cost of living is going while the war continues.

On the first of these questions about which the entire country is concerned I can assure you that if we allow inflation to get loose in the land today we surely will pay for it later. Whoever causes that inflation will be responsible for the ensuing headaches. Perhaps we had better think that over.

The second principal question troubling the American voter, according to the Gallup poll, has to do with the high cost of living and I quote from the Gallup poll report at this time:

> What is Congress doing to bring the high cost of living down? Why don't they keep prices down? Why doesn't price control work for food? Why do prices keep going up? Something's got to be done about the price of food. What is my Congressman doing about it?

We cannot encourage the production of food without paying good prices. We cannot pay good prices and hold the line on retail prices without subsidies.

After the last war we had inflation, real inflation. We did not have it until the armistice was signed. The war was not officially over until July 2, 1921. If we had had upon the statute books then the law we have on the statute books now, to protect the farmers after this war, that inflation against the farmer would not have occurred; at least, he would not have suffered from it.

The House of Representatives and the Senate passed a bill which originated in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, but which was suggested by President F. D. Roosevelt, which provides that for 2 years after the 1st day of January after the war is officially over the farmers will be entitled to a loan of 90 percent on their basic commodities, 90 percent of parity. This means that where cotton is 20 cents a pound they would be able to obtain a loan of more than 18 cents a pound, and there would be that same ratio on wheat and other basic commodities. That is placing a floor under the prices of these basic commodities for the farmers of this country to protect them after this war is over. That is good protection. No other group enjoys this protection. It was very thoughtful and considerate of Congress to insert this provision in permanent law, which can only be carried out, of course, if the Commodity Credit Corporation is extended.

Applying this law to the last war, which was officially over on July 2, 1921, the farmers would have had a loan value equal to 90 percent, which would have been a floor under their prices all during the war in 1917 and 1918, and also in the years 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923. It would have absolutely protected and saved the farmers.

If we are going to defeat the bill to extend Commodity Credit Corporation, of course we shall not have any opportunity or any vehicle to carry this out. I do not think there is any attempt made to defeat the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, but tied to that is this obnoxious amendment which will destroy price control and do as much damage to the farmer or more than to other classes and groups in this country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman has already covered part of the point I wanted to make, and that is this: The Commodity Credit Corporation is the only vehicle set up by this Government to stabilize the farm prices. It looks as if there is serious danger at this time of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation not being extended, and if this occurs the vehicle for stabilizing farm prices not only now but after this war is over will be destroyed. I cannot understand how men who profess to be friends of agriculture and who give lip service to agriculture seem to have little concern for the future of the only agency in this country that has rendered a real contribution in stabilizing farm prices and really helping the farmer.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman. That agency has done more for the farmers than any other agency of our Government.

This is the point I want to bring out. The Commodity Credit Corporation, which unquestionably is the best organization for the farmers in this country, was not created by law, it was created by Executive order. The finest and best organization the farmers have in this country was created by one of those so-called obnoxious things referred to in an obnoxious way, a directive. That is what created the best friend the farmers have in Washington, D. C., put into existence by the President.

Permit me to say a few words about a gallant people:

GALLANT GREECE WHICH HAS BEEN THE SEAT OF ART, OF CULTURE, OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, TODAY STANDS AS A MONUMENT TO ALL WHO ARE WILLING TO FIGHT, SACRIFICE, AND DIE FOR FREEDOM AND THE RIGHT TO LIVE AS HONEST MEN

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, October 28, this Nation, and all of the United Nations fighting for freedom, had reason to pause a moment and reflect on the magnificent fight and the terrific sacrifices which one small country, Greece, has made for our cause. The opportunity was passed over and not much attention paid to the significance of that day in the age-long struggle for freedom and the sacrifices involved in that struggle. I, therefore, would like to say a few words to recall to our minds the debt that this mighty Nation owes to the freedom-loving people of Greece.

The gallant stand which this small country, with a total population of only 7,000,000 people, made against the forces of fascism and nazi-ism, and the priva-

tions and starvation they have endured since, is a model for all nations who love freedom more than they love ease.

The Greek incident, as it is sometimes referred to, is marked already in the minds of many historians as one of the major turning points in the war. When Mussolini marched into Greece upon the curt rejection of his demands and was later chased out by the fighting men of Greece, whose major weapon was only a fierce love of their country's freedom, an example was set to the world. This was really the first major defeat that an army of the Axis had suffered. It stiffened the backbone of many a people wavering on giving up without any struggle whatsoever.

Mussolini's defeat in Greece forced Hitler to come to his aid, causing the Balkans to flare up, particularly Yugoslavia, and upsetting completely his timetable for the subjugation of Europe. The time, manpower, and materials which Greece thus caused Hitler to expend have been given credit by some as the reason for Russia's ability to absorb Hitler's initial blows and get ready for the turn of the tide.

As a result of the gallant stand of Greece and her effect upon the Hitlerian era, the country since has been subjected to every terror and privation that could be devised by her conquerors.

It is to the historic fight made by this nation, to the willingness of these people to undergo the terror and the privations that have been visited upon them, that the United States owes a great debt. Greece through the ages has given the world much. She has been the seat of art, of culture, of the first principles of democratic government. Today Greece stands as a monument to all who are willing to fight, sacrifice, and die for freedom and the right to live as honest men.

I am inserting herewith an article entitled "Debt to Greece," which appeared in the Washington Daily News, October 28, 1943:

DEBT TO GREECE

(By William Philip Simms)

At 3 o'clock in the morning of October 28, 1940—just 3 years ago today—occurred one of those relatively "minor incidents" which, later on, writers record as a turning point in history.

The incident was Italy's ultimatum to Greece. Rome charged Athens with allowing the British to use Greek bases and, true to form, the Italian dictator gave Greece just 3 hours to back down. Her curt "no" changed the whole course of events in southeastern Europe if not of the war itself.

Unquestionably Hitler wished the Balkans to remain quiet. What he wanted from that area was friendly neutrality, oil, foodstuffs, and raw materials. War would upset the economy of the region and possibly hamper his plans rapidly to defeat Russia, knock out Britain, and end the war by the winter of 1941.

Little Greece, with less population than New York and smaller than Florida, upset the Axis applecart. At 5:30 a. m., Italian troops crossed the Albanian frontier and the war was on. Mussolini had been told it would be a walk-over; that the country was lousy with fifth columnists; that the Greeks wouldn't fight. The Greek Navy consisted of 1 old cruiser, 10 destroyers, and a few smaller craft. The Italian Fleet ranked only after the American, British, and Japanese. The Greek Army had only 10 divisions ready for battle, and even these were without modern equipment. They had no tanks, almost no heavy artillery, and only about 200 obsolete planes. The Italians were not only mechanized but every division was composed of veterans who had learned their trade in Spain. On paper, Greece did not have a chance. Il Duce certainly thought so, and his blunder helped the Axis lose the war.

What the Greeks lacked in equipment they made up in spunk. With their planes, the Italians leveled Greek villages. With their Fiat tanks, they blazed their advance. Five columns penetrated Greece and for a time her plight seemed hopeless. But presently the Italians slowed down, then stopped. The light mountain batteries of the Greeks, hauled to the peaks by main strength and awkwardness, picked off enemy tanks one by one. Light machine guns, hidden high up among the crags, mowed down Italian infantry slogging through the passes and utterly demoralized them. Soon Mussolini's men were in full retreat, back into Albania whence they started.

Hitler's fear had been well-founded. Much as he hated to do it, he found it necessary to go to the rescue of his pal. Otherwise the whole Balkans would explode in his face. He began to work on Yugoslavia. He frightened the government of the regent, Prince Paul, into joining the Axis in March 1941, but there was a military revolt, young King Peter II assumed his royal powers and Yugoslavia joined the Allies.

What Hitler had wanted of Yugoslavia was an easy road to Greece. Now he was in a worse fix than ever. He not only had to put Greece down but Yugoslavia as well. And this would take time and men. Eventually, of course, all this was done, but before Yugoslavia and Greece and Crete were occupied the Axis had received a staggering and unexpected set-back.

Today, therefore, is one of the vital anniversaries of the United Nations. Paraphrasing Prime Minister Churchill, seldom have so many great nations owed so much to one so little.

Almost certainly the next few months will see a major Allied invasion of southeastern Europe, and its success will be due in no small part to the firm stand of King George II of Greece and his little, poorly equipped Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement submitted today by the House Committee on Small Business relative to the control, disposition, and sale of Government-owned surplus property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] be permitted to address the House on Tuesday, November 2, for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WITHHOLDING TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be on the floor when the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] made his talk on subsidies. I think he was perfectly within his right in speaking as he did. I happen to agree with him, but to those who may disagree I say that the courage to get subsidies have no relation to Guam or other pre-war controversies. It is regrettable that the matter of subsidies must be debated in that way.

Mr. Speaker, as the tax gatherers for the United States Government go forth and reach farther and farther into the pockets and pay envelopes of our people, the money that is available in the hands of the American people for contributions to churches, educational institutions, and institutions of service and mercy, becomes less and less.

For many years it has been the policy of the United States Government to exempt from Federal taxation that portion of an individual's income which he gives to religious and charitable institutions up to 15 percent of his income. This long-established principle is evidence of the Government's recognition of the value of the church and its related institutions.

A new era of taxation began with the adoption of the withholding tax. For the first time, the hand of the Government reaches in and takes the earnings of people before they even get them. Let us consider the effect of the withholding tax upon the ability of people to make a contribution. Before the individual gets his pay check, the withholding tax is taken out. The salary in effect is lessened that much. Then many of these people are buying bonds with 10 percent of their income. That comes out. The cost of living has gone up. Millions of Americans have had no increase in income because of the war. Among this group who have had no increase in income we find many of the leading citizens of every community upon whose shoulders rest the responsibility for carrying on the institutions vital to our welfare. We have a situation where there is little or no money left to be contributed to the church, our hospitals and colleges and the many other fine institutions which have to do with the spiritual and educational welfare of our country. It is true that it might be suggested that an individual can go ahead and make his contributions, that is, if he can, and receive a credit for contributions made when he

makes his final tax return at the end of the year, but that violates the principle that 15 percent of his income, if used for contributions, is exempt from tax. He is forced to go ahead and pay taxes on exempt income and then wait for a refund or a credit.

Mr. Speaker, it might also be argued that the withholding tables already allow 10 percent for deductions. I want to point out that this is for all deductions, including not only contributions, but taxes and interest. The people who support our religious and charitable institutions are people who pay taxes and oftentimes interest. The amount allowed for contributions in the withholding tables is an average amount, which the Government is willing to settle for, and it is based on the premise that many individuals make no religious contributions whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point to insert a table based on figures from the Internal Revenue Bureau, supporting the proposition that the present withholding tables do not make adequate allowance for the individual who regularly gives for the support of his church and other institutions:

A 25-year comparison of individual returns with net income, including returns of estates and trusts showing deductions taken and contributions made in dollars and percent [1]

[All figures n thousands of dollars]

Year	Net taxable income reported	Total deductions reported	Percent of total deductions to net income	Total contributions	Percent of total contributions to net income	Deductions exclusive of contributions	Percent of deductions exclusive of contributions to net income
1916	6,298,578	2,051,324	32.5	[2] 137,569	[2] 2.2	[3] 1,913,755	[2] 30.3
1917	11,191,246	885,763	7.91	245,080	2.0	640,683	5.91
1918	15,924,639	1,821,122	11.4	[2] 350,342	[2] 2.2	[3] 1,470,780	[2] 9.2
1919	19,859,491	2,578,194	12.9	[2] 436,908	[2] 2.2	[3] 2,141,286	[2] 10.7
1920	23,735,629	2,954,641	12.4	387,290	1.6	2,567,351	10.8
1921	19,577,213	3,751,569	18.6	[2] 522,074	[2] 2.7	[3] 3,229,495	[2] 15.9
1922	21,336,213	3,535,696	16.5	425,218	2.0	3,110,478	14.5
1923	24,777,466	4,470,127	17.9	534,977	2.1	3,935,330	15.8
1924	25,656,153	3,922,843	15.2	533,168	2.1	3,389,675	13.1
1925	21,894,576	3,377,458	15.4	441,590	2.0	2,935,868	13.4
1926	21,958,506	3,488,930	15.8	484,205	2.2	3,004,725	13.6
1927	22,545,091	3,663,470	16.2	507,705	2.25	3,155,765	13.95
1928	24,727,114	4,681,170	18.9	541,351	2.18	4,139,819	16.72
1929	23,775,606	6,971,404	29.7	540,109	2.27	6,431,295	27.43
1930	16,579,183	6,944,646	41.8	434,401	2.56	6,510,245	39.24
1931	11,668,018	6,900,083	59.1	353,929	3.03	6,546,154	56.07
1932	10,174,987	5,048,685	49.6	316,660	3.11	4,732,025	46.49
1933	9,867,307	4,252,335	43.0	281,915	2.85	3,970,420	41.15
1934	12,383,943	3,053,072	24.6	279,816	2.25	2,773,256	22.35
1935	14,528,459	3,076,699	21.1	310,143	2.13	2,766,556	18.97
1936	19,240,110	3,183,324	16.5	389,591	2.02	2,793,733	14.48
1937	20,930,056	3,774,437	18.2	444,929	2.12	3,329,508	16.08
1938	18,543,218	3,831,001	20.6	413,979	2.23	3,417,022	18.37
1939	22,907,544	3,711,794	16.2	498,910	2.18	3,212,884	14.02
1940	[3] 35,730,644	[3] 4,387,910	[3] 12.3	[3] 731,277	[3] 2.04	[3] 3,656,633	[3] 10.26
25-year total	485,810,990	96,317,697		10,542,956		85,774,741	
Average			20.24		2.26		17.98

[1] Statistics based on taxpayer's returns as filed, includes those classes of individuals and fiduciaries who, under the revenue laws of the respective years were required to file returns.
[2] Estimated, no report given.
[3] Preliminary figure.

Source: Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I discussed this matter before the Ways and Means Committee when their hearings were held; you will find my remarks in the hearings. After my first appearance there, a bill to remedy this situation was drafted and has been introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and myself. Our bills are identical. They are numbered H. R. 3472 and H. R. 3473.

I sincerely hope that every friend of the church and every friend of the colleges and hospitals and our other institutions, contributions to which are deductible under the income-tax law, will join the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and myself in urging the Ways and Means Committee to accept the principle of these bills and incorporate it in whatever tax bill is sent to the floor for consideration.

The Gearhart-Curtis proposal provides that an employee may, at his option, include in his withholding exemption certificate a statement of the amount of contributions he has made or will make in the calendar year, which are allowable as deductions. If such statement is so included, the amounts so stated shall be prorated to the pay-roll periods in that taxable year and the withholding exemptions for each such pay-roll period shall be increased by the amount of this contribution. In other words, it means this: Suppose an individual draws a salary of $200 a month. At the time that he notifies his employer of his marital status and the number of children and other dependents that he has, he will also notify his employer of the amount that his deductible contributions will be. Suppose his contributions are going to be $25 a month. His employer, instead of withholding the tax on the full $200 less his family exemption, will withhold the tax on the $200, less his family exemption, less $25.

The taxpayer is entitled to this. He gives of his earnings to support religious and charitable institutions.

The law is that up to 15 percent of his income is exempt from taxation. This merely carries that principle into effect for the withholding tax. Without the enactment of this proposal, the individual would have to pay taxes on exempt income and then ask for a refund or a credit later.

I believe all will agree with me that this will greatly add to the amount of contributions that the churches in each and every one of the local communities can obtain. It will mean much to every Christian college in America. It will mean much to the U. S. O., the Red Cross, community chests, hospitals, and all like institutions. If those in charge of the money-raising program for a church can point out to their members that, if that individual chooses to contribute regularly, his contributions will be deducted from his income before the withholding tax is figured, it will help the church a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Congress would be interested in knowing how contributions to churches have declined in the last 12 years. The national income in 1942 was 155 percent of what it was in 1928, yet, as Americans, we only contributed 68 percent as much money to the church as we did in 1928. Church contributions have gradually gone down in America since 1928. In 1942, we reached an all-time low in the percent of our income given as contributions to the institutions which represent the kingdom of God on earth. The picture in 1943 will be worse. Is it any wonder that when we as a nation so disregard spiritual things, we were unable to save our Nation from a tailspin toward war and burdensome debt? "Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation."

Mr. Speaker, while we want to forever keep the Government and the church separate, the Government of the United States should and must recognize the need for the church. I wish to include in my remarks at this point a table showing the decrease of church gifts from 1928 to the present time:

A study of decreasing church gifts in contrast with increasing national income and expenditures

	Increasing national income [1]		Decreasing church gifts [2]		Soaring Government expenditures	
	Billions	Percent	Millions	Percent	Billions	Percent
1928	$77.2	100.0	$512.2	100.0	$0.7	100.0
1929	83.3	108.0	495.0	96.6	.7	100.0
1930	68.8	89.1	488.8	90.4	.8	114.0
1931	54.4	70.4	457.9	89.4	.8	114.0
1932	39.9	51.6	398.8	77.8	.8	114.0
1933	42.3	54.7	331.6	65.7	.68	97.0
1934	49.3	65.1	283.6	55.5	.53	76.0
1935	55.7	72.1	289.3	56.5	.69	98.6
1936	64.9	84.0	300.2	58.6	.90	128.6
1937	71.5	92.6	314.9	61.3	.93	132.8
1938	64.1	83.0	327.0	63.9	1.1	157.0
1939	70.8	91.7	312.2	61.0	1.4	200.0
1940	77.8	100.7	321.7	63.0	2.7	385.0
1941	95.6	125.8	327.7	64.0	12.5	1,784.0
1942	119.8	155.1	352.5	68.8	49.1	7,020.0
1943	144.0	186.6	-------	-------	70.1	10,001.0

[1] Source: Survey of Current Business—National Conference Board.
[2] Source: United Stewardship Council representing 19 major religious bodies having an inclusive membership of 234,975,087 of the 67,327,719 church members (including Catholics, Protestants, and Jews) in the United States. Official statistics of other bodies are not available.

Source: 1933 to date, Treasury Department; prior years—statistical abstract which figure is the total of the War and Navy Department expenditures.

This proposal is endorsed by many, many organizations. It is vigorously recommended by Dr. G. L. Morelock,

who, as president, speaks for the United Stewardship Council, representing 22 major American church denominations. Dr. D. Allan Locke, secretary of finance of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, has submitted a statement in support of this proposal. The general secretary of the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, Mr. Gould Wickey, representing 780 institutions, says:

We sincerely hope that Congress will see fit to pass the bill.

Dr. Guy E. Snavely, executive director of the Association of American Colleges, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, endorsing this proposal and stressing the need for it. The Jesuit Educational Association, speaking through their executive director, Edward B. Rooney, S. J., endorses this proposal and has written a letter that appears in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee. The New York Province of the Society of Jesus, speaking through James P. Sweeney, S. J., endorses the Gearhart-Curtis proposal and, in stressing the need for it, said:

While we should give our best in blood and possessions for the preservation of our country, we should not allow what was always considered best in religion, education, and charity to perish in the midst of war.

Monsignor George Johnson, S. J., speaking for the National Catholic Educational Association, submitted a statement favoring this proposal and it too can be found in the committee hearings.

Dr. Bryant Drake, president of Doane College at Crete, Nebr., says:

I want to express to you my hearty appreciation of your endeavors in presenting the amendment to the current tax payment act, which called for deduction from wages of the average amount of religious, educational, charitable, and other contributions. If there is anything I can do to promote the adoption of this amendment, please let me know.

Dr. William Marshall French, president of Hastings College, at Hastings, Nebr., endorses this bill and says:

If you succeed in this endeavor, you will have conferred a great boon on our private educational and philanthropic foundations.

Dr. Benjamin F. Schwartz, chancelor of Nebraska Wesleyan University, says:

May I express to you hearty appreciation for your leadership of this fight.

And in referring to the Nebraska Association of Church Colleges, he further says:

I know they are eager to put whatever influence we have behind this movement.

The Reverend Joseph P. Zuercher, S. J., president of Creighton University at Omaha, Nebr., says:

Creighton welcomes and appreciates your proposal.

Bishop Edwin H. Hughes, of the Methodist Church urges the adoption of the principle and says:

I am quite sure that you have gotten hold of something very much worth while.

Dr. William E. Lampe, secretary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, speaking for the pastors and members of nearly 3,000 congregations in 40 States, endorses this proposal and says:

Some of our church members give tithes of their incomes and others give in larger or smaller proportions. We feel that these tithes or other gifts ought not to be subject to taxes either at the source or at any later time.

Among the many, many letters written in support of this proposal there are letters from O. C. Carmichael, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; President Ernest M. Best, of the International Young Men's Christian Association College, of Springfield, Mass.; President N. C. McPherson, Jr., of Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga.; the Reverend James F. Maguire, S. J., president of West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Ind.; President Hersey Egginton, of the board of managers of the Methodist Hospital of Brooklyn, N. Y.; President O. A. Hanke, board of trustees of Carthage College, Mount Morris, Ill.; President O. W. Carrell, of the Nebraska Central College, Central City, Nebr.; Executive Secretary Walter C. Eells, of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.; President H. A. Kelsey, Sterling College, Sterling, Kans.; President Theodore A. Distler, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.; the Reverend M. H. Cloud, pastor of the First Methodist Church at Rhinelander, Wis.; and President W. H. Cowley, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that every Member of Congress interest himself in this measure that is being sponsored by the gentleman from California and myself. The bills are identical. They are H. R. 3472 and H. R. 3473. It is sincerely hoped by millions that the Ways and Means Committee will accept this proposal. There are 67,000,000 church members in the United States. They are entitled to consideration.

When this war is over the already overburdened taxpayers may be called upon to pay fabulous sums of money to rehabilitate a war-torn world. It is my firm conviction that a small fractional part of any such sum, if put to work in the missionary programs of the Christian church, will do more good toward rebuilding the world than any government program, regardless of how large. We are dealing here with that which relates to the eternal.

Oh, where are kings and empires now
Of old that went and came,
But, Lord, thy church is praying yet
A thousand years the same.

Unshaken as the eternal hills,
Immovable she stands,
A mountain that shall fill the earth,
A house not made with hands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a very inspiring and informative address about the legislation that he and my colleague from California [Mr. GEARHART] have introduced in the House, and with the gentleman's permission I shall read a portion of a letter received by me from San Francisco endorsing this legislation. My constituent who writes the letter goes on to say, in speaking of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that—

It is designed to allow current exemption of the amount given for support of churches and other tax-exempt institutions of a religious character upon a pay-as-you-go basis. The enactment of this amendment would seem to encourage the continuance of the support of these religious activities, whereas deferring the deduction until the end of the tax year might have the effect of discouraging such contributions. In addition, from the standpoint of accounting, the amendment would seem to simplify things for the Government.

I would be grateful if you would do what you can to have the pay-as-you-go credit for religious and educational donations enacted into law.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. I commend the gentleman and also the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] for this proposed legislation. I have had a number of communications from my own district calling attention to the fact that because of the operation of that law withholding taxes, the stream carrying donations for charitable, educational, and other like institutions has dried up. As the gentleman has said, it does not give away taxes from the Federal Government; it merely means that by allowing these exemptions to be made against the withholding tax, men and women who are inclined to be generous with these worthwhile institutions will continue to contribute, while under existing law they will not.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] for 10 minutes.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the splendid presentation of the two bills to which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has referred, there remains very little that can be said in behalf of the legislation under consideration. I might well content myself by congratulating him, not only on his fine presentation of his case for the bills, but for his having conceived the necessity for the legislation itself. It happens that I was on the bench in the Ways and Means chamber at the time he made his presentation of the situation to the members of that committee. It was because of the convincing nature of his remarks that I at that moment became an advocate of the legislation and,

thereafter, consented to become a cosponsor of it. If, because of my attachment to the couse, I can be of any assistance in furthering the measure during the course of the executive hearings of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the legislative committee to which the bills have been referred, I will deem it a real opportunity to render a service to my country and at the same time to organizations that are deserving of our most sympathetic consideration.

During the last 15 years taxes have been increased by 1,200 percent, a percentage which represents a tremendous increase in that which the people of the United States have been annually called upon to yield to their Government in the effort to meet the mounting cost of war. During this same period of 15 years, a reference to the record reveals, contributions to churches and charities have fallen off 31 percent. But a moment's contemplation of these contrasting percentages will, I am quite sure, clear away any doubt that may have existed in the minds of any reasoning individual just why church and charity have suffered. It is but natural that when taxes go up that the taxpayers' funds which remain available for the support of worthy institutions go down.

It is when our taxpayers are confronted by situations of this kind that they naturally jump to the conclusion that they must curtail expenditures. And it follows as the night the day that the first activities against which they do curtail are, of course, those that are conducted by religious organizations, charitable societies, and educational institutions.

The enactment of this legislation has a peculiar appeal to me, for two reasons, one of which is that it will make people ple again conscious of the obligation which is theirs to see to it that worthy institutions, eleemosynary in character, are adequately supported; that those who are engaged in their beneficent activities are not permitted to suffer because of an insufficient budget.

It will compel the taxpayer, at least four times a year, to give consideration to just what he should contribute in the way of charitable donations for the support of organizations that fall within the classification of religious, educational, character-building, and philanthropic. If we encourage people to give thought to that subject at least four times a year, I am sure that in the ordering of their affairs and their plannings for the future they will make far more generous provision for the maintenance of those worthy institutions that are so intimately associated with our American way of life.

The second reason why I am in favor of it grows out of the fact that the recently enacted so-called pay-as-you-go legislation requires our citizens to file at least four times a year an estimate of anticipated taxable income. If we do not allow them to say in those estimates what they plan to give to charity, to religious work, and to educational institutions, we will have created a situation which will compel all employers to withhold, as against his employees, 20 percent of their taxable incomes, a portion of which would be exempt from taxation if given to charitable, educational, or religious institutions.

So, simple justice to the taxpayer requires that we give him an opportunity to indicate in a no uncertain manner, to the Government and to his employer, when he makes his estimate of taxable income just what part of his income is to become exempt from taxation as a consequence of his planned gifts to church and charitable institutions.

For the Government to levy and collect a tax upon income exempted by law is unconscionable when a simple amendment to the revenue laws, such as the gentleman from Nebraska proposes, would eliminate the possibility and, at the same time, relieve our already overburdened taxpayers of the necessity of choosing between the constant filing of claims for adjustments of taxes or foregoing donations to churches and charities of their choice.

So simple is the change in the law which the enactment of either of our bills would accomplish I do not think there is anything further in the way of explanation of the measures that could be said in the light of that which has already been said by the gentleman who has just preceded me. But, in conclusion, I would like to call attention to what would be the kind of world we lived in if we did not have our churches, our charitable organizations, and our educational institutions. I need not point out in any words that I might choose that it would be a very different kind of world than that which we now live in and have heretofore known. This legislation which is proposed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will do much to reverse the tendency which today threatens these most worthy institutions with utter destruction. Instead of having, on the one hand, taxes increasing, by 1,200 percent, and, in time, perhaps, to an even higher figure, and donations to charity, religious, and educational institutions falling off by 31 percent, and less, I am quite certain we will witness a decided increase in donations to educational, charitable, and religious institutions if we will but give the people a chance to so arrange their affairs in advance of the tax-paying periods.

Let it suffice for me to assure the membership and, especially, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], that I, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, both within and without our committee room, will do my utmost to induce my colleagues on that great committee to adopt the substance of the bill which he has introduced and to write it into the revenue bill which that committee is now preparing for later presentation to this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar tomorrow may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCMURRAY, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, November 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington. D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10 a. m. on Tuesday. November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled, "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be an executive session of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, to consider some general public lands problems.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, November 4, 1943. Business to be considered: Continuation of petroleum hearings—Ralph K. Davies, first witness.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 9, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

885. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting a revised quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Information covering the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

886. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380); to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

887. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 19, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Red Lake River and its tributaries, Minnesota, including Clearwater River, Minn., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with four illustrations.

888. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944, to remain available until December 31, 1944, in the amount of $35,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

889. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting copies of estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for the bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Third interim report of the Committee on Small Business, pursuant to House Resolution 18, creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; without amendment (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BELL: Committee on Insular Affairs. S. 981. An act to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3428. A bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); without amendment (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee; with amendment (Rept. No. 820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 3209. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly; without amendment (Rept. No. 812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle; without amendment (Rept. No. 813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works; without amendment (Rept. No. 814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley; without amendment (Rept. No. 816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum; with amendment (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 3570. A bill to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 3571. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Council of Negro Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3572. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Rural Electrification Act, to provide other aids to agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3573. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3574. A bill to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 3575. A bill relating to certain creditor reorganizations under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3576. A bill relating to the time within which contributions into State unemployment funds must be made to secure credit against the tax imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3577. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3578. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in northwest Louisiana in the vicinity of Shreveport, in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 3579. A bill providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel sites; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3580. A bill to provide for the conservation and proper disposal of surplus war properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3581. A bill to grant to persons serving under the command of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo in the campaign against the city of Manila, P. I., the right to wear the Spanish campaign ribbon and badge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 3582. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of district judges of the district courts of the United States for 6-year terms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 337. Resolution recommending to the Secretary of the Navy that he give immediate, full, and thorough consideration to the solution of the problem of in-plant feeding at shipyards and shipbuilding plants under his jurisdiction; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 338. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3377, a bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 339. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3356, a bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 3583. A bill for the relief of James H. Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 3584. A bill for the relief of Elsie Hawke and Charles Hawke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3586. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Andrew Godwin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 3587. A bill for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3588. A bill for the relief of Carl M. Frasure; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 3589 (by request). A bill for the relief of the Royal Exchange Assurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3590. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3325. By Mr. SCHIFFLER. Petition of sundry patrons of Fulton Tavern, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3326. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Alfred J. Fleischer and 27 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3327. Also, petition of John Casey and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3328. Also, petition of Joseph J. Knezevich and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3329. Also, petition of John Briley and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3330. Also, petition of John Binguih, Jr., and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3331. Also, petition of Thomas W. Fahey and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3332. Also, petition of Henry Hoog and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3333. Also, petition of Clarence V. Simpsen and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3334. Also, petition of Ferd M. Litsch and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3335. Also, petition of Frederick W. Etling and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3336. Also, petition of Harry Streitz and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3337. Also, petition of Louis E. Renner and 20 others, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3338. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of Rev. R. P. Lippincott and five other citizens of Cadiz, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3339. By Mr. KING: Letter from Rev. P. Meredith McCluer, pastor, Manchester Avenue Christian Church of Los Angeles, Calif., and petition signed by members of that church, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3340. Also, petition signed by members of the South Lomita Church, of Lomita, Calif., Rev. Urban Hall, pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3341. Also, letter from Rev. W. A. Penner, pastor of the Nazarene Church, and petition signed by members of the Nazarene Church of Torrance, Calif., urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3342. Also, letter received from Rev. Paul H. Perry, pastor of the Assembly of God Church, of Torrance, Calif., and petition signed by members of that church, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3343. Also, letter received from Rev. R. DeWitt Howell, pastor of the First Church of God, Los Angeles, Calif., and petition signed by members of that church, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3344. Also, petition signed by members of the Bethel Methodist Church, of Los Angeles, Calif., Dr. W. T. Gilliland, pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3345. Also, petition signed by members of the Community Presbyterian Church, of Lomita, Calif., Rev. John E. Orr, pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3346. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Hewitt and signed by members of the Calvary Church, of Lomita, Calif., Rev. James Lynd, pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3347. Also, letter received from Rev. Ernest O. Forde, pastor of Sunnyside Baptist Church, of Los Angeles, Calif., and petition signed by members of this church, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3348. Also, letter received from Rev. Harry Branton, pastor of Torrance Methodist Church, Torrance, Calif., and petitions signed by members of his congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3349 Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Lee, of Torrance, Calif., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization, and therefore requesting Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3350 Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. T. C. Bowen, of Inglewood, Calif., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization, and therefore requesting Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3351. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Louisa C. Paterson and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3352. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Sunnyside, Mabton, Outlook, Grandview, and Walla Walla, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3353. Also, petition of 194 citizens of Pomeroy, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3354. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Contra Costa County Taxpayers' Association, Martinez Calif., urging the enactment of a general sales tax and a rigid program of economy by the Federal Government as a means of yielding the balance of needed revenues for war purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3355. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, Fond Du Lac, Wis.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3356. By Mr. FORD: Resolution of the Western Cooperative Dairymen's Union, supporting the fight to prevent inflation by allowing funds from Commodity Credit Corporation to be used for providing cost of production to dairymen through subsidies when

necessary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3357. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution adopted by California Commission on Interstate Cooperation, that the construction of the entire Central Valley project be expedited and completed at the earliest possible date, for the immediate purpose of providing additional food and electric power for war needs and the further purpose of realizing the project's original objectives of preserving existing agricultural production and developments, maintaining municipal and industrial developments, and providing for improvement of navigation, flood control, and development of hydroelectric power; and urging Congress to appropriate the necessary funds and the War Production Board to grant priorities for the required material, equipment, and manpower to complete the project as expeditiously as practicable; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3358. Also, resolution of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, opposing House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3359. Also, petition of the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., recommending that Shasta, Keswick, and Friant Dams, Friant-Kern, Madero, and Contra Costa Canals, and other necessary works of the Central Valley project, be completed and placed in operation as rapidly as feasible for the purpose of obtaining increased production of critical war crops to meet the increased food shortage, and that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Food Administrator, and War Production Board are urged to approve the necessary materials required, and that the Congress appropriate adequate funds therefor; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3360. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Potomac Boat Club, Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3361. Also, petition of T. J. Daly, of Washington, D. C., and 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3362. Also, petition of the Occidental Hotel, Washington, D. C., and signed by 29 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3363. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Cox, Washington, D. C., and 18 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3364. Also, petition of George F. Eccardt and 29 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3365. Also, petition of John Rohrback and 40 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3366. Also, petition of Harold E. Quirk and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3367. Also, petition of H. C. Hartkop and 14 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3368. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. Hauser and 190 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3369. By Mr. ANDREWS: Letter received from Sol Lenzer, president of Sol Lenzer Corporation of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against any tax being placed on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3370. Also, petition signed by 60 persons belonging to the Niagara County Chapter of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, protesting against passage of the Kilgore bill (S. 702); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3371. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Joseph F. Lamp, of La Verne, Calif., and 23 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3372. Also, petition of William Gilson, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3373. Also, petition of Nannie E. Chandler, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3374. Also, petition of Bessie L. Angelow, of Pomona, Calif., and 19 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3375. Also, petition of Ruth B. Fuller, of Pomona, Calif., and 19 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3376. Also, petition of Margaret E. McPherson, of Pomona, Calif., and 16 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3377. By Mr. BARRY: Petition of sundry residents of New York City, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation, especially during the war emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Guide of these pilgrim days, strained and tense with our burdened lives we seek the shelter and strength that surrounds us in the shadow of Thy wings. At this our daily altar of prayer we are made vividly aware that victory for the precious things we hold dearest is not to be won alone on battlefields half a world away, but in the quality of our inner lives. We who have been commissioned to find the truth about this ailing world would face the truth about ourselves. We confess that we dread to know our own heart with its strange deceptions, its studied selfishness and its calculating prudence. O God, as for this moment we look away from our tasks to Thee, Thou judge of all men, strip us of our illusions, chasten us for our willful blindness, cleanse our hearts, capture our wills, clarify our minds. With the duty of our daily lives illumined and made glorious by the light within, lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Buck	Holman	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
George	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent from the city.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS FROM MASSACHUSETTS—PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Mr. LODGE presented petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials, numerously signed, of sundry citizens and organizations, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, and also any and all proposed prohibition measures, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present for the RECORD and for appropriate reference a letter in the nature of a petition which I have received from John Frost, for many years one of the leading State officers of the Kansas Farmers' Union. The letter is as follows:

Do all you possibly can to secure additional funds to help many hard-pressed dirt-farmer families to continue to produce food for war needs. The cut in F. S. A. funds is unjust and against winning the war.

JOHN FROST.

ABILENE, KANS., *October 29, 1943.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

POST-WAR PEACE PLAN—SUGGESTIONS BY THOMAS J. REARDON, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter embodying a suggested resolution and a prepared statement on the subject of post-war peace plans by Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn. I do this at Mr. Reardon's request. I also ask unanimous consent that the letter and statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 25, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR: Inasmuch as no opportunity was given the public to be heard on the matter of post-war plans by either the Senate or House Committees on Foreign Relations, I humbly submit for your consideration the following substitute for Senate Resolution 192:

"*Resolved*, When complete victory is achieved, that the United States, acting through the "divine formula" for peace and tranquillity—'good will'—and article V and amendments IX and X of the Constitution, will cooperate with other free and sovereign people in securing a just, honorable, and lasting peace on earth.

"When the testamentary has been prepared and before it has been executed, adopted, or ratified, the voting citizens of the United States will be summoned for their verdict by ballot."

Will you kindly read this letter into the record of the Senate as a part of the discussion on the Connally resolution.

I would appreciate an answer from you, stating what action you will take on this request.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS J. REARDON.

HARTFORD, CONN.

THE PEOPLE AND FREEDOM VERSUS THE POLITICIANS AND PAWNDOM

Senate Resolution 192 (CONNALLY):

Lines 1 and 2 state the immediate objective.

Lines 3 and 4 designate those with whom it is proposed to cooperate and defines the purpose.

Lines 5 to 9 define the process for the accomplishment of the purpose.

Proposed substitute for Senate Resolution 192:

Lines 1 assumes the attainment of the immediate objective of the Connally resolution.

Lines 2, 3, and 4 define the process for the accomplishment of the purpose.

Lines 4 and 5 designate those with whom it is proposed to cooperate.

Lines 5 and 6 define the purpose.

Lines 6 to 10 define the method of implementation.

Senate Resolution 192, by ignoring article V and amendments IX and X to the Constitution of the United States, indicates clearly that the proponents of the resolution have, in their minds, suspended those provisions for the exigency of government; whereas the substitute specifically provides that cooperation should be through those provisions.

Both Senate Resolution 192 and the substitute deal with post-war plans for peace.

Senate Resolution 192 is based upon a false premise, in that it proposes to cooperate with our comrades in arms and with free and sovereign nations; whereas the true premise is that our cooperation should be with free and sovereign people.

Senate Resolution 192 does not clearly define sovereignty, whereas the substitute defines it in no uncertain terms.

Senate Resolution 192 neglects to provide for the implementation of the voice of the people in reaching a verdict on this plan; whereas the substitute sets forth the method of implementing the voice of the people so that the will of the people will prevail factually and not theoretically.

The people are an irresistible force; and thus you have the power to preserve peace when it is properly implemented. Science and mathematics will not discredit the premises and methods of the substitute resolution in the attainment of the objective. They will discredit the premises and methods of the Connally resolution.

The proposed substitute is a resolution to serve one master, and it would further the cause of freedom which is possible only in government of, by, and for the people. Senate Resolution 192 is a resolution to serve two masters and would further the cause of pawndom, which is government of the politicians, for the people, by the politicians.

The Fulbright and the Connally resolutions are both simple declarations of our national post-war policy. This at least is the claim of those who propose and defend them.

I do not agree. I believe both documents to be dangerous in the extreme, bartering away our sovereignty for no apparent return.

Its future interpretation can involve us in the affairs of every nation perpetually and can keep us sending armies to all parts of the world forever.

Therefore, I oppose both resolutions. I have carefully scrutinized the course of this movement, the men, methods, and arguments involved in promoting what is a world monarchy.

Both resolutions favor peace but propose to maintain it by force and aggression. This sounds to me like a contradiction in terms, involving false premises and conclusions, which will leave the peace of the world disturbed for generations.

Their passage without amendments means the surrender of our independence against our will and without our consent. Nowhere in our Constitution is there a provision for the surrender of our independence, either by charter, proclamation, doctrine, resolution, or treaty.

The success of these resolutions will create the greatest danger that has faced this Nation since its birth, and the accomplishment of the purpose would be the death of it. Wittingly or unwittingly, it will be either ignorance or cupidity of our representatives that will permit the passage.

I ask them in the name of God and our country by their ballot to defend the very thing that our armed forces, at their command, are defending with their lives.

The objective of both the Connally resolution and the substitute I propose is apparently the same, a post-war plan for peace; but the premises for its accomplishment between the two differ in the following respects:

The Connally resolution provides that the United States shall cooperate with its comrades in arms. The substitute provides that it shall cooperate with other free and sovereign people.

The Connally resolution provides that the United States shall act through its constitutional processes. It does not disclose the method by which this proclamation will become an obligation on the citizens of the Nation; and furthermore it is indefinite and subject to subtle interpretation.

The proposed substitute provides that the United States shall act through the "divine formula" for peace and tranquillity—good will—article V and amendments IX and X to the Constitution, which is in strict conformance with moral and natural processes and our constitutional provisions.

Article V provides for changes; amendment IX provides for the sovereignty of the people; amendment X provides for the sovereignty of the States. This is our constitutional process in the purpose proposed, and gives the ingredients that have made us a sovereign nation. The method is that, when the testamentary has been prepared, and before it is executed, adopted or ratified, the voting citizens of the United States shall be summoned for their verdict by ballot.

In conclusion, this substitute asks only that the method provide that the voice of the people of this Nation shall prevail factually, not theoretically. This will further the cause of freedom, where the Connally resolution would further the cause of pawndom.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 509) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MEAD):

S. 1500. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended,

for the purpose of clarifying its provisions with respect to its application to certain officers in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of the Rau Motor Sales Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1502. A bill to transfer funds of the Blackfeet Tribe now on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the treasurer of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of John H. Gradwell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 1504. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1505 (by request). A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 6 months after the termination of the present conflict;

S. 1506. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make further provision for the rehabilitation of honorably discharged World War No. 2 veterans;

S. 1507. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make further provision for further education of World War No. 2 veterans under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

S. 1508. A bill to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

INQUIRY RELATING TO AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS

Mr. SMITH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 200), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the supply, production, distribution, and sale of fertilizers for agricultural purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

NAVY DAY ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL ERNEST J. KING

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Admiral Ernest J. King at the Navy Day celebration in Indianapolis on October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FUTURE OF AVIATION—ADDRESS BY CHARLES I. STANTON

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject The Future of Aviation Is Your Business, delivered by Charles I. Stanton, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, October 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PEACE—ADDRESS BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by John Foster Dulles, chairman of the committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ to study bases of a just and durable peace, delivered at the opening of the Christian mission for world order at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COURAGEOUS SENATORS—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Courageous Senators," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of October 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE J. F. T. O'CONNOR BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM LEMKE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Doings in Congress," by Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, paying tribute to Judge J. F. T. O'Connor, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEOPLE AND THE NAVY—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT TIMES

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The People and the Navy," published in the Shreveport (La.) Times, of October 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN YUGOSLAVIA

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nazis Stir Up Rival Factions—Yugoslavs May Turn on Invading Allied Army," published in the Washington Daily News on Monday, November 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Canadian Sovereignty," published in the Toronto Mail and Empire of October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BEWARE OF A SUPERSTATE—EDITORIAL BY EDWARD J. MEEMAN

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Cooperate to Enforce Peace, but Beware of a Superstate: Let Nations Stay Free," by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF CONNALLY RESOLUTION—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the pending Senate Resolution 192, written by Gould Lincoln and published in his column, The Political Mill, in the Evening Star of November 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRIBUTION OF FARM INCOME AND THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles, one entitled "Farm Income Unevenly Distributed," and the other entitled "Boxcar Shortage Hits Co-ops," published in the G. T. A. Digest of September-October, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY ON THE FOOD FRONT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate had a message from the President relating to food, and the distinguished Vice President some days ago discussed the food situation.

An elementary review of the food front discloses one simple fact—our strategy on the food front has not been so effective as our strategy on the military front.

We need the greatest possible food production in order to win a total victory and an effective peace.

For many months we were living on 1942 food production, and despite optimistic administration statements about the extent of our food production, the grim specter of hunger actually began to stalk in the shadows of black markets and food shortages.

Last year's harvest gave us a yield 12 percent greater per acre than ever before in our history. Production of meats and fats hit a high point. In 1942 the Allies did not have to worry about famine because we had a bumper crop.

That crop is gone now. We cannot always expect bumper crops. Consequently, we have to place our reliance on average yields which, with increased acreage, will bring us adequate food.

Lack of farm manpower and lack of farm machinery has cost us some 47,000,000 acres of production, according to former President Herbert Hoover. Our food supplies are dwindling, and our demand is rising.

Our field-crop production will be 7 percent below last year's record levels. The feed grains we have raised will not be sufficient to maintain our present rates of livestock and poultry feeding. We will have a large corn crop, and large potato and bean crops, but we will have 10 percent less fruit of all kinds.

The aggregate tonnage of the eight principal processing vegetables will be about 7 percent below last year's levels. The total canned pack of vegetables this year will probably be somewhere between 5 and 10 percent smaller than that of last year.

Why are there food shortages? The answer, in part at least, is simple. Government has not used common sense in its planning.

Let us discuss briefly some of our food policy shortcomings, and the remedies for them.

We are soon to face a food crisis. That food crisis could determine the course of the war, and it could certainly determine the stability and permanency of the peace. Yet, despite the importance of the food front, we face a food crisis—face it without a completely workable food program.

What is the first and most obvious shortcoming in this connection? It is the lack of a centralized direction for food production. At the present time there are five men who have leading posts in our food administration—but there still is not one central authority. There still is not any one man who can survey the over-all food picture, and determine just where food processors and canners fit into that picture. There still is not any one man who can definitely establish the vital relationship of food processing and food preservation to food production itself. There are too many food agencies, and too much division of authority. Too many cooks and too many recipes are spoiling the broth. Changing cooks every now and then will not accomplish the job. We need to fire

all the extra cooks, and then have just one cook with just one recipe.

The War Food Administrator does not have adequate authority. He functions in a fantastic Alice in Wonderland setup in which he shares ultimate authority with the Director of Economic Stabilization and the Director of War Mobilization. Recommendation No. 1 is that we settle our management problem now, and place final authority for the food program in one centralized source. Experienced men must be called in to organize a single, workable program, to be directed by a single authority.

What are some of the elements which must be considered in that program? To begin with, it must be a program which lodges adequate power in the War Food Administrator. It must also establish public responsibility for the program in the Administrator.

Secondly, while authority is centralized, administration must be decentralized from bureaucratic Washington to the production areas themselves. Rationing and regulations must be administered locally, in accordance with localized needs.

The program must continue to maintain those policies now under way which are designed to preserve our farm manpower. Along with this program, however, it will be necessary to give further attention to the farm machinery program.

It seems elementary to state that our machinery must match our acreage requirements, but this obvious fact has been consistently overlooked in governmental planning. We are planning now on supplying 80 percent of the farm machinery requirements of 1940 or 1941. That is the bedrock minimum for a normal planting next year. But the requirements for next year will be above normal.

We should study the possibility of limiting our price control to basic items; and if we are to have price controls, we had better consider establishing them at all levels. In any event, the control and rationing regulations must be greatly simplified. The retailer's job ought to be simplified. Production should be underwritten by guaranteeing to producers, long in advance of planting and breeding seasons, minimum prices for their products.

As to grade labeling, I do not think there is any room in our food production planning for experiments along that line. The average individual spends 4 percent of his food budget for canned products. He spends about 16 percent of his budget for fresh fruits and vegetables.

During the first 14 months following the issuance of general price regulations, food prices as a whole advanced 24 points, though the retail prices of canned foods advanced only 10 points for the same period. Canned foods have had the smallest percentage of price inincrease of any food. There have been fewer violations in canning price controls than in other fields. The over-all food program should take cognizance of these facts.

I shall not take time to discuss, or even outline, all of the many elements which must be considered in an over-all food program, but I do want to say that it is imperative for us to organize our domestic program in the immediate future, or we shall find some of our existing domestic program more or less permanently enshrined in a world-wide program for the control of farm-commodity production and prices.

We know the administration contemplates a world-wide triple-A, a world-wide surplus commodities disposal plan, and some type of a world-wide ever-normal granary.

Frankly, at first blush, that looks as though we may be contemplating the perpetuation on an international scale of some of our domestic blunders. Our ever-normal granary cost us tremendous sums, and did not do the job. Our Federal Farm Bureau hit bottom when it tried to stabilize wheat and cotton prices against the dwindling demand from 1929 to 1932. The Commodity Credit Corporation was distorted from its original purpose to serve as a price-raising machine. Such an organization operated on a world-wide scale would run up a fabulous deficit of many billions.

Now, what about the food policies for 1944? Well, the administration has consistently written its food-production policies in the shifting sands of day-to-day expediency, and I doubt if there is anyone who can predict what 1944 food policies will be.

Probably the 1944 farm-production schedules will call for the use of every available acre of land—the use of every farming facility. Probably foods destined for direct consumption—dry beans, peas, wheat, vegetables, potatoes—will have first claim in the administration's program. Low-yielding feed crops will probably be displaced by high-yield feed crops.

The over-all feed supply will be about 18 percent smaller per animal unit, and consequently there will be a reduction in certain types of livestock and poultry—probably hogs, broiler-type chickens, and turkeys.

The War Food Administration will set up increased goals for wheat, soybeans, sugar beets, fresh vegetables, vegetables for processing, dry beans and peas, milk, beef cattle, corn, hay, eggs, and cattle for slaughter.

There will probably be decreases in hogs, sheep and lambs on farms, farm chickens, commercial broilers, barley, sorghum, oats, rye, and flaxseed.

We will probably be using about 380,000,000 acres of crop—the largest ever utilized by the country.

Despite these heroic goals, and despite the superhuman efforts of farmers, processors, canners, and all the other people involved in our food production, we will face a serious possibility of food shortage if we do not centralize our food authority and outline a definite program. I do not attempt to say what this program must be, but many excellent programs have been submitted by men who are actually on the food-production front. Any one of them would probably be better than the constantly shifting, poorly defined, hit-or-miss, trial-and-error hodge podge which has been serving as a makeshift food policy. The sooner we recognize that food is a weapon of war, competitive with all other war materials, the sooner we shall have a workable food policy.

The same chemicals that go into explosives also go into fertilizers; the same seed that could go into livestock feed can be used in the production of alcohol or can be ground for oil; the same steel that could go into tractors or milk cans may be used for tanks.

It is up to us to strike the best possible balance—one which will allocate sufficient acreage, manpower, and materials to our farms so that our fighting front and our home front can be maintained.

It is difficult to believe that our acreage increases will keep pace with war requirements. It appears inevitable that there will be shifts to new types of food—soya flour, for example. There will certainly be some sort of a trend toward compressed and dehydrated foods. One scientist in the Department of Agriculture has already developed ration foods—adequate for a day's means—which will fit into a candy box. Of course, these foods must be rehydrated before consumption.

It is interesting to note that 25 bombers could carry enough of these packages to feed all Athens for a single day. Think what that may mean in the postwar period. Think what it may possibly mean today in times of transportation shortage.

As to steel, we know that it takes 18,000 tons to make the cans for 5,000,000 cases of evaporated milk. We know that it takes steel to make cans for vegetables; and we also know that if many of our crops are not canned the crops will go to waste—and that is criminal in a time of grave potential food shortages.

I do not know precisely what the administration will do with respect to the allocation of materials to the canning industry; but regardless of what allocations are finally determined, it seems likely that there will be some increased emphasis on food-freezing programs. It is alleged that an expansion of our frozen-food capacity by some 75,000,000 pounds would require less than half as much steel as would be needed to put that much food into cans. It is further contended that if no new storage facilities had to be built, only a twentieth as much steel would be needed to freeze the food as to can it. The proponents of frozen-food facilities also claim that it would take 1,860 less freight cars of 46,000-pound capacity to transport the frozen food than to move it in canned form.

Expansions for the frozen-food industry have already been authorized. How this will affect the canning industry, it is difficult to say; but at least it is well at this time to be aware of these trends so that we can plan intelligently for the future.

The canning industry has accomplished an outstanding job on the food

front. It has rendered a tremendous service to the Nation in spite of the handicaps of severe labor shortages, shifting price policies, poorly planned restrictions, and general food Government directives and interference. Not all the Government regulations have been bad—but a good many of them have. The great canning industry has patriotically and constructively worked on the home front to provide one essential requisite for victory—food.

I believe that we will do some intelligent planning, and I have faith that we will meet the food crisis. I also believe that this entire food problem is closely linked to the Armistice Day which we are soon to observe.

Our solution of the food problem will determine to a large degree whether the armistice of this war will be a hollow mockery or the beginning of a new era.

Just a year ago, on November 11, we received word that the French Fleet and some of the French fighting forces had joined the Allies. Twenty-five years ago the Allied Nations had terminated one of the bloodiest wars in history. Today, a quarter of a century later, we are engaged in an even more terrible war—and today we have an even greater responsibility to our fallen heroes.

Part of that responsibility is the solution of the food problem so that we may have ample food not only to win the war, but to preserve the peace for which those men have fought. Our job today is to keep faith with the men of Bataan and Corregidor and Africa and the beach at Salerno.

There are still great forces here in America which enable us to maintain our hope for a peaceful world. Here in America we have met the challenge of this war with the vision and initiative of a young people. We are casting off the prophets of despair who thought that there were no new horizons for America. We are experiencing a new sense of unity. We are beginning to measure our policies by the yardstick of the general welfare, rather than by the needs of particular pressure groups.

All of this means that we must let the world know now that we mean business in seeking a way to secure world peace. It is not enough for us to pass pious resolutions expressing a devout hope for world peace. We must mean them, and we must be willing to make them stick.

There is imperative need for understanding rather than underestimating the tremendous extent of the task confronting us before the war can be won. There is the imperative need for working out complete accord between the United Nations throughout the war effort and in the post-war period. There is an imperative need for making certain that America will be strong and secure—secure from attack from within and without.

In all this, food will play an important role. On this day, while we are still engaged in another great war, it is well for us to realize that there can never be world peace while men are hungry. There can never be peace while there is famine. Dictators and unrest lurk in the shadows of breadlines. Revolutions and wars are bred when men are starved physically and spiritually.

To the extent that we succeed in feeding men's bodies and men's spirits—to that extent alone can we dream and hope for an abiding peace.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to insert a new section after line 9, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. TUNNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I wish to say to the distinguished and very accommodating Senator from Delaware that I desire at this time to make a short statement because I have official business which obliges me to leave the Senate for the time being.

Mr. President, I am rising to express my conviction that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators, including myself, should be adopted. It is my opinion, amply supported by able arguments made on this floor by the co-authors of the amendment, that the Connally resolution is not specific, that it does not specify the establishment of an organization with power to act in order to prevent aggression of such outlaw nations as Germany, Fascist Italy, and Japan, and that it does not authorize the grant of power necessary to enforce decisions.

It is gratifying to read of the successful conclusion of the Moscow conference and to find the great Secretary of State of the United States expressing the opinion that the agreement is the end of isolationism. But, Mr. President, isolationism cannot end and will not end unless the Senate is willing to end it. A small group of wiliful men kept us from assuming our world obliagtions in 1919-20, and the same thing can happen again. I am just as sure as I can be that this World War is the result of the 1919–20 isolationist attitude, and I am equally sure that another and a worse war will follow this one, unless the United Nations and their allies, and all the other sovereign nations, decide to work together for peace as they are working together for victory.

I want this greatest of legislative bodies to go on record in no uncertain terms that it will not again contribute to a condition that will cause another world war.

Therefore, I am supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and other Senators to the Connally resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have received a telegram relating to the pending resolution and the amendments proposed thereto, from a very earnest and sincere man, Mr. G. Ashton Oldham, of Albany, N. Y., which reads as follows:

ALBANY, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*

CARL HATCH,

Care Senate:

Greatly appreciate the effort you and co-author of Senate Resolution 114 are making to strengthen Connally resolution. I hope Senate will pass resolution containing essence of paragraphs 4 and 5 of your resolution, thus confirming more closely to joint declaration of the churches.

G. ASHTON OLDHAM.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have listened very attentively to the debate on the pending resolution. I have received a statement from a man by the name of King, of Quincy, Mass. I do not know who he is or what he represents. I am somewhat taken by some of the things set forth in the statement, and I propose to read it to the Senate. It is very short:

World War No. 1, greater than all previous wars of the world combined, had a direct cost of over $186,000,000,000 and over 13,700,000 lives.

The forces of liberty and law won the war; but then lost the peace.

Now, only 25 years later, we are in the midst of World War No. 2, even greater and more terrible.

The forces of liberty and law will again win the war; Will they again lose the peace?

The United States of America is the most powerful Nation.

After World War No. 1, we dominated the peace.

Then, because of politics and isolationism, we failed to join the League of Nations with its 42 nations (later 60) united for peace and justice.

Chiefly because of our failure to follow through what we began, the League of Nations failed in its accomplishments, and there evolved World War No. 2.

Have we learned our bitter lesson?

Have we profited by the calamity our failure brought upon the whole world?

Shall our continued blindness and stupidity lead to World War No. 3?

"Any man may make a mistake; none but a fool will persist in it." (Cicero.)

Mr. President, if we are satisfied with present world conditions we are wasting a great deal of time. I think each Senator and each citizen should ask himself the question whether he is satisfied with the world conditions as we now see them and whether the likelihood exists that, unless something is done, there will be a repetition of the present World War within the next 25 years.

As one of the Foreign Relations Committee who was not a member of the subcommittee appointed for the purpose of considering all resolutions concerning post-war relations, I desire to express my appreciation to the four Senators who have devoted so much time and attention to creating public sentiment for some form of international cooperation. For many months these four Senators have unselfishly devoted themselves to this cause. In my opinion they accomplished much in the way of affecting public opinion. I think the Senators who have in this discussion contributed toward the understanding of the American people of the purposes and intent of

the authors of the various resolutions deserve the commendation and gratitude of every American citizen. I particularly desire at this time to congratulate the members of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee who, while being accused of deliberately delaying the report, were in fact considering a problem which may affect the future of mankind. The resolution which was prepared by the subcommittee and recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee, without amendment, had the support of persons with entirely opposite views.

I desire to say that observing the members of the subcommittee and hearing their statements regarding the real position they had taken and the words they had been willing to substitute caused me to have an increased respect for the Senators who spent their time and their energy in the preparation of the resolution. Yet, I do not believe anyone who reads the resolution can say that it is either weak, vague, or innocuous. I know there are those who, without thought, it seems to me, say the resolution is weak. If it is weak to have the power which is suggested in the resolution, I do not know what weakness means. It suggests more power than has ever been wielded by any potentate in the history of the world; and to say that it is weak is a revelation to me.

It said that the resolution is vague. I do not see that it is vague. It sets forth exactly what it intends to do, what power it intends to grant, and the purpose of that grant if the opportunity arises. The men responsible for the resolution have performed a public service of great value.

I am one of those who have opposed the idea of presenting in the Senate a declaration as to a definite plan of postwar procedure. As to this particular question, I have found myself rather in harmony with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I believed it was not advisable to present a definite plan covering all the questions which we believe might arise. I still so believe. In the first place, I feared the effect on our relations with our allies. I feared the effect of the discussion in the Senate as to the pros and cons of such a plan, but I did not believe that was the only danger involved. I feared the division of public sentiment in America as to the details of any plan for international cooperation. I know of no way of assuring a division of public sentiment more certainly than to consider and discuss not only every question which arises but every question which we think might arise with reference to such a problem as that which faces the people of the world at this time.

With our constitutional system of ratification of treaties, any controversial matter is likely to attract to each side more than one-third of the Members of the United States Senate. The present discussion demonstrates the danger of any premature division of public sentiment. In the Senate practically all Senators who have spoken have been united on the general question, and yet there is a division of sentiment. The discussion in the Senate proves that public sentiment in America could easily be divided on matters which do not at this time need to be discussed in the determination of a post-war policy. The debate in the Senate has developed into a contest between Senators who favor the establishment and maintenance of an international authority with power to prevent aggression and other Senators who favor the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with power to settle international disputes peacefully and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression. In other words, the contest is one between those who believe in the declaration of a policy to enforce international peace, but who do not favor the detailing of specific plans at this time, believing that such plans properly belong to the discussion and language of the peace treaty when it shall be written, and those who insist on a more specific resolution. A majority of those who have opposed the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations have stated that they desire more specific details relative to the powers referred to in the resolution. Thus far a majority of the Senators who have participated in the discussion in the Senate are practically in agreement that the Senate of the United States should declare for some policy of international cooperation to enforce the peace. I think there has been only one Senator who, during the debate, made a speech against that general proposition.

It is interesting to consider the points of agreement between the Connally resolution and the Pepper-Ball amendment, as well as the differences between them. In both the Connally resolution and the Pepper-Ball amendment the language of the first and second paragraphs is identical. As I have understood the objections to the Connally resolution by those who favor the Pepper-Ball amendment, it seems to me the disagreement arises with respect to certain words or phrases among the 36 words of the third paragraph of the Connally resolution. Since the last 9 words of the Connally resolution are identical with the last 9 words of the Pepper-Ball amendment, the disagreement must be entirely with reference to the first 27 words of the Connally resolution. Since the first 11 words of the Connally resolution are identical with the first 11 words of the Pepper-Ball amendment, I arrive at the conclusion that the disagreement is entirely with reference to what is contained in the 16 words of the Connally resolution, which are as follows:

> Free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent.

I am not one of those who believe that the pending matter is one of definition. I do not think the issue can be drawn that close. I think the question is one as to whether the Senate of the United States desires to make a declaration to the world that it favors some form of enforced international cooperation after the present war. The difficulties in reaching agreement are multiplied, it seems to me, by reason of the ghost of the League of Nations and the debates as to the existence of the League, after the First World War. If one is to criticize the Connally resolution because it does not set out an international plan, the criticism is correct. From Webster's dictionary, I find one of the definitions of the word "plan" to be "a way proposed to carry out a design." "Policy," by the same dictionary is defined as "a settled or definite course or method adopted and followed by government, institution, body, or individual." It seems to me that the difficulty among a great many of those who have disagreed as to the various resolutions has arisen because some have insisted upon a definite plan with all the details, while others, including the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, believe that the designation of a policy is sufficient, and is all that should be agreed upon at this time.

I am one of those who believe that at this stage of the World War a definite plan which would specifically either include or exclude certain details might be more embarrassing than helpful in the preparation of the peace treaty. The declaration of a policy by the United States or by either branch of Congress is a matter for the United States or the particular branch of Congress. The agreement upon a plan or treaty of peace must be a plan agreed upon by the various nations ratifying such a treaty. This is not our work alone. We can very well declare for a policy such as that of the Connally resolution, in the hope and on the theory that other nations may agree as to the same general policy. No other nation can take exception to the fact that the United States Senate favors a policy of agreement with it.

The probability that any human being, or any group of human beings, could at this stage prepare a treaty of peace which would include an entire plan which would be appropriate at the end of the war is extremely unlikely. That any group or collection of human beings could prepare any plan for the peace treaty which would not include something not desired or advisable in the treaty of peace is also extremely unlikely. I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that a complete plan for the peace treaty suggested by the United States or by either branch of its national legislature might be a source of annoyance to other nations who might participate in the preparation of the peace treaty. Such a plan might very easily be considered by many of the Allied Nations as an attempt on the part of the United States to dictate to the rest of the world the details of an agreement to be entered into in the future by nations which might not only be unfavorably impressed by such a move, but might be prejudiced against the attempt of the greatest Nation in the world to dictate the details of a plan, some of the provisions of which might even appear more or less ridiculous in view of the developments before the ratification of a peace treaty.

The discussion of any plan at this time partakes of the nature of a debate of moot questions which may never arise,

and which otherwise would not become matters of contention between nations. However, since these various resolutions are now before the United States Senate, and are subjects of discussion throughout the civilized world, our first question is to determine whether or not there should be any declaration of policy by which the Senate of the United States would declare itself in favor of international cooperation to prevent or suppress aggression. Many of us believe that the stake is of such momentous value that such a plan is worthy of the greatest effort. I am forced to the conclusion that the world must change its methods of settling international disputes. The present methods are those used in the main by savage man.

Yesterday we were told that possibly the pending resolution was no longer necessary because of the announcement of the successful conclusion of the Moscow Conference. I have examined all the statements which are available as to the Moscow Conference and its conclusions, and I find nothing which is contrary to the spirit of this resolution. I find nothing which in any way conflicts with the spirit of the resolution which we are considering. I do not believe that the United States Senate should simply endorse the Moscow Conference and its conclusions, and drop its own resolution. I see no reason why the Senate should not, if it wishes to do so, approve the provisions of the announcement from the Moscow Conference. I do not believe that the Senate should take that as the whole, and simply announce that it favors the conclusions reached there.

We have heard a great deal in the past year or two about the Senate taking its place in world affairs; that it should no longer listen entirely to the State Department or to the Executive. If such statements have any basis of reason, I think that the Senate should adopt its own resolution at this time.

As instruments of destruction increase in their effectiveness, the necessity of some great change in the settlement of international disputes is apparent to all, unless the population of the world is to be practically wiped out and civilization entirely destroyed. International morality has never been seriously considered by nations believing themselves to be wronged. Law recognizes the right of a man to kill or destroy when he is attacked with sufficient force to make such killing or destruction his only way of preserving life or protecting his property. A nation, as a matter of self-defense, resorts to any weapon by which it believes its continuance as a nation can be assured. At the beginning of the First World War we heard much about international law and its violation. We heard much about attacks by submarines and airplanes, without warning, on neutrals and civilians. Prior to World War No. 1, neutrals and civilians were recognized to have certain international rights. Ships of neutral nations were not sunk without notice. Nations at war attempted to protect civilians as far as possible. We are told that in the present war already 19,000,000 civilians have been destroyed, the great part of these in violation of what we so recently considered international law. In World War No. 2, warring nations are using the submarine and attacking neutral ships without warning. All the warring nations are using the airplane to attack and destroy civilian population. As distance is wiped out and destruction of life and property increases, it is conceivable that methods of destroying whole nations at one blow may be developed. The principal nations in World War No. 2 are constantly watching for the use of new and more dangerous weapons. Each side stands constantly in fear of the invention and use of more terrible weapons of destruction of both persons and property. The discoveries of methods of preserving and keeping alive the human body in its weak, wounded and disabled condition do not compensate for the increased destruction of human life. In the destruction of human life, the men and women with the greatest prospects of individual success and of scientific development are not spared. The boys of America are taken from high school and placed in the military forces. Perhaps there may be education in military technique. One thing cannot be denied. The separation of the best and greatest prospects for civilian development of young men and women will have an extremely important effect upon the civilian development of the great nations of the future.

A couple of days ago I read a statement, the author of which I believe was a Mr. Kirschner, in which it was stated that there are 10,000,000 starving boys and girls in 4 countries of Europe. That is the number of children who are starving. The statement contained nothing about the millions of children who are half-starving and are being dwarfed in their development.

Not only the small nations which have been overcome by Axis domination, but the large and powerful of the United Nations as well, are paying a penalty which will shock and weaken civilization for generations. Methods of communication have brought nations so close in the matter of approach and attack that no nation can continue to consider itself safe from the perfidy or desire of any other nation which may believe itself to be wronged, or which may be motivated by ambitions or desires for territorial possessions or military power.

The great nations of the world, and particularly our own, are paying a tremendous financial penalty. It is not only the Government of the United States, or the government of any of our allies, or of our enemies that are in financial distress, but the individual fortunes of every man, woman, and child in the civilized world are being affected by this war. Businessmen are obstructed in their business operations. The tax collector, in order to preserve civilization under present methods, must take a very large part of the individual incomes of all men. War and war's inventions, as well as war's destructions, are giving a terrific jolt not alone to the lives of mankind, but to their assets, and to the tools and equipment which enable them to live civilian lives with comfort.

In the short period that I have been a Member of the Senate I have heard some of its most sincere Members express themselves to the effect that it was possible for the United States of America to stay out of European, Asiatic, and African wars. I do not now hear that argument used. Those who once used it believed it possible. They do not now believe it. In a war involving civilization and its continued existence, the greatest nation in the world cannot stand aloof and disinterested.

There was a time when we could declare the Monroe Doctrine with some hope of military enforcement of our ideas. The present war has shown that no nation in the world is capable of defending its colonial dominions or distant possessions. Holland has lost its Indies. Italy has lost its African possessions. Continental Germany is being closed in by the greatest military forces ever collected by the power of man. The United States was unable to protect the Philippines. Hawaii was the scene of the opening of the contest, or attack against the United States. France has lost not only its possessions, but its home territory. Great Britain, with its far-flung empire, some parts of which are basking in the noonday sun at each hour of the day, from a defense standpoint has been the most conspicuous failure of all the great nations. Great Britain's Singapore fell without a serious defense. Even the mother country was unable to defend either India or Australia.

What is the position of the United States in this situation? We have repeatedly declared that we have no territorial ambitions. In the present world situation, not only have we become responsible for the territorial solidarity of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, but in an attempt at world domination by the Axis Powers we have been compelled as a matter of self-defense to help defend the territories of all our allies. In a struggle for the control of the world by one nation, the United States in self-defense must ally itself with the opposition, or take the chance of contesting alone with the remainder of the civilized world. If this had been, as many seemed to believe, simply another European war, a war between individual states with no ambition for, or possibility of, world domination, our country could well have afforded to take some chance of being attacked. In a contest which bade fair to place more than half of the world's population under the domination of a half-civilized yellow race, and the remainder under the domination of the totalitarian power centered in Germany, the existence of our honor, our lives, our property, and our freedom was at stake.

No one nation, including our own, is capable of defending its own territory and meeting its own commitments. We might as well face the fact; it is the situation we confront. I do not know whether colonization and territorial possessions are advantageous to any nation. I do not know whether they are beneficial to civilization. I do not favor placing all these positions and details in a declaration of policy. I believe that more

properly belongs to the peace table and the peace treaty. However, I am opposed to taking the position that we will have no part of such possessions, and at the same time assume the responsibility of defending the distant possessions of Great Britain, France, Holland, Italy, Germany, Japan, and even of continental Russia. This international game cannot and must not be played entirely for the purpose of using the military force of our country to preserve the territorial possessions of our allies, or those of our enemies, or those of our allies today who may be our enemies tomorrow. I do not favor such a plan. The plan which this Nation can subscribe to after the war shall have been concluded must be one in which there is some mutuality.

There must be some agreement by which the various nations of the world who participate in the formation of such an organization must pay, must work, and must assume responsibility somewhat commensurate with the advantages they are to obtain.

I believe that in this critical situation the United States cannot evade a world responsibility. It cannot evade a responsibility to civilization. It cannot evade a responsibility to itself. We cannot and dare not again sit idly by, diminish our Army, sink our ships, neglect our airplanes, while the war clouds gather, and then bankrupt our Nation and our citizens because the world has allowed an international mad dog to escape the kennel. We have had an interest in the European situation since the First World War. We shall have an interest at the peace table. We shall have an interest in post-war conditions, to make certain tnat there shall not be a recurrence of the calamity which has overwhelmed the world.

No citizen of the United States has a stronger feeling of pride in our great Nation than have I. No individual has a greater desire to preserve our Government free and apart from international complications. However, it is now apparent to all Americans that any attempt to dominate the world by any nation or combination of nations on the eastern continent must eventually involve the United States. This condition must not recur.

Shall the United States join with other nations in an attempt to preserve the peace, or shall we assume the full responsibility for preserving a world peace? Shall we undertake the policing of the whole world, and refuse the protection of our sovereignty to any part of the world? Shall we allow the benefits, if there are such, to flow to our trade competitors, and at the same time protect by the flag and armies of the United States the sovereignty and commercial supremacy of our competitors, with no participation therein by ourselves? In my humble opinion, the time has come when the United States must not only take part in the suppression of world eruptions, but must participate in the preservation of peaceful development and commercial growth throughout the world during peacetimes. I agree that Uncle Sam cannot be the policeman of the world without pay, without thanks, and without appreciation.

I shall support the Foreign Relations Committee's recommendation because I believe that some form of declaration of policy should be adopted, and I believe this one to be sufficient. I shall favor this resolution, not because I believe it sets out the conditions necessary in a treaty of peace, but because it declares for a policy which I believe to be sufficient, and because it does not attempt to specify in great detail the means by which this purpose is to be accomplished. I have discussed one particular phase of the world situation which I think must be taken care of at the peace table, and have no desire to have those ideas or provisions incorporated into any resolution of policy. I desire to demonstrate, if possible, the desirability of having much in a peace treaty or a peace plan which cannot be included in a declaration of policy by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, we have tried isolation. The world has outgrown it. Our inventions and our growth have made a continuation of that policy impossible. Two world wars are sufficient to prove to 90 percent of the American people that the United States cannot stay out and refuse to participate in world struggles. The great military struggles of the future will necessarily be world struggles. Germany has proved that one nation uncurbed can, by alliances and military aggression, make itself a serious contender for world domination, and can destroy international good will from the face of the earth. Gentlemen, isolationism has failed. The American people recognize it. Its former advocates recognize it. We hear now instead of the word "isolationist" the word "nationalist." Instead of the word "isolationism," we hear the words "total isolationism."

There are those who point to the silence of Josef Stalin as the model of international statesmanship. I am not willing to concede that the American people are comparable to the Russian people in their experience as to freedom in government. I am not willing to concede that the United States Government has the power in the settlement of international disputes that Mr. Stalin has. There are those who insist that the United States should not make a declaration of policy. Millions are asking the Senate to make such a declaration. The world is demanding that the United States shall now state its policy as to whether it will again "run out" on all efforts at compelling international peace as it did after World War No. 1. The world, including our own citizens, is entitled to know that the Senate of the United States is in sympathy with humanity in its effort to prevent a third world war. Can this plan of international cooperation succeed? Can any plan of international cooperation succeed? I do not know. No human being knows. I can conceive of no organization, authority, league, or any other combination that will be a greater failure in preservation of peace or civilization than has been the failure caused by the attitude of the United States after the last World War. Woodrow Wilson, with prophetic vision, foresaw this World War. He sincerely attempted to avert it. The United States was not quite ready to enter into any form of international cooperation. At any rate, two-thirds of the Senate could not be combined to make that momentous decision.

They decided to risk not alone our civilization, but the world's civilization on a chance. We are now paying the price of risking the chance that was taken. This war is the greatest struggle ever known to man, but the difficulties and the struggle facing civilization today in the war are far less than the problems which face us when we attempt to prevent a repetition of such wars. The preservation of world peace is far more difficult than the winning of a world peace by a world victory. Resolution 192 attempts to pledge the Senate to the policy of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. I presume that many military struggles would not call into operation the activity of such an authority. Such authority should not be compelled to participate in all military struggles. Had there been such an organization and such power applied in 1776, there would have been no United States of America. I presume that there will be other struggles for freedom; that there will be other international struggles between nations that have no dangerous significance.

This resolution in no way pledges the United States to participate in any particular aggression or in any particular war. It declares in favor of the power to do so. The resolution simply declares the belief of the Senate of the United States that the United States can, through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of such authority. The authority shall have power to prevent aggression and power to preserve peace.

It is not my purpose to criticize the Pepper-Ball amendment. If it were here alone, my vote would be for it. If its purpose is to establish and maintain an international organization to promote cooperation among nations and to have authority to settle international disputes peaceably or with power, which includes military force, I think it has some merit. I am for the purpose of the Pepper-Ball amendment, but the resolution coming from the Foreign Relations Committee also has that objective.

At this time, for its psychological effect on the world, I believe, as I believed in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that the greater the degree of unanimity in the Senate, in the Nation, and in the world, for some plan, some authority to preserve peace, to prevent aggression, or suppress aggression, the greater its effect for good will be. Believing that nothing but a declaration of policy could get support approaching unanimity or be desirable at this time, I favor the declaration of policy contained in the resolution as it came from the Foreign Relations Committee.

I cannot agree that this declaration of policy is weak or vague. I cannot agree that the word "power" does not include the military. I cannot agree that the words, "prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world" have no clear meaning, and do not include the suppression of aggression and the use of power in such suppression. I believe that the word "power" includes mental power, spiritual power, moral power, financial power, international power, as well as military power. When I hear it argued that a resolution which authorizes or approves authority with power unlimited is weak, I cannot understand that sort of argument. If this authority has the power, I do not think the criticism that it is weak in any sense applies.

However, there are those who fear the surrender of sovereignty by our Government. This argument was used in the Constitutional Convention against the ratification of the Constitution by the States. Had those who feared any agreement succeeded in preventing the ratification of the Constitution by the various States, there would have been no Federal Union, and there would undoubtedly have been a lack of development in North America comparable with the lack of development in some other sections of the world. It is not necessary or desirable that the United States surrender its sovereignty or any part thereof. The same sort of argument was applied to the far West when the settlement of that area was taking place. There were those who did not wish to give up what they thought to be their rights. The result was first what was known as the vigilance committees, and later there developed regular governments.

There are those who fear that in some way our joining or becoming a part of an organization having power to prevent the violation of all the laws of man and of mankind in some way makes us give up rights which we now have. It seems to me that the world wars have proven that no government is capable of protecting those rights. If an organization can be created which will be able to save our Government and our people and the people of the world from such a catastrophe as that in which the world is now engulfed, it is worth the effort.

It is not necessary or desirable that the United States surrender its sovereignty or any part of it. It is exceedingly desirable—it is necessary—that something be done by this generation to protect our descendants and our successors against the horrible conditions and results of international agreements such as were handed down to us by our predecessors.

Mr. President, I do not favor the surrender of American sovereignty. I do not favor the diluting of United States sovereignty, whatever that may mean. I, at least, do not like the word. I do not believe that either the surrender or dilution of United States sovereignty is necessary, or that it is necessary for us to do something as to world affairs under an agreement that we are doing without an agreement. Without any agreement as to participation in the great struggles of the world, we have become one of the greatest contributors to the sacrifices to maintain world civilization. Let us not, as the prospect for victory increases, forget the terrible cost of the present struggle. Let us not fail to take every possible step that may accomplish the laudable result we all have in mind. Generations unborn will sing the praises of those with sufficient patriotism and sufficient foresight to aid in bringing about such a result.

However, we are told that if the resolution is agreed to no ratification of a treaty will be necessary, as the adoption of the resolution might be considered to be the advice and consent of the Senate in advance.

Yesterday we heard that question raised in the Senate. We saw the tenpins set up; we saw them knocked down. We heard it said that the President of the United States might be impeached, on the presumption that he might violate his oath and do what he should not do, or if he were not impeached the Congress could refuse to furnish him the money requested. Finally we were told that we would have to rely somewhat on the honor of the President of the United States. As I listened to the discussion I thought what a contrast there was between the standpoint of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who went into a conference and discussed every possible phase of the situation without any malice or partisan bias so far as I have ever heard charged, and the contention which was made that the President of the United States may possibly one of these days fail to do what he should do. I cannot think of anything much more ridiculous than at this time to assume that we had better not agree to a resolution which we favor because it might be that some President may not do what he should do.

I do not believe that the nations of the world will accept this sort of an explanation of failure on the part of the Executive to submit a treaty to the Senate for ratification. I do not believe that other members of such organization or parties to such treaty would be content to accept the responsibilities placed upon them without a real assurance that the United States had legally agreed to assume its part in world policing, or in the enforcement of peace, or suppression of aggression, or the prevention of aggression. When it comes to writing the terms in the treaty of peace, all nations must perform their part. The United States cannot and must not be left to enforce world morality and guarantee world peace.

Mr. President, there are those who say that this resolution is too strong. I have more sympathy with those who make that statement than I have with those who say that the resolution does not mean anything, and personally I hope that no Member of the Senate will vote for the resolution on the assumption that it is not sufficiently strong. It is strong enough to include all the power necessary to do the thing it sets out to do, which is to preserve peace. I do not agree with those who claim that the resolution is too strong in its terms. I think after all we have to rely somewhat upon the intelligence and the foresight of those who will later have the responsibility of determining other momentous questions. The resolution can be too strong only for those who favor no resolution, who favor no authority, who favor no league and no organization, and who desire us to go back in our beliefs to a prewar period, and again deceive the people of our Nation into the belief that we can live separate and apart from all other civilized nations. This must not be. Whether any particular plan which may be suggested at the peace table or elsewhere may be implemented within the province of this resolution is to me not so important as to have a practically unanimous declaration of the Senate of the United States to a form of international cooperation in accordance with a policy which can be implemented by the provisions of a treaty of peace so worded as to protect and preserve not alone other Allied Nations, but protect and preserve, Mr. President, your children and my children, your grandchildren and my grandchildren, your property and my property, your flag and my flag, from such a catastrophe as has fallen on civilization in this era.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, which were, on page 5, to strike out all after line 11 over to and including line 19 on page 6 and insert:

SEC. 8 (a) For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term "full military benefits" means all rights, privileges, immunities, and benefits provided under any law of the United States in the case of commissioned military and naval personnel of the United States (including their surviving beneficiaries) on account of active military or naval service, including, but not limited to, burial payments in the event of death, 6 months' pay and allowances in case of death, veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, retirement, including retirement for disability, the rights provided under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, as amended, the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, travel allowances, including per diem allowances for travel without regard to repeated travel between two or more places in the same vicinity, allowances for uniforms, exemption of certain pay from Federal income taxation, and other benefits, privileges and exceptions under the Internal Revenue laws;

(2) the term "limited military benefits" means full military benefits, except veterans' compensation and pensions and other veterans' benefits, and eligibility under the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended.

(b) Beginning with the date of enactment of this act, commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries)—

(1) in time of war, shall be entitled to limited military benefits with respect to all active service in the Public Health Service;

(2) while such officers are detailed for duty with the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard,

shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such duty;

(3) while such officers are serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska in time of war, shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to such service.

(c) In time of war, the President may by Executive order declare the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service a part of the military forces of the United States and provide the extent to which it shall be subject to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy. Upon the issuance of such an Executive order, all commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries), shall be entitled to full military benefits with respect to active service rendered while the Public Health Service is a part of the military forces of the United States.

SEC. 9. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, regular and reserve (including their surviving beneficiaries), shall be entitled to receive the same benefits for injury or death in the performance of their duties as civil officers and employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That any such officer or beneficiary of such officer eligible to receive any benefit authorized by this section who is also eligible to receive any payment or benefit (except the proceeds of any insurance policy) under any provision of law other than such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, on account of the same injury or death, shall elect which benefit he shall receive

SEC. 10. The surviving beneficiaries of any commissioned officer of the Public Health Service, regular or reserve, who, since December 7, 1941, and prior to the enactment of this act has lost his life while on active duty in the Public Health Service or while detailed to the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall receive 6 months' pay and allowances as provided in the act of June 4, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. II, title 34, sec. 943), and, unless entitled to compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, shall receive the benefits provided under section 9 of this act.

On page 6, line 20, to strike out "9" and insert "11"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments with two minor amendments, one in section 8 (a) (1) about the middle of the first page of the House engrossed amendments after the words "burial payments in the event of death, 6 months' pay", to strike out the words "and allowances", and the other in the last line of the third page of the House amendments in section 10, after the words "Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall receive 6 months' pay", to strike out the words "and allowances."

The motion was agreed to; and the amendments of the House were concurred in as amended by the Senate.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which worked out the resolution now before us, I deem it proper that I should at least express myself in regard to the resolution. In doing so I realize that I shall probably repeat what has already been said, but in the repetition I hope to contribute to the discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want the Senator to have an audience. Will the Senator yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Very well; I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Buck	Holman	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
George	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which reported the pending resolution, I deem it a part of my duty to explain my reasons for supporting the resolution. At the same time I wish to express my gratification at the fact that the Senate is considering such a resolution at this time. That, in and of itself, is to me a great victory.

I believe that the people of United States, as well as the people of the world who have wanted to see not only the war won, but the peace won also, have desired for a long time that some constructive sentiment be expressed by the Senate of the United States.

I believe that the action of the Senate in regard to the Treaty of Versailles, and especially its action in regard to the Covenant of the League of Nations, had a profound effect upon the world. The whole Congress accepted the Treaty of Versailles by resolution, after the Senate refused to accept the Covenant.

The entire world is wondering what the attitude of the Senate of the United States will be toward world cooperation in an attempt to expand and to make useful world government. I am sure that after the discussion, carried on in the way in which it has been carried on, there can be no doubt in the mind of anyone that the Senate of the United States wishes to present a united front to the world when those who represent the United States assemble at a peace conference or during the time of treaty writing.

What happened in 1919 did great damage to America. While our negotiators were attempting to bring about agreement with representatives of other governments, the Senate took action which nullified much that was being done. We need a united front in foreign affairs in the making of peace quite as much as in carrying on war.

In one of the plays of Sophocles there is a wail by one of the characters, who asks the question, "Why is it that men unite so well for war, but never unite for peace?" The question probably can be answered by merely saying that peace is difficult and complex, while war is comparatively simple. There is but one objective in war, and that is to crush the enemy, while peace must be brought about through the processes of deliberation.

One of the greatest documents ever issued by a government was that which in the last war became known as the 14 points, a splendid statement, a wonderful war aim, which contributed toward bringing about the defeat of the enemy; but at the peace conference it was an out-and-out liability to the representatives of the government on whose behalf the 14 points were announced. Why? Because the 14 points were thought of as a great national aim for carrying on the war. They were an idealistic statement; and idealistic statements, when read into law, or when an attempt is made to put them into agreements, are really difficult, because the definition process makes them almost impossible.

Therefore, my first thought when I was placed upon the Foreign Relations Subcommittee was to attempt to do two things: First, to obtain a declaration on the part of the Senate which would contribute to the peace effort, and in no way interfere with the war effort; and second, to bring into actual operation that extremely important point of our Constitution which refers to advice and consent by the Senate.

During all the time I have studied the American Constitution, I have felt that a serious mistake was made in the interpretation of the phrase "advice and consent." When we make the motion in the Senate we consider it as a single act. Advice and consent have been deemed by practically all our Executives to be a single act, and probably they are recognized as a single act in other parliaments. Very likely they were a single act when the words were taken from British constitutional law and incorporated into our law. However, the fact remains that in creating the Senate of the United States, which was an entirely new thing, just as the federal system was a new thing in government and politics, it was assumed that the United States Senate would be the equivalent of a council of state. Someday I hope to see that status attained. Then democracy and representative government will be functioning

in our land in the way in which they should function.

Mr. President, government by deliberation is not easy. Dictators have one simple device, and it works. Government by coercion is quite simple, and it works. Government through the use of man's reasoning power, based upon the theory of democracy and upon the idea that first there shall be deliberation with freedom of speech, and then action, is the hardest kind of government to make function, because government by deliberation seems to be endless.

But we have made it work in the United States for 150 years, and as a result we have exemplified to the whole world that men can be free and yet be strong; that man can have his beliefs and his choice between this, that, and the other, and yet speak jointly with a power which the nations of the earth must respect.

Mr. President, the United States, and its type of government, are still not out of peril. I remember that in a debate in the Senate, when we were dealing with one of the pre-war measures, I made the statement that the United States was in peril. I felt it; I knew it. I realized the force of aggression in the world, and yet I knew that government by aggression could never be successful so long as government by reason and deliberation existed anywhere. I realized that at some time that type of weak government would be tested because I knew that in the beginning of his regime Mussolini had scoffed at the word "liberty," and that he had said it was time to drag the flag of liberty in the mud. That was a challenge to the Government of the United States and to the American people. We did not accept the challenge, but we know that had we accepted it we probably would have been wiser than we were.

Mr. President, there is memory in my mind, too, of the fact that immediately after the last World War—it was during the time of the worst inflation in Germany that I myself saw at first hand—the attempt was made deliberately to make it appear that the Treaty of Versailles was a wicked and a vicious treaty. Some Americans aided in the advancement of that idea. If we will but examine the discussions which took place in the League of Nations we will find that many persons spent more time discussing the inequities and injustices of the treaty than they spent in challenging the League or defending it as such. The first nation to walk out on the Versailles agreements had objected to a provision contained in the treaty in regard to itself. It was not to a provision contained in the League Covenant. It was easy for Germany to blame everything on a harsh, improper, and unjust treaty, and then to turn that psychology against collective security, and against cooperation for peace. It was extremely easy for Mussolini to shout that sanctions meant war. People in our country accepted and defended his definition.

Mr. President, I am glad that we have moved on to the place where we do not accept such contentions. Whether the pending resolution shall be adopted, with amendment or without, we are going to accomplish in a dignified way that part of our constitutional scheme which every Senator, I am sure, wishes to see accomplished, namely, advice to the Executive, so that he will know that he has the backing of his Government when he speaks for it in international relations.

If that is the objective, the advice surely must be in very general terms or else it will become a liability at the time of negotiation. No one is wise enough to foresee the contingencies which may arise during the making of the peace, but all men are wise enough to say that we want the peace which may be achieved to work properly, and that we understand the basic and fundamental responsibilities which face the Government of the United States in assuring that it shall work successfully.

We know the weaknesses of the League of Nations. Selective security was provided for; the sanction idea was embodied; but there was no way of letting the will of the world be known except by expressing it, and there was no way of enforcing it.

We want to retain all the good which has come about through world organization, because by it great things have been accomplished in the last half a century for the good of the world, for the people of the world, and for the good of our own country.

We are party to much of the world cooperation, in fact, most of it. We do not want to have violence done to the progress which has been made in regard to arbitration. We do not want to have injuriously affected the progress which has been made in regard to labor aims and ideals. We do not want to destroy the progress which has been made in regard to the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. We want to preserve all the techniques which have been invented and used for good. Above all, we do not want to see violence done to one of the finest ideas that came out of Versailles, namely, the idea of a world trusteeship for backward peoples and for parts of the earth which cannot be represented under the definition of a free and sovereign nation. We do not want to have repeated the mistakes which were made in connection with the mandate system which came into existence. We want to correct those mistakes, and there is a way to correct them.

It may be worth while to spend a minute or so upon a concrete illustration of the type of mistake we wish to correct. The mandate theory was an advanced notion. The trustee idea was good. It meant the overcoming of actual conquest, and the ending, in theory, of the exploitation of backward peoples. So the world set up in theory a trustee system. But the agency which represented the world had no power to enforce its will. It selected as trustees entities which were more powerful than was the agency granting the authority. When the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations tried to speak to Great Britain, Great Britain did not listen. When the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations tried to speak to France, France was too great to be bothered. Senators know the cases. When the Mandate Commission tried to speak to Japan, Japan would not even allow, for example, an inspection of her mandated territories. She broke her trust and there was no way of compelling her to enforce it.

Mr. President, the conditions to which I have referred can be overcome under the pending resolution. They can be overcome by proper world organization. The mandate system can be preserved, the trustee idea can be made a part of the world scheme, and backward peoples of the earth can be developed and not exploited.

Mr. President, I am not talking about mere theory when I change the word "exploitation" to "development." It was either in the parliamentary conference at Budapest or Paris that the committee brought in the report which referred to the "exploitation of backward peoples." I took the floor on the part of the United States, Mr. President, and told the conference the United States would never consent to any kind of a resolution which contained the words "the exploitation of backward peoples"; but, if the resolution were changed in such a way as to read "development of backward peoples," I thought the United States would adhere to it. I was surprised; my suggestion brought applause from every part of the conference. No one wanted to retain in theory, and especially in discussion, the idea of exploitation; all were ready for the idea of development. So the world is ready to move forward in world government under the leadership of a country such as ours, which has made Government function without taking away powers from individual entities.

Mr. President, the word "sovereign" appears in the pending resolution. When the conference of the Republican Party held at Mackinac Island on the Great Lakes began writing its resolution, I happened to be attending another conference which was discussing this very question. On first thought, I was sorry that a technical word such as "sovereignty" should enter into the discussion, because it was an extremely bothersome word in the making of the last peace; it was a bothersome word and a bothersome idea in the creation of our Federal Union; indeed, it was such a bothersome word in its tight definition that it actually caused a civil war in the United States. We had made the definition of "sovereignty" so tight, so strong, and so binding that we actually went to war over it. There was no difference between Mr. Webster and Mr. Calhoun in their definition of sovereignty. They both accepted exactly the same definition. Webster said sovereignty must be indivisible, and, therefore, it must vest in the National Government. Calhoun said, since sovereignty is individual, it must vest in the States; and so we had a civil war.

That is how serious definitions may become, especially when going through the evolutionary process of bringing about a great change in governmental habits and notions. When the Covenant

of the League of Nations was first presented one of the members of our delegation went to another member of the delegation and said, "I doubt very much whether I can accept this Covenant; I think it destroys the sovereignty of the individual nations who are parties to the Covenant."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in discussing sovereignty at the Great Lakes conference gave one of the finest definitions of sovereignty or the rights in regard to sovereignty that we have yet had when he said the basic notion of sovereign rests upon the ability of the sovereign to give away some of its sovereignty. I have not improved on the Senator's words, but I have done my best to express his idea.

I am glad, Mr. President, that the word "sovereign" appears in the pending resolution, despite the fact that it has been a troublesome word in the past, because it is essential in any world government that the greatest of all fundamentals in international law be preserved, and the greatest fundamental is absolute independence and sovereignty in the parties to a world government. Our Federal Union could never have functioned without some sort of arrangement whereby the last word of the State in regard to the things which are the State's could be maintained.

Sovereignty, thank goodness, too, has developed in another way, which is a helpful way from the American standpoint, and, therefore, a helpful way for the New World. Sovereignty today is invariably connected with those governments which function through and by law. The idea of sovereignty does not worry a man such as Hitler. He does not work through law; he does not respect the treaties which his state has made and which others in his state have agreed to. There can be no sovereignty where there is chaos, where there is coercion, where there is disorder. In such circumstances sovereignty is the first thing lost. The best illustration is probably what happens in any community when it is faced with a terrible disaster. If the city begins burning the first agency to be called upon is the waterworks; next the fire department, then the police, the soldiers, and on down the line. When the chaos resulting from the fire or disaster is too great for these agencies, which represent the sovereign will of the State, there is no sovereignty. Where chaos is too great, there is no sovereignty, and where coercion is too great there can be no sovereignty. The word has done great damage to political thinking, and yet it has been a constructive word in the evolution of government, especially of world government and in the advancement of our Federal ideals. Mr. President, we will never go forward in world organization and world cooperation in any other way except by using some of the techniques that have been evolved here in the United States where the Federal system was created.

That brings me to another reason why I am happy about the pending resolution and about the willingness of the Senate to adopt it. I want a new world to go forward under American leadership, American responsibility, and American auspices, not because I depreciate the rest of the world, but because I have faith in our ability after 150 years of meeting our own problems. They have been great problems, but we have solved them without destroying the mighty fundamentals which were in the minds of the founding fathers when the Constitution was adopted. A reading of the works of Thomas Jefferson will disclose the finest arguments for the possibilities of a decent world order.

That brings me to the great differing point in the minds of those who have discussed the Ball-Hill amendment and those who have compared that proposal with the resolution reported by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The difference hinges upon the police power. When it comes to international discussions, police power causes just as much trouble as the concept of sovereignty, and yet there is no need for being troubled by that term if we realize from our own American experience that police power is not absolute at all times, functioning everywhere at all times, but is relative and may be highly localized. When it was suggested that there be adopted the theory of the League to Enforce Peace, to put power into the League of Nations, exactly the same answer was given by the conference in Paris which was given by our own Constitution, when its makers faced the same problem.

It was Madison who pointed out that if the Federal Government had power to send an army into one of the States, it would destroy the police power of the State. It was thought, therefore, that no peace could be established in the world by any enforcing agency. Yet an enforcing agency does not have to be strong, it does not have to do away with other enforcing agencies; it can remain in its own jurisdiction; it can have its proper place.

If, instead of an extremely powerful police force in the world, there should be set up a peace force with limited objectives, with limited jurisdiction, and with delegated authority, all the fears which have been expressed in the last 20-odd years could be overcome.

To illustrate how it can be done, I shall return to the mandate idea for a moment, and use an example from our own history to show how quite by accident our American Federal system turned from a league to an actual government because it had something to administer.

When the Articles of Confederation were proposed, there was disagreement among several of the States over that portion of the United States then known as the Northwest Territory. Before all the States would agree to the articles, they insisted that the rights and claims of the conflicting States be assumed by the whole United States; then the 13 States agreed to the articles.

In the establishment of the Northwest Territory as a territory to be administered by the United States, there was given a jurisdiction which had within it police power and the power of administration over actual territory and actual people by the United States of America functioning under the Federation. Until that time there was no way for the revolutionary government to assert itself directly on any people or on any land, because there was merely a government representative of the various States, but with the creation of the Northwest Territory, the United States got a police power, the United States got an army, if you will.

If the mandated islands or the mandated territories are given over to an entity such as the United Nations, and they are invited to administer such territories as trustees for the whole world, and are given power to use all the rights of government in those territories, then the police power comes into existence without in any way frightening even the smallest nation in the world about the existence of a world police force.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am loath to break into my distinguished colleague's discussion, but if I do not interrupt him too much, I should like to do so while the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and my colleague the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are all present.

I am very much disturbed about what happened here on October 29 in a presentation by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the Chair, which at that time was occupied by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. The question was propounded whether or not the pending resolution, Resolution 192, meant anything, whether it was at all binding on anyone, or whether all the debate in the Senate for the past week was merely for amusement and entertainment.

If I understood the ruling at that time—and probably the ruling was correct, in view of the way the question was put—it was that if we adopted Resolution 192, or if we amended it by adding the amendment of the Senator from Florida and then adopted it, we would do nothing except express the sentiment or the conclusion of the Senate.

If I have understood the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, he takes the position that the treaty-making power as provided in the Constitution, so far as it concerns the Senate, is divisible; that is, that there are two functions which the Senate performs. One function is to advise, the other is to consent. Am I correct in that conclusion?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the point I tried to make in the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator made the same point a few days ago on the floor of the Senate. As I view the proceedings of the Senate on Resolution 192, if and when it shall be adopted, we will have formally, under the treaty-making power of the Constitution, ad-

vised the Executive. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is as I understand it. I think it is a very serious proposition.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, if my colleague will yield to me, whether or not he takes the position that the resolution offered by him and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate was offered and was reported, and is now being discussed, as a matter of advice to the Executive under the treaty-making power, and should be considered as advice if it shall be agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the senior Senator from Utah yield to permit me to answer?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Utah in his statement that the constitutional provision that the President may make treaties by and with the advice and consent of the Senate implies that the Senate has two varying functions. The advice provided for, according to my view, would be advice prior to the act of making the treaty, and it is not possible to have consent very well as to something until it occurs. Consent follows the doing of the act, in this case the writing of the treaty.

It might be said, of course, that any legislative body, under its inherent powers, could adopt a resolution expressing its views. We could probably adopt such a resolution as the one before the Senate if there were not any advice and consent provided for in the Constitution at all, but it is certainly my view that we are acting in pursuance of the "advice" portion of the constitutional provision when we adopt the resolution before us. It is perfectly clear to my mind that the makers of the Constitution intended that the Senate should exercise two functions, or it would not have used two words. It would have simply said "consent of the Senate," and left out all reference to advice. But "advice" presupposes, I am sure, that during proceedings, or in the process or formation of a treaty, the Senate would be at liberty, if it so desired, to advise the President. Then, after the treaty is made, it has no controlling effect, imposes no binding obligation on the United States, until it is brought to the Senate, then we give our consent or refuse our consent.

Mr. MURDOCK. If my colleague will yield further, I take the position taken by the Senator from Texas, and I am happy to know that he agrees with the two Senators from Utah that the powers are divisible, and that we are now exercising the power of advising.

I do not wish to take up too much of the time of my colleague, but I should like to have this question made perfectly clear in my mind.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If what we are doing is advising the Executive, certainly, if and when we adopt a resolution of advice, it should mean something to the Senate, it should mean something to the President, and it should mean something to the people.

If my colleague will yield for another question, I should like to have an expression, if it is appropriate at this time, from the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], as to whether he considers that in the consideration of the various resolutions which have been presented, and in the adoption of one of them, we are acting under the treaty-making functions of the Senate to advise the Executive as to some future treaty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am complimented to be included in this battery of experts, but I disclaim possession of any credentials which qualify me in the group.

So far as I am personally concerned, I consider that we are acting under the advice clause. I consider that, so far as I am concerned, when I cast my vote in favor of Senate Resolution 192, I have indicated to the Executive, a general attitude, for whatever it is worth, for his guidance, if he is in the slightest interested in my point of view, which would be a novelty, and I consider myself morally bound by the general attitude which I have asserted; but I consider that the Constitution also has given me the right under the consent clause ultimately to be the sole judge, on my responsibility, as to whether or not the President has implemented my advice the way I think it should be implemented.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will my colleague indulge me for a moment or two longer?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think, then, that the three answers I have received from three of the distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and my distinguished colleague [Mr. THOMAS of Utah], all agree now that, in considering Senate Resolution 192, or any amendment to the resolution the Senate is proceeding under the treaty-making power under the Constitution as it affects and includes the Senate in advising the Executive.

Mr. President, under the treaty-making power—if I may have the indulgence of the Senate to read it—section 2, article II of the Constitution provides:

> He shall have the power—
>
> Meaning the President—
>
> by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

That brings me to this point—and I want to make it with all the vigor and emphasis I can—that I consider that as a Senator of the United States I am participating in this debate, that I shall finally vote for the resolution which, I hope, will be agreed to, and if Senate Resolution 192 shall be adopted, it is my intention as a Senator to have expressed, so far as I can, in general terms, my advice to the Executive Department of the Government, in broad terms, I admit, but nonetheless solemn. Because it is a comprehensive resolution, expressed only in broad terms, Mr. President, it is no less solemn than if it were detailed.

The question now arises in my mind, If we are proceeding under the treaty-making power under the Constitution as it affects and includes the Senate, and if and when we agree to the resolution we are advising the Executive as to the attitude of the Senate on this most important question, then does it not require a two-thirds majority of the Senate to adopt the resolution?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I would answer that question with a definite "No." In the first place we are simply in one stage of the treaty-making, if we accept it as that. We cannot by the adoption of the resolution take away the powers which are the President's. We cannot destroy his discretion. We cannot, of course, destroy the powers which still rest in the Senate of the United States to modify a treaty which is sent to us by the President.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will my colleague again yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly I do not take the position today that we in any way impair the right of the President under the Constitution, by the adoption of Senate Resolution 192, but I agree thoroughly with my distinguished colleague that we can divide the functions of the Senate under the treaty-making power of the Constitution, and we can advise the President at this stage of the proceeding, but later any proposed treaty must come back for the Senate's consent before it becomes effective. We cannot dissociate the two-thirds majority, however, from the treaty-making power, whether the Senate is exercising the power to ratify or the power to advise.

Mr. President, if my colleague will indulge me for a moment or two longer, the other day when we so lightly threw aside the efficacy and the solemnity and the meaning of the resolution by saying that it did not bind anyone, I think we certainly did not give due study, we certainly did not give due weight to that provision of the Constitution which allows and, I say, which makes it the duty of the Senate to advise the President on treaties.

If we take the position in the Senate that in advising the President under the treaty-making power a two-thirds majority is not necessary, and adopt the resolution by only a majority vote, of course the President and everyone else can very well say that we were not exercising our treaty-making function at all, because we did not insist on a two-thirds majority. But, Mr. President, if the resolution leaves the Senate of the United States with a two-thirds majority, then neither the President nor anyone else can say that we have merely conducted a debating society here in the Senate for the last 2 weeks. I hope that the Senate, when it acts in advising the Executive on treaties, will do so under

the constitutional procedure, and will do so by a two-thirds majority, if at all, and then it is done.

I thank the Senator very much for his very patient and generous indulgence.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank my colleague for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I partially agree with the Senator from Utah in this respect, that if the Senate adopts the resolution by only a majority vote, then, of course, the resolution is not binding upon the President of the United States or anyone else. But if we adopt the resolution by a two-thirds majority, then in my judgment it can be held to be not only advice to the President, but both advice and consent, because there is no question that we consent in general terms, as Mr. Hackworth has pointed out. Incidentally, Mr. President, Mr. Hackworth is not only the Solicitor for the State Department, but it will be noted that he is one of the American advisers at the conference held in Moscow. I do not think we can lightly disregard what Mr. Hackworth has said, particularly in view of the precedents to which he has called attention.

If I were to say to someone, "I consent that you shall act as my agent to enter into a contract in general terms," and if that person, as my agent, entered into the contract in general terms, the contract would be binding upon me. I, as the principal, would be bound by the contract entered into by my agent for me under the consent I gave him in general terms. I say that if we vote for the resolution by a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States we are advising the President, and if the President follows the general terms of the resolution—and they are extremely broad terms—as I have previously pointed out, it may include a military alliance, and if he should enter into a military alliance the Senate of the United States would have already advised and consented thereto. Then assuming that the President of the United States does exactly what has been done in previous treaty situations, and proclaims it as a treaty, what is the Senate of the United States going to do about it? If he proclaims it as a treaty after taking the advice of his Cabinet members and the advice of the Solicitor of the Department of State, and then says to the Senate, "You have already advised and consented to this kind of a treaty," what is the Senate going to do about it? How are we going to raise the question as to whether we have consented and advised? How are we going to question the treaty? My judgment is that the treaty will never be submitted to the Senate of the United States after a vote in the Senate on the pending resolution, if the Senate agrees to it. I hope I am wrong about it, and I wish I could agree with the views expressed by my colleagues; but I say that in my judgment the Senate will be agreeing to a very dangerous resolution, provided it is agreed to by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I missed the argument which has been referred to, and I realize that the statements which have been made are repetitions of what has previously been stated on the floor of the Senate. However, I think we should at least keep in mind one or two phases of the treaty-making power which have not been mentioned. In the first place, no foreign government has ever had anything to do with the pending resolution. In the second place, the President of the United States has not had anything to do with it as yet; and no matter whether it is agreed to by unanimous consent or by two-thirds vote or by a mere majority vote, the Presidential discretion cannot be destroyed. How in the world could the President of the United States ever proclaim a resolution of the Senate as a treaty without negotiating with some foreign country, and how could it be made binding?

Mr. President, I think sentimentally the arguments are fine; morally they are all right, too, in that they are used to show the important position the Senate has in connection with the treaty-making power and the seriousness of the present occasion; but if there is joint action between the Executive and the Senate in regard to the making of a treaty, and then if there are other actions in relation to other countries, the whole treaty-making process must be carried through all its channels before a conclusion can be reached about making it binding. On whom would the treaty be binding if the resolution were proclaimed by the President of the United States as a treaty?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with everything the Senator has said, with one exception. I do not have the same apprehension the Senator from Montana has about this matter. I have no doubt that we can advise in advance, under a resolution such as Senate Resolution 192, and that by merely advising we do not bind the Senate to consent later to a treaty built within the general framework of a resolution of advice. But I cannot follow the distinguished senior Senator from Utah when he takes the position that the treaty-making power is divisible, with advice on the one hand and consent on the other, and then takes the position that the Senate can advise without a two-thirds majority, but cannot consent without it. If that is possible under the Constitution, I am very much mistaken. If it is not possible, then I should say that when the Senate advises by a two-thirds majority it has said to the President, "We have acted, under the Constitution, by a two-thirds majority, and have advised you." Then, in my opinion, the Senate can expect action in conformity with its advice.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield. I wish we could settle this question right here, this afternoon. It would be desirable to do so.

Mr. WHEELER. The Constitution says "advice and consent." If the Senate can advise by a two-thirds majority, in advance, it can consent by a two-thirds majority, in advance.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, we can advise without any majority. Advice happens to be a greatly expanded matter. The President has other advisers. Mr. Hackworth has gone to Moscow. His advice is valid. Whether it is accepted is quite another matter.

I think that in the acceptance of advice by the Executive and in entering into the agreement we get closer to the treaty than by merely giving plain advice. But, Mr. President, we cannot carry theories any further than they have been carried by my colleague the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]. I can conceive of no way of binding the President even to negotiate a treaty against his will. The Senate cannot destroy his discretion. The Senate would destroy the Presidency if it did. When we enter into these theoretical discussions we must pay respect to every step in the process. The proclamation of the treaty is, of course, a Presidential function.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MCCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, who first addressed the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I was simply wondering on what basis anyone could conceive that the Connally resolution could be a treaty, in view of the general terms and language in which it is couched at the present time. I should like to know under what theory anyone could conceive that it could be a treaty, and with whom. It strikes me that the argument which has been made here has no basis whatsoever, because, under the Constitution, if it is anything at all, the resolution is merely advice to the President as to how the Senate of the United States feels.

But, Mr. President, more than that, if we were not in the position before the world in which we now are because of what happened following the rejection of the League of Nations in 1920, I dare say the pending resolution would not be before the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, as I view it, what the Senate has been attempting to do has been more to advise the world as to the position of the United States Senate, rather than to advise the President of the United States. Why did the House of Representatives agree to the Fulbright resolution? The House of Representatives has no power relative to treaties. It agreed to the Fulbright resolution as an expression, not to the President of the United States, but to the world, as to how the House of Representatives feels regarding world peace in the future. The House of Representatives is closer to the people than is the

Senate. As a result of what the Members of the House of Representatives found out when they returned home last summer, immediately after the House of Representatives reassembled they agreed to the Fulbright resolution, which in my opinion had much to do with what happened at the conference at Moscow. Not only that, but, in my opinion, the Connally resolution also had something to do with what happened at the Moscow conference. Cordell Hull knew that the Connally resolution, when the Senate finally got around to it in one form or another, would be agreed to by the Senate. He knew there would be only four or five votes against the Connally resolution whenever the Senate acted upon it. He transmitted that information to those at the conference at Moscow. So the Fulbright resolution and the Connally resolution, with the full realization by the powers represented at the Moscow conference that the one resolution had been agreed to and that the other would be agreed to by such overwhelming majorities, went far, in my opinion, in aiding Cordell Hull to obtain the kind of agreement which resulted from the Moscow conference. That is the important thing at this time, and not the question with respect to whether we are giving advice to the President of the United States by a two-thirds majority. That argument is fallacious from the beginning.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree in connection with the argument which he puts forth as to how advice comes about, that not only did the resolution give Cordell Hull greater authority to speak for the United States, but it also gave the representatives of other nations information in regard to the stand of the United States, which made the resolutions adopted at Moscow—if we may call them resolutions—meaningful.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In that respect alone, the Senate has already expressed one of its advisory functions, in speaking for the people of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I concur wholeheartedly in what the Senator has said. He has only implemented what I attempted to say in the remarks which I made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It occurs to me that the House of Representatives has just as much right—though not a legal right by reference to the Constitution, by which the right is reposed in the Senate—to express its views and reflect the sentiment of the people of this Nation, as has the Senate. The fact that the Fulbright resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives by such a large majority evidently has influenced the result of the conference at Moscow. Instead of being derided for its action, I think the House is entitled to the praise and commendation of the people of the Nation. It is ahead of the United States Senate. We are here today debating and quibbling over words. The House has already acted and advised as to the sentiment of the people of the United States. It has no constitutional function of consenting, but it has advised. Good can come from resolutions of that character. The fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported this resolution implemented what the House had already done, and fortified and reinforced the Secretary of State in the Moscow conference. As a result, today the world knows that the four major allies of the United Nations are ready to cooperate, not only to win the war, but also to win the peace. The enemies of this country know today that there is unity between us and our allies not only in bringing about military victory but also in the consummation of a lasting peace.

Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to my colleague.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, no one can be more emphatic in commendation of what has happened at Moscow than am I. I yield to no one in my conviction that the foreign affairs of this country are in capable hands, in the hands of our great President and the Secretary of State. In my opinion, they are so far out in front of the Senate that the adoption of a resolution at this time might be considered a very tardy thing; but we have the resolution before us.

It is easy to condemn the argument of another Senator as fallacious, and throw it out without consideration. I hope I shall never reach the point where I discard, without serious thought, the statement of one of my colleagues.

I did not arrive at my conclusion as to the two-thirds vote haphazardly. I went back into the history of the Senate and the history of the country. What do we find? We find that in the early history of the country, when President Polk asked the Senate for advice on a proposed treaty, he specifically stated in the message that he expected that the advice would come from the Senate by a two-thirds majority, indicating, as my distinguished colleague has stated, that the function of the Senate with respect to treaties is a divisible function—one to advise and the other to consent. On the other hand, President Polk, when he submitted that request for advice, specifically followed the Constitution of the United States and said that the advice should be given to him by a two-thirds majority if it was to be considered as at all binding upon him as President.

Senators are correct when they say that the House of Representatives had a perfect right to adopt the resolution which it adopted; but under the Constitution it has no power to advise the President in the making of treaties. That power is specifically granted to the Senate. The Constitution does not provide that we can advise by a majority vote, and later consent or ratify by a two-thirds vote. It provides that the President of the United States may make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate, by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. President, I do not depreciate at all the Connally resolution or the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I agree thoroughly with my colleague [Mr. THOMAS of Utah] in the position which he takes. I think it is proper for us to advise the President. In the Connally resolution we have gone to particular pains to state that the proceedings under the resolution shall be according to constitutional procedure.

Mr. President, I am just as anxious as is any other Senator to adopt one of these resolutions. No one has been a stronger supporter of the President and Secretary Hull than have I. In the future no one will be more anxious than I to cooperate with them in their herculean efforts to bring about a just and permanent peace. The point I make is that if the resolution is worth the time and energy we are giving it, then certainly, if we expect the resolution to be noticed by the President, we should pass it by a two-thirds majority, in accordance with the Constitution. That is my only point.

Mr. MURDOCK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at the proper place in the remarks I made during the afternoon, when the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] yielded to me, a message to the Senate dated June 10, 1846, from the President of the United States, who at that time was James K. Polk.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I lay before the Senate a proposal, in the form of a convention, presented to the Secretary of State on the sixth instant, by the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of her Britannic Majesty, for the adjustment of the Oregon question, together with a protocol of this proceeding. I submit this proposal to the consideration of the Senate, and request their advice as to the action which, in their judgment, it may be proper to take in reference to it.

In the early periods of the Government, the opinion and advice of the Senate were often taken in advance upon important questions of our foreign policy. General Washington repeatedly consulted the Senate, and asked their previous advice upon pending negotiations with foreign powers; and the Senate in every instance responded to his call by giving their advice, to which he always conformed his action. This practice, though rarely resorted to in latter times, was, in my judgment, eminently wise, and may, on occasions of great importance, be properly revived. The Senate are a branch of the treaty-making power; and, by consulting them in advance of his own action upon important measures of foreign policy which may ultimately come before them for their consideration, the President secures harmony of action between that body and himself. The Senate are, moreover, a branch of the war-making power, and it may be eminently proper for the Executive to take the opinion and advice of that body in advance upon any great question which may involve in its decision the issue of peace or war. On the present occasion the magnitude of the subject would induce me, under any circumstances, to desire the previous advice of the Senate; and that desire is increased by the recent debates and proceedings in Congress, which render it, in my judgment, not only

respectful to the Senate, but necessary and proper, if not indispensable, to insure harmonious action between that body and the Executive. In conferring on the Executive the authority to give the notice for the abrogation of the convention of 1827, the Senate acted publicly so large a part, that a decision on the proposal now made by the British Government, without a definite knowledge of the views of that body in reference to it, might render the question still more complicated and difficult of adjustment. For these reasons I invite the consideration of the Senate to the proposal of the British Government for the settlement of the Oregon question, and ask their advice on the subject.

My opinions and my action on the Oregon question were fully made known to Congress in my annual message of the 2d of December last; and the opinions therein expressed remain unchanged.

Should the Senate, by the constitutional majority required for the ratification of treaties, advise the acceptance of this proposition, or advise it with such modifications as they may, upon full deliberation, deem proper, I shall conform my action to their advice. Should the Senate, however, decline by such constitutional majority to give such advice, or to express an opinion on the subject, I shall consider it my duty to reject the offer.

I also communicate herewith an extract from a dispatch of the Secretary of State to the Minister of the United States at London, under date of the 28th of April last, directing him, in accordance with the joint resolution of Congress "concerning the Oregon Territory," to deliver the notice to the British Government for the abrogation of the convention of the 6th of August, 1827; and also a copy of the notice transmitted to him for that purpose, together with extracts from a dispatch of that Minister to the Secretary of State, bearing date on the 18th day of May last.

JAMES K. POLK.

WASHINGTON, *June 10, 1846.*

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

I can conclude in a minute or two, and I should like to do so. I turn now to the resolution itself. I have already hinted time and time again why I am glad that the resolution is in general terms. I am particularly glad that it is so general in its nature that it cannot cause discussion with respect to questions which should not be discussed at any peace conference. But the mere fact that the resolution is general in its terms does not make it weak. A generality may be just as strong as a specific statement. The resolution strikes at the very point which caused the trouble in the last attempt to bring about world organization. It aims directly at an international power, and would create an international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. That is a tremendous step forward. It is without limitation, except as limitations are imposed by the first part of the sentence.

Everything that has been done at Moscow could be done under this resolution. Had the resolution already been adopted it would in no way have interfered with what was being done. Judging from the quotations in the press, it seems to be the consensus of opinion of the Senate that that which took place at Moscow was good and in accordance with our ideals, and bids fair to be helpful in its results.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senate leaves his discussion of the relationship between the Moscow conference and the pending resolution, I should like to submit this thought to him:

I was somewhat disturbed yesterday afternoon by the trend of the argument, particularly as presented by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that Senate Resolution 192, as reported from the committee, lagged so far behind the Moscow conference that it had ceased to have any integrity or validity, and that it required the addition of the so-called Pepper amendment in order to catch up.

If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me that if the Pepper amendment were added to the committee resolution delimiting the effect of the Senate's action exclusively to the creation of an international authority for specific purposes, it would actually rule out point 5 and point 7 of the Moscow declarations, because Moscow is not only discussing the international authority which would be comprehended within the Pepper amendment, but, pending the establishment of this international organization, is also considering and recommending consultative pacts on the one hand, and, under paragraph 7, conference and cooperation in respect to disarmament. In other words, if the action about to be taken by the Senate is to be parallel with the action taken at Moscow, at least for myself I am driven to the conclusion that the committee recommendation, being broader than the Pepper proposal, infinitely better comprehends the Moscow attitude than would be the case were we to amend the committee report as proposed by the very able gentlemen who are attacking it. Does the Senator agree with me in that interpretation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I agree with the Senator entirely, and I would go one step further and say that everything which is included within the Pepper amendment itself can be done under Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was very much interested in the discussion which has just taken place about the possible limiting effect of the so-called Pepper amendment. I wish to call attention to the language of the amendment. It states, "to promote cooperation among nations."

That is an expression which is not found in the committee resolution. It is not limiting, is it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I disagree. The expression is not found in the committee resolution but surely cooperation is implied and is contemplated.

Mr. HATCH. I am speaking of the words themselves.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; they are not there.

Mr. HATCH. Setting those words forth and expressing the fervent hope and the highest desire that all the nations may cooperate is not limiting, is it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I doubt very much if a prayer ever limits anything.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, everything to which the Senator is now referring would be under the aegis of "an international organization," and I am saying that Moscow has gone far beyond an international organization in creating the instrumentalities upon which it is seeking to rely for the serial effort to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The only difference is that the Pepper amendment uses the words "an international organization." The committee resolution expression is "international authority."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Which includes everything done at Moscow, if we wish to apply it to the Moscow formula.

Mr. HATCH. The Moscow formula includes our language, a general "international organization." It does not include the language of the committee resolution.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It seems to me that the final paragraph of Senate Resolution 192 is not concerned with a number of the provisions in the agreement reached at Moscow which are concerned primarily with the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of order immediately after hostilities cease in Europe, and during the transition period before a permanent set-up for peace can be worked out. As I understand the final paragraph of Senate Resolution 192, which follows the paragraph providing "That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace," what we are trying to advise the President on is not with regard to transitional arrangements to maintain the peace, but with regard to the permanent structure to be established to maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And the Senator wants to use any agency which exists or can be set up to accomplish those purposes, does he not?

Mr. BALL. I think we want to use organizations, not alliances.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; organizations, but not an organization.

Mr. BALL. The essential job must be done by an organization. The League of Nations was an organization, but had many subsidiary organizations functioning under it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It may be done by many organizations instead of by only one. That is the reason why the article "an" in its limiting sense was not used. I ask to be forgiven for getting into a discussion over the article "an," especially with the Senators who

are present. But the article "an" was deliberately taken out of the resolution for the very reason which I have stated. We cannot tell how the war will end. It may end in Europe very much sooner than in Asia. It may end in Asia very much sooner than in Europe. We may resort to regional understandings of some kind. Such a term was used by President Woodrow Wilson in calling the Monroe Doctrine a regional understanding, and the textbook writers objected to its use. But the fact remains that it was a great regional understanding and that it later became recognized by the world.

Mr. President, if we have functioning today an international organization which can be used in a particular way, let us not install another one. So far as our advice is concerned, let us advise in the broadest way. We want an international authority with power to carry through and to accomplish. We do not want to be limited as to time, as to place, or as to any particular organization. I say that as one who has always supported the theories back of the League of Nations. I say it as one who has always said that we do not want to do anything which will bar any institution which has been established under the League, or under international agreement, which is functioning toward overcoming the ills of the world in any particular field. That the commission of the League in regard to disarmament failed does not mean that the Committee for the Repatriation of Lost Persons did not succeed. What I fear is that when we begin to particularize in our advice or resort to a generality to bring about the authority and power which is necessary to put down aggression, we may destroy some other institutions which are not related to aggression.

I believe the pending resolution covers the whole field as it is presented to us today. We are still in war. We are not working toward peace, but we are doing the sane and sensible thing of trying to reconcile differences with our own allies, and to bring about an understanding with our own allies in order that the peace may be a better one.

I refer to one significant thing which we have done and which we might not have done had we followed the advice of either our Government or the Government of Great Britain. We and Great Britain renounced our extraterritorial rights in China. If the Senate of the United States had been willing to say nothing and do nothing when statements came out of the Foreign Office of Great Britain, and out of our own State Department, so far as extraterritoriality in China was concerned, we would have waited until after the end of the war before taking up the subject and discussing it. Had we not done what we did, one of the four countries represented in the agreement of Moscow could not have been described in any way as a sovereign and free people, because so long as extraterritoriality held China in grip she was not a sovereign nation, and we all know it. We renounced our extraterritorial rights in China; and we can do a great many more such things. What we must not do is anything which will limit the great field and make it harder to have united action on the part of the United States when we speak to the other nations of the world.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I know the Senator is anxious to leave the floor, and I interrupt him only because I have such a high regard for his work on the committee and for his opinion, and I am asking the questions I now ask merely to have his interpretation put into the RECORD.

As I understand the Senator from Utah, he construes the words "authority" and "power" as used in the Connally resolution to be most broad and general in their terms; that the word "authority" would include a general association or organization of nations. Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The word "power," I may say, I think, has always been construed to be general until Jean Bodin created the word "sovereignty" in the late sixteenth century. The sovereignty of a nation was expressed by the word "power" in all the theoretical writings.

Mr. HATCH. An authority to be set up, whether by the exercise of an existing organization such as the League of Nations or a new organization, would, coupled with the word "power," as used, have full authority to proceed to settle disputes peacefully among nations, which would necessarily include the establishment of the necessary machinery to do that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I agree with that wholeheartedly.

Mr. HATCH. The word "power" also includes military and economic sanctions if necessary to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think so; I say "yes" to that.

Mr. HATCH. It would also go further and be sufficient to authorize the authority to establish, we might say, an international police force?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I say "yes" to that.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator. I merely wanted to get his interpretation. There is no limitation whatever, then, under the word "power" as it is used in the Senate resolution?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If power and the sovereign nation idea and international authority were left without limitation, I think we might present a general statement to the people of the United States and to the world. They are all-embracing, as I understand, limited only by the remainder of the resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator because I think it very important that the United States and the world understand what is meant by the use of those words. That is the reason I asked the Senator for his interpretation, and I thank him for giving it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, my mind runs back to one of the most interesting stories which came out of the last war when we were so far as the stage of the war was concerned about where I hope we are now. A returned soldier came down the gangplank in Boston and was asked when the war would be over. He said, "In a month and a century." He was asked why he expressed it in that way—"a month and a century." "Well," he said, "it will take a month to lick Germany, and then it will take a century to wind up all that barbwire." Mr. President, with the conference in Moscow, the denunciation of extraterritorial rights in China, and the discussions which are being held here, we are beginning to wind up the barbwire, so as to bring about a just and peaceful world. That is the way in which I think we should accept what we are doing, in all seriousness, and assume that we are going to do only those things which will make it possible for the United States when we speak to the rest of the world to speak with the authority of unity. What would we think if we tried to curb in wartime the will of the Commander in Chief? Let us present the same united front in the making of the peace that we present now in carrying on the war.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah, whose knowledge of this problem I respect greatly, whether he believes the agreement signed at Moscow is in the nature of a treaty which under the Constitution should be ratified by the Senate? The question was asked me. I might say that it seems to me that the obligations assumed by this Government under the agreement primarily relate to the conduct of the war, and, therefore, it was well within the province of the Executive to make such an agreement without making it a formal treaty; but some of it does contemplate action beyond the end of the war. I would appreciate the Senator's opinion on that point.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I can only answer offhand. I do not deem the agreement reached at Moscow to be a treaty. I think that it can be made into a treaty by negotiation and presented as a treaty, if the President wishes to do so. It is entirely within his discretion to present it to the Senate of the United States as a treaty, but I doubt very much whether any of the three or four nations parties to the agreement have thought of the agreement as anything but an agreement for the future prosecution of the war and the planning of peace under a form of treaty which will be presented later.

Mr. REYNOLDS obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. REYNOLDS. May I inquire of the Senator for what purpose?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a matter of fact, I am not requesting a call of the roll. I have not done so at any time since this body began the serious consideration of this momentous question. I do not believe, frankly, that I have ever seen a greater number of Senators present on the floor than there are this afternoon, and, in view of the fact that I am anxious to get on with what I have to say, I am not particularly desirous to have the roll called.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It seems to me that, inasmuch as a very important subject is being discussed, many of the Senators who are not here would like to be advised of what is going on.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is very gracious and flattering of the Senator, and I shall be glad to have the roll called.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Russell
Buck	Holman	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
George	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] for his graciousness and kindness and consideration in requesting a roll call. I am not sufficiently egotistical to presume to flatter myself to the degree of believing that one single word I shall say or any argument I may make this afternoon will change the attitude of any Member of this august body. Consequently, it is my intention merely to make my position clear to the American people at this time, through the facilities of this body and through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So I respectfully state that I shall not yield for any question, or for any other purpose, for that I am desirous of maintaining the continuity of my address, for my own benefit, and for the enlightenment and the information, I trust, of my constituents, and of the American people, whom I am endeavoring as best I conscientiously can to represent in this, the most deliberative body of the world.

Mr. President, never in my whole life have I felt a more solemn duty than the present one, to make known to the Senate and to the American people the compelling reasons why I must oppose the adoption of Senate Resolution 192, known as the Connally resolution.

The Connally resolution, in my humble opinion, is fatally defective for three reasons:

First. It contemplates the submergence of our American sovereignty into some as yet undiscovered form of supergovernment in which this Nation most probably would be a minority of one in affairs affecting the dearest interests of our people.

We would find ourselves governed from abroad, subjected to the pressure or coercion of combined and superior forces.

Under our Federal Constitution, the American Government has no authority to make any such destructive commitment, either by action of the Executive or by joint action of the two Houses of Congress, or by any action of the Senate, which is the final constitutional treaty-making power—and the Senate cannot bind itself in advance to some future action, the exact nature and certain consequences of which are at this time totally unknown.

Second. The Connally resolution fails to specify whether or not the pledges of freedom previously advanced in the name of the United Nations with respect to conquered peoples will be carried out.

Our people are not fighting for their own aggrandizement. They are expending blood and treasure to punish aggressions and to prevent the subjugation of once-free peoples by the Axis Powers.

It is obviously unthinkable, therefore, that our people will assent to, or that this Senate will ratify, any peace by which either ourselves or any of our allies shall acquire subject territory by the extinguishment of the liberties and nationalities of others.

We are not fighting conquerors to become conquerors ourselves nor to substitute one set of conquerors for another.

Third. The Connally resolution, in the light of the Moscow conference and of the attitudes and declarations of two of our allies, must either sanction the acquisition or retention of subject territories by these allies or else make World War No. 3 inevitable to prevent these injustices; and a third world war will signify and seal the destruction of our occidental civilization.

For, plainly, if Soviet Russia intends to have and to hold the once-free Baltic republics and parts of Poland and other countries, that intention must be resisted by force of arms or be permitted to prevail by default.

There is no avoidance of this tragical dilemma in the words of formulas of the Connally resolution.

The Connally resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. President, I shall later offer a substitute resolution, but I shall first develop in larger outlines the faults and dangers which I have found in the Connally resolution.

As civilization is disappearing before our very eyes in seas of blood and debt, no one except a person directly implicated in causing war can be indifferent to the horrors of war or lacking in enthusiasm for practicable steps to prevent recurrence of war.

At the very outset let me say that I am in hearty agreement with one statement made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; namely, that "international bandits and robbers" must be curbed. No more correct diagnosis of the chief cause of the woes and wars of the world is possible. All peoples instinctively crave peace, and no peoples want war. International bandits and robbers cause wars and keep the world in a state of turmoil through fiendishly agitated racial hatreds which divert attention from themselves.

With such manifestly correct diagnosis of the cause, the remedy should be perfectly apparent. Civilized nations have never been isolationist in their attitude toward international bandits and robbers but have collaborated and cooperated against them. Such offenses on the high seas are treated as piracy and punishable in the competent tribunal of any country where the offender may be found or into which he may be carried. Civilized nations have provided collective security against piracy without any necessity for surrendering any part of the sovereignty of any nation, such as would result from the establishment of a supergovernment or superbody of any kind. When international bandits and robbers plunder ships of state, instead of ordinary ships, they are committing the most heinous crime conceivable against mankind generally. Collaboration and cooperation of civilized nations against such crime will provide collective security in the only possible or practicable way.

At its recent national convention held in Omaha, Nebr., in September 1943, the American Legion adopted the report of its committee on foreign relations which advocated, as the way to maintain world peace, "an association of free and sovereign nations" rather than the creation of international organizations or superbodies or a supergovernment which would necessarily, if created, reduce free and sovereign nations to the status of puppet states. I, for one, am unwilling to close my eyes to this magnificent contribution by the great American Legion to a right understanding of this vital problem. What a contrast to the avalanche of propaganda in behalf of an international Frankenstein—a godless, soulless, nationless nondescript to impose its will upon all mankind. Yet, without alluding in anywise to this magnificent resolution of the American Legion which

makes deliberate use of the term "association" rather than "organization" as descriptive of the proper course, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations tells us that the words "international authority" used in the resolution proposed to this body are intended to cover and comprehend international organizations, and further tells us that the word "power" used in that resolution "was chosen with the deliberate intent to include all forms of power necessary to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." Upon his own interpretation of the meaning and purpose of that resolution this body can afford to have nothing whatever to do with it, except to reject it.

Toward the close of his explanation of the pending resolution the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations disclosed his evident misgivings as to the constitutionality of what may be attempted under the broad scope of the resolution by volunteering the observation that—

> The Constitution of the United States has been amended, and may be amended again.

Of course, "an association of free and sovereign nations" for curbing "international bandits and robbers" could not possibly be considered as needing a constitutional amendment. On the other hand, the setting up of a superbody or supergovernment of any sort would not only violate the Constitution of the United States, but the Constitution is not by any stretch of the imagination susceptible of any such changes as would involve our Republic in, or subject it to, any such set-up. The Constitution, as we all well know, is a charter of delegated powers. Those not delegated are reserved to the States and the people. The President's powers are enumerated, the powers of the Congress are enumerated, the Senate's powers are set forth, and in none of the provisions is any power given to the President or the Congress to vote this Republic into any superbody or supergovernment. Are we going to entertain even a suggestion that we abdicate as a great, free nation, as we are now, to become a component part of, or subject to, any superbody or supergovernment?

Not only is it legally impossible for our Republic ever to become a component part of, or subject to, any superbody or supergovernment, but, in its legal collaboration and cooperation with other civilized nations to curb international bandits and robbers, it should be extremely careful not to consort with bandits and robbers as supposedly representing civilized nations. The unfortunate practice of extending recognition to regimes of bandits and robbers seizing ships of state and subjecting whole peoples must cease. The late Samuel Gompers, one of the finest Jewish Americans who ever lived, had no hesitancy in branding any such recognition as a "needless and base betrayal of civilization." This may be deemed a delicate subject at the present time, but it is such an essential part of what must be given consideration in connection with the pending resolution that those who do not want it discussed should not press for adoption of the resolution at this time. We cannot be gagged and bound so as to avoid consideration of practical realities vitally affecting the future of the American Republic and of the civilization in which all of us are vitally interested.

Mr. President, a so-called Executive agreement, which has never been submitted to this body for its advice and consent, was signed on January 1, 1942, by Franklin D. Roosevelt as supposedly representing the United States of America for the purpose, Winston S. Churchill as representing the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Maxim Litvinoff as representing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Tse Vung Soong as representing the National Government of the Republic of China, and various other signatories, including Girja Shankar Bajpai as representing India. The paper undertook to endorse "a common program of purposes and principles," including the following, among others:

No aggrandizement, territorial or other.

No territorial changes not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Universal right to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

The paper embodied the introductory recital that the signatories are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious—at least to me—that the aforementioned four purposes and principles specifically enumerated would constitute a magnificent basis for world cooperation and understanding by free and sovereign nations; yet what has been submitted to the Senate for adoption avoids reciting anything definite and practicable, and uses the vague general language "a just and honorable peace," with no suggestion for carrying out the four enumerated pledges or even a guaranty of the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, and other subjugated nations. Collaboration and cooperation for world peace, conducted on the basis of the four enumerated already-made pledges, would insure the participation therein of civilized nations only, and in my opinion would point the way to the effectual curbing of international bandits and robbers. If any one of what are called the United Nations, of which we are one, contemplates repudiating any of the four enumerated pledges aforementioned, solemnly made by each of them on January 1, 1942, the Members of the Senate should know it now. If they do not so contemplate, what possible objection could there be to making such pledges the basis of world cooperation now? We would thus have some tangible and practical basis upon which to proceed.

A break-down of good faith and mutual trust between nations cannot be the way to peace. There have been alarming recent indications that neither the British Empire nor the Soviet Union is disposed to abide by the aforementioned four pledges.

There should be no secrets from the American people about such a vital matter.

If the Soviet regime, Great Britain, and China carry out the aforementioned four pledges accepted by them on January 1, 1942, then they will have adopted and put into practice standards upon which world peace can be built. Otherwise, there can be no reasonable expectation that they will collaborate and cooperate in good faith in a program for world peace, the Moscow conference to the contrary notwithstanding.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of Members of this body a paragraph from the remarks made yesterday by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. He said:

> Today we have heard much about the declarations recently issued at Moscow and about them being stronger in their terms than the resolutions pending before the Senate at the present time. I should like to make the suggestion that the terms of the Atlantic Charter, which has been approved by so many of the nations of the world, including Russia, China, the United States, and the United Kingdom are much stronger than those contained in the declarations made at Moscow, and are infinitely stronger than those contained in the resolutions which are now pending in the Senate of the United States.

Further in connection with the Moscow conference, let me say that to many the excitement created by the announcement of the Moscow agreement was ludicrous. Why the announcement of such a "momentous accomplishment and success" when Russia had already, many months ago, agreed in full to and adopted the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which went much further than anything embodied in the agreement at Moscow?

Let us profit by experiences of the past, and plan for future world peace in a realistic and practical manner through collaboration and cooperation among civilized nations only.

It is perfectly manifest that the adoption of the Connally resolution would constitute an evasion, rather than performance, of solemn duties reposed in the Senate. The resolution is interpreted as meaning all things to all men. By many it is interpreted as giving the advice and consent of the Senate now to the making by the President of a pact of any kind coming within the broad scope of the resolution, so as to require no later submission of such pact for the Senate's ratification. Frankly, in view of the announcement by the White House on yesterday of the huge success and general agreement reached at Moscow, I ask why the necessity for the passage now of any such resolution as the Connally resolution. Let the documents relating to the Moscow agreement be submitted to the Senate now for its advice and consent, on the one hand, or rejection, on the other.

Mr. President, having given my reasons for my opposition to the Connally resolution, at this point I wish to read into the RECORD a substitute for Senate Resolution 192, which I now offer to the Senate:

Whereas the Senate of the United States of America desires to clear away any doubts and ambiguities regarding the attitude of the people and Government of the United States of America toward international relationships now and after this war; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States of America recognizes that to call for mutual action of sovereign powers without first stipulating the standards to govern such action or actions, is premature and possibly pledging the United States of America to a future collaboration which might turn out to be a pact with new world conquerors dividing loot and therefore be contradictory to the conscience and the best interests of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved:

1. That it is the intent of the United States of America in concert with her allies to wage war to a successful conclusion against her enemies.

2. That it is the declared purpose of the Senate of the United States of America, as the final treaty-making power of the United States Government, to insure, by every constitutional means, against the recurrence of international clashes, and particularly the break-down of good faith and mutual trust between nations.

3. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the United States join with other sovereign nations on a basis of world cooperation and understanding on the following principles:

A. No aggrandizement, territorial or other.

B. No territorial changes not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

C. Restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them; and recognition of the right of all peoples to choose the forms of government under which they will live.

D. Universal right to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Provided, That the policies and attitudes of other nations agree with these principles so that cooperation of nations on these fundamental principles would be effective in actual practice.

4. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the duly constituted authority of each Allied Government should declare now, clearly and definitely, whether or not it accepts these principles as the governing standards of such post-war cooperation.

5. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the government of each ex-enemy enjoying de facto recognition by the United States and its allies should be invited to declare on a date after the armistice with such ex-enemy whether it accepts these principles as a preliminary to future collaboration.

6. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that when these declarations have been made by the aforementioned nations and they have given evidence of their desire for sincere collaboration, then the United States of America, through its constitutional processes, shall collaborate and cooperate with other free and sovereign nations to preserve world peace.

7. That the Senate of the United States of America believes in the dignity of American moral leadership, based on the continuance of humanitarian policies, in a large sense illustrated by:

a. The American principle of the federation of the 48 States.

b. The freedom of the individual and the guaranty of the rights of individual enterprise.

c. The good-neighbor policy in this hemisphere.

d. The American championship of the sovereignty and independence of nations and peoples throughout the world.

e. The open-door policy in the Pacific.

f. The American attitude toward minorities.

8. That the Senate of the United States of America declares, in making this statement of hopes and policy, that it in no way sets itself up as a judge of the kind of government of any civilized nation.

9. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America, constituting the final treaty-making authority of this Government, that it should stand firmly upon this solid basis, offering continuously the hand of fellowship to any nation or nations in accord with these ideals and principles.

Mr. President, if there ever was a time in American history when "off the record" vagaries should be channelized in "on the record" to definite statements—it is now, at the time when American thinking is in a fog of bewilderment. Fine-sounding words, meaningless words, are the cause of this confusion, bewilderment, and distrust.

The argument constantly revolves around the two vague words, "internationalism" and "isolationism." No thinking person denies the global theory of post-war collaboration and rehabilitation, but we want a post-war global scene that is framed in some vestige of reality.

Whether the principles expounded by the old so-called isolationists are right or wrong, history alone will tell. But, we do know now that many of the old so-called isolationists were no more or less than genuine American nationalists. These were men and women who did not want to plunge into world hates and conflicts, old European feuds, and European power politics.

That is now a thing of the past; it is water over the dam. We are in it now to the tune of billions of dollars and millions of wrecked American lives. Is there not still some way to make unity a thing that exists because of mutual faith and definite statement of principles? Is there not still some way to make our American people and the long-suffering people of the world feel that they are dying this time for something very tangible, real, and noble?

Mr. President, I think that a clean-cut incision into the cancerous body of power politics at this time can do the trick.

I have been in this Senate for 11 years. A strange and strangling type of hood seems to have fallen over Capitol Hill—a hood of fear to speak and act like real Americans. Why? Is it treasonable to speak out for America, or is it heresy to make suggestions that one believes to be in the interest of Americans?

Yesterday that hood was lifted in the body of the Senate by the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] when he made bold to utter in the Senate the words I shall quote. Before doing so, let me state that the Senator from Colorado submitted a resolution in this body similar to the one submitted by me and he was speaking upon his resolution when he said, without hesitation:

The people of the United States and the world will be bewildered and confused by the clever and adroit language of the Connally resolution. They will not know any more about what it means and what its effect will be than do the 96 Senators assembled here, and they will interpret it to suit themselves, as we do now.

This is no time to hedge or indulge in double talk and platitudes and threadbare generalities. This is a time to be forthright. This is a time to say what we mean and mean what we say. We ought now to put our cards on the table face up, or remain discreetly silent. My resolution puts the ideals of the Atlantic Charter into concrete and definite form. It is a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

I realize that many will shrink from its blunt provisions respecting the basic problems facing the world. Many will say it will offend Churchill, it will offend Stalin, and it will cause endless and bitter controversy at a time when we need unity to destroy the common enemy. If that be so, the United States has no business in this war. If that be so, we ought to keep our mouths shut forever about freedom, aggression, imperialism, and exploitation and subjugation of weaker peoples. If that be so, we ought to keep our signature off such documents as the Atlantic Charter.

Do you wonder, Mr. President, at the bewilderment of the American people when certain principles of the Atlantic Charter, which are supposed to be our guide, are applied only to certain peoples and countries in certain parts of the globe?

How can some of the principles of the Atlantic Charter be applied to certain countries and the same principles not be applied to other countries?

What can world understanding possibly mean if it does not accept the significance of the historical fact that peoples, regardless of race, color or creed, are equal, and that each group has its inherent right to freedom and self-government.

The American people fought for that principle and should take their stand—and record their stand right now—otherwise, the dying, misery, and sacrifices will all be in vain.

All thinking Americans realize that, due to geographical, racial and traditional backgrounds, each group has different problems to face. How different racial groups work out their participation in the world scene is up to them; but it is up to us that we, still the strongest member of the United Nations, assure them that right. Otherwise, this war becomes a farce. It is up to us to take a stand and demand the same stand from our allies—that people all over the world, under all conditions, and under all colors of skin, are insured the human dignity of the four freedoms: Freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, freedom of religious worship.

How each works out its national problems is its business, just so long as each national group adheres to the principles of the larger world order. We, as Americans, by the same token reserve and demand the right to work out our national destiny and solve our own American problems under the American form

of government—the government that has offered the greatest good to the greatest number of people for the longest time.

We legislators today in the functioning heart of America have within our hands the sacred privilege of carrying out the wishes of the American people—and guiding its ship of state into the harbor of its highest destiny. We are still functioning, thank God, in the democratic way—which means that all officials in Washington are the servants of the American people.

We have the greatest crisis in world history facing us right now. America, in spite of mistakes, has a noble heritage. We have proven our spiritual integrity. It is because we are who we are, it is because our record is what it is, that I hope through my substitute resolution to keep our American direction straight, our record clean, permitting never again an opportunity for the world to ridicule our efforts; and that is why we should first ascertain what is definitely and completely in the minds of our allies respecting the post-war period, not only as relates to Italy and Austria, but also the other subjugated countries of the world. My substitute resolution outlines clearly and definitely our attitude, aims, and objectives; so why not ascertain of our allies their true attitude, aims, and objectives. In other words, before we adopt a resolution reflecting our aims and objectives, we should be informed and have the benefit of the aims and objectives of our allies; and that is the sole intention of my resolution.

The European scene has been such a hotbed of power politics, feuds, hates, balancing of power, for so long, that history alone sifts the chaff from the wheat. History proves each time that the peoples of the world are the same throughout, that the political machines are the instigators of chaos and misery.

Of course, it should be demanded now that each government take its stand now and record that stand and record its intentions. We have the right to demand and receive an answer. This right has nothing to do with being pro or anti toward any individual, ally, or enemy. This is purely a presentation of principles. If the principles as set out in my substitute resolution, which are embodied in the Atlantic Charter, are not adhered to after the aggressors, Hitler and Tojo, have been defeated, then what are we fighting for? It may not be possible for our allies, enemies, or ourselves to rectify glaring errors immediately, but we can demand, and have a right to demand, that nations definitely declare themselves and take steps to rectify faults.

Therefore, the best way in the long run, no matter how it may hurt, is to make incision clear and definite right now. This position should have been taken before, but we were lost in a wave of strongest reaction to propaganda that has ever hit the thinking of our people. However, it is not too late to take a stand now, but if we do not take it now this war may be in vain.

We cannot fight for one thing and mean another in our hearts. A real definition of America's position should give us the right to withdraw from any collaboration in the post-war world when it would be to our moral and material interest to do so.

We should refuse to form any association unless it be a world association with all civilized nations, for the good of all. Otherwise, we shall have fought on a false premise.

We assume now that after the war all nations will be sovereign nations, with self-determining powers, because the principles of the Atlantic Charter expressly demand and guarantee this position of free choice for all groups. Our reservation to withdraw from a post-war collaboration or association if principles are not adhered to is the only way to maintain the dignity of America's moral standards. Our only concern is that the Nation itself comply with the standards and law set for the family of nations.

Each national group has its own problems within its geographical boundaries. The cure for its ills must come from within itself, and will, as long as it is demanded that nations adhere to basic rules.

America's attitude toward Asia is the key to a promising future. Asia offers the trade and commerce. Europe will be in ruins. How can we help anybody, let alone ourselves, if there is no two-way trade? The day of Asia's awakening is here. Half the world's population is to be found there, in the Orient. Four hundred million of these people are in China, our glorious ally. May her perseverance result in the destruction of her invaders, and may she emerge a free and strong China.

The American Republic has crusaded for principles, and has lived them in more cases than she has succumbed to the rottenness of imperial procedures. Because of this heritage, we assume moral leadership. There have been mistakes in national policies, but we must never destroy the structure of the American Republic in order to bring about changes. We must not be hood-winked by false prophets under the cloak of internationalism.

We have all we can do to keep the American Republic operating in an oiled fashion, devoid of political intrigues and power-mad individuals, without judging the structure of government of other nations. What kind of government each chooses is immaterial to us, as long as it offers its peoples complete opportunity to attain and express the "four freedoms."

Mr. President, may I express, therefore, the hope that the Senate will adopt my substitute resolution, which, as I have stated heretofore, is merely a declaration of principles, in order that we may ascertain what is in the minds and the hearts of our allies and ascertain their attitude relating to post-war matters before committing ourselves in any manner or in any form by any resolution.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from North Carolina made some remarks concerning the independence of Poland, with which I heartily concur. I hope that any peace treaty which may be made will recognize the independence of Poland. In that connection I desire to call attention to an article appearing in the Weekly Dispatch, of London, under date of February 4, 1939, wherein Lord Halifax, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was quoted as follows:

> Poland could rest assured, if she felt her independence threatened, Britain would accept her word that this was the case and would immediately declare war on any country whom Poland named her aggressor.

This is one of the most remarkable commitments in history because the decision as to whether or not British blood should be poured out was taken out of the hands of the British Government and left to a foreign power.

Great Britain honored her pledge when Poland named Germany as an aggressor. It remains to be seen if she will do so if Poland invokes the guaranty as against Russia, assuming that Russia acts in accordance with her statement that she will demand a large part of Poland.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am inclined to believe that now is the opportune time for me to ask that there be published in the RECORD at this point a number of telegrams addressed to me. The first two relate to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. I shall not take time to read them. One telegram is from Chicago, signed by the chairman of the American Friends of Lithuania. Another is from Ann Arbor, Mich., signed by an individual, and deals with the Baltic states. The remaining telegrams deal with the independence and territorial integrity of Poland. One is from New York, signed by the chairman of Central of Polish-American Societies of New York. Another telegram is from New York signed by the president of the Polish National Council of New York. Another telegram is also from the Central of Polish-American Societies of New York. Still another telegram is from the Polish-American Council, District 5, of New Jersey. Another is from the League of Polish Women of New York. Another telegram from the Polish Workmen's Aid Fund, Inc., New York. Another is from the Polish Socialist Alliance of New York. Another telegram is from the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Detroit, Mich. Still another telegram is from the president of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent. Finally a telegram from the Central of Polish-American Societies of New York. All the telegrams are dated either the 1st or 2d of November.

Mr. President, I have already had printed and shall submit in a few days an amendment to the Connally resolution, which calls for the independence and the guarantee of political territorial integrity of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia,

Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, and all the subjugated nations of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *November 1, 1943.*
Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

Your amendment plan to provide for integrity of Baltics and other subjugated nations voices the opinion of all America. Rest assured you have the support of all freedom-loving people.

STANLEY PIEZA,
Chairman, American Friends of Lithuania.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS,
United States Senate:

The Americans of Baltic, Scandinavian, and other origins are rejoicing for the first time since the peace discussion started in our Congress by your peace plan suggested in your resolution.

J. KRIPAS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

American friends of Poland commend your decision to inject into congressional discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of invaded and occupied countries. The Atlantic Charter unequivocally defined at this time expressed the ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our valiant men are giving their lives. May this sacrifice not result in a different form of slavery to the living.

CENTRAL OF POLISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK,
FRANCIS X. WAZETER, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend your outright decision to forcefully bring into open Senate discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of Poland and the invaded and occupied countries. The ideology for which a host of brave sons of Poland have fought and died are exemplified in the Atlantic Charter. Fair play and justice are an attribute of an American. Let us not lose the victory by receding from enunciated principles.

POLISH NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEW YORK,
FRANCIS X. WAZETER, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

American friends of Poland commend your decision to inject into congressional discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of invaded and occupied countries. The Atlantic Charter unequivocally defined at this time expressed the ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our valiant men are giving their lives. May this sacrifice not result in a different form of slavery to the living.

CENTRAL OF POLISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

You have our sincere admiration and appreciation for your fight to inject a real meaning into the bill now under discussion.

POLISH-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
JOSEPH ONKA,
President, District 5 of New Jersey.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The League of Polish Women in New York votes sincere thanks to you for your noble defense of Poland's right to her land and her people.

M. FUTUYMA, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is with deep appreciation that we learned about your defense of Poland's inalienable rights to sovereignty and independence.

POLISH WORKMEN'S AID FUND, INC.,
(a national Polish-American fraternal organ).
FELIX POPLAWSKI, *President,*
FELIX SIEKIERSKI, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is with appreciation that we learned about your defense of Poland's inalienable rights to integrity, sovereignty, and independence.

POLISH SOCIALIST ALLIANCE,
JOHN TRZASKA, *Secretary.*

DETROIT, MICH., *November 2, 1943.*
UNITED STATES SENATOR ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Chamber:

We noticed your amendment to Senator CONNALLY'S resolution. Integrity of all countries attacked by aggressor countries should be guaranteed. We wholeheartedly support your point of view.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, (Circuit No. 1).
HENRY KOGOT, *President.*
ARTHUR F. RECLAW, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Your decision to inject into the so far academic discussions a concrete proposal that the independence and territorial integrity of those countries that sacrificed their all in defense of our and their security be guaranteed is a courageous step in the direction of a clear and inequivocal definition of the Atlantic Charter. If we permit other powers to distort the very ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and sailors are dying we shall win the war but lose the victory or at best have the repetition of our failure to answer the call of destiny after the First World War.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT.
M. F. WEGRZYNEK, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Washington, D. C.:

American friends of Poland commend your decision to inject into congressional discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of invaded and occupied countries. The Atlantic Charter unequivocally defined at this time expressed the ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our valiant men are giving their lives. May this sacrifice not result in a different form of slavery to the living.

CENTRAL OF POLISH AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK,
FRANCIS X. WAZETER, *President.*

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, since I was one of the joint introducers of the so-called Pepper amendment to the Connally resolution, it had, of course, been my intention to speak in its behalf and to vote for it and then if that amendment did not prevail, to support the committee resolution, but now we are confronted with an accomplished fact and no longer restricted to theoretical concepts.

The Moscow conference has developed the four-power compact and since its terms looking to harmonious international relations and to the prevention of war seem to be most wise and agreeable to the American people—as well as to the Members of this body—it would appear but one natural course lies before us and that is the adoption of a simple resolution endorsing and approving the Moscow program. At least, it is my intention and desire to support such a resolution in lieu of either of the pending proposals.

Mr. President, while everyone may now properly hope the world will soon emerge from this global war into an era of peace and friendly relations among all people, we should from the very beginning soberly and candidly realize that no international agreement, however wise and provident, will prevent wars or promote international welfare unless such a compact is implemented by justice and good will. The era that now lies ahead will witness the continued development of a civilization dynamic and complicated beyond anything that we have ever known. Only by vision, wisdom, and the sympathetic understanding of the difficulties of other nations and other individuals can we hope to solve the myriad problems, both foreign and domestic, that will press upon us for solution.

Upon the surrender of Germany and Japan, one of the immediate questions that must be answered by Congress is what disposition our Government should make of our lend-lease claims against our allies. It is my own hope and desire that these obligations will be canceled at once, without quibble and procrastination. I think any other decision on our part would be lacking in natural justice and common sense. The lend-lease obligations have been incurred by our allies to permit the more effective waging of the war against the Axis Powers. For us to press an obligation against our associates for munitions furnished them to help defeat the common enemy would seem not only absurd but also violative of all principles of natural justice. We have suffered as a result of this war only very slightly in comparison with Russia, China, and Britain. Our abundant and increasing wealth not only makes it easy for us to be just and fair concern-

ing these lend-lease obligations, it likewise makes it impossible for us ever to collect them. We now possess most of the gold of the world and almost every nation is heavily indebted to us. To attempt to collect our lend-lease debts would be wrong; measured by economic laws, it would prove impossible and destructive because of the existing world-wide economy in which we are the only great creditor nation.

Nor do I believe that we should seek to advance our own interests by any attempt to acquire through their cancelation the territories or sovereign rights of any of the lend-lease debtors. It may be that our own safety might be advanced by the possession of additional areas and bases in the Atlantic or the Pacific, but in my opinion a tolerant and fair attitude toward their present owners would necessitate new and satisfactory considerations beyond the surrender of lend-lease claims.

Yes, Mr. President; the people of the United States and of every nation except the Axis may rest easier as a result of the Four Power Compact, and we may more optimistically look forward to a world of peace and prosperity as a result of what already has been accomplished. But let us not blithely assume that world-wide trials and tribulations will soon be a thing of the past. During the coming decades an infinitude of difficulties will continuously present themselves. Justice, vision, tolerance, and sympathy will find the way successfully to meet these difficulties, but if these qualities be lacking, no international compact, however admirable and intelligent it may be conceived, will prevail over the brutality and selfishness of humankind. So, Mr. President, while all of us should with enthusiasm and renewed courage applaud and endorse the Moscow plan, let us, by its accomplishment, find new strength, courage, and inspiration by which we may bring to the world of the future those qualities of character and intellect that will be so vitally needed if we are to move forward into a new world of peace, prosperity, and progress.

Mr. President, it is my desire that there shall be carried as a part of my address two letters which I have received upon the issue now pending before the Senate. I refer to a communication from Mr. John B. Elliott, of Los Angeles, Calif., and to one from my brother, Mr. Stephen W. Downey, of Sacramento, Calif. Mr. Elliott's letter comes from one who, throughout his life, has been committed to a firm conviction in the necessity and possibility of establishing some sort of an international authority such as the League of Nations for the preservation of peace and the determination of international controversies. Mr. Elliott is a man of high reputation in California, of outstanding ability, and his statement to me is of such extraordinary quality that I believe it should be made a part of the Senate debates and records.

My brother, Stephen W. Downey, who is a lawyer in California, was an officer in the First World War, and now has three children in the armed forces. He, too, has long been a crusader for the League of Nation's principles and I believe his letter is of importance and worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It should be noted that both these communications—the one from Mr. Elliott and the one from Mr. Downey—were written some time before the Moscow Conference. Mr. Elliott, more than 30 years ago, was a member of the Press Gallery of this Capitol, in charge of the floor of the House for the A. P., and was then considered one of the principal political writers for the Associated Press of that period. He is still a member of the National Press Club in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR:

"The shadow of another war already looms before us.
We have to think straight and think fast."
—*Lin Yutang.*

Straight and fast. Yes, straight and fast, indeed.
When there arises the factual apparition of a quarter of a century;
Where only one more than a mere one-third of the total membership
Of the greatest deliberative body of a single nation
Can, and, in fact, has already actually, on a certain notable occasion,
Completely nullified and struck down the concerted judgment
Of the combined statesmen of the rest of the world:
Ensuing to date, without the slightest exaggeration,
The most disastrous results to mankind in all recorded history.
So again, now, behold—
In the handsome, brightly lighted, soft-carpeted, historically furnished Chamber
Of the august Senate of the United States,
'Mid an air of pervading calm and dignity,
Certain well-groomed, well-nurtured, and confident-appearing Senators,
Truly representative of obliquity and the one-third,
Quietly, comfortably exchanging the politest of speech,
As though newly exploring, earnestly, cautiously,
Some delicate, dubious, opaque subject,
At most, not a familiar subject,
Freighted, as this one certainly was, and still is,
With calamitous consequences, sudden and premature death
To millions of human beings.
Meanwhile,
And at the identical instant,
Hundreds of young, eager, bright, typical American boys,
Who have, as yet, hardly begun to breathe the real breath of life
For which their mothers bore them,
And who have just been suddenly torn from their homes,
And with it, all that is dear to them,
By force governmental (exemplified also by urbane Senators),
And with deadly weapons of war thrust into their untried hands,
And under stern military direction,
Are undergoing the unique experience
Of having their clean, healthy, young bodies
Blown to bloody bits
In fierce conflict with savage foes
In nearly every corner of the inhabited world.
Think of it, if you can.
Nationalist and isolationist Senators, of intelligence and mature years,
Of experience with life and high station,
Arguing in elegant phrases and graceful gesticulations,
Offering their personal animadversions
On world disagreements and complications and such;
While these earnest youths from the homes of all America,
Who had never yet had a chance to live,
And who, now, never will have,
Are being violently hurled to tragic, terrible deaths on every continent.
Think of it, if you can; think of it!
Men, of dignified maturity and apparent erudition, consume hours,
With poise and deliberation coining agile, virile phrases and sentences,
Composite of nouns, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, and punctuations,
In selected and sonorous order and sequence.
Meanwhile,
These ardent young Americans,
Who were just beginning to know life and love it,
Ruthlessly plunged to their swift, unwanted destruction
In the steaming, fetid jungle wilds of the thousands of South Pacific islands;
Or on the parched desert sands or barren hills of Africa;
Or in the unbelievably frigid, penetrating mists and fogs
Of the heartless Arctic wastes;
Or dying, amid the snow and ice of northern oceans;
Or in shark-infested waters of the deadly Tropics;
Or, if especially singled out by ill fortune,
Cremated in towering waves of flaming oil on the surface of violent seas,
Their oil-soaked clothes afire,
Searing flames leaping to their faces and down open throats;
Where a mere drowning death is most merciful;
Or else, in shattered planes, roasted, in flames of high octane,
Miles above the earth,
Their torn, bleeding bodies, still conscious, falling down,
Down;
Finally crushed in charred, shapeless mass,
Not ever to be recognized or even seen again,
On unknown terrain, of which they, in their immaturity had, perhaps, never heard;
Or slowly suffocating to a desperate, miserable death
With a small group of fellows, already coffined alive
In the close, dark chamber of a flat, stricken, doomed submarine,
Helpless and forever lost on the very bottom of a distant ocean,
Under weight of hundreds of fathoms of water,
Vainly gasping for a last, weak, hiccoughing intake
Of chlorine-charged oxygen for exhausted lungs.
Think of it, if you can; think of it!
American boys from homes they loved
And where they were, in turn, treasured and loved—
Homes, great and humble, in Ohio, New York, Virginia, Rhode Island, Texas, Colorado, Dakotas, Iowa, Hawaii, California, Minnesota, Florida, Alaska, Illinois, Michigan, the Philippines, Arizona, the District of Columbia,
Every State, every community in this Union of American commonwealths;
Violently wrenched away,

And thrown into these sometimes boiling, sometimes freezing maelstroms
Of blood, fragments of burning or freezing human flesh,
Exploding TNT; and rending, tearing metal, scalding steam, searing flames—
The whole hellish gamut of human suffering and destruction.
Think of these, Flower of America,
Not only those who thus die, near or far from home,
But also those who, finally, do partially survive;
Crippled, maimed, disfigured, legs gone, arms gone,
Whose face obliterated,
Eyes put out, forever sightless,
With only dogs to lead them through stumbling years;
Or helplessly paralyzed, never able to move the slightest,
Without aid of other human;
Or minds gone, hopelessly, violently insane; shackled;
Incoherent, alternately mumbling and screaming in mental void against remorseless fate
Through a long blacked-out, meaningless night;
Thousands of these American boys!
Horrible! Yes; horrible!
Or stricken with strange, slowly fatal, physical maladies and pestilence,
Spread by all the tropical, miasmic germs
And vermin, and deadly flying or crawling creatures;
Or frozen stiff in unspeakable Arctic cold;
Or starved of sustenance to the verge of dissolution before belated rescue,
Never to know, again, a single hour of health or happiness.
These, and endless pages more
Of only mere listed categories of tragedies;
The wild, ruthless wasting of substance and well-being;
The abrupt and final ending
Of all future, education, spiritual solace, hope, happiness, ambition, life, itself
Everything, for these who are thus sacrificed;
The utter wasting of years of devoted, unselfish effort
Of tens of thousands of American fathers and mothers for their sons, and daughters, too.
The loss of love, faith, charity;
The embellishment and enthronement of cynicism and hate;
Crushing economic burdens upon all future existence;
The maximum of penalty, heaped upon the backs of coming generations
Of those who are in no way to blame—
The terrible, endless total of woe, suffering, destruction, devastation,
Death to participants and helpless innocents, alike.
An endless litany of needless, useless, frightful consequences,
For which there must certainly be, somewhere—responsibility.
Meanwhile:
Solemn, questioning, able Senators; aloofists;
Who, too, are, of course, highly patriotic Americans,
Argue eloquently, notably;
With strong and stirring words and phrases,
Illumined by graceful gestures,
Energizing themselves into slight degrees of Fahrenheit,
And perhaps unpleasant perspiration and such kindred discomforts,
In the calm, quiet, scientifically-conditioned atmosphere
Of the august Senate Chamber of the United States of America!
Oratorical pyrotechnics; to what end?
This, to wit:
The threats, "dire dangers" to our revered democratic form of government,
Possibly involved in suggested or subtly implied "Foreign Entanglements"
And all such like!
A distinguished senior Senator,
Isolationist, in extremis,
Thundering, in high peroration:
"I will die all right; but I will die fighting Joe Stalin!"
Pitiful! Pitiful! It all is.
To such lofty heights—shall we say—
Has our great and incomparable civilization,
So tediously, laboriously, and tragically mounted!
The Chair recognizes a Senator:
"Mr. President, I suggest the apparent
Absence of a quorum of Senators on the floor."
Meanwhile:
Official communique from the War Department:
"The next of kin of personnel have been notified."

My dear Senator, a great and solemn responsibility, perhaps unprecedented since our constitutional adoption, is put upon the present individual Members of the Senate of the United States. The welfare of the world will rest upon what you and your colleagues ultimately do. It is frightening when so much depends upon so few. Will the Senate be equal to it? Will the Senators realize that America cannot stand these devastating shocks of isolation, but perforce, must join with other civilized countries in a practical and permanent solution of the international problems attendant upon the progress of mankind? Dare we indulge the hope that feeble human nature will prove strong, brave, and wise enough to take and maintain so vital and vitalizing a step in the onward, upward course of civilization? Or, shall the record show that we have failed again? Unthinkable! Failure is such a flat word! So much depends. You must not fail! Else the whole world may fail, too. This is your task, your opportunity, your responsibility, your duty! Do not let us down!
Or, there may come upon us, Chaos and Old Night!
It may be, and probably is, much later than you think!

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. ELLIOTT.

(Letter from Mr. Stephen W. Downey, of Sacramento, Calif.:)

OCTOBER 22, 1943.

DEAR BROTHER: You remember the story of the Greek philosopher who fell into a muddy ditch head first. One of his disciples came along presently and—mindful of the teaching of his master—couldn't make up his mind, whether or not, considering the matter in a detached way, it were worth while to pull him out. He finally decided it was not and went his way. As Tweedledum might put it: "If it wasn't so, it wouldn't be and if it weren't, it hadn't been but as it is, it is and no contrariwise no-how."

Today millions of Americans are wondering whether, after this war is over, the United States is to be left in status quo—meaning as we lawyers say, in a hell of a fix—or whether a genuine effort is to be made by wise statesmen to create a new status that does not lead inevitably to new and better wars.

What I am thinking about of course is an international agreement or organization to maintain peace and prevent aggression. Obviously cooperation must start with an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China. Eventually all nations, in my opinion, should be permitted to participate; however at the moment I am concerned only with the first step.

But there can obviously be no agreement and no collaboration unless the Senate lends aid and comfort. That is why, as one of your humble constituents I am writing this letter. It is literally no exaggeration to say, as I believe, that one of the decisive battles of history will soon be fought on the floor of the Senate and that the outcome of that battle will, in large measure, determine whether we are to have world order or world anarchy. On such a theme I cannot write without emotion.

You and I are not old men, at least we don't think so. Yet already in our short span we have seen three wars—each more terrible and comprehensive than the last. Unless something is done about it we may still see other wars and the destruction not only of armies but of nations. I remember father, who fought in the Civil War, telling us jokingly at the outbreak of the Spanish American War that in 1865 the only war that imagination could discern was a pitched battle between the Army of the Potomac and the Army of the Tennessee. Well, in the year of grace 1943 the dark and threatening shadows of future wars move ominously like storm clouds everywhere along the skyline.

When what Alexander Woollcott calls hopefully (or perhaps ironically) the "next to last war" came to the United States you generously took over some of my responsibilities so I could go and, as I thought, fight for a peaceful world in which to raise my two boys. But in little more than 20 years—just long enough to grow to manhood—these same boys put on the uniform that I had put off. Even my daughter is now in the armed service. My oldest boy, as you know, just about to hang up his shingle with me, enlisted 3 years ago. He is now a professional soldier. Years of preparation for community service, as in the case of millions of other young Americans, have been replaced by intensive training for slaughter.

In his first letter to me in 1940 my son says, as countless other boys have said:

"It is not so hard to look forward to years in the Army when I know it is part of an effort to make a world that will be worth coming back to when it's over."

A few days ago, October 1, 1943, he wrote me what so many others, both in and out of the service are saying in substance:

"No fooling, Dad, the more people talk about the post-war world and the closer we get to it, the more worried I get. People are already beginning to talk in a completely resigned way about the next war and they even talk lightly of a scrap with Russia as a part of this one." The letter closes in due military style as follows: "We are going to win this war, make no mistake about that; but what are those who run the country going to do to really give us peace. Reply by endorsement of action taken."

My "action" is this letter. The men who are fighting this very second high in the sky over Europe and the Pacific, the sailors fighting on the sullen sea or under it, the soldiers marching on Rome, servicemen everywhere who await with a smile the zero hour and the bloody rendezvous want to know about the world they hope to return to—so do their mothers, sweethearts, and wives. Is this war to be just a mere episode, a prelude to a greater cataclysm a few years hence? Surely unless we are to have chaos there must be some semblance of international law enforced by the United Nations or a world organization that will accept responsibility for world law and peace.

I have heard many men meet the problem this way: "Wars," they say, "always have been and always will be. Three in your own lifetime proves my point." These men have no faith that men can live together in a world so little that all men are neighbors whether they want to be neighbors or not. "Even families fight," they say. "Nothing can be done about war any more than anything can be done about birth and death." So nothing is to be done except next time to be prepared and ready.

Next time! A continuance of conscription, billions for defense annually, an armed alert, more and bigger planes and guns and battle-

ships and gas masks. A military autocracy. The best of our youth manning outposts of the seven seas—waiting, waiting. They will not be disappointed.

"I'll put a girdle around about the earth in 40 minutes," says Puck in Midsummer Night's Dream. With what Mark Twain (or was it Will Rogers) called all the modern inconveniences it is only slight overstatement. The world shrinks. Hates multiply. Science forges more terrible weapons. There is no place where one can be secure. Men walk in fear.

Sooner or later—war—and every city a potential Hamburg with women and children screaming—trapped in the melted asphalt. The sky ship of tomorrow. What will it be like? The block-buster bombs? Maybe smaller than apples but certainly with explosive power now undreamed of. Even the humble airplanes of today are enough to wipe out hundreds of years of culture and civilization on a summer night. A single air raid a decade hence could turn our giant dams of California into dust and mobilize against our cities and industries the very wealth of water and molten gold we stored behind them. So job like, why not accept the futility of existence and take a potsherd and sit down among the ashes and with cheerful resignation wait for the next life?

Do I overstate the picture? I believe not. Only Dante could paint the picture of the post-war era that will surely come if the United Nations fall apart.

That's one choice—slow death to civilization. All that is beautiful in life to fade and ultimately to perish. What other choice is there? I have heard only one suggested—a striving for international solidarity and unity to enforce what essentially all the common people in the world must want—peace between nations based on law. A compact inaugurated by the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and China to hold the nations together. Maybe it's just a dream in a world of nightmares. Will it work? Who knows? Certainly, no man can look into the future and say what the fruits of collaboration would be. A step into the unknown—a shot in the dark. Perhaps, but in the night there is a star.

But maybe Russia won't agree to international cooperation on any rational basis. Maybe Great Britain won't. Maybe China won't. Well, one thing is sure. The United States can't agree for them. All we can do is to speak for ourselves but maybe our attitude will influence their attitude. The start of any agreement is a burning desire to agree. We must begin by really wanting to. With the history of 1919 in mind how can any nation consider that we are serious about international cooperation until the Senate has said so?

After all, who poses the big question? Is it Russia? Great Britain? China? Maybe the United States poses at least a little question. We know how uncooperative Russia looks to us. How do we look through Russian eyes? The Senate, by a gesture, might change that picture. Remember if it later says "No" it can render futile everything our negotiations have accomplished. But when Stalin speaks it is the last word for Russia.

Obviously no agreement can be founded on hate or ill will. For 25 years, rightly or wrongly, we have been deluged with anti-Soviet poison. We are now reaping the harvest of accumulated suspicion. Doubtless Russia is reaping a similar harvest. Actually when I read some of the papers I can't tell whether we are fighting our enemies or our allies. Of course, no one is asking the United States to endorse communism any more than the United States is asking Russia to endorse republicanism or the New Deal. We're not trying to get an agreement on ideology. It's enforcement of world law that we're talking about.

The thing that really scares me, brother, is the ease with which some Americans in these critical days voice hatred of friendly countries and people. It's so easy to create suspicion. It's so hard to build good will. The myth of national superiority is certainly not the exclusive property of Germany and Japan.

We've had lots of fun, I guess, talking about "foreigners"—the awful mess Russia made after the revolution; pulling the tail of the English lion and listening to him roar. And do you remember, brother, how as boys we used to holler "chink, chink, Chinaman" at the old Chinese laundryman and fairly thrill with excitement in the chase that followed? I remember now the little bunch of flowers the Chinaman brought to father's funeral. It's always fun, I guess, to holler at the other fellow, but personally I am willing to forego that luxury if we can get an agreement with him to cooperate for peace. None of the things that stir ill will between friendly nations seem funny to me this morning with news that the smiling boy who lived across the street will never walk to the streetcar with me again.

This letter is written, as I have said, in response to a summons from servicemen and their loved ones. Those of them who come back will face peacetime problems aplenty—unemployment, readjustment, taxation, inflation, to mention a few. These problems will demand the deepest resources of faith, patience, character, and statesmanship. It is too much in addition that these men should go from one battlefield to preparation for another. Yet, if we stand alone in a world of snarling nations there is no alternative. I know the difficulties of collaboration among nations. They are enough to stagger the most courageous man. But what good will and friendliness as we approach negotiations can do. Good will and a willingness to cooperate. Lincoln asks, "Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" Maybe, too, we can make headway if, as Barrie says, we "never ascribe to an opponent motives meaner than our own." That, he says, is a "way to immortality but not as easy as you think."

Affectionately,

STEPHEN W. DOWNEY.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have already sent to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the pending committee proposal, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved,"* and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Senate approves the findings and declarations of the Moscow conference and recommends that these findings and declarations be made the basis of a treaty or treaties between the United States and such nations as the President may deem advisable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have been detained from the Senate for the past 10 days by "flu," and when I prepared some rather brief remarks I expressed my approval of a resolution which would embody the findings of the Moscow conference and expressed therein my intention of supporting such a resolution. It seems to me that if the Senate approves of what has been done at Moscow, the logical and simple thing to do is to say so just as briefly and simply as possible, so that the other great nations who were represented at Moscow may know, so that the Chief Executive may know, and so that the people of the United States may know that we are agreeable, and may know how we stand.

Mr. President, I was rather amazed when I returned to the Senate to find that a resolution similar to the amendment I have just offered had not been proposed by a group of Senators or by some individual Senator. It was only because such a resolution or amendment had not already been presented that I took upon myself the burden of preparing and presenting the one I have now submitted. I desire to say that I should very much prefer that a resolution or amendment along the lines of the amendment I have submitted should be presented by some group of Senators.

Of course, Mr. President, I should be most happy if it were to come from our most distinguished and beloved chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or, if he did not approve of it, from the bloc of Senators who have been making the fight in the Senate for the so-called Pepper amendment. If any group of Senators or any individual Senator who has been taking a more active part in the debate than have I presents such a resolution or amendment, it will be my purpose to withdraw my amendment and to support the other one.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, it has sometimes appeared that the controversy in the Senate has been a controversy over words. Why are we concerned with words? Actually, I belive we are not. We are concerned with the intentions, meanings, and ideas to which the words point.

The argument on this floor is not one as between the use of the words "international authority" and the words "international organization," nor is it relative to the meaning of the word "sovereignty."

As I see it, the basic argument is between those who recognize the need for curbing the virulent imperialistic and nationalistic rivalries which have been set loose by the growth of technology in the modern world, and those who still view the problem of internationalism in the framework of the nineteenth century power politics.

I doubt if any of us would feel the wholehearted vigor and patriotic will to fight and win if after this war we were to return to the old power politics of "maintaining the balance of power in Europe." This was recently brought more freshly and most impressively to my mind by a short poem sent to me by my son from Fort McClellan. The poem was written by Pvt. Arthur J. Bachrach, of the Tenth Battalion of the Infantry Replacement Training Center of that fort. It impressed itself on my mind more forcibly than did In Flanders Fields or Rendezvous With Death, because in the poem written by this young soldier I see the philosophy of the American

people who refuse to fight this war in vain. Let me take time to read the poem:

ETERNAL PEACE

(By Pvt. Arthur J. Bachrach, Company A, Tenth Battalion, Fort McClellan)

And now I depart,
As many more have done ere myself.
I leave for the wars,
A crusader without a sword,
Khaki cloth my coat of mail.

What, I ask, do I leave behind?
Those myriad things not meaningful before,
That now so priceless be.

I leave a family behind,
Good folk who bore me twice—
Once from the darkness of the womb,
And once from boyhood into man.

I leave a girl behind,
A girl whom I love,
Whose image seared across my mind
Will hold me here where'er I go.

I leave my books behind,
Nurses of my mental ills,
Guardians of my mental growth,
Changeless, faithful, firm, and wise.

One more thing,
I leave a message behind,
That we who fight for freedom now
Can see no right in futile strife,
If lessons writ by dying men
Go unlearned at home.

This I make as no request
But rather a demand,
For pleas go unheard.

If ye who rule lose in parley
What we gain in blood,
And cause our unborn sons to march
Again for nought,
We shall come back,
Though some be off this mortal roll,
And then shall ye know full well
The fury of a disillusioned heart.

And now I depart,
As many more have done ere myself.
I leave to seek a prize
More precious than the Holy Grail.
I seek eternal peace.

Mr. President, in my mind there springs afresh, as they should spring in the minds of all Senators, the beautiful sentiments of 25 years ago with which we, an earlier generation, went forth to battle with the dragon of imperialism and world domination. Then we went forth with the slogans fresh in our minds "to keep the world safe for democracy" and the "war to end wars."

We won that war. An armistice was signed, and later a treaty was formulated. In that war we sought nothing save as is expressed in the poem Eternal Peace, which I have just read. We asked for no land acquisition, no trade concessions—nothing but the right to live our American lives in the American way. Our commissioners, headed by our President, went to the peace table at Versailles with that thought—and only that—in mind. A treaty was formulated curtailing the activities of Germany and other nations, limiting their armament, and announcing punishment by way of indemnities—not indemnities to us, but indemnities to certain European nations. An agreement was had by those commissioners formulating a world league for peace, commonly known as the League of Nations, with police powers, a court to try offenders, and ways and means of enforcing those agreements. Whether the League would have worked, I leave to your imagination. But strange as it may seem, the very people who fought the idea of the League and their sons and grandsons are now espousing some form of international cooperation. That fact demonstrates the change which has occurred in the attitude of our people. The Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate at that time was presided over by the late very able Senator Borah, of Idaho, who, although chairman of that very important committee on international affairs, nevertheless had never been outside America. As a result of that situation, and by reason of our insular ideas, and many other things, that treaty became a political football, a springboard from which certain ambitious individuals sought to reach a solution of domestic problems by dragging in international complications.

In debating the peace treaty after the last war we looked back to the days of George Washington, the great founder of our country, and we endeavored to see the world through his eyes—through the eyes of those who lived in the days of sailing ships, of coaches with leather springs bouncing over rough trails thrcugh the woods, taking days to reach points we now reach in a matter of hours. We brought back the thoughts of Monroe and his policies based upon the same conditions—a new nation struggling for its existence, surrounded by thousands of miles of ocean barriers over which only sailing ships could pass. At that time there was no thought of steam transportation. Our Nation then was only a small one. Shortly before, the States of which it was composed had been only a group of colonies.

At that time our Nation's only desire was divorcement from European turmoil—a Nation which had no capital to invest in foreign enterprises, no commerce to send abroad, no part in world economic policies. Upon that fallacious analogy and short-sighted reasoning, we limited our participation in international affairs to what is to me not only a humorous, but a ludicrous example of an impossible state of affairs.

We condescendingly agreed to participate in a world court with no power of enforcement and in the enforcement of whose edicts we would take no part. We placed ourselves in the position of a judge presiding upon a bench and with no sheriff to execute the decrees that might be entered, and refusing ourselves at the same time to participate in any enforcement of those decrees. From a military and economic standpoint at that time we were the most powerful Nation on the globe. Yet, politically in effect we espoused the cause of isolationism.

We reduced our forces to a size on land not sufficient to more than police the Territories of the United States. We reduced our naval forces to a size so that we were capable only of maintaining a fleet in the Pacific. The only argument adduced was the argument of reducing taxes by reducing Government expenditures.

But behind this apparent isolationism there grew up another phase of internationalism. This internationalism was only disclosed when this last chapter of world conflict opened our eyes to it. I am referring to the international brigandry of cartel arrangement, or shall we better say, internationalism by agreement between private corporations.

Corporations in the United States entered into contracts with corporations abroad to divide world territories. These cartels were more powerful even than treaties, because they were not so easily scrapped, the reason being that you can scrap a treaty without financial loss, but you cannot scrap a cartel without at least losing your ante in the particular poker game of which the cartel is a part.

The history of the past 30 years, the history which led to the two great wars which have ravaged the earth in our lifetime, in a history of unrestrained rivalries and economic domination which have threatened, and will continue to threaten, the peace of the world unless they are brought within the controls of international collaboration.

What good does it do to set up the finest array of world courts, leagues of nations, international courts of arbitration, supreme supreme courts, and other tribunals which deal only with the political effects of fundamental economic causes which are left untouched? What good does it do the world for the governments to sit down at peace tables and work out fine political mechanisms if they leave the instruments of economic and technical power in the hands of unrestrained private individuals and corporations?

In my opinion, that is the vital problem which we are in greatest danger of overlooking. We must not limit international collaboration to political authority alone, which suggests no pattern for a future economic collaboration without which political collaboration, no matter how elaborate the form or how generous the terms, means nothing. For too long have we permitted our international political relations to be conducted in an economic vacuum.

Only yesterday the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China declared:

> That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I submit that the least this body can do is support our Nation in following this decisive step toward a new, enlightened policy of international cooperation.

Any peace resolution which we may adopt must show that we understand this dire need. If it does not, it is merely a pious gesture. Mr. President, we are at the crossroads. In the past our policies, dating from the day of the great founder of our Nation, George Washington, have been to isolate ourselves, to keep our place in the Western Hemisphere, and to rely upon oceans to defend us. We must serve some kind of notice to the world at large that we intend to take our place in the world of

affairs, if our commissioners abroad are to be accorded the treatment they should be accorded, and if we would not be subjected to secret treaties.

Cartels have dominated the channels of international trade, have oppressed and exploited whole peoples, have restricted production and technology, have stemmed the tide of progress, and have plunged the nations of the world into two of the bloodiest wars in history. Cartels embody secret agreements between industrialists, superseding and taking the place of the governmental and economic and political agreements which should have been reached. These criminal cartels are not dead. Cartelists are merely awaiting the opportunity to reestablish and increase their power over the world's economic relations. The masters of the cartels are watching us today, Mr. President. They can take comfort from what we resolve here, or they can be confounded and given plain indication that we do not intend to live under their system any longer. I say that the cartelists can take comfort from any vague resolution which we pass here. They and their cohorts—the munition makers and isolationists—can see a ray of hope from a vague resolution because it will show that we do not yet realize the danger from cartels and from the lack of international collaboration, both economic and governmental.

In weighing the possibilities of permanent peace we cannot evade the effect of the cartel system on the exploited countries. We large nations have given cartel groups a hunting license with a 12-month open season to hunt in weak countries. We have applied no sanctions to their foreign activities. The only sanctions are applied by the exploited countries. The natural result is that the monopolists work for control of those countries by meddling in their politics. Of course, our Government does not technically support the foreign activities of these monopolists. But those countries are weak, small, and backward. The impression is definitely given that the Government does support them, if for no other reason than that it does not stop them. We are a Colossus to some of the weaker countries. After all, there are many of our 48 States which have fewer wage earners than the large corporations engaged in cartel activity.

Of course, the classic example of the results of a partnership between government and cartels is Nazi Germany, where the government went into general partnership with corporations for the purpose of controlling them when the Nazis took over. I should like to point out that this alliance was an inevitable one springing from the inherently undemocratic character of both the cartel system and the fascist form of government. In the case of Germany, the cartels, led by the great chemical trust of I. G. Farben, became the economic arm of the Hitler government. In turn, the Hitler government became the political arm of the cartels. Both worked together for the domination of the world, economically and politically. It is characteristic and inevitable that the two worked closely and in easy harmony.

Let me say at this point that frequently there have been produced before committees of this body statements by officials of corporations of the United States to the effect that cartels which had been found to be holding up our defense effort were only being held in abeyance pending the outcome of the war.

Cartel arrangements are not only undemocratic; they are antidemocratic. They are never subject to ratification or examination by the people. Just as the Nazi state requires an economic as well as a political dictatorship, so do the cartels flourish best where a political dictatorship is able to back up and promote the economic dictatorship for which the cartels are striving.

I wish to state emphatically that it is my opinion that if we are to have a people's peace—and I mean that in the sense in which I use it, a peace of and for the people—after the victory has been won; if the free peoples of the world, as stated in the Atlantic Charter, are not to be deprived of the fruits of their victory; if our children are to enjoy the "four freedoms" which we have by strength of arms and sacrifices of our valiant youth sought to attain for them, then cartels and monopolies, with their secret, strangling agreements and treaties must be eliminated from the earth. They must be forestalled by open, plain treaties between governments, having both governmental and economic sanction. There can be no compromise on this. Either there is freedom for cartels to operate, or there is freedom for the peoples of the world. We cannot have both.

It is an inescapable fact which we must face that the private ambitions of cartels, linked and identified with aggressive political dictators, started this war just as they started the war in 1914. It is also an inescapable fact that our own negative economic policy—or lack of any policy at all—disarmed us to the extent that international and domestic cartels were able to enforce their manipulations and set the scene for war. We, and the other democracies, allowed cartels to exist. In some cases, we gave them aid and comfort. The lack of a genuine Government policy on the international economic plane within a world-wide political framework was in itself sufficient to give cartels carte blanche for their private international manipulations.

To paraphrase the German militarist Von Clausewitz: Cartels are a continuation of war in times of peace. When, inevitably, cartels become closely allied with governments, when cartels and cartel systems become an accepted part of national policy, as would happen should we fail to adopt a clear policy of collaboration, they become a constant threat to the peace of the world. At such a time, when the domination of the world's economic resources can no longer be held secure by measures short of war, the governments, and their economic counterparts, the cartels, have no hesitancy in plunging the world into war.

After the World War of 1918, a number of our great industrialists, due to the lack of international agreements between the nations, entered into agreements limiting markets in the United States in order that they might keep foreign industrialists out, while at the same time we were busily engaged in erecting tariff walls to accomplish the same purpose.

American money went abroad in huge quantities to build plants which are now the bane of our existence and a thorn in the side of our war effort. For example, we limited or inhibited by our private agreements, the building of hydrogenation plants for the making of aviation gasoline in this country, while American money and skill went abroad to build hydrogenation plants that are now keeping German aviation alive and active and enabling it to shoot down our planes. We are now feverishly seeking strategic materials to build the plants which could have been built prior to the war at much less expense.

Even after Hitler came to power we sent abroad and built plants for the manufacture of ethyl tetrachloride, on which Germany now relies to sustain that flow of aviation gasoline which is the lifeblood of modern warfare. We apparently did not realize, or at least our businessmen failed to realize, that in a nation such as ours, with competitive industry and no government control, contracts of this kind are not coordinated to meet a national problem.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from West Virginia has rendered an immeasurable service to his country and to democracy and free enterprise in the world by the splendid work which he has done in respect to international cartels. If I correctly understand the able Senator, one of the purposes he has is to show that we should substitute the machinery of cooperation among nations so as to promote world welfare rather than to allow private cartels to act as a sort of international machine which serves the private rather than the public interest, and sometimes a national interest contrary to our own national interests.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Cartel agreements, that is, secret private agreements in lieu of treaties, all but wrecked our rubber program; they even held up the production of gunpowder in the early days of the war. We discovered to our sorrow that there had been substituted for an international agreement to guarantee peace an international agreement governing commerce which acted as a brake on our activities as a nation, although it was beneficial to a number of our great corporations in time of peace but detrimental to us when the emergency arose.

I might sum up the major portion of the cartel agreements by saying that we bartered away not only cash, but inventive skill and technology for the exclusive right to exploit the people of the United States as to prices. So instead of a league of nations or a league for peace, we had a commercial league for pelf, and thus with large numbers of our biggest producers under agreements limiting their production to the will of our greatest enemy, we entered into the chute

which eventually brought us into this war.

These agreements were so phrased as not only to control markets, but to furnish secret and confidential information to our potential enemy. For this I cite the Bausch & Lomb cartel with Zeiss, which required Bausch & Lomb, an American corporation, to list for Zeiss, and incidentally the German general staff, all military optical instruments, including periscopes, range finders, altimeters, bore sights, bomb sights, gun sights, torpedo directors, and fire-control apparatus manufactured by this American precision concern and sold to our own armed forces. The mere study of this information by our enemies gave them a measure of our preparedness. As a result of this cartel, we found it necessary at the outbreak of this war, due to the curtailed production of Bausch & Lomb, to ask the people of this country to give up their privately owned binoculars, field glasses, and any other instruments of this kind in order that our Army might be expanded rapidly enough to meet the occasion. Another feature of the Bausch & Lomb-Zeiss cartel was the power given to the German company to dictate the research personnel employed by the American company. The Bausch & Lomb instance is paralleled by many other cases which have jeopardized our national defense.

We are now confronted with a similar situation. Leading industrialists of the United States and other nations are broaching the plan of continuing the government of the world by private cartel arrangement, in lieu of a government by the people, by treaty properly approved by the proper authorities.

The time has come when we as Americans must realize that we cannot isolate ourselves between the oceans. As one of the two nations in the world that are practically self-sufficient, we must take our place in world affairs and assume our responsibility as a Nation, and not through private agreements of barter and trade entered into by a few of our businessmen. We must realize that if we survive, we must see to it that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren and their children are not forced into the conflicts we face in order that we may maintain our national integrity and our right to live in the way we have developed by our ability, our skill and initiative.

We must shake the scales from our eyes in our dealing with other nations and realize that they, with their problems, see things from a different angle than we do with ours. A nation of slaves cannot see things as does a nation of free men. A nation in the process of starvation sees with the eyes of desperation, whereas a nation well-fed sees with the eyes of peace, comfort and well-being. A nation educated in the ways of imperialism or totalitarianism cannot see things and does not do things in the way of a nation educated in the ways of democracy.

We must also realize that the world, educated to consider the United States of America as a nation refusing to take its place in world affairs, must be brought into line, must be made to see that we, the people of the United States of America, are no longer isolating ourselves between two oceans while sending our boys abroad, but expect to take our place in the proper cooperative method of conducting the affairs of the world.

The representatives of the United States must go to the parley table at the end of this war with these thoughts in view. We must realize that words and verbal guaranties are not sufficient to maintain the peace of this world. We must realize that there can be no lasting peace without cooperation among the major nations, and that that cooperation must be backed by guaranties in which we must furnish our part.

We must realize that while it will be necessary to render assistance to the conquered nations—and by conquered nations I refer to those that were conquered by our enemies, the Axis Powers—it is also necessary for our well-being that they be made self-sustaining and not become objects of charity. It is necessary that we realize that if we are to maintain ourselves as a nation—strong and rich as we are—we must take care of our domestic problems as well as our foreign problems.

We must see to it that dollar profit alone is not the measure of prosperity. A nation, no matter how strong in dollars and machinery, is only so strong as its manpower and the incentive it may have to preserve itself, and its way of living.

Let us lay the foundation for a peace with guaranties so strong that no nation, however powerful, will dare to make war. Let it be a peace that will be dictated as a result of complete conquest of the war-hungry Axis Nations and will place them in a position where their war-hungry tendencies can be completely curbed and where eventually they may be educated to a state where they will not desire acquisition of power through bloodshed, chicanery, and false representations.

What we do here today will affect not only our chances for winning a lasting peace but will have an immediate effect on our ability to win the war as speedily as possible. Any resolution we adopt can either encourage and spur on the fight of free peoples, or it can discourage and dishearten them by showing that we are still blind to the demands of victory and peace. We can either adopt a vague resolution and accomplish nothing, or we can give a lift in morale to all the peoples fighting the foes of all humanity, and give the support needed by our commissioners in carrying on their great work in Moscow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of events intervening since the drafting of the Connally resolution, including the Moscow declaration, and in view of the debate which has taken place upon the floor of the Senate, does not the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations think that at least some informal consultation might be had which perhaps might lead to an accord upon the resolution now pending, and which might eliminate protracted debate, in that way perhaps achieving what the able Senator has in mind in proposing a request for a limitation of debate?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is not acting in his individual capacity; he is acting as the agent of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am not prepared to make any commitments without consulting the committee. Yesterday the Senator from Florida wanted to recommit the resolution. I do not know what he has in mind now in the nature of an agreement.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that if the able Senator will read my remarks in the RECORD, which I have not seen, he will find that I made an alternative proposal, either that the resolution be recommitted—and I think I said for only a matter of hours, perhaps—to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration, or that the able Senator from Texas, recognized as the leader on this subject because of his chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations, quite informally bring together representative groups of opinion on the floor for an informal accord as to what might reflect a cross section of the Senate's sentiment.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is always available to discuss these matters with any Senator informally, and with any group of Senators. I do not know what the Senator from Florida has in mind, but if he has in mind that the overwhelming majority of the Senate will accept some proposal he makes, I do not think I could speak with any degree of authority.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Florida has no such thought in mind as that. I think I understand what he has in mind. It is merely that in the light of the circumstances which have developed in the last day or two, some accord, some understanding, might be reached which would have the effect of limiting the debate, and that the Senator from Texas would cooperate in reaching such a desired end, and knowing the Senator from Texas, I think I can assure the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Texas will always adopt a cooperative spirit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already expressed a desire to do so. I am willing to see any Senator at any time. I shall be very glad to call in other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and discuss all these matters. In fact, all during the day I have discussed these questions with Senators, both with the group represented by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the group sponsoring the resolution. I am available, and I shall be very glad to call in anyone with whom these gentlemen desire to discuss the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Texas is always modest, and exhibits his modesty in this instance, as he always does. In view of the official position and the personal prestige of the able Senator from Texas, he will realize that he has an opportunity to be the focal point of

accord, and to extend invitations which perhaps would appear presumptuous if extended by any other Member of the Senate. I certainly know of no one in my group who would feel disposed, for example, to call a meeting or try to get groups of divergent opinion together, and I assume other Senators would feel the same degree of diffidence. But I am equally certain that no Member of the Senate would fail to respond most cordially to any invitation, however informal it might be, which might be extended by the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to see if certain adjustments might not be made which might result in an accord.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Florida for his usual graciousness in saying nice things about other Senators. I assure the Senator, just as I did a while ago, that we are approachable. I do not know what these Senators have in mind. I shall be glad to talk with them between now and tomorrow, and with any other Senators with whom they wish to confer, but, so far as limiting debate is concerned, if the hope they have shall be realized, there will be all the more reason why we should not have so much debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make the request that, beginning tomorrow, no Senator shall speak more than 15 minutes on the resolution and 15 minutes on any amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, I merely wish to observe that there are only a few Senators on the floor at this time. I happen to know how anxious the Senator from Texas is to limit debate and to dispose of the pending matter, and I think we are in quite complete accord. But I also know that there are some Senators who desire to speak longer than the time indicated by the Senator from Texas. Therefore, I am duty bound and compelled at this time to object to the request made by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely within his rights in making the objection. I will say, however, that there are a number of amendments on the desk, and the absent Senators who are clamoring to be heard could speak 15 minutes on every one of the amendments if they should so desire, even under the proposed limitation of debate. But there is no use discussing that.

LEGISLATIVE RIDERS ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on several occasions when I was a Member of the House of Representatives I made statements concerning the attachment of legislative riders to appropriation bills. I condemned that practice as vigorously as I possibly could. I have also on the floor of the Senate condemned the same parliamentary procedure; that is, the procedure which has been indulged in to too great an extent, in my opinion, in the last 2 or 3 years, of attaching legislative riders to appropriation bills.

On October 30, a very fine editorial on this very question appeared in the Washington Post, and I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATION LAWS

The Comptroller General has brought to light another instance of legislation through an appropriation act. He has concluded that Congress, in providing funds for the National Labor Relations Board, forbade that agency to investigate complaint cases arising out of agreements between management and labor if these agreements were in existence for more than 3 months prior to the filing of the complaint. As a result, the N. L. R. B. has been forced to drop proceedings in nearly all cases involving complaints of company domination of unions. The effect of this is to nullify one vital section of the Wagner Act.

Ironically, this proviso was written into the appropriation measure at the behest of the metal trades department of the A. F. of L. It was designed to smite the C. I. O., particularly in the jurisdictional dispute over Kaiser shipyard employees. Now it has boomeranged badly. It operates to injure both C. I. O. and A. F. of L. and to entrench the company unions which both organizations seek to overcome and which the Wagner Act sought to disestablish. Wherever these company unions are shielded from the N. L. R. B. they will make true collective bargaining impossible.

If Congress desires to modify the Wagner Act, it has appropriate procedures for doing so. So drastic a modification as this would clearly merit hearings before a responsible committee and a full opportunity for debate. Certainly it should not be slipped across as a rider to an appropriation bill. This method of legislating by indirection is a violation of the House's own rules and an invitation to chaos. In the instant case it amounts to a legalization of contracts which Congress itself has declared to be illegal. The right hand of Congress had better be aware of what its left hand is doing.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that two nominations on the calendar be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Vice to be United States marshal for the northern district of California, and the nomination of Robert E. Clark to be United States marshal for the southern district of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 2 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

George Vice to be United States marshal for the northern district of California.

Robert E. Clark to be United States marshal for the southern district of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our gracious Father and our eternal God, we praise Thee that wherever there is a longing and a seeking soul there Thou art to comfort and to bless. Breathe upon us all Thy sweet and gracious spirit, to calm, to purge, and strengthen our hearts. Enable us to enter into that unshaken and unshakable peace which belongs to those who enter into fellowship with Thee.

We pray for all the weary, the oppressed, and the homeless; make us more active and generous, and allow no yoke of bondage to cast its snares about our feet and entangle us in our labors. O cleanse and purge our hearts from any evil purpose and withdraw us from the distractions of indifference and compromise. Father in heaven, let Thy blessed providence brood over the confusions of men that they may bring order from misunderstanding and may know better the whole compass and depth of Thy will. We pray Thee to restrain the violent actions of misguided men everywhere and bring them together in peace and concord for the sake of those who are suffering and dying that we may live. We ask every blessing to attend our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, and enable us to be true to our best selves and to our highest resolutions. Through Christ, the everlasting Word. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of the Interior.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
War Manpower Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees with amendments to the

amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 400. An act for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from a statement made by Mr. Robert M. Black, president of the White Motor Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Hubert M. Harrison, of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the completion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the case of the railroad employees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of the proposed increase of postal rates and to include therein a short editorial on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a portion of a chapter of a book by Howard E. Kershner entitled "Incredible Folly of Starving Our Friends."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday consent was given me to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Herbert Hoover in Kansas City. Word comes back from the Government Printing Office that it exceeds the limit by $105. Notwithstanding this I ask unanimous consent that the speech may be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, when the historians of the future undertake to chronicle the rapidly changing events of this era, one of the brightest pages will be devoted to the Moscow conference. It will rank in importance with the conference of the North Atlantic and Quebec, for out of this conference is created a new hope and in the hearts of the peoples of the world a new courage is born. The program adopted will have the effect of bringing the war to an earlier conclusion and the establishment of a peace that will be enduring. Outstanding statesmanship makes this a historic event and Americans will always refer with pride to the part played by an outstanding statesman of the world—a great American, a Tennessean—the Honorable Cordell Hull.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

THE LATE HONORABLE C. WILLIAM RAMSEYER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is recognized.

NONE KNEW HIM BUT TO LOVE HIM—NONE NAMED HIM BUT TO PRAISE

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I speak of our late beloved statesman and jurist and former Congressman from Iowa, Judge C. William Ramseyer, who died yesterday while in the full bloom and vigor of his judicial work in the Court of Claims.

He was born on a farm in Ohio in 1875. His parents emigrated from Switzerland in 1874. They moved to McLean County, Ill., in 1877. Since 1877, Davis County, Iowa, has been his residence. He was married during his first term in Congress to Ruby Phillips, and brought her as a bride to this city. They have been blessed with two daughters, Jane and Barbara, both married.

He was graduated from the Iowa State Teachers College, and from the College of Law at the State University of Iowa. He taught school 6 years; practiced law in Bloomfield 9 years. Was elected county attorney in 1910, and was reelected in 1912. In 1914 he was elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress and served in nine Congresses for a period of 18 years continuously.

At the close of the Seventy-second Congress on March 4, 1933, he was made commissioner in the Court of Claims and he served in this capacity up until the time of his death on yesterday, November 1, 1943.

It is interesting to note that Judge Green, of Iowa, a Republican, who served with him in Congress, was then on the Court of Claims, as was also the present Chief Justice Whaley, Democrat, of South Carolina. Each of them knew Judge Ramseyer and had served with him in Congress and they were both very influential in making him one of the commissioners of that court.

The Court of Claims relied upon Judge Ramseyer and upon his legal learning, judicial wisdom, and uncompromising integrity, and it sent him as commissioner to different corners of the world to take the testimony and report findings of law and fact. He went to Panama in an important matter and to Hawaii in another. These litigations involved large sums of money, and just now he was working on the famous Silas Mason case in connection with the Coulee Dam, which involves more than a million dollars worth of property. His reputation as a jurist and judge is unexcelled. He was an indefatigable worker and sought most diligently to render justice in all decisions. He believed that justice is a thing that the righteous pray for and that the wicked fear. Lawyers and attorneys who had faith in their cause were always anxious to have it assigned to Judge Ramseyer. Just a few days ago one of the attorneys in some Indian litigation told me that he was delighted to know that his case had been referred to our deceased friend for trial because this attorney was now sure of being given a fair deal and a wise judgment or decree. Judge Ramseyer is just one more example of the Biblical proverb:

Seest thou a man diligent in his work? He shall stand before kings.

On yesterday Judge Ramseyer went to the court in pursuance of his duties. Folks there noticed that he retired from the room rather abruptly and went to his own office. His secretary then discovered him to be in great distress and he was immediately taken to the Emergency Hospital. Mrs. Ramseyer was called. Doctors administered oxygen treatment but he passed away in another hour at about 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

We all know about the Ramseyer rule which he wrote. It is a rule that has guided the deliberations of this body for more than 14 years. It has come to me through his son-in-law that Judge Ramseyer was both amused and gratified at the success of the Ramseyer rule. "It was so simple," said he. But we who

make use of this rule to guide our deliberations must remember with Emerson, "That nothing is more simple than greatness. Indeed, to be simple is to be great." So therefore this rule alone is a monument to the greatness of our departed friend. It will never be repealed but will guide deliberative bodies for centuries yet to come. Thus, his work lives after him.

Ramseyer always took an active part in legislation and was logical and forceful in argument. He had a certain kindness and grace of demeanor that charmed both friends and opponents—this was one of the reasons for his success. He was learned and lenient and carried his argument without sting. He was successful because he believed in himself and in the righteousness of his cause. Tennyson described him when he said:

My good blade carves the casque of men—
My tough lance thrusteth sure,
My strength is as the strength of ten—
Because my heart is pure.

I am the only Member of the present Iowa delegation that served with the man whom we affectionately called Bill. Those in service before me report that he was very much interested in agricultural matters and insisted upon raising the income of farmers so that they and their families could live with all the comforts and conveniences of life in a Christian twentieth-century civilization. He always supported and believed in the pay-as-you-go principle and fought for it even during and after the First World War. In fact while in Congress he was active in all legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is an inscription on the monument in the old St. Paul churchyard in London dated four centuries ago which reads: "Virtue lives after the funeral."

No more fitting epitaph could be written at the last resting place of our friend when interred at Bloomfield next Saturday than this for William Ramseyer was not alone of splendid legal attainment and ability but he was also excellent in all the virtues. "His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'This was a man.'"

Judged only by his importance and worth, it may be said that his was a short life; but there is an appointed time on earth for all men, and his memory will live and his influence prevail for long years yet to come.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Hon. C. W. Ramseyer, Iowa has lost one of the strong men of the State. Mr. Ramseyer was elected to Congress in 1914, in the Sixty-fourth Congress, from the old Sixth District of Iowa, and he was reelected to every succeeding Congress, including the Seventy-second in 1930, covering a period of 18 years. Eighteen years is a long period of service in the great Congress, and at all times he was a useful and active member.

Following the 1930 Federal census an unfortunate situation developed in the State of Iowa. By reason of the loss of population, Iowa lost two seats in the Lower House of Congress, and as a result thereof a redistricting of the State occurred and the old Sixth District and much of the Eighth District were thrown together to form a new district, the one which I have the honor to represent at this time.

Mr. Ramseyer was never defeated in the seven counties that comprised his old district. In his last primary race in 1932 he carried every county. Practically every township and precinct stood by him loyally, as the voters had done for 18 years. He was defeated in the primary by a narrow margin by Hon. Lloyd Thurston, who served honorably in this House for many years. Mr. Ramseyer never had a close or difficult contest for election during the 18 years of his service.

The old Sixth District of Iowa has sent distinguished men to Congress. Gen. J. B. Weaver, who was later a candidate for President, represented the Sixth District in the earlier days following the Civil War. Maj. John F. Lacey represented that district for 20 years and was author of some of our most important conservation measures. Hon. N. E. Kendall, afterward Governor of Iowa, a very great orator, served 4 years in Congress from the old Sixth District. Hon. C. W. Ramseyer now takes his place among the galaxy of great men who have some from southern Iowa.

Mr. Ramseyer was a conscientious, careful, conservative legislator. He was regular in his politics but he was not intensely partisan. He viewed every measure on its merits. He cooperated with his fellow colleagues. He had the affection, I know, of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Following his retirement from Congress he served honorably, usefully, and well with the Court of Claims, and was at his post of duty yesterday morning when the call came to him. The great State of Iowa mourns the loss of an able man in the death of Hon. C. W. Ramseyer.

During his congressional service he was at various times a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the Rules Committee, the Post Office and Post Roads, and other important committees. At all times he was a giant in debate. At one time his name was mentioned for the Speakership.

Perhaps he will be best remembered as the author of the Ramseyer rule—a rule that enables Members to understand bills clearly and proceed carefully and wisely.

The best years of his life—from 39 to 57—he served in the House and he gave to the service his tireless energy and conscientious effort.

Throughout Iowa he was loved and esteemed. Young men knew the value of his counsel. Older men enjoyed his confidence and his companionship. The most ideal relations prevailed in his home.

With an aching heart I acknowledge my personal obligations to this distinguished leader and fearless and forward-looking statesman.

Truly it can be said, a strong man has left us. We will not soon see his like again.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I learn of the death of our former colleague, Judge Ramseyer, of Iowa. It was my privilege to serve with Judge Ramseyer not only in the House but also on the Committee on Rules. He was a devoted student of all subjects that came before the Congress, and he was an expert on parliamentary law. As has been mentioned, he was the author of the Ramseyer rule, which for many years has functioned so well in this House. This rule has been responsible for the saving of vast sums of public money, and it has contributed in the interest of better legislation. Our deceased friend served not only in the House but on the judicial bench, with honor and distinction. As a judge he could be depended upon to serve with firm justice and fairness. Judge Ramseyer was a splendid public servant and a fine American. We all join with the Iowa delegation today in mourning his untimely passing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I join in paying my tribute of love and respect to the memory of our colleague of a few years ago, Judge William Ramseyer, who represented an Iowa district in the House for many years?

Judge Ramseyer was in the House when I came here in 1919. Agriculture had no more enthusiastic advocate in Congress in his day. He was a lawyer of splendid ability and judicial temperament. He was a polished gentleman. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Rules Committee. To know him was to love him. He was a student of parliamentary procedure. As a presiding officer in the House when the Republicans were in power and, by reason of his clear presentation in debate, he had much influence in establishing procedural precedents that will last so long as this parliamentary body endures. The so-called Ramseyer rule is well known to every Member of the present Congress. This rule is a monument to Judge Ramseyer's foresight and perseverence. Surely it would not have been embodied in the House rules at the time it was included were it not for his sponsorship. We all regret this splendid man's passing, and extend our sympathy to the bereaved family.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the death of Mr. C. W. Ramseyer, former Member of the House of Representatives from Iowa, is a distinct loss to the people of his home State and the Nation. Mr. Ramseyer served the State and the Nation long and well. He will always be

remembered as a gentleman of outstanding character and integrity, a devoted family man, and forthright citizen. As a public servant, he was just and fair to all. He possessed the vision and understanding that makes for true statesmanship. Iowa sincerely mourns his passing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years I served in the House with Hon. C. William Ramseyer, a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Iowa, and who passed away in the city of Washington yesterday.

During his service in this body he was an outstanding Member and a recognized leader, and wielded a great influence in the shaping of legislation.

He was a man of exceptional ability, possessing a fine, judicial, and analytical mind, and he could weigh all issues fairly and impartially, and this he always did. He was not a partisan, and always placed his country and its welfare above every other consideration. He was not regarded as a reactionary in his views, but as a conservative progressive.

He participated frequently in debates in the House, and his arguments were always logical, persuasive, and convincing, because he had the complete confidence of the House, for he was honest, courageous, and sincere.

He was the author of the Ramseyer rule in the House, which requires committees, in reporting bills, to compare the proposed change in the law with existing law, and which has been helpful in enabling the House to intelligently pass upon the effect of new legislation, and if he had done nothing else while a Member of the House he would have left the Congress of the United States indebted to him.

Since his retirement as a Member of Congress Judge Ramseyer has served continuously for about 10 years as Commissioner of the United States Court of Claims, in which position he has made a splendid record and rendered very valuable service, and went to his office in that court yesterday morning, apparently in the best of health, and was engaged in the discharge of his duties when the attack came which caused his death within a few hours.

While we belonged to different political parties, the center aisle did not prevent us from becoming good friends, and our association together ripened into a warm friendship which has endured throughout the years. His wife and mine became intimate friends, and our families have been closely associated. His passing is a distinct loss to his country and a deep personal loss to me.

The SPEAKER. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct shock to me to learn of the passing of Bill Ramseyer, with whom I served in this House for 12 years and whom I consider one of the most valuable men I have ever met.

He has built for himself a monument, inadvertently, as someone has said, in the passage of the Ramseyer rule. Shakespeare said:

Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
Live registered upon our brazen tombs,
And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
When, spite of cormorant devouring Time,
The endeavor of this present breath may buy
That honour which shall bate his scythe's keen edge,
And make us heirs of all eternity.

Of all the men who served here during his day I dare say that Bill Ramseyer's name will live longer in the history of parliamentary government than that of any of the rest because of his service in the development and promulgation of the Ramseyer rule.

But that is not what I loved Bill Ramseyer for. I loved him because he disregarded party lines when it came to fighting for fundamental principles. He was what we call a liberal Republican. He was liberal without radicalism; he was progressive without fanaticism, democratic without communism, American without any Fascist or reactionary leanings, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile.

One of his greatest fights was for an adequate inheritance tax. He labored on it day in and day out, year in and year out. He realized that although our Government is not more than 150 years old, less than 5 percent of our people own more than 90 percent of its wealth. He saw that growing concentration of wealth which he thought would probably result in the ultimate wreckage of his country, and with a spirit devoted to this cause he bucked the leaders of his own party and strove to correct that condition. He agreed with Oliver Goldsmith when he said:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
When wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

I know of no man who rendered a greater service in a greater cause than Bill Ramseyer did in struggling for an adequate inheritance tax that would not only provide revenues but would break up the large fortunes that are now accumulating in dead hands and turn them back through the channels of our economic life. If his policies had prevailed, we could not then have had the ridiculous spectacle we have today of an offspring of a former family of wealth inheriting $70,000,000, escaping the payment of one penny of taxes, and then using it to finance a subversive publication.

God give us more men like Bill Ramseyer, "Men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy."

I knew him in his home. I knew his elegant wife and his lovely children. His family life was ideal. No man who ever came to Congress, in my opinion, measured up more thoroughly to all those great standards of statesmanship, of fatherhood, of manhood, and of Americanism than Bill Ramseyer from Iowa.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Judge Ramseyer, those of us who have served here for two decades feel that we have lost a fine friend, and the Nation a splendid citizen. In my time, Iowa has had many able men represent her in Congress. Iowa has been fortunate in having unusually strong delegations, according to my recollection, and I think I can say without disparagement that Mr. Ramseyer was one of the ablest of those who have come from that State within my memory. Not only was he a deep student, a clear thinker, but also a hard worker. He was a fine American who placed his country first, and his memory will long be cherished by those who were privileged to serve with him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the death of former Congressman Ramseyer, of Iowa. It has been my great privilege to have many interesting heart-to-heart talks with Mr. Ramseyer, whose counsel was always timely and good. He was a great statesman, a great American, a devoted husband and father, and a real man. Iowa will miss him, as will everyone who knew Mr. Ramseyer. He goes to the Great Beyond. The Supreme Commander in Chief of Heaven and Earth has willed it so. My heart goes out to his loving, devoted wife and family. May the same God who called him home give his loved ones strength and courage to bear the great loss of the one who we all were so proud to call our friend.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was not until late last evening that I received word of the death of my very dear friend, William Ramseyer. I know him, and I knew him well. My family and his family were closely associated. We were frequently entertained in his home, and he was entertained in ours here and also up in the country on our farm. Much has been said here in regard to his great record. I would say that the greatest contribution that William Ramseyer had made to his country is to present to the country at all times the figure of a true and valuable American, because of his sterling character. No man ever had a finer character than William Ramseyer, and to know him was to respect him. To know him well was to love him. Do you know that a man in a public position for any length of time assumes a tremendous responsibility for the upbuilding and preservation of this great Republic of ours? It has been said, and truly said, that there is no act of man which is not the beginning of a chain of consequences so long as that no human providence is high enough to give us a prospect to the end. Men of the character of William Ramseyer travel on down through the ages. He will be making his contributions to the strength of this Republic many years hence. I never tire of thinking of what a great civic leader, living in the Golden Age of his country, would often say to young men who were about to become citizens. I refer to Pericles. He would take the young men into the public square, point up to the Parthenon, the most beautiful structure in all the world, and say to them, "I would have you, young men, day by day fix your eyes upon the greatness of Athens until you be-

come filled with love of her, and when you are filled with the spectacle of her glory, reflect that it has been acquired by men who knew their duty and who had the courage to do it."

That spirit of Pericles still works in the hearts of the young men of Athens, and, of course, that country because of it will again be free. Hon. William Ramseyer has by his clean, wholesome family life and pure public life set a splendid example to the young men who will determine the future of this great republic.

My sympathy and that of my family goes out to his lovable family, in this dark hour of their great bereavement.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was very greatly shocked to hear of Congressman Ramseyer's death. It was my privilege to be a resident of the old Sixth Iowa District when he first came to Congress to represent that district in 1914. I was a constituent of his until I took up my residence in my present congressional district in 1921. During all those years I learned to know and to admire the great statesmanship of Congressman Ramseyer. It was just 30 years ago at this time that I saw him come forward as a candidate for Congress from the old Sixth District of Iowa. He was recognized for the great record that he had made in his earlier years, and his worthiness to represent that district in the House of Representatives.

It was also my great privilege when I came to Washington to represent the present First Iowa District in 1939, to meet Congressman Ramseyer here in Washington and to look to him and his friendly, kindly, and sympathetic guidance and advice in taking my own place in the House of Representatives.

Throughout all the years I know of no man who has enjoyed a finer reputation and greater accomplishment in statesmanship than Congressman Ramseyer. I am proud indeed, and Iowa is proud of the great record that he made as a Member of Congress and on the bench.

It is a real privilege at this time to bring you this message dating back before his first coming to Congress, and to do honor to him today. My family still claims the original homestead in the district that he represented, and they have been there for more than 100 years. I know that what I say here is only a feeble presentation of their great admiration and respect for Congressman Ramseyer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by my colleague from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief release by the Bureau of Reclamation on the war food program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COFFEE and Mr. KEFAUVER were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a copy of a letter from the manager of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce to the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce on the freight-rate situation.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STRIKES IN INDUSTRY

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I desire to read an Associated Press dispatch from Little Falls, Minn., dated November 1. It reads as follows:

LITTLE FALLS, MINN., November 1.—The Morrison County draft board announced today it would refuse to process any more men for induction until all strikes are settled for the duration.

The four-man board made its stand known in a statement forwarded to State Selective Service headquarters at St. Paul, to President Roosevelt, and to Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, and Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota.

The board members are Adolph Peterson, a retired road contractor; A. L. Christianson, retired creamery man; George W. Merkling and John H. Hanfler, farmers.

"We, the members of the Morrison County Board," the statement read, "wish to go on record as refusing to process any more men for induction until all strikes are settled for the duration.

"If a million men can go on strike, who is going to support the soldiers already in the armed forces? Why put more men into the service if we cannot take care of those already in."

Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming truly apprehensive over the labor unrest in this country and they cannot understand why the President does not issue an order to fight or work. If you will not work, go into the Army and fight.

That is the only way to prevent these outlaw strikes. Recently the electrical workers in Tulsa, Okla., went on a strike. The local draft board immediately began inducting the strikers into the military service and that brought the strike to an early end. That policy must be made general if we are to win the fight on the home front. This administration has too long temporized with a problem that is daily becoming more serious and dangerous. From now our policy must be work or fight. Anything short of that is playing into the hands of Hitler and Hirohito.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has called attention to the action of some local board. There is no question but what the coal strike is reprehensible. There is no question but what the coal strikes are subject to severe condemnation. There is no question but what the strikers should go back to work. But that certainly does not justify the action of the local board in taking the action it did. I am not going to condemn those men by severe language, but certainly the reprehensible action of those who are responsible for the coal strike is no justification for any local board reacting thereto and taking the action which that board did as evidenced by the statement of my friend from Minnesota. Two wrongs do not make a right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL JUSTICE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, "equality before the law" is an ancient maxim that is well grounded in our theory of justice. Law and order are absolutely essential to civilization—no modern society can exist without it, and no law can or ought to stand which is founded upon inequality. Therefore, in devising laws great care is taken to eliminate inequality as much as is humanly possible.

In spite of these efforts, inequality constantly creeps in, and as trial and error discloses these inequalities, efforts are made by legislative bodies to do away with them. Sometimes facts are distorted and misrepresented which produces confusion and results in a wrong interpretation by legislative bodies, but in the main, legislative bodies are honest and try to serve the people conscientiously and make every possible effort to eradicate any inequalities before the law.

For several generations, a most sinister influence has been gradually and effectively at work upsetting the intent and purpose of the legislative body in drafting the law. This influence has been the will of the judiciary. Time and again decisions have been rendered by judges in disregard of the express legislative intent. Such judgments have too often been an expression of the prejudice or political philosophy of the judge, who through force of circumstance happens to occupy the bench at that particular time. This applies both to cases involving civil questions as well as those involving criminal questions.

Let me point out more specifically a few cases showing the outrageous perversion of justice in recent months in criminal cases dealing with violations of the law directly relating to our war effort. It would seem that at a time of war

emergency, when young and old, rich and poor, men, women, and children in every walk of life are making some sacrifice for the common good, that courts would be particularly eager and anxious to punish the criminal who takes advantage of the war emergency to further his own private interest. Yet such is not the case. While I believe that most of the judges are mindful of this situation, nevertheless some of them have been grossly indifferent and to my mind have violated their oath of office in dealing with criminal cases involving war frauds.

I shall point out a few cases to illustrate this point:

First. In December 1942, the Department of Justice obtained an indictment against the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., in a shocking war-fraud case. This company was charged with having installed a secret device in its plant at Marion, Ind., in order to deceive Government officials and permit defective cable, intended for use in the war, to be passed by these Government inspectors. The present law in case of conviction for such an offense provides for 2 years imprisonment, $10,000 fine, or both. Such a penalty is small enough for cheating one's country in time of war and endangering the lives of thousands of our young men on land, on sea, and in the air.

Several months ago this case reached its final disposition in the Federal court at Fort Wayne, Ind., Thomas W. Slick presiding. The company offered no defense, thereby admitting that the charges were true and that it was guilty as charged. What did the judge do about it? He fined the company $10,000 which will, no doubt, be deducted from the corporation's income tax. Then he fined the general manager $10,000, which no doubt the company will pay. Two other officials of the company were fined $500 each, and one official was fined $100. The total fines amounted to $21,100. This company is a subsidiary of Anaconda Copper, which is one of the wealthiest corporations in the world. It can hardly be claimed that the amount of the fines in this case mean anything to such a wealthy corporation.

Now, let us look at some of the other cases that have fallen in the same category.

Second. Typical of the curious brand of justice being dispensed were two recent Baltimore cases. In the Federal district court two young workers were sentenced to prison for 22 months because they had tried to increase their earnings by doing welding and riveting in a slovenly manner.

In the same Federal district, Gustav H. Kann and Joseph Ben Decker, former executives of Triumph Explosives Co., Inc., were tried for violating the Renegotiations Act by falsifying and concealing production costs.

The devious and tortuous routes these two defendants traveled in their schemes to cheat their Government in time of war must shock the sensibilities of every honest citizen. Three times they faced the Federal court under criminal indictment, and three times they were convicted. The first time they were convicted of mail frauds involving Government contracts and received suspended sentences. The second time they were tried for violation of the Renegotiations Act by falsifying the records and the jury found them guilty, but the presiding judge set aside the verdict. In the last case, these defendants were again tried for using the mails to defraud. The defendants used a rather ingenious method to accomplish their criminal purpose. They organized a subsidiary of the Triumph Explosive Co. called the Elk Mills Loading Co. Officials of the Elk Mills Loading Co., among others, were Kann and Decker. Among the stockholders of this fake subsidiary were some key employees of the Triumph Co. who secured extra pay through this means. Apparently Kann and Decker's luck ran out on this last case for Kann was sentenced to 3 years while Decker's sentence was postponed.

The Department of Justice should receive an award of merit for its persistence through discouragement after discouragement in prosecuting these cases. The Department certainly received no encouragement from the judges sitting in these cases involving Kann and Decker.

It is this kind of justice which smells to high heaven and destroys one's confidence in the courts. It is to be regretted that the same yardstick of justice was not applied in measuring out and meting justice in the case of the workmen and in the case of these munitions executives.

I am not condoning these offenses; on the contrary, I believe that such offenders should be punished and punished severely, but if the welders deserved 22 months, then Kann and the officials of the Anaconda subsidiary deserved life. Why two kinds of justice, a severe penalty for one class and a very mild one for those who seek blood money in addition to the liberal profits they are already making?

The most flagrant violation of justice meted out in the Federal courts and which stinks to high heaven was the action of Federal Judge Albert W. Johnson of Scranton, Pa., in the war frauds prosecution of officials and employees of the Lackawanna Pants Co. I want to go into some detail in regard to Judge Johnson's peculiar conception of justice as indicated in this particular case.

Originally, four defendants were indicted on four counts of embezzlement and one of conspiracy. But Judge Johnson ruled out the possibility of a conspiracy conviction in his charge to the jury. The jury, however, rendered a verdict of guilty on all counts in spite of the judge's manifest effort to aid the defendants. Therupon, Judge Johnson reprimanded the jury for disregarding his charge and ordered them to return to the jury room and bring in a verdict of not guilty as to the count involving conspiracy.

In that case, the Federal prosecutors had clearly demonstrated that the defendants not only knew what was going on but took an active participation in the proceeding. Yet, the judge disregarded this testimony and ordered the jury to throw out the count charging conspiracy. Please note that the jury of 12 responsible people disregarded the judge's charges and were all unanimously convinced that these 4 defendants were guilty of conspiracy. Evidently the testimony must have been sufficiently convincing to cause these 12 jurors to disregard the express mandate of Judge Johnson. A Federal prosecutor demanded that Judge Johnson impose sentence in accordance with the jury's verdict and pointed out that despite some controverted facts there were other facts not controverted. He mentioned especially the sudden removal of 8,000 yards of Government cloth and more than 1,300 pairs of pants from the Koppelman plant to a warehouse, "the day that a quartermaster corps inspector came to look into the contracts being executed by the company." He charged there was no question of fact on the sudden replacement of Government labels on the trousers by company labels and that there was no question about the equally sudden removal of the material back to the plant, and the additional fact that Theodore Koppelman and Luongo, the shipping clerk, consigned a shipment of these trousers to a fictitious California address. I quote from an editorial contained in the Scranton Times:

> Judge Johnson before passing sentence criticized the jury for its verdict. Attorney Max H. Goldschein, a special assistant to the Attorney General, pointed out to the court: "This is not an isolated proposition but a long series of considered actions, not a rash moment but a well organized plan. It is not enough to consider what will be required to rehabilitate the individuals involved in this crime. The public welfare must be considered. The question is whether the punishment will be sufficient to deter others from committing the same crime. As a member of the Department of Justice and as a citizen, I believe that a public example should be made in this case."

Let us examine the record of Theodore Koppelman, president of this pants company. In February 1935, at a time when a portion of the factory was working on Government contracts, Theodore Koppelman was guilty of a violation of N. R. A. This charge Koppelman denied, but Assistant United States Attorney Maguire pointed out that he paid a $700 fine. In 1941 a consent decree was entered against the same company, and the same Theodore Koppelman, because of a wage-hour violation. The assistant United States attorney also pointed out that Koppelman "at one time was in violation of the fire and factory laws in the plant where 750 people were employed. It was considered a sweatshop and he owed the boys and girls in his employ money."

In spite of these facts Judge Johnson, in sentencing these defendants, stated that—

> These three must be put in a class by themselves, and * * * the court also takes into consideration the matter of restitution and previous record of the defendants.

Judge Johnson must have been deaf, dumb, and blind to the previous violations of the Federal law by this company and by Koppelman, its president.

If ever a case, and the conduct of the judge, ought to be examined by the Committee on the Judiciary, with a view to impeachment proceedings, the case of Judge Johnson deserves full consideration. Let the Judiciary Committee call in the prosecutors involved in this case, the jurors who heard the testimony, and the reporters who were present and reported the case. I have secured my information from the full and complete report made of this case by the Scranton Times, and I feel that the reporter of the Times went out of his way to quote freely from the language of the judge and attorneys, both for the Government and for the defense. The Judiciary Committee cannot overlook this case nor the conduct of Judge Johnson. To ignore the matter is to permit other judges to continue to hand out special privileges to a few, and in that class it seems that Judge Johnson stands by himself. I am advised that some of this material has been forwarded to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SUMNERS of the Judiciary Committee, as long ago as July 30 but no one has heard anything about it nor has anything been done about it. Let us have a thorough investigation and ascertain the facts in regard to Judge Johnson.

I also want to call the attention of the membership of this House to the fact that last February, Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, read off 19 indictments against some of the largest and wealthiest and most powerful corporations in the United States for violations of criminal law, and not one of these indictments has been brought to trial. Today this number of delayed cases has increased to 32. I might even call attention to the fact that in my own State of Wisconsin several indictments have been pending in Federal court now for more than 2 years involving price fixing and monopoly control of cheese, but to date there has been no trial. During the First World War, we had the same kind of peculiar, and may I add, odorous, justice meted out to different defendants.

There is only one way to put an end to these high-handed practices by Federal judges and that is by making them responsible to the people. This can be done by changing the law so that Federal judges are elected by popular vote for a definite term instead of being appointed for life by the Chief Executive.

To accomplish this end, I have introduced an amendment to the Constitution in order to remedy what I consider a serious defect in our present method of seating Federal judges. My amendment provides for the election of Federal district judges by popular vote. The amendment relates only to Federal district judges, but if that plan works out successfully, as I think it will, then the same plan can be adopted in regard to Federal circuit judges.

It is high time that the questionable conduct of some Federal judges, appointed for life and responsible to no one, be ended, and that these judges be made accountable to the people, whose rights they are presumed to protect. Elections at stated intervals will give the people an opportunity to register their approval or disapproval. "More democracy, and not less, is the cure for the ills of democracy."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WASIELEWSKI). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUBSIDIES—MUST HAVE FIRM AND STABLE POLICY ON INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House I studied the question of subsidies for several weeks. I did not like the word "subsidy"; therefore in the beginning I was opposed to it, but I was convinced before the hearings were over that the use of subsidies was the only way that you could hold down the cost of living and at the same time give the farmers a sufficient price to cause them to produce sufficiently for this war.

It is my belief that we must have a firm and stable national policy on inflation; if we do not have some kind of policy we shall certainly have ruinous inflation. We have adopted a policy which involves a date, a time, to which we say we expect prices shall be held. There will be objections to any price we fix; certain classes and groups will say: "It is unfair to us"; so it is impossible satisfactorily to adjust a time that will meet with the approval of all classes and groups and all people who are selfishly interested; but we should not destroy a stable national policy on inflation just because a few are displeased. On the other hand, it would be much more desirable to try to adjust those differences, those inequalities, those inequities, which I believe can be done. Through subsidies they can be corrected without raising the cost of living.

ONLY SOME THINGS SHOULD BE SUBSIDIZED

On the question of subsidies I do not say we should subsidize everything that is bought by a consumer; there are many things that would be unwise economically for us to subsidize, but there are some things, on the other hand, that should be subsidized in the consumer interest and in the interest of our country; in other words, if we can pay a subsidy out of the Treasury of $1 to the producer of copper or to the producer of any other commodity and save the taxpayers $28, which has been proven, it occurs to me that that is not only good business, but just good common sense. That can be done in a number of items, a number of articles, but in all cases it cannot be done; so some subsidies are good and some subsidies are bad.

In a case like that, which is the wise thing for Congress to do? Just say: "Congress should try to legislate the type of subsidy to be allowed"? Or would it be better to delegate that power to the executive branch of the Government that can act more quickly and more easily than the legislative branch? Making laws is a very cumbersome procedure and we cannot quickly make the laws and make changes. It is necessary, therefore, and especially in wartime, for us to leave questions like that to someone who can act in a hurry and quickly. Some mistakes will be made. Congress could not correct those mistakes right off; it would take time to correct them, but an executive could correct them and correct them overnight.

MARVIN JONES RIGHT MAN FOR W. F. A.

It is my belief that if this country had been searched over from Canada to Mexico, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a better man for War Food Administrator could not have been found. He is none other than our former distinguished colleague who served here in the House for longer than 20 years, a gentleman who at one time was a tenant farmer himself. He was born and reared on a farm. He had a distinguished record as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives. No Member has ever lived whose words have been more helpful in legislative acts to the farmers of the country than the words written by this man into the laws the last 10 years. He is the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator.

I know that a lot of mistakes will be made by his organization, but it is my belief that Marvin Jones will do his very best to correct those mistakes. I believe that his every heartbeat and pulse throb is with the American farmer. Marvin Jones wants the farmer to prosper. No man has done more to help him prosper than has Marvin Jones. It is true that there are many complications and difficulties involved in fixing prices. After all there are 8,000,000 different commodities, including grades, styles, fashions, classes, and designs, but just a few commodities will cause a lot of trouble. I refer particularly to the beef and dairy situation, milk for instance. They have not been satisfactorily adjusted, but who can better adjust them, 531 Members—96 in the Senate and 435 in the House—through the cumbersome way that we have of communicating with one another in passing laws, for if we make a mistake it takes a long time to correct it, or could Marvin Jones better correct it? Marvin Jones can correct it quickly and overnight. He can do it right now. He is probably not going to be able to solve this thing right away. I have confidence in Marvin Jones and I believe all the Members have confidence in him. If they will leave it to Marvin Jones he will get both the milk and beef situation settled. Instead of trying to cause more confusion, pass a lot of laws, take away a lot of power and give a lot of power to somebody else, why not devote our efforts to making constructive suggestions as to how to best cure this situation?

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Does not the gentleman think that Marvin Jones has been bypassed by somebody along the line in

regard to the fixing of the price of live beef?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not think he has been bypassed except by Congress. You know, the Congress gave the President a directive to hold the prices. I believe the gentleman voted for it. The President, having that directive to hold the line as of a certain date, Marvin Jones is trying to carry that out just as the President is. That is the reason I say that the beef producers and the dairy producers in many instances, not all, have not been getting enough to encourage adequate production, but instead of raising the line up in violation of the gentleman's congressional act and mine, there is one other way to do it. The only alternative is give a subsidy in those particular cases and that is the question before the Congress now.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman still insist that Mr. Jones has not been bypassed on the beef situation? Does the gentleman mean to say that Mr. Jones has consented to that?

Mr. PATMAN. Why use the word "bypassed"? Do you mean to say somebody will take advantage of Mr. Jones?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He has been disregarded.

Mr. PATMAN. No; he has not been disregarded. No man's word is accepted more among officials in high quarters than Marvin Jones and I believe the gentleman concurs in my statement on that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman mean to say that Marvin Jones agreed to the beef prices and conditions that have been imposed lately?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman does not imply that somebody is taking advantage of Marvin Jones; that there is some sinister motive behind all this and that someone is trying to take advantage of the farmer when Congress has demonstrated its attitude toward the farmer. We have furnished them almost a billion dollars a year the past 10 years. That should demonstrate our attitude.

IS AN EFFORT BEING MADE TO MISLEAD THE FARMER?

Now they are trying to make the farmers believe it is an awful disgrace to accept a subsidy. They say that it is almost criminal. They are trying to make them believe it is an awful thing, but that is the only thing that helped the farmers out when they were desperate. I am afraid they are trying to lead the farmers down a blind alley now. Suppose they succeed in getting that out and convincing the farmers of the country that they should not take another subsidy. Suppose they succeed in convincing the country that no, we farmers will not take another subsidy; we are against it in principle; we think it is wrong, and we will never take it any more.

POST-WAR AGRICULTURE

When the war is over we will have to have post-war planning, and we cannot have an agricultural program without subsidies. The party in power then can say: "No; the farmers do not want a subsidy. They convinced them of that a long time ago; it was wrong, and we cannot put in another in the way of subsidy." I wonder if some of the farm leaders are not trying to lead the farmers up a blind alley.

We have written into the law a protection for the farmers after this war that is afforded no other class or group on earth. That provision is that for 2 years after the declaration of peace we guarantee to the farmers of this country a price the equivalent of 90 percent of parity, which the farmers will be pleased with. If the prices go down and we want to carry out this contract, which we will, it will involve a subsidy and a huge one, will not the party in power say, "We cannot have a subsidy; we cannot carry that out, because the farmers have said they do not want a subsidy; they will never take another one?"

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman does not feel that Marvin Jones has been by-passed in the meat program, I suggest he stay and listen to his colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], and he might be convinced.

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. He is a mighty fine man. He has one view of the situation, maybe I have another one, or probably we agree, I do not know; but I have as much confidence in Marvin Jones as I have in any man in public or official life, and I believe anyone who has ever known him has the same feeling about him.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman answer specifically the question asked him by the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose the gentleman repeats it and I will try to answer it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Texas, and all other members of the committee have a transcript which is available which distinctly shows that the plan approved by the industry and the plan approved by Judge Jones was just thrown away and another plan substituted. What is the gentleman's answer?

Mr. PATMAN. That does not mean there is no compromise. It does not mean that. It does not mean that Judge Jones will not finally prevail. Suppose that plan was brought into the Congress and we jumped on it for a few months' time. There is no telling what we would come out with. It is better to have Judge Jones' view, the view of the O. P. A., Judge Vinson's views, and so forth, then let them throw out one, turn down the other, but they will get together with something good. Marvin Jones will get a satisfactory plan, I assure the gentleman of that. I have no authority to speak for Marvin Jones, but I know that he is going to see the right thing done, and the gentleman can rest assured it will be done. He might have a temporary set-back, but it is not going to last long.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is that what the gentleman calls a compromise?

Mr. PATMAN. Every law that is passed is a compromise.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If Judge Jones' plan is thrown into the wastebasket——

Mr. PATMAN. You watch Judge Jones' plan. It might be temporarily laid aside, maybe by high authority, I do not know—and I am not saying, because I am not acquainted with the facts—but in the end Judge Jones will come out with a good program, just like Secretary of State Cordell Hull came out with a good program at Moscow.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman know that the other plan has already been put into effect?

Mr. PATMAN. If a mistake has been made, it will be corrected, and it can be corrected quickly by Judge Jones.

You know, our Constitution is very plain. It says that the Congress shall make the laws and the Executive shall execute them. We cannot execute the laws. If we are in the law-making business and also the law-enforcing business and the law-changing business, the law-regulating business, and all the others, we will get nowhere fast. We should stay by the Constitution.

Mr. O'HARA. We all join with the gentleman in his high regard for Mr. Jones, but if Mr. Jones and his excellent plans are disregarded, what is wrong?

Mr. PATMAN. He might have a temporary defeat. Cordell Hull had a temporary defeat, but he came out all right; did he not? I venture to say that Marvin Jones will come out the same way.

Mr. O'HARA. If they will listen to him, it will be all right.

Mr. PATMAN. They will listen to him. Anyone will listen to Marvin Jones, because he is a man of good common sense, he knows what is good for the country, and he has done so much for the farmers in the past. Nobody can make me believe that he has become an enemy of the farmer.

It might be said, too, that we cannot expect exact justice in everything. There will be a lot of mistakes made, some inequalities and some injustices. If you make those mistakes in a law they are difficult to correct, but if the Executive makes them, if Marvin Jones makes them, he can correct them, and it does not take months of time to get them corrected. So the point is, which is better, to leave these difficult and troublesome problems to the legislative branch and let it try to say which shall be subsidized and which shall not be subsidized, or to leave them to a good, honest, conscientious, intelligent, able public official like Marvin Jones? I say that the latter is preferable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I know that each and every one of you, yes, all of us in this land and the world over, are gratified by the successful result of the Moscow conference. I am especially pleased, because for many years I have been assuring this House and the country that when the time comes the great Russia would be able to prove to the

world that it desires nothing but peace and cooperation with other nations for the promotion of the cause of a democratic form of government the world over.

Frequently in the past I have urged on the floor of the House the resumption of friendly relations with the Soviet Union and, as I look back and reflect, there were some appeasers and isolationists who seemed to be misled with Fascist-Nazi ideology judging from their attacks on Marshal Stalin and the Soviet Government. And even today, Mr. Speaker, some members of this Fascist-Nazi misled group continue to express their fear of the danger of communism. It has always been my contention and belief that they have followed the Hitler propaganda to hide the Fascist-Nazi activities in this country. While all well-informed people appreciating the Soviet Union's aims and realizing that the attacks made were unwarranted and not based on facts, yet the minds of many sincere men and women were poisoned by the speeches made on the floor and by the reading of articles appearing in magazines and special publications of the intolerant group in our midst. Anyone who, not so long ago, advocated a friendly relationship with the Soviet Union and defended the President's policies was assailed and attacked, and even accused of communistic leanings.

I am glad that I was then fairly well-informed and in position to combat to the best of my humble ability many of the unjustified charges and accusations against the Soviet Union. Naturally, today, as I have stated, I am overjoyed that the assurance that I then gave that there was no danger of interference or from communism in this country is borne out by the Moscow agreement brought about by three outstanding, sincere, and able gentlemen, namely, our own Secretary of State Hull, Foreign Minister Anthony Eden of Great Britain, and Marshal Stalin of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Therefore, I again urge of those who have been misled by the shrewd, conniving, and lying Nazi propaganda to admit to the fact that they have been led astray and to desist henceforth from their un-American and seditious activities and to stop creating racial and religious prejudice. It is my sincere hope that they will serve notice on the rabble rousers that they have been misled long enough by them and that if, due to their hate and intolerance, they still persist in their unfair and subversive propaganda will be proceeded against in accordance with the law of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Navy Day address delivered by Rear Admiral Moreell. I am informed that this material will take up more than two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will cost $112; nevertheless, in view of the information contained in this splendid address, I ask that it be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GOVERNMENT OF LAW OR BY DIRECTIVE—RED MEAT OR RED TAPE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would deeply appreciate it if my colleagues in the House would refrain from interrogation until I conclude my effort to present a subject which I earnestly believe to be of deep concern to our country.

I regret that at this juncture my distinguished colleague from Texas is not on the floor. I heard only his concluding remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in approaching the subject of this statement today, I find myself beset with unusual difficulty presented in the size and ramifications of the subject when compared to the time granted to me for its discussion.

Let us not forget in approaching our governmental problems that we, the United States of America, were the first great Nation in the world to make democracy workable, that popular government was begun here amidst almost universal prophecy of failure, and that other nations which have attempted popular government have, with few exceptions, seen it give way to dictatorship or some other form of despotism.

Prior to the establishment of our Government, philosophers talked, and history confirmed their teachings, that democracy could succeed only to a qualified extent and that only in small and sheltered communities, but in a great Nation which has attained supremacy in world affairs, the United States, we have seen and we have proven that democracy is workable. To say the least, it is worth the inquiry, Why has democracy succeeded here while it has failed in so many other countries?

To my mind, the answer is that we have embodied in our constitutional system the true principles of popular government, the principles upon which the exercise of sovereignty by the people must proceed if government is to be even partially or permanently successful. The mainstay, yes, the Gibraltar upon which these principles are based is the division of the powers of sovereignty in the Federal Government among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

It should likewise be noted and earnestly considered that the Constitution of the United States would not be in existence had not life been breathed into this immortal instrument by its ratification by the several States which make up the Union which our Constitution was intended and purposed to make perfect. The importance of this division of power in the maintenance of liberty is apparent even upon the most cursory reflection. The concentration of the sovereign power in one agency not only leads to but establishes despotism, this because of the inevitable tendency to substitute the will of the individual exercising the power for law duly prescribed. If the same body is given, not only the power to enact and enforce law, but added to that the power to hear and determine violations of the law, the enforcing body will have in mind not law as prescribed but the end at which the law was directed and the limits of legality which must be observed in executive action. Those limits will, of course, be obscure.

In talking this afternoon I am fully conscious that in the effort to definitely discharge my responsibility as a Member of this group, that along with this body and another body, the free press of this Nation has a representative function to perform. Whenever the function of the press or of the Congress is colored by the directives, coercion, or other forms of stimulation, the representative function of our form of government is balked by an impassible barrier. I want that to remain in the forefront of your minds. If the same body makes, enacts, and interprets the law, the same evil results with the added danger that safeguards against ex post facto laws and other retroactive forms of legislation will, of course, be erased, and in the case of our system, when laws are enacted by representatives coming directly from and chosen by the people and such laws are enforced and carried out by other men, who have nothing to do with their passage, and which are subject to review by yet a third body of men, who are independent of the others, and have no duty to declare the law save as they find it, it becomes a government of laws and not of men. It is true that under such a system laws are enacted by men, interpreted by men, and enforced by men, but in the end what is enforced is not the arbitrary will or power or notion of any man or group of men, but the law as prescribed by those who represent the popular will, executed by administrative decision and judicial decree by those withdrawn from political contest, to exercise judicial power.

Today public confidence, shocked as it is by repetitious innovation, is in dire need of the stabilizing influence of true and conclusive evidence to the effect that the Congress of the United States—and mark these words—proposes to be true to that instrument, the Constitution of the United States, which gave the Congress being and life. The fact is that uncontrolled writing of regulations, directives, proclamations, or whatever they may be termed, by some of the divisions of the administrative branch of the Government have become so pernicious and numerous that the actual intention, the real intention of the Congress is vitiated. There are strong indications, evidential at every hand, that a fourth branch of government has arisen, certainly without constitutional sanction—shall we call it, for the purpose of this discourse—the regulatory branch? This branch is operating contrary to the fundamental principles of representative government. It is undermining and in some instances it is committing breaches which are tantamount in fact to a change in our form of government. Although some Government officials now operating within this fourth branch of government will tell you that the rules which they create

are not laws, yet Mr. Chief Justice Hughes some time prior to 1938 stated:

> The making of regulations is essentially legislative in character, for they set forth what a citizen may or may not do.

Mr. Speaker, you and I both know that within the Constitution are to be found provisions permitting a change or amendment to that instrument. Also we know, Mr. Speaker, that this procedure requires the submission of such change or changes by Congress to the American people for their vote and their ratification or disapproval. Despite this provision, speaking as a Representative of a great congressional district, the people whom I represent under the Constitution are entitled to pass upon any such contemplated change. Keep that in mind.

Recently the attention of the Congress and the country was attracted by a widespread confusion and uncertainty occasioned by a shortage of beef, milk, and other items of food on the counters throughout this country. The time-honored system of price and distribution was completely thrown out of kilter. Producers, processors, wholesale and retail distributors found themselves in a regulation- and directive-built and leaky boat on a bureaucratic tossed sea without either rudder or compass, and no land in sight, and in the midst of a storm and far from land they were called to serve the vital needs of this great Nation at war. Our armed services, our civilians, our allies all need the food of which they were the purveyors. This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is called upon to represent them in their plight. To extricate them at this moment is among our most vital tasks. Let me give you some matters of record by way of analysis. For instance, take the meat problem, and I desire to approach it first from its governmental aspect. Let us analyze the position occupied by the O. P. A. with respect to this beef problem. The O. P. A. is confronted with power, to be exercised by it, coming from a twofold source, pricing and rationing of quotas. It operates upon two sources of power and authority when you get right down to the facts. The authority of the O. P. A. is supposed to be derived from the Price Control and Stabilization Acts of 1942 insofar as price is concerned. The rationing power comes from the Second War Powers Act.

I want to call your attention to two important distinctions, and I hope you keep them in mind. Live cattle are one thing, and they are classified by law and by agencies of Government as an agricultural commodity. Beef is another thing, and beef results from the slaughtering and processing of live cattle. Beef has recently been included as one of the strategic materials. Keep that in mind. Live steers are agricultural products, while beef is a processed product. Beef is classified, I repeat, as a strategic material under the war stimulus under which we now find ourselves. Both agricultural and processed commodities are, by statute, distinct from others, and I mean with reference to processed commodities, those which are processed from agricultural origins. They are priced under different legal aspects. Certain individuals are empowered to fix prices in a channelized legislative act setting the range within which such prices are to be set. The Price Administration is empowered to fix the price of meat, a processed product, while the law requires prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. I am talking about the law creating this Price Administration. This law requires prior approval of the Secretary of Agriculture before the price of livestock on the hoof may be set by the Price Administrator. In other words, the Price Administrator proposes what the price may be, and the Secretary of Agriculture either ratifies or rejects, but neither one nor the other may act without the consent of the other, and both are limited within the legal standards of the act, unless, under the Stabilization Act, the present modification to standards within the limits set out in this act for the purpose of increasing production for war purposes are to keep pace with the increasing cost of farm labor.

Now, by directive—and I want somebody down in the executive branch to challenge the statement—and in defiance of the statute, the substantive law, the power of the Secretary of Agriculture is transferred to the War Food Administration, and the Office of Economic Stabilization has been created to referee disputes between the Price Administrator and the Food Administrator. To add to this complexity, the Director of Stabilization is called upon to act in accordance with the policy established by another agency, the Director of War Mobilization, who acts in the name of the Chief Executive.

This leaves the meat problem squarely in the lap of the Director of Economic Stabilization.

The Price Control Act of 1942, under section 3 (e), carries a provision which you gentlemen know, that no action may be taken by the Price Administrator to restrict prices on agricultural commodities without prior approval by the Secretary of Agriculture, except that he may take such action as may be necessary to enforce compliance with any regulation previously approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 3 (f) of this act provides:

> No provision of this act or of any existing law shall be construed to authorize any action contrary to the provisions and purposes of this section.

With reference to the limits between which prices shall be established, section 3 (a), among other things provides:

> No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity below the highest of any of the following prices as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now we go into another field. Executive Order No. 9250 authorized under section 2 of the Stabilization Act, sets forth in section 3 (c) as follows in this language:

> No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity processed or manufactured from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of same a price equal to the highest price therefor specified in subsection (a).

Those are the prices which the Secretary of Agriculture is instructed to put out. All of this is to indicate congressional intention to preserve agricultural prices and to tie processed values in with them. The Congress likewise intended to insure minimum legislative price to the producer of an agricultural commodity from which the processed product is derived. Here the authority to fix the price of some agricultural commodities within the stated standards has been delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator, and the power to fix prices of processed commodities was vested solely in the Price Administrator. The Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to determine and publish parity prices as authorized by law, substantive law, law passed by this Congress. The formulation of this parity price situation is well known to the Congress and to the country. It would be pretty good at this point for you folks to dig in and analyze Executive Order No. 9250 and the Stabilization Act, side by side. Lay them down and look at them.

Section 201 (b) of that order indicated that the position and authority of the Secretary of Agriculture was to be respected and maintained. He was exempted from the otherwise general authority granted to the President to change and rechange functions of departments.

I quote from the Stabilization Act of 1942:

> Notwithstanding any provision of this or any other law, no power or function conferred by law upon the Secretary of Agriculture shall be transferred to the Office of Price Administration or to the Administrator; and no powers or functions conferred by or upon any other department or agency of the Government with respect to any agricultural commodity, except the powers and functions relating to priorities and rationing shall be so transferred.

This is the law indicating the clear congressional intention of keeping the power to fix agricultural commodities undisturbed by the provisions of this act. From a part of the Stabilization Act, section 2, where the President is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act and to exercise powers or authority conferred upon him through these agencies. The section carries this change in its controlling clause. Now, mind you, this is the controlling clause:

> He may not under the authority of this act suspend any other law or part thereof.

And in addition, in section 7 (c) the law goes on to state:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to invalidate any provision of the Emergency Control Act of 1942 except to the extent that such provisions are suspended under authority of section 2.

Which I have just called to your attention—

> Or invalidate any regulation, price schedule, or order issued or effected under such act.

It should be noted too that the price-fixing order with reference to processed commodities remains likewise undis-

turbed by this act. Keep this in mind when I get down to a discussion of exactly what has transpired.

The power to fix the price of agricultural commodities is vested in the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture, and the power to fix prices of processed commodities is still exclusively with the Price Administrator. Continuing the legislative limits within which prices may be fixed under the Stabilization Act, you encounter certain provisos. Take proviso 1; it states that the President—I quote—

May not fix the price so low that agriculture will not receive the parity price of clause 1

Proviso 2 states:

If necessary to increase production for war—

And so forth—

such prices shall be modified under Presidential regulation.

Proviso 3 with reference to products processed from livestock, states that a reasonable margin must be allowed for processing—that means slaughtering. I could go on and indicate clearly all about the system of delegation and redelegation of congressional power which has resulted in this confusing miasma, or fog. We finally come, however, to Executive Order No. 9250, title IV, which states that—

The Director may perform the functions and duties, and exercise the power—

Now, mind you—

and authority, and decrees conferred upon him by this order through such officials or agencies and in such manner as he may determine, the decision of the Director as to such delegation and the manner of its exercise shall be final.

It is reasonable to presume that this language was intended to preclude review by the courts; and if such be true the Director may not overrule the Secretary of Agriculture contrary to substantive law; but on the other hand the Secretary of Agriculture may delegate the authority to overrule to anyone else. Keep this in mind; it is interesting.

As additional evidence we have but to glance at Executive Order No. 9328, and look at section 1, which transfers the powers, functions, and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Food Administrator. Therein you will find that the provisions of this Executive Order No. 9328 constitute in themselves knowledge on the part of the executive branch that that authority has been vested by law in the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator, and their transfer thus indicated is wholly incompatible with section 3 of the Price Control Act, and section 2 and section 7 (c) which I have just read, of the Stabilization Act. The Executive did not have this authority by law either under the First War Powers Act—now listen, of 1941—the Second War Powers Act of 1942, the Price Control Act, or the Stabilization Act. So we have now a situation by which the power to fix the price of steers on the hoof is vested in the Price Administrator and the Food Administrator. Now, follow that and let us see what has happened. This is subject to the Economic Stabilization Director.

We come now to Executive Order No. 9334. This I understand is Executive Order No. 9322 as amended. Executive Order No. 9322 was issued on March 26, but was corrected and numbered 9334 on April 19, 1943. This is how quickly the change occurred. It created in the Department of Agriculture an administrator of food production and distribution which, if you will study it, you will find involved a distinct encroachment upon the powers defined by statute and conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture. Section 3 transferred the unexpended balances of appropriations from the Department of Agriculture to the War Food Administrator. Considerable legislative legerdemain in this section created an hiatus as to whether or not there existed legal authority to replace the Secretary of Agriculture with the War Food Administrator, and we heard discussions on this floor concerning that matter. I quote a portion of section 4 of this Executive order, a portion of a sentence:

And shall not be subject to challenge by any third party affected by the exercise of the power on the ground that the action taken was within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture rather than the War Food Administrator, or vice versa.

What do you think of that? This brief analysis leads up to a release from the Office of War Information and the Office of Economic Stabilization setting up a plan completely changing the operations of O. P. A. with reference to beef and livestock or live cattle. This release accompanied a directive from the Office of War Stabilization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to include in my remarks the release and directive referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION—OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

(For immediate release, Tuesday, October 26, 1943.)

1. Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson today announced that he has directed a series of important changes in the present plan under which payments are made by the Defense Supplies Corporation to slaughterers of live cattle. These modifications, which will not involve any increase in the original estimates for financing the slaughter payment program are designed to accomplish the following purposes:

2. First. To enable slaughterers who do not engage in the processing of beef—a group, made up principally of small enterprises, whose margins have been adversely affected under existing regulations—to continue in business.

3. Second. To maintain prices of live cattle within a stated range approximating the present price levels, thus affording a support price to livestock producers and at the same time discouraging unwarranted advances in the live market.

4. Third. To provide a more economical and effective allocation of present payments to all slaughterers by increasing the amounts paid for certain grades of live cattle and reducing them for others.

5. The new directive provides for a special payment of 80 cents per hundredweight live to nonprocessing slaughterers, who are defined as "slaughterers who during the year 1942 * * * sold, and who currently sell 98 percent or more of the total dressed carcass weight of cattle slaughtered by them in the form of carcasses, wholesale cuts, frozen boneless beef * * * or ground beef." This sum will be in addition to the amounts paid all slaughterers. The funds for these special payments will be provided as a result of economies effected in the general payments.

6. Since May 1942 beef prices have been subject to control at wholesale and retail. On December 16, 1942, uniform dollars-and-cents prices were established by zones throughout the country for beef carcasses and wholesale cuts. Based upon these regionally uniform wholesale prices, uniform dollars-and-cents retail prices were established in May 1943. As part of the Government's program for reducing the cost of living to the general level of September 15, 1942, the wholesale and retail prices of beef were reduced by approximately 10 percent in June of 1943. In order that this reduction might not threaten production of livestock by unduly reducing the return to the producer, the price reduction was accompanied by the institution of an equalizing payment to slaughterers, enabling them to continue to pay the same prices for live cattle. The amount of this payment, which is readjusted by the directive issued today, has heretofore been $1.10 per hundredweight on all grades of live cattle slaughtered.

7. There is, and has been, no direct control on the prices at which live cattle may be bought or sold. Price control of meat has been predicated on the assumption that the level of livestock prices would continue to be determined, as it was in the past, by the price which could be secured for meat and meat products. In fact, however, cattle prices during the past year have remained at levels consistently higher than past relationships would have indicated.

8. Despite the fact that the spread between live cattle prices and carcass meat prices has diminished, by far the greater part of the industry has experienced a substantial increase in profits above peacetime levels. A study made by the Office of Price Administration shows that the industry's profits on sales was 2.4 percent in 1942, compared with 1 percent during the period 1936 to 1939, while the return on invested capital increased from 4 to 14 percent. The peak level of 1942 profits has continued into 1943. Since the packing industry is a highly integrated industry on the whole, it is evident that the relative increase in the production of the more profitable items has permitted the industry to support a higher level of cattle prices than was anticipated when the dollars-and-cents wholesale beef prices were instituted.

9. Despite the generally integrated character of the meat packing industry, there is a substantial number of slaughterers, responsible for approximately 15 percent of the total beef supply, who perform no processing operations. This group has suffered under the existing wholesale ceilings. For the industry as a whole, the average value of beef carcasses and unprocessed byproducts has historically been less than the cost of purchasing and slaughtering cattle. This historical relationship is reflected in present wholesale ceilings, and has been accentuated by the rise in live cattle prices. Nonprocessing slaughterers have operated profitably in the past by various means, notably skill in buying and selling and ability to command premium prices in particular markets. Increased wartime demand for beef, pressing hard against the supply, and the establishment of uniform ceiling prices for all sellers, have tended to eliminate the conditions under which these slaughterers could operate

profitably. Returns from processing operations, which have increased the earnings of the great bulk of the industry, have not been open to them.

10. The present directive, affording relief to nonprocessing slaughterers by means of a special additional payment, has been issued after exhaustive study of alternative possibilities. A higher selling price for these slaughterers alone would have destroyed the structure of uniform dollars-and-cents prices which experience has shown to be essential for effective control of meat prices. Higher selling prices for the industry generally would have caused a major break in the Government's hold-the-line program and would have nullified the gains from the subsidy payments already made, while at the same time adding unnecessarily to the peak profits now being enjoyed by the greater part of the packing industry. A reduction in live cattle prices sufficient to permit the nonprocessing slaughterers to stay in business would likewise have added unnecessarily to the profits of the bulk of the packing industry. This would have been done at the expense of cattle producers, and would have nullified another major purpose of the present subsidy program to insure the maintenance of a level of livestock prices sufficiently high to encourage maximum production. The alternative of permitting the greater part of the nonprocessing slaughterers to be forced out of business would not only have been contrary to the national policy in favor of protecting small enterprises, but would have deprived the Nation of slaughtering facilities which are needed to assure the full utilization of existing meat supplies.

11. The directive has a second major purpose: to stabilize the prices of live cattle within a range corresponding approximately to current levels.

12. A substantial increase in present live-cattle prices would nullify the relief which the directive affords to nonprocessing slaughterers. It would also threaten the position of the industry as a whole. A decline in live-cattle prices, on the other hand, would defeat the purposes of the general subsidy program by discouraging production, and would be detrimental to the interests of livestock producers.

13. The Director has considered the possibility of establishing both price ceilings and support prices for live cattle. The present directive, while avoiding the disadvantages of a formal price regulation or support price program, seeks to accomplish the purposes of both. This it does by requiring deductions from subsidy payments in the case of any slaughterer whose monthly payments for live cattle are either above or below the range of prices provided for in the directive.

14. The directive states both high and low market prices for each of the various grades of live cattle at Chicago. A spread of $1 per hundredweight separates the high and low price for each grade. Similar high and low prices at points other than Chicago, which are in line with Chicago prices, will be determined and published by the Price Administrator and the War Food Administrator. Recipients of livestock slaughter payments will be required to report each month the aggregate amount paid for live cattle and the dressed carcass weights of each grade slaughtered. The maximum and minimum amounts which should have been paid for live cattle will be computed on the basis of the dressed carcass weights. The amount, if any, by which the aggregate prices actually paid either exceeded the maximum or fall short of the minimum which should have been paid will then be deducted from the regular slaughter payment. The method of varying subsidy payments will thus be used to assure that cattle prices are neither unduly depressed nor bid up to a point, beyond that required for production, which threatens the stabilization program.

15. A primary objection to a live-cattle ceiling has been the difficulty of grading live cattle on the hoof and, in particular, of determining the grade of carcass beef which any individual steer will produce. The industry has customarily bought cattle at varying prices depending on expert estimation of the quantity and quality of meat which will be obtained. The appraisal which cannot be made with certainty on an individual basis can be and normally has been made on the basis of aggregate purchases over an extended period. The directive recognizes this normal method of buying. It measures prices paid on the basis of average monthly payments. Individual purchases are thus uncontrolled. A range of $1 per hundredweight, moreover, is permitted between the high and the low prices. Deduction from subsidy payments is the only penalty for falling outside this range.

16. The subsidy payment heretofore made has been in the amount of $1.10 per hundredweight of live cattle, irrespective of grade. The new directive provides for modified payments varying according to grade. The payment for Choice will be $1 per hundredweight, for Good $1.45, for Medium $.90, and for the lowest grades $.50.

17. The prices set forth in the directive have been determined so as to return to cattle producers approximately current prices. At these prices, and at prices prevailing in recent months, the relationship between the live-cattle price and the value of the carcass and its unprocessed by products has varied materially for different grades. These prices in some respects increase this variance. They have been calculated so as to assure the continuance of essential feeding. Hence a spread of $3 per hundredweight has been provided between the top prices for Medium and Choice cattle and of $4.25 between Common and Good. For certain grades these spreads increase the negative margin between the live-cattle price and the value of the carcass and unprocessed by products. Thus, the present flat payment of $1.10 per hundredweight is more than is needed for certain grades and less than is needed for others.

18. To remove these variations by altering the present wholesale and retail price structure would impose a substantial burden on the industry and upset the stability of beef prices which has only recently been established. The directive accomplishes the same result by varying the subsidy payment for the different grades. This will benefit slaughterers of all types who slaughter in the main those grades of live cattle with respect to which the negative margin has been greatest. Included in this group are many nonprocessing slaughterers.

19. The savings effected by reducing subsidy payments on grades for which the payment has been excessive are estimated to be sufficient to cover the cost of the additional payment of $.80 per hundredweight which is provided for nonprocessing slaughterers.

20. The directive also requires the War Food Administration to develop a system of allocation as soon as practicable.

21. It is recognized that the success of this program in keeping cattle prices within the desired range will tend, at certain times, to create intense demand among slaughterers for the available supply. To prevent either a break-down of the program, or maladjustments in the movement of cattle to individual slaughterers or feeders or to various regions of the country, a method for directing the flow must be ready for immediate use. Accordingly, this directive directs the War Food Administrator to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

DIRECTIVE

1. This directive is issued pursuant to the authority vested in me by the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," and by Executive Order No. 9250, October 3, 1942, and Executive Order No. 9328, April 8, 1943.

2. First. The purposes of this directive are to insure: (a) That the livestock-slaughter payments made with respect to cattle under Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock-slaughter payments) inure to the benefit of cattle producers;

3. (b) That such payments are made only to the extent necessary to maintain live-cattle prices within a range consistent with the purposes of the stabilization and production programs;

4. (c) That such prices do not impose undue hardship upon any group of slaughterers whose output is needed to obtain the maximum necessary production; and

5. (d) That the available supplies of live cattle are equitably distributed among slaughterers and feeders.

6. Second. It is hereby determined that the stabilization and production programs require the maintenance of live-cattle prices within the following ranges:

7. Grade:	*Price per hundredweight at Chicago*
Choice	$15.00 to $16.00
Good	14.25 to 15.25
Medium	12.00 to 13.00
Common	10.00 to 11.00
Cutter and canner	7.45 to 8.45
Bologna bulls.	

8. The Price Administrator and the War Food Administrator are directed to determine and publish, and to certify to Defense Supplies Corporation, live cattle prices at points other than Chicago which are in line with the foregoing Chicago prices.

9. Third. There shall be deducted from the livestock-slaughter payments hereafter made to any slaughterer under Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock-slaughter payments) the net amount, if any, by which the total of the prices paid by such slaughterer for all live cattle purchased during the month for which the payments are made either fell short of the total amount he would have paid at the lower of the applicable prices, or exceeded the total amount he would have paid at the higher of the applicable prices, set forth or provided for in paragraph 6 above.

10. The grade of live animals purchased by a slaughterer shall be determined on the basis of the carcass grade. The Price Administrator and the War Food Administrator are directed to determine and publish, and to certify to Defense Supplies Corporation, conversion factors for determining the dressed-weight equivalents of live weights.

11. In the case of slaughterers who operate more than one plant, the amount of the payments and deductions to be made shall be determined separately for each plant.

12. Fourth. The livestock-slaughter payments hereafter made with respect to cattle under Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock-slaughter payments) to any slaughterer whose beef carcasses are graded by an official grader of the Food Distribution Administration shall be revised and computed on a grade basis as follows:

13. Grade:	*Payments per live hundredweight*
Choice	$1.00
Good	1.45
Medium	.90
Common	.50
Cutter and canner	.50
Bologna bull	.50

14. Livestock-slaughter payments made to slaughterers whose beef carcasses are not graded by an official grader of the Food Distribution Administration shall remain unchanged.

15. Fifth. Slaughterers who during the year 1942, or a representative portion thereof sold and who currently sell 98 percent or more of the total dressed carcass weight of cattle slaughtered by them in the form of carcasses, wholesale cuts, frozen boneless beef (Army specifications) (carcass equivalent), or ground beef, shall be paid in addition to the payments authorized by Regulation No. 3 of Defense Supplies Corporation (livestock-slaughter payments), the amount of $0.80 per hundredweight of cattle slaughtered during the month for which such payments are made.

16. Sixth. Defense Supplies Corporation is directed to amend Regulation No. 3 (livestock-slaughter payments) in accordance with this directive.

17. Seventh. The War Food Administrator is directed as soon as practicable to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

18. Eighth. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to determine on the basis of facts certified by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration whether the effectuation of the expressed purposes of this directive require adjustments in, or addition to, the payments contemplated by this directive because of inequities resulting from differences in transportation costs.

19. Ninth. This directive shall become effective immediately, except that paragraphs 3 and 4 shall become effective on December 1, 1943, and payments under paragraph 5 shall be made with respect to cattle slaughtered on and after November 1, 1943.

Issued this 25th day of October 1943.

FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, from the record of the hearing held on Tuesday, October 26, before the House Committee on Agriculture relative to this directive, Mr. Gene Carroll, Director of Food Prices; Mr. J. F. Brownlee, Deputy Administrator of the Office of Price Administration; Dr. Richard B. Gilbert, Chief Economic Adviser to the President; and Mr. R. B. Heflebauer, economist of the Office of Price Administration, Food Price Division, testified, in part, as follows:

Mr. KLEBERG (acting chairman). What grower has asked for this plan?

Mind you, the plan I am talking about is contained in this directive which I have asked to be inserted at this juncture in my remarks.

Mr. CARROLL. I would not say that any have asked for this specific plan.

Mr. KLEBERG. What grower has been consulted with reference to this plan?

Mr. CARROLL. At a meeting in Chicago—I attended a meeting in Chicago with the Industrial Advisory Committee and on that committee were five representatives of the stockmen.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did they agree to this plan?

Mr. CARROLL. Not to this specific plan.

Get that, and just think of it—"Not to this specific plan."

Mr. Speaker, I have here before me a copy of the hearings held before the House Committee on Agriculture, and I think the Members will be interested in just what goes on here.

Mr. KLEBERG. Has this plan been adopted?

Mr. CARROLL. The plan has been approved for the present.

Mr. KLEBERG. Has it been actually approved?

Mr. CARROLL. I think so.

Mr. KLEBERG. Don't you know?

Mr. CARROLL. That is my understanding.

Mr. BROWNLEE. My understanding is that the Director of Economic Stabilization is issuing a directive to us—

Mind you, "issuing a directive to us"—

to put this plan into effect.

Mr. KLEBERG. Was this plan presented to the Office of Food Administration?

You will recall what my colleague from Texas has just said to you in his remarks just preceding me. Listen to this:

Mr. KLEBERG. Was this plan presented to the Office of Food Administration?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLEBERG. Who presented it to the Office of Food Administration?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Mr. Carroll, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Heflebauer, and myself.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did the Office of Food Administration agree to it?

Mr. BROWNLEE. No, sir.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did they oppose it?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLEBERG. Do you know whether or not Judge Vinson opposed or approved this plan?

Mr. BROWNLEE. I understand he has approved it.

Mr. Speaker, right at this very juncture, may I say to you, at this very moment during which this interrogation was under way, the plan had been approved by Judge Vinson and signed, and these gentlemen knew it. Let us continue.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] asked this question with reference to the directive and the ceilings contained therein on live cattle:

Mr. COOLEY. Why was this ceiling necessary?

Mr. BROWNLEE. May I make a statement on that, because, as you have stated, we are caught with the time factor, which makes time of the essence. The situation in which the agency finds itself is an unusual one.

This is from the hearings.

Follow this:

A group of packers—the small nonprocessing slaughterers—have entered in the emergency court a series of protests against the fairness of the meat regulations. He has stated in these protests that he is caught between wholesale ceilings and the price of cattle which has forced him to the point at which he cannot operate at a profit—in fact, where he is operating at a very great loss. This is not confined in any way to the marginal producers in the industry. This is a group of—

Mr. KLEBERG. You are speaking of the Nagle case?

Mr. BROWNLEE. This is among them.

I am going to jump just a little, but on the same subject. You cannot follow the whole hearings.

Let us pursue that just a moment in the matter of these cases. The Nagle case, when did it come up for trial?

Mr. BROWNLEE. I think it was originally entered back along in April or May.

Mr. KLEBERG. When was the trial completed?

Mr. BROWNLEE. The trial has not been completed yet.

Mr. KLEBERG. Where is the case now?

Mr. BROWNLEE. The case is in the emergency court.

Mr. KLEBERG. From what court did it come to the emergency court?

Mr. GILBERT. The first court in this case is the emergency court.

Mr. KLEBERG. Now, then, this setting up of regulations that are now going on are for the purpose of or their purpose is to be put into effect before the decision in this case?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Stop and think that over for a minute.

Mr. KLEBERG. Now, then, when do you expect a decision in that case?

Mr. BROWNLEE. We are directed by the court to answer that case, I believe, on Thursday of this week, the 27th or 28th.

Mr. KLEBERG. You say you are told by the court?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

I will omit here a rather lengthy statement prior to the following statement.

Mr. KLEBERG. You say you were told by the court?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLEBERG. Then you immediately went at the purpose of setting up new regulations to take the place of those for which the case was brought?

Mr. BROWNLEE. May I say to you, sir, there is nothing there new. Many months before I was with the O. P. A. they realized that this matter was one for which they had to find a solution

Mr. KLEBERG. Did anyone discuss the probability of the decision with the court connected with the O. P. A. to give you an idea that the regulations attacked might be construed as illegal by the court?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this matter presents the unusual picture of members of a body which constitute this fourth branch of Government giving to another agency within it the power to write laws by directive to be administered by them, to supplement the irregularity of their operation under substantive law passed by the Congress, all of this without the knowledge or consent of that part of the public affected. Keep that in mind.

The O. P. A. by the hearings indicated that the producers did not agree, yes, that they had not been consulted, but opposed the program, and notwithstanding that fact you have here the fully developed picture of a directive in operation with the full force and effect of law, first by changing from the legislative branch to another law-making branch which operates under and by directive without the sanction or approval of the Congress in excess of powers delegated to the Executive under either the First or Second War Powers Acts, as I have explained to you.

Seriously, does this increase or decrease the confusion in the minds of those who are called upon to fill the larders of this Nation to meet the demands of our civilian, Army, and Allied requirements?

Mr. Speaker, there are those among us who remember the National Recovery Act, passed on June 16, 1933. Following this, the most remarkable demonstration of administrative speed in history codified 80 percent of all industry in less than 18 months. Before the end of 1934

some 500 codes had been approved. One of these codes was the live poultry code, which gave occasion for the famous Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1935, in the Schechter or "Sick Chicken" case.

Did Congress overstep its power to delegate powers by the passage of this Act? Did Congress attempt to transfer its essentially legislative functions to others? Did Congress have the right to delegate its legislative authority to trade associations, and so forth?

I think most of you who were here at that time and even those who were not can well recall the blistering opinion of the Court with reference to the delegation of legislative power. In part the decision of the Court read as follows:

> But Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President to exercise an unfettered discretion to make whatever laws he thinks be needed or advisable for the rehabilitation and expansion of either trade or industry.

In the conclusion of the same opinion the Court had this to say:

> We think that the code-making authority thus conferred is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority.

Mr. Speaker, under a directive recently included in my remarks and to which I have just referred, and under the powers created in Executive Order 9250 and Executive Order 9328, we find the requirement that the War Food Administration in addition to being the result of unbelievable imagination and in addition to the fact that it is claimed that this directive does not fix the price of the live cattle—we find this statement in the prospectus accompanying it. In paragraph 11, which you will find in my extension of remarks, appears this language:

> The directive has a second major purpose, to stabilize the prices of live cattle within a range corresponding approximately to the current level.

What does "stabilize" mean? Does it mean the permission of prices to fluctuate, to operate as an inducement, or as a retarding influence on the coming in of cattle to the packers? What does it mean? Mr. Speaker, to stabilize prices in the cattle industry is to stagnate the industry.

Let me quote again from this release. I quote paragraph 13, and they will be numbered:

> The Director has considered the possibility of establishing both price ceilings and support prices for live cattle.

Would you, my colleagues, say in view of the claim that this directive does not fix ceiling prices on live cattle that this language would do otherwise? The directive itself states in paragraph 3 under 1-b that such payments are made only to the extent necessary to maintain live cattle prices within a range consistent with the purposes of the stabilization production program.

Mr. Speaker, right at this juncture let me as a cattle producer—and I think maybe I am still one—clear your minds and the minds of the country of an illusion which I am much afraid has warped your assay of the facts and your keen judgment. The cattle industry is not demanding and has not demanded higher prices, get that straight. Make of it whatever you will provided you do not alter its truth. There has been no cattleman, no producer, who has complained of any price connected with any legitimate grade of livestock. On the other hand, there have been complaints, of course, from feeders. There have been complaints, of course, from those who would like to buy feeder cattle and put them in their lots if they could buy corn and if after the cattle were finished they could be sold to the processor at a price which would at least include the cost of that feeding.

Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry has developed through the years into one of the most technical and highly skilled businesses in this land. It has grown up, it has been nurtured and developed not only under but by the American system of doing business under a government of laws, keep that in mind. A government of laws is relatively fixed. I am not going to ask any questions of you gentlemen concerning the complete variability of government by directive or other forms based on whim or notion. This government of laws has up until this particular period been continuously and consistently interpreted as a guaranty of equality of privilege to all of the people and a denial of special privilege to any one group or any one person within this land.

Mr. Speaker, even a horseback review of this directive would indicate, first, that it was born of subterfuge and was a result of a design to evade the explicit direction of the Congress of the United States.

It sets up a system of preference and advantage to the packer, discriminates against the producers, and militates against the best interests of the American consumer and the best interests of our armed services. It completely brushes aside the entire system of the fundamental custom of the producer, which through the years has been evolved out of the experience of millions of producers and farmers, running back for nearly one and a half centuries. It completely casts aside our long established price and distribution system by substituting an arbitrary power in bureaucrats for the constitutional power exercised under representative government. These bureaus are not elected by the people, and their appointments are not even ratified by the representatives of the people in this Congress.

Let me quote at this juncture some of the reasons for this system. In paragraph 17 of the directive under No. 7 I find this language:

> The War Food Administrator is directed as soon as practicable to institute a system of allocation of livestock to slaughterers and feeders, which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

Quoting further from the release which accompanied paragraphs 20 and 21, and quoting from paragraph 20:

> The directive also requires the War Food Administration to develop a system of regulations as soon as practicable.

And from paragraph 21 I quote:

> It is recognized—

I do not know by whom—

> that the success of this program—

That is what is important—the success of the program, regardless of the result, and God knows its objective—

> in keeping cattle prices within the desired range will tend, at certain times, to create intense demand among slaughterers for the available supply." To prevent either a breakdown of the program or maladjustments in the movement of cattle to individual slaughterers or feeders or to various regions of the country, a method for directing the flow must be ready for immediate use. Accordingly this directive directs the War Food Administrator to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

This directive directs the War Food Administrator to institute a system of allocations of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is adequate to maintain an equitable distribution of available supplies.

This is what comes of the laxity of the Congress in the performance of its constitutional functions, by the delegation of its legislative and its representative duties. The farmers all over this land under this directive who would like to stay in business have two choices, and just two. They have the first clause of the directive, this No. 1, which is No. 1. They have the choice of selling calves still simply fed on the mother's milk, or allowing them to grow to cows and breeding them, and this is the final scheme—the inevitable ultimate decrease in supplies. It prevents patriotic Americans from keeping their full productive capacity for work in the service of this great country of ours, now in the midst of a great war, and shouldering the greatest responsibility in its entire history.

This directive suspends or rules out the function of price in inducing production against the demands and the allocation of supplies, and substitutes every shifting and highly questioned bureaucratic notion for a system under which this country has operated for a century and a half. This sort of system, if continued in force, promises a reduction in actual supplies of beef of from 20 to 30 percent, even though a much greater number of cattle will be killed. I forecast, and I hope you will remember this, and I have a hat bet and will make it a matter of record with both Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Brownlee and I am going to give you my prediction and upon that I am sure that I will collect a hat, for I forecast that from December through March a great shortage of beef will result, first, because of the fact that pastures and farms during the winter months will have no grass, and the Government also dislocating the feeding program and the cattle which come to market will be killed and will be of a class which in ordinary times would be deemed unfit, even to merchandise, because of their low condition in flesh.

Many producers, if they have any means whatsoever, will hold these cat-

tle off the market until improvement in range conditions occurs or protein feeds are made available to them to permit those cattle to put on requisite poundage.

Let us continue to scan this directive, with which I hope you are all familiar, and which is made a part of my remarks. Go back and look it over in connection with these charges. Read it over carefully when it comes out in the RECORD.

It has been admitted both officially and unofficially, not only in the producers, in the processors, in the distributing circles but by O. P. A. itself in the record of its hearings, that no one could write an effective or workable ceiling price for live cattle. There are Members on this floor from the Committee on Agriculture who have heard that statement, and without even hearing it, they knew it to be true. In the face of all of these statements, this directive attemps to establish a ceiling price for live cattle at federally inspected slaughtering plants but leaves unchanged the price ceiling applying to nonfederally inspected slaughterhouses. That means slaughterhouses where there are no Government grading facilities. These plants formerly slaughtered approximately 65 percent of the beef of this entire Nation. The language of this directive changes the system of even questionably subsidy payments such as to penalize feeders, and force cattle out of the feed lots, when the need is to attract them to the feed lots, so as to increase the supply available to the armed services, to our people, and to our allies.

The directive deviously forces the undermining of quality and requires early reduction of the supply of better quality beef as the result of overlapping ceiling and floor prices on different grades of cattle; not standard grades to which the business has been accustomed, this directive allocation of slaughter cattle and feeder cattle fixes it so that additional bureaucracy must be set up and bureaucratic devices in forms must be "thunk-up" and put in motion, to tell the farmer where, to whom, and when he must ship and sell his stock. Is this representative government? Where are we, in God's name? It completely destroys the effective purpose of buyers, so that it requires the grading of livestock on the hoof, to determine whether they are slaughter or feeder cattle. The O. P. A. and its entire group who had to do with this operation testified before the House committee, with only two absentees, after giving their biographies, their histories of experience and entire background, that there was not a single man of the four who knew one little tinker's smidgin about the business of producing cattle on the range or on the farm or in the feed lot or shipping it to the market. This in response to my questions as to how they expected to make beef out of cattle without first getting them into a packing plant; and I wanted to know if they knew anything about the business on which beef on the counter and in the pantries and on the tables of our armed forces and our civilians and our allies depended.

This completely destroys the effective purpose of buyers insofar as the grading of livestock on the hoof to determine whether they are slaughter or feeder cattle, and it does require the setting up of criteria, formulas—and those fellows down there love formulas—which no one has yet been able to formulate; but they want to keep trying. God and the Congress helping them, they will have more formulas in spite of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who defends them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I will yield at the conclusion.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman will excuse me. I know he is my friend.

Now, they have not been able to formulate these criteria. As a matter of fact, they have not even attempted it, but they are just waiting to get started. Yes; we have one criterion in this directive. The directive is in the RECORD, and I hope you study it. It is based on dressing percentage alone. Of course, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] knows what dressing percentage is, but I am going to tell him, anyhow.

Dressing percentage means the percentage of edible beef in its ratio to the offal and nonedible portion of the animal. This criterion is in complete disregard and discard of all of the facts of quality which have been developed through the years and which have heretofore entered into the grading, not only of beef but of cattle themselves.

Mr. Speaker, an awful lot of this monkey business which is going on downtown in this great governmental center is coming from the facile brains of men who are not Democrats. They are not Republicans. Maybe I should not say "men." Maybe I should refer to them as individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may conclude. I am almost through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. I am going to repeat: Maybe I should not say "men"; maybe I should say "individuals"—neither Republicans nor, in my candid opinion, American in either background or ideology. One of these men who testified before the House Committee on Agriculture recently was an individual by the name of Dr. Richard V. Gilbert, who, by the way, as I understand it based on his own statement, is the chief economist of the O. P. A., and he is one of the chief inspirations involved in the subsidy and price roll-back program which has recently been so vehemently defended. Yes, Mr. Speaker, he even wrote a book. Think of it. The title of that book is "An Economic Program for American Democracy." He knows just as much about democracy as he knows about the beef-cattle business, or any one practical thing upon which this Nation must depend to meet its responsibilities in this critical and incomparable hour. Not so very long ago a very able radio commentator, an American—I hope the press gets this and the commentators, too—his name was Fulton Lewis, Jr.—broadcast on Monday, October 11, 1943, and stated that the general theme of this particular book to which I have referred is that private business is totally incompetent to manage itself and that the entire fate of the American people and the very existence of the American people lies in the hands of the Federal Government. This statement, of course, is only a conclusion drawn by Mr. Lewis, but, Mr. Speaker, I take it as acceptable to me as recognized fact. Unless, Mr. Speaker, this Congress does its duty, analyze that statement—and I mean it as much as I ever meant anything in taking the floor on rare occasions in this Well where I stand in this group with my feet amidst the shattered debris of the greatest Government God ever had a part in forming—and I want you to know I mean it—of course the fate of the American people is in the hands of the Federal Government, which if it continues to operate as an Executive bureaucracy without check or responsibility to the Constitution, the Congress, and the people, will work its will upon them even though it be an agency completely perverted from its original constitutional form unless the voice of the people through this body is effectively heard in the halls of state. Think that over; and I am not too serious, I can still grin when trouble comes thick and fast.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I hold that the development of this great Nation did not come through the brains of men. I am sorry I used Mr. Gilbert as a guinea pig; God knows there are a host of others working with him just like maggots at the foundation of this great enterprise. This Congress, Mr. Speaker, must take definite and immediate action to rectify these perversions of a government of law and of a government operating as a representative democracy. If we do not there is no doubt but what the Congress of the United States is to blame if our form of government and the American way of life be doomed, and we will have failed to keep the faith with young Americans who die on the battlefields scattered throughout this world. Think that over. That is a serious proposal. It is your responsibility, my colleagues. This Government was created by the people and it must be maintained and supported by them. It was never contemplated in our past, our glorious past, that the Government should support the people. Let me read you a quotation from a statement made by the President in 1933. He has many sources of information, and he has a right to make any statement he sees fit to make in the discharge of his incomparably important functions. He said that the economic plant will not expand in the future as in

the past. This was in 1933. I quote from his statement:

> We may build more factories, but we now have enough to supply our real and luxury needs.

All of us Democrats here remember that. What was that statement when you analyze it but uninformed defeatism without being willing to accept the glorious past of this great Nation and its ability to meet emergencies and crises as it has in the past on innumerable occasions? This was the plan of complete satisfaction, the doctrine of stagnation. Every man makes mistakes, and it is by the correction of those mistakes that we progress.

The doctrines of freedom from want and freedom from fear likewise upon careful and close analysis are defeatist and seek complete self-satisfaction. Both of them destroy initiative and ambition. There is no incentive remaining on the part of the individual to improve his lot by the exercise of his best mental and physical efforts. Genius becomes comparatively a drug on the market. Emphasis on security instead of opportunity is always a destructive power except when security of opportunity is the goal. Whenever the fields of investment are destroyed, of course, even a sense of security vanishes with them.

Mr. Speaker, if we can separate the myths of this situation from the truths of our past we can progress. To reenact a mistake is retrogression; to correct it is progress. Mr. Speaker, we have erred; we have gone too far afield from the tested and tried fields of our activities and our consequent attainment. There was once a philosopher, Mr. Speaker, who walked along looking at the stars and fell into a well. When they fished him out of the well he made this comment:

> I was so intent upon what was going on in heaven I failed to see what was at my feet.

We have star- and planet-gazers with us yet and now, yes, those utopian gazers who see a Brave New World, a new planet which they planned.

O Master, high up in heaven, didst Thou plan this world on which we live or who?

Mr. Speaker, whatever the dreamers and star-gazers may dream or see in this new planet and for it, and no matter how they planned it, may I speak for those with real, not stardust between their toes. I speak for men with feet on this good earth, on this "our country 'tis of thee." With all of the vehemence I pray for the aid of God Almighty to make itself clear to you, and mean it. Mr. Speaker, I speak for their sons and daughters who are offering their lives, yes, and giving them on 14 bloody battle fronts and countless others in this old and war-torn world, yes, offering and giving their lives and healthy bodies for what? Not for this new planet, for is it new? My God, centuries back we had the acid test performed or this so-called new form of life. Emphatically no, they are not giving their lives for that. They are giving their all for our part of this—I mean this—old world, our part of it, for our way of life, the American way of life, that a Government of the people, for the people and by the people shall not vanish from this earth.

I am not talking about that new one. I am talking about this one. And I am not concerned with this dream planet, nor am I concerned for those who plan it. For my part they can have their new world and plan it for their own "baloney" selves all alone. They have earned this right and I will defend their right to talk all they wish about it or to say all they may say about it. Yes, I could even voice a fervent prayer that as they claim to see it so plainly they set sail for it en mass now. I do not care how they go, by rocket plane or any other contrivance of their especial kind of genius, just so they go now.

We have, whether they know it or believe it or not—and by "they" I am referring to this group—a war on our hands, a grim, terrible, and, up to this tragic hour, a never-equaled war in intensity, seriousness, or danger to us and our homeland. To win it—and win it we will—we will need a lot of things. We need things that this old world produces and has produced in the past. We need clear eyes, not starry eyes, we need clear and devoted minds, minds devoted to this, our part of the world, this old world, not dreamy minds devoted to this new and foreign world, this distant, new, planned world. We need stout American hearts which appreciate and respect our allies, but who in turn expect and demand their respect, not soft, sycophantic hearts that fawningly would buy respect and gain instead disdain.

Mr. Speaker, as God is my witness, we need men and women here at home who truly appreciate our freeman's government of law and our way of life, pledged in faith on high to our common God, yes, men and women who are as devoted as those who laid down their lives to win our right to be free, yes, and, lest we forget, even as our sons and daughters are laying down their lives to keep us free.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "Europe—American Style," by Leathem D. Smith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STATISTICAL MIRAGES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a magnificent analysis of the serious situation that confronts this Nation, a situation which I think can best be described by the phrase "confusion worse confounded." The gentleman from Texas has certainly placed his finger upon a good big part of the cause of this confusion worse confounded. I propose in the time allotted me to discuss another cause of the confusion that is bothering us today. I was motivated to ask for this time and to make this speech by the two extended, elaborate statistical messages the President has presented to us during the past 10 days, because these messages have confused my mind and obscured the facts in connection with the problems discussed in those messages; at least, that is my opinion. I want to direct my remarks to the cause of part of this confusion.

Mr. Speaker, with bureaus piled upon bureaus, with overlapping bureaus, overlapping commissions, overstaffed bureaus, and overstaffed commissions; with bureaus failing to correct administration incompetency, and with continual sleight-of-hand shifting and shuffling of these bureaus like a deck of cards, the Congress, in trying to untangle this scrambled mess of executive incompetency through its investigations, has now run into a new barrier, statistical mirages.

The statistical mirage is an invention of New Deal bureaucrats to add further to the confusion of the Congress and the people of the Nation by making it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for congressional investigators to get the facts. The most competent investigator or statistician finds these statistical mirages an almost impossible barrier for him to climb over or get through when he endeavors to get accurate figures in connection with the Government waste of manpower, or the number of men in the Federal bureaus who should be in the military service; and it makes it very difficult for an investigator, after he has gained the facts, to substantiate them for the benefit of the people. These statistical mirages are thrown up by the bureau heads to obscure the facts, much as ships in battle throw up a smoke screen to hide themselves from the enemy.

This is a sad state of affairs. It indicates a lack of intellectual honesty on the part of this administration. There was a time when the American people who read Government statistics knew they were reading the truth as accurately as competent, honest officials could determine it, but that is not true today.

Government statistics—until the advent of the New Deal—were never supposed to be used for political purposes to affect pending legislation. There is every reason to believe that they are being so used now. Events within the last week point in that direction. Let me give you a timely illustration. You will recall that on October 21 Prentiss Brown, Director

of the O. P. A., after months of failure, bowed out of the picture. In his letter of resignation, addressed to the President, he cited statistics to show that prices had been brought under control by the O. P. A., that inflation had been prevented, and the cost of living was being steadily forced down and rolled back. He stated in his letter that since Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, the income of farmers has risen 90 percent; average weekly wages, 33 percent; corporate profits after taxes have advanced 15 percent over level of 1941; and prices generally were up only 12 percent.

That was a nice picture of governmental efficiency and success which Mr. Brown painted. But, did he state the facts or did he throw up a "statistical mirage" to obscure the facts?

Compare Mr. Brown's statement with the statement released 1 week later, October 28, by Secretary of Labor Madam Perkins. Her statement was based on a check-up of commodity prices as of September 15, 1943. Mr. Brown must have used the same statistical information as a basis for his statement.

The Washington Daily News of Thursday, October 28, carried the headline, "Old Man Cost of Living is off on another spree." Under that headline Madam Perkins was quoted as announcing a 6-percent increase in the price of eggs; a 3.6-percent increase in fish prices; a general increase in the cost of women's wear; that the cost of housefurnishings had edged up, and that rents were higher in 15 cities out of 34; that the cost of services and miscellaneous goods was up in September, continuing the steady advance beginning in August 1942.

These conflicting statements from supposedly authoritative sources tend to create doubt in the minds of the Members of Congress and the people, who, because of the juggling tactics of the New Deal bureaucrats, have begun to question the validity of governmental statistics. It was a nice picture for the administration and for Mr. Prentiss Brown to give to the American people when he was retiring from the O. P. A., but the picture Madam Perkins painted—using the same statistics, I suppose—was of a different color; in fact, it was a dark picture. Which picture is the true picture? Are we to believe Prentiss Brown or are we to believe Madam Perkins?

Mr. Speaker, during the last week the Congress has been favored by the President with two messages, the first one on the number of men in Government service who had been exempted from the draft, and the second one on the need for greater food production and the necessity for paying food subsidies. Each of these messages contained such a quantity of statistics that they confused the mind and tended to obscure the essential facts in connection with those subjects.

Yesterday the President in his long statistical message to the Congress really opened up a second front in his campaign for subsidy payments. In that message he presented another "statistical mirage" to prove to the American people that Congress is wrong and that he is right in demanding that a subsidy be forced upon the farmers in order to roll back prices. His subsidy roll-back program is opposed by the farmers and the milk producers of the Nation, but it is supported by William Green of the American Federation of Labor and Philip Murray of the C. I. O. The issue will come to a show-down very shortly when the bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation comes up for action in the House. Every force that can be controlled by the administration is being whipped into shape to beat down the opposition of Congress to subsidies. Full dress rehearsals for the fight are being staged today by the bureaus.

Can it be that this sudden increase in the price of living which is claimed by the statistics of the Labor Department may have been given out at this time for the purpose of alarming the people and the Members of Congress and thus prepare the groundwork for the President's subsidy roll-back program? Are we expected to forget the nice picture Prentiss Brown painted a week or so ago?

I would not charge that such statistics are given out now in an attempt to influence the course of subsidy legislation, but I can see that these statistics do fit in very nicely with the present administration's program. The point I want to make is that here we have the use of Government statistics to support Mr. Brown and the administration a few days ago, and today we have them in absolute reverse which, whether so intended or not, support the administration in legislation it now desires. Which set of statistics is right? Whom are we to believe, if anybody? Is the people's money appropriated to carry on this vast bureaucratic set-up at an enormous expense to be spent in such a way as to prevent Congress from securing accurate information for the Nation? It raises the further question as to whether the statistics quoted by the President are correct, or are they statistical mirages devised by the administration to accomplish its objectives?

The Military Affairs Committee of the House seeking to determine the number of young men eligible for the draft in the various departments of the Federal Government has just filed its interim report. After weeks and months of labor this committee found some 721,237 young men in Government service between the ages of 18 and 38 eligible for military service. The committee members apparently became confused and confounded by the statistical mirages that were thrown up in front of them. On page 10 of House Report No. 790, a report of the subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, we read:

STATISTICAL MIRAGE

There is amazing faith on the part of Government in mere statistics. The trouble with them is they become a substitute for thinking about a problem, or for getting to the reality of the situation. Statistics are merely symbols and in themselves meaningless except as they are interpreted back into the situation from which they developed. Figures on a national scale, covering a multitude of actual situations, lose reality in their consolidation. The same is true in an over-all picture of an agency.

It seems that the report of this committee was almost prophetic, or that the writer had a premonition that there were more statistics to come, and that they would come from the White House.

George D. Riley, editor of U. S. and Us in the Washington Times-Herald, had this to say, and I quote:

The President is in an argument with the House Military Affairs Committee over statistics. Figures have been used several years now to confuse those who want to prove or disprove something; in this case the number of occupationally draft-deferred Federal officials. Last week we said there was a race on to see whether "Fire Chief" S. I. Rosenman could whip up a batch of statistics for public consumption or whether Selective Service would tell the story first. The President and the "Fire Chief" lost; got there too late; and the Costello committee adopted Selective Service's findings.

It appears from his message to the Congress on the number of men in Government service who have been deferred that the President has been a little irritated by the criticism of the Federal Government bureaus under his control for not disgorging more young men of military age. Being so irritated he proceeded to give the Costello committee, a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, a slight verbal spanking and covered them up with statistics in which he sought to prove his point that there was not an undue number of men being deferred in the Federal departments of military age—another sample of a statistical mirage.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the Congress to know what is the true situation with respect either to the cost of living or the number of young men deferred in the Federal bureaus who should be in the military service, because of the use of these statistical mirages. We hope that the President was nearer correct in the statistics he quoted on the Federal bureaus and their young men who are eligible for military service than he was recently when he made the statement that oil production in the Nation had increased by 66 percent since the beginning of the war, because on that occasion his figures did not give a true picture of the oil situation. In fact, according to Secretary Ickes, the increase was only 19 percent. Ickes' figures have been found correct.

It is to be hoped that Judge Rosenman, who was referred to by the columnist as the "Fire Chief" for the administration, if he compiled the data the President used in his message to the Congress on the number of men of military age in Government service who have been deferred, and also the figures the President used in yesterday's subsidy message, checked and rechecked his computations. We are becoming accustomed to confusion in government. Perhaps there is some excuse for that under war conditions. However, we see neither excuse nor justification for the use of statistical mirages to confuse the mind and becloud the issues.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE RAW DEAL HANDED RAILROAD WORKERS BY THE NEW DEAL

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, the million railway workers represented by the 15 nonoperating railway labor unions have recently made public a history of the 13 months' old wage dispute involving practically all of the railways in the United States. On the basis of this public document it now becomes apparent that these loyal and faithful railway employees in the Nation's vital transportation industry have been handed a raw deal by the New Deal.

After the President's Emergency Board made its report last May 24, recommending an 8-cent hourly increase as a compromise basis of settlement in the dispute growing out of the employees' request for a raise of 20 cents an hour, the representatives of these railway workers notified the President of their disappointment with the small amount of the increase recommended.

On May 27, when the employees made their views known to the President he requested them to accept the increase as recommended by the Board and in view of the national emergency the employees' representatives agreed to do so, and as a result of the White House conference they regarded the wage question as closed.

Immediately thereafter, according to press reports, the President again indicated his willingness to approve the 8-cent hourly increase and likewise made public the fact that he contemplated taking action which would establish for the railway workers the same overtime provisions after 40 hours per week that had been provided for in an Executive order for other war workers.

Following this White House conference on May 27 the representatives of the employees then made arrangements with the national committees representing the railways for a meeting to be held in New York on June 24, for the purpose of writing the Emergency Board's recommendations into an agreement.

However, on June 23, the employees were advised that Stabilization Director Vinson, on June 22, had issued an order canceling the Board's recommendations and directing that they should not become effective.

This unexpected action on the part of Mr. Vinson, following the impression that had been left with the employees at their White House conference, contributed greatly to a further disturbance of morale on the part of railway workers who were already highly resentful because of the long delays that had already been encountered in their efforts to establish a more reasonable minimum wage, and to correct the existing wage inequities prevailing in the railroad industry.

These wage inequities were found to exist in the report to the President by the Emergency Board, appointed February 20, 1943, from which report we quote:

1. The railroad industry, which constitutes the heart of our transportation system, is indispensable to the effective functioning of our national life, even under normal conditions; in these critical days, the entire war effort of the Government and the people of the United States is dependent upon uninterrupted, efficient, and vigorous performance by the railroads.

2. The record of the railroads during the war emergency, including the period of defense activity, has been a magnificent one.

3. This outstanding performance of the railroads has been the result of the constructive, self-denying, and patriotic attitudes of both the managements and the men. * * * Fundamentally, a spirit of cooperation has vitalized the efforts of the managements and the men, without free and complete and wholehearted cooperation between the carriers and their employees the magnificent record of the railroads, as made thus far, could not have been achieved.

4. It is of the utmost importance that this spirit of cooperation be not impaired. * * * Every care must be exercised not to weaken or endanger this morale either through indirection or through outright injustice.

6. As a result of the influence of this legislation as applied to the rail carriers, railroad wages have maintained a degree of stability, entirely apart from the anti-inflation measures of the war emergency, that has been equaled or surpassed by few industries. Wages on the railroads have moved more slowly, both up and down, than in industry as a whole, and the level of railroad wages, both up and down, has changed more moderately than in other industrial spheres.

15. The Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, sought to stabilize wages, as far as practicable, on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. It did not, however, freeze all wages as of that date. It authorized the President to provide for such adjustments as might be found necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.

20. The wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees, on the basis of a careful study and analysis of the entire record, are designed to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. We certify that they conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder. They are the minimum and noninflationary adjustments necessary for these purposes. They are within the existing price structure: That is, they do not provide a basis for increases in railroad rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in such rates; and they are within existing levels of production costs; that is, they do not provide a basis for increasing production costs in comparable industries or occupations. The correction of the gross inequities disclosed by the facts of record is indispensable to the effective prosecution of the war.

21. The average earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees involved in this dispute, embracing skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers, as of October 1942, were 73.8 cents an hour. The prevailing minimum wage for these employees is 46 cents an hour.

22. The total number of railroad workers in these 73 classes in October 1942, a month of higher than average employment, was 1,097,180. About one-half of these workers—544,106, or 49.6 percent—received less than 70 cents an hour; 411,684, or 37.5 percent received less than 60 cents an hour; 255,813, or 23.3 percent received less than 55 cents an hour; 160,438, or 14.6 percent received less than 50 cents an hour; 104,269 received the prevailing minimum rate of 46 cents an hour, and 16,871 received less than 46 cents an hour—this bracket of those receiving 46 cents and less comprising more than 11 percent of all the workers.

25. On July 16, 1942, in the Little Steel case, the National War Labor Board fixed the minimum rate in the steel industry for common labor at 78 cents per hour, which is substantially in excess of the average hourly earnings of the 73 classes of railroad employees.

26. On a craft or class basis, 40 of the 73 classes of railroad employees, embracing in the aggregate slightly more than 400,000 workers, have not received the full 15 percent increase in straight-time average hourly earnings since January 1941, provided for under the Little Steel formula as a cost-of-living adjustment.

27. The 73 classes of railroad employees have an established 48-hour workweek. If these employees were to be compensated at time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours per week, that is, on the basis that is being increasingly applied in industry as a whole, an adjustment of 8.33 percent on basic rates of pay would result. This would mean an increase in pay of slightly more than 6 cents an hour, independently of any change in basic rates of pay.

The Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, as recently as September 1, 1943, has made this statement:

The indications are clear that the railroads of the country are headed for a manpower crisis unless extraordinary measures are taken and taken quickly to forestall it.

The program advanced by the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation includes the recruiting and enlisting of women employees, provision for time-and-a-half payments for overtime for certain employees, the utilization of Mexican workers and of prisoners of war for certain work of groups of employees involved in the present proceedings. The emergency board reported to the President on May 24, 1943, that these employees were inadequately paid on many bases, that various crafts received sharply lower wage rates than those paid to comparable groups in nonrailroad industries. I am officially informed that more than 1,045,000 new employees were hired by the railroads during a recent 12-month period, with only a net gain in total employment of approximately 100,000.

There is no disputing the fact that railroad transportation is a vital necessity in the effective prosecution of the war. There is no disputing the fact that the flight of labor (not collectively but individually) from the railroad industry is caused in large measure by the inadequacy of existing wage payments. There is no disputing the fact that the inability of the railroads to obtain and to retain the services of competent employees is steadily reducing the efficiency and safety of railroad service, and that the establishment of wage payments which will permit the railroads to employ and to retain the employment of an adequate number of trained workers is vitally necessary to the effective prosecution of the war.

Following Director Vinson's cancelation of the 8-cent hourly increase the representatives of the railway workers again discussed the matter with the President in a further effort to reach an understanding which would serve as a basis for adjusting the dispute. The matter then apparently dragged along with further conferences being held with Mr. Vinson and with Mr. Byrnes, the Director of War Mobilization. Finally, on July 29, Mr. Byrnes, repre-

senting the President, requested the union spokesmen and the railways committee to meet and reach an agreement. The employees' representatives agreed to this request with the clear understanding that if such an agreement was to be made it would have to provide for the same wage increase as recommended by the emergency board.

As a result of this continued effort an agreement was signed in Washington on August 7 by the representatives of the railways and the employees which provided for the 8-cent wage increase effective as of February 1, 1943, as recommended by the President's fact-finding board. This agreement provided that it was subject to any existing requirements of law and that it was in settlement of the dispute that had been pending since the employees first served their notices on the railways on September 25, 1942.

In spite of the fact that the agreement signed by the railways and the employees on August 7 was in keeping with earlier understandings had with the President and other Government representatives, the spokesman for the New Deal again broke faith with the railway employees and refused to give formal approval to the agreement in behalf of the Government. As a result of this reversal of position on the part of Mr. Vinson, the agreement did not become operative.

Further conference then developed the fact that the New Deal bureaucrats were unwilling to grant a flat 8-cent hourly increase, but that they were agreeable to a step-rate increase embracing the $204,000,000 represented in the emergency board proposal, but granted on a step-rate basis which would give 10 cents an hour to the railway employees receiving 46 cents an hour and graded down to 7 cents an hour for higher-paid workers.

This new position on the part of the Government resulted in another conference between the President and the union's spokesman on September 16, at which time the President insisted that the lower-paid groups should have a larger wage increase than those in the higher wage brackets. Therefore, an understanding was reached along that line in order that the case might be settled that day, namely, September 16. Pursuant to this White House understanding the employees' representatives submitted a wage scale which provided that those being paid 46 cents an hour or less would be increased to 56 cents; the 47-cent rate would be increased 9 cents per hour; the rates of 48 cents to 75 cents, inclusive, would be increased 8 cents per hour; and the rates of 76 cents per hour and above were to be raised 7 cents.

At the President's request on September 16, the representatives of the employees met later that same day with Mr. Byrnes and discussed the proposed scale of wages in keeping with the understanding reached at the White House, but here again it developed that the promises were not kept, with the result that another bitter disappointment was added to those which had already had a serious effect upon the morale of the workers in this vitally important industry.

Instead of following through with the program for adjusting the dispute on the basis of the understanding reached with the employees' spokesman, the President later, on October 16, created another special emergency board to reconsider the entire matter. This new board, however, was not given free and unhampered opportunities to consider the matter on its merits, but under the President's Executive order they were called upon to consider the wage dispute, not only in the light of the stabilization program, but also in the light of the opinion made public earlier by Director Vinson, when he refused to approve the first emergency board's recommendations.

During the 13 months that this dispute has been pending, the labor situation in the railroad industry has become more and more serious until now we are not only confronted with a labor crisis but likewise with the threat of a Nation-wide railroad strike.

As a result of all this backtracking, this failure to keep one promise after another, this political shadow-boxing, and one disappointment on top of another, we now have a chaotic condition in the railroad industry where labor relations have been remarkably stable for a period of 20 years.

If this situation were not so dangerous and so critical from the standpoint of the successful prosecution of the war, it would be amusing to note that these hopelessly unstable conditions, in an industry long known for its stable labor relations, has grown out of the stabilization program directed by the head of the New Deal and administered by his flock of New Deal "lame ducks."

I sincerely hope this railroad wage dispute can be adjusted without a strike and that an early solution to this serious question may be found in order that the morale of the railway workers can be restored to its normally high standard. I feel that in view of the present grave situation a solution short of a Nation-wide railway strike can be found and should be found.

In the face of the record which has now been made public, I think we can safely assume that no matter what the final outcome of this issue may now be, the powerfully organized railway workers will have a better understanding of the political manner in which the New Deal functions. On the basis of this record of political juggling, broken promises and repeated disappointments, the workers in the railroad industry should now be fully convinced that the New Deal has become such a raw deal that it is long overdue for a trip to the laundry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RAILWAY LABOR CRISIS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, or on September 25, 1942, the representatives of 15 standard railway labor organizations, in compliance with the demands on the part of more than 1,000,000 organized railway workers, requested an upward revision in the wages existing at that time.

Now, more than a year later, we have a dangerous labor crisis in the vitally important railroad industry due to the fact that the wage dispute has been permitted to drag for more than a year without being adjusted. This threatening situation has reached the critical point where it is no longer merely a wage dispute between a group of highly organized workers and an equally highly organized group of managers. It is now a matter of serious national concern since it has produced a combination of circumstances that threatens the continued successful prosecution of the war. The safe and efficient operation of the railroad industry is indispensable to our successful war effort. Failure to adjust this wage dispute over a period of more than a year has now produced a labor crisis which involves the national well-being, and it is therefore a matter that Congress can well afford to give its attention to. In fact, it is a matter that Congress cannot afford to ignore.

The requests for wage changes were served by the representatives of these 15 railway labor unions more than a year ago in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and in keeping with the appropriate requirements of the existing wage and working agreements that have long been in effect between the employees and the employers of the railroad industry.

Following the procedure laid down in the Railway Labor Act, which has avoided any major strike in the railway industry for more than 20 years, the organized railway employees first held conferences with their separate system managements in an effort to reach an agreement in connection with their request for wage adjustments. Without a single exception, the representatives of these separate railway managements refused the requests of the employees in their entirety, and thereafter the dispute thus created was made a matter of national conference or discussion between national committees representing the employees as a whole and substantially all railroad companies.

In these national conferences the proposals of the employees were again rejected, thereby creating a condition which, in peacetimes, would have led to the immediate taking of a strike vote for the purpose of determining the wishes of the involved employees for further action.

By Executive order the President established a national railway labor panel in February 1942, from which so-called emergency boards might be designated to hear, investigate, and make recommendations upon any dispute which in peacetimes might lead to the taking of a strike vote and a strike threat. The same basic procedure was to be followed as is provided for in section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. A board was finally selected from this railway labor panel and began its public hearings in the dispute in Chicago on March 1, 1943.

Both parties to the dispute were afforded a full opportunity to be heard in their own behalf, to submit all the evidence and testimony that they desired in support of their own interests and to cross-examine witnesses of the opposing side. The organizations and the railroads were both represented in the hearings by an impressive array of legal counsel, and each party to the dispute was allowed all the time it desired in presenting voluminous testimony through statistical and economic experts and other witnesses. The public hearings ran from March 1 to May 7 with a few brief recesses, and during that period 44 days were devoted to public hearings and investigation. The Government's stabilization program was strongly emphasized throughout the hearings by the railways as a major part of their case against any increases. The employees strongly emphasized the necessity for more equitable wages as a means of retaining the experienced employees who were already beginning to leave the industry for the higher wages prevailing in other war activities.

During the 44 days of public hearings, a total of 234 exhibits was introduced, 122 by the employees' organizations and 112 by the carriers. These exhibits ranged in size from 1 to more than 100 pages. The official transcript of the hearings consisted of 6,338 pages. The Emergency Board engaged a staff of economic and statistical experts for the purpose of analyzing and digesting the voluminous evidence and testimony. The Board then considered the matter in executive sessions for a period of about 3 additional weeks following May 7.

Thereafter, on May 24 of this year, or 9 months after the wage case was first inaugurated, the Board submitted its report to the President and recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour, informing the President that the inequalities found to exist in railroad wages and the substandard character of the railroad wage structure justified an even greater increase, but, at the same time, recommending that the increase be restricted to 8 cents in the light of the Government's stabilization program.

Mr. Speaker, the chief executive officers of the 15 involved organizations then informed the President of the bitter disappointment of railroad workers with the small amount of increase recommended by the Board but stated that in view of the war emergency and all related circumstances, it would be accepted as a basis for the settlement of the dispute.

Under the provisions of Executive Order 9299, the Director of Economic Stabilization has 30 days after a railroad emergency board files a report in which to act upon any recommended wage increases. During the early part of this 30-day waiting period provided for in the Stabilization Act, the President, in one of his press conferences, indicated his approval of the Board's recommendations, and this fact was then widely publicized throughout the country, with the result that the million railway workers involved, together with their representatives, took it for granted that the dispute could be concluded and terminated on the basis of the 8-cent hourly increase as recommended by the Board.

However, after waiting 29 days, the Director of Economic Stabilization issued an order on June 22, canceling the wage increase. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the issuance of this order, the Director of Stabilization had not reviewed the 6,338 pages of transcript covering the public hearings, nor had he examined any of the 234 exhibits introduced at the public hearings by the involved parties. He held no conferences and sought no discussions with the representatives of the million railway workers involved in the dispute who were adversely affected by his arbitrary cancellation of the wage order after the President had publicly indicated his approval of it.

However, the attorneys and other representatives of managements were allowed to file and did file with the Stabilization Director's office a brief in opposition to the 8 cents recommended by the Board, but the employees' representatives and their legal counsel were kept in the dark with respect to the brief as filed by the railways in that they were not provided by management with a copy of it; nor were they informed that it had been filed; nor were they afforded by the Stabilization Director's office an opportunity to review it, reply to it, or comment upon it. In fact, they knew nothing about such brief until after the Stabilization Director had canceled the increase recommended by the President's Emergency Board.

During the 8-month period that passed between the time the employees served their notice for a wage increase on September 25, 1942, and the issuance of the Emergency Board's recommendations on May 24, 1943, the railroad industry lost many of its experienced workers who left their railroad jobs for higher wages and the more favorable overtime payments prevailing in other major war industries. During this period, however, many railroad workers remained on their jobs apparently with the expectation that their substandard and unequal wages would be improved as a result of the Emergency Board's recommendations and investigations. While not satisfied with the amount of increase recommended by the Board, they still preferred to remain on their railroad jobs, and they were fully confident that this 8-cent raise would be granted in view of the President's public statement at a press conference.

As a result of this long delay which had seriously affected the morale of the workers, and under all the existing circumstances, the wholly unexpected and arbitrary action on the part of the Stabilization Director fell like a bombshell on the ranks of railroad labor on June 22, with the result that the railroad labor situation became more serious. The industry had been losing its experienced workers at an alarming rate, and thereafter the labor situation became more critical from day to day.

In addition to losing their trained and experienced forces, the railroad industry also found itself unable to recruit new workers of the high standard required for safe and efficient operation of this indispensable industry, with the result that they were then forced to the extraordinary employment policy of employing women in section gangs and in and around railway shops where hard physical labor constitutes an inescapable part of the job. They then began hiring 16-year-old children and over-age men. They urged and obtained the privilege of importing thousands of Mexicans, and they petitioned for the right to work war prisoners. When all these unusual sources of substandard labor proved inadequate, they then began the practice of contracting out their work at wage rates much higher than the railroad industry itself would have been required to pay even with eight cents added to the basic rates set forth in their agreements with their own organized employees. However, notwithstanding all these unusual and extraordinary attempts to engage even substandard types of workers, the industry was ultimately forced to make public acknowledgment of the fact that they were threatened with a dangerous labor crisis.

Following the Stabilization Director's cancelation of the wage increase, which was on June 22, the railroad labor shortage became more critical from day to day, and the morale of those remaining in the industry fell to lower and lower levels. The membership of these well-disciplined and well-behaved standard railway labor unions become more and more resentful, and finally, in July, one of the involved organizations of employees, assembled in national convention, authorized and urged its chief executive officer to withdraw the organization's "no strike" pledge and proceed immediately with the spreading of a national strike ballot. Demands for strike action likewise increased in each of the involved railway labor organizations with the membership insisting that they were no longer obligated to adhere to their "no strike" pledge in view of the fact that the recommendations of the Emergency Board had been repudiated and canceled by the head of a Government bureau which did not exist at the time the "no strike" pledge was given.

In the early part of August the unions and the railroad managements met in Washington, and in response to what they understood to be a suggestion or request from the President's representative they signed an agreement increasing the wages of the men in the so-called nonoperating group. This agreement was made "subject to requirements of existing law" and efforts have since been unsuccessfully made to obtain the approval which the railroad managers consider necessary from Government before making it effective. Although this agreement was made at the suggestion of the Government as a means to settlement of the whole matter, the Government has since declined to approve it.

As a result of the long delay and these repeated disappointments, we now have 1,000,000 railway workers, as represented by these 15 so-called nonoperating organizations, in a justifiably resentful attitude. The industry has lost a tremen-

dous proportion of its trained and experienced workers. The morale of the railway employees is probably at the lowest level in railroad history. Railroad wrecks and accidents are occurring at an alarming rate. Congestion of freight in large railway terminals has already reached such an extent that office workers, minor officials, and all available labor are being frantically urged to work on Sundays and at nights in an effort to relieve the congestion. The railroad industry which collapsed in the First World War is now threatened with a collapse at this critical period of the present war. While dissatisfied with the amount of increase recommended by the Board, the employees are, nevertheless, willing to accept it. Railway managements which opposed it for 10 months are now so concerned with the labor crisis that they are anxious to grant the 8-cent increase. The President has publicly indicated in press conferences that he favors it. The Director of Stabilization still refuses to give it his approval.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, I repeat that this is no longer merely a wage dispute between railroad workers and railroad managements. It is now a national crisis that threatens the successful prosecution of the war, and it is a matter of such tremendous concern and of such vital importance that Congress can no longer afford to ignore it. It is with this thought in mind that I have deemed it desirable to place the history of this dispute and the railroad crisis that has resulted from it before the Members of Congress for your careful consideration, with the thought that Congress may deem it imperative to concern itself directly with the problem and take appropriate action.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN] be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WASIELEWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, November 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. Thursday, November 4, 1943. Business to be considered: Continuation of petroleum hearings—Ralph K. Davies, first witness.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 9, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS—NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING

The executive session scheduled for today by the Committee on Patents was postponed until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. Proposed legislation by the National Patent Planning Commission will be discussed.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

890. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

891. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

892. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

893. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a revised copy of form estimating personnel requirements in the Territories and possessions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

894. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

895. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

896. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 407 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3505) to authorize the President of the United States to present a Congressional Medal of Honor to Jennings Jack Bennett, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3591. A bill to provide 6 months' pay to all honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3592. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution directing the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress on various matters with respect to natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to create the War Shipping Field Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 340. Resolution creating a select committee on post-war plans; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3593. A bill granting an increase of pension to Walter Clement Haigh; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3594. A bill granting a pension to Sophie Pincus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3595. A bill for the relief of Robert Futterman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3596. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3597. A bill granting a pension to Cle M. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3378. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of A. Hrivnak, of Joliet, Ill., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3379. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Sarah Huftalen and other citizens of Delaware County, Iowa, urging the enactment of House bill 2392; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3380. Also, petition of Sarah Huftalen and other citizens of Delaware County, Iowa, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3381. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of George Kiburz and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3382. Also, petition of Joseph Ringenbach and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3383. Also, petition of Fred Mogab and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3384. Also, petition of John B. Ross and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3385. Also, petition of William Getchman and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3386. Also, petition of Paul Kokalis, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3387. Also, petition of the Municipal Architect's Office, Washington, D. C., and signed by 20 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3388. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry members of the Rockville Center (N. Y.) Baptist Church, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3389. By Mr. TOLAN: Petition of the Central Labor Council and Building Trades Council of Alameda County, Calif., and signed by 856 residents of Alameda, Calif., requesting active support of legislation to (1) repeal of the Smith-Connally bill; (2) the American Federation of Labor amendments to the Social Security Act; and (3) subsidies for the purpose of rolling back the cost of living; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3390. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of the Commissioners' Court of El Paso, Tex., urging favorable action on House bill 2426 and Senate bill 971, authorizing an appropriation of $3,000,000,000 for highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

3391. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of 29 citizens of Union County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3392. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Wilma A. Morgan and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3393. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. W. P. Davis and others of Neosho and Newton County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3394. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and support of House bill 2011, making citizenship possible for persons of Oriental nationality; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of light, in whom is no darkness at all, with gratitude we lift our hearts to Thee for the daily sacrament of beauty when morning glory gilds the skies and the splendor of dawn awakens the earth to newness of life. O Thou Sun of Righteousness, dawn upon our shadowed lives with the light of Thy revealing truth. Dispel the darkness of our minds, burn up the dross of our little loyalties with the fire of a consuming sacrifle for causes greater than ourselves. May we die to the things that seem—earth's sham and show—may we rise above poisoning hatreds, above greed and pride and prejudice and all the base contempts of sect and creed.

Release us from an inner tyranny which makes us cry out in our slavish chains, "The things I would do I do not, for when I would do good evil is present with me." Break down every debasing idol, cast out every lurking foe. Smite down the arrogant specter of self; set our spirits free. May love cast out fear. Send us forth more than conquerors in tune with the Infinite, at home with the eternal. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., November 3, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ELMER THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 2, 1943, was dispen[illegible] with, and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the American War Mothers covering the period October 1941-October 1942, submitted pursuant to law, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF KANSAS ENGINEERING SOCIETY—PROPOSAL TO MOBILIZE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESOURCES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kansas Engineering Society expressing its opposition to the bill (S. 702) to mobilize the scientific and technical resources of the Nation, to establish an office of scientific and technical mobilization, and for other purposes, which I also ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the board of directors of the Kansas Engineering Society, being in session on this 9th day of October 1943, at the Jayhawk Hotel in Topeka, Kans., an analysis of the Kilgore bill, S. 702, was taken up and thoroughly discussed and it being the consensus of opinion that this bill is a measure to socialize and regiment engineering and scientific research and design, it is the opinion of this society that such socialization and regimentation will retard progress and undermine individual thinking and initiative and therefore be detrimental to the public welfare of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Engineering Society go on record as opposed to this or any similar type of legislation.

RESOLUTION BY BOARD OF MANAGERS OF AXTELL CHRISTIAN HOSPITAL, NEWTON, KANS.—PROPOSAL TO PLACE HOSPITALS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a letter from the superintendent of the Axtell Christian Hospital, of Newton, Kans., together with a resolution adopted by the board of managers of the hospital, in opposition to Senate bill 1161, which provides for the placing of hospitals under the social-security program. I also ask that the letter and accompanying resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AXTELL CHRISTIAN HOSPITAL,
Newton, Kans., October 29, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: There is before Congress a bill known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, that proposes to put practically all hospitals under a social-security program. If this bill becomes a law, it will not only make hospitalization very expensive to the individual, but it will place a very large sum of money under the direction of one man. It is generally felt that it would force every hospital to become, in fact, a Government hospital. I am enclosing a resolution passed by our hospital board after they had reviewed this bill and considered what it would mean to our hospital. I sincerely hope you will use your influence to defeat this measure.

Very sincerely,

AXTELL CHRISTIAN HOSPITAL,
JOHN R. GOLDEN,
Superintendent.

Whereas this hospital is a part of the free and voluntary hospital system of the United States, and of the State of Kansas, rendering service alike to those who can and cannot pay for it. This hospital is a nonprofit corporation. The board of managers of this hospital believes that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill now pending in Congress, which proposes that in return for substantially increased payroll taxes, hospitalization and medical care would be taken into the control of the Social Security Board; that these proposals, if enacted into law, would seriously damage, if they did not destroy, both the voluntary hospitals and the voluntary nonprofit hospital-service plans, and further, that it would not aid the very poor who most need hospital care: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of managers of this hospital, express its opposition to the said bills, and urge that they do not pass.

AXTELL CHRISTIAN HOSPITAL,
Newton, Kans.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Administrator, Office of Price Administration, vice Prentiss M. Brown.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1509. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1510. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jess Musgrave; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1511, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading; and he also introduced Senate bills 1512 and 1513, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions, and appear under separate headings.)

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate Joint Resolutions 93 and 94, which were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appear under a separate heading.)

ADVISORY AND POLICY-MAKING STAFFS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to equalize and balance Veterans' Administration policies and recommendations through balanced personnel. I also ask consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1511) to equalize and balance Veterans' Administration policies and recommendations through balanced personnel, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER relating to the bill is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL (S. 1511) TO MORE EQUITABLY EQUALIZE AND BALANCE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS THROUGH BALANCED PERSONNEL

To handle affairs of World War veterans the the Veterans' Bureau was created right after the World War. In 1930 the Veterans' Bureau, staffed in all responsible positions with World War veterans, absorbed the Pension Bureau and other agencies and became the Veterans' Administration. In that absorption there was no dilution of highly placed personnel in the old Veterans' Bureau. As a result we today have a Veterans' Administration staffed solidly in all responsible advisory and policy-making positions with veterans of the World War and the viewpoints of that particular group is reflected in all policies and recommendations as to all groups of veterans, including those of the Civil War, Indian wars, Spanish War, and the Regular Establishment.

Obviously a Veterans' Administration to present a balanced view as to all groups of veterans should be staffed in responsible advisory and policy-making positions with a composite of all groups; certainly not all from one group.

Congress relies heavily upon the Veterans' Administration for advice. Congress is entitled to such balanced advice as can come from a balanced body. For Congress and the people to get the views of but one group from a supposedly unbiased Government agency is wrong and Congress should correct this wrong. This bill will do it.

PENSIONS FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL DISCHARGED FOR DISABILITY AFTER 6 YEARS' SERVICE

Mr. LANGER. I also ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing pensions for enlisted men discharged for disabilities incurred in line of duty in the armed forces after 6 years of service. I also ask consent that a statement in explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1512) providing for pensions for enlisted men discharged for disabilities incurred in line of duty in the armed forces after 6 years' service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER relating to the bill is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL (S. 1512) TO IMPROVE MORALE OF THE REGULAR ARMED FORCES BY EQUALIZATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO CARE OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN

A half century ago Congress provided for retirement at three-fourths pay of disabled officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for disabled enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

Enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have never been so entitled except that recently Congress provided retirement for disabled enlisted men of the Army with more than 20 years' service, and who were disabled subsequent to enactment of that statute.

The Coast Guard has, by regulation, provided for temporary enlistments up to 6 years during which there is no entitlement to disability retirement.

As to officers of all the services there is no required length of service as a prerequisite to disability retirement.

Enactment of this bill would provide equally for minimum pensions equal to three-fourths pay for all enlisted men of all four services who have served 6 or more years. Pension would be payable by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs so as to not unduly burden the War and Navy Departments with administrative work. Pension would be payable at the three-fourths pay rate only where there was separation from service due to line-of-duty disability.

Enactment would eliminate the present unjust proposition under which men with long service have only pensions based upon severity of service-incurred disability to look for. Now a man may serve 15 years; be dropped for tuberculosis, and 15 years later reach an arrested tuberculosis stage and be dropped from the pension rolls to try to get a foothold in life at 50, 60, or even 70 years of age. With a protected minimum pension men could plan ahead. Present conditions severely interfere with morale.

DISCLOSURE OF EVIDENCE USED IN VETERANS' CLAIMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to improve the practice and procedure relating to disclosure of evidence in claims before the Veterans' Administration. I also ask consent that a statement in explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1513) to improve practice and procedure relating to disclosure of evidence in claims before the Veterans' Administration, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER relating to the bill is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL (S. 1513) TO IMPROVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

It is the law that a pension claimant has the burden of proving his claim. That burden can be maintained by the claimant only when he has knowledge of all evidence considered in adjudication of the claim. For the Veterans' Administration to consider evidence held secret from the claimant there is destruction of the first essential element of a full and fair determination of a claim. That is what we now have. The Veterans' Administration acquires and considers evidence which it declines to disclose to the claimant; of which the claimant has no means of knowing and of refuting, if he can.

This bill would require the Veterans' Administration to disclose all evidence to every claimant except where there has been an affirmative finding by a competent medical board that such knowledge would be injurious to health and in which event disclosure to representative would be required.

To dispose of pension claims on secret evidence is un-American and wholly out of line with our concepts of justice. It should be eliminated. This bill would eliminate it.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE AND REHABILITATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce two joint resolutions, one dealing with the question of when the Philippine independence shall occur, in the light of

present-day conditions in the islands, and the other dealing with the setting up of commissions and other economic considerations having to do with the question of rehabilitation, future trade relations, and the like. These joint resolutions have been worked out between the Filipino representatives and those of our own Government, and as they will be introduced in the House of Representatives simultaneously with their introduction here, I should like to get them under way, because of the importance of the questions involved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolutions introduced by the Senator from Maryland will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1361) to extend the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, in connection with the public lands, to certain persons serving in the merchant marine and to certain civilian workmen, and, with the accompanying papers, it was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENT

Mr. REVERCOMB submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DUTIES OF POSTMASTER AT LINCOLN'S NEW SALEM, ILL.—AMENDMENT

Mr. LUCAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1119) imposing additional duties upon the postmaster at Lincoln's New Salem, Ill., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS ON REHABILITATION OF AMERICA'S PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CITIZENS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address discussing the problem of the rehabilitation of America's physically handicapped citizens, delivered by Senator DAVIS at the annual convention of the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America, New York City, October 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ARTICLES AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles on health insurance written by him and published in the New York Post of October 25 to 29, inclusive, and other matter dealing with the health-insurance provisions of the social-security bill S. 1161 which appear in the Appendix.]

A FREE RADIO—ADDRESS BY T. A. M. CRAVEN

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "A Free Radio," delivered by T. A. M. Craven, member of the Federal Communications Commission, on November 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY HULL AND THE MOSCOW AGREEMENT—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Moscow Agreement—Hull's Contribution," by Mark Sullivan, published in the Washington Post of November 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS—ARTICLE FROM LIBERTY MAGAZINE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ballots as Well as Bullets for Fighting Men," from Liberty magazine for October 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Soldiers' Vote," published in the New York Herald Tribune October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MOSCOW DECLARATION—EDITORIAL FROM PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moscow Declaration", published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal of November 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOSCOW AGREEMENT—ARTICLE FROM THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Moscow Miracle," published in the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of November 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY HULL AND THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a speech delivered by him before the Advertising Club of Boston, November 2, 1943, and an article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Washington Star of November 3, 1943, dealing with Secretary Hull and the Moscow Conference, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RUSSELL REPORT—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Russell Report," published in the Washington Evening Star of November 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT TO SENATE GALLERY OF BOYS OF BOYS TOWN, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there is in the Gallery today a group of boys from the Father Flanagan Home, located at Boys Town, near Omaha, Nebr. I think all of us are familiar with the splendid work being done by Father Flanagan and his associates at that school. If it is not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate, I would appreciate it very much to receive unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD of the names of these boys—the group is a small one—as well as the cities and States from which they come. The group of boys in the Gallery represent 14 States of the Union.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the names of the boys, together with the cities and States from which they come, will be printed in the RECORD.

The names of the boys, together with the cities and States from which they come, are as follows:

NEBRASKA

Dick Watson, South Soo City.
Don Paul, Elsie.
Clarence J. Adams, Omaha.
Duane Luedke, Ogallala.

MISSOURI

James Mitchell, St. Joseph.

MONTANA

Earl Willey, Great Falls.

OHIO

Ed Fitzgerald, Cleveland.

WISCONSIN

Don Jensky, Marinette.

WYOMING

Don Gunnell, Sheridan.

COLORADO

Leo Vigil, Trinidad.
Steve Marquis, Pueblo.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Sam Trewolla.

IDAHO

Lloyd Bucher, Lewiston.
Johnny Brogan, Coeur d'Alene.

IOWA

Jerry Parent, Sioux City.

KANSAS

Dick Thomas, Kansas City.
George Pfeifer, Hays.
Tom Hentzen, St. Paul.

MINNESOTA

Charles Knapp, Minneapolis.
Robert Lee, Minneapolis.

MICHIGAN

Frank Roe, Monroe.
Jim Duffy, Mt. Pleasant.

KENTUCKY

Paul Hall, Covington.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to make a personal remark. Last week in a discussion of the history of the debate and contest over the League of Nations, while quoting from the footnote on page 24 of a book called United States and World Organization, by Professor Flemming, of Vanderbilt University, I cited what purported to be a conversation between the then Senator from Indiana, James E. Watson, and the then Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, and in respect to a part of that quotation I orally and extemporaneously interpolated the word "Mephistophelean" or something to that effect.

My attention was called later to that remark, made on the spur of the moment and extemporaneously, as perhaps having the effect of creating the inference that I questioned the motives of the able senior Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge. While everyone recognizes that Senator Lodge is a part of history and what he did is a part of history and therefore open to public comment, and while I can never bring

myself into accord with the course the able Senator from Massachusetts pursued in what I regard a tragic era and in the tragic decision made, at the same time I should certainly be among the last to attribute to him or to any other participant in that debate any questionable personal motive; and if by the remark I made or the figure I used on the spur of the moment I could give such an impression, I am sorry that I did, and I want it to be very clear that I was speaking only about public action and about public affairs and a course of conduct that affected history, and certainly not, Mr. President, about anything which might personally reflect upon the then Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Florida for being so courteous and so fair. If public debate is to be conducted on such a high level, we can really make progress. I am grateful to the Senator.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] inserting, after line 9, a new section, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and which embodies the joint four-nation declaration made by the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and China in their recent meeting at Moscow. I am offering this amendment as a substitute for the pending resolution.

For the first time since the pending resolution was submitted we have a definite joint statement and a commitment from the larger nations with whom our cause in this global war is cast. For the first time we know that the Soviet Union, China, and the United Kingdom place the same construction upon words that express the determination of the Allied Powers to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion and to maintain peace and security in the post-war period that we of the United States do. For the first time we know that they, these other nations, will agree with us and do agree with us that it is necessary to establish, as early as possible, a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership to all such states, large and small, for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. For the first time we know that all these powers will stand by our side, not only now, but in the post-war period, and that in the post-war period they will cooperate with us to the end that the regulation of armaments may be worked out with the idealistic thought in mind and purpose in heart that there will be no more wars fought upon this earth. Furthermore, we know, as a result of this meeting, that these nations are determined to carry out the agreement they have entered into with our representatives, and we believe and have faith that these powers will stand squarely by the United States of America in fighting the present wars to a successful conclusion and establishing a permanent peace upon the earth.

The pending resolution, as well as the amendments, were offered before the Moscow agreements were made public and before it was definitely known just how far our allies in this war might be willing to go in matters of this sort; therefore, the resolution is necessarily less definite than it might now be made.

I will say, concerning the resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee, that it seems to me to be a rather remarkable paper, and the more one studies it the greater is the impression of the tremendous amount of thought and work that has been put into it, and I commend the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], for the excellent resolution which he and his committee framed and reported to the Senate.

I likewise commend the authors of the so-called B2–H2 resolution which was sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], which represents, on their part, diligent and very productive effort.

We have spent days and days in debating the resolution and the various amendments to it. They all, to begin with, have one certain objective in view, and yet we were not quite sure in just what direction to go. Now we have word from the conference at Moscow that the four great powers have agreed upon seven distinctive points, all of which are included in the amendment which I have today submitted. There is no longer any doubt about what our allies will do concerning the fighting of this war and the making of the peace; so what now could be more simple and more direct than to adopt a resolution which embodies the agreement which the three other nations have made with our representatives.

Mr. President, if I can make any assumption from the long days of debate on the post-war policy resolution and amendments to which I have listened, it is that there is no substantial difference in what the proponents of each proposal intend it to mean. I believe the Members of the Senate are in accord on aims. Their objective is to express our willingness to join with our allies on a course of action to secure the world against future wars.

The chief difficulty and source of disagreement has developed over the proper framing and wording of this expression, in advance of any knowledge of the wishes and contingencies of our allies. It is elementary, I believe, that the world can be guaranteed secure peace only through the agreement of the principal powers now engaged in the war against nazi-ism. We have been in danger of stating our position too vaguely, or too specifically.

That contingency has now been cleared up for us, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and other Senators have pertinently pointed out, through the expression of the joint conference of this Government with the governments of our allies at Moscow. It is not important whether the Connally resolution is more like the four-power declaration than the so-called B2–H2 resolution, or vice versa.

It is the constitutional function of this body to express its sentiment through its approval or disapproval of foreign policy proposed by the Executive authority of the Government. What we have been engaging in up until now is a sort of verbal target practice with blank cartridges.

Manifestly, further consideration of any post-war policy resolution now before the Senate would be unrealistic, in view of the action taken in the name of this country by its remarkable Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull.

It seems to me that the most practical, the most effectual action the Senate could take to forward this Nation on the road to secure peace, after victory shall have been won, is to give its approval to the Moscow Pact.

These historic documents embody, in a soundly realistic framework, the aims and ideals for which this Nation is fighting. Furthermore, we are reassured that nations brought together by pragmatic concerns of self-preservation in war can still, by mutual confidence and calm intelligence, initiate plans for an ideal peace. That prevailing confidence and calm intelligence, I am persuaded to believe, were preeminently embodied in the person of Cordell Hull. He has represented this country with great purpose, brilliantly and sagaciously. He has done much more; he has represented people of all lands who love freedom and peace.

This tenacious and serene Tennessean, through chaotic years that have clouded the hopes of most of us, though always keeping his feet firmly planted on the ground of reality, has yet steadfastly faced his vision of a world peace, secure in reciprocity throughout the community of nations. In the Moscow Pact he has laid a cornerstone for a hopeful future. It is with a sense of high privilege that I acknowledge my right to refer to him as a fellow citizen of the State that I have the honor in part to represent in the Senate of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment submitted by me be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by

Mr. STEWART to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert:

"That the Senate approves and endorses the results of the Moscow Conference as announced on November 1, 1943, and embodied in the joint communiqué of tripartite conference at Moscow; the declarations of the Foreign Secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Union regarding Italy and Austria; the statements signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin regarding atrocities; and the joint four-nation declaration of the Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, which reads as follows:

"The Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, united in their determination, in accordance within the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender; conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression; recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments; jointly declare:

"1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

"2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

"3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

"4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

"6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

"7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

"That the agreement expressed in such joint four-nation declaration constitutes the basic policy of the United States for the further prosecution of the war and, following its conclusion, for the maintenance of lasting peace and security."

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Pennsylvania begins his speech, will he yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent from the city.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, on this great and solemn occasion, as we meet to discuss the responsible role which our country must play in the post-war world, it is fitting to remember the saying of one of the great leaders of our times that—

> We live in the present, we dream of the future, and we learn eternal truths from the past.

It is of the past, and the eternal truth we learn from the past, that I speak today.

In September of 1890 I entered Princeton College. A few weeks after I was enrolled as a member of the freshman class, I attended a Democratic rally which was addressed by a young professor of history.

Our party was then carrying on a congressional campaign based on Czar Reed and the Reed rules, on which the Democratic Party won an outstanding victory by gaining 150 seats in the lower House of Congress. One of the older students asked the professor what he thought of the Reed rules. He replied that the Democratic Party would have to adopt rules very much similar to the Reed rules if they wanted to carry on the business of the Government.

That young professor was named Woodrow Wilson. He had just returned to Princeton as a teacher, 11 years after his graduation, and there began a warm friendship which lasted until his death.

The last time I saw Woodrow Wilson was a few short weeks before his death.

I called to see him at his home on S Street and on his sick bed that great American said to me, "GUFFEY, the trouble with us is that our ideas are ahead of the time. Perhaps it will take another world war before there can be acceptance of the truth for which we fought." And, taking my hand, he said, "I am glad you called."

That was said without bitterness and with the awful lucidity of prophecy by the man who had given his life to the cause of world peace through the League of Nations.

It is of the League of Nations and the forces, the motives, the men, who defeated the League of Nations here in the Senate Chamber a generation ago, that I would like to speak.

Then, as now, there were many brilliant and respected members of the Republican Party who shared the hope of Woodrow Wilson and fought for his ideals.

I was particularly glad to see the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] quoted as favoring enactment of the Covenant of the League of Nations by this body.

I may say that I have voted and will vote for the Connally resolution and for any and every amendment which, in my opinion, would strengthen that resolution, and I would like the opportunity to vote for the League Covenant as it was originally offered for ratification in this body in 1919.

As I say, I was particularly glad to read that the Senator from Ohio proposed to support the League Covenant because the Senator's father, former President Taft, and later Chief Justice, fought long and hard for the League of Nations against the entrenched group of insiders who controlled the Republican policy at that time.

Because of the cogency of Mr. Taft's reasoning and the affectionate respect in which he was held by the American people, who still remember him with love and good will, I shall read a number of speeches delivered and magazine articles written by him during the League of Nations debate.

I read an article published in the Philadelphia Ledger of January 15, 1919, signed by William Howard Taft. It is headed "Roosevelt's contribution to the League of Nations":

> The last editorial of Colonel Roosevelt on the League of Nations, posthumously pub-

lished, is one of the most important he ever wrote. It is important in its useful suggestions and limitations as well as in the spirit of constructive statesmanship which prompted it and shines through it.

The idea of a League of Nations is not a new one, as Senator Knox pointed out in his Senate speech. Among others, Sully, the great Minister of France, proposed it. Tennyson, with his poetic vision and pen, fixed it forever in memory.

In more recent times Theodore Roosevelt, in his speech accepting the Nobel peace prize, revived the thought and gave it more definite character by emphasizing the features of an international police force which could impose international justice.

During the war, men of action, intensely absorbed in the great and critical task of developing all the energies of the Allies to win in a contest so fraught with the fate of the world, found it difficult to be patient with the discussion of a plan for peace which could only be realized after the war was won, and under which they saw lurking a tendency to a peace by negotiation and without victory. Roosevelt, Clemenceau, and Lloyd George shared this feeling. As might be expected, it found freer expression from the American leader, in his unofficial status, than from the other two.

Colonel Roosevelt's nature recoiled from association with an idea he found supported by men without a country who exalt internationalism and deprecate nationalism. With them the League of Nations seems to mean the dilution of that intense and moving love of country, the source of all real effective progress, into a nervous, colorless, flabby, and transcendental brotherhood of man.

Universal brotherhood should, of course, be an increasing influence in the world and is, but it will never be useful if it means the loss of patriotism. The relation of one to the other should be as a love of home and family is to the love of country. The one strengthens the other. The emasculated supporters of internationalism as an antidote for love of country are inclined to regard the home and family as reactionary. These institutions find no sympathetic protection among the Bolsheviki, foreign or domestic.

Moreover, men of the dynamic type, like Roosevelt, had a suspicion that all pacifists were pressing a league of nations as a stalking horse for compromising the vital principles at stake in the war. Hence their coldness toward the subject and their criticism of any definite plan.

But proceeding in due order, these men of action now find themselves confronted by a situation that demands an organization of world force to secure the just fruits of the war.

Now they look upon a league of the great powers, who won the war, as an existing fact, and they face the problem of how the manifold and complicated purposes of the treaty, after they have been defined and the treaty signed, shall be effectively carried out and maintained. As practical men, they now take up the League of Nations and study it in the earnest desire to make it work.

In this way, Theodore Roosevelt, having long ago proposed a league in his Nobel prize address, was brought around by logic of events to a sincere effort to frame a plan which would avoid the numerous objections that have been suggested by himself and others and still make progress toward the ideal he held out at Christiania.

He studied all the plans proposed, considered their possible weaknesses and defects, and busied his ingenius mind with finding alternatives which would be practical and still achieve the main purpose.

He had in his mind the thought that under the general obligations of the League, when force had to be threatened or used, a great power like the United States should act as a policeman in the Western Hemisphere, while the great powers of Europe should in the first instance keep the peace of the world in the Balkans and in eastern Europe.

It was clearer to him than it seems to be to others who do not see the real need of a league, and who are not so anxious, therefore, to make it useful to the world, that the European nations will only be too glad to recognize our Monroe Doctrine as a policy in the interest of world peace.

Why should they not, when the principles and operation of the League are really directed to the creation of a Monroe doctrine of the world?

What Colonel Roosevelt always insisted on was that the United States should not promise in a treaty to do things which it could not or would not perform.

Certainly everyone must sympathize with this common-sense restriction upon unwise and transcendental enthusiasm.

He feared there were issues not to be settled on principles of law and thus called nonjusticiable, which might, nevertheless, be submitted to a court and decided against the will of a party to the treaty.

His suggestion is that each nation might state those issues and, after discussion, have them specifically incorporated in the treaty as nonjusticiable.

He feared, too, that the United States might be committed to an obligation not to maintain military preparedness sufficient to protect itself against unjust aggression.

He protested against reduction of armament which was on the theory that the League of Nations would form a substitute for reasonable defense, at least until its efficacy for such a purpose had been fully demonstrated by actual test of time.

Certainly many who earnestly support a league concur in such a view and believe with him that universal military training of the Swiss type may well be instituted in this country, both as an insurance against unjust aggression and as a proper preparation for such contribution to the world's police force as the United States may be called upon to make.

Incidentally, it will constitute an important factor in the education of our youth in the duties of life.

For these reasons, the proponents of the League of Nations to enforce peace may rejoice in this posthumous aid that Theodore Roosevelt gives to the League.

He has the greatest personal following in this country, and his words go far.

His attitude toward the problems involved in the League may well furnish an example to the doubters and opponents.

Let them treat the League as something in its purpose to be desired, and let them lend their thoughts, not to devising and imagining objections but to finding alternative substitutes in its structure which will not be subject to their own objections.

At this point I read an address delivered by William Howard Taft at Portland, Oreg., on February 16, 1919:

THE GREAT COVENANT OF PARIS

(By William Howard Taft)

The League to Enforce Peace, of which this is a congress called for Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, is a voluntary association of men and women of the United States, organized early in 1915 to spread propaganda in favor of a plan for world cooperation to maintain peace by enforced settlement of differences likely to lead to war, on principles of justice and fairness.

Its promoters had long been interested in promoting arbitration between nations. They thought that the end of this world-destructive war would find the peoples of the various countries in a frame of mind in which they would gladly accept any reasonable international cooperation to prevent war.

Accordingly, the league adopted a platform in which it recommended that the United States enter a league of nations, in which the members of the league should stipulate that all differences arising between them of a justiciable character should be submitted to a court and those of a nonjusticiable character to a council of conciliation; that every member of the league should agree to refrain from going to war until after judgment by the court or recommendation by the council of conciliation, and that any member who violated this obligation by attacking any other member should be overwhelmed by the economic pressure of all the members of the league and the joint military forces of the league, if need be.

Similar associations were formed in England and France, with similar platforms, except that they provided for a forcible execution of the judgments and a dealing with the recommendations of the councils of conciliation by the league.

There has been until now no means of knowing exactly what is meant by a league of nations except by reference to the platforms of these voluntary associations.

The Governments of England and France created commissions for the special purpose of studying the proper framework of a league of nations, but the result of their studies was not given to the public.

Our Government had declined to create such a commission.

On Friday last, however, the committee to whom the great Paris Congress had delegated the work of preparing a plan for a league of nations, of which President Wilson was the Chairman, made a report which was concurred in by the representatives of all of the 14 nations at the conference.

Now, therefore, we have an authoritative statement of the constitution of a league of nations and an official basis for its discussion.

This constitution is, indeed, wider in the scope of its purpose than was the platform of our League to Enforce Peace. The platform of our league was a mere skeleton. It had prepared a tentative draft of a treaty to give it body and constructive details, but that tentative draft was never given to the public, because it was thought wiser by governmental authority to withhold it.

The sole object of the League to Enforce Peace platform was to promote peace and avoid war by instrumentalities for administering justice between nations and by enforcing submission to such instrumentalities.

It did not even contain a provision with respect to the limitation of armament. The purpose of the constitution reported at Paris, which we may properly call the Great Covenant of Paris is much wider.

It is to organize a real and permanent league, whose first object is to provide for the just settlement of differences between nations and the prevention of war, and for this purpose to limit armaments. Its second object is to exercise executive functions in the administration of international trusts like the government of backward peoples whom this war has released from the sovereignty of the Germans and the other Central Powers.

Its third object is to promote cooperation between the nations, with a view to the betterment of the condition of labor in all the nations and for joint action in respect to other useful matters now dealt with by international bureaus, like the Postal Union.

This provides a constant series of functions for the league to perform and gives it substance.

The league is to be formed by a covenant which recites in its preamble its general purpose and then states in 26 different articles the agreements included in the covenant.

On the whole, the short program of the League to Enforce Peace, adopted in June 1915, differs but little from the nub of this, except that military contribution is not expressly obligatory and that in this either

party to a difference may avoid a court and an award and seek a council of conciliation in the executive body of the league, where unanimity of recommendation is required.

The proposal to use compulsion to secure submission rather than execution of judgment or recommendation came from the program of the League to Enforce Peace and was adopted by General Smuts in a remarkable brochure submitted by him December 16, 1918.

It is understood that the President was much impressed with the paper of General Smuts and with his plan as well. We may be certain the constitution as now adopted was largely taken from his recommendation. He argued for the joint obligation of league members to use force, which was only partly adopted, as I have pointed out.

He, too, recommended required submission of the justiciable questions to a court and of nonjusticiable questions to a conciliation council as the League to Enforce Peace had done.

But the Smuts plan was much more comprehensive than that of the League to Enforce Peace. From that plan came the mandatory system of administering backward countries and internationalizing cities as wards of the league through competent and existing governments as agents answerable to the League. From that plan came the union of all present international bureaus under the league, as well as the permanent secretariat.

He advocated international labor reforms through the league, and this function is left to be developed under the league. He, too, brought nonmembers of the league under its influence and action.

On the whole, we should thank God that such a great advance toward the suppression of war and the promotion of permanent peace has been made as in the agreement upon this constitution, with every reasonable prospect of its embodiment into the permanent treaty at Paris.

Is it possible that such a vital feature of the treaty, upon which 14 states through their representatives at Paris agree, is to be defeated by the lack of the necessary two-thirds vote in our Senate? I cannot think so.

When President Wilson returns to present the result of his visit to Europe it must be that the American people will welcome him with approval and congratulations upon the success of the congress in which he has taken so prominent a part.

In the President's addresses and messages during the war and since he has promised to the long-harassed peoples of the Allied Nations that the United States would press for a league of nations which should secure permanent peace when this war ended. Thus he revived the morale of the war-weary soldiers and workers of our allies.

These promises were not repudiated by any American when they were made. They were echoed in all the appeals to the American people and they found ready response among them and no protest.

The Nation is thus pledged to the idea of a league of nations to render peace permanent.

Good faith requires that what other nations are willing to undergo to secure the peace of the world we should ourselves be willing to undergo.

I read another article by Mr. Taft, published in the Philadelphia Public Ledger of March 16, 1919:

PARIS COVENANT HAS TEETH

(By William Howard Taft)

Many misconceptions of the effect of the Covenant of Paris have been set afloat by broadside denunciations of the League based on loose constructions of it entirely unwarranted by the text.

The attitude of those who favor the Covenant has been misconstrued, increasing the confusion in the mind of the public in respect to the inestimable value of the instrument as it is.

Were the alternatives presented to me of adopting the Covenant exactly as it is, or of postponing the coming of peace and continuing the state of war until the conference could reconvene and make other provisions for peace, I should, without the slightest fear as to the complete safety of my country under its provisions, vote for it as the greatest step in recorded history in the betterment of international relations for the benefit of the people of the world and for the benefit of my country.

I was president of the League to Enforce Peace, and continue to be. Our plan was somewhat more ambitious in the method of settling differences peaceably, in that fewer might escape a binding peaceful settlement.

The proposed Covenant, however, makes provision for peaceful settlement of most differences. Both plans include a definite obligation on the part of all members of the League to use economic power to suppress an outlaw nation by withering world ostracism.

Ours also provided for definite contributions of force to an army to be called upon if the boycott failed to effect its purpose.

The present Covenant does not, in my judgment, impose such a definite obligation on the members of the League, but its theory, doubtless sound, is that their voluntary action in their own interest will lead to the raising of sufficient force without a covenant.

The proposed League has real teeth and a bite to it. It furnishes real machinery to organize the power of the peaceful nations of the world and translate it into economic and military action.

This, by its very existence and certainty, will keep nations from war, will force them to the acceptance of a peaceable settlement, and will dispense with the necessity for the exercise of economic pressure or force.

Why, then, it is asked, if this is my view, have I animadverted upon the language of the League Covenant and suggested changes?

I have done this not because I wished to change the structure of the League, its plan of action or its real character. I have done it for the purpose of removing objections to it created in the minds of conscientious Americans.

There are many such anxious for a League of Nations, anxious to make this peace permanent, whose fears have been aroused by suggested constructions of the Covenant which its language does not justify.

These fears can, without any considerable change of language or additions, be removed.

I now read another statement by former President William Howard Taft:

It is conceded that the other members of the League would have accepted us as a member with the modification of article X insisted on by a sufficient number of Senators to prevent ratification.

The Democratic Party and its platform adopt completely Mr. Wilson's position and, if Governor Cox is elected, the League will be defeated and a deadlock ensue just as before.

Two-thirds of the Republican Senators have already voted for the League with reservations and enough Democrats have expressed themselves in the Senate and elsewhere on this matter to insure a ratification of the League with the Republican reservations if Mr. Harding is elected and submits the German treaty to the Senate.

The doubt on this point is whether Mr. Harding will do so, arising from his failure to say, in his letter of acceptance, that he will do so.

My own belief is that, as Mr. Harding has already twice voted for the League with reservations, and will find that a Democratic minority will prevent his putting through a separate treaty with Germany, he will conclude that the only satisfactory solution is a ratification of the League covenant with reservations.

For these reasons—though had I been a Senator I would have voted for the League covenant just as submitted and also for it with the reservations—I shall vote for Mr. Harding.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT.

JULY 23, 1920.

Mr. Taft heaped scorn upon the character of the opposition to the League of Nations in a letter written from Salt Lake City on Washington's Birthday, 1919, to his friend, Gus J. Karger, Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati Times-Star, an excerpt from which reads as follows:

As I write I look out upon the desert of Nevada, and it suggests the waste that war makes; and when I think of the vicious narrowness of Reed, the explosive ignorance of Poindexter, the ponderous Websterian language and lack of stamina of Borah, the vanity of Lodge as an old diplomatic hand on the Foreign Relations Committee, the selfishness, laziness, and narrow lawyerlike acuteness of Knox, the emptiness and sly partisanship of Hale, with the utter nothingness of Fall, in the face of this great world's crisis, I confess I don't see where we have any advantage over the women—at least in this juncture.

I beg of you to believe I am not drunk or wild, but am only roused to the critical situation in world affairs that those who gather around the council board in Paris know, and that these barking critics do not seem to realize.

It is their American selfishness, their American littleness, blinding them to the real interests of this Nation as well as of the world, that arouses me. I can see that little head of Hays wagging over the errors I have made from a political standpoint. I can hear the discussions in the cloakrooms and the damning of me. I can hear the wiseacres say, "that shows what defeated the party in 1912, and here's a repetition of it.

"Weren't the Progressives justified in breaking off? Taft's loyalty to the party was always weak. Now, thank God, he is out of it."

To have incurred this condemnation by so noble a body as the Republicans of the Senate, and such a shining leader as Fess, is certainly a sad fate, but I must bear it.

Mr. President, the issue which faced America then was whether there would be a "next war."

Woodrow Wilson himself had no illusions as to what defeat of the League might mean.

Here are Wilson's own words on the subject, as quoted by Hamilton Foley in a booklet entitled "Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations":

Stop for a moment to think about the next war. For I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it. What shall I call it? The final war? It might be the final arrest, though I pray only the temporary arrest, of civilization itself; and America has, if I may take the liberty of saying so, a greater interest in the prevention of that war than any other nation. America is less exhausted by the recent war than the other belligerents; she is not exhausted at all. America has paid for the war that has gone by less heavily, in proportion to her wealth, than the other nations. America still has free capital enough for its own industries and for the industries of the other countries that have to build their industries anew. The next

war would have to be paid for in American blood and American money. The nation of all nations that is most interested to prevent the recurrence of what has already happened is the nation which would assuredly have to bear the brunt of that great catastrophe. It is not likely that, with the depleted resources of the great fighting nations of Europe, there will be another war soon, but unless we concert measures to prevent it, there will be another and a final war, just about the time these children come to maturity; and it is our duty to look in the face the real circumstances of the world in order that we may not be unfaithful to the great duty which America undertook in the hour and day of her birth. The next time will come; it will come while this generation is living, and the children will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives.

I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and, shot into the heavens, went for a hundred miles and more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers know what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the absolute destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization.

Mr. President, to win support for the League, Wilson urged both Mr. Taft and the late Elihu Root to submit criticisms of the draft of the covenant, and succeeded in having the final text of the League covenant revised so as to incorporate practically every suggestion these two distinguished Americans had made.

Even with the many obvious defects which time and experience showed to exist in this charter for a world society and even after the outbreak of the present war had proven the inadequacy of the League mechanism, it was possible for responsible students of world affairs to report as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS IN WORLD POLITICS

(Extract from chapter from World Organization, a symposium of the Institute on World Organization published by the American Council on Public Affairs)

(By Arthur Sweetser)

Too often the League of Nations has been thought of as a mere abstraction, without flesh or bones, far off in a distant vacuum, above and apart from the daily lives of peoples.

Quite the contrary is the truth.

The League is and has been the most human of human creations. It represents the battleground of the best and the worst in human nature.

It was conceived by man, built by man, and betrayed by man. Today man—or, rather, mankind—is paying the price of that betrayal.

One sweeping assertion may be made at the outset—namely, that the League represented the greatest political effort ever attempted. It aimed at nothing less than bringing into cooperation all nations, all continents, and all races of mankind.

It sought to create a single international mechanism and to establish the embryo of a world society. Its object was to free mankind of history's greatest evil—the scourge of war.

Nothing even vaguely comparable had ever been attempted before, or had, indeed, even been possible until the agony of the First World War. Smaller leagues and local confederations there had been, but never before a universal league of this type.

It differed from all previous efforts, first in being world-wide, and second in being predominantly an agency of peace rather than of alliance for war.

It is vitally important to see this essential fact at the outset. The picture has heretofore been obscured by hostility, prejudice, and provincialism. The United States incurred the initial responsibility for this misunderstanding in not only not entering, but still more in misrepresenting, the agency which it had itself helped to call into being: the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese later followed suit after their particular fashions.

Sentiment in the United States ever since the 1919 treaty fight, has been paralyzed, inhibited, and disproportioned. The time has come to be realistic and objective. The question now is the single overwhelming issue—do we, or do we not, want world peace; do we, or do we not, want to be rid of war?

Mr PEPPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Waligren
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the same issues present themselves to the American people today as were presented in 1919, and to their constitutional government of which this body is a part.

Again it is a question of establishing the foundations, however faulty, of a just world order or of allowing the world to drift into another and more terrible war.

Let me take the time of the Senate at this point to read the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant declaration on world peace:

CATHOLIC, JEWISH, AND PROTESTANT DECLARATION ON WORLD PEACE

THE MORAL LAW MUST GOVERN WORLD ORDER

1. The organization of a just peace depends upon practical recognition of the fact that not only individuals but nations, states, and international society are subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God.

THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL MUST BE ASSURED

2. The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious, or other discrimination in violation of those rights.

THE RIGHTS OF OPPRESSED, WEAK, OR COLONIAL PEOPLES MUST BE PROTECTED

3. The rights of all peoples, large and small, subject to the good of the organized world community, must be safeguarded within the framework of collective security. The progress of undeveloped, colonial, or oppressed peoples toward political responsibility must be the object of international concern.

THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES MUST BE SECURED

4. National governments and international organization must respect and guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities to economic livelihood, to equal opportunity for educational and cultural development, and to political equality.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE WITH JUSTICE MUST BE ORGANIZED

5. An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will develop a body of international law; guarantee the faithful fulfilment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION MUST BE DEVELOPED

6. International economic collaboration to assist all states to provide an adequate standard of living for their citizens must replace the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states.

A JUST SOCIAL ORDER WITHIN EACH STATE MUST BE ACHIEVED

7. Since the harmony and well-being of the world community are intimately bound up with the internal equilibrium and social order of the individual states, steps must be taken to provide for the security of the family, the collaboration of all groups and classes in the interest of the common good, a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life, decent conditions of work, and participation by labor in decisions affecting its welfare.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, editorial comment by various newspapers of the country with respect to this declaration. The editorial comment is from Newsweek, New York, October 11, 1943; the New York Times, New York City, October 10, 1943; Catholic Action of the South, New Orleans, La., October 14, 1943; the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., October 7, 1943;

America, a Catholic review of the week, New York City, October 9, 1943; the Christian Century, Chicago, Ill., October 13, 1943; the Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y., October 10, 1943; the Post, New York, N. Y., October 11, 1943; the Traveler, Boston, Mass., October 9, 1943; the Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., October 7, 1943; the Commonweal, New York, N. Y., October 15, 1943; the Catholic Courier, Rochester, N. Y.; the Church World, Portland, Maine, October 8, 1943; and the Catholic Sentinel, Portland, Oreg., October 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, New York City, of October 11, 1943]

Clear, forthright, and brief, the document was designed as a minimum set of principles for practical cooperation among nations, not as a full program. More important to churchmen was the fact that the three faiths had been able to agree in every detail of the extremely precise and concrete statement * * * the goal of this declaration, like other religious peace pronouncements, is to influence public opinion enough to force the diplomats to take heed.

[From the New York Times of October 10, 1943]

These are minimum requirements which all men of good will can do their utmost to implement. The religious leaders of the country have fulfilled their duty. They have indicated the way to unite in a common effort to attain a just and peaceful world order. But the practical steps required to implement their proposals must be taken by our politicians and statesmen. We do not fulfill our responsibilities as citizens in this matter merely by acquiescing to these proposals in our own minds. We must point out their importance to others and do our utmost to make our legislators follow the directives they give.

For these moral principles will not save the world unless the men to whom we grant the power to frame the institutions and construct the machinery for peace are guided by them. On the other hand, the best institutions and the most perfect machinery men can devise will fall without the wholehearted support of the vast majority of men. Our duty as citizens is therefore twofold. We must first urge and then support it with all the energy and good will we possess. If we fail this time we will have nobody to blame but ourselves.

[From Catholic Action of the South, New Orleans, La., of October 14, 1943]

We believe that this action should have a profound influence on the peace discussions and post-war planning. Beyond doubt, it serves as a warning as to what the basis of a just and lasting peace, resting on moral principles, must be, as viewed by religious leaders, who are the best qualified to point this out. The statement crystallizes the opinion of the religious leadership of the country, hence represents moral views that must bear weight with those who will have in their hands the tremendous task of planning world peace.

In our opinion these points dare not be overlooked or nullified, because of their very essential nature in the establishment of a lasting peace. One need but glance over the seven points to realize that they cover the major ills of humanity, and they offer the remedies for elimination of those injustices and fallacies that have caused so many woes and consequent wars. If they are ignored or nullified, we shall have before us only the clouds of future wars on the horizon.

[From the Washington Post of October 7, 1943]

The manifesto * * * is certainly an historic document. Its significance lies less in its actual content or in the position it takes concerning various problems of reconstruction than in the evidence it gives that leaders of the three great religious faiths are now willing openly to work together for the achievement of important objectives.

The most striking parts of the document, however, are its insistence on adequate sanctions to enforce when necessary the arbitration of international disputes and on international economic collaboration, and the very strong position it takes against "the present economic monopoly and exploitation of natural resources by privileged groups and states * * * it goes far beyond any declaration of post-war policy made thus far by any of the now warring powers.

[From America (A Catholic Review of the Week) of October 9, 1943]

The declaration announces to our statesmen and economists and businessmen, as well as to the great masses of the people, certain elementary truths of natural justice in their application to the complex problem of an international world order. These truths belong to Christian teaching. They are not the whole of that teaching, nor its loftiest heritage. They are simply the indispensable minimum of that moral law which in the language of Pope Piux XII: "The Creator Himself manifested in a natural order, and which He has engraved with indelible characters on the hearts of men * * *"

The proclamation of these truths places upon all men a grave responsibility for their fulfillment. This responsibility tests most heavily upon those who by reason of their position and influence can most easily see these aims effected. But it rests in a proportionate measure upon all men, and to Catholics above all falls the duty of providing the spiritual leadership in the moral combat for a just world. The seven points are not compiled merely to be dreamed over. Our responsibility will not have been fulfilled until we have, through study, fully grasped their meaning for ourselves, spread the knowledge of them, and seen that our elected representatives follow their direction when they apply themselves to working out the concrete problems of peace. (Quoted in Our Sunday Visitor, October 19, 1943.)

[From the Christian Century, Chicago, Ill., of October 13, 1943]

It needs to be borne in mind that this declaration represents the minimum demands of America's churches and synagogues as to the nature of the peace. As the preamble adopted by the Catholic signers in presenting the document to Roman Catholic states, the seven "postulates * * * express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men." * * *

One other characteristic of this document gives it a peculiar authority. Although it has been written and signed by these religion leaders acting as individuals, behind every one of its seven points there stand declarations which carry maximum weight with the members of all three religious communities. The digest of supporting documents prepared by the Federal Council of Churches (and doubtless to be obtained from that body) makes this authoritative undergirding clear. Thus, every item in the declaration is given standing among Catholics by deliverances of Pope Piux XII. For Jews, there are the supporting affirmations of the Synagogue Council, the Rabbinical Assembly, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and similar acknowledged sources of Jewish teaching. And for Protestants, every position is reinforced by the findings of the Oxford and Delaware conferences, as well as of numerous denominational conventions. * * *

In the first place, as has been indicated already, it marks the formation of a true united front by the religious forces of this country to bring to bear their influence on the nature of the peace. As such, it marks a new stage in religious cooperation—a stage far advanced beyond any attained in the past. * * * That united front will in itself constitute a major influence for the making of a just, generous and hopeful order—an influence tragically missing from pre-war society. * * *

But now the churches and synagogues have lined up solidly behind a conception of world organization and order which utterly repudiates both the practice and the spirit of isolationism and acknowledges full responsibility for American participation in a whole network of international institutions. Neither the isolationism of withdrawal nor the isolationism of empire can find sanction in this pronouncement of the nation's united religious forces.

Finally, the appearance of this declaration constitutes notice served on political leadership that it must submit its acts in making the peace to the review and judgment of church and synagogue as interpreters of the moral law. There have been distressing signs of late of a tendency in political quarters to drift back toward secret manipulations in that tradition of power politics out of which has come so much of the agony of the past. With Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leadership uniting on such a platform as this declaration lays down, political leaders who may be tempted to return to the moral nihilism of balance-of-power diplomacy and military-alliance statecraft must reckon with a condemnation not to be lightly provoked. Not only in Washington, but in London, and in Moscow and in Chungking the publication of this common agreement by American religious bodies as to the requirements of a just peace will from this moment constitute a tremendous fact which statesmanship must take into account.

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle of October 10, 1943]

To the American people, first, and to the peoples of all the embattled world, this news which press and radio properly places among the vital announcements of military and political and economic and diplomatic happenings, and declarations of purposes and policies, will come as a great uplift of morale. It is both a revelation of the innermost purpose of the war, and of the purpose which must be recognized in the winning of true peace to follow the war. * * * Great as the domestic effect of the joint declaration undoubtedly must be called, its world-importance transcends even its vast national import. For it places beneath the platform of the world-policies of the United Nations in a practical fashion basic and indestructible principles, instead of the shifting and temporary devices of material and conflicting political, racial, economic, and military interests and expediencies to which our diplomats, and other secular leaders, have so vainly resorted since long before World War No. 1.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Post of October 11, 1943]

Absolutely essential to the creation of a real peace, which must mean a peace which resolves differences, instead of hardening and perpetuating them, are principles ac-

ceptable to large bodies of men in all countries, including those of our enemies. The pacification of the world, after this war, is a missionary task. Statesmanship can be used as its instrument. But the spirit cannot be created out of nationalism and national interests, for nationalism, raised to the point where it has usurped all values and laid hold on the throne of God, is the basic cause of this war.

Therefore it is essential that a voice come out of the darkness to speak for the human race, and for principles untainted by national interests. That this voice should come from men of three creeds, who mutually seek to serve God and man, is altogether fitting and is the correct answer to Hitler.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Traveler of October 9, 1943]

A common call without precedent in world history has been issued by the three great religious faiths of America. In an hour of world crisis, leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish churches have issued a joint testament of faith in the rights of man and the dignity of the human spirit.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, of October 7, 1943]

The importance of the church's militant leadership in winning the peace cannot be minimized. It is one of the vital forces which influence men's thoughts and actions, and united as the three great faiths now are, they can be a potent force in arousing the people of this country to the support of a realistic program to achieve the objectives they have set out as the moral basis for an enduring peace.

[From the Commonweal, New York, N. Y., of October 15, 1943]

The joint statement of October 7 is an important step toward winning the coming peace. Each of its seven points is backed up by more detailed enunciations of principle, such as papal allocutions, resolutions adopted by the Rabbinical Assembly, and Protestant denominational and interdenominational statements. If these principles are unflinchingly insisted on by American adherents of the major religious bodies, there will, indeed, be some chance of winning the peace. This is interfaith activity at its utmost value.

[From the Catholic Courier, Rochester, N. Y.]

Extreme significance must be attached to the identical statement on peace issued simultaneously by members of the hierarchy and Protestant and Jewish religious authorities. Agreement by religious leaders on what constitutes basic principles for permanent peace will be of no little concern to industrial labor and political leaders as well as to legislators and those who direct foreign policy. * * *

To all who respect the role that religion should play in formulating plans for peace, the statement presents a basic frame of reference for the several specific plans and programs being brought to the fore.

The statement will bear fruit only in attaining specific application by those responsible for formulating post-war programs. Ultimately its effectiveness will rest upon a widespread popular acceptance and insistence.

[From the Church World, Portland, Maine, of October 8, 1943]

The real significance of the declaration of world peace recently sponsored by nationally known representatives of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism would seem to lie in the fact that for the first time in our national history there is a concerted effort to read religion into the peace program which is now being formulated by the United Nations.

[From the Catholic Sentinel, Portland, Oreg., of October 14, 1943]

It is of interest to note that the program in six of its seven points makes allusion or direct mention of international organization as a necessary medium in the post-war era for the establishment and maintenance of peace. * * *

The seven-point program is full of constructive thought, no matter how hard it may be to realize in full. And having the endorsement of representative Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, it should have a strong influence upon forthcoming legislation on the subject of peace.

Mr. President, there speaks the moral and religious sentiment of America.

The same voices were heard in 1919 and were ignored. Why were they ignored?

Why did the Senate of the United States fail to ratify the League Covenant?

The League was defeated chiefly by three men: Henry C. Frick, of Pittsburgh, who is reported to have contributed a large sum of money—even up to a million dollars—to the fight against the peace treaty; and by two United States Senators, Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania, and Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, grandfather of the present Senator from Massachusetts.

Together these three men plotted and delayed, intrigued, and maneuvered, until they had reduced the disillusioned William Howard Taft to the dire expedient of telling the American people that the election of Warren Gamaliel Harding, of Ohio, would guarantee American adherence to the League Covenant.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts not long ago wrote a letter to explain his grandfather's attitude toward the League of Nations in which the following statement was made:

The current discussion with regard to the attitude of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge at the time of the League of Nations debate has just come to my attention, and in order to keep the historical record perfectly clear, I should like to make a few observations.

Mrs. Corinne Roosevelt Robinson is right when she says that no interpretation of Senator Lodge's attitude is necessary since he has himself stated for all time what his attitude was. As he has said, he gave the League with reservations genuine support and was surprised when President Wilson drew away enough Democrats to prevent its ratification on that basis.

Whether he was disappointed or not is, of course, a matter of personal impression. He certainly had favored some sort of machinery for international cooperation earlier in his career, and in the last years of his life he inclined to the belief that fate had been good to the United States by keeping it out of the League altogether.

There is certainly no foundation in fact for the statement that he was "an irreconcilable at heart," although my personal feelings are such that I should be proud to think that he was.

The above quotation is taken from Professor Flemming's book, The United States and the League of Nations, page 476.

On the same page of this book I would like to call the attention of Senators to a letter written by Mrs. Clarence C. Williams, daughter of Senator Lodge, to Mr. Henry Morgenthau, former Ambassador to Turkey, published in the New York Herald Tribune on March 7, 1930, which stated that she had been in close association and confidence with the Senator during the struggle and that—

My father hated and feared the Wilson League and his heart was really with the irreconcilables. But it was uncertain whether this League could be beaten straight out in this way, and the object of his reservations was so to emasculate the Wilson pact that if it did pass it would be valueless and the United States would be honorably safeguarded. My father never wanted the Wilson League, and when it was finally defeated he was like a man from whom a great burden had been lifted.

Because this whole curious story is so important to our present decision on post-war organization, I propose to give in some detail a chronological account of the story of the League of Nations, from 1915, when it was proposed, until 1920, when the election of President Harding sounded the death knell of American membership in the League, William Howard Taft and other eminent Republicans to the contrary notwithstanding. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks certain extracts from a chronological account of the story of the League.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1915

APRIL 9

Fourth dinner conference for the purpose of formulating proposals for the constitution of a league of peace called to order by Theodore Marburg in New York City.

Mr. Hamilton Holt called attention to the fact that two movements were being advocated, one for the establishment of an international court and the other for the forming of a league of peace. The one seemed to imply the other. The court may emerge first, but the league in the end will be more important. A court alone would, he said, have the fatal weakness of not being able to anticipate and remove causes of troubles.

It was then moved by Mr. Lowell and unanimously voted that it is the opinion of those present that it is desirable for the United States to join a league of all the great nations. (For platform adopted at this meeting see Theodore Marburg, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 790.)

JUNE 9

Senator Lodge spoke on the necessity for inviting the nations of the world in one league. He declared that such a league was neither impracticable nor utopian.

JUNE 17

Program of the League to Enforce Peace adopted at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, June 17, 1915. William H. Taft, President.

AUGUST 10

Sir Edward Grey to Colonel House: "My own mind revolves more and more about the point that the refusal of a conference was the fatal step that decided peace or war last year, and about the moral to be drawn

from it; which is that the pearl of great price, if it can be found, would be some League of Nations that could be relied on to insist that disputes between any two nations must be settled by the artbitration, mediation, or conference of others. International law has hitherto had no sanction. The lesson of this war is that the Powers must bind themselves to give it a sanction." (Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters, 1915–17, by Ray S. Baker, New York, 1937, p. 125.)

AUGUST 15

Wilson to W. E. Dodd: "But at the end of the struggle I would try to bring peoples into a cooperative association which would unite them against any nation that resorted to war—the savage method of solving problems." Dodd in New York Times Magazine, December 27, 1936.

SEPTEMBER 22

Grey to House: "Would the President propose that there should be a league of nations binding themselves to side against any power which broke a treaty * * *. I cannot say which governments would be prepared to accept such a proposal, but I am sure that the Government of the United States is the only government that could make it with effect."

NOVEMBER 12

Wilson to House: Wilson regards the league idea as emphatically the necessary item in the program for peace. (See Notter, op. cit., p. 448, n. 40.)

1916

FEBRUARY 1

Wilson's address at Des Moines, Iowa: "I pray God that if this contest have no other result, it will at least have the result of creating an international tribunal and producing some sort of joint guaranty of peace on the part of the great nations of the world."

MAY 8

Wilson in an interview with a group from the American Union Against Militarism: "If you say, 'We shall not have any war,' you have got to have the force to make that 'shall' bite." (In Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters, 1915–17, by R. S. Baker, vol. 6, New York, 1937, p. 204.)

MAY 10

Cablegram, House to Grey: "I believe the President would now be willing to publicly commit the United States to joining with the other powers in a convention looking to the maintenance of peace after the war, provided he announced at the same time that if the war continued much longer he purposed calling a conference to discuss peace." (Text in Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters, 1915–17, by R. S. Baker, vol. 6, New York, 1937, p. 204.)

MAY 18

Bryan objected in a speech against the League idea on the ground that it would involve the United States in entangling alliances with Europe; that it is incompatible with the Monroe Doctrine, etc.

MAY 26

Samuel Gompers announced that the A. F. L. favored a League of Nations provided it was not controlled by the great powers in the interest of the status quo but was one allowing democratic changes in favor of the masses.

MAY 27

Lodge and Wilson speak at the same meeting of the League to Enforce Peace (New Willard Hotel, Washington). Lodge, by way of introduction, said: "I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with the other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and to encourage peace."

President Wilson said: "The United States is willing to become a partner in any feasible association of nations formed in order to realize these objects and make them secure against violation."

JUNE 7–10

Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill. Charles E. Hughes nominated for President. He approved the essential parts of the program of the League to Enforce Peace.

JUNE 14–16

Democratic National Convention in St. Louis, Mo., resulting in the nomination of Hon. Woodrow Wilson for President and Hon. Thomas R. Marshall for Vice President.

The Democratic platform reads in part as follows: "We believe * * * that the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression or disregard of the rights of peoples and nations; and we believe that the time has come when it is the duty of the United States to join with the other nations of the world in any feasible association that will effectively serve those principles." (Official Report of the Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, held in St. Louis, Mo., June 14, 15, and 16, 1916, p. 124.)

OCTOBER 26

President Wilson, address at Cincinnati, Ohio: "I believe that the business of neutrality is over; not because I want it to be over, but I mean this, that war now has such a scale that the position of neutrals sooner or later becomes intolerable. We must have a society of nations, not suddenly, not by insistence, not by any hostile emphasis upon the demand, but by the demonstration of the needs of the time. The nations of the world must get together and say, 'Nobody can hereafter be neutral as respects the disturbances of the world's peace for an object which the world's opinion cannot sanction.'"

NOVEMBER 7

Wilson reelected President of the United States, receiving 277 electoral votes as against 254 for Hughes.

1917

JANUARY 22

President Wilson, in address to the Senate, declared that a just peace must be "a peace without victory," must recognize equality of right among great and small nations, security for "subject peoples," freedom of the seas, limitation of armaments, and replacement of the old system of alliances by a general concert of powers.

JANUARY

"Roosevelt was the first to attack (the League idea). Writing in the Metropolitan magazine for January 1917, he attempted to explain away his former allegiance to the principles of a league, combining with his explanation a [vindictive] personal attack on Wilson and on Taft. Senator Lodge promptly supported Roosevelt. * * * He was now, January 3, 1917, manifesting profound concern about the abandonment of the policy we have hitherto pursued of confining ourselves to our own hemisphere." (R. S. Baker, Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters, New York, 1936, vol. 6, p. 417. See also Lodge in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 64–2, pp. 2368, 2370.)

JANUARY 25

Senator Borah introduces a resolution to reaffirm the faith of the Senate in the permanent wisdom of the isolationist policies of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 25, 1917, p. 1950.)

MARCH 5

Wilson inaugurated as President of the United States for a second term.

APRIL 2

Delivers address at a joint session of the two Houses of Congress: "I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States."

APRIL 4

War resolution passed in the Senate by vote of 82 to 6.

APRIL 6

House adopts war resolution by vote of 373 to 50.

1918

JANUARY 8

President Wilson in address to Congress on war aims and peace terms laid down his Fourteen Points. Project for a league of nations set forth in the fourteenth point.

FEBRUARY 11

Address of President Wilson to Congress in which he laid down the "four principles" as additional terms.

JULY 4

President Wilson in address at Mount Vernon laid down the "four ends," as Allied war aims, to wit: "The destruction or reduction to impotence of every arbitrary power that can disturb the peace of the world, a settlement on the basis of the free acceptance of the conditions of the settlement by the peoples immediately concerned, the consent of all the nations to be governed by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern individual citizens of modern states, and the establishment of an organization of peace.

JULY 19

W. H. Taft, speaking before an unofficial Republican State convention in New York, accused the Wilson administration of having "allowed party considerations, which the crisis should have entirely neutralized, to rule too much in its appointments to important tasks. * * * Now we need a Republican Congress to call for and insist upon adequate preparation and to formulate legislation to this end. Such a Congress will in every way back up and sustain the Democratic President in winning the war." (New York Times, July 20, 1918.)

AUGUST

Roosevelt and A. J. Beveridge held a conference with George Harvey at Beverly Farms, Mass.: "At this meeting Roosevelt and Beveridge are reported to have guaranteed Harvey 20,000 subscribers a year for the next 2 years, during which period Harvey was to attack Wilson as strongly as possible on every occasion." (D. F. Flemming, The United States and the League of Nations, 1918–20, New York, 1932, p. 27. See also William E. Dodd, in the New York Times Magazine, December 27, 1931, p. 15.)

AUGUST 23

Senator Lodge, addressing the Senate, insisted upon the dictation of harsh terms. "* * * No peace that satisfies Germany in any degree can ever satisfy us. It cannot be a negotiated peace. It must be a dictated peace and we and our allies must dictate it." Writing to Theodore Roosevelt a week or so later, Lodge said: "* * * The speech seems to have had a rather wide success and has gone very much further than I ever dared to hope. I trust it will help to make it difficult for Wilson to betray the United States and the Allies by negotiating a peace with Germany with a view to the German vote in this country." (Selections from the correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, vol. II, p. 536.)

SEPTEMBER 14

Austro-Hungarian note to the United States and all belligerents suggested "confidential and nonbinding discussion of peace terms" rejected by President Wilson on the 16th.

SEPTEMBER 27

Address by President Wilson at opening campaign for Fourth Liberty Loan in New York City: "To achieve by the coming settlements a secure and lasting peace, it will be necessary that all who sit down at the peace table shall come * * * ready and willing, also, to create in some virile fashion the only instrumentality by which it can be made certain that the agreements of the peace will be honored and fulfilled. * * * That indispensable instrumentality is a league of nations formed under covenants that will be efficacious."

OCTOBER 13

Will H. Hays, chairman of the Republican National Committee and others, inspired ex-President Theodore Roosevelt to issue a violent attack upon the President and his leadership (See D. F. Fleming, the United States and World Organization, op. cit., p. 18.)

OCTOBER 13

Statement by Theodore Rocsevelt: "I most earnestly hope that the Senate of the United States and all other persons competent to speak for the American people will emphatically repudiate the so-called 14 points and the various similar utterances of the President * * * to do as the President has done in this case * * * becomes dangerously near to being treacherous diplomacy." (New York Times, Oct. 14, 1918.)

OCTOBER 24

Theodore Roosevelt sent identical telegrams to Senators Lodge, Poindexter, and Hiram Johnson: "As an American citizen, I most earnestly hope that the Senate of the United States, which is part of the treaty-making power of the United States will take affirmative action against a negotiated peace with Germany and in favor of a peace based on unconditional surrender of Germany. I also earnestly hope that on behalf of the American people it will declare against the adoption in their entirety of the 14 points of the President's address of last January as offering a basis for a peace satisfactory to the United States." (New York Times, Oct. 25, 1918.)

OCTOBER 26

"I do not like Mr. Roosevelt," wrote Secretary Baker to the President, "and therefore I mistrust my judgment. But should you not take some occasion to point out that your 14-point address was made on January 8 and that it is scandalous for Mr. Roosevelt to remain silent about it for 9 months, until our allies rely upon it, our own country approves it, our enemies in professed good faith accept it—until our national good faith is pledged to it as a statement of our war aims, and then seek to repudiate it by writing to Republican Senators in an effort to make a partisan row?" (R. S. Baker, Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters, New York, 1939, vol. 8, p. 515.)

Charles E. Hughes, e. g., wrote: "Did I not think that the Republican Party would through its representatives aid * * * in the settlement of a righteous peace I should leave the party." (Washington Post, October 30, 1918.)

OCTOBER 28

Senator KNOX. "As to the 'League of Nations' question, I will add a few words. The phrase is heard much of late. Some envisage it as a utopian world state. * * * There will be no room for a task of such problematical possibility in either of the phases of negotiation that now confront us." (CONGRESSIONAL RECOORD, 56–2, p. 11488, October 28, 1918.)

NOVEMBER 5

Election gave Republicans a majority in both Houses of Congress. In the Senate, however, the majority was only two. Senator Newberry's mandate was subsequently declared void.

NOVEMBER 11

Armistice signed in the forest of Compiegne.

NOVEMBER 15

The editor of the Washington Post was surprised to find that "Opposition has suddenly developed in this country to the proposal for a league of nations to guarantee the permanency of the peace that has been won in the war." Senators Knox, Poindexter, and Senator James A. Reed (Democrat) attack the League. (See Washington Post, November 16–22, 1918.)

DECEMBER 3

Senator KNOX. Resolution * * * (3) "That any project for any general League of Nations or for any sweeping change in the ancient laws of the sea * * * should be postponed for separate consideration not alone by the victorious belligerents but by all the nations i. and when at some future time general conferences on those subjects might be deemed useful."

Early in December, T. Roosevelt and Senator Lodge held a conference in New York City. It was agreed that if the President secured a League of Nations along the lines explained to the country throughout the preceding 3 years it should be attacked by reservations. (See D. F. Fleming, op. cit., p. 21 For account of this conference, see New York Times, October 29 and 30, 1920. Corinne Roosevelt Robinson, my brother, Theodore Roosevelt, New York, 1921, pp. 361–352 See also D. F. Flemming, The United States and the League of Nations, op. cit., pp. 72f.)

See furthermore letter by Senator Lodge to Henry White (Apr. 8, 1919). "Two weeks before his death I had two long talks with Theodore (Roosevelt). The draft that Mr. Wilson finally produced was not then in our hands but Theodore and I discussed the whole question with the greatest thoroughness, and we were in full agreement. I am following precisely the line that he wished me to follow and that he mapped out as the true line to be followed with the League whenever it came before us." (Allan Nevins, Henry White, New York, 1930, p. 413f.)

DECEMBER 14

The American press carried a dispatch saying that the President regarded the creation of a league of nations as the foremost task of the Peace Conference.

DECEMBER 18

Senator Knox suggests again postponement of any action on the League.

DECEMBER 21

Lodge in the Senate: "All * * * untoward results can be avoided if the Senate frankly expresses its views beforehand on certain leading points for the consideration of the Allies."

1919

JANUARY 3

Editorial written by Theodore Roosevelt on January 3 and published January 13 in the Kansas City Star: "Mr. Taft has recently defined the purpose of the League and the limitations under which it would act, in a way that enables most of us to say we very heartily agree in principle with this theory and can, without doubt, come to an agreement on specific details."

JANUARY 14

Senator Borah attacks the idea of a league by saying: "We have come in contact with two evil forces from the Old World—Prussianism and internationalism."

JANUARY 18

President Wilson delivers address at the opening session of the Peace Conference. "It seems to me that we must concert our best judgment in order to make this League of Nations a vital thing, not merely a formal thing."

JANUARY 25

Sun editorial: "Republican Senators say that a league without force to back its decrees amounts to little more than an 'international quilting circle.' They are not concerned over the final form which any noneffective league takes."

FEBRUARY 19

Senator Poindexter attacked Covenant of the League of Nations as surrendering high functions of sovereignty. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57–4, p. 3748.)

FEBRUARY 21

Senator Borah made speech against the Covenant of the League of Nations. (Ibid., pp. 3911–3915.)

FEBRUARY 22

Senator Reed denounced League of Nations as abrogation of the Monroe Doctrine. (Ibid., pp. 4026–4033.)

FEBRUARY 24

President Wilson lands at Boston, Mass., and delivers address in Mechanics Hall at which Governor Calvin Coolidge presided. President Wilson said: "* * * Arrangements of the present peace cannot stand a generation unless they are guaranteed by the united forces of the civilized world. And if we do not guarantee them can you not see the picture?"

FEBRUARY 26

Senator Cummins attacked the League in the Senate. He said, among other things, that the civil-service employees in Constantinople would "outnumber our employees in Washington." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57–5, pp. 4309–4316.)

President Wilson met members of the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations at the White House in conference on the League of Nations.

FEBRUARY 28

The Sun reports on February 28, 1919, on the White House conference, that the United States under the Covenant "must surrender vital points of sovereignty. Chinese and Japanese exclusion goes out of American control into the hands of League control. Ireland is to be left to the mercies of England."

Senator Lodge made speech against the Covenant of the League of Nations. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57–5, pp. 4520–4528.)

MARCH 1

Senator Knox attacked the Covenant of the League of Nations as productive of future wars. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57–5, p. 4687.)

MARCH 3

Senator McCumber (Republican of North Dakota) defends the League. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57–5, pp. 4872–4882.)

MARCH 3–4

Resolution recommending rejection of proposed League of Nations presented in Senate and round robin signed March 2 by H. C. Lodge and 38 other Senators.

The proposed resolution states that the Covenant of the League "in the form now proposed to the peace conference should not be accepted by the United States."

MARCH 4

Senator Lodge became chairman of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations.

Congress adjourned.

President Wilson delivers address at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, at which ex-President Taft also spoke in favor of the League of Nations: "My fellow citizens: * * * the first thing that I am going to tell the people on the other side of the water is that an overwhelming majority of the American people is in favor of the League of Nations. I know that that is true. I have had unmistakable intimations of it from all parts of the country, and the voice rings true in every case.

"I account myself fortunate to speak here under the unusual circumstances of this evening. I am happy to associate myself with Mr. Taft in this great cause. He has displayed an elevation of view and devotion to public duty which is beyond praise. And I am the more happy because this means that this is not a party issue. No party has a right to appropriate this issue and no party will in the long run dare to oppose it.

"We have listened to so clear and admirable an exposition (Mr. Taft's address having preceded that of the President) of many of the main features of the proposed Covenant of the League of Nations that it is perhaps not necessary for me to discuss in any particular way the contents of the document.

"Mr. Taft has set a picture for you of what failure of this great purpose would mean."

MARCH 1

Senator Knox assailed League of Nations. The Covenant strikes "down the precepts of the Constitution"; he envisioned our boys being ordered by the League to "the aid of Armenia, or to the sleeping-death regions of Central Africa, or to the inhospitable South Pacific isles. * * * Let the discussion of a league of nations be postponed for later consideration * * * when at some future time a general conference on this subject may be both possible and useful." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57-5, pp. 4687-4694.)

MARCH 2

Senator Brandegee suggests that "some declaration * * * be made, receiving for it, if possible, the signatures of more than one-third of the Senate, to the effect that a League of Nations * * * could not be passed." (H. C. Lodge, The Senate and the League of Nations, New York, 1925, p. 118.)

MARCH 9

Henry White cabled to Senator Lodge: "I should be grateful if you would cable, in cipher through the Department of State, to me the exact phraseology of amendments modifying the League of Nations Covenant which Senate considers important. It is our desire to meet the Senate's views as closely as it is possible." (Full text of the telegram and Mr. Lodge's comment in H. C. Lodge, The Senate and the League of Nations, op. cit., p. 123.)

MARCH 15

Lodge to White: "Have considered your cable of March 9. The President expressed no willingness to receive any communication from the Senate while that body was in session."

MARCH 18

Mr. Taft to Mr. Wilson (telegram): "If you bring back the treaty with the League of Nations in it, make more specific reservation of the Monroe Doctrine, fix a term for the duration of the League, and the limit of armament, require expressly unanimity of action in the Executive Council and Body of Delegates, and add to article XV a provision that where the Executive Council of the Body of Delegates finds the difference to grow out of an exclusively domestic policy, it shall recommend no settlement, the ground will be completely cut from under the opponents of the League in the Senate." (Text of this cable in D. Hunter Miller, the Drafting of the Covenant, New York, 1928, vol. I, p. 277.)

APRIL 28

Text of the revised Covenant released by the State Department.

APRIL 28-29

Members of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress were asked in a telegram today, signed by leading Italians in this city, to support Italy in the Fiume controversy. (From a clipping.)

MAY 9

Secretary Tumulty makes public a cablegram from President Wilson: "I have promised to propose to the Senate a supplement in which we shall agree subject to the approval of the Council of the League of Nations to come immediately to the assistance of France in case of unprovoked attack by Germany, thus merely hastening the action to which we should be bound by the Covenant."

MAY 10

Senator Brandegee (telegram to the Sun): "I want you to know that there are some determined and resolute men in the Senate who have decided to save this country from the shame and disgrace which President Wilson is preparing for us."

JUNE 7

Ex-President Taft in a speech before the Albany Chamber of Commerce warned: "The opponents of the League * * * have aroused protest against the League among businessmen and partisan Republicans by asserting that Mr. Wilson is seeking personal credit and party advantage in making a League of Nations."

Speech before the New York State convention of the League to Enforce Peace: "This is not a partisan question. We should be for or against the League without respect to whether we are Democrats or Republicans."

JUNE 22-23

The talk of a new "round robin" signed by 28 prominent Republicans led Senator Borah to "threatening that if the Republican Party did not make a party issue of the League of Nations a new party would be created to do so, while a half dozen other Senators ridiculed the statement as coming from 'the Taft crowd.'" (D. F. Fleming, The United States and the League of Nations op. cit., p. 225)

JUNE 28

Peace treaty with Germany signed in Paris. (Treaty of Versailles.)

JULY 8

President Wilson arrives in New York. Delivers address in Carnegie Hall. "Yes, the formulation of the peace is ended, but it creates only a new task just begun. * * * And now the great task is to preserve it." (Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson, vol. III, I, p. 532.)

JULY 10

President Wilson formally presented the peace treaty with Germany to the Senate urging ratification: "I avail myself of the earliest opportunity to lay the treaty before you for ratification. * * * It had been our privilege to formulate the principles which were accepted as the basis of the peace. * * * They spoke the conscience of the world as well as the conscience of America." (Ibid., p. 537.)

JULY 21

Senator Harrison: "Your opposition arose simply and merely because he (the President) happened to be the spokesman and leader of another political party. I had never believed that partisanship could become so acute that jealous leaders would rather see the star of their country dimmed than to witness the ascendancy of an individual because he was of a different political faith." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 58-3, p. 2939.)

JULY 23

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries an editorial from the National Republican: "Of course, if it had been the desire of President Wilson or his party henchmen in the Senate to bring about the creation of a satisfactory league of nations. * * * Instead of this they (attempted) * * * to force the political opposition into what they believe would be a hole, by attempting to make the public believe that the Republican Senators oppose any arrangement for forming a world organization to prevent war." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 58-3, p. 3047.)

AUGUST 12

Senator Lodge made speech against the proposed League: "We, too, have our ideals, even if we differ from those who have tried to establish a monopoly on idealism. Our ideal is our country. * * * Our ideal is to make her ever stronger and better and finer, because in this way alone, as we believe, can she be of the greatest service to the world's peace and to the welfare of mankind."

AUGUST 19

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in conference with President Wilson at the White House on the German peace treaty.

AUGUST 23

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations voted for adoption of amendment to German Peace Treaty providing for reversion of German rights in Shantung to China instead of Japan.

Senate Committee on Foreign Relations voted for adoption of amendment to German peace treaty to eliminate the United States from membership on all commissions except that on reparations.

SEPTEMBER 4

President Wilson started for the West on speaking tour to make direct appeal to the people for the German peace treaty and the League of Nations. Address at Columbus, Ohio, "* * * it has become increasingly necessary, apparently, that I should report to you (the people of the United States). * * * As I said this treaty was not intended merely to end this war. It was intended to prevent any similar war. * * * When gentlemen tell you, therefore, that the League of Nations is intended for some other purpose than this, merely reply this to them: If we do not do this thing, we have neglected the central covenant that we made to our people, and there will then be no statesmen of any country who can thereafter promise his people alleviation from the perils of war."

SEPTEMBER 10

Senator Lodge, Chairman of Foreign Relations Committee, presented majority report of Committee on Treaty of Versailles presenting together with the more than 50 amendments agreed to by the committee and four reservations. (Cf. H. C. Lodge, the Senate and the League of Nations, op. cit., p. 173.)

SEPTEMBER 14

The New York Times reports from Washington. "A written appeal for ratification without delay or amendment of the Versailles treaty of peace has been submitted to every Member of the Senate by 250 leading Americans, Republicans as well as Democrats, in a nonpartisan effort to bring about prompt action by the Senate on the treaty. * * * No partisan plea can be made. Party lines are already broken. We beseech the Senate to give the land peace and certainty by a ratification which will not keep us longer in the shadows of possible war, but give the whole world the light of peace." (Rejects Lodge amendments.) Signers include: Ex-President Taft, ex-Attorney General Wickersham, President Lowell of Harvard, Judge

George Gray of Delaware, President Gompers of the A. F. L.

SEPTEMBER 20

Secretary of State Lansing declared: "The treaty should be ratified without delay and without change." It was his first public utterance made by him since the statement of William C. Bullitt before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in which it was alleged that the Secretary of State on May 19 in Paris said that if the American people knew what was in the treaty they would defeat it.

SEPTEMBER 26

President Wilson at Pueblo, Colo., on return from the Pacific coast, forced by illness to give up his speaking tour and return to Washington. In the course of this tour he had delivered 37 speeches within 22 days.

OCTOBER 2

Herbert Hoover in an address to the students of Stanford University: "If the League of Nations is to break down we must at once prepare to fight. * * * The peace treaties cannot be carried out without the League. If the League fails the treaties also fall. In that event civilization will be taken back to the Middle Ages."

OCTOBER 11

George Harvey wrote: "Senator Lodge is now in full control of the situation" (Harvey's Weekly, vol. II, No. 41, p. 2).

OCTOBER 27

The amendment of Senator JOHNSON of California providing for equality of voting in the council and the assembly of the League was defeated.

NOVEMBER 13

Senate adopted reservation to article X of Covenant of the League of Nations, declaring that military or naval forces of the United States cannot be used under the article without consent of Congress by act or joint resolution. "Therefore, when we came to the final vote on this reservation * * * the line was sharply drawn, and it was really the test vote on the adoption of what was known as the Lodge reservations. The reservation was carried by a vote of 46 to 33." (Lodge, op. cit., p. 185.)

NOVEMBER 18

President Wilson's letter to Senator Hitchcock in which he said that the majority reservations amounted to nullification of the treaty. "I trust that all true friends of the League will refuse to support the Lodge resolution."

NOVEMBER 19

Motion for ratification of Treaty of Versailles.

(a) Conditional ratification: Treaty plus Lodge reservations defeated; ayes 41 (39), nays 51.

(b) Unconditional ratification: 38 for and 53 against. Congress adjourned.

NOVEMBER 29

Senator Newberry indicted of violating the Federal Corrupt Practices Act; sentenced to 2 years prison. However, on May 2, 1921, the Supreme Court freed him by declaring the law under which he was convicted unconstitutional.

1920

JANUARY 8

President Wilson writes letter to chairman of Jackson Day celebration, explaining his attitude as to reservations, stating that he has no objection to interpretative reservations, but strongly objects to reservations which are really nullifications of the Covenant.

JANUARY 10

Ratification of the Treaty of Versailles automatically brings the League of Nations into existence.

JANUARY 13

President Wilson called first meeting of the Council of the League of Nations. Cablegram addressed to the Government of Great Britain. "In compliance with article V of the Covenant of the League of Nations * * * the President of the United States * * * has the honor to inform the Government of Great Britain that the first meeting of the Council of the League of Nations will be held in Paris at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Friday, January 16, at 10:30 a. m. * * *"

JANUARY 14

Japan issues an announcement to China that she has succeeded to the German rights in Shantung by virtue of the peace treaty and demands direct negotiations in accordance with the demands of 1915.

JANUARY 16

First meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, at Paris. Present: Belgium, Brazil, the British Empire, France, Greece, Italy, Japan, and Spain.

JANUARY 24

Return of the American Expeditionary Force completed.

JANUARY 26

"There can be no compromise of principle," declared Senator Lodge. (New York Tribune, January 27, 1920.)

"I had made up my mind at the beginning," added Lodge in 1925, "that if the conference was to break up it should be on Article 10, which was the crucial point throughout the contest over the Covenant of the League of Nations." (Lodge, op. cit., p. 194.)

From President Wilson's letter to Senator Hitchcock (January 26, 1920): "I am happy to add * * * that I have once more gone over the reservations proposed by yourself, the copy of which I return herewith, and am glad to say that I can accept them as they stand * * *" (Fleming quotes this letter as of January 28.)

JANUARY 31

Statement of Senator Lodge: "For the past 2 weeks nine Senators—four Democrats and five Republicans—have been meeting to consider the question of changes in the reservations adopted by the Senate before the adjournment of the last session of Congress, commonly known as the Lodge reservations. The Senators who thus met did not constitute a committee. The meetings were entirely informal and it was understood at the outset that they had no power or authority whatever to bind anyone. Their only purpose was to see whether there were any changes which they would be willing to lay before all the other members of the Senate for their consideration. No final agreement, even to submit any changes to their colleagues in the Senate, was reached." (Lodge, op. cit., p. 195.)

FEBRUARY 1

Ambassador Grey (letter to the London Times, published in the New York Times): "If the outcome of long controversy in the Senate is to offer co-operation in the League of Nations it would be the greatest mistake to refuse that cooperation because conditions are attached to it, and when that cooperation is occupied let it not be accepted in a spirit of pessimism."

MARCH 8

President Wilson's letter to Hitchcock: "If article X is not adopted and acted upon, the governments which reject it will, I think, be guilty of bad faith to their people * * *. I hear of reservationists and mild reservationists, but I cannot understand the difference between a nullifier and a mild nullifier."

MARCH 18

"The resolution of ratification was presented to the Senate together with the reservations already adopted in the Committee of the Whole." (Lodge, op. cit., p. 208.)

MARCH 19

The resolution of ratification plus reservations was voted upon and received 49 votes in the affirmative, 35 votes being cast against it.

Resolution to return the Treaty to the President: "As I thought that the time had now come to make final disposition of the Treaty of Versailles, I moved to return it to the President. The vote in favor of this resolution stood 47 to 37; all the Republicans and six Democrats voted or were paired in favor of sending the treaty back to the President." (Lodge, op. cit., p. 208.)

MARCH 20

Senator Newberry and 16 codefendants found guilty of corrupt practices in election and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment; Newberry to 2 years and $10,000 fine.

APRIL 9

Joint resolution to end war with Germany passed House by vote of 242 to 150.

APRIL 19-26

Conference of San Remo. A mandate for Armenia is offered to the United States.

MAY 9

President Wilson sends telegram to Oregon Democrats: "I think it imperative that the party should at once proclaim itself the uncompromising champion of the Nation's honor and the advocate of everything that the United States can do in the service of humanity; that it should therefore endorse and support the Versailles Treaty and condemn the Lodge reservations as utterly inconsistent with the Nation's honor and destructive of the world leadership which it had established, and which all the free peoples of the world, including the Great Powers themselves, had shown themselves ready to welcome. * * * The League of Nations is the hope of the world. * * * The Democratic Party has now a great opportunity to which it must measure up. The honor of the Nation is in its hands."

MAY 13

Senate resolution expressed congratulations to Armenian people on recognition of independence.

MAY 24

President Wilson sends message to Congress: "In response to the invitation of the Council at San Remo, I urgently advise and request that the Congress grant the Executive power to accept for the United States a mandate over Armenia."

MAY 27

Knox resolution to declare a state of peace with Germany vetoed by President Wilson.

MAY 28

Motion to pass Knox resolution over President Wilson's veto defeated in House by vote of 219 to 152, a two-thirds majority being necessary for adoption.

JUNE 1

By a vote of 23 for and 52 against, the United States Senate "respectfully declines" to grant the power requested in message of May 14, 1920, to establish an American mandate over Armenia.

JUNE 8-12

National Republican Convention met in Chicago. Warren G. Harding nominated for President on the tenth ballot; Gov. Calvin Coolidge nominated for Vice President.

JUNE 28

National Democratic Convention met in San Francisco. James M. Cox, Governor of Ohio, nominated for President (July 5) and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, was chosen for Vice President by acclamation.

JULY 15

President Wilson calls first meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations on November 15 at Geneva, Switzerland.

OCTOBER 3

President Wilson in letter addressed to voters, asked for endorsement of the League of Nations at the election in November. "You have been grossly misled with regard to the treaty, and particularly with regard to the proposed character of the League of Nations, by those who have assumed the serious responsibility of opposing it. * * * Those who drew the Covenant of the League * * * would have been amazed and indignant at the things that are now being ignorantly said about this great and sincere document. The whole world will wait for your verdict as it would wait for an intimation of what its future is to be."

OCTOBER 15

Thirty-one leading Republicans signed a statement made public on October 15, endorsing the League. Signatories include: Elihu Root, President Lowell of Harvard University, President Butler of Columbia University, Herbert Hoover, Charles E Hughes, Henry W. Taft, the brother of ex-President Taft. Prof. P. C. Jessup comments on this statement as follows:

"At the time the paper caused a considerable stir, eliciting high praise and severe condemnation. It unquestionably had a great effect in turning toward Harding the votes of many sincere believers in the League." (P. C. Jessup, Elihu Root, New York, 1938, vol. 2, p. 413.)

OCTOBER 20

Elihu Root delivered a speech at a meeting under the direction of the National Republican Club, New York; he said, in part: "It is my purpose to speak this evening of the League of Nations. * * * I think a large majority of the American people earnestly wish for an organization among civilized nations, through which the nations shall cooperate to prevent future wars, and that the United States shall do her full share in that organization. I certainly desire this very strongly, and I shall assume that you have the same feeling."

NOVEMBER 2

Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge elected for President and Vice President.

"This means the death of the League of Nations" said Senator Borah, commenting on the election results.

NOVEMBER 3

However, the impossible, fortunately, has not happened.

The United States will now proceed to look after its own business, allowing other nations to do the same.

The United States will repair and restore its Constitution, shot to pieces by one-man autocracy in wartime. A good deal of silly nonsense died in this election, and the country is thankful for it.

Now watch the League of Nations crumble abroad, Europe having learned today that Uncle Sam is not to be the "angel of the show."

Secretary Tumulty, leaving the White House, quotes Wilson: "I would rather be defeated in a cause that some day will triumph, than triumph in a cause that some day will be defeated."

Globe (by Frank J. Taylor): "Senator, the Globe has supported you believing in the League of Nations. The Globe wants to know, now that you are elected, whether or not you intend to enter a league." To which Senator Harding replied: "You can assure the Globe that it need have no apprehension about our entering into a league or association of nations. I have covered that question thoroughly in my campaign, I hope. The Globe need have no worries."

New York Times editorial: "Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. Borah, and all the legions of bitter-end opposition will resist to the uttermost all attempts to move the country from the attitude of isolation in which they have sought to place it. The contest will be rude but his (Harding's) administration will be ruined if it yields to these counselors of evil."

NOVEMBER 15–DECEMBER 16

First meeting of the assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva.

Mr. President, in case this chronology of the Frick-Knox-Lodge conspiracy may not be accepted as conclusive, let me produce some expert witnesses on the subject of that conspiracy.

First, let us consider the memoirs of former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, published in 1936.

Everybody believes that he (Woodrow Wilson) made the greatest blunder of his life when he went to Paris. * * * Then came the fight in the Senate over the ratification of that treaty, the adoption of which would have landed us immediately and unreservedly in the League of Nations, and would at once have embroiled us in all the unknown and unknowable entanglements of European politics. I cannot believe that there are any great number of people in this country today who wish that we were partners in that enterprise or who down in their hearts are sorry that that treaty was not ratified by the Senate of the United States, and yet 36 of us waged that fight and saved our country from that inconceivable disaster.

We had not been in the contest 10 days (sic) before Senator Lodge called me over the telephone and asked me to take dinner with him that evening. * * * At that Sunday evening dinner he said to me that, while Senator Curtis was the regular whip and would have charge of all matters pertaining to the ordinary routine of legislation, yet he wanted me as his special representative to have charge of the organization in the Senate in the League of Nations fight. He asked me to keep "mum" on this assignment and to report to nobody but him, to which I readily agreed. My service having been largely in the House up to that time, I had never had to deal with a treaty concerning which there was any conflict and knew little or nothing of the procedure in such cases. "Senator," I said to him, "I don't see how we are ever going to defeat this proposition. It appears to me that 80 percent of the people are for it. Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war and who imagine this opens a way to world peace are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it."

He turned to me and said: "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

"What do you mean by that?" I asked. "Illustrate it to me."

He then went on to explain how, for instance, we would demand a reservation on the subject of submitting to our Government the assumption of a mandate over Armenia, or any other foreign country. "We can debate that for days and hold up the dangers that it will involve and the responsibilities we will assume if we propose that course, and we can thoroughly satisfy the country that that would be a most abhorrent policy for us to adopt."

I paused to remark what a beautiful mess we would be in today, if we had accepted a mandate over Armenia. Yet that is precisely what President Wilson expected us to do.

Senator Lodge then went on for 2 hours to explain other reservations and went into the details of the situation that would be thus evolved until I became thoroughly satisfied that the treaty could be beaten in that way.

It was fought through the Senate at length, covering about 2 months of time, and undoubtedly it was the most absorbing and brilliant contest ever waged in that body since the Civil War. Everything else was swept aside and the whole country gave earnest heed to everything that was said and done from start to finish.

Senator Miles Poindexter, of Washington, fired the first projectile [sic] in the Senate against the Versailles Treaty, and thereafter the battle raged with undiminished fury until the day of the vote. Senator William E. Borah and Senator James A. Reed reached the very acme of their oratorical ability and fame in antagonizing our entrance into the League of Nations; also, Senator George H. Moses and Senator Frank B. Brandegee were constantly prodding and probing and piercing and jabbing at the treaty day after day until, operating in conjunction with others, they left it an inane and lifeless skeleton.

The fight on the floor of the Senate on the Republican side was led by Borah. He was so ably seconded by HIRAM JOHNSON that it was difficult to tell which [sic] was dealing the more destructive blows to the treaty or rendering the greater service to the country.

Then let me quote from the correspondence of Mr. Henry White, Republican member of the peace delegation which accompanied Wilson to Paris.

On March 7, 1919, White wrote Senator Lodge:

Your suggestion that the League be made up by the European nations, whose interests are chiefly concerned, is impossible to carry out, for the reason that none of them will be willing to form any such league unless we are parties thereto.

At the same time, Mr. White wrote Congressman Rodgers that—

It seems to me that a frightful responsibility will rest upon any set of men who are instrumental in preventing the trial, at least, of an experiment to settle international differences in some other way than by methods involving such frightful sacrifice of human life and tending toward the destruction of civilization.

Finally, let me quote from George Harvey, himself, who, as editor of Harvey's Weekly, and political sponsor of Warren G. Harding, spearheaded the journalistic attack upon President Wilson and the League of Nations.

Mr. Harvey, whom President Harding later sent as our ambassador to London, is quoted by Mr. D. F. Fleming, in his book The United States and the League of Nations, on pages 208 to 211, as follows:

The strategy here agreed upon was undoubtedly clever and it was most ably followed up in the months to come. It was, moreover, a good bargain for both leaders.

If it could be executed, Lodge had the practical certainty that at the worst the Republican trade-mark would be stamped on the League; Borah knew from long experience that he need not have much fear of any treaty that Mr. Lodge set out to "perfect."

One first requisite was essential to success—control of the Senate machinery. This control was in their hands. The Foreign Relations Committee could take all the time that was necessary and when it was ready to

move it could attach to the Covenant, by a bare majority of the Senate, such amendments or reservations as seemed likely to be effective.

A WAR CHEST NECESSARY

This group might thus hope to prevail unless public support of the League continued to be so strong that it would be unsafe to delay the treaty or seriously to modify our adhesion to the League. To succeed it was necessary to expand the campaign to arouse popular sentiment against the League.

This effort would require a great deal of money and the funds of the group were small. No one had yet been found who was willing to pour out large sums to defeat the achievement of a great cooperative endeavor of the nations to free themselves from the wholesale destruction of periodic warfare of life, wealth and the orderly virtues which constitute civilization.

The immeasurable folly of continuing a state of international anarchy was so clear at the hour that contributions of money went to the cause of the League rather than against it.

The situation was very serious for the opposition when, one evening in May 1919, says George Harvey, the group opposed to joining the League, assembled at their accustomed meeting place in Senator Brandegee's residence in Washington, were apprized that their whole plan of campaign was seriously endangered. Their strategy had consisted of disseminating propaganda chiefly throughout the Middle West at mass meetings and by distributing quantities of campaign literature for the purpose of starting backfires upon wavering Senators.

The campaign had progressed favorably, continues Harvey, but the time had come when essential traveling and mailing expenditures required considerable sums, and the modest funds which the committee had been able to supply were completely exhausted.

The problem of ways and means, to oppose successfully skillful antagonists suffering from no such handicap was poignant. The finding of a deeper reservoir upon which to draw for financial aid had become a paramount necessity.

FRICK AND MELLON APPEALED TO

Various plans were rejected and the outlook was lamentably gloomy when, late in the evening Senator Knox suggested as a last resort an appeal to two multimillionaires among his Pennsylvania friends, H. C. Frick and Andrew W. Mellon, who were accustomed to act together in such matters.

Mr. Frick, according to his biographer, was a staunch Republican of the type of George F. Edmunds, who held to his dying day that the Democratic Party never was, is not and never will be fit to govern the United States.

Support might therefore be expected from him if the matter could be properly put up to him. Circumstances, too, favored such a presentation of the case to him.

Mr. Frick was giving a dinner in New York the next evening for Gen. Leonard Wood to which the New York representative in the conference on ways and means, presumably Harvey, was invited.

It was, accordingly, arranged that he should broach the matter to Frick and fortunately for his design, the delegated conspirator, to use Harvey's phrase, was asked by his host to remain after the party and tell him about the contest over the League.

"Marveling at this auspicious fortuity, the eager propagandist set forth the stock arguments of the group of irreconcilables with whom he was alined as succinctly as possible, although at considerable length.

After further explanation Mr. Frick characterized joining the League as a crazy thing to do and agreed to help fight it.

A DEEP RESERVOIR FOUND

"Three days later the New York member of the cabal" received a note from Senator Knox, written in the Senate Chamber, saying that he had been able to obtain "the same amount from Mr. Mellon" and that Senator McCormick, of Illinois, said he could now go to Chicago and "raise about 20."

"The desired reservoir had been found and it was both deep and full. All anxiety respecting sinews of war was dispelled. Rejoicing pervaded the camp of the irreconcilables, efforts were redoubled all along the line and the redoubtle little band pushed on to the victory which, whether desirable or not, presently was won in the Senate and ultimately was ratified by the people.

"Mr. Frick's interest became intense and never flagged for a moment during the 7 months left to him of earthly existence. After listening, 3 days before he died, to an encouraging report of progress in what proved to be his last fight, he smiled contentedly and pronounced it 'good.'"

After his death, recorded Harvey, in beginning the narrative thus concluded, appraisal of Mr. Frick's estate showed that his fortune "shrank many millions between the beginning and the ending of the war of the United States against the Central Powers."

How much of this shrinkage of millions was due to Frick's intense share in the fight on the League is not made clear.

The continuance of Mr. Mellon's support in sums approaching those of Frick is indicated by Harvey's statement that the two were the only multimillionaires "who supported quietly, but effectively, the successful organized effort to prevent the inclusion of the United States in the League of Nations."

AN EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN LAUNCHED

The money reservoir of "the cabal" was to be henceforth "both deep and full." The second requisite of success was in its hands.

The "organized effort" to arouse distrust of the League could now go forward on a Nation-wide scale backed by practically unlimited funds.

Meetings could be advertised in many cities, for example, as in the Boston Herald and other Boston newspapers of July 8, 1919:

"AMERICANS, AWAKE!

"Shall we bind ourselves to the war-breeding covenant? It impairs American sovereignty, Surrenders the Monroe Doctrine, flouts Washington's warning, entangles us in European and Asiatic intrigues, sends our boys to fight throughout the world by order of a league, the evil thing with a holy name.

"Mass meeting, Tremont Temple, Tuesday, July 8, at 8 p. m., under the auspices of the League for the Preservation of American Independence. Doors open at 7 o'clock. American songs."

Mr. President, at the risk of repeating some of the material which I have already cited, I should like, in conclusion, to refer to the forecasts of another war, both those made during the last war and those made today, by responsible American leaders. I have already referred to these statements. I ask unanimous consent that the statements be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEN: THE NEXT WAR

Stop for one moment to think about the next war, if there should be one. I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time.

There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction, unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and, shot into the heavens, went for a hundred miles or more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable.

What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers knew what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization. (Woodrow Wilson, Denver, Colo., September 25, 1919.)

If the upshot of this war is inconclusive, the whole world will be preparing for another. The control which within the last century science has given us over the secrets and forces of nature, instead of being used to increase the material comforts and the intellectual and spiritual elevation of mankind, will be exploited for the destruction of our fellow men. (A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard University, Philadelphia, May 17, 1918.)

NOW: THE NEXT WAR

I shudder to think of what will happen to humanity, including ourselves, if this war ends in an inconclusive peace and another war breaks out when the babies of today have grown to fighting age. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, D. C., January 7, 1943.)

If at the conclusion of this war the governments of the United Nations are not afforded by their peoples the opportunity of collaborating together in effective policies of recovery, or of assuming a joint responsibility for making completely sure that the peace of the world is not again violated, there can be no result other than utter disaster. The structure of civilization is not so tough as to make it conceivable that it would resist a repetition of the present holocaust. (Sumner Welles, Toronto, Canada, February 26, 1943.)

If Woodrow Wilson's forecast of a second war infinitely more horrible than the first one has come true because the nations of the world did not "concert the method by which to prevent it," isn't his view of the future just as sound and valid today? If the nations do not concert now to prevent a third war, we will again be plunged into agony. It is not a time either politically or economically or socially for isolation, and if a small group of willful men insist on it they deserve short shrift from their colleagues in the party. (From the Post Standard, Syracuse, N. Y., December 29, 1942.)

THEN: THE NEXT WAR

If the nations of the world do not maintain their concert to sustain the independence and freedom of those peoples (small nations) Germany will yet have her will upon them, and we shall witness the very interesting spectacle of having spent millions and millions of American treasure and, what is more precious, hundreds of thousands of American lives, to do a futile thing, to do a thing which we will then leave to be undone at the leisure of those who are masters of intrigue, at the leisure of those who are masters in combining wrong influences to overcome right influences of those who are the masters of the very things that we hate and mean always to fight. (Woodrow Wilson, Indianapolis, Ind., September 4, 1919.)

Were the United States to withdraw, the League would be nothing but a return to the

system of alliances and the balance of power. We would witness a speedy recurrence of war in which the United States would be as certainly involved as it was in this war.

New inventions for the destruction of men and peoples would finally result in world suicide, while in the interval there would be a story of progressive competition in armaments, with all their heavy burdens upon peoples already burdened almost to the point of exhaustion.

With such a prospect, and to avoid such results, the United States should not hesitate to take its place with other responsible nations of the world and make the light concessions and assume the light burdens involved in membership in the League. (William Howard Taft, New York City, March 4, 1919.)

NOW: THE NEXT WAR

It was at Omaha that he (Woodrow Wilson) declared, only a few weeks before paralysis struck him down, on his tour to win support for the League: "I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war, if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it."

The German invasion of Poland, almost 20 years to the day after Mr. Wilson uttered those words, was the complete confirmation of his forecast. Not only so, but the events that have followed with relentless sequence during the more than 3 years of ever-widening conflict also have borne out the prediction Wilson made a few days later at San Diego that "the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time."

In the light of this remarkable prescience, it is no wonder that men are turning to the writings of Wilson in these grave days and summoning his spirit for guidance. * * * If the Allied statesmen learn aright the lessons which Woodrow Wilson tried to inculcate and a durable peace is builded on the agony and death through which mankind is passing now, the name of this Virginian will shine as brightly down the centuries as that of any other American.

May they have the courage and the idealism and the vision at some future Versailles to make Woodrow Wilson's dream come true. (Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va., December 29, 1942.)

THEN: THE NEXT WAR

If the League of Nations is to break down, we must at once prepare to fight. * * * The peace treaties cannot be carried out without the League. If the League fails, the treaties also fail.

In that event civilization will be taken back to the Middle Ages. (Herbert Hoover, Stanford University, October 2, 1919.)

THEN: ISOLATION OR INTERDEPENDENCE

We have got to depart from the traditional policy (isolation) of this country, I agree. But this war has borne in on us the fact that we are so near to all the nations of the world today that we are vitally interested in keeping war down as far as we can and that we had better step forward and assume certain obligations in the interest of the world and in the interest of mankind because there is a utilitarian reason for it—we are likely to be drawn in ourselves. Therefore, we ought to depart from the policy of isolation that heretofore has served us so well, because we are a strong Nation.

We must bear our share of the responsibilities of the moment, and we must help along the world, and incidentally help along ourselves, for, I believe, even if you view it from a selfish standpoint, in the long run it will be a better policy. (William Howard Taft, Philadelphia, June 17, 1915.)

I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and to encourage peace. (Henry Cabot Lodge, Washington, D. C., May 27, 1916.)

NOW: ISOLATION OR INTERDEPENDENCE

If our withdrawal from world affairs after the last war was a contributing factor to the present war and to the economic instability of the past 20 years—and it seems plain that it was—a withdrawal from the problems and responsibilities of the world after this war would be a sheer disaster.

Even our relative geographical isolation no longer exists. (Wendell Willkie, One World, 1943, p. 84.)

Our American history has not been achieved in isolation from the rest of mankind; there is no more dangerous folly than to think that its achievement can be preserved in isolation. (Cordell Hull, Cambridge, Mass., June 20, 1940.)

THEN: ISOLATION OR INTERDEPENDENCE

The isolation of the United States is at an end, not because we chose to go into the politics of the world, but because by sheer genius of this people and the growth of our power we have become a determining factor in the history of mankind. (Woodrow Wilson, Des Moines, Iowa, September 6, 1919.)

NOW: ISOLATION OR INTERDEPENDENCE

Our world is a smaller community than were our original 13 States. It can be encompassed in 4 days' travel. It can be instantly informed of the news and views of all peoples. It will know peace and opportunity and freedom as a whole, or no part of it will long be secure or prosperous or assuredly free. (Elbert D. Thomas, Senator from Utah, N. B. C. broadcast, June 5, 1943.)

Some indeed still hold to the new somewhat obvious delusion that we of the United States can safely permit the United States to become a lone island, a lone island in a world dominated by the philosophy of force. Such an island may be the dream of those who still talk and vote as isolationists. Such an island represents to me and to the overwhelming majority of Americans today a helpless nightmare, the helpless nightmare of a people without freedom, cuffed, hungry, and fed through the bars from day to day by the contemptuous, unpitying masters of other continents. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Charlottesville, Va., June 10, 1940.)

THEN: ISOLATION OR INTERDEPENDENCE

What is our own business? Is there any merchant * * * or any manufacturer, or any banker who can say that our interests are separate from the interests of the rest of the world, commercially, industrially, financially?

There is not a man in any of those professions who does not admit that our industrial fortunes are tied up with the industrial fortunes of the rest of the world. (Woodrow Wilson, St. Louis, September 5, 1919.)

The argument that to enter this Covenant is a departure from time-honored policy of avoiding entangling alliances with Europe is an argument that is blind to the changed circumstances in our present situation.

The war itself ended that policy. * * * We were driven into it because, with the dependence of all the world upon our resources of food, raw materials, and manufacture, with our closeness, under modern conditions of transportation and communication, to Europe, it was impossible for us to maintain the theory of an isolation that did not in fact exist.

It will be equally impossible for us to keep out of another general European war. We are, therefore, just as much interested in stopping such a war as if we were in Europe. (William Howard Taft, St. Louis, February 25, 1919.)

THEN: MAGNA CARTA OF NATIONS

It is our duty to remember that a nation has no moral right to do injustice to another nation, strong or weak, than an individual has to do injustice to another individual; that the same moral law applies in the one case as in the other (Theodore Roosevelt, International Police, 1919, p. 227.)

If I did not believe that the moral judgment would be the lasting judgment, the final judgment, in the minds of men as well as the tribunal of God, I could not believe in popular government. (Woodrow Wilson, Annapolis, Md., June 5, 1914.)

The choice is between two ideals: On the one hand, the ideal of democracy, which represents the rights of free peoples everywhere to govern themselves, and on the other hand, the ideal of imperialism which seeks to dominate by force and unjust power. (Woodrow Wilson.)

The peace that is sought is a peace of justice, not a peace of force. The universal peace must come through the proper development of the free national states, and through the voluntary recognition by those national states that they are members in a society of states.

That voluntary recognition of international duties is the thing that has been sadly lacking. (Dwight W. Morrow, the Society of Free States, 1919, p. 184.)

Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace, the very principle of which is equality, and a common participation is a common benefit. (Woodrow Wilson, Washington, January 22, 1917.)

But the progress of the great world movement that has doomed autocracy cannot be turned back, or defeated.

That is the great peace movement.

There the millions who have learned under freedom to hope and aspire for better things are paying the price that the peaceful peoples of the earth may live in security under the protection of law based upon all-embracing justice and supreme in the community of nations. (Elihu Root, Washington, D. C., April 26, 1917.)

NOW: MAGNA CARTA OF NATIONS

What is it that in last resort should rule and guide the action of men and shape the public policies of the governments which the several nations may from time to time set up? Obviously, it is the moral law. This moral law is not difficult to understand. * * * unless it be learned, however, there is no escape from that barbarism which is return to the jungle. (Nicholas Murray Butler, Southampton, N. Y., September 3, 1939.)

THEN: MAGNA CARTA OF NATIONS

We believe these fundamental things: First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. * * * second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon. (Woodrow Wilson, Washington, D. C., May 27, 1916.)

THEN: WORLD ORGANIZATION

The free peoples of the world must draw together in some common covenant, some genuine and practical cooperation, that will in effect combine their force to secure peace and justice in the dealings of nations with one another. The brotherhood of man must no longer be a fair but empty phrase; it must be given a structure of force and reality.

The nations must realize their common life and effect a workable partnership to secure that life against the aggressions of autocratic and self-pleasing power. (Woodrow Wilson,

message to the Russian Government, June 8, 1917.)

There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is an offensive and defensive alliance of great powers.

The other type is a society of free nations, or a league of free nations, animated by considerations of right and justice, instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace, but so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility.

Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinction as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society, or a league, or what not. (Warren Gamaliel Harding, August 28, 1920.)

NOW: WORLD ORGANIZATION

Thus those discussions come back to Woodrow Wilson's original idea of the League of Nations as an international council that would, whenever need arose, correct injustices, ameliorate grievances, protect minorities and small powers, and adjust all differences, territorial and otherwise, that might lead to war.

Is it too much to hope that the "better way" of which Wilson spoke can this time be found? (From the Newark (N. J.) News of December 30, 1942.)

There is only one answer. The struggle for the unity of the world has come to a head in our century. This revolution was implicit in the last war and we resisted it; it is explicit and imperative in this war. Every invention and discovery man has made for a hundred years makes the earth smaller.

Every push of machine, every movement of his mind, every airplane and wave-length and power plant has leaped across frontiers. * * * The pressure is for unity and the conflict is between unity under domination and unity under freedom. (Anne O'Hare McCormick, New York Times, August 30, 1942.)

THEN: WORLD ORGANIZATION

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice, and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference, whenever peace shall be threatened, by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war. (Republican Party Platform, 1920.)

NOW: WORLD ORGANIZATION

The League of Nations envisaged a plan of peace not impossible of attainment if its defects are remedied in the light of the experience gained under that plan. The great objective of victory is to eliminate the scourge of war. The trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace consider that to this end all feasible plans should be thoroughly explored, but they repeat that the sacrifices entailed by the present war will be unavailing unless the peace is made secure through organized international cooperation. (The Trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, December 14, 1942.)

THEN: WORLD ORGANIZATION

You cannot establish freedom without force, and the only force you can substitute for an armed mankind is the concerted force or the combined action of mankind through the instrumentality of all the enlightened governments of the world. This is the only conceivable system that you can substitute for the old order of things which brought the calamity of war upon us. Your choice is between the League of Nations and Germanism. (Woodrow Wilson, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., September 8, 1919.)

NOW: WORLD ORGANIZATION

Victory connotes the establishment of powerful institutions to guard nations from aggression, and to insure their integrity. Therefore, we fight for a more perfect union, though not uniformity, of the United Nations.

To make this union real, there must be international organization for strategic security, comprising council, court, and military power.

Let us start with a council, or similar body, the name does not matter, to perform the political function of republican government. Representation in such council should be the right of every nation that is willing and competent to collaborate in the development of a code of world conduct. (WARREN R. AUSTIN, Senator from Vermont, NBC broadcast, June 5, 1943.)

NOW: NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

The last and most prevailing objection (to world organization) is that people of the democracies, and especially the people of the United States, will never consent to surrender any portion of the national sovereignty.

If this objection be valid, that ends the discussion. We may as well then throw up our hands and let the world roll on into chaos. Unless the United States espouses, and promptly and vigorously urges, a project of world organization, none such will reach fruition.

No plan of organization, however apt, however desirable, can have any chance of adoption or successful operation unless it is backed by the sentiment of the American electorate. (Owen J. Roberts, Justice, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1943.)

THEN: WORLD COURT

Nations must unite as men must unite to preserve peace and order. The great nations must be so united as to be able to say to any single country, "You must not go to war," and they can say that effectively when the country desiring war knows that the force which the United Nations place behind peace is irresistible.

In differences between individuals, the decision of a court is final, because in the last resort the entire force of the community is behind the court decision.

In differences between nations which go beyond the limited range of arbitral questions, peace can only be maintained by putting behind it the force of united nations determined to uphold it and prevent war. (Henry Cabot Lodge, Schenectady, N. Y., June 1915.)

My proposal is that the efficient civilized nations—those that are efficient in war as well as in peace—shall join a world league for the peace of righteousness. This means that they shall by solemn covenant agree as to their respective rights which shall not be questioned; that they shall agree that all other questions arising between them shall be submitted to a court of arbitration; and that they shall also agree—and here comes the vital and essential point of the whole system—to act with the combined military strength of all of them against any recalcitrant nation, against any nation which transgresses at the expense of any other nation the rights which it is agreed shall not be questioned, or which, on matters that are arbitrable, refuses to submit to the decree of the arbitral court. (Theodore Roosevelt, the Independent, January 4, 1915.)

NOW: WORLD COURT

But * * * to get rid of war we must enthrone justice in the place of force and a decent regard for human rights in the place of violence.

So we must understand that any plan to keep order in our world, and to prevent another war, must include a court system which can deal with the disputes of nations.

For those disputes are not going to end, but to continue. They will be adjusted by one of two means—the means of peaceful decision, or the means of violence. (ELBERT D. THOMAS, Senator from Utah, broadcast over N. B. C., June 5, 1943.)

THEN: WORLD COURT

There is plain need for a league of nations in order to provide for the adequate development of international law, for creating and maintaining organs of international justice, and the machinery of conciliation and conference, and for giving effect to measures for international cooperation which, from time to time, may be agreed upon. (Charles Evans Hughes, a letter to Senator Frederick Hale, July 24, 1919.)

NOW: WORLD COURT

It seems obvious that a world government must have a representative assembly to implement its delegated powers.

Equally plain is the necessity for an executive to administer the laws and see to their enforcement. And under that executive there must be an independent police to effectuate the legislative policy and the executive action pursuant to it.

Lastly, there must be a judiciary to which disputes between the citizens and the supranational government, between citizens and any nation a party to that government, and between nations, must be submitted for adjudication. (Owen J. Roberts, Justice, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1943.)

The structure of this rudimentary world government would be defective without a court of justice.

The peace that prevails within our great country is nourished by the law solely because the law is made a living spirit through the courts of justice backed by force.

This is our guide, as Americans, in planning our footsteps for peace on earth.

To the same purpose would be the application of law by a court or courts to controversies between nations.

Without use of arbitration or civil trial there is no other recourse than force alone. (WARREN R. AUSTIN, Senator from Vermont, June 5, 1943, N. B. C. broadcast.)

THEN: WORLD COURT

Peace can be rebuilt only upon the ancient and accepted principles of international law, only upon those things which remind nations of their duties to each other and, deeper than that, of their duties to mankind. (Woodrow Wilson, Washington, October 11, 1915.)

What we must seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed, and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind. (Woodrow Wilson, Mount Vernon, July 4, 1918.)

NOW: WORLD COURT

We have our choice between looking backward and looking forward. We may, if we insist, continue to look backward, entrench ourselves behind the breastworks of armed and competitive nationalism, relapse into the dull placidity of somnolent selfishness and let civilization take the consequences, whatever these may be.

Or we may look forward and throw our whole force, intellectual and moral, behind those institutions, still in the making, which are the expression and the embodiment of forward-facing men's convictions and ideals.

Chief among these are the institutions for international consultation provided by the League of Nations at Geneva, the institution for judicial determination of international differences provided by the permanent court of international justice at The Hague, and the institution for financial international understanding and cooperation furnished by the bank for international settlements at Basle.

These three cities, Geneva, The Hague, and Basle, embody the hope of the world.

They are centers at which the highest type of human effort will focus itself for the purpose of realizing those ideals of national prosperity, national security, and national happiness which in these modern days can have no other foundation than international understanding, international cooperation, and international peace. (Nicholas Murray Butler, Philadelphia, January 15, 1932.)

NOW: INTERNATIONAL POLICE

The lesson taught by the League of Nations since its history began is that it was without the power to provide an effective force to preserve order in the world upon which it looked.

Even the most law-abiding of peoples require a trained and ready police to meet those emergencies which no one can foresee and which, if not met, become invitations to new disorder and crime. (Nicholas Murray Butler, Southampton, N. Y., September 3, 1939.)

On the principle demonstrated by this war—that peace is indivisible, and that the security of one particular state depends upon the security of the United Nations—it logically follows that provision for military power adequate to overwhelm any violator of the code ought to be available to this community of nations.

The strength of military forces maintained in the separate states pledged to service in the joint peace effort would be relative to the weakness of offender nations. (WARREN R. AUSTIN, Senator from Vermont, N. B. C. broadcast, June 5, 1943.)

THEN: INTERNATIONAL POLICE

In no war, moreover, has the direct interest that neutrals have in preventing a war between neighbors been so clearly made known.

This interest of neutrals has been so forced upon them that it would require only a slight development and growth in the law of international relations to develop that interest into a right to be consulted before such a war among neighbors can be begun.

This step we hope to have taken by the formation of a peace league of the great powers; whose primary and fundamental principle shall be that no war can take place between any two members of the League until they have resorted to the machinery that the League proposes to furnish, to settle the controversy likely to lead to war.

If any member of the League refuses to use this machinery, and attacks another member in breach of its League obligation, all members of the League agree to defend the members attacked by force. (William Howard Taft, Philadelphia, June 17, 1915.)

NOW: INTERNATIONAL POLICE

Out of the horror of this war will come a new order, a league of all nations, with an international police force to maintain order. (Wendell Willkie, Dayton, Ohio, August 9, 1941.)

One thing is certain, in a peace based upon balance of power, the chief energies of nations are either used in maintaining it or in challenging it or getting ready to challenge it.

So there remains for us only one other choice—a choice so far untried as between sovereign nations, though not untried as between partially sovereign states.

That is the creation of a mutual association of the nations of the world, or of enough of the world so that nobody else can do anything to them; who agree to relinquish from their own particular sovereignty certain things, minimum things, to start with, such as police power, and the movement between themselves of goods and materials. (Dorothy Thompson, New York City, May 11, 1942.)

THEN: INTERNATIONAL POLICE

The one permanent move for obtaining peace which has yet been suggested with any reasonable chance of obtaining its objective by an agreement among the great powers, in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal, but to back with force the decisions of that tribunal.

The great civilized nations of the world which do possess force, actual or immediately potential, should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness. (Theodore Roosevelt, New York Times, October 1919.)

We believe it is still necessary to use a threat of overwhelming force of a great league with a willingness to make the threat good in order to frighten nations into a use of rational and peaceful means to settle their issues with their associates of the league. (William Howard Taft, Philadelphia, June 17, 1915.)

Mere agreements may not make peace secure.

It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged or any alliance hitherto formed or projected, that no nation, no probable combination of nations, could face or withstand it. (Woodrow Wilson, Washington, D. C., January 22, 1917.)

THEN: AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

It is surely the manifest destiny of the United States to lead in the attempt to make this spirit (of democracy) prevail. * * * The United States cannot refuse this role of champion without putting the stigma of rejection upon the great and devoted men who brought its Government into existence. (Woodrow Wilson, Washington, D. C., December 2, 1920.)

What are we debating in the United States? Whether we will take part in guiding and steadying the world or not. It is the only country in the world whose leadership and guidance will be accepted. If we do not give it, we may look forward, my fellow citizens, to something like a generation of doubt and of disorder which it will be impossible to pass through without the wreckage of a very considerable part of our slowly constructed civilization. (Woodrow Wilson, Minneapolis, Minn., September 9, 1919.)

NOW: AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

I am dedicating my life to arousing the American people so that the Senate cannot prevent the United States from taking its place in world leadership. Every place you go in all the world, millions are looking to America. They hope and pray that America will lead the world to freedom. America must see the light this time and lead the world to it. (Wendell Willkie, New York Times, March 26, 1943.)

When the fighting ceases, I believe it will be taken for granted that this country must assume leadership in establishing peace and order. Isolationism will be as extinct as the volcanoes of the moon. (James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University; Our Fighting Faith, 1942.)

For my part, I believe that the American people have profited from their experience of the last 25 years. I believe that they will perceive, with increasingly clear vision, the place of leadership in the world which the United States can scarcely avoid occupying, and that they will support policies and arrangements for sensible cooperation with other countries. (HENRY A. WALLACE, Foundation of the Peace, Atlantic Monthly, January 1942.)

SHALL WE FAIL AGAIN?

The aspirations at the end of the First World War, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, produced a concrete program of international cooperation intended to safeguard all nations against military aggression, to protect racial minorities, and to give the oncoming generation some confidence that it would go about its affairs without the return of the disrupting and blighting scourge of war.

Whatever we may think about the details of that program, it was a definite, affirmative action for world peace. We cannot state positively just how effective it might have proved, had the United States extended to it support, influence, and active participation. But we do know that we tried the opposite course and found it altogether futile. (Wendell Willkie, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., May 11, 1943.)

That nation-building process will go on, I assume, until the time shall come—and I wish, indeed, it might come soon; 20 years ago we thought it had arrived—when these nations, instead of attempting to prey upon each other, to take advantage of each other, either in a military or in an economic sense, shall find it possible to bind themselves together in a world federation that will do for them all what our national federation did for us 150 years ago. * * * There is no other solution of the world problem in terms of prosperity and peace, and the longer it is postponed, the more difficult will its achievement be, the greater will be the loss in human life, and the greater the disturbance and distress to our civilization. (Nicholas Murray Butler, New York, February 14, 1939.)

The tragedy and irony of our present position is that we who would make no commitment to support world peace are now making contributions a thousandfold greater to support a World War. (Justice Robert Jackson, October 2, 1941.)

I happen to believe that if the United States again withdraws within itself after this war there can be no peace or economic security in this world. At least, under a democratic form of government.

During the last war public opinion was not sufficiently molded by discussion within America or between the people of America and the peoples of other countries to withstand the onslaught of these beliefs when presented by able and adroit political leaders. The Wilson idealism, unsupported by an educated and firm public conviction, was easily defeated. That same experience is likely to occur again unless the American people, while we fight, through discussion of the viewpoints of both the leaders and the people of our allies, come to an unemotional and reasoned understanding of cooperation. Likewise, they must have not only admiration for the heroism of their allies' struggle for survival but full faith in the post-war purposes of those allies. (Wendell L. Willkie, London Evening Standard, December 7, 1942.)

When Woodrow Wilson proposed the League of Nations, it became apparent that these same principles of liberty and unity—of home rule and centralized authority—needed to be applied among the nations if a repetition of the First World War was to be prevented. Unfortunately, the people of the United States were not ready. They believed in the doctrine of liberty in international affairs, but they were not ready to give up certain of their international rights and to shoulder certain international duties, even though other nations were ready to take such steps.

They were in the position of a strong, well-armed pioneer citizen who thought he could defend himself against robbers without going to the expense and bother of joining up with his neighbors in setting up a police force to uphold civil law. They stood for decency in international affairs, but in the world of practical international politics the net effect of their action or lack of action was anarchy and the loss of millions of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars in a Second World War. It is in this suddenly shrunken world that the United Nations, like our Thirteen American States in 1781, soon will be faced with a fundamental choice. (HENRY A. WALLACE, Washington, D. C., December 28, 1942.)

We in America have today the clearest choice in history between doing the necessary and doing what is easy but negative. The latter would be the end of our Nation as a moral force. We are caught in the position of highest responsibility at the moment of our world's supreme test. Because of what we have said and done in the past, because of what Providence did for us in the way of physical resources with which to live up to our promises, we are the test as to whether our western, Christian, freedom-loving civilization is fit to survive. America stands for the idea that respect for every man (based on our equality in God) and free government and economic well-being can spread across the world. The American idea has always been universal. It has now come face to face with universal corruption and immorality. America, when she stands for anything, stands for Wilson's principle of the right of all peoples to 'live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak." Germany and Japan stand for the doctrine that the strong must conquer and enslave the weak, for that is the law of life—as it was the law of the Spanish Main—as it is the law of the wilderness. Here are eternal opposites. The United States has become the shield and symbol of freedom, as Germany is the symbol of piracy. It is not complacency to admit this fact; it is humility. We have not yet deserved the responsibilities that are ours, but we have inherited them. If we try to deny them we shall lose our souls. (Herbert Agar, A Time for Greatness, 1942, p. 296.)

OUR SECOND CHANCE

Nobody ever pretended that by winning a war we could make the world safe for democracy. But by winning the war instead of losing it, we did earn a chance to make the world safe for democracy. Our selfishness and our shortsightedness prevented us from taking the chance. (Herbert Agar, A Time for Greatness, p. 55.)

Contrary to popular belief, the foreign policy of the United States has been, for more than 50 years, one of effective international cooperation for the establishment and preservation of international peace.

As a matter of fact, the United States Government has never supported any policy of national isolation, from the time of Franklin and Jefferson. Leaders of both great political parties have for the last half century and more urged international cooperation in most emphatic terms. International cooperation was earnestly supported by Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson.

It is of particular interest at this time to note that, on June 24, 1910, a joint resolution passed both the House of Representatives and the Senate by unanimous consent. The joint resolution authorized President Taft to invite the nations of the world to cooperate with us in bringing into existence a plan of international cooperation to establish peace and to maintain it by a police force made up of the combined navies of the world.

This joint resolution was reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee on June 4, 1910, and a statement was contained in the report to the effect that the reasons for the joint resolution were given in the remarks of former President Theodore Roosevelt at Christiana and of Representatives Fassett and Bennet in the House of Representatives on March 30, 1910, and an article by Hamilton Holt, managing editor of the Independent.

The following are quotations from the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee:

EXCERPTS FROM MR. ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH

Finally, it would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others. The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power—of any police to enforce the decrees of the court.

In any community of any size the authority of the courts rests upon actual or potential force; on the existence of a police, or on the knowledge that the able-bodied men of the country are both ready and willing to see that the decrees of judicial and legislative bodies are put into effect.

Each nation must keep well prepared to defend itself until the establishment of some form of international police power, competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations. As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be assured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions.

The combination might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions; but the ruler or statesman who should bring about such a combination would have earned his place in history for all time and his title to the gratitude of all mankind.

EXCERPT FROM REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE BENNETT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

We are the only nation that, in the last century at least, has fought a war entirely and alone in the name of humanity. That gives us the right to say to all the world, "Let us have peace," and to pass such legislation as will bring the day of universal peace nearer.

EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE BY HAMILTON HOLT, MANAGING EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT

The only two powers that ever have or ever can govern human beings are force and reason—war and law. If we do not have one, we must have the other. The problem before the world is how to decrease the area of war and increase the area of law until war vanishes and law envelops the world. At the present moment the world is organized into 59 nations claiming independence, and within their territories—nominally at least—organization, law, and peace prevail. We have already learned to substitute law for war in cities and States and even up to the 59 nations; but in that international realm over and above each nation in which each nation is equally sovereign, the only way at the present moment for a nation to secure its rights is by the use of force. Force, therefore, or war, as it is called when exerted by a nation against another nation, is at present the only legal and final method of settling international differences. In other words, the nations are in that stage of civilization today where without a qualm they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner they would put their own subjects to death for imitating. The peace movement, therefore, is nothing but the process of substituting law for war.

The history of international law presents striking analogies to the history of private law. Likewise, the history of the organization of the United Nations, which gives the sanction to international law, will correspond to the history of the organization of the Thirteen American Colonies into one Nation. The United States, therefore, furnishes the model for the United Nations. The Declaration of Independence foreshadows the declaration of interdependence.

I read an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 1910:

UNIVERSAL PEACE COMMISSION

Mr. LODGE. I desire to call up for present consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) to authorize the appointment of a commission in relation to universal peace.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a commission in relation to universal peace

Resolved, etc., That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war: *Provided*, That the total expense authorized by this joint resolution shall not exceed the sum of $10,000 and that the said commission shall be required to make final report within 2 years from the date of the passage of this resolution.

Approved June 25, 1910.

Let me repeat that the issue before the Senate is not whether one kind of resolution is better than another, or whether one kind of treaty is better than another, or even whether one kind of world organization is better than another.

The choice before us is much more terrible and urgent than any quibbles over details, amendments, or reservations.

We must choose whether there will be yet another world war, to consume the children of a generation from now, or whether the world and we, as part of the world, can muster the will, the intelligence, and the courage to organize for

peace, and to maintain peace on the basis of human dignity and simple justice.

For this reason, and for this reason only, have I insisted on taking the time to read the simple and appalling record of the men, the methods, and the motives which, in 1919, made it sure that today our children should be sent to fight for our national life and our wealth be consumed in the fires of this war.

I repeat that I have voted and shall vote for every resolution and strengthening amendment which will pledge this body to the course of world cooperation.

We know what happened to the hopes of the world last time; so far as my voice can carry and my vote be effective, I propose to make sure that it shall not happen again.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Scrugham
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Millikin	Wallgren
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, until the signing of the pact at Moscow on October 30, there had been two schools of thought on the question of whether or not we should discuss peace while we are at war. That question has now been settled by the four great powers in the United Nations group.

It is too late to decide the question as to whether or not we should discuss the problems of peace while we are at war. We have heard from Britain, Russia, and China. The Senate should speak for the people of the United States. Our people want to rid this world of the madness of future world wars and they want their thoughts expressed on this issue. They want action now. To be effective, a foreign policy should have the people solidly behind it, and only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, which is a cross section of the people of the 48 States, can such an opinion be voiced.

Our hope that the other United Nations would advise not only their own people, but our people as well, as to where they stood on the great question of the peace of the world, which is to follow victory, has been accomplished. It is only by the mutual desire of our people, and the peoples of our allies, to bring about a permanent peace after this war, that we can have such a peace. It is not only what the people say about peace but what they think, that will govern. Thoughts, however, must be translated into realities; we must so organize that the wishes of the people can be carried out. Any pledge we make as representatives of the people must have behind it the strong support of the people of this country. This pledge must not be in weak words or glittering generalities. Our people want deeds, not talk.

We have before us Senate Resolution 192, which resolves:

That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The question we must decide is as to whether or not this resolution should be passed in its original form or amended before passage.

Certainly no one can disagree with the first sentence of the resolution. When we declared war, we advised the world that we would carry on that war until complete victory had been achieved against our common enemies.

We believe that we should cooperate with our comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace. This naturally follows the declaration of war by the people of this Nation. It will certainly do no harm to advise again our allies, as we have our enemies, that we will cooperate in securing a just and honorable peace.

To have any effect, that is to be the supreme law of the land, a treaty of peace, under section 2, article II, of our Constitution, must be negotiated by the President of the United States, and must be by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring.

There are two types of treaties; first, self-operating, that is, they require no further action after ratification; and, second, treaties requiring legislative action. If legislative action is required then, of course, such action must be taken by both Houses of Congress. An example of this is where appropriations are necessary to furnish money for carrying out the terms of the treaty.

No one can quarrel with that part of the resolution now before the Senate which provides that the United States shall act through its constitutional processes. The United States, being a constitutional government, can act only through its constitutional processes. When we deal with another nation, which has a constitution, we deal with it through its constitutional processes. And, of course, all other nations must deal with us in the same way. So, if we are to do anything in peace, as we are doing things now while we are at war, they must be done under our Constitution. Paraphrasing Mr. Churchill, the Senate was not elected by the people to liquidate the American constitutional government.

This resolution proposes that we join with other free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority. There are some of us who feel that we should be more specific than that; that we should join with the other United Nations. It appears to me that when our Nation and the nations of our allies are fighting this world war for their very existence we should be willing to join with those other nations in making the peace and in attempting to maintain that peace in the future.

Senate Resolution 192 does not so provide. The resolution designates only "free and sovereign nations" as those with which the President is to negotiate. Our amendment proposes that we should not only join with the United Nations but with "such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted."

Hence, the resolution and the amendment differ in that one proposes that we join "with free and sovereign nations" and the other proposes that we join "with the United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted."

It appears to me that it is only fair, just, and equitable that we should tell our allies, our comrades in arms, that we appreciate their support, that we are fighting together for a certain cause, and that we are willing to cooperate with them in making the peace which will follow the war.

In the next place, the resolution purports to establish and maintain international authority. This can mean the old balance-of-power system, through an alliance with other sovereign nations, or it can mean the sort of an international authority which I am discussing. Yes, the authors of the resolution say it can even mean an international organization, a league of nations. In fact, Mr. President, it can mean anything. But the amendment proposes that the United States join "in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization." That is more definite and certain than international authority.

The resolution says this international authority is to have "power to prevent aggression." It does not say "to prevent military aggression." There again the resolution is indefinite and uncertain for the phrase "to prevent aggression" could mean whatever one wanted it to mean in relation to preventing any action by other nations. For aggression of one nation against another does not necessarily mean military aggression. It might mean aggression through sanctions, or cartels, or interference in domestic affairs, or with our own competitive system.

The amendment proposes that this international organization would have "authority to to settle international disputes peacefully." This is clear and

definite. For example, the international organization could function through a world court, or could establish a world court by means of which disputes among nations might be settled peacefully. Now, I am so earnestly in favor of maintaining peace and justice in the world, that I plead for some definite organization to settle disputes between nations before those disputes lead to war. There are many disputes between nations which lend themselves to settlement before an international court.

This is where international law can be applied. We provide in the amendment that if a dispute cannot be settled peacefully, and there is military aggression, the organization can use military force. This is due to the fact that nations are separated, they involve large masses of people, and there is no other method of force which has been found to be effective. Therefore, military force must be available to prevent military aggression. The very existence of that power would prevent military aggression.

Our amendment provides that this international organization would have this power, including military force, for a certain purpose only, and that purpose is to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. In other words, under the provisions of this amendment military force can only be used by this international organization to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. This is not true of the resolution now pending before us.

Now, let us see what this means. We have discovered, through our experience in two world wars, that if there is military aggression of any magnitude it will result in a world war. Therefore, I believe we must come to the conclusion that military aggression should be prevented by military force before a world war is brought about. We have come to the conclusion, too, or, Mr. President, we should come to the conclusion, that this is a world problem—a problem of all peoples—and not merely a problem for those who are attacked.

It is comparable to a man who owns a house; he has title to it; he owes no one; no person has a mortgage or a lien against it; and he decides that, since it is his, he will burn it down. No one would contend that he had such a right. In fact, we have laws which prevent an owner from doing so. We have such laws, not because we want to interfere with the right of the citizen in and of itself but because we do not want other houses to burn and we do not want human lives to be threatened.

The same thing is true in connection with military aggression. We have discovered, at the present stage of civilization, that military aggression can set the world afire and destroy countless thousands of human lives. It is for this reason that the nations of the world must, by military force if necessary, prevent such world conflagration.

It is no longer a question as to whether or not one is an isolationist or an internationalist. The world has become so small by virtue of transportation and communication that military aggression anywhere results in a world war. Therefore, new rules and regulations are essential to the establishing and maintaining of peace.

It is not my purpose that there should be formed, nor do I believe in the forming of a superstate. No such state is necessary to keep peace. I do not believe in an international police force of a superstate. No one is trying to impair the sovereignty of the country or turn over our military power to an internationally managed international police force. The organization proposed by our amendment does not create, and does not authorize, the creation of a superstate.

This organization would have but the power to settle international disputes peacefully and to use military force to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. To prevent military aggression this organization must have use of a military force. This does not imply an international army big enough to subdue the armed forces of any nation. The international organization would be dependent upon its constituents for the men, ships, planes, and tanks which might be necessary to put down the aggression.

An example of this joint use of American armed forces was the joint use of American armed forces in China during and after the Boxer Rebellion. This action was taken under Executive authority and there was no action by Congress. We must rely upon the nations, joined together and working together, to preserve peace and to prevent world wars growing from military aggressions. Each nation in the organization must be ready, able, and willing to do its part to keep the peace or we shall have no peace.

I do not believe a special police force should be used by this international authority at will. It will mean that we must have armed forces strong enough in and of themselves to protect our interests and, in combination with others, strong enough to put down military aggression when used by this international organization, thus preventing military aggression by the use of military force.

The resolution may mean anything, as I have pointed out. It is so broad that it might conceivably receive the support of men who do not want any international authority and those who do want an international authority. It is not the duty of Congress to pass laws which can mean anything or nothing. The action of the Senate should mean something specific and definite. Advice, to be advice, must have certain limits.

By this amendment we would not attempt to lay out a detailed blueprint of future problems. We do, however, have certain limits. These are essential. We have tried the method of attempting to keep peace by staying out of world affairs, and two world wars have resulted. It has been conclusively demonstrated that playing ostrich and refusing to face the facts cannot keep us out of war.

If Hitler had known that we were fully prepared to meet his aggression, he would not have moved. If a United Nations had stopped Japan in Manchukuo, Mussolini in Ethiopia, and Hitler in Czechosolvakia, we would not now be at war. Countries do not start wars unless they think they can win.

The method of isolationism has been tried and has utterly failed. The committee resolution amounts to a blank check to the White House on international affairs. Because of its broad declarations it could be interpreted as support for any international action without placing any limits on presidential discretion. Much might be done before a final treaty draft ever returned to the Senate.

It will be well, Mr. President, for the Senate to add to the resolution the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], which provides that the treaty of peace, and the conduct of foreign affairs after the war to keep peace, shall come back to the Senate for its advice and consent.

We face a great opportunity to assert specific and positive leadership for future world peace. Let us not allow it to slip away in a fog of glittering generalities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I noticed that time and time and time again, the Senator used the words "military aggression." How does the Senator define that term?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would define that as the action of a country taking it upon itself to send its military forces across the boundary of another nation.

Mr. LANGER. Assuming that to be the Senator's definition, suppose the 300,000,000 people of India did not like British rule, would it be the Senator's purpose, under the resolution, to have the United States back up England in keeping India in subjection?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not think that question is at all raised in connection with the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Or if China wanted to keep Hong Kong, and England said, "We want Hong Kong," is it the Senator's contention that under the resolution the United States would be bound to help England?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the United States should help to prevent military aggression, and what is proposed is to take effect after the present war shall have ended, not during the war. It is not proposed that we should interfere with the World War now being fought.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose it were provided in the treaty of peace, for example, that King George of Greece should go back on the throne, and the people of Greece voted that they did not want him, would it be the Senator's idea that the United States should help to put King George back on the throne?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is an internal matter, and not the matter of one nation crossing over the boundary of another nation to subdue the other nation.

Mr. LANGER. Then, as I understand, Mr. President, as the Senator defines the words "military aggression" contained in the amendment it would mean when

the soldiers of one country crossed its boundaries and went into another country?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I think that is a fair definition of it. I think "military aggression" is well defined in international law. It is well understood what military aggression is under international law.

Mr. LANGER. And so if the peace terms provide that certain kings shall go back upon their thrones, under this resolution, if we adopt it, the United States would not be bound to send a single soldier to carry out such terms?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree to that statement.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, no more grave or important subject has engaged the attention of the Senate than the policy expressed by Senate Resolution 192.

A generation ago, during the First World War, when mankind could evaluate its past and look into the future with sympathy and understanding, the Allies had the vision of a better world, and the opportunity to lay the foundations for it. They failed.

That is one of the factors in the unique significance of action by the Senate today, before cessation of hostilities, and while, through the spirit of comradeship in mortal combat, the vision of a better world is commonly perceived.

Doubt not that the world eagerly looks to us for a new principle in international law upon which may be founded the edifice of peace and freedom. We are the conspicuous example of liberal political leadership which has succeeded in raising the standard of living of its people and in lifting their aspirations to new horizons of spiritual furtherance.

Shall we give our policy to the world, or shall we supinely take from some other nation the policies which it has formulated on the premises of its history?

The National League of Women Voters, well known in Congress, as well as throughout the country, representing a great cross section of the population of America, put the question in this way, which is a popular way of putting it:

> Who is going to make United States foreign policy?
>
> If other nations are doubtful what part we are going to play in the world after the war, they will be forced to make their plans without knowing what to expect of us. This means that they will have to make different kinds of choices than they otherwise might, and the chance to get the kind of world we need will have passed. We won't have much choice left. We will have to cut our pattern according to the kind of world others have made.

That is the end of my quotation from their statement which they have broadcast all over the country.

The joint four-nation declaration of the Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8120, indicates that the executive branch of this Government has taken a sound and strong position in the formulation of our foreign policy; but the executive branch cannot alone determine that policy so far as it may be established in treaties. The coordinate and equal authority and responsibility for treaty making rests upon the Senate.

The momentous event of the publication of that four-nation declaration makes it important for the Senate to perform its function to advise.

Mr. President, the time is especially opportune for the Senate to formulate and announce its position in the hope that these two constitutionally coordinate makers—that is the word in the Constitution, "makers"—of any treaty of peace will ultimately agree.

In the midst of total war, we are about to act. Shall it be bravely and wisely, or are we to again fail to meet the great issue that is presented? God forbid!

If we are animated by the conviction that justice shall supersede force as the sanction for peace, now is the precious moment to act vigorously and unequivocally. Now is the opportunity. Yes; I believe that now is the imperative demand for our leadership. Our sons give their lives for the assurance that their sons shall not have to fight another war.

In this critical hour, shall our timidity defeat their purpose? Or shall we, by courageous action in this Chamber support the victory that connotes law and order, the rule of justice, and the sovereignty of the word of God? The fulfillment of that victory may be far in the future, but the choice of the way is before us now.

I intend to discuss sovereignty of nations with regard for the vital interests of America, and not omitting due consideration for the national pride and welfare of our vis-à-vis at the peace table, but the one essential element which outweighs all others whose omission from former treaties has been fatal to peace is the spiritual foundation upon which this treaty must be erected.

The Golden Rule among nations should characterize this treaty as one in which peace is attained, as distinguished from a peace that is negotiated.

Attained peace is the only peace that will prevail.

The new concept of peace should respect the problems and the vital interests of all the subjects to international law, notwithstanding that conditions upon nationalism and sovereignty are required of all the members of the family of nations.

THE NEW SANCTION

The fundamental rules of international law that is the source of this new sanction for peace should be written and submitted to the members of the organization for peace for adoption according to the constitutional manner of each subject to international law.

The resolution that we adopt should require codification of fundamental rules of international law upon a new basis of right, justice, and humanity. Our long experiment with laws which disregard right and wrong, laws which were founded on nothing but the practice of states, has failed, miserably failed, to establish order and promote freedom.

Hitherto international law has been regarded, not as an instrument for the discovery and interpretation of a transcendental rule of right, binding upon states as moral beings, whether or not they observed it in practice, but as a science whose chief end is to find out by observation the rules actually followed by states in their mutual intercourse, and to classify and arrange these rules by referring them to certain fundamental principles on which they are based.

I will speak of this in passing, to show the aspiration of the human race for this ideal.

Four years after the epoch-making work of Hugo Grotius, De Jure Belli ac Pacis, had appeared at Paris in 1629, the Puritan idea that the Bible contained a complete code of conduct applicable to all possible conditions inspired such works as Richard Bernard's The Bible Battels, or the Sacred Art Military; for the Rightly Wageing Warre According to the Holy Writ.

Mr. President, in order to save time, I request unanimous consent to have certain material incorporated in the RECORD at this part of my address, in order to show that the historical theory of so-called international law is to follow the actual practice of states, instead of adopting rules of conduct determined by the test of right against wrong.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By T. J. Lawrence, 2d ed.)

Page 19: The era of universal dominion is over, and independent states now recognize no earthly superior. Do they then appeal in their controversies to innate ideas of justice implanted in the mind of the human race by its Creator ("the engrafted word" "the perfect law of liberty", James 1:20–27 Moffatt 1: 19–26; Weymouth 1:21; 20th Century New Testament 1:21; Basic English New Testament 1:21; Roman Catholic New Testament in Modern English 1:21; Romans 11:17–25), or to principles asknowledged by the general opinion of statesmen and jurists?—to precepts deduced from the consideration of absolute rights existing antecedent to custom and law or to rules which can be shown to have been adopted by all or most states? A very slight acquaintance with the history of international affairs will teach us that the latter alternative is the one adopted with something approaching to unanimity. Statesmen uphold the cause for which they are contending by reference to acknowledged rules deduced from the general practice of states. They quote the words of treaties and of authors who are universally recognized as authorities. If there are no precedents exactly applicable to the matter in hand, they endeavor to show that admitted principles, logically developed, lead to the conclusions they wish to establish. Very seldom do we find appeals to natural right or innate principles of justice and humanity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, one of the sources of the information which I have secured unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD is an author by the name of T. J. Lawrence, a very distinguished author, perhaps well known to many of my colleagues. He was a teacher of international law at the University of Chicago and had been a teacher of international law in the great colleges of Great Britain. He is well

known to students of international law in our day. Back in 1898 he said:

> But if the principles of the law of nations are really to be gathered, as we have been contending, from the practice of nations, whenever that practice is consistent and uniform, it is time to alter our statement of principles in deference to the logic of established facts.

The joint four-nation declaration is animated by this ideal, as shown by its implied promise in paragraph 5, to undertake the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security. It recognizes necessity for such reform by paragraph 4:

> 4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The opportunity is ours to reform the real, which has failed to secure peace, by application of the ideal. We can and we should codify the fundamental rules of international conduct with faithful regard for what is right, just, and humane.

No more auspicious opportunity for the achievement of a peace that will prevail could be given mankind than during these sad conditions, when statesmen, as well as fathers and mothers the world over, are determined that the prize of victory shall free their posterity from the causes and the horrors of war.

This new sanction for peace is attainable if we cooperate with our embattled sons and daughters by insisting upon it.

Peace, prosperity, freedom, and happiness all depend upon security. Therefore, some yielding of particular features of independence, necessary for the security of the subjects to international law, can be made without fear of impairment of our sovereignty.

The premise of the joint four-nation declaration recognizes this. That premise is contained in the preamble, reading as follows:

> conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression.

Three of the declarations are:

> 1 That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.
>
> 2 That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.
>
> 3 That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

The above premises and declarations are aimed at that security which is regarded as entitled to first consideration because it is necessary for peace, prosperity, freedom, and happiness. Moreover, it comprehends, as we do by the Pepper amendment, armed force, if necessary, arbitration, judicial proceedings, as well as by other measures adequate for that security.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLIKIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been very much interested in the Senator's able discussion. Let me say it has been contended by some on the floor of the Senate that the word "authority" as used in the original resolution did not comprehend the word "organization." I should like to have the views of the Senator from Vermont on that subject.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I disagree with that view of the matter. I think it does comprehend "organization." My complaint about it has been that it was too comprehensive and included intangible things besides the tangible things known as "an organization."

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me further suggest to the Senator that it was the view of some of us on the committee that when we used the language in the resolution "join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority," we would not only include thereby one organization which might be created—"an organization," which would be one—but that through use of the words "international authority" there might be ultilized other means which are now in existence—the World Court, for instance, or the arbitration treaties, or The Hague Convention.

In addition, the "authority" would have power to create an additional organization and still an additional organization. That is a point which Senators who have been urging the adoption of the amendment might have in mind.

I should like to say one other thing, and then I shall not disturb the Senator from Vermont any longer: I should also like to have the view of the Senator from Vermont as to the meaning and scope of the word "power," as it appears in the phrase "international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

It is the contention of some of us that by the use of that language—if the treaty so provided, of course; the language would not be a warrant to act without a treaty or agreement—the word "power" would place in the hands of such international agency, if warranted by the treaty, the use of any power necessary to effectuate the objectives of preserving peace and preventing aggression.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have accepted the views expressed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the author of the resolution, as being what was comprehended in those words. I have accepted those views; and there has not been a time since Senate resolution 192 has been pending that I did not feel firmly persuaded to support it ultimately if it could not be made more precise. I have no doubt whatever that the statement of the distinguished Senator from Texas is accurate with respect to the connotation of "authority." It does comprehend the organization of government; and "power" does comprehend judicial process, through courts or arbitration tribunals, as well as the other things which may be conceived of as purely intangible.

This is why I prefer the Pepper amendment, and would much prefer another amendment, if it should be offered: At first glance, with no statement supporting and explaining the resolution, it gives the impression of the revival of power politics in the world. There is no doubt in my mind that "international authority" comprehends, as well as organizations of various kinds, the organizations which we have seen fail to maintain peace—the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. I shall refer to that point later in stating my reasons for preferring the amendment of the Senator from Florida and other Senators to Senate Resolution 192; but at no time in my study of this matter have I doubted the great value of Senate Resolution 192 as an answer to the question whether the United States Senate stands for a policy, to be executed in a treaty, which will commit the great leadership of the United States of America and her great influence to the substitution of justice for force in the world, justice to be administered not by the United States imposing decrees upon her neighbors, but by the united efforts of the peace-loving nations of the world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Although it may be said, as was suggested by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that "international authority" is comprehensive enough, possibly, to include or permit an international organization, I wonder if the able Senator from Vermont would conclude that the use of the words "international authority" would necessarily mean an international organization such as the League of Nations.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should have to answer that question "No."

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator will recall, I believe, that in the language of the resolution of the League to Enforce Peace, adopted by an unofficial body in which former President Taft was a distinguished leader, there was the following straight-out declaration:

> We believe it to be desirable for the United States to join a league of nations binding its signatories to the following.

There, of course, was a clear-cut declaration that they believed in an international organization and they actually named it.

The Senator may also recall—although I do not have the exact language before me—that in the resolution approved at the peace conference at Versailles, in the early part of the deliberations of that conference, they expressly committed themselves to the setting up of a league of nations and appointed appropriate committees to begin the drafting of the structure of such an organization.

There were two declarations, one by an unofficial body and the other by an

official conference; but when they contemplated an international organization they definitely said so, which at least carries the virtue of certainty.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator for this help. My memory is not perfectly clear about the details to which he refers, but I do recall the substantial fact involved in what he has said.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. As the proponent of an amendment to Senate Resolution 192, I wish to modify my amendment by striking out, in line 1, the word "agreement" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "treaty"; and in line 5, by striking out the word "agreement" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "treaty."

I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I would not take the time of the Senate to speak of the subject of sovereignty and sovereign states were it not for the fears, pretty generally held in America, and occasionally expressed on this floor, that the treaty of peace, which should provide for the security of the subjects to international law, might destroy our sovereignty. I heard this fear pretty generally expressed at the Mackinac meeting. I have heard it here. I have heard it elsewhere. Therefore, I wish to say, in order to put myself on record with respect to this point, that an authority on this subject, Dr. Amos S. Hershey, who published the Essentials of International Public Law and Organization, puts the matter this way. It will be noted when I read this statement that his definitions of sovereignty differ somewhat from those which we find in Webster's Dictionary. I quote:

> The sovereign states are those which are fully autonomous and independent—i. e., relatively free from higher or outside control—a freedom not fully enjoyed by part-sovereign states.

We have been talking about sovereign states. Now we depart to the word "sovereignty."

> Sovereignty is one and the same power, will, or capacity inherent in the state, but it has a double aspect—an external as well as an internal face.
>
> On its internal side, sovereignty implies such supreme control over everything found on a state's territory and such power to regulate the conduct of its subjects as may be necessary to realize the purpose for which the state exists.

That is very nearly an absolute power. It is so supreme in its character that we cannot possibly conceive of a relationship of that kind of sovereignty to another sovereignty anywhere on earth, because under that definition one of them would have to be supreme and the other would have to be subject. So we are dealing with a perfectly natural condition when we come to the definition of the external aspects of sovereignty.

Dr. Hershey continues:

> On its external side, sovereignty may be limited in various ways:
>
> (1) By the rules, principles, and customs of international law.

I shall not quote in full at this point. I skip a part of the definition in order to save time, but I should like to quote subdivision (4) because it is applicable to our debate. I read again in order to get the heading for the subdivision:

> On its external side, sovereignty may be limited in various ways:
>
> (4) Treaties of alliance, guarantee and protection by which a State obligates itself to give aid to another under certain conditions or to assist in maintaining a certain state of affairs agreed upon.

That is what we are talking about when we speak of a union of sovereign powers for the purpose of establishing and maintaining security. Thus it is apparent in both the text of Senate Resolution 192 and the Pepper amendment that in the use of the term "free and sovereign nations," unlimited power is not implied.

Dr. Hershey says:

> External sovereignty or independence must not be understood in any absolute or unrestricted sense. Whatever may be the case in theory, in practice it is very limited and wholly relative.

In a note on page 196 appears the following:

> Oppenheim (I, p. 174) points out that a state does not lose any part of its sovereignty by concluding a treaty of arbitration. This is true, but suppose it were generally bound to arbitrate all or any class of international disputes, while other states retained the right to go to war. Would such state be fully sovereign? If we had a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, the contracting states would remain sovereign because all would be equally and reciprocally bound.
>
> Merignac (II, p. 43) urges that treaties of guarantee do not destroy sovereignty. Such treaties do not necessarily imply a limitation of sovereignty—not unles the state whose rights are guaranteed binds itself permanently not to exercise important or essenial sovereign powers such as other states enjoy.

In discussing the various resolutions we should bear in mind that the primary thing with which we deal is external sovereignty, and it is not internal sovereignty, except in its most indirect effect.

During the greater part of the nineteenth century Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia exercised a kind of superintendence over certain European questions under the name of the Great Powers. They exercised power enough, Mr. President, to receive Italy into that concert in 1867. They arrogated unto themselves that degree of combined sovereignty to say to a neighboring nation, "We will let you in with us so that you may enter into the consultations of this conference of great powers."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall have to leave the floor in a moment, and I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me in order that I may ask him one question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question which I wish to propound relates to the subject of the surrender of sovereignty. There are those who contend that by entering into a treaty a nation surrenders some of its sovereignty. Is not the implication just the opposite? Sovereignty implies an independent and free nation with the choice and with the power to do those things it wants to do, and the making of a treaty, instead of being a limitation upon its sovereignty, is really a demonstration of its sovereignty. So far as the terms of a treaty are concerned, a nation's liberty of action is restricted until the treaty has expired. But if we were bound by the exaggerated view of sovereignty that a nation cannot make a treaty without giving up some of its sovereignty, we could never make a treaty respecting anything.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has stated the proposition so clearly, as he always does, that I blush to go on with my discussion of the question. I agree with him, and I undertake to support what he has said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. No one will doubt that France was a sovereign state, that Austria was a sovereign state, that Prussia was a sovereign state, that Russia was a sovereign state, and, indeed, that Italy was a sovereign state throughout the century when those countries acted together under the name of the Great Powers. One of the authors whom I have consulted, Mr. Lawrence, in speaking historically of the way in which the countries were grouped, states:

> We will divide the sovereign states who are subjects of international law into two classes. The six Great Powers and the United States of America, we place in the first class, and in the second the remainder of the body of independent and sovereign states.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, the Senator's idea is that if in the instance cited by him those four powers had gotten together and said that other countries could come in, they would thereby have given up some of their sovereignty.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. Each had to surrender a certain particular act of sovereignty to the combined organization, as they said, for the purpose of securing peace.

Mr. WHEELER. When the recent agreement was entered into in Moscow between Russia, England, China, and the United States to do certain things and to say that they themselves would invite other countries to come in, did not that involve the giving up of some of the sovereignty of the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, indeed; there was some surrender of the abstract thing called sovereignty, but there was no reduction of the capacity of the Nation.

Mr. WHEELER. No. Let me invite the attention of the Senator——

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator will permit me, I should prefer to say that it placed a condition on sovereignty. It did not destroy or take away any of the sovereignty of any one of the nations, but it placed a condition upon them for a time and for a purpose; but it was specific and not general.

Mr. WHEELER. According to the afternoon papers of today, State Department officials have made a statement. I read from the newspaper article:

> State Department officials said the Moscow declarations had the same force on participating nations as a treaty—

If it has the same force and effect as a treaty, then, of course, we would be giving up some of our sovereignty—

though they did not have to be ratified.

That is a statement issued by the State Department. They say that the declarations had the same force and effect as a treaty, but do not have to be ratified.

The article continues:

In international law, they maintained, an Executive agreement can bind a state effectively. They placed the Moscow pact in the same legal class with the Atlantic Charter and the destroyers-for-bases deal, both of which were carried out by Executive order without Senate approval.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask who made the statement which the Senator from Montana has been reading?

Mr. WHEELER. I have been quoting from the Washington Star of this date. The article does not quote any official, but it states:

State Department officials said the Moscow declarations had the same force on participating nations as a treaty.

If it has the same force as a treaty, there is no question but what we are giving up some of our sovereignty, as is claimed. I thoroughly agree that we do give up some sovereignty when we enter into an agreement with three powerful nations for the purpose of saying that we are going to use power and force to maintain the peace.

I read again from the article in the Washington Star:

In international law, they maintained, an Executive agreement can bind a state effectively. They placed the Moscow pact in the same legal class with the Atlantic Charter and the destroyers-for-bases deal, both of which were carried out by Executive order without Senate approval.

It is true they were carried out without Senate approval, but I do not believe there is any Member of the Senate who will agree that the President of the United States has the right to give away the property of the United States. Even if he attempted to do so he would have no right to do it, in my judgment, without the consent of the Congress.

That is a question that has passed, but I submit that if the State Department says that agreements have the same binding effect a treaty has, then, under the Constitution, they should come back to the Senate of the United States for concurrence.

I said on the floor yesterday that, in my judgment, if we adopt the Connally resolution the treaties will never come here to be passed upon and concurred in by the Senate of the United States. That is one of the reasons why I have so consistently been opposed to the pending resolution. I am amazed, however, to read as coming from the State Department the statement:

State Department officials said the Moscow declaration had the same force on participating nations as a treaty.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it would divert me somewhat from the subject I am discussing, but I wish to say that I dislike to pass judgment upon a statement of that kind without having the full statement before me and understanding more of its import than I can gather from listening to the distinguished Senator from Montana. I do not mean to assent to or dissent from the position he takes about the matter; but if he will excuse me from further discussing that point I should like to go on with this discussion on the point that a sovereign state does not lose its sovereignty by entering into a treaty for such purposes as security and the maintenance of peace, even though it gives up some of the ordinary functions that it alone exercises when it is not in combination with other states for that specific purpose.

I assure the Senator from Montana that I will not advocate a treaty based upon such principles in the joint declaration as relate to the future post-war conduct of the United States without having those propositions brought to the Senate of the United States for consideration in connection with its function of consent. I am talking now solely about the function of advice.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate what the Senator says, and I was going to ask him that very question. The Senator certainly does not take the position the State Department apparently takes, according to the statement I have read, that the Department or the President of the United States could bind this country to give up a part of its sovereignty without submitting the proposal to the Senate of the United States for its consent?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I want to continue this discussion for a little while on the question of sovereignty.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds further will he yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been discussing internal and external sovereignty. I, too, have heard statements made throughout the country that by entering into a treaty of any kind we will lose a part of our sovereignty—some say all, depending upon who is making the statement and for what purpose the statement is made. I am wondering if the Senator agrees with me that, as a result of our participation in this war, we have lost some of our sovereignty?

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course when we submit to the opinion and judgment of our allies in the conduct of the war, in the cooperative effort of the democracies, we have to yield a little bit and they have to yield a little bit, but we do not lose our sovereignty; we exercise it.

Mr. LUCAS. And it is no greater crime to exercise sovereignty in peace times through a treaty in order to try to bring about peace in the world than in time of war when we are fighting to save our very life.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true, I believe.

Since the State Department has been called to our attention, it is quite appropriate for me at this point to say that Mr. Green Haywood Hackworth in Volume I of his Digest of International Law, he being the legal adviser to the Department of State, cites numerous precedents for the opinion held by us—and I believe that now it is pretty generally held by us—that the status now existing of sovereignty and independence of a subject to international law would not be lost by a treaty made in conformity to Senate Resolution 192 or the so-called Pepper amendment or another version of Senate Resolution 192 if it should come before and be acceptable to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Vermont for a moment, and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana I understand read portions of an article from the Evening Star as follows:

State Department officials said the Moscow declarations had the same force on participating nations as a treaty, though they did not have to be ratified. In international law, they maintained, an Executive agreement can bind a state effectively. They placed the Moscow Pact in the same legal class with the Atlantic Charter and the destroyers-for-bases deal, both of which were carried out by Executive order without Senate approval.

I do not question anything the Senator from Montana said, for I was not present and did not hear him, and I am sure he was not guilty of any inaccuracy; but I want to say that the rumor reached me that the statement would be in the press before it appeared. So I called the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, who most unequivocally denounced the report as emanating from the State Department and stated that the Department had authorized no such statement to anybody. Then, shortly afterward, an Assistant Secretary of State came to the Foreign Relations Committee to reinforce the statement of the Under Secretary of State and to explain that nothing whatever of this kind had gone out with any authorization from the State Department.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, may I say a word?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am delighted to hear the statement of the Senator from Texas, because frankly I was very much shocked when I read that statement on the front page of the Star, which is, as we all know, one of the very reliable newspapers of the country. I was amazed to read, as emanating from the State Department, a statement that any agreement they entered into could bind this Nation and have the full force and effect of a treaty and would not have to come before the Senate. I thank the Senator for calling the correction to the attention of the Senate; I am grateful to him, and I think all Members of the Senate should be grateful to him, for calling up the State Department and obtaining a repudiation of the statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that I took this matter up even before the Senate met this morning, because I did not understand how the State Department could give out a statement of that kind, and the officials of the Department in the most unequivocal and emphatic

manner said to me that no statement of that kind had been handed out; that nothing of that kind had been authorized, and they were proceeding to investigate to ascertain what insignificant subordinate might have talked confidentially to some representative of the press, and if they found who he was they would discipline him.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the Senator's conversation was with the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was with Mr. Stettinius in person, and an Assistant Secretary of State who made the trip to the Capitol to reassure me and explain the matter this morning before the Senate met.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for this intrusion upon his time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this colloquy indicates that the two coordinate branches of our Government having the sole executive authority over the subject under consideration, namely, the making of a treaty of peace, are not working at odds and are not even making claims that differ from each other. But I want to bring the Senate back to the point of sovereignty, for once having started out upon it, I should like to clothe it, and clothe it so effectively that it cannot rise again as an issue to becloud our further thought in the discussion of the very important action we are about to take.

Mr. Hackworth cites an authority which should be reliable. I refer to page 52 of his volume 1. This is a quotation:

> In its judgment rendered on August 17, 1923, in the case of the steamship *Wimbledon* * * * the Permanent Court of International Justice said with respect to the relation of state sovereignty to international engagements * * *. The Court declines to see in the conclusion of any treaty by which a state undertakes to perform or refrain from performing a particular act an abandonment of its sovereignty. No doubt any convention creating an obligation of this kind places a restriction upon the exercise of the sovereign rights of the state, in the sense that it requires them to be exercised in a certain way. But the right of entering into international engagements is an attribute of state sovereignty.

Thus it would be if we were in a union of the United Nations, and we in that union agreed upon action in Germany some day in the future. We would be exercising our sovereignty through that organization.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is not the question a relative one, as to how much sovereignty we are yielding? When we go to the bank to borrow money we are exercising solvency, but by that act we can precipitate insolvency.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, we are dealing with degrees, because limitations may be great or little, and we do put limitations on the exercise of our sovereignty when we agree to act with another sovereign.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would it be correct to say that, so far as the question of sovereignty is concerned, we should try as a practical matter to picture for ourselves the degree of sovereignty we might lose in any international organization?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly; I answer that in the affirmative. I would say we would not agree to a treaty which would surrender our sovereignty. That is just what I am trying to settle and put at rest here forever, if possible, that we can make a treaty with the other sovereign powers in the world which will assure, as much as human frailty can assure, the security of all the members to the agreement, through justice administered in a court, through arbitration, or, if necessary, through the wielding of force, and make it without loss of our sovereignty, but rather in the exercise of our sovereignty, to preserve our sovereignty.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield so that I can bring that into a more practical relationship with a definite type of loss of sovereignty?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For example, suppose that through the exercise of our constitutional processes, through the exercise of our sovereign powers, we entered into a world organization to which there was committed the right to conduct war with an international force composed in part of American soldiers. Up to that point we have acted in accordance with our constitutional processes; we have done something as an act of sovereignty. But we would be limiting the power of Congress to declare war. So would it be correct to say in that kind of a situation that we would not be substantially impairing our sovereignty?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator has pictured a possible case in which we would agree to have our sovereignty exercised in a certain way that was unwise, perhaps, but I cannot agree that that would mean the destruction or loss of our sovereignty. Each one of the questions which might arise in the future would have to be considered with regard to the circumstances of the time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was most respectfully suggesting that when we discuss sovereignty as an abstraction we have an interesting discussion, but one which has no practical value. It does not have practical value until we relate it to things we can predict or reasonably conjecture in the way of loss of sovereignty.

If I may cite another example to test whether we would be losing sovereignty, assume that we committed to a world court the right to determine boundary disputes of nations. The maintenance of the territory of a nation, I assume the Senator will agree, is one of the primal powers and responsibilities of sovereignty. If such a right were committed to a world court, would there not be danger of a signatory losing some of its lands?

Mr. AUSTIN. Perhaps so. The Senator asks a question that is specific, and which does not deal with the question I am discussing, which is that the sovereignty of this Nation, in its relation to other countries, is not absolute, and that if we are to live in a new world, different from the old world in which our human frailties have resulted in war and the slaughter of our sons, we have to step out boldly and adopt an entirely new position, which involves the very conditioning of our nationalism and of our sovereignty to the extent which may be necessary for our defense and our protection from aggression. The question whether it would be wise to do it or not will depend upon the circumstances of the time.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How can it ever be said that we lose sovereignty so long as what we do we do through constitutional processes? It may be a mistake, as the Senator has pointed out, but so long as it is done through constitutional processes, in line with what the framers of the Constitution laid down, how can it be said that we legally lose anything in the way of sovereignty?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my answer is that it cannot be done in any other way except by constitutional process, and that we are powerless to make a treaty which is in violation of our Constitution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield for one more observation?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Under the reasoning of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, we would constantly maintain our sovereignty by continuing to surrender it and that to me simply does not make sense. I resuggest that the problem is relative, and to have any value for our consideration, if we are to discuss sovereignty, we have to discuss exactly what part of our sovereignty we are giving up.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I cannot complain if the Senator from Colorado does not regard this discussion as relevant or pertinent to a resolution which describes the parties who are to be subject to the international law which we are proposing to create as free and sovereign nations. I think that is the most relevant thing that is at issue, and that is why I am discussing it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then may I say that that was why I queried the Senator to see if we could bring his discussion into direct relationship with some contemplated surrender of sovereignty, so we could judge what it is we would be getting into. I thank the Senator for his courtesy to me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. It has been a little difficult for me to follow the discussion. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Colorado has asked for specific instances of surrender of sovereignty?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I was saying that we all agree that every time we enter into an international agreement there is always an impairment of the rights we had theretofore. We give up one type of right; we get back another. I was suggesting that, to give the thing relevancy in this discussion, we should have in mind the type of sover-

eignty and the degree of sovereignty which we might be asked to surrender under the amendment that is under discussion.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado agrees with me, or I agree with him. I believe that the last statement shows that what I am trying to demonstrate is correct, namely, that we cannot think of the external sovereignty of a nation as absolute, as unconditioned sovereignty; that we cannot live with our neighbors and make any agreement by which they give us something without giving up something ourselves.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree entirely with that statement. I am interested in how much we give up, what we give up, and what we get back. I wish especially to repel the theory that we can keep on exercising our full sovereignty forever while we are constantly giving it away.

Mr. AUSTIN. If we are going to take an example, let us take one which is current. Article 6 of the joint four-power declaration provides:

> That after the termination of hostilities they—

Meaning each one of these great four powers—

> will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

There is a good example, because it is a live one, it is a real one, and it is a magnificent step toward an organization for world peace. It begins in the spiritual way, with self-discipline, where all such declarations should begin. No treaty of peace that does not contemplate that spiritual basis will succeed any better than the old treaties which depended upon power.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Following the argument advanced by the Senator from Colorado, is it not true, on the other hand, that a failure through the exercise of the powers of sovereignty to cooperate with nations which might be looking to the establishment of law and order, might, by the failure to act, cause the country to lose its sovereignty, just as of America would lose its sovereignty. acting might limit in degree the sovereignty which we are discussing? We take a chance either way of losing our sovereignty, whether we act or do not act. It is a question of judgment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the very existence of sovereignty is involved, of course.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, please.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree entirely that there is that risk. If I were to make a point about it I should say that under one type of international organization we would retain some choice of what we would give up to meet a risk, and under another type we would be confiding the decision to an international body.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the record of the United States upon that subject is clear. We have already put ourselves on record that the United States recognizes that in order to save sovereignty we must use sovereignty in joining other nations for security. I think it is rather remarkable to be able to turn back the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find a precedent for what we are called upon to do today.

On June 25, 1910, President Taft, the father of the present distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, approved a joint resolution which was passed by both Houses of Congress unanimously. Note what the resolution undertook to provide:

> That a committee of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armament of the nations of the world by international agreement and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force, for the preservation of universal peace and to consider and report upon any other means—

That language is quite broad, it will be seen—

> to diminish the expenditures of Governments for military purposes and to lessen the possibilities of war.

That is what we are after. The record thus made is an American precedent.

I am not informed whether there was a wave of fear running underground or overhead that thereby the United States of America would lose its sovereignty. Yet we have had such a wave of fear in connection with the present discussion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. In this discussion which constantly goes on with respect to the preservation of sovereignty, always I come back to the thought that the greatest enemy of sovereignty to any nation is war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. The Japanese destroyed our sovereignty at Pearl Harbor. We had a right to live in peace at Pearl Harbor. That was taken from us by the Japanese. War has destroyed not only our sovereignty abroad, but has destroyed our sovereignty at home in many details of our domestic life.

Mr. AUSTIN. That was territorial sovereignty, which was something more.

Mr. HATCH. We talk so much and are so fearful of yielding a little bit of sovereignty and trying to preserve something—I do not know what—that I am reminded of the words of the Saviour, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it." Sometimes I think when we talk too much about our sovereignty and protecting it we are likely to destroy and lose it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No one could disagree with the splendid statement which has just been made by the senior Senator from New Mexico. The question is not: Do we want to have peace; do we want to avoid the kind of condition in which we find ourselves? The question is: What remedy shall we pick among the offered remedies in an attempt to realize our ambitions? People may issue pious proclamations saying, "This is for peace; this is to prevent this thing; hence we must all be for it"; but it is no more than to invite one into a drug store to help himself to all the lethal medicines which may be on the shelves.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado indicate very clearly the necessity for discussion and settlement of this question among us. If the Connally resolution, either in its original text or as proposed to be amended by the Pepper amendment or as it may later be presented by the Committee on Foreign Relations, is going to be voted against because of the idea that by it we shall be permitting in the future a new violation of our sovereignty, then for heaven's sake let us see this discussion on sovereignty through, to the end that it may be settled. That is where we are.

If I could assume that the matter were simply one of a choice between the committee text, the Pepper amendment, the Danaher amendment, and other amendments, it would be much easier for me, and I would not need to weary the Senate with a discussion of the subject of sovereignty, and particularly a discussion of what the expression "free and sovereign nations" means.

Mr. DANAHER rose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have paid avid attention to the Senator's very able argument, and I have enjoyed my various discussions with him about the subject matter. I may add, however, that when I first read the resolution, after it was printed and made available to us, and tried to give some study to the definitions and the actual meaning of the words and the nature of the commitments which might be read into the advice, I saw, or thought I saw, at least, the need for an understanding of what we were talking about.

When I offered the amendment which is the pending question, I took the term "free and sovereign nations," as it appears in line 6, to refer to a nation such as the United States. We can be said to be free and sovereign and hence to have the capacity to act with others. We can take from our vast reservoir of external sovereignty and merge a portion of it into some new entity. For example, the State of Texas, once a republic, possessed of the external sovereignty the United States itself has, merged its external sovereignty into the sovereign United States of America. In that respect the State of Texas differed from all other States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Except Vermont.

Mr. DANAHER. Except Vermont? Well, Mr. President, as the offshoot of my own State of Connecticut, I will except Vermont. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, having in mind that the external sovereignty of a nation is what is affected—and I agree with the Senator from Vermont in that respect—there is

some point in the observation of the Senator from Colorado, surely, that if a free and sovereign State at the beginning, having power to negotiate, shall so far negotiate its external sovereignty that it is lost, he asks—and advisedly—"At what point are you going to stop yielding your sovereignty?"

I do not undertake to answer that question. I simply place my interpretation on the comments of the Senator from Colorado. But in order to meet any such possible question I found it necessary in my thinking on the subject to try to define the word "join"; because in line 6 of the resolution it is specified that we advise, "that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations." I undertook, therefore, to define the word "join" to mean to unite in effort, meaning that a group of free and sovereign nations unite in an effort to accomplish whatever else is specified in that clause.

I ask the Senator from Vermont whether my reference to the term "join" coincides with his understanding of what will eventuate if free and sovereign nations shall join in the establishment and maintenance of international authority.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, Mr. President. By that, I do not mean that I would assent to the proposed amendment just as it reads.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have talked about this with the Senator from Connecticut. My own choice would be "'join' means unite in effort and organization." However, that is not in conflict with the point I have been making. All this discussion rather corroborates the claim I have been making, that by joining with other free and sovereign nations we shall not be destroying our sovereignty or their sovereignty, but shall be exercising it. We may impose conditions upon it, that it shall be exercised in certain ways, but we shall not be giving it up.

The other possibility that is conceived here, namely, that we could give away enough of it so that we would not have any left is inconsistent with realism, because we have a check on us in the Constitution of the United States, which we cannot transgress, and we are so interested in not doing so that I think we are about to have from the Committee on Foreign Relations a proposal which will expressly provide that we shall not try to short-cut the Constitution in the making of a treaty, but shall follow the customary processes of the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for about 2 minutes?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been authorized and directed to offer an amendment to the original resolution, rather an addendum or supplement to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. An annex.

Mr. CONNALLY. Or, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan, an annex.

We do not propose any change in the language of the original resolution, either as to substance or form or punctuation. However, we do propose the following amendment:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CONNALLY, in line 9—

I believe it is, or at the end of the resolution to insert the following:

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The second paragraph:

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. President, the amendment is not being offered with a view that it in any wise changes the purposes or the principles enunciated in the original resolution, but it is being offered upon the theory that the first paragraph of the amendment is simply a restatement and a ratification and a confirmation of the language contained in the original resolution, which we think has met with the general approval not only of the people of the United States, but of foreign nations and their representatives.

With respect to the second paragraph, which refers to the necessity for the Senate acting upon any treaties, we do not think that from a legal standpoint that is necessary, because in the original resolution we used the language, "United States, through its constitutional processes." When that language was used, we used it with the specific intent of saying that this Government could act only through its constitutional processes, one of which is that any treaty negotiated by the Executive must be negotiated with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is still our view. We do not think it is necessary to add this supplement; but certain Senators were rather disturbed by a fear that the resolution might be construed as a ratification in advance. We have seen fit to recognize their views in that respect, and to make perfectly clear what we intended in the original resolution. I hope that these views will meet with the approval of Members of the Senate.

I see that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is present. I should like to have his attention for a moment. I am instructed by the committee to ask unanimous consent of the Senate that this amendment be considered as the one in order, ahead of other amendments, if we can obtain the consent of the Senator from Connecticut, whose amendment is pending.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Texas to modify the committee resolution by submitting this committee amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I am doing now.

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection to a unanimous-consent agreement that the amendment be offered without displacing the pending business.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not merely offering it. I want it to take precedence in consideration over other amendments.

Mr. DANAHER. I have no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I am now offering be considered as the pending business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to the Senator from Texas that, instead of having his amendment pending, he ask unanimous consent that it be considered a part of the original resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I agree to that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the request of the Senator from Texas, assuming that unanimous consent were granted, preclude the offering of other amendments?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. President, I will modify the unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that I may modify the original resolution by having these two paragraphs considered as a part of the original resolution.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it necessary for the Senator from Texas to obtain unanimous consent to modify his own amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not seeking to modify the amendment. I am seeking to modify the resolution. It is not my personal resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment is offered at the unanimous suggestion of the committee, unanimous consent is not required.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cannot say that it is the unanimous action of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the action of the committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is the action of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Senator has a right to modify the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that be the case, I modify the original resolution by adding the two paragraphs, which will constitute additional paragraphs of the resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee, on this action modifying the resolution so as to embody the language now proposed. The language embodies, practically verbatim ad literatim, point 4 of the Moscow Conference declaration. It embodies the point of that declaration which deals with our post-war policy and plan.

Those of us who have supported Senate Resolution 114 ever since March 16 last have felt that the basis of our whole post-war policy should be a general international organization. A general international organization, open to all nations, has been the foundation and framework of all that we have contended for and all that we have fought for. In my opinion other provisions of Senate Resolution 114 must and will inevitably follow the establishment of a general international organization. I shall wholeheartedly support the resolution as now modified by the distinguished chairman of the committee. I hope that the resolution may be brought to a speedy vote.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Alabama has stated the theory upon which his group has accepted the composite whole which the Senator from Texas is now presenting. I simply wish to add, from the standpoint of the subcommittee which has been laboring with this subject for many months—and I think I speak for every member of the subcommittee—that we have accepted it because in our judgment there is absolutely nothing in it which was not comprehended and encompassed by the original resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The point which the Senator from Michigan has just raised is one which I wish to stress. Of course this amendment or modification was worked out in consultation with those of us who have been advocating other amendments and other proposals. In accordance with the interpretations which have been given on the floor of the Senate to Senate Resolution 192, I believe that what the Senator from Michigan has just said is correct. However, Mr. President, some of us have not always interpreted the resolution in just that way. The modification makes clear some of those things which we thought it was essential to make clear.

At least the offering of this modification by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations gives to the resolution, as now modified, a common ground upon which all can stand who are truly desirous of having an expression of the United States Senate toward the general aims and objectives which the proponents of Senate Resolution 192 claim for it, and also the objectives which we who sponsored certain amendments claimed for our amendments.

Mr. President, I see no reason why we cannot all unite in support of the resolution as modified.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to push consideration of the resolution along as rapidly as possible. I shall remain in the Chamber constantly. To my mind promptness in voting on this resolution is essential if it is to have any psychological appeal to the other countries of the world and to the people of the United States.

For that reason I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it take a recess to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. WILLIS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish very cordially to concur in the statements which have been made by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and to join in commendation of the action of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in what he has just done in the modification of Senate Resolution 192. Obviously, the group with which I have been associated believes that the modification of the resolution has achieved some clarification of the original resolution. We propose to support Senate Resolution 192 as modified by the amendment of the able chairman of the committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall not offer, as I had previously given notice that I would do, for myself and 13 other named Senators, the amendment which is printed and which lies on the desks of Senators, designed to clarify and strengthen Senate Resolution 192.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. As the proponent of the last paragraph of the newly modified resolution, I wish to say I think the committee has acted wisely in including the content of the amendment which I had formerly proposed to the pending resolution. We who are not experts in the interpretation of the Constitution in its strictest sense, but who speak as laymen for the common citizenry of the country, will find, I hope, that our fears and our doubts have been greatly resolved by the action of the committee. Speaking for myself—and I believe I express the sentiments of the many able Senators who have talked with me concerning this amendment and have commended it—we can concur in the wording of the modification and in the new form of the resolution, subject, of course, to careful study of its contents. It appears that the sovereign rights of the people have been safeguarded.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me so that I could make this statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

I wish to speak for about 2 minutes on the matter of having inserted in the RECORD at this point a clipping from the New York Times of yesterday, November 2, and in order to read from it one paragraph which seems to me to have something to contribute at this point, as we see evidence of a possible happy resolution of our discussions.

Speaking, if I may, on behalf of bystanders in the Senate who have heard the discussions of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the 14 Senators, we have been rather innocent bystanders hoping for a resolution. Lest there should be any contention as to whether we are Paul or Cephas, I wish to quote from an interview with Cordell Hull at Moscow—an interview which he authorized yesterday or the day before—as a contribution to what he undoubtedly anticipated would be the present scene.

In discussing the part isolationist sentiment played in bringing the war, he did not fail to censure the United States, including both the Democratic and Republican Parties. He recalled that as late as 1940 there were shouts from every part of the political prize ring about keeping out of the war and keeping the American boys at home.

The political parties, he said, vied with each other as to who would make the most extreme representations.

It seems to me that all of us may pause in proper humility and modesty as we look forward to the achievement of this unanimity of action, in welcoming whatever power from above is bringing us to this path.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times for November 2, 1943]

U. S. ISOLATIONISTS CENSURED BY HULL—STRESSES IN MOSCOW THEY DID NOT PREVENT WAR—SAYS SOVIET LEADERS SCORN DOCTRINE

Moscow, Nov. 1.—At press conferences last night Secretary of State Hull and Foreign Secretary Eden both made it clear the Moscow meetings had accomplished far more than the most optimistic had predicted before it began. Mr. Eden spoke off the record but Mr. Hull permitted attribution of his remarks without direct quotation.

Looking well and cheerful despite the twelve lengthy sessions, Mr. Hull gave reporters a lengthy background talk on the steps that led to the war, and, finally, to international cooperation to defeat the Axis and then to preserve peace.

He thought the conference had laid the foundation for cooperation of the United States, Russia, Britain, and China on a basis of broad, sound, mutually advantageous policies and that now there was no way to stop a sound, healthy concept of the post-war world.

He expressed the belief that since the cooperation was founded on trust and confidence and was to mutual advantage, there would be a fuller exchange of military information so all would know what the others were doing. He said the European Advisory Commission would work out a system for a better exchange of military information.

Pleased by cooperation

He thought it was of the greatest importance that the four countries had decided to adopt sane, moderate, international cooperation. He recalled that the war had been brought about by the failure of peace-loving countries to cooperate.

He said he was tremendously gratified beyond all expectations to find that Soviet statesmen and leaders, as they surveyed all phases of the world situation, accepted the doctrine that isolation was bad for their country and that they should work with other countries.

Mr. Hull said that when he left the United States most persons thought nothing would come of the meeting and that the Russians were more likely to go on the isolationist route. That had not been proved to be true, he added.

In discussing the part isolationist sentiment played in bringing the war, he did not fail to censure the United States, including both the Democratic and Republican Parties. He recalled that as late as 1940 there were shouts from every part of the political prize ring about keeping out of the war and keeping the American boys at home.

The political parties, he said, vied with each other as to who would make the most extreme representations. Such slogans as: "Stay out of other peoples' wars" and "Don't pull others' chestnuts from the fire" had been worked overtime, he said.

He made clear that he was not questioning the patriotism of those who clung to the old isolationist ideas, but he made it equally clear that they had not prevented this war, nor would they prevent a future conflict.

Stresses ties to Russia

Discussing cooperation with Russia, Mr. Hull said he did not recall any two countries whose national interests presented less antagonistic interests and more common interests. Opportunities present themselves on every hand for cooperation between the United States and Russia, he said.

He stressed it was high time for Russia, Britain, and the United States to get together to solve the world crisis before it was too late, and he made plain, too, his gratification that China joined as an original signatory.

To Mr. Hull, Joseph Stalin is a remarkable person who quickly impresses you with his ability, judgment, and broad grasp of world problems. The Secretary said he regarded Mr. Stalin as one of the leaders, along with Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt, who are bearing a responsibility such as no other leaders will have to encounter for the next five centuries.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. On behalf of those of our group of some 15 or 16 Senators on this side of the aisle, I desire to thank the Foreign Relations Committee and its chairman for their sincere effort to find a common ground on which we could be united.

To many of us in our little group, a clearer statement of the principles this Nation espouses in the field of foreign policy would suit us much better. We believe that the modification of the pending resolution stating the Senate's conviction—and I believe it is the conviction of the Senate—developed in the discussion during the past days, that the permanent structure to maintain peace and security in the world should be a general international organization, which is one of the cardinal points we have sought to establish from the beginning of this debate, constitutes a clarification and a strengthening of the pending resolution. I am very happy that this action has been taken.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to add my further personal endorsement to the resolution as modified. I wish to thank the Committee on Foreign Relations and the subcommittee for the consideration they have given to this matter, and for bringing forward the modification at this time. It seems to me that the modification adds clearness to the resolution. It makes it of more value to the President, as advice; of more value to the people, as a statement of our position; of more value to our allies, and it also will provide a clearer test of the sentiment of the Senate on the issue before us. It specifically provides for a continuing organization to meet conditions in the post-war period, and it specifically invites in all nations, large and small. I believe it is a substantial step forward, and that it meets the requirements of the times.

I wish to congratulate the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for its contribution to this discussion, and to join cordially in the endorsement of the resolution as modified.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, it being apparent that there are no other Senators now seeking the floor at this particular time to refer to Senate Resolution 192, as modified, I shall proceed to finish my remarks.

Earlier in the day I made the claim that although the fulfillment of victory may be far off, yet the choice of the way is now before us. One of the most encouraging signs that the Senate is about to choose the correct way is the report of the Foreign Relations Committee just made and favorably commented upon by, I believe, all Senators who have proposed amendments.

Of course, I shall support Senate Resolution 192, as modified. It answers two questions: First, whether the Senate of the United States is going to cooperate with the executive branch of the Government in the making of a treaty which involves cooperation with the other sovereign and peace-loving powers of the earth for the purpose of maintaining the security of each of those nations, as well as our own. The answer to the question whether we will join is perfectly unequivocal.

However, Mr. President, it also answers the other question—namely, how the Senate will cooperate or assent, and to what kind or manner of cooperation will the Senate agree, with the executive department.

It is now found in the new paragraph, namely, that—

> The Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I am very much gratified that the Senator from Texas has proposed this amendment, and I assure my distinguished colleagues of my hearty support.

I should like, if I could do so properly without violation of the rules of the Senate, to have the remainder of what I should like to say on this subject printed in the RECORD. However, I refrain from making such a request because I understand that that practice is frowned upon by the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the paragraph which the Senator has just quoted there is a phrase "based on the principle of a sovereign equality of all peace-loving states." Has the Senator given consideration to what may be the significance of the words "sovereign equality"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should be very much interested to hear the Senator discuss it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have fully discussed the sovereign element in that combination of words. I have before me chapter IV of The Principles of International Law, by Lawrence, to which I have referred before as a book that has guided me since I was a boy in college. I shall not undertake to read the chapter, but I shall undertake to quote from the language of this distinguished author the definition of equality as applied to sovereign nations. It is this:

> From the time of Grotius to the present day publicists have declared that all independent states are equal in the eye of international law. The equality they speak of is not an equality of power and influence but of legal rights. They hold that the smallest and weakest of independent political communities has exactly the same position before the law of nations as the strongest and most extensive empire.

Mr. President, if I were discussing this subject fully, I would have to admit that that idealistic definition broke down in the nineteenth century and that nations were not, in fact, equal in the eyes of the law. The great combinations of power known as the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance, of course, had to exercise, if they carried out their purposes, certain controls that rendered legal rights of small states less secure than they should be under the definition I have read. Ultimately the six great powers got into such a situation in the attempt to exercise this sort of primacy

over smaller powers that peace could no longer exist, and the First World War ensued. It was to avoid a repetition of such a condition that I believe the negotiators at Moscow reverted to the ancient ethical doctrine of sovereign equality.

We have not seen sovereign equality for a century. It is one of the things I have spoken of in what I have said heretofore as a spiritual element which we must consider as a fundamental in any treaty into which we may enter hereafter. We must regard right and wrong in writing the code of international law. That code has never been written; it must be written, and it must be written on the theory that the law of God is the foundation for the laws of man and is the only safe and sound foundation for an enduring peace on this earth.

Mr. President, I cannot bring myself to go on with my address. I have before me some additional pages prepared on the theory that I was to discuss the Connally text as it came before the Senate; that I would support the Connally text as proposed to be amended by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and other Senators, and I have analyzed the difference between the original text and what it would be if the Pepper amendment were accepted. I would have favored the pending amendment, but, if the Pepper amendment had been rejected, I would have favored the Connally text, because I wanted, at least, to have the Senate affirm that it would cooperate with the executive department in the making of a treaty which would bind the United States of America to join with the other sovereign nations of the world in the maintenance of security.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, last week the able Senator from Vermont discussed the difference between a treaty and an agreement between the United States and foreign nations, and I believe it was stated that, under the Constitution, a treaty was required to be concurred in by the Senate, whereas an agreement was not required to be submitted to the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not discuss it, Mr. President. I pointed out that the Constitution recognizes that a treaty differs from an agreement. I was then really answering that question alone, which was asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask another question of the Senator from Vermont. Can the international organization referred to in the resolution as amended, or as proposed to be amended, be joined in by the United States of America by any method other than by treaty?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; of course not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It cannot be?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not by agreement?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. I know to what the distinguished Senator refers. I have seen what I believe he refers to, that is, the publication of the theory that it may be joined in by concurrent resolution, or by act of Congress, using the admission of a State into the Union as a precedent. That is no precedent at all. Acting under the Constitution to admit a State into the Union is quite different from entering into a treaty with a foreign nation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am afraid the Senator from Vermont does not gather exactly the point I am driving at. It is this: Does the Senator believe that an agreement may be made by the Chief Executive without concurrence by the Senate; that is, can the Chief Executive make an agreement on behalf of the United States which would be binding upon the United States and bring us into any world organization plan?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would have to be by treaty, and by concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present of this body?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. I have no question about that at all, and when I referred to the difference between a treaty and a contract I merely pointed to the fact that in section 10 of article 1 of the Constitution the framers recognized the difference when they said in the first clause, "No State shall enter into any treaty." And when they stated in the third clause of the same section, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign power," the makers of our Constitution recognized that there was a distinction, and that if the Congress saw fit to approve an agreement or a compact made by a State with a foreign power, that would be a binding obligation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator, because I may say that it was in the light of the very able discussion of the distinction between an agreement and a treaty that I addressed my questions to him today, because I wanted to have it very clear in my mind that if the resolution should be agreed to as amended, any agreement made pursuant to it which would take this country into any organization, would have to be by treaty, and would not be effective until ratified, as a treaty is ratified under the provision of the Constitution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I could not be more emphatic than I have been, I am sure. I am willing to repeat my affirmative answer, and say that I think that the last provision of Senate Resolution 192 does away with any question of that kind, providing, as it does, "That pursuant to the Constitution of the United States"——

Mr. REVERCOMB. "Any treaty"—mark those words——

Mr. AUSTIN (reading)—

> Any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

I think that takes care of the matter fully.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That certainly takes care of it so far as a treaty is concerned, and I understand that it is the Senator's view that by treaty only can this country be joined in a world organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, I have concluded what I am willing to say at this time, having a sort of a feeling of frustration in respect to the record which I intended to leave behind me in connection with the great debate which has occurred on Senate Resolution 192.

I have in view, of course, the parliamentary situation, and the desire of practical men to get to an agreement. I have in view the value of early decision, as early as is expedient and reasonable in our relations with the rest of the world, but the primary cause for my getting out of the way and yielding to others, and for backing to the fullest the resolution as it stands, is that I see in it, and in the early adoption of it, a tremendous step toward that victory for which our boys are fighting, and for which we will show that we have courage ourselves to fight. When we adopt the resolution as it now reads, we answer the question whether we will stand up elbow to elbow with them to fight for the great cause of security and peace and freedom, and the assurance that their children and children's children shall not be caused to yield their lives or make any other sacrifice in war for generations to come. That is the main thing, and the fact that we are willing to risk our political lives for that cause is some gratification to me. I have been risking mine for that cause for some time, and I have made some sacrifices which the record does not reveal.

At last we have a resolution before us for which we can vote knowing what it says, a resolution providing for something which never has been tried before with any ground to believe that it could be successful.

I am glad to close by saying that I support the resolution as it is now framed with much more interest than I could have supported either the original text or the text as amended by the Pepper amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as one of the original supporters of Senate Resolution 114, and as one of the Senators who joined in presenting the amendment to the Connally resolution known as the Pepper amendment, supported by some 14 of us, it was my desire to speak today at some length in connection with the amendment. However, in view of what has happened since early this morning, when our group first met, it will be necessary for me to digress from the speech I had prepared and had intended to deliver, and to read from parts of it and to speak extemporaneously on other sections of it.

First let me say that, through the kindness of the people of New England, last summer I had the opportunity to learn at first hand how the American public felt about the participation of the Senate of the United States in some form of resolution that would go a long way toward insuring the peace of the world,

the protection of our children and our children's children, and perhaps bring about that result.

Let me say that today will go down as a great day in the annals of American history for what has been done by all of us on the floor of the Senate and in the Committee on Foreign Relations. As one of those who joined in offering the Pepper amendment to the Connally resolution, it is going to be a privilege and pleasure for me to vote for the resolution as modified by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as he has just submitted it to the Senate. I also desire to take this opportunity to express in my humble way the high esteem in which I hold those Senators who joined with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in his amendment, which in my opinion would have strengthened the original resolution before this body.

History will show, Mr. President, that the original authors of the B2-H2 amendment, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] will in the years to come deserve much praise from the American public for last winter opening up the discussions with respect to post-war peace.

So, Mr. President, I stand today before this great body with a deep appreciation for what has been accomplished through the cooperation of both the Republican Members and the Democratic Members of this body. I am certain that when the resolution, as modified, shall be agreed to—and I trust it will be adopted shortly—it will put new life into those in the executive branch of our Government who have worked so diligently, those representing the other nations who have worked so patiently, first at Washington, and lastly at Moscow, and, Mr. President, above all, the men of our armed forces, the heroes who have protected our country.

None of us, I trust, wants to burden the administration and the State Department with specific instructions or a detailed map of what the post-war world should look like. Indeed, it would be the height of stupidity for the Senate to engage in dispute over post-war boundaries in central Europe, or the particular details of any kind of peace settlement. We are giving advice; we are not giving instructions. We are expressing the wish and the will of the American people for a neighborly give-and-take in international affairs, rather than the dog-eat-dog mentality which marked the years of isolationism, high tariffs, and international cartels.

I have been a businessman all my life. I view all questions from a practical standpoint. The only ideology I know is what is practical for America. The real dreamers are those who fancy that our country can prosper and remain at peace in a world of economic and political isolation, in a world of ruthless and unrestrained economic competition. As practical men we may as well realize that economic prosperity and security for America can exist only if security and prosperity exist in the other national economies of the world. A peaceful America depends on peace throughout the world.

As a businessman I have been forced to think in economic terms and it is in those terms that I think of world-wide cooperation following the war.

Whatever the immediate causes are of the present war, in my opinion the dynamics of economic isolation over the past 20 years helped to produce fascism in Europe and led through the accumulated irritations and aggravations of economic conflict to world-wide war.

As a businessman thinking of the vast mass of American capital to be invested, thinking of our great shipping fleet and of the export and import business to be done, I am convinced that an international authority to promote cooperation, to adjudicate disputes will be imperative.

For practical business reasons, I favor a clear statement on the part of the Senate and, Mr. President, I am happy today that a clearer statement has been made than was originally presented. We must be clear or we are evading our responsibilities. To be clear now will demonstrate not merely to our allies but to the peoples of occupied Europe and the peoples in Axis countries that from now on our economic and political power will be used in conjunction with the power of the other great nations of the world to maintain peace.

As a practical businessman I am going to support also the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. This amendment puts its finger on what in my opinion must be the primary function of the international organization to promote cooperation. The Senator's amendment specifies the broad spheres of activity and the general principles to guide the activities of an international organization to maintain the peace.

In the history of America, political isolation has been promoted by certain manufacturing industries that are interested in obtaining exclusive control of the American domestic market through high tariffs. Not only have they tried to control the American domestic market, but they have fought in open economic warfare upon the world market with the help of high tariffs.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that 25 of the 37 Senators who signed the Lodge resolution of March 4, 1919, also voted for the Fordney-McCumber tariff when it first passed the Senate.

Of the 37 Senators who signed the Lodge resolution, only 1 Senator, Borah of Idaho, voted against the Fordney-McCumber bill when it first passed the Senate, although 3 voted against the conference report on the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922.

In the minds of southerners, isolationism has long been identified with economic isolationism, high tariffs, and monopolies. As a cotton and agricultural economy, the South has suffered for decades from the high tariffs beneficial primarily to the industrial monopolies of the North and the East. This is not a new story. It is not necessary here to repeat and analyze the history of the American tariff. However, it should be said that the South, probably more than any other section of the country, has depended upon the maintenance of foreign export markets, and those markets have been materially affected by the high-tariff policy. The history of shipping and the history of cotton exports, so far as the South is concerned, are one and the same.

Mr. President, every Senator, I believe, is familiar with the fact that the monopoly price paid for industrial articles as against the competitive price of agricultural commodities has milked the rural areas of the country for the benefit of the industrial areas. Let me digress to say that a study of the per capita wealth, of the per capita income, of outgo, a study of any worth-while thing in the American economy, will show at the bottom the rural areas which have been milked for the past 75 years.

It is clear, then, why almost without exception southern Senators have been ardent advocates of international trade and low tariffs, and have been consistent opponents of economic isolationism.

I do not wish to debate the part the Hawley-Smoot tariff played in bringing on the depression of 1929, nor would I argue the stimulus which that tariff gave to fascism in Europe. It is sufficient to point out that within a year after the passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff at least 30 nations had adopted retaliatory steps. The consequent "dumping" on the world market of commodities which the home markets could not consume at monopoly prices did much to aggravate and irritate international relations. Charges of "dumping" were quite common during the depression.

Fortunately, in the last 10 years we have, under the guidance of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, seen the institution of an intelligent reciprocal-trade-agreement policy. Reciprocal agreements are in direct opposition to high tariffs; reciprocal agreements are the reverse of economic isolation. As every Senator knows, the South has earnestly supported this program. Indeed, the reciprocal trade agreements have in the past 10 years become identified with our good-neighbor policy in South America, and have done much to strengthen the willingness of the other nations to support America's foreign policy and our war effort. Permit me to quote from the Columbia (S. C.) Record of April 7, 1943, when the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was under discussion:

> If we renew the act, our partners among the United Nations may expect to see us take the lead in building a sound world economy after the war. They can guess what kind of world they may expect to do business in when the fighting ends and the period of post-war reconstruction begins. If we reject the bill providing for the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act they may know then that the United States will try again to withdraw its immense power into the shell of economic isolation.

Those trade treaties, Mr. President, and those final agreements, have much in common with what the world will think of the resolution and of the modification of it which has been so ably prepared, and I sincerely hope that the resolution as modified will be adopted by the Senate, certainly before the week is out.

The South has benefited from the trade-agreements program. The agreements have done much to protect and strengthen foreign markets for American cotton.

Mr. President, here let me turn my mind to a time a few years ago when the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution providing for a process, as we knew it in those days in the business world at home, of swapping cotton for rubber. I can remember now the statements from London, and I can remember the large quantities of cotton which were shipped from warehouses, and the large amount of rubber which was exchanged from England.

My only regret, and I believe it was the regret of most of those who were associated with the cotton business, was that the swapping process did not go quite far enough. If we could only have swapped several million bales of cotton, instead of several hundred thousand bales, Mr. President, we would have removed from this country much of the surplus cotton, we would have benefited farmers by an advance in the price of cotton, and when the war came, the stocks of rubber in this country would have been such that, although they might not have been all that were needed for war, certainly we should not have found ourselves in the position in which we found ourselves when the supply of rubber from the Orient was discontinued as a result of the treacherous Japanese attack.

In those days England was so anxious to swap rubber, because of the economic conditions and because of the foreign-exchange rates on sterling and United States dollars, that I hesitate to say what would have been the benefits which would have accrued to the war effort had the cotton-for-rubber program been materially enlarged.

Mr. President, after the war American shipping tonnage will reach at least 50,000,000 tons. Ours will be the greatest merchant marine of all times. In that connection let me turn back to the time after the last war when we not only scrapped much of our Navy, but much of our merchant marine. Let us hope and pray it may never happen again. I will do all I can to that end. Let me commend the Members of the Senate who worked out, through the Committee on Commerce, and on the floor of the Senate, the proper program for the handling of the few remaining merchant vessels we had in the late twenties. I say "the few remaining merchant vessels" because many were scrapped, junked, or sold. It was through the contracts which were written and through agreements which were made in accordance with the legislation passed by the Congress that we had at least some semblance of shipping under the Maritime Commission when we started to develop our merchant marine.

Mr. President, after the war the tonnage of American shipping will be greater than the tonnage of the remainder of the world combined, and, in addition, we will have a shipbuilding capacity of 25,000,000 tons a year.

Just as we predominate today in the production of the weapons of war, so in the peace we will greatly out-produce the rest of the world combined.

Our post-war economy will not be able to function on the basis of economic isolation and high protective tariffs. On the contrary, if we are to employ our workers, our facilities and our capital, we will be forced to become the world's greatest creditor Nation, the world's greatest shipping Nation, with the greatest export and import trade of all time.

Either the United Nations will go forward together to build a prosperous and peaceful community of nations or else they will return to the law of the jungle, to ruthless economic conflict and competition, the only end of which is war.

Mr. President, in my opinion, these considerations are buttressed by the announcement of the Moscow agreements. I cannot conceive that the Senate of the United States will do less than the representatives of the four great powers of the United Nations have done.

The time has come for the Senate of the United States to act vigorously. Secretary of State Hull on his first air trip has flown 12,000 miles to a foreign capital to reach agreements essential to the security and protection of the American armies and people. I believe the Senate should support his hand in the conduct of our foreign policy. It is time we stopped talking about our constitutional functions, and began to exercise them in full support of the war effort.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I speak in behalf of an amendment which will be offered, but which I shall not present at this time. Stripped of excess verbiage, the amendment would add the following language at the end of the resolution:

> And since it is recognized that trade and economic collaboration are necessary to assure the maintenance of peace, the United States will cooperate with other nations to promote trade and to remove impediments and restraints which tend to hinder the prosperity of the United States and other nations, and which prevent nations from access upon fair and equitable terms to the raw materials and trade necessary to their national well-being.

Mr. President, I am a friend of the principles of collective security. I shall vote for the compromise resolution. I would have voted for the amendment presented by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] for himself and other distinguished Members of this body. I do not think either the original resolution or the modified resolution goes far enough. There can be no permanent peace, regardless of what kind of world organization is set up, unless an arrangement is made to remove the causes of war, and unless the organization is based upon a foundation of economic justice between the nations.

Last week in the city of New York, Hon. W. L. Clayton, one of the great cotton men of the world, spoke at the Foreign Trade Convention. He made a statement which is certainly true, and which fits the situation here. He said:

> It is perhaps natural that the popular conception of this collaboration centers in political and military arrangements.
>
> But it is quite impossible to obtain collective security through military arrangements if economic warfare as it was waged throughout the world in the inter-war period is to continue.
>
> As someone has well said:
>
> "The greater the economic significance of political frontiers, the greater the danger of war; and the greater the facility with which all nations may secure through commerce the basic necessities of national life, the greater the prospects of peace."

On October 28 Hon. Sumner Welles—and let me say that I do not agree with Mr. Welles in all matters—made a great speech to the Federal Council of Churches in the city of New York. I shall quote from what he had to say, because he put his finger on the weakness in the pending resolution and on what will be required to give us a chance for a permanent peace. Mr. Welles said:

> Without in any way minimizing the importance or difficulty of political problems relating to the creation of a new cooperative world structure, it seems abundantly clear, on the basis of painful experience in the past, which should be fresh in the memory of everyone, that whatever system of international security we and the other United Nations may devise will need a strong economic foundation.
>
> Because this basic truth was almost entirely ignored in the Treaty of Versailles, economic chaos began to develop immediately after the last war. Each nation promptly went its own economic way regardless of the effect on others. Nation after nation cut off trade and cut down production in other countries.
>
> These acts of economic warfare spread over the globe, causing untold suffering, bitterness, and despair. These acts of economic aggression caused unemployment and distress in all countries, including our own, despite our unmatched resources.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very glad to hear the statement made by the Senator. I entirely agree with him. Let me say to the Senator that I was in favor of the League of Nations until I went to Europe in 1923 and saw how, pursuant to the Versailles Treaty, countries had been divided up. It was made absolutely physically impossible for them to exist from an economic standpoint.

The reason why I hesitate, and shall probably vote against the resolution—although I think it is improved—is the fact that the adoption of this resolution would not mean anything. What will matter will be what is done by Russia, England, the United States, and other powers in solving the economic conditions of European countries so that from an economic standpoint it will be possible

for them to live. If that problem is not solved, all the resolutions we adopt, and all the fine phrases we use today, will mean absolutely nothing because unless those people can exist from an economic standpoint we are certain to be heading toward an economic war, unless it is prevented by force, which means, in effect, economic slavery. That is the reason why I have repeatedly said that the first thing which ought to be done is to bring about an economic union of Europe and do away with tariff barriers, quota systems, and that sort of thing, so that the peoples of Europe can live from an economic standpoint.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator and I thoroughly agree with him. As I shall show in a moment, economic warfare caused the failure of the League of Nations. In my judgment, the League of Nations would have failed, regardless of whether the United States had ratified its covenant or not.

Mr. WHEELER. I thoroughly agree. There are those who say that the reason why the League of Nations failed was that the United States kept out of it. The reason it failed was that European diplomats turned down Mr. Wilson's 14 points and threw them out the window. Selfishness and greed were so great that little nations were divided up so that they could not live. Austria was left with the city of Vienna, with nothing to draw upon. There could have been only one result, and that was revolution.

It was the economic distress which brought Mr. Hitler into power in Europe. Unless there is enough statesmanship and wisdom to do the things about which the Senator from Mississippi is talking, we shall have another war in Europe, regardless of all the Leagues of Nations, the pious resolutions, and the lip service we give them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Unless all impediments to the free flow of world trade are removed, we shall have a third world war, regardless of what organization is set up to promote the peace by armed force or otherwise.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am in hearty accord with the sentiments which have just been expressed by the able Senator from Mississippi and the able Senator from Montana relative to the absolute necessity for economic collaboration among the nations of the world.

Our group thought that an affirmative function should be exercised by the proposed international organization. For that reason we put into the amendment which we gave notice of proposing, as stating an objective of the international organization contemplated, the words "to promote cooperation among nations." Of course, it was contemplated that the principal cooperation which would be desired as the firm foundation of a stable peace would be economic collaboration.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if my friend the Senator from Florida will pardon an interruption, I think his principles are right. I would have voted for his amendment, because it was stronger than the Connally resolution; but I do not think it was strong enough on this point. The Senator stated in his very able and statesmanlike speech the other day that we should make a direct, concrete statement of intentions, as to what the Senate will do in the post-war world.

I think we should do that in the resolution as modified. The people of this country and the people of the world want to know if we will cooperate to remove restrictions and tariff barriers just as much as they want to know if we will join an organization of nations to preserve the peace by armed force.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to conclude?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Mississippi is absolutely correct. He will recall that I stated on the floor of the Senate in the course of my remarks that I heartily approve of his amendment. If the amendment of the able Senator from Mississippi shall not be adopted by the Senate, I think it certainly should be the contemplation and understanding of us all that the first paragraph which was added today by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] and which, in substance, is the fourth section of the Moscow agreement, means, by the use of the words "international peace and security," the objectives of the international organization, the establishment of the kind of economic cooperation and collaboration about which the able Senator from Mississippi has been speaking. The fourth section of the Moscow agreement reads:

That they——

That is, the joint signers of the Moscow agreement—

recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The able Senator from Mississippi has mentioned the possibility of a third world war based upon an economic condition.

The Senator from Montana made a statement in regard to the tariff situation. Let me say that the tariffs among European nations themselves, the reparations, and other things, from 1919 on, after the Versailles Treaty, certainly through 1927, were such that I believe everyone will agree that they were the leading factors in the rise of Hitler and Mussolini.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

I read further from the speech of Hon. Sumner Welles:

Each nation promptly went its own economic way regardless of the effect on others. Nation after nation cut off trade and cut down production in other countries.

These acts of economic warfare spread over the globe, causing untold suffering, bitterness, and despair. These acts of economic aggression caused unemployment and distress in all countries, including our own, despite our unmatched resources. They helped to bring about the state of mind which brought military dictatorships into power.

That sort of thing must not happen again. We cannot afford to concentrate our attention solely on questions of political and military security and overlook the economic problems which will confront us when the victory is gained. To do so would be fatal. No political and security structure of international organization could stand for long if economic relations between nations were characterized, as they were after the last war, by thrusts and counterthrusts of such economic weapons as high tariffs, restrictive quotas, embargoes, and discriminations. The nations in the world organization of the future must be economic friends, cooperating in that basic field of human relations, as well as political friends. Political cooperation and economic isolation simply will not mix.

Mr. President, I submit that economic isolation, in which the United States was the leader, was one of the fundamental causes of the present conflict. But before discussing the drift of this country and the world into economic isolation after the last war, I should like to quote from the most tragic casualty of World War No. 1, former President Woodrow Wilson, in a speech which he made at St. Louis on September 5, 1919:

Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here or any woman—let me say is there any child here—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry?

The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her. And the reason some nations went into war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred, was hot—successful commercial and industrial rivalry.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator from Mississippi to yield for the purpose of permitting me to submit an amendment to the committee resolution as modified, so that it may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the committee resolution as modified and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the pending resolution would not bind anyone. It would not bind any Member of this body. It would not bind this Senate or any succeeding Senate. It would not bind a succeeding Congress. What is the reason for adopting it? The reason we are asked to adopt the resolution, and the reason we will adopt it, is to assure our allies that we will cooperate to promote the peace of the world, and to assure the citizenship of the United States that in the post-war world we will cooperate to the best of our ability to remove the causes of war. The people of this country and the people of the world are not primarily interested in another League of Nations or another world organization; they are primarily interested in a world organization which will

cooperate to remove the causes of war, and make possible a permanent peace. I submit that unless such an organization is set upon a firm foundation of economic cooperation and collaboration which will remove tariff barriers and other restraints to the flow of trade it will be a failure, and we shall be headed for another world war.

The United States was the leader in economic nationalism and economic isolationism after the last World War. We passed the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. By so doing we made it practically impossible for the debtor nations of Europe to pay their debts. In June 1930 we passed the Hawley-Smoot Act and, as my distinguished friend from South Carolina has said, 33 nations immediately protested and adopted boycotts and discriminations against American products. In addition, they engaged in economic warfare among themselves, and during the period from 1929 to 1933 the stage was set for the present World War.

What happened in 1930, when we passed the Hawley-Smoot tariff law? I shall read from page 30 of a very noted work on the subject, Challenge to Freedom, by Hon. Henry W. Wriston:

> They set the tariff wall so high as to bring protests from 33 nations. The long debate in Congress on the Hawley-Smoot bill was observed with intense interest all over the world and retaliatory tariffs quickly followed its passage.
>
> One of the nations since occupied by Germany, whose independence we must now seek to reestablish, protested that the tariff meant that many of its citizens were forced "into the ranks of the unemployed * * * causing a general depression and * * * decreasing the buying power of the people and diminishing imports even of the most necessary articles." The process of economic retaliation greatly stimulated the drift toward totalitarian autarchy.

I now quote from page 500 of another very noted work, The League of Nations Economic Review, 1932:

> During the year and a half in which the Hawley-Smoot tariff was under discussion in both Houses of Congress and in the 2 years following its passage in June 1930, the material appearing in public print regarding international indignation, reprisals, and threats of reprisals would fill many sets of volumes.

From page 104 I quote the following:

> The fact is, according to seasoned observers, that rarely in history have the peaceful and phlegmatic people of Switzerland become so thoroughly aroused against a foreign nation as was the case against the United States during the year 1930 and, to a lesser extent, 1931.

I now quote from page 254:

> The whole movement was undoubtedly accentuated both by the alarm and resentment felt in many countries as the discussions of the new Hawley-Smoot tariff dragged on in the United States Congress from May 1929 to June 1930, and by the real effects of the tariff when it went into operation. It was followed quickly by new tariffs in many other countries; among others, Canada, Cuba, Mexico, France, Italy, Spain, Australia, New Zealand. In the case of the British Dominions, higher general tariffs were accompanied by an increased measure of imperial preference, and the general idea of a more extensive system of preferential duties with the British Empire was appreciably advanced.

Let me say that following our leadership, and under our influence, Great Britain abandoned her age-old trade policy in 1931, and adopted a system of protection.

I quote further from the League of Nations Economic Review, page 258:

> The Hawley-Smoot tariff went into effect in June 1930, in the full blast of the depression. Under the circumstances there was great indignation and resentment on the part of the majority of the countries of the world, but that of the debtor countries of Europe was extreme. This intense indignation, coupled with the absolute necessity of securing a favorable trade balance, could result in but one course of action: retaliatory tariff increases against the United States and the multiplication of import restrictions of all sorts.

I read from the statement issued at that time by the then head of the Italian Government:

> Italy will defend herself in her own way. We will make purchases only in those countries which will buy our goods. We will buy in the United States only the amount of goods equivalent to the amount of goods the United States will buy in Italy. We will purchase the rest elsewhere. Our ships will load foreign goods for Italy only if they be allowed to return to the same ports with Italian goods. These are the precise limits of the new problem.

Mr. President, the worst feature was not the discriminations and boycotts of American goods, but that the countries of Europe members of the League of Nations, immediately engaged, under our leadership, in economic warfare among themselves. From 1929 to 1939 the average level of tariff duties rose in England 112 percent, in Belgium 50 percent, in France 38 percent, and in Germany 29 percent. The point is, how can any world organization succeed when its members engage in economic warfare against each other? The world organization which we are pledging ourselves to cooperate in setting up can succeed only if it is based upon good will among the nations who participate, if it is built upon confidence. It is bound to fail if there is trade war, with the rivalry and hatred engendered thereby.

It is certainly worthy of note that the League of Nations became ineffective from the very time when its members engaged in trade warfare, partisanship, and the consequent hatred which was engendered, so that in 1931, when Japan invaded Manchuria, principally to get the resources for her economy, a league of nations, destroyed by rivalry, by the hatreds within itself, was not strong enough to resist that aggression.

There is not a responsible statesman, there is not a responsible economist, who does not say that at the very least the world depression of the 1930's was greatly deepened by economic warfare among the nations, of which the United States was the leader. Nations live by trade. The nations of Europe, with the exception of Russia, do not have within their borders the natural resources on which to feed their populations, and to enable them to live as decent human beings.

What is the picture of Germany? Germany is a nation normally without natural resources. She is a great industrial nation, second only in industrial production to the United States. Germany lives by buying raw materials in world markets, manufacturing them in German factories, and shipping the manufactured goods in world commerce.

The depression came on. Germany's neighbors, France, Britain, Czechoslovakia, and Spain, engaged in economic warfare, and set up barriers which prevented the flow of German trade. The United States did the same thing. The day Hitler assumed power in Germany in 1933 there were 4,800,000 unemployed workers who walked the streets of that country, the highest percentage of unemployed in the world, and whereas the strength of the Nazi Party had been declining for months, it picked up as the depression deepened, and Hitler came to power in Germany on the wings of the depression, a depression caused by economic warfare. The day he assumed power there the stage was set, and there was lit the spark that has set the world on fire.

In 1935 Italy invaded Ethiopia to get land on which to grow food, principally to get land on which to grow cotton. We had cotton and the South needed Italian goods. The South, with the lowest standard of living in this country, wanted the trade, but there were obstructions, the Hawley-Smoot tariff, which prevented the flow of commerce.

Italy, because she could not trade with us, could not obtain the cotton needed for her textile industry. She could not obtain the land on which to grow food. So she engaged in aggressive warfare. The League of Nations was pledged to stop war, and yet, because of the hatreds existing in Europe and because of the trade rivalries of the nations which belonged to the League, the League was so weak, so ineffective, that it could not prevent aggression on the part of one of the weakest nations on the continent of Europe.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is making some very able statements in connection with trade and with trade barriers, so far as tariffs are concerned, but I should like to ask the Senator if the international bankers did not also fix the exchange rate so that the value of the mark, greatly depreciated, and the value of the lira were not sufficient to purchase cotton?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true. That was during the period of inflation in those countries.

Mr. MAYBANK. The lira was worth about 4 cents at that time, as I remember.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I should like to go further and quote one of the first statements of policy that the Chancelor of Germany, Hitler, who later became its dictator, made upon assuming power:

> Germany must live. To do that, we must export or die.

He came to power as a result of economic warfare between the other nations of the world, as I have said, because of the depression their economic warfare caused, and he then began to manufacture the arms and lay the plans that

have resulted in bathing the world in blood.

Mr. President, we talk about an association of nations to preserve the peace by force, both economic and military, without agreeing to cooperate to remove trade barriers, and yet such an association has already failed. Does anyone for one moment think that had the United States joined the League of Nations, the League would have been effective? There was even less sentiment in the United States to intervene in the affairs of Europe than there was sentiment in Great Britain and France for membership in the League to intervene, and those countries were, therefore, unable, through the machinery of the League, to stop aggressive warfare. Disarmament failed to stop the present war. The United States took the greatest navy in the world, and, as a friendly gesture for permanent peace, sank it to the bottom of the sea; and the only good it served was to give Japan the opportunity to win in her assassin's attack at Pearl Harbor.

There is no use to argue the matter, Mr. President. There is no dispute about it. We cannot have permanent peace, much as we desire it, unless we remove the restrictions, the embargoes, the boycotts which have dammed the flow of world trade, which have caused a lowering of the standards of living of the countries of the world. If we do not remove those restrictions, there will in the future, as Woodrow Wilson predicted, be another great war.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Many people speak loosely and blame the United States for the failure of the League of Nations. I was glad to hear the Senator from Mississippi point out that England and France could not stop a war of aggression. The truth about it is that England and France completely dominated the League of Nations. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think they wanted to stop the war. If my remembrance of dates is correct, when Germany reoccupied the Rhineland, instead of Britain collaborating with France to stop it, she negotiated with Germany for the establishment of a German Fleet, which was to be as large as the navy of France. My recollection of dates may be inaccurate, but I know that England entered into an agreement with Germany that Germany's Fleet should be 35 percent of the British Fleet.

Mr. WHEELER. The truth about the matter is that France wanted to stop Germany going into the Rhineland, but England did not agree.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my impression.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. The Senator has spoken of taking down tariff walls, and so forth, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that there is something just as important, and that is the matter of the great cartels which control the raw materials of the world. There will not be peace in Europe unless the have-not countries are permitted to obtain the raw materials upon some decent basis.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. If the cartels are to control the raw materials of the world and be able to fix the prices of raw materials at such rates that the poorer countries will be unable to buy them—of course they can buy them if they have the money, but they must have enough money to enable them to buy them—if the cartels are going to control the materials and keep the have-not countries from obtaining them because of the tremendously high prices they fix upon them, the situation will become exceedingly difficult.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Montana. I may say that we have some cartels in this country. This Government for war purposes has built nitrogen fixation plants which should certainly be used after the war to give the agricultural interests of the country cheap fertilizer. There is certainly a great fertilizer trust. I have attempted in my own business to compete with it, or to buy fertilizer away from it in foreign countries. I think I know that that trust is scheming and conniving to continue to make American agriculture pay tribute to it, for it has been exploiting agriculture for years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] mentioned control by cartels and by corporations, but the greatest control of all was the control by the international bankers of the value of the money itself and of foreign exchange, whether it be liras, piasters, marks, dollars, or francs, or whatever it might be. I merely wish to ask the Senator if he agrees with me in the statement that in the control of exchange the international bankers controlled practically everything.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. President, one other matter and I shall be through. If we set up a world organization to outlaw aggression and to stop warfare by military means, and then do not make provision to remove the causes of war, instead of promoting peace we would be promoting tyranny, for millions of the citizens of have-not states could not get the resources on which to live.

I wish to quote from the Honorable Cordell Hull, one of the greatest Secretaries of State the United States has ever had:

> It is difficult—
>
> Said Secretary Hull—
>
> to keep the peace while at the same time engaging in trade wars. Trade wars breed all sorts of friction and bitterness between nations and move them to prepare armaments for possible defense against each other.

I read the following quotation from a statement by Dr. Francis Sayre, the able assistant to the Secretary of State, who pointed this out very clearly:

> The pathway of economic self-sufficiency leads as surely as the rising of the sun to growing unemployment and industrial break-down. It leads to economic chaos, international conflict, and eventual war. On the other hand, the pathway of increased international trading leads with equal sureness to increased employment and heightened standards of living. It leads to lessened international strain and conflict. It constitutes one of the absolutely necessary foundations for lasting peace.

Mr. President, I submit that the economic foundation for peace is not included in either the original resolution or in the resolution as now modified.

I speak as a friend of collective security. I believe in the principles of collective security. If I had been a Member of the Senate 24 years ago, I would have cast my vote in favor of ratification of the Covenant of the League of Nations. I believe in cooperative action by dominant states to stop aggression and to prevent war. I believe the United Nations should agree to respect the territorial integrity and the independence of each other and their neighbors, and I most certainly believe in a court of international justice to settle disputes between nations, and, further, that that organization should be backed by power, both economic and military, to enforce its decisions, and that the United States, acting in its sovereign capacity to supply its part of the forces, should assume its share of the responsibility to preserve the peace.

Oh, Mr. President, would that this country had only listened to the brilliant words of that great statesman, Woodrow Wilson. He pointed out the causes of war. He said we must have two things: a removal of trade restrictions and a league of nations.

I wish to quote now from President Wilson's last speech in behalf of this great cause. President Wilson said:

> And if the nations of the world do not maintain their concert to sustain the independence and freedom of those peoples, Germany will yet have her will upon them, and we shall witness the very interesting spectacle of having spent millions upon millions of American treasure and, what is much more precious, hundreds of thousands of American lives, to do a futile thing, to do a thing which we will then leave to be undone at the leisure of those who are masters of intrigue, at the leisure of those who are masters in combining wrong influences to overcome right influences, of those who are the masters of the very things that we hate and mean always to fight.

Mr. President, that speech was made at Indianapolis, Ind., in September 1919. Listen to this prophecy by Woodrow Wilson:

> For, my fellow citizens, if Germany should ever attempt that again, whether we are in the League of Nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not stand off and see murder done. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends and advocates of free government and then willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes. If a power such as Germany was, but thank God no longer is, were to do this thing upon the fields of Europe,

then America would have to look to it that she did not do it also upon the fields of the Western Hemisphere, and we should at last be face to face with a power which at the outset we could have crushed, and which now it is within our choice to keep within the harness of civilization.

I quote a part of one of the last statements President Wilson made in defense of the League of Nations, while he was on his last tour. At Pueblo, Colo., in the last speech President Wilson made, he said:

We said that they went over there not to prove the prowess of America or her readiness for another war but to see to it that there never was such a war again. It always seems to make it difficult for me to say anything, my fellow citizens, when I think of my clients in this case. My clients are the children; my clients are the next generation. They do not know what promises and bonds I undertook when I ordered the armies of the United States to the soil of France, but I know, and I intend to redeem my pledges to the children; they shall not be sent upon a similar errand.

Mr. President, I submit that had we but followed those prophetic words, had we but followed the brilliant statesmanship of Woodrow Wilson, who in my judgment is one of the great world figures of the ages, we would not be in this war, and this world would live in peace.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say that I fully endorse everything the Senator has said about President Wilson. I was a member of the Senate during the fight over the League of Nations, and I very strongly supported Mr. Wilson in the noble fight he made. I was a member of the Senate when the catastrophe occurred. It was my opinion then, and it is my opinion now, that if the United States had become a party to the League of Nations, we would not now be in a war with Germany, that we would not now be in any war.

The League of Nations was wonderfully conceived, and if it had been developed according to the plans of those who sponsored it, it would have been very different from the League as it actually developed. The League of Nations was a farce almost from the beginning, and was so treated by our European friends, who disregarded it and who changed its terms whenever they saw fit to do so.

In my judgment, we are fighting in this war for but one thing, and that is to establish a permanent peace. Unless we effect a permanent peace after the war is over—and if it is effected it will have to be effected by the United States—we shall have spent the lives of all our boys and we shall have spent all our money in vain. A permanent and just peace is the only thing we will get out of fighting this war, and in my view it is the sense of all of us, or it certainly should be, that we must establish something like the League of Nations in order to bring about permanent peace in the world. It can be done only by America. It has been tried by the other nations, and has failed. We must have enough force in it to make it work. Only America can make it work, in my judgment.

For that reason, I believe that the pending resolution as modified should, as I have said before, be agreed to, but with the reservation, now contained in the resolution, and, as I understand, in the modification, that any treaty of peace shall come before the Senate of the United States. I am quite sure the Senate will adopt a strong and vigorous proposal for securing the peace of the world.

My purpose in rising to speak at this time was not to talk about that provision; it was more to endorse what the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has said about Woodrow Wilson, who was one of the grandest men with whom I ever came in contact.

I never was associated with a stronger character in all my life. I do not know that I ever saw a stronger man mentally. He was one of the world's outstanding characters. He lost his life trying to effectuate the permanent peace of the world. All honor to him. I thank the Senator for having said something of that kind about him.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I shall offer my amendment in all sincerity. I know that if the proposed international organization is not founded on economic cooperation to remove trade barriers, we shall be off again on the pathway toward another war.

Mr. President, the eyes of the civilized world are on the United States Senate. The eyes of the people of the United States are on the United States Senate. The people want this body to create an organization which will bring about world peace, and I submit that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree that the eyes of the world are on the United States Senate, but I also assert that the eyes of the world were on the elections yesterday more than they were on the United States Senate. I think the elections which have taken place were much more significant and will advise the President far more than would the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the pending resolution would not bind the Senate or its membership to anything. If conditions should change in the next week and it should appear that this country would be better protected by not entering such an organization as is proposed, I think it would be our duty so to vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know what it was the intention of the able Senator from Montana to imply by saying that the effect of the elections yesterday will have more influence in advising the President than will the pending resolution. I think the record of President Roosevelt will show that he has never needed any particular advice to try to carry out the principles of President Wilson, which have been so much commended here this afternoon. He has been willing at all times to cooperate with the Senate in the promulgation and execution of principles of international collaboration which would make for world security and world peace. I am sure the Senator from Montana did not intend to imply that it was necessary for the Senate or the country, or the election, to advise the President to pursue such a course.

Mr. WHEELER. Apparently the Senator from Florida took my statement a little too seriously.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the question asked by the Senator from Montana——

Mr. WHEELER. It was not a question. It was a statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Was there an election in Mississippi yesterday?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Mississippi voted Democratic, as usual. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Florida in his statements about the President with relation to the post-war world reorganization. I shall vote to go all the way to set up an organization to preserve the peace, but to do this and to make America prosperous tariff barriers must be wiped away.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it was my purpose to renew the unanimous-consent request for limitation of debate, but in view of the altered situation by reason of what has happened here today, I shall not press the request at this time. However, I wish to say, so that Senators may have notice, that it is my earnest hope that we may have a vote on the resolution tomorrow. With that in view, the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock, and I hope that all Senators who plan to make addresses will be here promptly and make them so that we may dispose of the resolution tomorrow.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there being no Executive Calendar for consideration today, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, November 4, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"Lift up our hearts, O King of Kings,
To brighter hopes and kindlier things,
To visions of a larger good
And holier dreams of brotherhood.

"Thy world is weary of its pain,
Of selfish greed and fruitless gain,
Of tarnished honor, falsely strong,
And of its ancient deeds of wrong.

"Almighty Father, who dost give
The gift of life to all who live,
Look down on all earth's sin and strife,
And lift us to a nobler life."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, November 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 407 aliens whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

EMPLOYMENT OF MONGOLIAN LABOR ON IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, suggesting a proposed amendment to the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, so as to eliminate from section 4 of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388) known as the Reclamation Act, the provision prohibiting Mongolian labor from being employed on irrigation projects; to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for that Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

LAND ACQUISITIONS OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Executive Officer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting pursuant to law, a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, together with a statement showing the cost of each tract and method of acquisition, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (4) and Agriculture (8) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

JURISDICTION OVER INTRASTATE AIR COMMERCE — RESOLUTION OF WYOMING PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the Wyoming Public Service Commission referring to a provision of House bill 3420, which is a bill now pending on the House Calendar to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The purpose of the resolution is to protest against a provision in that bill which is interpreted as taking away from the States jurisdiction over intrastate air commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the resolution of the Wyoming Public Service Commission there also be printed in the RECORD section 4 of House bill 3420 so that it will be obvious to readers of the RECORD against what section of the bill protest is being made.

I also ask that the resolution and the section referred to be referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution and section 4 of House bill 3420 will be printed in the RECORD, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolution of the Wyoming Public Service Commission and section 4 of H. R. 3420 are as follows:

WYOMING PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—STATE OF WYOMING

Resolution adopted by the Wyoming Public Service Commission at a regular session, Cheyenne, Wyo., October 28, 1943, relative to the civil aeronautics bill (H. R. 3420) amending the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

By the commission:

The Wyoming Public Service Commission has examined the civil aeronautics bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and has reviewed reports relative thereto on interstate and foreign commerce pertaining to said bill and finds, if enacted in its present form, said bill would eliminate the present authority of this commission to regulate intrastate commerce. It is clear the proposed bill is so worded as to bring about the broadening of the scope of Federal authority thereby precluding any jurisdiction vested in State commissions.

The importance of transportation by air in both interstate and intrastate commerce, particularly transcontinental movements related to the war effort, is fully recognized by this commission; however, we further recognize post-war potentialities in intrastate commerce and it is our opinion nothing should be done to deprive the various States of their powers over such transportation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Public Service Commission opposes the passage by the Congress of the United States of civil aeronautics bill (H. R. 3420), and further opposes any and all attempts to deprive the State of Wyoming of its rights to regulate intrastate commerce; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Wyoming who are Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States.

By the public service commission, dated at Cheyenne, Wyo., this 28th day of October 1943, A. D.

WYOMING PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
ARCHIE EWALDSEN, *Chairman*.
M. H. LEITNER, *Commissioner*.
EDWARD A. PRIESHOFF, *Commissioner*.

Attest:

J. A. ANSELM,
Secretary.

SEC. 4. The United States of America is hereby declared to possess and exercise complete and exclusive national sovereignty in the air space above the United States, including the air space above all inland waters and the air space above all those portions of the adjacent marginal high seas, bays, and lakes, over which by international law, treaty, convention, or otherwise, the United States exercises national jurisdiction.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1278. A bill for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 510); and

H. R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Harry L. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 511).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 817. A bill for the relief of George A. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 512).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 513).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 514); and

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 515).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1555. A bill for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 516); and

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson; without amendment (Rept. No. 517).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman; without amendment (Rept. No. 518).

REPORT OF THE CLAIMS COMMITTEE ON A VETOED BILL—BLANCHE H. KARSCH, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF KATE E. HAMILTON

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the veto message of the President of the United States (with an accompanying bill), returning without his approval the bill (S. 514) for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of

Kate E. Hamilton, reported the bill with the recommendation that it pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

REPORTS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE — CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 190) to investigate the effect upon the country of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States (submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on October 12, 1943), reported it with an amendment, submitted a report (No. 519) thereon, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

JOINT RATES OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS AND COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1425) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 520) thereon.

Mr. REED submitted minority views on Senate bill 1425, supra, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 520.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MURDOCK introduced a bill (S. 1514) to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian Irrigation Project, Utah, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. SHIPSTEAD each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF ACTIVITIES OF ARTHUR DERUNIAN, ALIAS PAGANELLI

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the activities of one Arthur Derunian, alias Paganelli, an Armenian, and particularly with respect to his connection with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the number of times that he has been employed by said Federal Bureau of Investigation, the amount of money that he has been paid for such employment, and to ascertain whether or not the work that he has done as a representative of said governmental agency has been used by him as a basis for private profit.

This man is the author of the book entitled "Under Cover," which seeks, by inference at least, to smear anyone and everyone who tried to keep this country out of war. He goes under another assumed name in the book. My understanding is that he has been employed by the Department of Justice as an undercover man, and that he used a part of the information, or supposed information, which he received in that capacity as a basis for some of the alleged facts stated in the book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 201) submitted by the Senator from Montana, will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INEQUALITY IN PAY RESULTING FROM AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1942

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a warrant officer in the Coast Guard, who was recently promoted from a chief petty officer, regarding the recent amendment to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, which liberalized family allowances. He claims that men who are promoted from chief petty officer to warrant officer are penalized financially by this act. He states that in his own case he would receive $58 more per month if he had not accepted his promotion to warrant rank, but had remained a chief petty officer.

If the facts as alleged in this letter, and in other letters and personal information which I have received, confirm the fact to be true, it is believed that many very well qualified enlisted men in all branches of the military service will not seek promotion to warrant and commissioned rank, and that the armed services will not be utilizing to the best advantage the experience and skill of men in this category. In other words, Mr. President, the effect of the recent amendment will be to give enlisted men more money than some warrant officers or commissioned officers receive when there are the same number of children and dependents in each case.

The act which brought about this unfortunate situation is Public Law No. 174, approved October 26, 1943, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs. I request that the letter from the warrant carpenter heretofore mentioned by me be treated as in the nature of a petition and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which made the original study that led to the enactment of Public Law 174.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

OCTOBER 21, 1943.

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a member of the United States Coast Guard and wish to call to your attention the injustice of the present legislation recently passed to aid servicemen having dependents.

I am 51 years of age, was not subject to draft, also a veteran of World War No. 1. I entered the armed forces without selfish reasons; my income in civilian life was $2,400 per annum; I entered at $1,900, a loss of $500 each year. I entered the service feeling confident, that by proper application and hard work I would gain promotion, and by so doing I would gain back the loss in pay and my family would again have money enough to live as formerly.

I entered the service as chief machinist's mate; had the rating changed to chief carpenter's mate and in less than 1 year was honored by a promotion to warrant carpenter. I have a wife and two children to support, and a son who volunteered for naval service 3 years ago.

Now, under the new law, I lose $58 per month for earning a "promotion" as against what I would receive if I had been content to "sit tight," stay at my same former rate, without ambition. Here are the facts:

As a chief carpenter's mate with present allowances:

Base pay	$138.00
Wife allowance	50.00
First child allowance	30.00
Second child allowance	20.00
Clothing allowance	6.25
Total	244.25

Which is net pay, meals, and housing allowed.

As warrant carpenter with present allowances:

Base pay	$150
Rental allowance	60
Quarters	42
Total	252

Out of which I must pay $45 per month for room and $21 per month for meals at the Institute.

This leaves a net balance of $186 as a warrant officer comparable to $244.25 as chief carpenter's mate (family allowance being the same) a loss of $58 for taking a "promotion."

This all "boils down" to the fact that a chief petty officer would be insane to accept a promotion to warrant officer because he would be depriving his dependent family of the necessities he could give them staying at the lower rate. It seems to me that if this condition is not properly adjusted it will mean the demoralization of the present promotional system.

In conclusion, I believe that the law should provide some adjustment, at least to allow the rights to those who have dependents without discrimination.

I would appreciate your reaction to this letter, I am,

Respectfully,
ARTHUR J. LANDRY,
Carpenter Instructor,
United States Coast Guard Institute,
Groton, Conn.

RELIEF TO STARVING PEOPLES OF EUROPE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter, with the signatures, from a substantial group of citizens of Hanover, N. H., one of whom is Ernest Martin Hopkins, the distinguished president of Dartmouth College, appealing to the Senate to pass speedily Senate Resolution 100, submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], to give relief in the food situation to starving millions in occupied Europe, through joint international action.

I am in entire accord with the views and conclusions contained in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter, with the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANOVER, N. H., *October 30, 1943.*

The Honorable C. W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, should like to cast our votes in favor of Senate Resolution 100, which urges joint international action now to save the starving populations of Europe.

We favor this resolution for the following reasons: Germany no longer has any chance whatsoever of winning the war. It is only a matter of time before the Nazis will be compelled to surrender to the growing power of the United Nations. In the meantime, however, they have the power of prolonging the starvation and adding to the death toll of the civilian populations of the invaded countries. We in America have the power to initiate joint action with our allies and with the neutrals of Europe to alleviate somewhat this appalling condition. The experiment has worked well in Greece and without benefit to the Germans, according to the statement of our own State Department. The American Friends' Service Committee has distributed food and supplies successfully and efficiently to the starving children of several countries.

The Swedish Government has ships which could be used for this purpose. Many of the occupied countries have frozen funds in the United States which could be used to buy food. There is surplus food in South America.

It is to our interest to support the populations of invaded Europe. Their peoples are carrying on effective guerilla warfare against our common enemy. They are our allies in spirit and in deed. We shall be conjointly responsible for their restoration after the close of this war.

Continued starvation of Europe will not only bring disease and death to the present generation; it will sicken, dwarf, and cripple the children, thus aggravating for one or two generations more the problems of restoration.

Since we in America are morally and materially concerned with the present conditions, and since we can take steps to help alleviate them without aiding the enemy, we, the undersigned, strongly urge you to support the Gillette resolution, which is to come before the Senate for consideration within the near future.

Yours respectfully,

Charles R. Bagley, Florence K. Bagley, François Denoeu, Suzanne Denoeu, Edgar E. Thomas, Marie-Louise M. Hall, Vernon Hall, Jr., Joseph B. Folger, Mrs. Lilian Wardner, Mrs. Mary C. McDowell, Harold E. Washburn, Sidsell N. Washburn, Louis G. Barrett, Georgeina Y. Barrett, Alice R. Cox, Sidney Cox, Gordon C. Bridge, Mary A. Bridge, Leona G. Poole, James P. Poole, Bruce W. Knight, Lucian Dean Pearson, Dorothy H. Pearson, Ernest Martin Hopkins, Mary Peet, L. G. Norton, L. K. Neidlinger, Polly Trees, all of Hanover, N. H.; Carl A. Palmer, Wilder, Vt.; Mildred D. Hoyt, Alexander Laing, John S. Tanzi, Charles E. Wilder, Benfield Pressey, Wm. Doty Maynard, Dr. Colin C. Stewart, Harriet Adams Gundersen, Sven M. Gundersen, all of Hanover, N. H.; Lucy Lanzer, Wilder, Vt.; May Rowan Potter, Alene Demers, Betty Banagan, all of Hanover, N. H.; Jane G. Snowman, Lebanon, N. H.; Katherine C. Connell, Winifred E. Jordan, Phyllis E. LaVokey, Madeline Thill, Mary-Elizabeth Barrett, all of Hanover, N. H.; Louise Keane, West Lebanon, N. H.; Irma L. Reed, B. Laura Bennett, Mary Gay Marble, Marie Dowler, Gertrude M. Seifert, Dr. John J. Boardman, Leslie B. Morse, E. Frances Bennett, H. W. Olsen, E. M. Olsen, all of Hanover, N. H.

ADJUSTMENT OF PAY OF RAILROAD WORKERS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the people of America have at all times felt a great pride in that vast network of iron ribbons constituting the railroad transportation system of the United States, which wends its way into almost every community of the Nation. The American railroad has played and will continue to play a signal and historic part in the growth and development of this Nation.

At the present time, the American railroads have, as their contribution to the war effort, assumed the greatest transportation task that has ever been undertaken in the history of the world; and it is to the eternal credit of the workers and managers of the railroads that that task is being done in full and on time. Had it not been for the remarkable accomplishments of those men, the war effort of this Nation could not possibly have achieved the remarkable records of production and distribution which it may now claim.

The workers and managers of the American railroads have earned the respect and admiration of the world. But the fact remains that, with the increased costs of living occasioned by the war, the workers of the railroads are finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet. Unless some remedial action is taken, it appears that the railroads of America will be unable to maintain their present standards of effective and efficient service.

For a long time, the workers of the American railroads have sought a modest pay adjustment. In their negotiations, these employees have adhered to all legal procedures; they have exhibited great patience; they have maintained an attitude of complete fairness. During the course of all these negotiations, Mr. President, the railroad workers have remained on the job.

Mr. President, I quote from an editorial which appeared in the October 23 issue of the Philadelphia Record which had this to say about the procedure followed in this particular case:

Under the Railway Mediation Act, the Nation had what we felt was a model system for preventing wartime strikes. That act provides:

(a) That if either labor or management wants to change the status quo, it must give 30 days' notice; (b) to negotiate on their own; (c) if those negotiations fail the National Mediation Board steps in; (d) if the Mediation Board is unsuccessful, it proposes arbitration; (e) if arbitration fails, the President has 30 days to appoint an emergency board, and that board has another 30 days to report before a strike may be called.

Since this legislation has been in effect, there has been no major railroad strike in America.

After pointing out that the railroad workers fully complied with the foregoing procedure, the editorial continues:

The union was patient; so was management. Finally President Roosevelt appointed an emergency board, and the board cut down the railway workers' request for a 20-cents-an-hour increase to 8 cents. The workers decided to accept the award, and were prepared to sign contracts with the roads.

But before the terms granted by the emergency board could be incorporated into the contract which both the management and the workers of the railroads were ready and willing to sign, that 8-cent increase was nullified in Washington. Thus the long months of careful negotiation and fair dealing on the part of the American railroad worker had availed him nothing.

I repeat, Mr. President, this is not a wage dispute between management and worker. The management of the railroads has already accepted the terms of the award granted by the President's committee. The settlement of this problem is now being held up by the Government agency concerned.

Mr. President, it is well known that the rates of pay for comparable work are considerably higher among other war industries than they are among the railroads. This condition poses tremendous problems, for, if a reasonable adjustment is not forthcoming, it is not at all unlikely that we shall see a great exodus of workers from the railroads into the higher-paying war industries. Such a development as this could only serve to threaten and undermine the railway system of America, and hence our entire war effort as well.

The problem of wage adjustments for railroad workers has recently assumed Nation-wide importance. It is a problem which is commanding an ever-increasing public interest. It is a problem which the American people, in their full sense of fair play, want to see solved in equity and justice to all parties concerned—in order that the railroads of the Nation may be kept in continuous and effective operation, and in order that the employees of the railroads may be assured a reasonable and fair compensation for the proper performance of the vital and important work in which they are now engaged.

WHAT WILL HITLER DO ON NOVEMBER 8 THIS YEAR?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, thousands of Americans of German ancestry make their homes in the State which I have the honor to serve in the United States Senate—the State of Wisconsin.

Twenty years ago, on November 8, 1923, these loyal American citizens were profoundly shocked by the seizure of power by lawless elements in Germany, which later became known as the Nazi "putsch." They shared their outspoken dislike of this turn of events with other Americans of other national origins.

Since the Nazi "putsch" Hitler has made November 8 the occasion for speaking to the people whom he holds in subjection, telling them what they—under his leadership—will do, and pointing out what those who oppose his leadership will not do. He has been especially active in his speeches made on Nazi "putsch" day since he and his Fascist and Japanese allies plunged the world into war.

On November 8, 1939—only a little more than 2 months after his invasion of peaceful Poland—Hitler boasted that the war in which he was currently engaged would be fought under easier conditions than that of 1914–18 because for years he had been arming the German Nation spiritually and economically in preparation for the conflict.

On November 8, 1940, Hitler predicted the annihilation of any nation or group of nations which dared to carry the war in the air to Germany.

On November 8, 1941, Hitler joyfully anticipated the fall of Leningrad and announced that the Russian Army would never recover from losses inflicted by the Nazis.

On November 8, 1942, Hitler swore that the people of the occupied countries would never regain the ground which the Nazis had once seized.

From that day to this Hitler has been significantly silent in public. The events of the past 12 months have tipped the balance so far in favor of the Allies that not only Americans of German descent but all Americans are awaiting Hitler's explanation of his defeats and failures—provided he can explain his failures and defeats and provided he dares bring forth such a damning explanation. His own people, who now know war on their own soil, are awaiting his message. More than 1,000,000 civilians are dead, and probably 4,000,000 of the best blood of Germany's youth also are dead.

Should Hitler accept the challenge and speak on November 8 this year, he must explain to his questioning people what the hidden resources are by which the Nazi Government intends to reverse the unfavorable trend in Nazi war production, as contrasted to the favorable trend in United Nations war production. Our Office of War Production issues monthly figures concerning the output of war materials. Is it possible that Hitler will hide Nazi production figures behind his usual pretext of military secrecy?

Any Hitler speech that did not refer to victory at some time in the vague future would be, indeed, a rarity. Naturally the people of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the temporarily occupied countries are interested in the broad military means by which Hitler intends to gain victory.. Victory has a single requisite—surrender. Surely not even Hitler's ever-present intuition can tell him that the added impact of Allied blows by land and sea and air is an indication of possible Allied surrender.

The Nazi leader must then either tell his subjects that he does not believe in victory or point out that the only remaining alternative to defeat is a negotiated peace. Not the least of Hitler's difficulties—if he should dare to speak on November 8—will be in specifying how he proposes to dissuade the Allies from pursuing their aim of unconditional surrender for the Nazis as stated at Casablanca and reiterated at Quebec and Moscow.

The Russian situation poses other questions which Hitler must answer unless he intends to augment the ever-growing feeling of unrest among the people he governs. The millions of American citizens of German descent—many of whom are serving in the armed forces of the United States and many more of whom are engaged in essential war industry or agriculture—are also interested in Hitler's answers to these questions. They are interested because Hitler must either not answer these questions and lose face before the German people, or he must answer them dishonestly and still lose the support of his subjects. It is no longer possible for Hitler to conceal his dishonesty. The German people know that their sons, their brothers, their husbands, and their fathers are not returning from the eastern front.

How will Hitler explain his continuing strategy of failure in Russia? Why did he consider it wise to sacrifice millions of German lives to advance from Kiev to Stalingrad in 1941 and 1942? Why did he reverse his procedure and consider it wise in 1943 to fall back from Stalingrad to Kiev? How will Hitler clarify the discrepancies between the earlier communiqués of the German high command, which gave astronomical figures of Russian soldiers killed and Russian matériel destroyed, with later communiqués which told of Russian attacks sustained by an overpowering number of men and great masses of matériel? By the earlier communiqués, Hitler, the misleader of the German people, had led his subjects to believe that the Russian forward progress would soon be stopped.

There are other questions, of equal importance, which Hitler must answer or allow to remain unsolved—an action which will add fuel to the smoldering fire of resentment which may well burst into an angry conflagration in his unhappy country. How will he find it possible to assure the German people that somehow, somewhere, the Russian front will be consolidated? Can he indicate any reasons why the third Russian winter offensive—if it comes—will be easier to meet than the disastrous first and second Russian winter offensives?

These are the questions which Hitler, to the best of his limited ability, must answer if he would set at rest the perilous state of mind of the German people.

For more than 8 years Hitler has based Nazi foreign policy largely upon his faith in Mussolini. The major interests of the Italian people have never been compatible with those of German militarism. There are those in Allied countries and in Germany itself, who would listen attentively to Hitler's explanation of why he thought it reasonable to tie his foreign policy to Mussolini.

The German home front offers Hitler no respite as November 8 approaches. His subjects are asking, "What are we going to do now?" and "What are we going to do after the war?" Hitler will find himself hard put to resolve these problems for his aroused subjects.

One of the more pressing problems most difficult of evasion is that of what to do with the evacuees from German industrial centers. What does Hitler propose to do with the unfortunate products of the war which he created? There are large numbers of evacuees in southern and southeastern Germany and in the adjoining regions. Those areas have come well within the jaws of the aerial pincers movement from new bomber bases captured by the Allies. "Blockbusters" have been great destroyers of the faith of Germans in the Nazi Party. How will Hitler endeavor partially to restore that faith?

And what will Hitler dare to say, if anything, about the future of post-war Germany? After the war of 1914–18, Germany found that she could make a quick economic recovery despite her defeat, not only because her industrial system had then remained intact, but also because the German Nation's stock of skilled workers had been largely preserved from military duties. After this war, the Germany duped by Hitler will be confronted by an entirely different situation.

In the present war skilled workers have been sent, and are increasingly being sent, to the fronts. In his November 8 speech—if he has the effrontery to speak at all—Hitler must answer a potent, although probably unspoken, question from the German people. How does he propose to accomplish a German economic recovery after this war, in view of the fact that Germany will not be able to continue to draw upon foreign resources to hide the depletion of her own labor force?

Americans of German ancestry—and all other Americans—are not concerned with the effect of Hitler's probable November 8 speech upon the Allied war effort. They know, and Hitler knows, that, although the road ahead may be long and hard, at its end lies Allied victory. The interest of Americans in what Hitler might choose to say on November 8—should he have the courage to speak in the face of defeats and blunders—is in how he might explain his obvious failures, which he has formerly been able to conceal with a smoke screen of falsehoods, to the German people, who have grown resentful through the hardship, suffering, and death which have been visited upon them as a result of Hitler's criminal acts.

POST-WAR OPPORTUNITIES IN THE GREAT WEST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him by means of radio transcription at the annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, Denver, Colo., on October 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR BARBOUR CALLS FOR ACTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARBOUR

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on October 8, 1943, entitled "Senator Barbour Calls For Action," which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL FOR THE ELECTION OF WALTER E. EDGE AS GOVERNOR OF NEW JERSEY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. MCNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by

Senator Hawkes on October 30, 1943, in behalf of the election of Hon. Walter E. Edge to be Governor of New Jersey, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW WAR CAME—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How War Came; Extracts from the Hull Files," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of July 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN AWARDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civilian Awards," published in the New York Times of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOVEREIGNTY—LETTER FROM EMERY REVES IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of sovereignty, written by Emery Reves, and published in the New York Times of October 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HATE NEVER BUILDS—EDITORIAL IN THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS-AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hate Never Builds," published in the Birmingham News-Age-Herald of October 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES POLICIES IN ALGIERS—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Policies Questioned in Algiers," published in the Washington Post of November 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF SICK TIME IN ARMY HOSPITALS—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Army's Reconditioning Program Cuts Down Sick Time in Hospitals," written by Albert Deutsch and published in PM of October 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STARVING CHILDREN—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Starving Children," published in the Washington Post of November 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Martyn B. Kenney, secretary of the Milk Control Board of New Hampshire, with an enclosure, relating to conditions in the dairy industry in New Hampshire, which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT CENTRALIZATION—ARTICLE FROM FARGO (N. DAK.) FORUM

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, under the headline "Government centralization is scored by a Governor," by Earl K. Bitzing, editor, under date of October 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCRIMINATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW ENGLAND DAIRYMAN

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Discrimination," by Fred M. Learned, editor, published in the October 1943 issue of the New England Dairyman, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], proposing to insert after line 9 a new section. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, day before yesterday I presented to the Senate an amendment to the pending resolution expressing the endorsement of this body of the declarations and findings of the Moscow Conference. Since that time the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has presented for his committee a resolution which clearly expresses the approval of the Senate to the Moscow Four-Power Compact. In view of that fact, it is not my intention to press the amendment having the nature of a resolution which I have presented.

I wish to add that the committee resolution, as it has now been modified by the committee itself, will have my energetic support. I believe the Senate may consider this resolution upon its final passage one of the great achievements of this body. Apparently, we are about to express the unification of the Members of this body upon a far-reaching, wise, and effective international understanding, and this unification of the Senate itself is commendatory and supportive of the unification of four great nations of the world upon a new and potent international program.

Mr. President, I am most happy to withdraw my amendment, and to express my approval and support of the committee resolution as modified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Judge Peter J. Shields, of Sacramento, one of the ablest and most beloved jurists of our State, dealing with the pending issue. Judge Shields has long been a devoted crusader for the League of Nations concept.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERIOR COURT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,
October 29, 1943.

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SHERIDAN: I hope that you intend to address the Senate in favor of the Connally resolution. I think that all of us except a very few who are geographically and politically stone blind realize that at the end of the war some agreement must be made with our allied friends by which we will all join together in an effort to prevent future wars.

It is unthinkable that we should call our forces back from the war and say that we have no concern with what other nations do, that we are going to live at home and "attend to our own business"; that we are going to return to the "isolation" to which we have been so long accustomed and in which in the past we found security but that is the idea of a few of your members. I don't know what they mean by isolation in the midst of nations which through the new agencies of contact and approach, touch us at every mile of our border. A buffalo could isolate himself by withdrawing from the herd and retiring to some area where there were no other buffalos. But there are no places in the geographic or social world where we would not be in the midst of all the other nations. We can't isolate ourselves by simply saying that we are isolated no more than an ostrich can escape danger by saying that there is none. The only alternative to this foolish policy is by agreeing upon a form of treaty with other powers along the lines indicated by the Connally resolution. I think that you should advocate it in its present form as it came from the committee. If the time were here when the treaty was being written and I was actually writing it I would make it much more specific and probably as strong and positive as advocated by Senators Ball and Pepper. But we are not writing it and I fear that it may be a long time before we may have that happy privilege. When that time comes what will the conditions be? No one can tell how far the other powers will go; what their temper will be, nor what concessions we may have to make. Why not leave the formation of the treaty to those who are to know the responsibility of writing it.

Is your Senate more virtuous or wiser than the Senate, maybe 6 or 8 years from now, which may have to advise our representatives who are writing the treaty and which before it obligates us, will have to be approved by them? Do you know better what the treaty should be, when you can only speculate as to what the conditions will be when it is being written, than those of that time who will write the treaty in the midst of and with full knowledge of the facts? Don't try to tell the future what to do. They will have history and our example to guide them. But when they come to act they must be left free to make such modifications as change and experience and the parties they have to deal with render essential. The Constitution of the United States, written for the centuries, did not attempt to reach out 150 years to tell your Senate what treaties to approve. It just gave you that power (art. II, sec. 2) with no effort to tell you what treaties to "consent" to. The fathers had faith that the purity and wisdom of the country would continue. If they could trust you who are to act 150 years after they had given you that power, can't you trust the Senate of 6 or 8 years from now to properly discharge that same duty? The Connally resolution states that we favor an agreement between the nations which will operate to prevent wars. That means an adequate agreement; that means a treaty with all the "teeth" and power and efficiency contemplated by the Ball and Pepper amendments. Adopt the resolution quickly and get to the consideration of other questions which involve essential differences.

Now, about "isolation," I can't believe that it will ever again be advocated by anyone but a few Members of the Senate whose very support will discredit it. But if it should you might be able to use an example of isolation and of how it worked in the ancient days. I have been reading the Story of Greece by Will Durant, and he speaks luminously of Sparta which withdrew herself from the artistic and cultural activities of the other Grecian states and relied upon military power to preserve her separate ex-

istence and to win Grecian distinction. At the time spoken of Sparta had about 30,000 citizens, about 120,000 "Perioeci," a kind of high subject class, but denied citizenship; and over 200,000 helots or slaves. Durant says, "How could 30,000 citizens keep in lasting subjection four times their number of Perioeci and seven times their number of helots? It could be done only by abandoning the pursuit and patronage of the arts, and turning every Spartan into a soldier ready at any moment to suppress rebellion or wage war. The constitution of Lycurgus achieved this end, but at the cost of withdrawing Sparta, in every sense but the political, from the history of civilization." (P. 77, Story of Greece.) See what the Spartan code required (p. 81) and see what it did to Sparta. It produced good soldiers, but it made vigor of body a graceless brutality because it killed "nearly all capacity for the things of the mind." (P. 87.) Our condition would not have been exactly the same had we listened to the isolationists and remained out of the war. We might not have had the internal threat; our menace would have been from without. If we had, however, attempted isolation, by this time all Asia would be under the complete control of Japan and all of Europe the personal possession of Germany. We could have armed and fortified and practiced the Spartan discipline, we could have ceased all of the works of civilization, put every man, woman, and child into the works of war, and thus, like Sparta, for a while, have saved our territory at the cost of our soul. The men who urged isolation upon us then when it could be so clearly seen that it meant the enslavement of the world, and the destruction of America's spiritual life should be so discredited that they should never again be heard in the councils of our country.

Try and end discussion of the Connally resolution immediately; pass it and so assure our allies of our cooperative intentions. I send this in haste and will write you of other things when I have more time.

Sincerely,

PETER J. SHIELDS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall support the pending resolution. In my opinion it indicates a sound compromise and is based on sound thinking. It is a harbinger of better things to come. It manifests that spirit of cooperation which augurs well for America. When we shall have passed this resolution, it will simply be the first step. The Moscow Conference was another first step. We are now apparently united in purpose. That is the big thing.

But I would not indulge in any delusions. The mere adoption of a resolution or meeting in conference at Moscow will not do the job. It is a beginning, but back of this beginning there must be the will to keep and enforce the peace.

I believe that world peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together. Common ground is the important thing. If we do not find that, we can pass a thousand resolutions and they will have no effect. This common ground can be found only by clearing away existing differences, particularly among the major Allied Nations, and building the new order we seek on the basis of definite, common purposes.

Common ground has been found in Moscow, as follows:

JOINT FOUR-NATION DECLARATION

The Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China:

United in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender;

Conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression;

Recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments;

Jointly declare—

1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

More common ground will follow. It is for the Executive and our allies to develop that common ground. We in the Senate cannot draw the blueprint of a treaty. That will have to be done not by one nation, but by all the nations who are parties to the pact.

Mr. President, when we adopt the pending resolution we shall express a hope, yea, more, a faith, that the way will be found to peace. Now, we want to make it clear that there is no magic formula in this resolution, that it will not ipso facto do away with causes of war. We know that the nations of earth have to bring about in themselves a moral housecleaning as suggested by the great ideas given to us by the churchmen. There must be a moral and a spiritual renaissance in the peoples of earth before we can expect any real cure for war.

Today, contemplating the pending resolution, we, of course, are taking a step. We, the greatest nation on earth, are saying to the peoples of earth, "Come, join with us in an attempt to find the way which will lead to peace; come and we will sit down together, and we will work together to find the solution to world war."

Of course, until such time as this great moral awakening takes place, until international relationships become beyond all question orderly and morally secure, the United States must maintain such armaments as will not only enable her to discharge her international obligations but will keep America safe.

Mr. President, I remember in 1939 sitting in the lunch room in the British Parliament Building. It was then that I met Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill. I remember what a member of Parliament told me then. He was a Laborite from Manchester. It was barely 3 weeks before Hitler went into Poland. He said:

Senator, I hope to God we have 1 year more before the storm breaks. Senator, if Hitler had struck at Britain 2 years before, he would have found a people who wouldn't have believed their eyes. He would have found a nation sabotaged into false security, into a belief that war would never come again.

Turning to me with a smile on his face he said:

You know, America was not blameless in causing that condition among us Britishers.

He continued:

You know after the last World War when we and Europe had 10,000,000 of our best manhood killed, maimed, and wounded, a great star appeared not in the East but in the West. His name was Woodrow Wilson. And we listened to his great message and we felt that peace was here forever. Then followed years of the League of Nations, the Locarno Pact, the Kellogg Pact outlawing war.

He smiled and said:

As if you can by legislation or any other method merely outlaw war.

Well—

He continued—

there are two persons to whom, if England gets safely through this war, she will owe her salvation—Hitler and Chamberlain. Hitler, by his constant breach of faith, finally awoke the British people. Why, there were people in England who openly boasted that no matter what another war was about they would never fight again. That was the condition we were in. We had no army—no arms; we were psychologically, morally, and every way utterly unprepared for war. But Chamberlain kept appeasing and Hitler kept breaking his promises. Then it began to dawn on our people the danger Britain was in. Pray God, we have another year in which to get ready.

But they did not have another year. They had about 3 weeks, Mr. President. I draw this picture because I know the hunger of America and the hunger of everyone for peace, of doing away with this awful curse of war, and I hope and pray that we will find the way. But, Mr. President, there must be no more Pearl Harbors for America. There must not be the sabotaging of our people

to the point where they get into the rut of unreality and are unaware that they are living in a world where mortals live. Next time there might not be an R. A. F.

In other words, Mr. President, I do not want our people in America to develop a resolution fetish. We have in recent years gone through a period in which we thought we could by mere legislation change practically every law of nature and of economics. We know differently now. We have paid the price.

Mr. President, in saying this I am saying only what every true patriotic citizen should say; that is, that in the post-war period those who act for America must be constantly alert. They must be constantly on guard. We have demonstrated by this resolution that we are willing to cooperate with all honorable means to achieve peace—the hope of everyone. Resolutions do not contain magic power. Certainly no resolution we adopt will have magic power over our allies or over our enemies.

The world knows in fact where America stands without a resolution. They know America means business, that she will do what is right. In the First World War we not only said but we demonstrated the fact that we were not in the fight for territorial gain or for world power. That, Mr. President, is a most significant fact, an established fact, and history records it. If you were a European, you would know that fact and you would know the significance of it now and in the post-war period. That is why all the world is turning to America, hoping and praying that now she will lend her strength, her guidance, and her vision to a solution of this war problem. The world knows that America loves peace and hates war. Foreign powers know that America keeps her word, that she is a nation of convictions and integrity. All our history proves that. The world knows too that we are the most powerful Nation of the world, that we do not like to fight, but if we get into a fight we finish it. The world knows, as I have stated, that America wants to be helpful in seeking a solution to this problem of war. The world knows also that now that we have been burned in two world wars, America is a little more realistic than she was after the last World War and she has her feet on the ground. In other words, the world knows that we know that making another Locarno Pact or another Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war will not do the job unless there is the will of the contracting parties to enforce and keep the peace.

The world knows that the real issue is whether or not the United Nations can agree on a plan to keep peace in the world and then, which is the most important thing, whether the United Nations will abide by that plan and live up to it and its obligations. In other words, whether there is the will to keep the peace.

Mr. President, you and I know that this war found its inception in Europe. It was a European problem. But the League of Nations did not solve that problem. There are numerous historical instances indicating that there was not the will among the members of the League to solve this problem of war.

The world is in a ferment as never before. Our boys are all over the world and they are learning many lessons. Other peoples are learning many lessons from our boys. Everywhere on earth people are lifting their sights and enlarging their horizons. I believe they are ready for a great adventure of collaboration, of cooperation between nations.

Mr. President, two ideas meet in this debate—faith and fear—the thought that nations can learn to live together without war, and the thought that they cannot. I take my stand with faith. I believe that wisdom will come to the American people which will show them the way to teach others how to live together without war. Switzerland has done it with three different nationalities. Our own country, the melting pot of all nations, creeds, and ideas, has learned the way. I believe that way can be infused into the lifestream of other nations. It is a big job, but I think we are competent to take a major hand in that job.

Mr. NYE obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to propound a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the pending resolution and all amendments at not later than 4:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator have any objection to making an agreement that we should begin voting at 5 o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. LANGER. I object to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator object to our voting at any time today?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator objects to voting at any time today?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator object to our voting tomorrow?

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I shall wait a while before presenting another request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no doubt that by tomorrow we can reach a final vote. If the Senator cannot get consent to that, he could possibly get consent to bring it about at 2 or 3 o'clock tomorrow. I am glad to hear the Senator say that he will consider putting it off until tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. We will just leave the matter as it is.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Gillette	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I read from the pending resolution as originally offered:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That is the language of Senate Resolution 192. Two paragraphs have now been added, and it would appear that they will certainly become a part of the resolution as it may be agreed to.

The first added paragraph reads:

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I understand this paragraph to advocate the creation of a general international organization representative of sovereign and peace-loving states, and de-

voted to the maintenance of international peace and security. I assume that participation in such an international organization is dependent upon the consent of the United States Senate to a treaty creating it. If that is not the proper interpretation of the paragraph, I would have to vote against the resolution if it carried this paragraph within it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I simply should like to say, also, that if that is not the correct interpretation, then the Constitution of the United States has become a shambles.

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator.

More than that, Mr. President, it seems to me that the second paragraph being added to the resolution emphatically affords the assurance for such an assumption and conclusion as I have drawn. The second paragraph proposed to the resolution is as follows:

> That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resoluion, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

That paragraph may ultimately prove to be the only part of the resolution that has real and direct meaning and force. It is an addition to the resolution which I welcome. It forcefully meets the contention that the President might use this resolution as the consent of the Senate to any treaty or agreement that he might choose to tie to in the name of preventing aggression and preserving peace.

Though I continue to doubt the wisdom of any statement by the Senate on what we shall do in the future, at least until such time as we can know what sort of a peace treaty will come out of this war, I nevertheless find myself keenly desirous of participating in whatever might be done that will let all, and especially our boys on the fighting fronts, know that the Senate will strive earnestly for those conditions that will bring freedom from engagement in more war. This resolution, it seems to me, is a mere statement of what the Senate of the United States is prepared at this stage to announce itself ready to do in a general way, in cooperation with the rest of the world, to prevent aggression and preserve peace after we shall have won the war, and after, and if, we shall have won a just and honorable peace. We might have afforded a good influence if at the same time we wrote into the resolution a declaration that we would have nothing to do in cooperation with others if they failed to cooperate in winning a just and honorable peace.

THE RESOLUTION SAYS ONLY WHAT THE WORLD ALREADY KNOWS

The resolution does not say a thing that the world does not already know. I do not understand just why the resolution is here, unless it be for the purpose of asserting, for all to hear, that after the cards are finally dealt at the end of this war we shall bid our hand of cards as highly as we know how in the interest of winning a lasting peace.

To ask the Senate to do more than is done in this resolution is to ask the Senate to commit the crime of striving to bind the American people to a course of action following this war that might mean anything, even the liquidation of the United States, its gobbling up by some supergovernment, or a course of action that would have our boys continuing forevermore a policing job that for them would never permit the war to end.

THE WORLD HAS NOT ASKED FOR THIS RESOLUTION

Mr. President, this debate is revealing what I have always thought about resolutions of declaration as to what we would be ready to do when this war ended. It were better by far that no resolution had been introduced on the subject. Some would have us believe that the world was on the verge of crumbling if the United States was unwilling to adopt, for example, the Hatch-Hill-Ball-Burton resolution. If it be true that the world wanted this resolution, then it is going to be thoroughly downcast, its morale sorely injured, when it discovers that the H2-B2 resolution does not have a ghost of a chance of winning favor at this stage of the proceedings. But I am not alarmed. My guess is that the world is far less concerned about what we are going to do when this war is won than are some people in our own land who are afraid that we will miss the boat and fail to underwrite the interests of some foreign lands or decline to make the world our field for a gigantic W. P. A. operation after the war is won.

WHO DEMANDS A RESOLUTION?

Just why is this resolution here? Who is doubting the readiness of the United States to cooperate in preventing aggression and preserving peace? Who is demanding declaration by the Senate on the subject of what we will do to preserve peace and prevent aggression?

Are our allies uneasy about us? Are they uncertain about our readiness to do something more than win the war? Has Great Britain demanded that we explicitly declare ourselves? Has China asked for such an expression? Is Russia demanding to know where we stand? No. Not only have they not asked, but they have themselves refrained until recent days from declaring what they stood ready to do about maintaining peace and preventing aggression, and I am not yet clear in my own mind concerning precisely what they mean, even now.

Are our enemies insisting upon a declaration by the Senate of world purpose after the war? No. And even though they had right to demand, it would be rather out of order for them to be at all solicitous about such subjects as preventing aggression and preserving peace.

Who then demands, who is it that is so insistent that the Senate must clearly state what it will commit the United States to in an international way after this war is ended? It is every bit the right of America and every bit the duty of the Senate to measure with exceeding care its words and its resolutions about a world to come, a world about which we know so little. And in the absence of any tangible demand or request from abroad for a statement by us, I think we have some cause to suppose that there might be forces which would welcome a resolution now that would let the peacemakers in the days to come contend that our resolution of this hour was an authorization for anything the peacemakers might choose to elect as the kind of machinery to use in preventing aggression and preserving peace. Under these possible circumstances we cannot be too careful in our language.

OTHERS BESIDES US WILL SHAPE THE PEACE

Of one thing we can be quite certain, Mr. President: Everyone wants a lasting peace. No one raises voice against American cooperation in helping a mad world to its feet. There is not a shred of differing opinion on the general expectation of American contribution to the cause of making the world more secure against repetition of the thing going on now.

But it does not follow that we must at once pledge our country to a course of action that we and we alone may choose. We have not the faintest idea of what our allies will be willing to do in cooperation with us to the end that we can have the kind of peace and plan that will give chance for a lasting peace. Indeed, we can be reasonably sure of one thing, that while we might dictate the shape of things to follow in our part of the world, others shall have the larger say-so concerning what will be done in Europe and what will be done in even more distant places upon the face of this earth. Then what does it matter what we want to do if what we would do is at odds with what our allies might insist upon doing?

Only a few hours before we sit down at the peace table will we be able to know much of what we can hope for from our allies in the way of shaping a world that is going to be free from this eternal blood-drawing. Not before then can there be advantage from commitments as to what we Americans will do or can do. If in the meantime this Congress undertakes to commit the American people to a specific course of action to be pursued in a world whose shape and whose will at the end of this war we do not know and cannot know, then this Congress ought to resign, pleading guilty to acts it has no right under the sun to commit.

RESOLUTION 192 NOT SERIOUS OR BINDING

I do not believe Senate Resolution 192 is a commitment that in any wise jeopardizes the right and chance of the United States to wait for developments before asserting just what we can do, just what we will do in the way of establishing machinery of an international nature to make more secure our chance to avoid involvement in more war. But there are those who would make this resolution go further than it does.

WHAT ARE OUR ALLIES READY TO DO?

It seems to be the complaint of those who do not think that Senate Resolution 192 is strong enough or direct enough that the world, or some parts of it, are wanting and demanding larger assurance of what we will stand ready to do to make a better, safer world after this present insanity is finished. There seems to be a feeling that Churchill and Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek are going to do a much better job of fighting this war if only they can be assured that we in America are going to underwrite whatever peace follows the war with our lives and our substance. I do not believe that any such requirement exists. Instead I believe that there is vast danger with these same people in any undertaking now to give notice of what we expect them to concur in when the war is done.

Will those who do not think that Senate Resolution 192 is strong enough, those who are insisting that the peace of the world is dependent upon resoluting by the Congress of the United States, please recite which of our allies has pronounced what it is ready to do in contribution to the kind of peace that will go to the creation of a better world? Not one of our allies has undertaken through its dictators, its spokesmen, or its legislatures to give notice of what it stands ready to do to win a secure peace. Of course, our allies have spoken and said they were for international machinery to prevent aggression and preserve peace. There is nothing surprising about their pronouncement in this regard. After all, they were for a League of Nations too. Of course, they would welcome our joining in underwriting and guaranteeing any peace that they might dictate. So we are back to my question concerning the merit of the demand for a resolution of cooperation. Are we to believe that all the world hangs its plans on what might be the plans of 130,000,000 Americans, with the British Empire containing 500,000,000 souls, the Chinese having more than 400,000,000 people, Russia consisting of 180,000,000 people, with the French and the Poles, the Belgians, the Danes, the Norwegians, the Swedes, and others, numbering far more people than there are Americans, and with Italians, Germans, and Japanese numbering in excess of 200,000,000 more? Are we to believe that 2,000,000,000 people are dependent upon what we 130,000,000 Americans alone might do? The thought is preposterous.

Of course, Britain and Russia would like us to commit ourselves to something that might be converted to an all-out policy of American cooperation with them in an order that will hold things right where the war and the peace might leave them—borders, commercial advantages, alliances. But if there is good faith in their expectation from us, then what is wrong with our knowing what they are ready to contribute to the end of winning a more enduring peace? With that knowledge we might be able better to determine what are the advantages accruing to us and to the rest of the world that will begin to accrue to Britain and Russia.

BELITTLE OUR OWN COUNTRY TO GAIN ENDS

These resolutions which we are prodded to indulge are too often disguised as undertakings to assure the world that the United States is going to be more realistic in the future than it has been in the past—just as though we had not been realistic in the past.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator kindly inform us whether or not the Foreign Relations Committee, yesterday or at any previous time, had an expression from the Department of State which would define the term appearing on page 2, lines 1 and 2 of the committee resolution—"principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States"? Did the Department of State advise the committee as to that?

Mr. NYE. I will say to the Senator that I have no knowledge that the committee had access to such information.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NYE. The charge has been made that we have not been realistic enough. There is the will to belittle and jeopardize our own country for the ills that beset the world. We are told repeatedly that the world today is in the throes of death itself because of what the United States has or has not done since the last war. Yet the record reveals a greater willingness on the part of the United States than on the part of any other power on earth to do those things which would help the world.

The Willkies and the Wallaces can jeer about what they like to call our undertaking to stay out of war, isolating ourselves from the world, crawling back into a cave, building a Chinese wall around our country; they can talk to their hearts' content about how things should have been and how things should be; but they never, never, never can adulterate the true history of the effort of the United States since the last war effort to lead, encourage, and build a peaceful world. We certainly were anything but detached from the world in those years. In the years following World War No. 1 we were more solicitous than any other nation about the well-being of the peoples of the earth. We made direct loans to other nations to help them reconstruct, rebuild their trade and credit, and eliminate the then threatening causes of war. We made tremendously large loans to Germany, which enabled Germany to pay whatever reparations she did pay to France and Britain. We gave those helps when the ultimate recipients, including Britain, were playing their cards to accomplish repudiation of all Allied debts owing the United States. During those years following the last terrific struggle America and Americans were advising and lending helping hands everywhere in Europe in the administration of endeavor to save the world from the chaos that could bring more war. The Young plan and the Dawes plan were American plans. Our country devoted untiring effort to bring the world to policies of disarmament. Our country was responsible for the Washington Naval Conference. Under American leadership there was accomplishment to the extent of the pact renouncing war. President Hoover seriously proposed to the world that we abolish all weapons of aggression. We afforded a moratorium on Allied debt payments in those years.

WILLKIE ON DETACHMENT FROM WORLD AFFAIRS

These, mind you, were some of the efforts against aggression and in preservation of peace that America contributed in the years following the last war. But in spite of that sort of record, along come such as that great authority on world affairs, that brilliant historian, that wonderman who has devoted as much as 20 or 30 days to making himself the authority by visiting other parts of the world, that great campaign orator, Wendell Willkie. Along come Willkie and some others describing our record after the last war as an era of strictest detachment from world affairs. Will someone please show me just one power upon the face of this earth that was less detached from the problems of the world than was the United States of America during this period that some folks like to call the period of shameful isolationism?

Those who want to go all-out by resolution and take us into uncharted seas of internationalism in defense of any peace the victor of this war might write seem obsessed—and I am sure the word is well chosen—with the notion that to get America there they must first blame their own country for all the ills of the world. They must create the feeling that the world suffers because the United States does not feed the world, because the United States does not place a quart of milk within reach of everybody on earth at a quarter to six each morning; that we are not sufficiently mindful of the existence of others in the world. It seems that they must plant their theory that the world is in the throes of death itself today because this wicked old United States of ours did not join the League of Nations.

Let us explore into a few of the facts attendant upon this question of our League of Nations responsibility and this silly bunk to the effect that it was the America Firsters, the Isolationists, who led this world into war.

THE GREAT AMERICA FIRST MOVEMENT

First, I defy any American to find a more honorable lot of Americans than those who gave their names to the founding of the America First movement in those days when Americans felt that the best interests of our country dictated against our involvement in another world struggle. Name Americans more honorable, more patriotic, contributing more largely to the interest of their country in war and in peace than men like Gen. Robert Wood, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Gen. Hanford MacNider, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, and

others, who became the parents of the America First movement. They voiced the conviction of millions upon millions of Americans up to the hour of Pearl Harbor in their movement entertaining thoroughly American principle, principle that continues to live even though the movement liquidated itself in the interest of unity in the winning of the war that was brought to us. There will be both honor and glory in the days to come for the purpose which the America First committee and movement served.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement of the principles of the America First Committee which have been so frequently published.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPLES OF AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE

1. Our first duty is to keep America out of foreign wars. Our entry would only destroy democracy, not save it.

2. We must build a defense, for our own shores, so strong that no foreign power or combination of powers can invade our country, by sea, air, or land.

3. Not by acts of war abroad but by preserving and extending democracy at home can we aid democracy and freedom in other lands.

4. In 1917 we sent our American ships into the war zone, and this led us to war. In 1941 we must keep our naval convoys and merchant vessels on this side of the Atlantic.

5. Humanitarian aid is the duty of a strong, free country at peace. With proper safeguard for the distribution of supplies, we should feed and clothe the suffering and needy people of the occupied countries.

6. We advocate an official advisory vote by the people of the United States on the question of war or peace, so that when Congress decides this question, as the Constitution provides, it may know the opinion of the people on this gravest of all issues.

7. The Constitution of the United States vests the sole power to declare war in Congress. Until Congress has exercised that power it is not only the privilege but the duty of every citizen to express to his Representatives his views on the question of peace or war—in order that this grave issue may be decided in accordance with the will of the people and the best traditions of American democracy.

WHY WE STAYED OUT OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, as to the League of Nations and our unwillingness to become a part of it, had a just and honorable peace followed the last war, with or without a League of Nations, we might have avoided this war. Had our allies at Versailles shown a decent respect for the first fundamentals of peace which in part were laid down by President Wilson in his Fourteen Points, instead of merely using those points to entrap the enemy into an armistice, we might have won a different sort of world than the one which now engulfs us in all the terrors and wastes of war. A decent attitude on the part of our allies toward us and our honest purpose following the last war, together with a just and honorable peace, might have found us in the League of Nations. If our failure to move into the League of Nations was a factor contributing to the making of the present war, then I say that the failure of our allies at Versailles, and after Versailles, was one hundred times a greater factor in making for another war—the present war.

We talk about honorable peace and just peace. How can we ever forget the miserable way in which our allies dealt with us and our theories at the peace table following the last war? How shall we forget the extent to which some of our allies themselves ignored the terms of the treaty adopted at Versailles, when statesmen of that period have been ready to bear testimony concerning the shameful manner in which some of those allies demanded respect for the peace by others, but were themselves eager to deny respect for the terms of that same peace?

Mr. President, on the 9th day of May 1940 David Lloyd George, who was Britain's Prime Minister during the last war, rose in his place in the House of Commons and said:

The Treaty of Versailles was not carried out by those who dictated it. A good deal of the trouble was due to that fact. We were dealing with the governments in Germany which were democratic governments, based on a democratic franchise, with democratic statesmen, and it is because we did not carry out the undertakings we had given to those democratic governments that Hitler came into power. There was a good deal that was done in Germany, more particularly with regard to disarmament. The solid promise that we gave, not merely in the treaty itself, but in a document which I took part in drafting, which was signed by M. Clemenceau on our behalf, that if Germany disarmed, we should immediately follow her example, was not carried out, and there is no government that is more responsible for that than the present national government which came into power in 1931. They had their opportunity. America was ready, Germany was ready—it was a time when Herr Bruening was in charge—but we refused to carry out the terms after Germany had been completely disarmed. We had the certificate of the ambassadors to say that disarmament was completed, but in spite of that we did not carry out our part.

LORD KEYNES KNEW THE PEACEMAKERS

Why do some Americans, including some of our colleagues here in the Senate, persist in the fraudulent theory to the effect that an unholy United States Senate denied Americans a chance to be a part of a great, pure, and holy League of Nations? They are not unmindful of the fact that the American people themselves objected quite as truly as the Senate objected to the involvement which the League of Nations invited. When the American people sensed the selfishness of the peace terms which had been agreed upon and sensed the obligations which a League of Nations association would demand, when they discovered what a delusion had been the talk of making the war we had won a "war to end war," then did the people say in forceful terms "Let us have nothing to do with the League of Nations."

Even British statesmen have condemned the base which was built at Versailles for a League of Nations. Here was John Maynard Keynes, now with us here in America as a top agent and representative of his Government, telling us that the British, French, and Italian writers of the peace at Versailles were devoted, not to lasting peace, but to rottenly selfish purposes. In his book entitled "Economic Consequences of the Peace," written shortly after the last war, Keynes wrote as follows about the men who wrote the peace:

The future life of Europe was not their concern; its means of livelihood was not their anxiety. Their preoccupations, good and bad alike, related to frontiers and nationalities, to the balance of power, to imperial aggrandizements, to the future enfeeblement of a strong and dangerous enemy, and to the shifting by the victors of their unbearable financial burdens onto the shoulders of the defeated.

Any American, had he been guilty of writing as Keynes wrote, would be criticized today as an enemy of civilization, as an untouchable isolationist, by the Peppers, the Willkies, the American Communists, and the internationalist smear artists who have no trouble in getting whatever paper is needed with which to print their cheap, unprincipled attacks upon Americans. But in England, after Keynes wrote as he did, he was made a British lord. I remark, Mr. President, oh, "lordy," what a conundrum British internationalism is!

LANSING SAW TRUTH AND SPOKE UP, TOO

Robert Lansing was our honored Secretary of State back in those days at Versailles. He is dead and gone now, just as Senator Borah is gone—the Borah upon whom the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] today pours his scorn as having been, according to his concept, one responsible for the death of the League of Nations, and consequently responsible for the present crime in the name of war.

Robert Lansing has been honored no end. I now look across the aisle of this Chamber, into the eyes of those who knew him best, and ask: Shall we damn him? Shall we stamp him from memory because he wrote as he did of the peace treaty and the League of Nations which had been born just before he wrote? Though it will mean nothing, of course, to the hard-shelled internationalists in our midst, Lansing should be quoted here. If there be those who want to misrepresent and crucify his memory as they do in the case of Borah, La Follette, Lodge, Johnson, Watson, and others, that of course will be their privilege, if not their pleasure.

I quote from pages 272, 273, and 274 of the book entitled "The Peace Negotiation: A Personal Narrative," by Robert Lansing. At these pages are found his memorandum addressed to William C. Bullitt, dated May 8, 1919, the day after the peace terms were delivered to Germany. Perhaps it is not surprising that these particular pages had been torn from the first volume under this title sent to me at my request last week by the Library of Congress. But before me now is an uncensored, undamaged copy of the

book, and I quote from the pages to which I have made reference:

The terms of peace were yesterday delivered to the German plenipotentiaries, and for the first time in these days of feverish rush of preparation there is time to consider the treaty as a complete document.

The impression made by it is one of disappointment, of regret, and of depression. The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance.

The League of Nations created by the treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the Great Powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.

It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequence of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the quintuple alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

It is true that to please the aroused public opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo and called it the League of Nations. But whatever it may be called, or however it may be disguised, it is an alliance of the five great military powers.

It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of the five is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is primary.

The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue; and the law of unanimity in the council, which may offer a restraint, will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust.

We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest.

I have concluded the quotation from the letter written by former Secretary of State Robert Lansing.

Mr. President, it does not matter that Lansing later wished he had not then written as he did. It does matter that he, on the ground, saw the League of Nations as the "prey of greed and intrigue," as an instrument to "stamp as just what is unjust," as "founded on the shifting sands of self-interest," as a "halo" around a program "to subordinate all interests to" the interests of the victors in their determination "to rule the world." It does matter that Lansing, there to see the peace made and the League of Nations born, thought the League was as futile as a league intended "to prevent the growth of plant life in the tropical jungle."

It does matter, too, that Lansing read in the terms of peace to be underwritten by the League of Nations terms which "appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem impossible of performance."

Yet, Senators, this League of Nations, some would have us now believe, was the kind of thing some in our own body insist ought to have been accepted by Americans without hesitating, without debating, without objecting back there in 1920. I think Americans knew what they were doing then even if some among us today do not seem to want to acknowledge that the popular cause and the Senate cause in tearing down the League of Nations was anything but politics and ignorance.

GARET GARRETT ON LEAGUE OF NATIONS

But let us come back to this fairy tale of what our failure to join the League of Nations and to what so-called isolationism has brought the world. I want Garet Garrett, a most eminent and widely read American writer for many, many years, to tell that story as he so well tells it in a recent article from which I now quote:

We did not join the League of Nations. For this Mr. Willkie does not blame the people. He cannot, of course, blame the people for anything. "They were betrayed," he says, by leaders without convictions who were thinking of group-vote-catching and partisan advantage." How strange! Much stranger really than the discovery that continents and oceans are all in one world when you see it from an airplane. The people wanted to join the League of Nations but their conscienceless leaders defeated that wish in order to catch their votes.

Neither in Mr. Willkie's writing of the guilt theme nor in any other will you find that Europe may have been to blame for the fact that the United States at last declined to adhere to the League of Nations. It is probably true that the American people did at first intend to join. Then they changed their minds. Why they did that may be debated to any length, but certainly one reason was the disillusionment that took place in the time that elapsed between President Wilson's return with the document and the vote of the Senate on ratification. In that interval of time Mr. Wilson had angrily rejected the British scheme for an all-around cancelation of war debts at the sole expense of the United States; he rejected it on the ground that it meant charging German reparations to us. Thus we were already cast for the role of Shylock whether we joined the League or not. In that interval of time it became painfully evident that Europe was Europe, and that European intentions toward the United States had not changed since Canning, who, having accepted the Monroe Doctrine in place of the Anglo-American alliance he wanted, made this curious boast: "I have called the new world into existence to redress the bounds of the old." Mr. Churchill supported the scheme that President Wilson denounced—the European scheme to make America pay German reparations; he was saying then what he said recently again, "I am after all a European."

Now where in all that history is the Chinese wall, the broken shell, the Wallace cave? And where is the meaning of isolationism?

If you say of this history that its intense character has been nationalistic, consistently so from the beginning until now, that is true. Therefore, the word in place of "isolationism" that would make sense is "nationalism." Why is the right word avoided?

The explanation must be that the wrong one, for what it is intended to do, is the perfect political word. Since isolationism cannot be defined, those who attack it are not obliged to define themselves. What are they? Anti-isolationists? But if you cannot say what isolationism is, neither can you say what anti-isolationism is, whereas nationalism, being definite, has a positive antithesis. One who attacks nationalism is an internationalist.

The use of the obscurity created by the false word is to conceal something. The thing to be concealed is the identity of what is speaking. Internationalism is speaking.

It has a right to speak, as itself and for itself; but that right entails a moral obligation to say what it mean- and to use true words.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Garet Garrett, under the title "The Mortification of History," published in the Chicago Tribune of September 19, 1943, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

ISOLATIONIST ROOSEVELT DEFINES ISOLATIONISM

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, when we view in the light that Garrett has viewed them the considerations following the last war, it would be at least decent of those who want the international state in preference to nationalism to reason with Americans through understandable, definable terms. Is the success of their internationalist cause dependent upon ability to mislead and confuse the American people about issues, about terms, and about the purpose of individuals who may be solicitous about the welfare and future of their own country even to the extent of being for America first just as Stalin is for Russia first, just as Chiang Kai-shek is for China first, just as Churchill is for Britain first?

I have no inclination to run from the term "isolationist" when it is appended to me, except as I know that in some part those who use the term these days substitute it for the unprintable terms they might prefer to use, terms that voice the bitter anger of those who find American opposition to their plans to play with and to jeopardize the independence and sovereignty of our own country. I have no particular dislike for the term "isolationist" when I can use honest description of what I know so-called isolationist to be and to stand for. Even Franklin D. Roosevelt was once, not so long ago either, perfectly willing to be known as an isolationist, when he defined what I understand to be the meaning of isolationism. Speaking at Chautauqua on August 14, 1936, the President said:

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war.

Now, who of those who sought to avoid involvement of our country in war would hang his head in shame, the shame that some seem to feel would be becoming, because he was isolationist to that extent?

And who in the Senate, who in all America for that matter, represented any other degree of isolationism than just that of wanting to avoid involvement in more war?

It can hardly be said, with any degree of fairness to truth, that isolationism is dead, since there are millions upon millions of Americans determined that our country shall not be involved again in war. Certainly it is not dead when isolationism is confined to the meaning that President Roosevelt gave the term, the meaning that comes nearest to matching what is my own understanding of the term. And, what is more, the will to stay out of war, call it isolationism if you must, was the will of 80 or 90 percent or more of the people of our country.

ISOLATIONISTS BROUGHT ALL THE ILLS OF THE WORLD

Blaming American isolationism for the ills of the world is only a part of the effort of those who entertain the internationalist theories. They would place upon the isolationists the responsibility for lack of our defense and preparedness at the time the enemy struck at Pearl Harbor. It means nothing to these critics that if we had but had 10 times more defensive preparation at Pearl Harbor than we actually did have we would then have suffered a loss 10 times as great as we did suffer, so blame the isolationists for the Pearl Harbor mess. Ten times as many ships, 10 times as many guns, 10 times as many men, 10 times as many warning signal stations, 10 times as many officers, would probably have meant 10 times as many ships, guns, men, and officers, unalert and destroyed, as were destroyed by the Japs and their American-made tools on that awful day at Pearl Harbor; and, I suppose, the same delay in bringing anyone to trial for our miserable failure there, delay until evidence would vanish and witnesses die. Those whose hindsight dictates that we ought to have had large fortifications at Guam love to place the responsibility for the absence of these fortifications at the door of the isolationists, even though they know full well that the Senate was never asked for fortification there, never was even called upon to vote on the question, was never presented with a request for the fortification of Guam by the President, the Army, or the Navy; but, go ahead, blame the loss of Guam on the isolationists.

In a general way, some of the internationalists seemingly find it comforting, to themselves at least, to blame isolationists for the fact that we were without a larger army and navy when war came to us. It means nothing to them that, irrespective of how some of the isolationists voted on some of the naval defense program before Pearl Harbor—it means nothing to them that the President, the Army, and the Navy got from Congress everything they asked for in the way of defense preparation, got it from that time in 1933 when President Roosevelt shaved down naval preparation authorization to the day when he was asking billions for defense. They got everything they asked for; but blame all war failures and embarrassments on the isolationists. The isolationists are easy marks in this hour when they fail to disrupt unity in the war effort by not fighting back at those who unjustly blame them. But I fight back now, Mr. President, when the challenge becomes one threatening something more than unity, indeed threatening our very future as a nation.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to make this contribution. President Roosevelt's first request for the Military Establishment was for less money than Mr. Hoover's last request. On May 20, 1940, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on my motion, that committee rewrote the language of the bill as it came from the President's Bureau of the Budget dealing with the Military Establishment for 1940, and increased the total amount from approximately $800,000,000, as requested by President Roosevelt, to approximately $1,500,000,000. If Congress had not provided that increase at that time, 3½ years ago, where would we be today?

Mr. NYE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution and for his question.

ISOLATIONISTS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. President, isolationism was not at odds with a strong national defense. Isolationists supported every Army appropriation that I can remember. Some isolationists did oppose some of the proposed naval appropriations before the pre-Pearl Harbor days, but that opposition was to the giant battleships being proposed and which I, for one, thought unwise in light of the differing military opinion entertained respecting the utility of these giants in war. If I am not mistaken many of our own military men now share the conclusion that we ought build no more of these giants, that they have not proven themselves and their utility in modern war.

SCRAP IRON AND OIL FOR THE JAPS

And if my memory does not serve me wrong, it was isolationists who pleaded for an end to the business of America arming those who might become our enemies, the very enemies who some of our leaders now declare they knew all the time were going to fight us. I remember so distinctly the times I warned about the sale of American scrap iron to the Japs. I dare now to quote from a warning I delivered here on the floor of the Senate on August 10, 1937, when I said:

> It can hardly be said, then, that the return from this foreign trade (in scrap iron) is in keeping with our best interests in this country. Indeed, it seems to me that the only return we may expect from a continuation of this exportation, aside from the munificent return in dollars to the several exporting companies, is the probability that one day we may receive this scrap back home here in the form of shrapnel in the flesh and in the bodies of our sons.

This brings me, Mr. President, to an interesting bit of fact that developed since Pearl Harbor, demonstrating how much certain persons, not isolationists, would like to forget some things.

We all knew how extensive had been our exports of scrap iron, petroleum, and iron ore to Japan up to the beginning of the calendar year 1941. I wondered how much of these essentials we exported to Japan in 1941, right up to the day of Pearl Harbor, and I addressed an inquiry to the Department of State concerning these exports. My inquiry was dated December 18, 1942. I waited until April 21, 1943, for an answer which came in the form of a letter from Executive Director Milo Perkins, of the Bureau of Economic Warfare, which had inherited these statistics. I read the letter, minus certain figures, for the information of the Senate:

> Exports of petroleum to Japan in 1941, as reported by the Department of Commerce, totaled ——— barrels for all types of products. Of this total, 43 percent was crude oil, 18 percent gasolines of all types, including blending agents, 7 percent lubricants, and 32 percent all other types of petroleum products, primarily distillate fuel oil.
>
> Exports of iron and steel scrap from the United States to Japan in 1941 amounted to ——— long tons, and ——— long tons were exported from the Philippines. No iron ore moved from the United States to Japan during the year, but ——— long tons were exported from the Philippines.
>
> In Executive Order No. 8900 of September 15, 1941——

I pause for a moment, Mr. President, in my reading of the letter to say that I could not believe that 8,900 Executive orders had been issued, but I presume that is accurate. I continue to read from the letter:

> The Board of Economic Warfare (previously the Economic Defense Board) was given the power to license exports (except arms, ammunition, and implements of war) which was previously vested in the Administration of Export Control and the State Department. Since that time, there have been no licenses granted, nor exports made, for these commodities to Japan from either continental United States or the Philippines.
>
> The quota agreement negotiated prior to the transfer of export authority to the Economic Defense Board, whereby the Philippine High Commissioner was authorized by the Secretary of State to license the export of —— tons of iron ore for the period May 28, 1941, through December 31, 1941, was rescinded; and all exportations of iron ore from the Philippines to Japan were stopped by Administrative Order No. 2 of the Executive Director of the Economic Defense Board, dated October 18, 1941.

But now comes the concluding paragraph of the letter, after telling just how much scrap, ore, and petroleum we exported to Japan in 1941, warning me:

> The statistics of exports to Japan cited above have been declared strictly confidential under regulations of the Department of Commerce and should be safeguarded accordingly. The agreement to this effect is indicated by the attached letter.

The attached letter bears the signatures of chairmen or representatives of different units of Government. It is in the form of a recommendation entitled "Recommendation of Committee Relative to Publication of Export Statistics," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATION OF COMMITTEE RELATIVE TO PUBLICATION OF EXPORT STATISTICS

It is the recommendation of the committee that statistics governing trade movements of commodities which are or may be subject to export control under the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, be curtailed, insofar as they disclose information showing the country of destination, except that such information may be made available to proper agencies of the United States upon request.

It is recommended further that no curtailment be made where publication of trade statistics is required by law or where the statistics involved are printed in annual reports.

A. N. Ziegler, chairman, major, J. A. G., Office of the A. E. C.; L. H. Price, Division of Controls, State Department; E. C. Whitmore, lieutenant, assistant to secretary, Clearance Committee, A. N. M. B.; Joseph Meehan, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; C. L. Hall, colonel, Board of Engineers, War Department; L. P. Nickell, United States Maritime Commission; Russell W. Arnold, secretary, lieutenant, Infantry, Office of the A. E. C.

Mr. NYE. So, Senators, I must not reveal to you, or to anyone else, what were our exports of petroleum, scrap iron, and iron ore to Japan in 1941, up to the terrible day at Pearl Harbor when Japan dumped hundreds of tons of these supplies of ours upon our own ships and upon and into the bodies of our own defending sons at Pearl Harbor. I must assume, with no effort to disguise intended sarcasm, that our own Government does not wish to reveal the figures of export to Japan in 1941 for fear the Japs, the enemy, will learn how much we helped Japan in 1941. Or, perhaps we do not want China to know how we contributed to her suffering, as though she did not know.

NOT HIDING FROM THE RECORD

I have no intention, Mr. President, of countering the continuing insinuations which are obviously intended to bring disunity to our common cause in America in this hour. I am not glibly answering continued taunting with any "I told you so's." There may and there will come the day when people will know the truth and all of it. But for now I do rather gladly insist that those who would smear by carelessly applying the term "Isolationist" as descriptive of myself are not going to cause me to hide from any record that was mine in this whole consideration of foreign policy up to and following Pearl Harbor. I but gave the best that was in me to the end that we might save our country, save our substance, save our sons from involvement in another war. And I will do it again. And in doing it, should anyone derive pleasure or satisfaction out of calling me "isolationist," I will gladly respond to that title.

WILL OUR ALLIES COOPERATE FOR PEACE

I wanted my country to escape involvement in this war. I still wish we might have avoided it. And when we are through with this present war, I want to do everything within my power to save my country from another. I would like to help save the world from another war. I have no difference with those who argue that we could best save our own country from more war by seeing to it that there is no more war anywhere on earth. I go along with that theory up to the point where the advocates of it insist that we, America, can prevent more war if only we have the determination to put ourselves to the task. Now, let us be reasonable with ourselves. We cannot do this thing all by ourselves. It is not in the cards that 130,000,000 people all by themselves are going to insure the peace of the world and prevent aggression. If we are going to attain that laudable purpose of stopping aggression and preserving the peace, we need the nearly complete cooperation of every other power on earth in obtaining it. And I have to confess myself to be skeptical, to say the least, about the prospect of finding any larger will among the powers of this earth to cooperate than those same powers revealed at Versailles and in the days and the years that have followed.

Perhaps those are right who insist that good Americanism is dependent upon our ability to forget some things, but somehow I do not feel that I am any less a good American when I remember what our allies of another day did and did not do in the name of writing a peace that might be enduring. I do not forget and I cannot overlook the things which Allied leaders of the present day have said and done that go to indicate how largely perhaps we are dealing with pretty much the same world, and pretty much the same Europe, particularly, that we dealt with during and after the last war. Is it wrong for me to say this? Is it injurious to the United Nations' cause in this hour to say these things? Then let me say that it is the responsibility of the challenge by those who would have us be blind in our post-war commitments that makes these assertions necessary now.

IT DOES NOT ALL DEPEND ON US

There are those who insist it is nonsense, and selfish nonsense at that, because some of us hesitate to push our country out in leadership, so to speak, in establishing or adopting a basis for world-wide cooperation looking to everlasting peace. They would have us believe that all America has to do is offer our country as the unselfish leader in this pious crusade, and that without fail, and immediately, there will be huzzas from Moscow, London, China, and from wherever else we make common cause against the mutual enemy. Do not experience and the very attitude of our allies foreclose this possibility?

But what difference does it make whether it is true or not? We are bearing the brunt of this war. We are underwriting it, lock, stock, and barrel, and I think it is not against any interest, or unkind to anyone, to mention the fact that by no stretch of the imagination is it as much our war as it is the war of our allies. We came in by the back door, and we have unhesitatingly given everything we could in the form of lend-lease and men. We are doing our utmost to win the war, yet I have heard no expression from our allies that shows them enthusiastic about any resolution yet presented here.

Perhaps I am being selfish when I want Stalin and Churchill and the rest of them to show us their cards first, but I do not see anything selfish in occasionally, at least, thinking first of all in terms of Uncle Sam.

IT IS HARD TO KNOW, WHEN THE ALLIES POINT TWO WAYS

Why must Americans cease questioning the probability of having Britain, Russia, and the United States get together seriously and willingly in the task of preventing aggression, when we know how great an Empire aggression has built for Great Britain, and when we observe how jealously Churchill and others guard against possible liquidation of any part of that Empire; when we go back and read what Churchill had to say another day about the Russians, about Hitler, about Mussolini, for he once wrote of his admiration of Hitler's "courage" and his "vital force," and once said he was charmed by Mussolini's "gentle and simple bearing" and by Mussolini's "triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of leninism." Perhaps the Moscow Conference is demonstration that these things do not matter. Perhaps these are to some minds trifling inconsistencies that can be ironed out, but at least one can try to be realistic about the future job ahead of us, and must at least question the size of the task facing a world that would bring conflicting powers and interests together with a view to molding them into one mighty effort, one mighty mind, to end war and prevent aggression. When men want to draw the United States into commitments on subjects yet to be defined, we certainly have right to question the likelihood of cooperation by others whose cooperation in the past has been particularly noticeable by reason of its absence.

BRITAIN ON COOPERATION IN MANCHUKUO

If some among us could have their way we would here and now adopt a resolution pledging our country to a part in a League of Nations, or pledging our country to an agreement that would see enforcement at the hands of an international police force—enforcement, for example, of a dictate against aggression in China or Africa. While men make such proposals, shall we forget that we had an agreement with Britain on which we wanted her to follow through with us when Japan moved into Manchukuo? Must we forget that Britain would have nothing to do with our expressed purpose when we asked her cooperation in enforcing that agreement? Is it unfair to ask now why, if Britain would not cooperate then, we can expect her to cooperate now under some new plan or agreement in the establishment of which she might concur in the name of preventing aggression and preserving peace?

AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

An international police force? What nation has offered to accept its jurisdic-

tion? Would we ourselves consent to its jurisdiction over us without even knowing who for the moment shall command that police force, without knowing who or what principles shall direct it?

It is definitely in order, Mr. President, to caution respecting any joint international effort after this war to prevent aggression and preserve peace. We must avoid repeating the blunders which have taken this world to war, even though that blundering might be the outgrowth of joint effort for peace. For example, wholly laudable is the present purpose to strike down and stamp out Hitlerism and Tojoism. But if we are to follow accomplishment of that purpose by action in which we are to find ourselves trying to police the world in as domineering a way as the Hitlers and the Tojos have domineered, then we can but expect that those we would dominate will be building for the day when they can do to us what we are now doing to Hitler and Tojo.

Skeptical, am I? Yes, indeed. And I am destined to remain so, I fear, about the future shape of things in this world until I find that they whose cooperation we anticipate and desire are vastly changed from the same people and interests we came to know so well after the last war when their cooperation was desired to the end that we might avoid more war.

THERE ARE LIMITATIONS EVEN UPON STRONG AMERICA

I am not misled nor am I going to be misled by those whose everyday record reveals that they are for the "four freedoms" with reservations, when they would have us believe that they are really for the "four freedoms." More than that, I have just got to realize how unattainable in our time are these freedoms for some—indeed, how unattainable they have been even for some Americans. Yet there are teachings, there are preachments, to the effect that we must have faith and confidence in the attainment of the impossible if we are going to be successful in winning the war, the peace, the end of aggression, and the preservation of peace. I fear I am not yet sufficiently indoctrinated with the germ called "globalitis." Perhaps I owe an apology for having escaped a shot of this germ in my veins, but I have large enforcement in my conviction that there are still limitations upon us, limitations upon what we can do, when I am permitted to read such intimate accounts as that which Henry J. Taylor, renowned journalist, who commands the respect of all who read his writings, affords in his work entitled "Men in Motion." The Reader's Digest made a splendid contribution to broader thinking when it published, in its issue of August 1943, excerpts from that book under the title "Boondoggling on a Global Basis." I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

NOT CLOSING THE DOOR TO A CHANCE OF COOPERATION

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, some will want to conclude that I have gone a long way around Robin Hood's barn in my remarks directed to the resolution which we are considering. But for my own part, I am sure that what I have had to say has something more than direct bearing upon our present consideration. As I have already said, I wanted my country to escape involvement in this war. Perhaps it is true that we need the complete cooperation of other powers if we are going to avoid involvement in more wars. I am skeptical, as I have said, about the availability of that kind of cooperation.

But my skepticism does not dull my desire or my willingness to hope for and try for the kind of cooperation that will bring us freedom from ever more frequent involvement in wars growing out of hate, suspicion and fear, jealousy, revengefulness, imperialism, boundary and commercial rivalry, and power politics through alliances. I think perhaps that is why I may lean to favor the pending Senate Resolution 192. I am not ready to close the door to whatever might develop in the way of a chance to win and enjoy the cooperation of the world.

COOPERATION MUST NOT JEOPARDIZE OUR OWN SOVEREIGNTY

If there is anyone in the United States who does not want his country to contribute to the making of a world more largely free from aggressors and a world more secure against war, I do not know who that someone may be. Yet there is organized hullabaloo in our country that undertakes to cause people to conclude that there are mean, nasty, unhealthy, untouchable forces, headed up in the Senate of the United States—forces that would have America assume a role to encourage, aid and abet more aggression, more war. I doubt that this hullabaloo has much following in our land. Common knowledge and common sense dictate that America, and especially the Senate of the United States, shall stand united in a desire to be done with these experiences of war that sap our substance, drain our best blood and wholly disorganize our homes and the economy of our people. If we can not isolate ourselves from these experiences of war, then at least we might try, with the hope of preventing them, cooperative undertakings with the rest of the world, but undertakings, mind you, that do not create some super-super-government that shall dictate our own destiny, undertakings that will not jeopardize our own sovereignty as a nation, undertakings of a purely cooperative nature that will not challenge our identity or our sovereignty any more than does cooperation with our allies in winning the war. That makes rather plain my own thought concerning the limitations upon the degree of cooperation that we can afford in any undertaking to free the world from aggression and war. I can not refrain, however, in passing from expressing the hope that our allies will be as cooperative in preserving peace in this world as we are cooperative in winning their wars.

WE COOPERATE ONLY IN EVENT OF JUST AND HONORABLE PEACE

To me Senate Resolution 192 is especially clear in at least one particular. It is an assurance of our cooperation in the affording of international authority with power to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world, provided—and I emphasize the word "provided"—provided that there has been attained at the end of this war a just and honorable peace. There definitely is no commitment in this resolution that will have the slightest bearing, according to my understanding, until there is a peace agreement that can be satisfying to an America which wants to contribute to the ending of war.

This being true, then there must vanish the ancient and lasting American fears and prejudices respecting international cooperation. A just and honorable peace is one that will bring us a world condition that would require the very minimum of international authority and machinery and power in the maintenance of peace and the prevention of aggression. Certainly there would be no need for an international police force or anything more than an agreement among the powers of the world to join their separate military and naval forces in checking and policing those who are in violation of peace terms and those who are demonstrating an aggressive attitude that again threatens the peace of the world. But if the peace to come after World War No. 2 is a repetition of the peace of Versailles, we can expect another Hitler to crawl out of the alleys of discontent and revenge—another somebody, or another who will be the hangover from the debauch of power politics at the peace table, just as Hitler was the hang-over from the debauch at Versailles. The just and honorable peace of which we speak must so read that not again will there be permitted festering spots to breed more Mussolinis, more Hitlers, more Nipponese war lords, and more "supermen" suffering from that sort of psychoneurosis which grows out of an inferiority complex imposed on entire peoples.

WHAT IS A JUST AND HONORABLE PEACE?

What do we, when we speak through this resolution, consider a just and honorable peace? What would Americans generally consider a just and honorable peace? Would I dare undertake a defining that goes to those questions? What kind of a peace I could count just and honorable, one that I would feel our country could undertake to enforce in cooperation with the rest of the world. What kind of peace would that be?

To me a just and honorable peace is one that will go further than merely to punish the leaders who have been responsible for the catastrophe that is upon the world. It would be satisfying to confine Hitler, Goebbels, Goering, Mussolini, Tojo and the other Jap leaders of the military clique to a single island,

all of them made to live together and alone, with such policing as will guarantee their being kept out of circulation forevermore.

It would be pleasurable to contemplate the plan advanced the other day by General Badoglio, of Italy. He suggested that the most satisfactory way to deal with the situation at the end of this war would be to put Tojo, Mussolini, and Hitler in a cage and move them around from day to day over Europe, so that the whole populace could observe this museum piece. But that would not solve the tremendous problem of how to avoid recurrence of these catastrophes.

To me, a just and honorable peace means one that seriously undertakes the elimination of positive factors making for war, a peace that will—

Undertake seriously the elimination of the factors making for war;

Afford liberation and sovereignty to all the peoples of the world wanting it;

Deny to the victors the acquisition of any territory without the consent of the people of the proposed newly acquired territory;

Give every nation equal access to commercial lanes and ports;

Withhold aid and encouragement from imperialistic and world domination ambitions;

Deny undertakings to preserve unpopular monarchies or their reign over others;

Restore and maintain the identity and sovereignty of lands like Finland, Poland, Norway, and Sweden, unless the peoples of those lands find an association or a partitioning to their own liking;

Refrain from undertaking to force a race of people to live forever under foreign masters.

Deny extraterritorial rights for any power in other lands unwilling voluntarily to grant such rights.

Refrain from subjecting any people or their resources to the profit or advantage of any other power.

IF WE WANT A LASTING PEACE

Mr. President, if a peace embodying these general principles and purposes could result from this war, I would feel that the war could be counted worth a part of all the blood and wealth that it is costing. That kind of peace would mean that our victorious powers had really wanted to win a lasting peace, a peace that would not at once be a standing invitation for another war. That kind of peace would do away with the foremost causes for war. That kind of peace could be underwritten without the necessity of maintaining expensive international machinery and without our having to surrender a shred of our own sovereignty.

A peace after this war which ignores the cardinal causes for war is a peace which could not possibly be successfully maintained with a league of nations, a world court, an international police force, a union now with Britain, and a superworld government all combined. To me it is folly to play with the thought that justice and the will and rights of people can be ignored and peace at the same time preserved irrespective of the kind or degree of international machinery we might create.

INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY IN 1776

The thing that frightens me about the prospect of American participation or cooperation in international machinery, even for so laudable a purpose as that of preventing more war, is that we would or might find our country a party to a procedure that would forever undertake to enslave some peoples. Is it not fair to guess that had there been international authority and machinery back in 1776, that authority would have been used to prevent American freedom from the tyranny to which our fathers were subjected? I have no apology to offer for what Americans of 1776 did then and for us all. Would we ask other enslaved peoples to refrain from doing what our fathers did then for us? We must never permit our country to subscribe to the theory that any definite order that grows out of this war must be or can be forever maintained.

RESOLUTION IS NOT CONSENT TO ANY TREATY

This resolution, unless it were to be amended as the Senator from Florida would amend it if he could, but cannot, is in no sense or degree a pledge by America, by the Senate of another day, or even by the Senate of this day. This is not even a vague promise that when we speak of "international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world" we mean specifically an international police force, the League of Nations, a World Court, union now, alliance with one power or more powers, or a super world government.

Nor is this resolution to be construed as consent as well as advice to any peace that might be negotiated. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] did a real service to the Senate and his country the other day in this debate when he called attention to the precedent that might cause an executive to feel that a resolution such as Senate Resolution 192 would be his authority to negotiate a peace that would never have to be submitted to the Senate for ratification. That possibility is quite completely met, it seems to me, by the pains to which the chairman and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee have gone on the printed, lasting record of Senate proceedings of last Friday to give notice to the President and to the world that under no circumstances was this resolution to be considered as a consent resolution in any sense. Since that moment, Mr. President, the Senate has virtually adopted the Willis amendment to the resolution, which seems to me to foreclose the chance of the conclusion which some have been able to reach. It may be that we need the Danaher amendment, which is pending, to safeguard against certain fears. I am not ready to conclude. But it does seem that the record we are making is making the real purpose of this resolution so clear that it can never be misconstrued.

UNCERTAINTIES TOO MANY TO CONTEMPLATE

I have said that it would be better if this resolution had not been brought here at all. The airing the whole subject has had, by reason of the presentation of Senate Resolution 192 and proposed amendments, has been good for the health and future of our own country. The consideration afforded here by days of debate has definitely brought realism back into our thinking and planning, which in itself is excellent gain. But whatever value the resolution ever might have had, it has been rather definitely destroyed by the Senate demonstration of American realism and acquaintance with what we might expect of our allies and the rest of the world. It seems to me that perhaps the best thing that could now be done with it would be to send it back to committee, with the understanding that we would bury the whole subject of after-war world cooperation until we could better see what shape of world we were going to have to look to for more cooperation.

It might easily be true that finally our country will be more definitely and overwhelmingly isolationist in its determination to avoid involvement in more foreign wars than has ever been true in the past. It might be that the world—and especially our allies—will afford so complete a demonstration of lack of interest in preventing more war that we will be forced back to dependence upon our own ability to enforce the strictest kind of neutrality while others abroad stew in juices of hate and revenge. It is even conceivable that President Roosevelt himself, fed up on ultimate developments as they come to pass, would want once again to assume leadership of what is called isolationism. Terrible to contemplate are the conditions and consequences that would bring about such developments, but, after all, none are quite so blind as those who will not see what has happened and what could happen again.

The pending resolution is nothing more than a pronouncement of what the world already knows, and possibly an assurance to our own sons on fighting fronts that we are going to try to find the way to avoid recurrence of this hell on earth which today holds us in its clutches—a pronouncement that we are going to be earnest in our endeavor to that end. The last thing I would want to do would be to allow this war's end be nothing more than a few weeks' furlough for American boys—a chance to get home for a visit—to be followed by more years of foreign service in policing a world that did not like being policed. Would that we could have equal assurance from those of our allies who will have as much or more to say about the peace and the shape of things to come when this present blood letting is ended.

I think it is fair to say, in conclusion, that the great majority of the Members of the Senate of the United States today, while earnestly engaging in thought of how this great and worthy, though difficult, accomplishment can ultimately be won, are determined that it be won without the loss of an iota of sovereignty to America. For myself I can say, and must say, that I do not any more consider myself to have been chosen by the

people of North Dakota for the purpose of liquidating the sovereignty of my country than Winston Churchill considered himself chosen Minister of Great Britain for the purpose of liquidating the British Empire.

[EXHIBIT 1]

[From Chicago Sunday Tribune of September 19, 1943]

THE MORTIFICATION OF HISTORY—NATIONALISM HAS BEEN AMERICA'S GUIDE TO GREATNESS

(By Garet Garrett)

If you say, "I am first of all an American," you have to be careful. It may be misunderstood. You might have said, "I am for America first." And the American who says that will be denounced in his own country and by his own Government. That is not enough. He will be denounced also in Great Britain, Russia, and China, all accusing him of one thing.

He is an isolationist.

But what is that? An isolationist is one who is said to have sinned against the peace and well-being of the whole world. He is held responsible for the necessity now to mortify American history by rewriting it to a theme of guilt and atonement. According to that theme he is—

One who would crawl back into the shell America lived in for so long (a favorite figure, that of an American crawling back);

One who would have America put a Chinese wall around itself and cut the world off;

One who thinks America can go on living all to itself, declining to cooperate with the rest of the world;

One who, having believed this and having persuaded others to believe it with him, is now to blame for the fact that after winning the First World War we lost the peace, and so brought the Second World War to pass; or

One who after the First World War, according to Mr. Wallace, belonged to the thing that "came out of its cave and * * * made certain that we would adopt international policies which would make World War No. 2 almost inevitable." The name of that cave-dwelling thing was isolationism.

What nation during 150 years has done most to alter the ancient weights and measures in the world and the ways of thinking and living of all the people in it? What nation during that time has been the principal factor in world history?

Do you ask? The answer is not what you think. The answer will be, "That's just it. The more we did the more we were not there."

Nonsense may create a kind of reality. The Mad Hatter lives, although he never existed. So there might be an elephant that lived as a mole and suffered from megalomania. The story of a people who lived in a shell and changed the whole world is nonsense. Nevertheless it creates an image that becomes in itself an important political fact.

Isolationism, according to this story, was from the beginning, and not a great sin at first, because we received it as doctrine from the founders, especially from Washington, who pronounced it in the Farewell Address, and afterward from Jefferson. Thus the distortion begins.

Neither Washington nor Jefferson was an isolationist, nor was any of the founders. They were Americans. They were Americans first. They were sick of the uproar and dissensions raised in the new American household by pro-European factions, first the pro-French, always wanting the new Republic to make war on England, and then the pro-British, wanting it to fight France. Washington well knew the weakness of his countrymen for such foreign infatuations, and it filled his mind with foreboding. That is why he so earnestly exhorted them forever to avoid embroilment in the quarrels and intrigues of Europe. There had been already one entangling alliance—the first, and the last until now. That was the alliance with France during our struggle for independence, and before we could buy ourselves off from that it had almost got us into another war with England.

Everybody knew at that time what Washington meant. Before 1776 the American colonists had been dragged through four European wars. On the frontiers they knew the war whoop of Indians armed and incited alternately by France, Spain, and England, who in their struggle for control of the North American continent thought nothing of setting the red savage to kill white pioneers.

Who could imagine there was such a thing as friendship between nations? Certainly this new Republic in a new world was not only without a friend, even France having turned against it, but every monarch in the world was its natural enemy. The only sound foreign policy, therefore, was one of strict and jealous neutrality.

But if Washington or any one of the founders had proposed a policy of isolationism nobody would have understood that at all, for never had there been a people more joyously minded to go forth in the world, to trade and compete in it, to demand their rights, and to make known their dissatisfactions.

Freedom of the seas could not have been the idea of a people thinking isolation. Yet that was the first article of American foreign policy. We were willing to fight for it and did fight for it more than once. The Yankee skipper was the first in seafaring history to keep his sails up all night. His fast clipper ships, with the best-paid sailors and the highest freight rates, carried tea from Canton to Liverpool, beating the slow British ships in their own China trade. This was to prove the American maxim that time is money.

The Mediterranean then was the private sea of the Barbary pirates who dwelt on the north coast of Africa and levied tribute on merchant ships. America said to Europe, "Let's go together and abolish this nuisance." Europe declined, saying it was cheaper to pay tribute, and, besides, it was an Old World custom. So at last the little American Fleet did it alone. On this page of the old book there is a curious footnote. Benjamin Franklin said:

"I think it not improbable that these rovers may be privately encouraged by the English to fall upon us and to prevent our interference in the carrying trade; for I have in London heard it is a maxim among the merchants that if there was no Algiers it would be worth England's while to build one."

A favorite distortion of the new theme makers is to say that during the first 100 years of its happy isolated life America went strutting about in a protective garment not of its own making, namely, the Monroe Doctrine, which had been a British idea to begin with, and then, calling itself American policy, owed its success entirely to the power of the British Navy. That is not so.

After the downfall of Napoleon the reactionary monarchs of the Old World set up what they called th Holy Alliance and conceived the idea of saving Spanish America for Europe. This boded no good for England. In the year 1823, therefore, the British Government proposed to the Government of the United States a joint undertaking to defend the new Latin American republics against the Holy Alliance. President Monroe discussed this proposal with Jefferson and Madison, and the three of them inclined to it, because the Holy Alliance, once established in Latin America, would be a perpetual menace to free government on this hemisphere. But John Quincy Adams, who was Secretary of State, said: "Only 10 years ago they contemptuously burned our Capitol. Now they are asking us to join them as an equal in a perilous enterprise. It is very flattering. But let us look for pitfalls."

The pitfalls were three. One, the United States would thereby become an ally of Great Britain against the Holy Alliance; two, the door would be left open to British colonization on any scale; and, three, the United States would itself be bound not to acquire any Spanish-American territory. And although nobody had yet imagined it, we were going to want Texas and California for our own territorial completion.

The founders were shrewd statesmen. The sequel was not what Great Britain expected or wanted. In his next message to Congress President Monroe announced the doctrine that has ever since borne his name. It meant simply America for Americans. Any attempt to extend the European system to this hemisphere would be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States; the Americas, both North and South, were no longer open to colonization. That went for Russia, for everybody in the Holy Alliance, and for Great Britain, too.

Those who say that in any case the British Navy did stand between us and the Holy Alliance, and that the American fathers had the astuteness to count upon it without the grace to acknowledge it, cannot know what would have happened if then or afterward the Holy Alliance had moved against this hemisphere. We do know that the British Navy did not interfere when during the Civil War Napoleon III invaded Mexico and set an emperor there, and that in 1895 in the Venezuelan boundary dispute Great Britain herself was the European power to whom an American President was saying in peremptory manner, "Hands off."

Before the end of our great maritime chapter, and while the clipper ship was queen of the sea, Commodore Perry, for better or worse, went knocking on the door of Japan with cannon. He had a message from the President of the United States saying: "Nobody can stay shut up like this, quite out of the world. Come forth and trade with the rest of us. It will make you rich and powerful."

We lost our seafaring eminence during the Civil War. Just then the iron steamship began to supersede the sailing ship, and although the first iron steamship to cross the Atlantic had been an American vessel out of Savannah, still, when the war was over and we looked again at the sea, that view was less exciting than the vision of empire to the west. The way to San Francisco was no longer by Cape Horn but overland by rail.

During the next 30 years the foundations were laid for the tower that was to be the one impregnable citadel of freedom in the whole world. That was something the builders did not know. They worked as if time were measured and running out, and it was, but they did not know that either. The only motive they were conscious of was the illusion of profit. Came then the war with Spain, over freedom for Cuba; and although Cuba was made free, the unintended sequel for us was a lurch toward imperialism when the flag went up in the Philippines. But even this was under a promise of ultimate independence for the Filipinos which we never drew back.

Our next foreign adventure was to assist in putting down the fanatical Boxer Uprising against all foreigners in China. Whereupon, facing Europe as the friend of Asia, we announced that America stood for the territorial integrity of China. Then Theodore Roosevelt, walking softly in the world with a big stick, tweaking the Kaiser's nose, stepping on the neck of a European war flame in Morocco, digging the Panama Canal with one hand, inserting the peace between Japan and Russia,

rattling the Monroe Doctrine, building a navy only second to Great Britain. After him was Taft.

By this time the tower was rising very fast. It was visible from every corner of the world. As an industrial power and in the international exchange of wealth, called foreign trade, we had arrived at first place, although never since the clipper ship had we possessed another great merchant marine. We had let that go. Our foreign trade was carried in foreign bottoms. Under Taft there evolved the idea—and a very naive idea it may seem to us now—that our surplus of industrial products could be loaned away in the form of foreign investments under a policy designed to promote international well being and to enable the backward peoples of the world to advance much faster. This was called dollar diplomacy, sneeringly, and Taft was its last prophet. But much more it will be remembered that he earnestly supported and afterward led the American evangel for a league of nations to keep and enforce the peace of the world. After Taft came Woodrow Wilson and then the slogan under which 2,000,000 soldiers went to Europe—"a war to end war."

For all of this, those who now are writing the theme of guilt and atonement say that the spirit of isolationism was always there, latent or manifest. They say it was not until after the First World War, however, that it took possession of our acts.

To say this no one has agitated so much paper and ink as Mr. Willkie. In One World he writes: "If our withdrawal from world affairs after the last war was a contributing factor to the present war and to the economic instability of the last 20 years—and it seems plain that it was—a withdrawal from the problems and responsibilities of the world after this war would be sheer disaster."

The guilt theme stated.

Then he says that after the First World War "we entered into an era of strictest detachment from world affairs. * * * We shut ourselves away from world trade by excessive tariff barriers. We washed our hands of the continent of Europe and displayed no interest in its fate while Germany rearmed."

One may allow for the fact that as Mr. Willkie discovered geography by flying around the world and seeing with his own eyes that "continents and oceans are plainly only parts of a whole, seen as I have seen them," so also he discovered American history and has the same naive impulse to impart his sensations, and it still is too much to believe that he could be entirely ignorant of what happened during those 20 years of "strictest detachment from world affairs." You could as easily suppose he had missed the Pacific.

During those 20 years an event took place that stands unique and alone in the waste behind us, like a shaft of light, only now forgotten. Immediately after the First World War a new and ruinous armament race began. Even President Wilson, bitterly disillusioned, was for an American Navy to be incomparably the most powerful in the world. Nevertheless, we did believe in disarmament and preached it earnestly, only to receive back the echo of our own words. The armament race continued. Then one day the American Government invited the principal naval powers to a Washington conference, and when they were assembled there the Secretary of State said:

"The United States is forging the longest sword of all. No matter how much longer you make yours we can make a longer one still. Yet we do not want it. When we talk of disarmament we mean it. To prove to you that we mean it we offer now to break our sword to the exact length of the next longest one in the world, on condition that we stop this mad armament race. Do you accept?"

The Nation that was saying this—the one that was offering to limit its weapon power—was the richest in the world, possessing absolute industrial supremacy. Such a thing had never happened before. The delegates were stunned. However, they signed the famous 5–5–3 arms limitation treaty; they signed also the famous Nine Power Pact which was to keep the peace in the Pacific, to maintain the American principle of the open door in Asia, and to guarantee the independence and territorial integrity of China. While we were sinking our ships the other parties were sinking the spirit of the treaty. It had limited the number of capital ships only; they began to build unforbidden ships of new design, and the race was on again, except that we hopefully continued to believe in disarmament and waited too long, with the result that the American Navy fell to third place.

During those 20 years the American Government persuaded the whole world in solemn writing to renounce war as an instrument of foreign policy. That was the Kellogg-Briand Pact, so called because Briand had first suggested such a treaty between France and the United States only, whereas Mr. Kellogg, the Secretary of State, conceived the idea of making it world-wide.

During those 20 years we poured billions into Europe to finance reconstruction, to build new works, to restore her trade and credit—direct loans to France, Italy, Poland, and the Balkan countries, besides enormous loans to Germany which enabled her to pay all the reparations she ever did pay to Great Britain and France. And we did this while Great Britain at the same time was leading a movement to repudiate her own and all Allied war debts to the United States Treasury. All of those billions we lost.

During those 20 years Americans sat everywhere in Europe as advisers and administrators. An American administered the Reparations Commission in Berlin. An American was at the head of the Bank for International Settlements at Basle. The Dawes plan was American. The Young plan was American.

During those 20 years the American Government was untiring in its efforts to persuade the world to disarm on the land and on the sea. The Washington Naval Conference was in the time of Harding. The universal pact renouncing war as an instrument of foreign policy was in the time of Coolidge. One of Hoover's proposals was to abolish all weapons of aggression. At this the world scoffed. How could the weapons of aggression be distinguished?

All of that happened in the 20 years defined by Mr. Willkie as "an era of strictest detachment from world affairs."

We did not join the League of Nations. For this Mr. Willkie does not blame the people. He cannot, of course, blame the people for anything. "They were betrayed," he says, "by leaders without convictions who were thinking of group vote catching and partisan advantage." How strange. Much stranger really than the discovery that continents and oceans are all in one world when you see it from an airplane. The people wanted to join the League of Nations but their conscienceless leaders defeated that wish in order to catch their votes.

Neither in Mr. Willkie's writing of the guilt theme nor in any other will you find that Europe may have been to blame for the fact that the United States at last declined to adhere to the League of Nations. It is probably true that the American people did at first intend to join. Then they changed their minds. Why they did that may be debated to any length, but certainly one reason was the disillusionment that took place in the time that elapsed between President Wilson's return with the document and the vote of the Senate on ratification. In that interval of time Mr. Wilson had angrily rejected the British scheme for an all-around cancellation of war debts at the sole expense of the United States; he rejected it on the ground that it meant charging German reparations to us. Thus we were already cast for the role of Shylock whether we joined the League or not. In that interval of time it became painfully evident that Europe was Europe, and that European intentions toward the United States had not changed since Canning, who, having accepted the Monroe Doctrine in the place of the Anglo-American alliance he wanted, made this curious boast, "I have called the new world into existence to redress the bounds of the old." Mr. Churchill supported the scheme that President Wilson denounced—the European scheme to make America pay German reparations: he was saying then what he said recently again, "I am after all a European."

Now where in all that history is the Chinese wall, the broken shell, the Wallace cave? And where is the meaning of isolationism?

If you say of this history that its intense character has been nationalistic, consistently so from the beginning until now, that is true. Therefore, the word in place of isolationism that would make sense is nationalism. Why is the right word avoided?

The explanation must be that the wrong one, for what it is intended to do, is the perfect political word. Since isolationism cannot be defined, those who attack it are not obliged to define themselves. What are they? Anti-isolationists? But if you cannot say what isolationism is neither can you say what anti-isolationism is, whereas nationalism, being definite, has a positive antithesis. One who attacks nationalism is an internationalist.

The use of the obscurity created by the false word is to conceal something. The thing to be concealed is the identity of what is speaking. Internationalism is speaking.

It has a right to speak, as itself and for itself; but that right entails a moral obligation to say what it means and to use true words. If one says, "I hold with Mr. Justice Roberts that for the sake of world peace we must be willing to surrender our national sovereignty," or, as the Federal Unionist says, "I would be a citizen of the world first and secondly an American citizen," you know what that means. You know where that one stands. But what is concealed in the obscurities speaks warily. There is something it cannot say—not yet.

This is notably true of Mr. Willkie's book. He says of those 20 years, "We shut ourselves away from world trade by excessive tariff barriers." Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, in his Blueprint for Peace says, "After the last war, when other countries were looking to us for help in their stupendous task of economic reconstruction, the United States * * * struck heavy blows at their war-weakened, debt-burdened structures. * * * Our high tariff policy reached out to virtually every corner of the earth and brought poverty and despair to innumerable communities." The Vice President says that by high tariffs after the last war we sowed the wind and could not avoid reaping the whirlwind.

You might be tempted to skip all this, pausing only to wonder a little that into a mighty discourse on the world to come they should have introduced a bit of the old debate entitled "Protection Versus Free Trade." But that is not what it is. This is not the old debate. It is the international point of view.

They do not go all the way. They are too careful. Mr. Willkie says that of course if all tariff barriers were cast down at once there would be trouble. Nevertheless, what they mean, saying it so guardedly, is that we shall make our tariff laws hereafter not in benefit of ourselves alone but with international welfare in view, not as hitherto to protect the American standard of living only but with the thought in mind that we are under a moral obligation to lift other people's standards, too. The shoemaker in New England shall share his job with a shoemaker in

Czechoslovakia, not in order that shoes may be cheaper here, as the old argument was, but in order that the shoemaker in Czechoslovakia may be able to sell shoes in the American market, for unless he can do that he cannot raise his standard of living.

Formerly, says Mr. WALLACE, the "high tariff prevented the exchange of our surplus for goods. (Other people's goods, he means.) And so we exchanged our surplus for bonds of very doubtful value." But what shall we do with our still greater surplus at the end of this year? "We can be decently human," he says, "and really hard-headed if we exchange our post-war surplus for goods, for peace, and for improving the standard of living of so-called backward people."

Goods so far as goods go. After that, what? So many dollars' worth of goods for so many dollars' worth of peace? Peace, no doubt, would be a bargain at any price in goods. Yet how shall peace be priced in goods? Anyhow, it shall be, as Mr. WALLACE says, "the great adventure in sharing." He says: "Bread cast upon the waters does return." And Mr. Willkie says: "To raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man everywhere." If that is true, and it probably is, then it follows that by raising the standard of our living here to the highest plane of all we have at the same time been improving other people's standards everywhere. But we were not thinking of that. We were thinking of ourselves, and that was selfish.

It is not yet inevitable that we shall have to buy the peace of the world with our standard of living; nor is it so resolved in the American mind. A terrific struggle for decision is bound to take place. When it comes the characters will be revealed, both to one another and to themselves, and many no doubt will change sides, seeing clearly for the first time where they were going. The isolationist will be an image cast aside and forgotten. The bitter conflict at last must be one between nationalist and internationalist. And the longer this painful fact is concealed in a field of engineered emotion the worse it will be.

Nationalism as an American characteristic now is powerfully, perhaps dangerously, repressed. This is owing partly to intimidation and partly to censorship, but even more to self-imposed limitations upon the freedom of speech, from the feeling every patriotic person has that for the duration of the war and for the sake of unity among the Allied Nations there are many things one ought not to say out loud.

Thus internationalism is released to pursue its own ideologic offensive over very wide and undefended spaces behind a screen of sanctioned propaganda. Its most effective propaganda is aimed unerringly at a singular weakness in the national character. Deep in the American heart lies a longing for the heroic errand—the errand of the plumed knight, clothed in the armor of right, bearing the sword of justice, going forth to perform feats of crusade, rescue, and deliverance, at any sacrifice whatever. But we are not like that in fact. We love the fantasy and sometimes indulge it to the point of ecstasy. Then just in time we remember that we do live in this world. If ever we had forgotten that, there would be nothing here now to lend-lease away.

So it may turn out at last that the apparent success of the international evangel is somewhat deceptive. At least, the internationalist cannot be sure. And moreover he has trouble of another kind.

American nationalism may be for the time being repressed. It may continue to be successfully repressed to the end of the war. All elsewhere in the world, however, nationalism is rising, becoming more and more vocal, powerful, and assertive, even in Russia. If this continues, and there is no sign that it will not, an astonishing sequel may begin to appear. The proposed great American adventure in world-wide sharing may assume a solitary aspect; internationalism at last may become isolated in America.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Reader's Digest for August 1943]

BOONDOGGLING ON A GLOBAL BASIS

(Excerpts From Men in Motion)

(By Henry J. Taylor)

I have just returned home after observing the impact on European minds of the American promises regarding what the United States will do for the people of the world after the war. In our deep anxiety to be helpful to the world, we are making promises and assuming superior attitudes which America and the world will deeply regret. We are speaking and writing glowingly about post-war matters concerning which we shall actually have little, if anything, to say.

The problems abroad are astronomical. They are deep-rooted in historic tensions, charged with local prejudices and ardors which date far back, and full of crosscurrents and contradictions. Any one of these local problems—economic, social, political, or military—is enough to baffle any European. Yet American words and pens are distributing promises everywhere.

Once you leave our shores, the only voices you hear speak about a better world order are either German, Japanese, or American. The American governmentalists in Washington are in strange company. And if our leaders were less vain they would see that, whereas the world resents the German idea of world influence as being repugnant to all free men, our own Government's idea of excessive internationalism is also unacceptable.

We cannot solve Europe's basic problems or "make the world free." The destiny of Europeans is within themselves. And so is the destiny of their world-wide colonial system.

Talking about colonial freedom is one thing. Insuring that freedom is quite another. Eighty percent of the colonials of the world could not, or would not, use freedom to maintain freedom. Eighty percent of the world's people simply are not ready for what we are talking about.

For a country whose own cities are in the most deplorable condition in their history, with vastly rich areas like Boston, Detroit, and Philadelphia facing financial crises in spite of maximum employment and maximum taxes, our Government planners go far afield in trying to solve the colonial problems for the world.

The attitude of some of our politicians and speech makers concerning our allies' colonies, mandates, and dominions is already building up vast problems in these places. America's social theorists, tying themselves to our war effort in the colonies of our allies, are creating vast confusion and disturbance abroad. Their folly is working against every solution which our allies may find for their own problems in their own lands.

In support of stubborn schemes for America's better world order, the credit and substance of our citizens are being expended now and pledged for the future in the same irresponsible way which made a scandal of the W. P. A.

Having abused the sound principle of emergency public works at home by using public moneys to buy votes and political power and to stimulate political machines throughout the country, these same determined men have now put boondoggling on a global basis. Nothing restrains them.

We set wage scales for labor abroad which make it impossible for anyone else to hire a native man or woman wherever the American boondoggling corps operates—and they are everywhere. Authorities in these distant communities, who have the long-term responsibility for peace and safety, are outraged. It is one of the most deep-seated cleavages among the governments of the United Nations.

For example, the Eskimos in Labrador have always lived by fishing, and trapping for furs. In this way an Eskimo family earns eight to ten dollars per week. The work is productive, and the community life has always been peaceful. In came the American boondoggers. They paid such high wages for labor and so much for furs that overnight the income of the Eskimo family became $80 per week. When an Eskimo got as much in a few days as he used to make in a month, he quit work. The supply of furs decreased at once, there was a famine of fish, and the willingness of the Eskimo to work on American air bases disappeared. In order to get the Eskimos to work, the boondoggers had an inspiration: They boosted their fur and fish prices and their wage scales still higher. They ran the Eskimo's income to $120 per week.

That soon stopped all trapping, fishing, and work for sure. So next they put the price down. And when they did that the Eskimo couldn't understand it. Serious dissatisfaction and unrest spread in Labrador. And then the American boondoggers turned to the local Newfoundland authorities to put the Eskimos in their place.

"They're out of hand," they said. "Control them. We're spending a lot of money here."

If you were mayor of Okkak, Labrador, or Governor of Newfoundland, how would you feel about that?

All the way from Bermuda to Sydney, local administrators are asking themselves, "What will happen when the Americans leave?" Who would say that this is the path to peace in the world?

There is the same hodgepodge duplication of Federal offices abroad as in our own country. Nobody can make sense out of the swarm of United States Government employees. They are a mystery both to the natives and to each other. They conduct negotiations independently of our ambassadors or ministers. They pay American cash to local politicians who are in opposition to the governments of countries friendly to the United States. They put such opposition leaders on their pay roll and stage political vaudeville acts which they have thought out overnight. If their ideas run counter to the policy of our State Department or embarrass the friendly nation's president or prime minister, as well as our ambassador, that is just too bad.

"This is a smart man's war," I heard one of them say. "We've got to be plenty smart with these foreigners. The thing to do is play along with both factions. You know, play both against the middle."

Another brash young employee of the United States Government asked me one day, "What do you think of Steinhardt? Has he got anything on the ball, or do you think we ought to get rid of him?" This young whippersnapper was referring to the distinguished American Ambassador to Turkey, Laurence A. Steinhardt, who for 10 years has spoken for his country so ably in Stockholm, Lima, Moscow, and Ankara.

"Do you know Mr. Steinhardt?" I asked.

"No," he said, "but he's making it hard for the Office of War Information in Turkey, and I think he's got a hell of a lot of nerve. I'm for canning Steinhardt."

Anything may happen when the representatives of our various and sundry Government agencies show up. Take Bolivia. One-fourth of the world's tin is produced there.

Tin is sorely needed in the United States now. The Bolivian contingent of the American boondoggling corps has a program in Bolivia which has so much politics and so little economics that it is doubtful whether Bolivia's tin will not stay in Bolivia for the balance of this war.

Coffee bulges all Latin-American warehouses. We have allotted to each coffee-producing country a quota for export to the United States. The reason we do not get more coffee is not because there are not enough ships. It is because no one in the Board of Economic Warfare has had gumption enough to authorize lifting the quota whenever an empty ship was in any port where the quota had been filled.

Meat abounds in Australia, for the shipping lane to England—formerly the market for Australia's mutton and beef—has been struck by the Pacific war. Because of this, American meat is sent to England. A constant flow of American vessels transports men and equipment to Australia, but for the most part these ships come back empty when they could bring Australian meat. The global boondoggiers, planning the world, are too busy looking at the forest to see such trees.

The Government's policies abroad are undermining the morale of our troops. This is not the time to pay an American workman $1,000 a month to fix electric wires on the airfield at Accra while privates in the United States Army, working on the same field, are paid $50 a month. This is not the time to build immense bases such as we are building in Eritrea with an understanding that only union labor be sent abroad. This is not the time to play into the hands of labor racketeers who require that any skilled American civilian electrician working overtime in Algeria be paid more per month than General Eisenhower is paid. This is not the time for anything but victory.

What would you think if you were an American soldier in north Africa or Eritrea? Well, that's the way our soldiers feel about it everywhere. They believe that a great injustice is being done by our Government in permitting labor extortion in this war. They have no patience with the political ambitions of the men who make this possible. These soldiers will return bitter and mad, and they will demand a reckoning.

As for our devious plans for a better world order—whatever that may mean besides the impoverishment of the United States itself—our fatuous assumption that we can set all well with words and dollars and a police force is a thoughtlessly impossible undertaking, as misleading as Chamberlain's Munich statement of "Peace in our time."

Here at home we shall be faced by every sort of readjustment. We must provide jobs for the returning American soldiers and for our present war workers. We must work tirelessly to regain our solvency and to recover from the present huge drain on every resource we have. In this alone we face the greatest task in our history. We shall be in no position to lift the standard of living in China, in Russia, among 400,000,000 impoverished people of Europe, desirable as that is. There is no possibility whatever of our succeeding in such an attempt. There are a hundred places to start and no place to stop.

There is a limit to the failures Americans can absorb. At some point our statesmen failed, or we should not have suffered as we did in the depression. At another point our statesmen failed, or we should have been so strong on land, on sea, and in the air that there could have been no war. Now they fail again if they saddle our citizens with the astronomical burdens of all the world.

Our citizens cannot give to the world (1) freedom of speech and expression, (2) freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, (3) freedom from want, and (4) freedom from fear. The whole conception of giving or infusing the "four freedoms" universally is preposterous. It is not idealism. It is sheer political "buncombe," and is so recognized abroad.

On the narrower question alone, the question of "freedom from want," anyone must know that the politicians of every country in the world will be pulling on us in a tug-of-war to get the most out of America's international W. P. A., exactly as our local mayors camped in Washington to get the most out of our W. P. A. at home. We will be asked to provide "freedom from want" to at least a billion people, most of them in primitive surroundings and 400,000,000 of them in Europe. One hundred and thirty million Americans are in no position to do this. The promise of the United States is utterly fantastic.

Yet this airy approach to reality is promulgated at the very time when the solemn and high purpose of the United States should be to have the people of all the world believe in us—what we say, what we do, and what we intend to do.

By immodest promises and visionary plans many of our leaders immensely increase the possibility that the people of America will wash their hands of everything outside the 12-mile limit, good or bad, at the earliest possible moment, as they did after the last war.

If our leaders persist in their present course, we shall fail the world. We shall be unable to do what our leaders say we should do. In these circumstances we shall make enemies of our friends. No one will thank us for starting down the road, going as far as we can, and then chucking the whole business through the revulsion of our own people to a program which Americans know in their hearts is unsound and untrue.

The fundamental error of our theorists is that they have never understood the place which integrity has in all the ramifications of life. They believe that to say a thing is the same as to do it, as though speech were capable of modifying the tendencies, habits, and character of people, and as though verbiage were a substitute for will, conscience, and education. They proceed by bursts of eloquence or of lawmaking; they believe they can legislate the nature of impulses, and in so doing they produce disintegration.

The obligation to assist toward a better world and the value in doing so are obvious. Our duty, however, is to be useful, not according to our desires but according to our powers. We should recognize our own limitations and abandon the impertinent idea that a world is to be built in the American concept. We should put a limit on our total post-war aid, both in time and in dollars, and require that any aid should be restricted to whatever nations took certain elementary steps in their own behalf. Only thus can we make good our promises. Only thus can we maintain our own integrity and win the respect and friendship of the world.

The global concept, stimulated by the war itself and by the new idea of the world's size in the age of air, is one of today's basic developments. It is one of the great generating thoughts in the history of man. But how could anything be more evident than that the process of achieving universal freedom and prosperity must be slow, and that to promise it overnight is a great disservice to the world? Our policy of exaggerated internationalism is as dangerous, foolhardy, and destructive as narrow isolationism.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Gillette	Pepper	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending resolution with a feeling that all other nations want world peace as much as we do and will try with us to find a way to make it possible. But I want to say for the record that if the contrary proves to be true, that if any of our allies seek indemnities that are unfair, if they would penalize the weak to the detriment of another attempt at world peace, then I shall conclude that a new turn of events makes it compulsory for me, as a Senator of the United States if I am then here, to act in accordance with the light guiding me at that time.

I want to say in all frankness, Mr. President, that I do not regard today's resolution as necessarily final. I do not want it to be construed as a commitment of more than our expression of purpose and desire and a solemn promise to support any program that is fair and is designed to establish peace on earth and good will to men.

Throughout this debate we have heard quotations from the speeches of Mr. Churchill, and have observed an absence of statements on the views of Mr. Stalin. Insofar as their specific or even very general post-war aspirations are concerned, apart from the results of the Moscow meeting, we are unacquainted with their views. Let me hastily add that I do not criticize them for the statements or the silence. They, like we, carry a terrific burden of responsibility, and in my judgment they carry it well.

Senators, we are here as the representatives of a great, free people. We carry the hopes and the aspirations and the confidence of millions of Americans, many of them beyond the seas, and we are in their prayers. They, like we, are attempting to look through the heavy veil which is hung between this day and the after years. They, too, perhaps more intensely, because their sons are on alien soil, are impatient with war.

They, like we, want to see a more successful program for peace this time. They, like we, hope that the guiding influence of the Creator will be with us—and with those who draft the final documents in the afterglow of the war.

Many of the best-intentioned people, with a burning desire that war be banished from the earth, suffer from a fear that our associates in the war will misunderstand us unless we now draft a plan committing us to a specific program. One day there will be such a program—but can we, with no more than a meager knowledge of what has gone on behind the scenes, or what is in the minds of those who are charged by the Constitution with the development of international affairs, run the race to the end before the starting gun has been fired—or the blazing guns of war are silenced?

One of the significant statements of this debate, at least for me, was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. He said that our Secretary of State had been almost constantly in communication with the Foreign Relations Committee. Does someone here deny, or for a single moment suppose, that Secretary Hull was not at the same time in agreement and understanding with the President? Is there one here who believes that the Foreign Relations Committee, in its vote to adopt the modified resolution before us, had any notion that it violated the wishes of the Executive or the State Department—unless some had the thought that they might be going beyond the wishes of the President?

Let me say that I have the feeling that the resolution is at least as much as the President now desires—and perhaps more. Certainly we are not holding back on our allies—and anyone at all familiar with the record knows it. Mr. Churchill has emphatically declared that he wants no resolution. Until a few days ago Mr. Stalin had been no less forceful in making it clear that he wanted no more action now than that which could be taken on the battlefield. His preference, insofar as political action is concerned, is that the subject be confined to study and discussion, and goodness knows we are keeping pace with him in that connection.

Why is there a demand that we go further? It is because there are men, good men, men of high intellectual quality, who have the feeling that their powers of perception reach far beyond the horizon. They mean well, their intentions are pure, and their purpose noble—but will they say less of us who would proceed with what we regard as a necessary caution? Surely none will insist they love their country more. Surely none will assume they have a greater stake in the Nation's future, or that they possess a greater courage.

Senators, this resolution is not a document requiring never-ending research. We are confronted with a statement which is intended to do no more than say that the American people, through their chosen representatives, now desire to utterly abandon any idea of isolation. We are trying to tell our own people, and others throughout the world who will listen, that we want to cooperate in a world-wide effort to establish an enduring peace; that we once more want to take up seriously, and studiously, God's age-old admonition that we are our brothers' keeper. We are saying that we abhor intolerance, and that we want to help to bring men and nations into an all-inclusive sphere of understanding and light and happiness.

It has been charged that there is ambiguity. Senators, it is wholly impossible to write so much as a paragraph that is not susceptible of misinterpretation.

The world knows that we, as a Nation, are without greed, and that we do not covet that which belongs to others. All should know that we have given of our wealth, counting the debt we have incurred, until our people are being bled white. The whole world knows that our young men by the millions have gone to the wars, and that we have done all this in the name of freedom and peace.

It is good that this debate has been thorough, and that our people, and the people of the countries abroad, have been given a chance to know how we intend to act and what we desire to do.

The problems which will follow the war will be of a greater magnitude and number than most of us yet visualize. Then will come a time the like of which the civilized world has not heretofore seen. So let it be clear now that while we seek no more than peace—a never-ending peace—it is not our intention to give away our wealth, or surrender the rights we have earned and have heretofore enjoyed. No doubt all of us understand that we shall pay more—more than the fabulous sums we have paid up to this sad hour—but our help should go only to those who would help themselves. Men will have the kinds of government and the standards of living for which they themselves are willing to struggle and sacrifice—and let none dream for a moment that it will be otherwise. We will be charitable, because that, too, is traditional with us. As their good intention is proven we will share our bread with other people who need it until their crops are in, but they must labor in the field as we do, and, like our people, bear the heat of the day.

After this war there will come the problems of trade and transportation and communications. Let it be clear that we will have our place and share—and all to which we are entitled under the standards we have established. Let it be clear that our people did not send us here to squander their possessions or to participate in the dissipation of our material resources.

Let it ever be clear, and especially to us who serve as temporary custodians of America's treasures, that we are trustees of a great heritage and the rich resources which God gave us. These belong to all our people, and millions yet to be born, and there is imposed upon us, as the representatives of our fellow Americans, the solemn and sacred trust of guardianship. God give us the strength to keep the faith.

Let it be understood that whatever the language of the resolution we adopt, we are appreciative of the limitations upon our power; that we are only binding ourselves in honor and conscience to meet the rest of the peoples of the world at least halfway, and that, although we say it with no intention to hedge, we cannot bind those who come after us. But there is no need for that. Our love of peace is never-ending. We have proven it and those who join us here next year will be of the same mind. They will want what we want. They will know that the world is smaller now, and that we can be neither happy, nor successful, nor safe, unless the other peoples of the world are given the opportunity by which they can work out their economic and political and eternal salvation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senate is asked today to take an important step in defining American foreign policy. As a matter of fact, the particular subject we are asked to consider seems to me a very small fragment of the total American foreign policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make the point of no quorum?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Gillette	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senate is being asked to declare itself on an important question of foreign policy. It seems to me that the whole purpose of any foreign policy of the United States is to assure freedom and peace for the people of the United States in order

that they may work out their destiny at home without interference. In other words, I believe in the policy of America first, and I believe that the policy of insuring freedom and peace for the people of the United States is the only proper basis for foreign policy.

I believe that is the only justification for going to war. It is because the people of the United States felt that their peace and freedom were threatened that we went to war in the present great world crisis. It was not with any general idea of benefiting mankind; it was not with any general idea of the "four freedoms." I do not believe that we went to war to establish the "four freedoms" or any other freedom throughout the world, and I do not believe we went to war for the purposes set forth in the Atlantic Charter. We did not go to war even to establish liberty throughout the world, except as such a world condition might result from the insurance of our own liberty.

Mr. President, let us look at the actual occurrences resulting from our course during the last 10 years. We did not go to war and no one suggested that we go to war against Japan simply because Japan attacked China. We did not go to war with Germany when Germany attacked Czechoslovakia or Poland. War occurred only when our people came to believe that aggression was so dangerous and so likely to be successful in the world of today that our own safety was threatened. That led first to aid to Britain, and finally it led to war itself.

Nor do I believe, Mr. President, that today we are engaged in any crusade for the "four freedoms" throughout the world, and I resent the use of those terms, for instance, on the military currency in use in Italy today. The first two of these freedoms, freedom of expression and freedom of religion, have to do with the individual citizens of each country and their relations with their own government. Certainly we are not going to undertake to interfere throughout the world with the internal government of every country in the world, by reason of the fact that they may fail to grant freedom of expression or freedom of religion. If we were to do so, we would not only have to defeat our enemies and establish governments with American constitutions in the Axis countries but we would have to interfere with the governments of our own allies.

This is not a war of democracies against dictatorships. There is no freedom or religion or freedom of speech in Russia. There are benevolent dictators in Brazil, in Cuba, in China. There was a dictator in Poland. There was a dictatorship in Greece, the country which made one of the most magnificent defenses against aggression that has been seen in this war. The people were governed under a dictator, Metaxas, who was so benighted as to prohibit the reading in Greece of the Republic of Plato. If we are to take such a crusade upon ourselves, we shall have to have a permanent army a good deal larger than 11,000,000 men, and we shall have to suspend for a long time any renewal of freedom in the United States of America.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the Atlantic Charter itself contradicts the idea of a crusade for these freedoms. The third paragraph of that document states that the parties—

respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live.

That means that if the Russians want a dictatorship of the proletariat they can have it. It means that China can be run by a generalissimo, and can avoid elections of every kind for all time to come. It means that other governments with a democratic form may permit the subjection of the right of the determination of freedom of expression and freedom of religion to the will of the man whom they choose to elect.

The other two freedoms are freedom from fear and freedom from want. It is just as impractical to insure those freedoms as the other two, if they are construed as individual rights of men against their own governments.

As a matter of fact, the original speech frankly considered freedom from want as applied to nations, but the Atlantic Charter extended it, very foolishly, to an assurance that all men of all lands may live out their lives free from fear of want—an absolutely untenable ideal, and so long as we resort to any such ideal we shall be regarded as having assured freedoms which we cannot attain for those people.

Of course if those two freedoms are interpreted as being intended to relate to the country itself, rather than to its citizens, a victory in the war can certainly be used to advance national freedoms.

After all, freedom from fear means no more than the discouragement of aggression by other nations. That is what we are endeavoring to do in the present war. Freedom from want, as applied to the nations, means that every nation shall be given access to the raw materials it needs and to the markets required in order that it may have the exchange with which to purchase raw materials. I do not believe we went to war in order to assure these freedoms to every nation of the world, but certainly if they can be established as the result of the present war we should help establish them. We should certainly use the opportunity afforded by victory to obtain many important improvements for which we would not have gone to war.

But, Mr. President, I feel very strongly that when we consider what our purpose in foreign policy is, we must first of all dismiss the idea that we are engaged in any crusade for world freedoms, or that we are seeking any other main purpose than the purpose of attaining the freedom and peace of the people of the United States. If we prevail in the war, it is undoubtedly true that the principles for which we stand and live will be stronger throughout the world. The world will have to be made over, in any event, after the cessation of hostilities, and we certainly can establish in the beginning a system of which liberty is the cornerstone, in every country where we have the power to do so and where the people appear to want it.

But if we admit that the United States can properly go to war to impose our ideas of freedom on the rest of the world, then it seems to me we must admit that the Soviets have a right to crusade to impose Communism on the rest of the world because they believe Communism to be the final solution of the world's problems. We would even have to admit that Hitler, however deluded he might be, had a right to crusade to impose his ideas of national socialism on the world. A crusade is by its very nature an aggressive act. Our purpose in this war is to punish and abolish aggression. If war can be justified as a crusade, the world will face perpetual war.

I do not believe we even went to war in order to give self-determination and independence to every people. There are many complicated situations in connection with which dependency or some other status imposed by the outside world may be a better solution of the problem, and a solution perhaps more likely to keep the peace of the world.

Finally, of course, I believe that every American will believe we did not go to war in order to acquire territory for the United States, or to rule the world, either by ourselves or in combination with our allies. In short, we entered the war because our people were persuaded that if we did not enter the war their freedom would be endangered. I opposed our entrance into the war so far as I could, because I did not agree with that conclusion. I may have been wrong, but it seems to me today, if we look at only the European situation, that there is no evidence whatever that there would have been any attack on this country, leading out of the European war, or, if there had been, that we could not have defended ourselves against that attack. If that be true—and for the moment I leave Japan out of consideration—then the only reason for our going to war when we did was to avoid a war in the future. Certainly there may be some justification for joining a league of nations and for engaging in a small war to prevent a larger war; but there can be no logical justification for engaging in an all-out war such as the present war in order to avoid another all-out war. The remedy is worse or just as bad as the disease itself.

So it seems to me the question we had to face was whether it was necessary, for the peace and freedom of the United States, to enter the present war. We were told that if we did not do so we would have to set up an army and a navy which would drain the resources of the United States. Mr. President, we could have set up an army and a navy and could have paid for them for 50 years without involving the expense that one all-out war is costing, in 2 years, the people of the United States. Certainly, I do not see any justification for the war unless it be true that if we had not gone to war we would have endangered the freedom of the people of the United States. I did not think so. The people did. So now we are engaged in war, a war in which we are bound to be successful, and our job here and now is to

see if we can bring out of that war a condition which will insure for all time to come the peace and freedom of the United States.

When I consider the question of whether we should have gone to war, I leave out the whole question of Japan, because frankly I was not advised at the time. The people were not told of the conditions of Japan, the people were not told what the Japanese might do and what they did do. It may well be—in fact, I myself think—that we could not have avoided a war with Japan. But the question of whether our policy of active participation in the war against Germany before Pearl Harbor was justified seems to me to be a debatable one, and it is an entirely different one from the question of whether we join now or after the present war a league of nations.

I was in favor of joining the League of Nations in 1920, and I have been in favor of doing so ever since; but the question of whether we join in an organization to prevent a war by perhaps a minor war, or perhaps without the development of a major war, is entirely different from the question of whether we enter a major war after that war has begun, and begun without our fault, and begun without our participation in it in any way.

Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate that the Secretary of State, in Moscow, chose to give the interview he gave according to the New York Times of Tuesday morning. He is reported to have said:

> In discussing the part isolationist sentiment played in bringing the war, he did not fail to censure the United States, including both the Democratic and Republican Parties. He recalled that as late as 1940 there were shouts from every part of the political prize ring about keeping out of the war and keeping the American boys at home.
>
> The political parties, he said, vied with each other as to who would make the most extreme representations. Such slogans as: "Stay out of the other peoples' wars" and "Don't pull others' chestnuts from the fire" had been worked overtime, he said.
>
> He made clear that he was not questioning the patriotism of those who clung to the old isolationist ideas, but he made it equally clear that they had not prevented this war, nor would they prevent a future conflict.

Mr. President, I resent the name-calling, so to speak, involved in saying that a man who was opposed to entering this war, when it had occurred without our fault, is therefore an isolationist, or does not believe in relations with other countries. I think it is unfortunate that the Secretary of State should take the position that the people who did that were wrong or that they did not have a perfectly logical position, or to identify them with the people today—the very few people in the United States—who desire to keep out of all relations with other nations.

Of course, Mr. President, my resentment of that interview is a good deal tempered by the fact that, after all, it is much more a criticism of President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie than it is a criticism of myself or my colleagues in the Senate who took the same position; because very obviously the gentlemen who were in the prize ring promising to keep the boys at home were the candidates who engaged in the election in 1940; and certainly I do not suppose I should resent having the Secretary of State reflect indirectly on my position if he is willing to reflect so strenuously on the position taken by the President of the United States in 1940.

Mr. President, the policy the United States has pursued during the last 150 years has not been a policy of isolationism. It is a policy, I think, of the free hand, a policy of insisting that we do not commit ourselves in advance to any action, that we keep the right to determine our national policy when the crisis arises, to deal then with the particular crisis. Certainly, no nation which announced and supported the Monroe Doctrine, which said it would not permit any nation in the world to colonize South America, could be called an isolationist nation. Certainly, no nation which engaged in the disarmament conference of 1922 and the subsequent treaty could possibly be called an isolationist nation. I think the people who are criticizing that disarmament conference and treaty or who are saying they had anything to do with bringing on the present war are making a great mistake. One of the best sections of the Moscow agreement is the section which makes it perfectly clear that we now recognize the necessity for a disarmament agreement very similar to the disarmament agreement of 1922, because regardless of what kind of an international organization we may have, certainly there will have to be a limitation on armaments, or we are not going to secure peace. The seventh clause of the Moscow agreement provides—

> That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

Mr. President, no nation which went to the economic aid of Europe in the Young plan or the Dawes plan, or in the freezing of German credits, could possibly be called an isolationist nation. The policy is the policy of the free hand. That is the policy which this Nation has pursued for 150 years, and which we are now asked to abandon. Before we abandon it, I think we ought to consider that it has been completely successful in the main purpose of any foreign policy—that of maintaining the freedom of the people of the United States.

Until today, the wars which have resulted have not been fatal to our permanent security. However, there have been modifications of that general policy. Back in 1910 and before that, we submitted our rights to arbitration treaties, and agreed that we would abide by the decision of an arbitrator. After all, that is the first step, and the fundamental step, in any international organization. In 1920 President Woodrow Wilson, as well as my father and many other leaders of the Republican Party, were in favor of going beyond that traditional policy of the United States. They were in favor of saying that they were willing to cooperate with other nations and to make certain agreements as to what they would do in the event that aggression took place anywhere throughout the world, because they thought that any world war then might easily extend itself until, regardless of our will, it might involve us.

There is a reason why I myself am willing to go beyond that traditional policy of the free hand today. I believe that physical conditions have changed to such a great extent that we must recognize new conditions, principally because of the development of air force. When this war began, I do not think that the addition of air power would have made it any more difficult for us to defend this country. Even today, I do not believe that there would be great difficulty; but everyone who knows anything about air forces and the growth of air power tells us today that within a very short time it may be absolutely impossible to prevent the bombing of a country on the other side of the world. It may be that we can defend our freedom; and yet it may be that while we are successfully defending our freedom and our land, the war will destroy all of our property at the same time that we are destroying the property of other nations.

War is reaching the point where, if it occurs at all in volume, it may mean the destruction of the civilization which has been built up in the world for thousands of years. Furthermore, the cost of wars today has become so great that the cost itself may destroy the American way of life, which we hope to restore in this country. The cost of this war will present to us the greatest problem we have ever had in this country in maintaining the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the people of the United States.

Therefore, I think that under the conditions which exist, if we find that there are agreements which we may make which we think would contribute to stopping wars, we should make such agreements, even though they might bind us in advance to do certain things which, when the time came, we might not wish to do.

Mr. President, the dangers of an international government may be greater than its benefits if we are not careful what kind of thing we enter into. I agree 100 percent with what the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] said today. It is not an easy thing to prevent wars. It is one of the most difficult things in the world. People have been trying to do it for more than 2,000 years. It is the hardest job in the world. It is not a lack of willingness on the part of anyone to enter into an international agreement which leads him to hesitate when the agreement is actually presented.

In this resolution I think we have a very general proposal, which simply calls upon us to say that we are willing to try to work out some kind of an international agreement. But there are many dangers. We certainly do not want an international agreement which suspends the freedom of the people of the United States to work out their own destiny in

the world. After all, that is the very purpose of any foreign policy. There can be such agreements.

What I resent today is the cry in many newspapers, "We must commit ourselves to some international action, no matter what it is. International alliances, or any kind of international action is better than nothing." It is not true, Mr. President. The old policy of the free hand is a sound policy, and we ought not to depart from it until we can find something that we think will be successful in the world to carry out our plans of international action.

I am in favor of this resolution because it simply expresses our desire to try to find the right kind of plan. I do not regard myself as bound to vote for any particular plan which may be presented unless it is a plan which seems likely to contribute to the peace of the world, without depriving the people of the United States of their freedom.

Mr. President, several different types of plans are proposed today as substitutes for the policy of the free hand. I wish merely to clarify my own ideas and to describe what those plans are. There are dozens of them. They seem to me to fall into one of three categories.

The first of them is federal union, or the idea of an international state bearing the same relation to nations and their citizens as our Federal Government bears to the States and their citizens. It seems to me that that plan is fantastic, dangerous, and impracticable. I think it is fair to say that in my opinion this resolution excludes that policy. On the one hand, it excludes the policy of the free hand, or absolute adherence to that policy. On the other hand, I think it excludes the extreme form of international state. That plan, in effect, proposes that we have a supreme legislature, executive, and court. It would maintain an all-powerful military force able to dominate all nations. It would control all trade, all seaports, and all airports within the various nations—at least as presented in the article by Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post.

In my opinion, such a state would fall to pieces in 10 years. The idea is based on the idea of the union of the Thirteen Colonies in 1787. But those Colonies, Mr. President, were made up of men of similar origin, similar methods of thought, similar ideals, with similar ideas of government. They had the English tradition and the English common law behind them for many centuries. They lived approximately the same kind of life, with similar standards of living. Even in that case, one single difference resulted in a violent civil war 75 years later, which almost destroyed the Union. Certainly the proponents of such a plan cannot point to federal union as a union to end wars, because it brought about the most severe war this country has ever seen. If we get a union which brings about just one such war in the world, under the conditions 25 years from now it may destroy the world itself.

In this case we would be attempting to unite peoples who do not understand even how their new fellow citizens begin to think. We would join democracies with dictatorships, Moslem states with Christian states, the Brahmin with the Rotarian, men who speak only Japanese with men who speak only English. We would attempt to unite the most highly civilized with the Aborigines, workmen who earn $20 a day with coolies who earn 20 cents a day. The difficulty of holding together such a tower of Babel under one direct government would be insuperable. The moment a law was passed against the will of one of the large nations, that tower of Babel would fall to pieces.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if it could remain in existence at all, it would not remain democratic—if a state including dictatorships such as Russia, China, Brazil, and Greece could ever be called democratic. True democracy depends on local self-government, effective access of the people to their central government, and the protection of inalienable individual rights. Sometimes I question whether the United States itself has not become so large that it will be almost impossible to maintain a democratic form of government.

The tendency in democratic states is toward decentralization. Take the British Empire as an example. There is no other example as nearly like the proposed state as is the British Empire; and yet the British Empire today has no over-all legislature. It has no over-all executive. It has no over-all police force. The members of the British Commonwealth of Nations are absolutely decentralized, and held together practically by contracts by a league of nations, if you please, among themselves. Certainly if the British have found that it is impossible to impose one supergovernment on nations as nearly alike as England and Ireland, Australia, and Canada, it is wholly impracticable to think that we can have an international state including all the nations of the world.

In the third place, Mr. President, I do not think our allies, England and Russia, would agree for one moment to submit themselves to an international state and have their seaports and airports operated by international bureaucrats. Remember that this would involve scrapping all armament for an international police force controlled by some international executive selected by a body the control of which would rest in a combination of member nations impossible to predict. If anyone can imagine Winston Churchill liquidating the British Fleet and Joe Stalin demobilizing the Russian Army, or either of them turning them over to President Whoosis of Worlditania, he is more of a clairvoyant than I am.

Finally, Mr. President, anyone who suggests such a plan is proposing to tear up the American Constitution, which has made this Nation the greatest power in the world today, and set an example of successful popular rule throughout the entire world. We are asked to scrap a tried plan which up to this time has successfully maintained our liberty and afforded this country protection against invasion and interference, which is the alleged purpose of all international plans. It does not seem to me consistent with American patriotism—and most of our people are still patriots. If the Senate is going to adopt any resolution at all, it certainly should exclude the possibility of an international supergovernment, and I think the pending resolution does exacty that.

The second type of plan, Mr. President, is that of a British-American alliance, or a British-American-Russian alliance, which is to dominate the world. Such a plan is completely antagonistic to the world state, and yet there are people who were enthusiastic for the world state 6 months ago who are today enthusiastic for the Lippmann plan.

Mr. Lippmann's recent book urges that we form an alliance with England, Russia, and perhaps China. Presumably this will bind the parties to go to the defense of each other if either is attacked, and perhaps to join in certain offensive action. The alliance is to be so strong that we cannot be successfully attacked. In other words, the alliance is to be so strong as to dominate the world. Of course, from the point of view of security, even this position seems to me to overlook the fact that alliances have their own weaknesses and are as likely to fall apart at crucial moments as any offensive plans based upon a nation's own armed forces. The experiences of nations from the beginning of the world are a very good example.

If we rely on alliances, we may find that our ally is someone else's ally before we are through. The whole theory is based on the assumption that there will be powerful enemy forces seeking to attack us and that there will be no general international machinery with power to prevent the growth of armament and renewed military aggression. Since by hypothesis this alliance is to be stronger than any possible opposition, it will have at least a benevolent control over the entire world. While it is suggested that this alliance may grow into an international association, that appears to be an afterthought. The alliance is to come first and is to remain in effect so that it is hard to see how it can develop into something fundamentally different.

Fundamentally, Mr. President, this presents a plan of imperialism. It derides the idea that we can defend the United States, or America, without sea bases, and air bases in Europe, Africa, and Asia. It is said that we cannot be safe unless our forces are equal to the job of meeting all our commitments, that is, of defending America, Greenland, Iceland, Alaska, the Philippines, and presumably Australia and England, against any possible combination. For that purpose we must obviously control all the sea lanes and all the air lanes over the Atlantic and the Pacific. If it is sound policy for us, Mr. President, it seems to me that we cannot deny that it is sound policy for all the other nations of the world.

England must control all the oceans; obviously Holland must control the routes to the Indies. Russia must have bases on all sides of the Baltic and control the north Pacific because the Bering Strait cannot be reached except by sea or air. If we must have bases in Africa

to defend South America, why does not France, or any other African power, have to have bases to defend Africa from us?

Since many nations are dependent on imported food for their very existence, they must dominate the sea lanes over which the food must travel.

This theory can only lead to vast national armaments in all parts of the world; every nation must be able to control the sea, which means control the world. It has long been recognized that militarism, the very existence of huge armaments potentially aggressive, is a cause of war. They are a tinder box which any spark may ignite. Those who control them unconsciously desire to see them in action. They create a profession of militarists.

The policy which is advocated in this alliance theory would have promoted war in the past and it would promote war in the future. I have pointed out that it would promote militarism, one of the causes of the war. But it has other dangerous results. A military alliance presupposes an enemy threatening war. A military alliance is always an alliance against someone else. It arouses the antagonism of the world and leads to the formation promptly of a counteralliance. It would sever our close relationship with the Latin countries of South America, and set up the control outside their interests and control, and keep them all at best in a secondary position. Once the whole world is lined up in two opposing camps another world war will be only a question of time. To avoid that condition is the very purpose of all the ideals and plans for any kind of world federation for peace.

Of course, this would be militarism. Our fingers would be in every pie. Our military force would work with our commercial force to obtain as much of the world trade as we could lay our hands on. We would occupy all the strong, strategic points in the world and try to maintain a force so preponderant that no one would dare to attack us.

How long can nations restrain themselves from using such force with just a little of the aggressiveness of Germany and Japan? Look at the history of the British Empire, how a trading post in India extended itself into a rule over 300,000,000 people, how the Boer War led to the domination of the Transvaal, how the desire for Chinese trade led to the colonization of Hong Kong. Potential power over other nations, however benevolent its purpose, leads inevitably to imperialism.

Any policy based primarily on alliances is an abandonment of the ideals on which the American Republic is founded. It substitutes force for a rule of law in the making of which law all those participate who are to be governed by it. It establishes government without the consent of the governed. It is of course inconsistent with the Atlantic Charter formally approved by 32 United Nations. The first clause of that document said, "The countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." Yet here certainly is a substantial aggrandizement of power plus the seizure of any bases which may be thought necessary. The desire to secure the alliance with Russia has led Mr. Lippmann to sacrifice the third clause of the Atlantic Charter promising the restoration of self-government to those nations who have been forcibly deprived of it, for he assumes that Russia will take over the Baltic states, and in his eagerness for the Russian alliance he seems prepared to go a long way in conceding Russian domination over Poland and all the other border states. He is proposing to substitute for the appeasement of Germany, any appeasement of Russia necessary to secure an alliance. He proposes to substitute for American isolationism, the isolationism of Britain, America, Russia, and perhaps China, from the rest of the world.

Finally my own opinion is that we are not fitted to a role of imperialism and would fail in any attempt at world domination. We do not have the interest or the temperament to make a success. We are so strongly democratic that we do not approve of ruthlessness even when necessary for success. We permit our colonial problems to be determined by domestic policies. We do not really want to boss other peoples, and so we do not do it well. If we did succeed in becoming imperialists abroad it would be likely to change our whole attitude at home.

The British have ability to maintain democracy at home and close their eyes to what is going on in other parts of the British Empire. We are in enough danger from totalitarianism now, without abandoning the ideal of a rule of democratic law in foreign relations.

Mr. President, I think it is fortunate that while these resolutions do not expressly exclude the idea of a British-American alliance, conceivably it might be consistent to be added to an international organization. Nevertheless, the whole effect, the whole tone, of the Moscow Four-Power Declaration is opposed to such an alliance. I think, therefore, it is wise to add that declaration to the Connally resolution, because it recognizes the necessity of establishing a general international organization based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states. I think that offers an improvement, and I think it certainly points away from the theory of an international alliance. I hope that the theory will not be subscribed to. I hope we will not resort to it. There is, of course, the possibility that a general international organization may fail, that we may not be able to work it out. In that case we will resort, I suppose, either to the policy of an alliance or to the policy of the free hand which this country has formerly pursued.

Mr. President, I believe that the only practical line on which we can succeed is one based substantially on the same principles as represented by the League of Nations of 1920. First of all, what we are seeking to establish—and I am sorry the resolution does not contain some of the language that was contained in the Mackinac resolution adopted by the Republican Party—is a rule of law and order in international roles.

It seems to me that we have allowed ourselves to be led astray a little bit by the question of how we are to enforce that law and order, but the basic principle is that we shall have an international law, that that law shall be worked out in detail to determine the relations between nations, and that there be a body, a court, if you please, to decide what the law is if some dispute arises with regard to its meaning. We are anxious to establish a rule of law and order, and I do not think it could be better stated than it was stated in the Mackinac resolution, as follows:

> First, that we desire responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

I think that was the language of the senior Senator from Michigan. It was elaborated somewhat in the resolution in language which I think was written by the senior Senator from Vermont, which reads as follows:

> In addition to these things the council advises that peace and security are to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies and the attainment of peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. In order to have the history of that particular paragraph stated as I remember it to be, let me say that I believe the distinguished Senator from Michigan participated in the language of the last paragraph read, changing my text somewhat, and I know I participated in changing the text of the first paragraph as it was presented. Both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Vermont cooperated in drafting those two paragraphs.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. I was not on the subcommittee. I knew that both Senators cooperated in drafting the language, and I am glad to have the history corrected as suggested.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like, for the historical record, to confirm the statement made by the able Senator from Vermont. We came to a total meeting of minds in respect to a common purpose, and the expression of it is a common effort.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. Unless we do have such a law as I have suggested, unless we clearly define what the duties and obligations of nations are, there is no use talking about a force to carry it out. In fact, no generation can make peace for the next generation. Unless 25 years from now there shall be an informed public opinion in favor of peace, there will not be peace. I think

that even before this war started a great majority of the peoples wanted peace, and I believe that in the future the people will want peace. What we want to do is to devise a means which will make that desire effective, and the first step is the writing of a law so clear as to the obligations of nations that public opinion can be marshaled behind that law, and can be marshaled against any nation which breaks the law. If, therefore, we are to succeed in our task of forming a league of nations, we must base it in the first instance on establishing a rule of law and order in international relations.

I myself believe that there are many other conditions which are necessary to make such a league effective, but I envision a league in which the nations will all agree that they will submit all disputes to arbitration or conciliation, or whatever other means of settling disputes may be made available. The League of Nations sent disputes to the Council of the League. I question whether that is the right place to which to refer them. It seems to me the body to which disputes could be submitted should be a wholly impartial one, and I see no abandonment of sovereignty in agreeing to submit any question to an impartial tribunal, and agreeing to abide by its decision, provided we write an exact law so that we may know what our obligations are.

In the second place, Mr. President, I should be willing to go further and say that we may, under certain circumstances, use our armed forces against a physical aggressor nation. In the case of Europe, I think that should be a secondary obligation. As suggested by Mr. Churchill, I think there should be a council of Europe to settle the disputes of Europe, in the first instance, and that there should be a council of South America to settle the disputes of South America. We should not be called on until they are failing, or certainly until they are afraid they will fail, in the effort to prevent aggression. We do not want to be called in and be the only policeman to punish some nation of Europe merely because we were willing to keep our obligation and others were not. It seems to me we should go into another continent only if we are invited to by a considerable majority of the people of that continent, so that we come at their request and only after they have exhausted their efforts.

If, for instance, Bolivia proposed to attack Chile in order to get a seaport, we should not have to go, in the first instance, because we have an army, and try to punish Bolivia. The South Americans themselves should attempt to handle the situation first, and we should go in only if we are invited by practically all the other nations of South America to punish the aggressor. That is the kind of league of nations I hope may be worked out.

There are certain requirements which, I believe, are essential if such a league is to work. I believe that there should be a limitation of armaments, one to which we can agree, one that will leave us in condition to defend ourselves as long as the other nations maintain their agreements regarding their armaments. I do not believe we should interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. I do not think we should assume the obligation, after we have once set up the world, so to speak, to say how the various governments shall treat their minorities, or how they shall handle their tariffs, or any other internal questions. I do not think we should set up a league of nations based on interfering in the affairs of other nations unless as to something in which we are willing to have a foreign force interfere in this country. I believe that if we do set up a league of nations based on interference with internal matters, it is going to be more of a war producer than a war preventer.

There is one exception, it seems to me, namely, that we do have to agree, if we have an armament limitation, that some body shall inspect the armaments of all the different countries, shall have the right to come into our country, if you please, even against our will, and inspect our armaments, to see that we are keeping our promises, instead of the condition which existed when Japan was able to fortify various islands, and no body in the world had the right to inquire whether they were fortifying those islands or not. With that exception, I do not think we should be able to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations after we set those nations up.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if we are possibly to have success, before we get to the question of an international organization we will have to remove economic sore spots throughout the world, that we will have to see that the "freedom from want" we hear spoken of is applied to nations, that every nation is self-sufficient, is able, if it works, to manufacture the things it needs, to import the raw materials it needs, and to export the goods which it must sell to enable it to pay for those raw materials. The Treaty of Versailles entirely forgot any such necessity, and its failure was largely due to the fact that it set up such peculiar economic units that no country could possibly maintain its own life in a manner that met with the approval of its people.

I think we have to set up the organization on a nationalistic basis, I hope better than that established by the Treaty of Versailles. We cannot set up a world and hope to impose an international organization successfully on it unless people are free, unless we keep the terms of the Atlantic Charter. I suppose more wars have started because some nation desired to be free from the domination of another nation than from any other cause the world has seen. People may think nationalism is selfishness, but it is one of the strongest emotions of mankind, which will never cease to exist, and certainly if we are to be successful, we will have to have a world in which nations that desire to be free are free nations. We must recognize that fact.

Let me take an extreme case. If Russia were to insist on the domination of Germany, we might as well forget a league of nations, because in my opinion we cannot possibly maintain peace on any such basis, and I think we certainly will have to examine with care the plans for the partition of Germany, to see whether we are not setting up a condition which will bring about war rather than peace.

Mr. President, I think the ideals I have stated are in accord with the general terms of the Atlantic Charter. They are absolutely in accord with the view of the Secretary of State in his speech of September 12. They seem to me to be in general accord with the tendency of the Moscow agreement, and I am certainly most hopeful that we may remove from political controversy the basic foreign policy of the United States as we go into the armistice and into the final peace.

I believe we have placed somewhat too much emphasis on the question of a permanent organization. I suppose many have read the proposals of ex-President Hoover and Mr. Gibson, and the emphasis they put on the vital necessity of having something ready to go into effect the very moment the armistice occurs, the very moment arms are laid down.

I certainly agree with that, and I believe the Moscow agreement has made a substantial step in that direction. But there is more to be done. The moment the armistice occurs we ought to know exactly what we are going to do. We ought to see that every blockade is lifted.

I remember when I was in Paris just after the last war it took 6 months before the blockades were finally lifted on the nations of central and eastern Europe, and during that time there was a progressive period of disintegration from which, as a matter of fact, Europe never did wholly recover.

When the armistice comes there ought to be an immediate abolition of every blockade; there ought to be a restoration of all commercial treaties automatically; possibly there ought to be an elimination of many tariffs which existed at that time between the states in central and eastern Europe. There certainly should be the designation, ready to go into effect immediately, of provisional boundaries—not final boundaries but provisional boundaries, so that we do not step into a war between two smaller states. There was a war between Poland and Czechoslovakia after World War No. 1. Certainly we want some definite provisional treaty.

Incidentally, if we get into any such dispute today, we might find Russia on one side and England on the other and so have something which might develop into a world war. We ought to agree in advance on exactly the provisional boundaries which are going into effect. We ought to provide for the immediate call for constitutionally elected assemblies and provide for preliminary boundaries of liberated countries, so as to get away from disputes as to whom we should recognize, and thus not make ourselves responsible for recognizing a Communist or Fascist or any other person whom our Government may happen to favor, or Russia may happen to favor, or England may happen to favor.

There ought to be a particular provision for an election, just as soon as

possible, to set up a responsible government in every one of those countries. That problem seems to me a little bit more important at the present moment than deciding what kind of an international organization we are finally going to have.

Mr. President, I have spoken about internal interference. During this period between the cessation of hostilities and final peace we shall have a unique opportunity. We cannot interfere in internal affairs of nations after we set them up, but certainly we can have a voice in saying what kind of government they shall set up. We certainly can require a majority vote, which, in effect, will provide a democratic form of government and be less likely to lead finally to war.

We certainly can require the setting up of customs unions, in the first instance, and a tariff policy which is not destructive of what we are trying to create. We cannot very well maintain that policy after it starts, but certainly we can start it. For 2 or 3 years America, Britain, and Russia are going to dominate the world; they are going to have to be making it over, and we have the responsibility of making it over in such a way as to make war less likely and afford a firmer basis for the international organization we are finally going to set up.

Mr. President, my belief with respect to this policy leads me to support the present resolution. Ordinarily I think it is unfortunate to consider expressions of opinion by the Senate which are not binding upon anybody, but the resolution has been placed before the Senate, and it seems to me we have only one choice. We have to say whether we are in favor of joining with other nations in establishing and maintaining an international authority with power to prevent aggression, or whether we are opposed to that action. That is practically the only choice we have. It seems to me obvious that nearly 90 percent of the people of the United States are in favor of trying to work out some form of organization, some form of international authority, if you please, which may attempt to end war.

Mr. President, it is a difficult problem. It may not be possible to do as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has pointed out, but certainly I believe that a majority of our people are in favor of that policy. I do not think the wording of the particular resolution makes much difference. As it is, the resolution sets forth the policy of which I approve. I think it absolutely excludes an international state. I think that means that it excludes an international police force, at least of the kind contemplated in the original resolution offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. That resolution provided for the appointment of a police force strong enough to overcome aggression by any nation, which seemed to me at least to make it a police force so great that it could dominate all the rest of the world; that we could have such a police force only if it had an international chief of police, a commander in chief, if you please, and that that necessarily implied an international state. The present resolution no longer implies any such international police force. I believe that it excludes, by implication at least, a policy of a limited alliance.

Mr. President, I, myself, do not think the resolution ever gave any authority to the President to act in advance. I do not think that it was advice in the constitutional sense. I do not believe that today more than a majority vote should be required to adopt it. But certainly that question is settled by the incorporation in the resolution of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] specifically providing for a two-thirds Senate vote.

Mr. President, I do not agree either with the theory that the Moscow declaration is a treaty or that it ought to be ratified by the Senate. It seems to me to be simply a declaration of executive policy. In most cases it does not purport to be a definite contract. Obviously the Executive must do the negotiating. He must in the first place determine what nations he will deal with and what nations he will not deal with. He must in the first instance agree to boundaries, and I do not believe the Moscow Declaration is more than what it says it is—a declaration of policy, policy which could be changed certainly by the next administration.

I think it is wise to incorporate in the resolution the Willis amendment, because the Executive has shown some indications of a desire to do by executive agreement things which certainly in my opinion ought to be the subject of a treaty. The effort to impose in the lend-lease agreements a binding agreement with regard to post-war economic policy was condemned by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and I think those provisions in the lend-lease agreements are absolutely null and void. The Executive entered into a contract with the 32 United Nations, the effect of which is to promise not to make a separate peace without their consent. I see no reason why that should not have been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not think that that agreement concerning a separate peace, or the provision in the Moscow Declaration, is binding on the United States of America, because after all we have the right to declare war. Only the Congress can make a peace. Certainly only Congress can say that we will not under any circumstances make peace except with the consent of other nations. It seems to me that the action in question represents a treaty and not an executive agreement. It has never been submitted to the Senate of the United States. The effect is that it, I suppose, is binding on the present administration, it is binding on the present President of the United States, but if there should be a different President I do not believe that the agreement would be binding on us; I do not think it has been completed in the form of a treaty.

Mr. President, I think it is well that we write into the resolution the Willis amendment, which definitely provides that this treaty, or provision for any international organization, which in my opinion can only be made by treaty, can only be put into effect by the consent of two-thirds of the Senate of the United States.

In short, Mr. President, I believe that the Senate today should say clearly that it has no intention of standing against the assumption of obligations to aid in enforcing the peace of the world; that it is prepared to consider international agreements which will bind us to take action in the future; that we are prepared to abandon the policy we have followed, but that we reserve the right to examine the agreement thus made; that we reserve the right to examine the conditions on which it is proposed to base this great international organization, to determine whether in our judgment that organization, when it is finally completed, is more likely to bring about peace, or more likely to produce again a world war of the character of the present war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want the Senator from Ohio to help me clear up a point which has been bothering me all through this debate. I note with a great deal of pleasure that the Senator is supporting Senate Resolution 192 as it now is modified, and that he also is opposed to an international police force. That happens to be my position, so perhaps the Senator can help me with one matter which has been troubling me. Under the present language there is the "authority with power to prevent aggression." Does that power to prevent aggression tie back to the United States acting through its constitutional processes?

Mr. TAFT. I do not say that the joining with free and sovereign nations and the declaration that we propose to maintain the sovereignty of the United States excludes the possibility of some small international police force, say, to police the Balkans, under some condition—in fact, after this war the armies of occupation may be joined in one force—but I think it excludes the possibility of an international police force of such size as to overcome the military and naval forces of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then the Senator does not believe that the powers delegated in this resolution would result in bypassing the Congress in its constitutional right to declare war? If we had an international army in Europe, or in South America, or in other parts of the world, and that army began shooting at the people of other countries and those people began shooting back, then, of course, we would be in the midst of a war, and the Congress of the United States would be bypassed in its constitutional authority to declare war.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Constitution would be changed. The weakness, many persons say, of the league of nations' form that I suggested is that there is nothing to make us carry out our obligations. I mean that I presume the Congress of the United States can

break the treaty. Agreement is made to go to war under certain conditions, but certainly war cannot be entered into without a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, and the Congress might refuse to do so. I think it is unfortunate to go into any such agreement with such a reservation, but that is the inherent weakness of any league of nations. The only alternative I can see is an international state, which, I believe, is very much worse. I think that if the organization is set up on a firm basis—on the kind of basis I have suggested—then the United States will keep its agreements. Incidentally the agreements should be clearly drawn so there cannot be much doubt as to what they are, and I have suggested the manner in which they should be limited.

I think the nations will keep their promises, except once in a while one nation may not; that nation becomes an aggressor, and then the machinery provided will begin to operate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator say that. As I understand, that was precisely the position of Woodrow Wilson, who, of course, as we all know, was intensely interested in having the League of Nations adopted. He went so far as almost to prevent the adoption of the League of Nations by resisting the insistence by France upon an international police force. I should like to read one paragraph written in 1928 by Charles Seymour, professor of history at Yale University:

> The French endeavored persistently and likewise without success to provide for an international army, or at least an international staff; coupled with their opposition to Germany's entrance into the League, this would have made of the League a continuance of the anti-German alliance. The proposition was persistently opposed by Wilson and Cecil, and it received no effective support from the smaller powers.

Next I should like to read a paragraph from an article by Mr. H. Wickham Steed, published in the Paris Daily Mail on February 15, 1919. Mr. Steed, a British writer said:

> The most serious hitch—

He was talking about the difficulty which came up with respect to the international police force—

> came on February 11, when Wilson absolutely declined to accept the French demand for the creation of an international force that should operate under the executive control of the League of Nations. M. Bourgeois urged the French view with much eloquence and pertinacity. Wilson claimed that the Constitution of the United States did not permit of any such limitation upon its sovereignty; and Lord Robert Cecil took a similar view in regard to the British Empire.

Of course, we have the same constitution that we had then, and Great Britain has the same unwritten constitution she had then.

I read further:

> The French stood their ground and declined to surrender the claim which, in their view, could alone prevent the League of Nations Covenant from being a philosophical treatise devoid of practical authority. Thus the sitting broke up toward midnight on February 11, leaving the position very strained.

That was February 11, 1919.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio if he feels, in view of the fact that the Moscow Pact has been signed, there is a necessity for adopting the so-called committee resolution.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is desirable to adopt the committee resolution to indicate that the Senate of the United States, in its joint care of the foreign policy with the President, agrees with the very general power declared by the Moscow agreement.

Mr. President, I think it is peculiarly desirable that there be just as little dissension as possible on foreign policy between the executive and the Congress, between the executive and the Senate, between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. It seems to me it is all the more necessary now because it seems to be indicated that the control of foreign policy may pass from one party to the other, next year, and I would hope that it would be a continuous and a continuing foreign policy with which we have to deal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is quite difficult for me to draw the line of demarcation between consent and advice. Does the Senator from Ohio feel that anything which has been entered into in the pact at Moscow goes beyond matters requiring Senate advice and consent which should come to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. TAFT. In the Moscow Pact?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. No; I think not. I do not think there is anything of that sort in the Moscow Pact, so far as today is concerned. There may be something there in the way of policies which may have to be implemented in some way, which would have to come to the Senate; but I see in the Moscow agreement nothing of the sort the Senator has mentioned, with the one possible exception of the statement that we will not make a separate peace. I think that is a perfectly proper statement for the President to make on his own, as applied to his own administration. The President would have to initiate negotiations for peace or for a peace treaty; and he can say, I presume, that "I will not initiate any such negotiations." I do not think that would be binding on a future President; but in the midst of a war, I do not greatly object to his stating that as his policy, without asking for Congressional approval. If Russia or Britain wants a binding agreement of the United States for the next 5 or 6 years, then I think it would have to be made by a treaty. That is my own personal opinion. I have not studied the matter closely.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, for a number of months, now, the American people have had their eyes turned upon the Senate of the United States, to see what action we would take in regard to the matter of post-war cooperation among the nations of the world. The people of America have been caught up in the blinding maelstrom of world war twice within the past generation, and they are determined, Mr. President, to exert their every power to see to it that enduring peace shall become a realty for all the peoples of the world.

While this debate has been going forward on the floor of the Senate, events of world-shaking implications have taken place in Moscow. An agreement among the four major Allied Powers—the United States, Russia, China, and Great Britain—has been completed there which will go far toward the sound and reasonable solution of our post-war problems, and which, if properly integrated, will serve as a substantial basis upon which we can go forward together in maintaining a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

Mr. President, I have long felt that a resolution such as the one we have been debating here should be approved by the United States Senate in order that our own people and all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world may know that henceforth the United States of America will carry out its obligations toward world peace with the same determination, the same courage, and the same high resolve that it has manifested in meeting the tremendous responsibilities born of war.

The United States of America cannot live unto itself alone. The march of science, the surge of air power, and the development of engineering have captured the world and made it small. The problems of the world cannot be isolated; they are interwoven and bound up with the lives of all peoples and all nations. Aggression upon one becomes aggression upon all. War upon one becomes war upon all.

In this world of our age collective security among all nations has become the most pressing need of all mankind. If such a security is not established, if lawless nations are not restrained, if war and the conditions tending to create war are not overcome, every nation in the world will go down to inevitable and certain destruction. The rhythmic recourse to world war which has marked our history thus far will, if long continued, drag us all down into the brutal barbarism of a new dark age.

Mr. President, the desire for peace and the distaste for war are not the sacred, monopolistic possessions of any creed, faction, or political party. Every thinking man and woman in the world realizes that war has been, and is yet, the most destructive, the most heart-rending, and, at the same time, the most futile undertaking ever to become associated with the society of man.

This resolution takes cognizance of those facts, and it has been drawn up in the hope that its adoption and a consequent adherence to its terms by all nations will make it possible to maintain

peace throughout the world. Let there be no mistake, Mr. President: the preservation of world peace must become the prime objective of mankind if we are to attain the mastery of our destiny.

Mr. President, the type of peace which needs to be built at the conclusion of this war represents an undertaking of monumental proportions, for we must build against a background of hate, rancor, and power politics. We must build against a background of divergent ideologies, competing ambitions, and unbounded intrigues. Yet, build we must, and build carefully and well, if we are not to see another generation of our life's blood sacrificed upon the altar of war. Build we must if we are not prepared to see the very civilization we have built crash down upon us.

This shall be counted an outstanding hour in the course of history. In the wake of this, the world's greatest tragedy, will emerge the opportunity of the ages—the opportunity to solidify the world in the common quest for peace. The course which the Senate now takes will go far toward determining the extent to which that opportunity will be realized. If we now turn our backs upon the world, we may never again recapture the moment when the world stood ready to welcome our cooperation.

Mr. President, the path which we are contemplating is a hard and tortuous one. It is a path upon which the leaders of men have rarely ventured. And yet it is the path along which all men must inevitably walk if we are to dwell in peace together. The problems we shall be called upon to meet will be many, the trials will be hard, and the way will be long, but if in the end we can emerge united, this will have been a glorious age for all men.

The preservation of world peace will be a continuing process—a process of constant integration among the nations of the world in the working out of their common problems in a constantly evolving situation. But, Mr. President, no aim can be realized, no goal can be mastered, unless we are prepared to take the first step in the proper direction. The important thing now required of us is that we take some definite action.

Mr. President, the resolution which has been offered by the Foreign Relations Committee here today represents, I believe, a sound and reasonable approach to those impelling problems of international cooperation and world peace, and I therefore raise my voice in support of its early adoption.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Gillette	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, the amendment I have previously announced I would offer contains the exact wording of House Concurrent Resolution No. 25. This resolution is more popularly and favorably known in Congress and throughout the Nation as the Fulbright resolution, after the name of its author.

Offering of the full text of the Fulbright resolution as a substitute for the last paragraph of the original Senate Resolution 192 is not done in a spirit of opposition to the pending Senate resolution or of criticism of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Quite to the contrary, I think the Foreign Relations Committee deserves not only the commendation of every Member of the Senate, but of all our people who believe that this country should formulate and express a foreign policy that incorporates a broad principle and declares it to be the purpose of this Nation to cooperate with other governments and peoples to the end that wars may be prevented and permanent peace established and maintained.

Therefore, Madam President, I wish to announce in the beginning of my remarks that if for any reason the amendment which I have offered is not adopted, I shall wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support the pending Senate resolution.

I believe, however, there is ample if not compelling reason why this amendment should be offered and adopted. Every Senator who now favors and intends to vote for the adoption of Senate Resolution 192 in its present form, can well afford to join with me and support the adoption of the amendment I shall offer.

This amendment is not an empty gesture. I readily agree that unless it will add something of value and will make a contribution to what we are trying to do, it should not be adopted. But the converse is equally true. If it will lend strength, enhance the value of, and add force to the action the Senate is about to take in agreeing to a resolution embodying a post-war peace policy, then it should be adopted.

If by resolution of the Senate this Nation and our people are to make official declaration of a post-war foreign policy with respect to lasting peace, and if our labors are to bear fruit that will culminate in preventing wars, then we are now embarking on a momentous undertaking, possibly the greatest in the history of the world.

Indulging that profound hope, Madam President, I can foresee that the third paragraph of Senate Resolution 192, whether as now written or if the text of the Fulbright resolution which I have offered as a substitute is adopted, may well constitute and become a preamble to or the cornerstone of a foreign policy that not only envisions, but when wisely pursued and progressively expanded, can make certain not only our own security and freedom from war, but the future security and peace of the world.

No one contends that either the Senate resolution or the text of the Fulbright resolution contains a complete formula or blueprint for permanent peace. Neither the Senate resolution as now proposed nor the Fulbright text if adopted can be more than the first step in that direction. Both, however, with very little difference in language, truly express the hopes and aspirations not only of the American people, but of all of the freedom-loving people of this bleeding and war-weary world.

Madam President, I do not suppose the mind of man can possibly conceive or could compose a resolution embodying a post-war peace policy on which every Senator and every Member of the House of Representatives would agree. That is too much to hope for or expect, but in this momentous undertaking it is important that we strive for unity and the strongest support that can possibly be mobilized in this venture.

When we make a fair appraisal of the real issue involved, it simply resolves itself into a question of whether we shall adhere to a policy of isolationism in the post-war period or whether our Government shall undertake to cooperate and work with other governments to maintain peace and prevent another world war. Some few of our people may honestly believe that the greater safety and security of our own country is to be found in staying aloof from world affairs, and, to use a common expression, "in minding our own business."

Madam President, a great majority of the Senate, of the Congress, and of the American people disagree with that policy. Isolating ourselves and standing aloof from world affairs, in my judgment, will be neither wise nor safe for us in the future. The philosophy of isolationism has been exploded and refuted by two world catastrophes from which we could not escape and in which we became involved. If we continue that course, we shall court and invite a third world war, which may well prove destructive and disastrous to our civilization.

Of course, there can be no absolute certainty of preventing wars. All human enterprises are uncertain, but as we face the realities of the present and hopefully contemplate the future, we are constrained to recognize and confess that the highest goal of governments and all humanity is the achievement and perpetuation of an enduring world peace.

The objective we strive for by the adoption of this or any similar resolution is not or should not be a partisan issue. It is not a partisan job. It transcends in importance and in consequence all political differences and controversies. It is a job for all Americans, irrespective of party, race, or creed, and in undertaking this stupendous task, vision, faith, courage, and unity of the American people are important factors bearing on its ultimate success or failure.

Madam President, if we are to succeed in the present undertaking and noble endeavor to formulate a foreign policy that will contribute to permanent peace, we must correctly interpret and express the will, hopes, and aspirations of the American people in the resolution we adopt. Whatever the Chief Executive of this Nation may promulgate, or whatever the Senate or the Congress may legislate, with respect to our post-war course in international relations, to be effective must incorporate and give voice to the overwhelming sentiment of the people of this Nation. It will not be sufficient if it merely reflects the wishes or policy of the President of the United States; nor will it be adequate if it represents only the views of the United States Senate, and/or the House of Representatives, or of all three combined. It must lend correct interpretation and expression to the will of the American people if it is to be of that quality and force necessary to make it an effective instrumentality of service and for good.

For that reason, Madam President, I do not agree with those who contend that only the Senate of the United States is competent to speak on this all-important question. True, there is reposed in the Senate by the Constitution the legal responsibility to advise and consent to treaties which the President may negotiate. This is a very sacred responsibility and a high trust imposed on the membership of this body. But I have never interpreted that provision of the Constitution to mean that the House of Representatives or the people themselves are denied the opportunity to contribute, by counsel or recommendations, to the formulation of our foreign policy. I do not subscribe to the belief that this high prerogative reposed in the United States Senate is so exclusive and sacred. For the House of Representatives to pass a concurrent resolution relating to our foreign policy and asking for the Senate's concurrence therein, does not, in my judgment, constitute a trespass upon the Senate's prerogatives, nor does such action invade a sphere of responsibility in which the House of Representatives has no part or obligation. The House of Representatives will have a duty to vote, along with the Senate, appropriations that may be required to carry out any program for the enforcement of peace that may emanate from any foreign policy on which we may now or may hereafter embark, and to have it join with us now in initiating a post-war policy, is support and valuable assistance we in the Senate should court and accept rather than spurn and reject.

The House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 25 by a vote of 360 to 29. That was long after a number of resolutions had been submitted in both the Senate and the House of Representatives and soon after a Congressional recess, when Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives had availed themselves of the opportunity to visit and confer with their constituents, and discuss problems and measures of major importance to this Nation. It cannot be said that the House acted hastily, or that it was ill-advised in taking this action. It has offered to the United States Senate its views by a majority of more than 12 to 1.

Madam President, it has been ably and fittingly said that in the passage of this resolution "The House of Representatives rose to a great occasion and acquitted themselves in a manner befitting the elected representatives of a truly great people." In this expression and sentiment I heartily concur. The House of Representatives gave a profound endorsement to the noble purpose and high principle embodied in the Fulbright resolution. They rose above party politics, abandoned petty partisanship, and demonstrated on this issue of such great importance a spirit and degree of unity seldom, if ever, witnesed in the halls of Congress. By so doing, the House of Representatives and its Members have merited and deserved the grateful commendation and esteem of all thinking Americans.

The action of the House of Representatives unquestionably presented a challenge to the United States Senate for prompt and similar action. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee in great measure met that challenge when it reported favorably the pending resolution. There is only one way, in my judgment, by which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee could have met this challenge more forcibly and acceptably than it did, and that would have been by adopting and reporting favorably House Concurrent Resolution 25. The Senate can still do this by adopting the pending amendment.

Let me make a brief observation regarding that measure. House Concurrent Resolution 25 contains 46 words. Senate Resolution 192, as originally reported, contains 68 words. The third paragraph, the heart of the Senate resolution, for which I have offered my amendment as a substitute, contains 36 words. An examination of the Fulbright resolution and the last paragraph of the Senate resolution reveals that 21 of the same words contained in the Fulbright resolution were used by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the drafting of the last paragraph of its resolution; and further, that only 8 words are contained in the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 192 that are not in the Fulbright resolution. Of these 8 words, we find that the Senate committee uses the word "preserve" and the word "authority," which are synonymous with the words "maintain" and "machinery," respectively, as used in the Fulbright resolution. In the Senate committee resolution we find the phrase "join with free and sovereign nations," which have the same purport, meaning and effect as that expressed in the Fulbright resolution when it says, "the Congress favors the creation of appropriate international machinery and participation by the United States therein."

Thus, it is perfectly obvious even on casual reading and without a thorough analysis of both resolutions that the third paragraph of Senate Resolution 192 differs from House Concurrent Resolution 25 merely by the rearrangement of the same words as contained in the Fulbright resolution, and by a choice of some 6 or 8 other words to express and give identical meaning to the same thing. The third paragraph of the Senate resolution is in effect a carbon copy of the same fundamental principle, formulated policy, and proposed objectives as are clearly and fully expressed in the Fulbright resolution.

Therefore, I venture to say that had not the Fulbright resolution previously been drafted and adopted by an overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives, we would not have before us today Senate Resolution 192 in its present form. That the wording and import of the Fulbright resolution and its passage by the House of Representatives made an indelible impression on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and influenced that committee in its thought, action, judgment and conclusion cannot be denied. A casual impartial comparison of the two resolutions provides evidence of that fact. So much alike are the two, not only in identical words, but in the common acceptation and meaning of the language used, that I say without fear of successful challenge that if these two resolutions were in the form of military orders and both should be delivered to a general on the field of battle, they would create neither conflict nor confusion, but the general could execute both at the same time, employing the same strategy and tactics, and when the operation was successfully concluded he would have arrived at the same objective, accomplished the same results, and won the same victory.

Does the Fulbright resolution express the will and have the approbation of the people of this Nation? As of September 25, according to the weekly analysis of newspaper opinion, it had received editorial approval of 89 percent of the press. Only 4 percent expressed disapproval and 7 percent was noncommittal.

After the Fulbright resolution had been fully publicized a Gallup poll showed that 78 percent of the people definitely favored it, while only 9 percent opposed it; 13 percent were still undecided. The House of Representatives, with its membership fresh from the people, passed the resolution with 92.6 percent of the votes recorded. What stronger proof can we expect? Can we demand greater evidence?

I am sure the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, when he departed for the Moscow Conference, was relying heavily on the House resolution. The knowledge that it had received such tremendous endorsement among the press and the public alike was a guiding and sustaining influence on him throughout the conference deliberations. The fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had reported Senate Resolution 192, embodying the same principle and declaration of policy as that contained in the Fulbright resolution, gave him reassurance that the United States Senate, although a little slow in taking action, would finally come through by giving appropriate expression to the will of the people and by meeting fully its constitutional responsibility.

Now that the heart of the Moscow declaration has been offered and will be incorporated in the Senate resolution, if we will also adopt the amendment I propose and insert the full text of the Fulbright resolution, we will have truly a great document—a product fabricated out of the best thought, wisdom, and statesmanship of both Houses of the Congress and of the Chief Executive of this Nation as expressed through the Department of State.

Madam President, what I am asking the Senate to do is the magnanimous thing to do under the circumstances. Good sportsmanship suggests and recommends the adoption of my substitute amendment. The adoption of the amendment will be conducive to and will be productive of the greatest possible unity of the people of the Nation speaking through all its constituted authorities. It will give to the actions on the part of this Nation in the post-war world the maximum force and influence.

It may be that someone will say, "Oh, for the Senate to do that will impair its prestige." I say, Madam President, it will not impair the Senate's prestige. Instead it will enhance the prestige of the United States Senate. Shall it be said that we arrogate to ourselves and make the claim that only the United States Senate is competent to speak in the formulation of the foreign policy which will affect every American citizen and the future generations of this country? I do not think so. We should avoid exposing ourselves to such criticism. We do have the constitutional responsibility for the ratification of any treaties that may be negotiated. Certainly we are not contending here today in the consideration of the resolution that we are actually ratifying or confirming any treaty.

If that were true we would have an entirely different situation. We have already heard Members of the Senate stand on the floor and make reservations with respect to what their votes mean. What we are doing is simply to give expression to an overwhelming prevailing American sentiment that the people of this Nation want its Government to undertake in the post-war world to cooperate and collaborate and work with the United Nations and others who may join in the formulation of policies that will insure, if possible, through human instrumentalities and endeavor, a permanent and a lasting world peace.

Certainly, by voting for the pending resolution, as it now reads, or if the amendment I offer shall be adopted, I am not making any surrender of any prerogative it may be my duty to exercise when any treaty is presented. I am not granting any blank-check authority to the Chief Executive of this Nation or to anyone else, that will bind me beyond my constitutional duty when the treaty, once negotiated by the Chief Executive, is returned to the United States Senate under the constitutional processes that we have specially reserved in the resolution. I shall then judge, Madam President, just as you will, whether the treaty goes too far for our safety, or whether it is inadequate to effectuate the very purpose for which we are today undertaking to set the machinery in motion.

I wish to make one further suggestion before I close. My purpose in offering the amendment is that we may have behind the resolution the maximum unity and force and influence to make it effective, but I wish to say that I realize that no matter what action the Senate may take at this time, in formulating the foreign policy as expressed in the resolution, it still depends for ultimate success upon the continued collaboration between the Chief Executive of this Nation and the United States Senate during the course of the negotiation of treaties. That collaboration, in my judgment, if carried on with the high purpose of keeping the country united, will prevent future discord, bitter dispute, and controversy when we shall have the duty of considering and ratifying any treaty submitted.

Mr. LODGE. Madam President, my ruling aim, insofar as our foreign relations are concerned, is to support a policy based on national interest and guided by justice. I am convinced that in this era aviation has already so completely shattered our concepts of time and space that considerations of national interest as well as considerations of justice demand effective international cooperation to keep the peace. If I voted against the pending resolution it would inevitably appear that I opposed international cooperation. For this reason I shall support the resolution.

Frankly, I have long doubted the advisability of bringing up such a resolution at this time. Either the language must be so specific that it is quite inapplicable to the actual conditions which will prevail at the conclusion of hostilities and thus hamper the peacemakers, or the language is so general that every man can read his own interpretation into it. I believe the Foreign Relations Committee has chosen the lesser of two evils in presenting a resolution general in scope.

Moreover, it is always a risky thing for a nation to tie its hands and restrict its freedom of action in advance of an event the exact nature of which cannot be predicted. We have tried this since my brief tenure of office here, and it did not work very well. I recall being one of a small group of Senators who voted against the Neutrality Act which contained the arms-embargo provision. Senators will recall that later on this provision was repealed, and I believe it is generally agreed it would have been much better had it never been on the books.

Some of the reasons advanced for bringing up these resolutions are not well founded. It is not true, in my opinion, that our foreign allies are afraid, as the saying goes, that the United States will "relapse into isolationism." Indeed, I have met many persons abroad who are far more afraid of the reverse. Nor is it true, as has been indicated here, that commitments given by nations not fundamentally governed as our Nation is governed are more dependable than commitments entered into by a democratic Executive who is backed by a Senate which is taken into his confidence and who will really try to meet the views of which in our democracy Senators are the exponents. Nor is it accurate to say, as has been said here repeatedly, that the present period is similar to the years 1919 and 1920, and that at that time it was the Senate alone which prevented American entrance into the League of Nations. I question the similarity between this period and the period following World War No. 1. To my mind they are utterly different. And the record, in my view, does not support the contention that the Senate bears the entire responsibility for our not becoming members of the League. On this particular, Dorothy Thompson on October 18 made the following comment:

> Our participation in the League of Nations foundered on the fact that the President insisted on the whole treaty and Covenant being accepted, in toto, without a single modification. Now, the interesting thing about the whole controversy is that the modifications demanded by the Senate, chief among which were those applying to sanctions, were not unacceptable to the Allied Powers. Actually, in operation, the interpretation of the Covenant desired by the Senators was internationally accepted, and was probably the sense of the questionable paragraph from the beginning. The President, who wished to force his will upon the Senate rather than take nine-tenths of a loaf, got, in the end, no loaf at all.

If there had been a willingness to adjust differences of opinion, we would have become members of some kind of a league. That such action would have avoided the advent of this war seems fanciful to me. We were overwhelmed, all through the period following World War No. 1, by a strong aversion to adequate military preparedness. So was Britain, and so was France. As we well know, dictators spurned our desires for peace. Why would they not have spurned them just as much if we had been the equally weak and defenseless members of a league?

There are other assertions made in this debate which do not commend themselves to me. We cannot, for example, take it for granted that the requirement of a two-thirds ratification of treaties by the Senate is bad. I venture the belief that many bad treaties have been prevented

by that requirement. Nor can I follow the line of thought that a basic weakening of national sovereignty occurs every time the United States makes a treaty or agreement with a foreign country. The making of such agreements indeed is an attribute of sovereignty.

As I have indicated to the Senate on a previous occasion, we should lay a strong foundation for international cooperation before we start building the roof. We must—and will—never abandon the moralistic approach to the question of peace. It is peculiarly a phase of the question which religious leaders can discuss with authority, but we should always be mindful of it. Our job, however, is preeminently that of convincing public opinion of the need for, the utility of, and the practical, earthy value of international cooperation in terms of everyday life. Solve these practical questions relating to oil, shipping, aviation, currency, and communications, and we have cleared the way for solution of the broader matters. The development of international law and the establishment of valid world institutions should be an outgrowth of a world order in which practical relationships have been adjusted. If we seek to impose these institutions prematurely, they tend to become a strait-jacket. Wendell Willkie used an architectural phrase to express this same thought when he said on October 15:

> In my opinion, we are not yet at the blueprint stage. We have yet by prospecting with the other nations to find the place on which we may stand together to move the world toward peace, away from war. The ultimate blueprint will be what we can work out with these nations in mutual accommodation, but first we must discover a common ground on which we can begin to build.

I believe that there is such a common ground. I believe that the principal matters in disagreement between ourselves and our allies are practical matters which can be adjusted by a meeting of practical men. I devoutly hope that the three nations having the greatest war potential—that is, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—will develop a workable arrangement for keeping the peace, and that they will be joined by China and the other United Nations. If—and why should it not be possible?—these three great nations can develop an arrangement, an enduring future peace may be confidently looked for. It was for this reason, as well as because of the destructive effect in Germany, that I heartily welcomed the results of the Moscow Conference.

But, Madam President, I prefer an approach to the question of international cooperation which stresses the contributions we would have to make, instead of the benefits we would expect to receive. In my view, insufficient emphasis has been placed throughout the whole debate on the military establishment we will require when this war is over, on the unprecedented manpower problems it will create, and on the likelihood of our keeping men overseas after hostilities have ceased. Yet without a proper military force, the whole structure we are trying to build will fall to the ground. Resolutions, treaties, alliances, international leagues, or societies are but beginnings. If we are not to live up to our obligations day by day, through the years, by maintaining proper armed forces, we had better not raise false hope by making promises to ourselves and to others which we are not going to keep. We should solemnly bind ourselves to maintain land, sea, and air forces equal to carrying out our commitments. The United States should make only those commitments which she is able and prepared to carry out. That is paramount.

The pending resolution is an improvement over its predecessor in some respects. It provides for senatorial ratification of treaties. It contains some words in support of the rights of small nations. I am not sure, however, that I grasp the full purport of the words favoring the establishing—

> at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

So far as I am concerned, this language does not preclude the operation of any workable international arrangement, whether or not it be categorically organized, nor does it preclude—and to this I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]—the determination of voting strength in any future organization with due regard to such other factors as may be properly considered. This question of voting is one of the rocks on which previous peace efforts foundered. However, let us not make the same mistake twice.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if he does not agree with me that the language I have cited does not preclude a proper allocation of voting strength if and when such an organization is set up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, I say to the Senator that the resolution does not undertake to go into that matter at all. That is a detail which in the nature of things should be defined and set forth in any treaty or in the structure of any organization which may be set up.

Mr. LODGE. And this language does not mean——

Mr. CONNALLY. It does not include, and does not exclude.

Mr. LODGE. But certainly it does not mean that a little, tiny country such as Luxemburg, for instance, should have the same voting strength as the United States would have; does it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Nothing is stated and nothing is implied to that effect.

Mr. LODGE. Well, Madam President, so far as I am concerned, it does not. I desire to make that clear.

If I thought this resolution were in any way tying the hands of the United States Government, the United States Senate, or the people of the United States, I would not vote for it. I am taking it on its face value, without hidden meanings. I do not think it constitutes advice to the President or that it in any way affects the authority of Congress with regard to any matter at all.

I favor international cooperation to maintain peace between nations, but I naturally do not favor having such cooperation perverted into a device to siphon off the power, prestige, and resources of the United States.

If this resolution is adopted by a large vote, however, it will tend to unite the American people—surely a desirable and, unfortunately, rare event where foreign policy is concerned. It will show that we think that in this air age we must cooperate effectively with other nations to maintain peace. That is a thought worthy of expression, and of wholesome psychology.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the little country of Luxemburg to which the Senator referred had a vote equal in strength to the vote of the United States, or if the President in connection with his power to make and to negotiate treaties were to set up an organization in which each of the commonwealths of the British Empire—say five—had a vote, would the Senator feel that in voting for the adoption of the pending resolution he was duty bound to vote to ratify such a treaty, and that other Senators were duty bound to vote to ratify such a treaty by a two-thirds vote, when it came back to the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. Madam President, if I understand the Senator's question, he desires to know whether a Senator who votes for the pending resolution is thereby committed to support in the future a voting arrangement which would be unfair to the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. My answer is that of course he is not, and I have tried to make that very clear in my speech. If there is any one thing which is going to endanger international cooperation when the war is over, it is the question of voting strength, which, as everyone knows, is one of the principal rocks on which the previous peace efforts have foundered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the resolution and all amendments thereto at not later than 2 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Madam President, I object at this time because I desire later to offer an amendment, and I do not wish to be blocked by any time limitation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Since objection is made, I now make the request that, beginning tomorrow, no Senator shall speak for more than 15 minutes on the resolution or 15 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall have to object at this time, not because I wish any time, or because it would interfere with me in the slightest degree, but I understand that one Senator expects to speak for about an hour.

Mr. McNARY. Madam President, I have sent word to the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and I think he will soon be in the Chamber. I understand that two other Senators desire to speak this afternoon. I shall have to object at this time, until I find out what the situation is.

May we have a quorum call? I think the Senator from Minnesota can be brought into the Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, I have repeatedly sent for the Senator from Minnesota. It has been stated that he wishes to speak for about an hour. He cannot speak in his office. He must speak here. We have sent for him two or three times. He could speak this afternoon, right now, and take his hour. I say that in all kindness. He is a member of the committee and he ought to be present and ready with his speech.

Mr. McNARY. I think we should have a quorum call to bring him here.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think that the statement made by my good friend the Senator from Texas with reference to the Senator from Minnesota is fair, in the absence of the Senator from Minnesota. Look around the Chamber, on the Democratic side and on the Republican side. A great many Senators are absent from the Chamber. A number of Senators were on the list of speakers. Everyone knows that from time to time we are called out of the Chamber and cannot be present. If the Senator from Minnesota is preparing a speech, he may have felt that there was a sufficient number of other speakers on the list to occupy the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Madam President, in connection with what the Senator from Montana has said, I did not even know that the Senator from Minnesota intended to speak. I do know that he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He voted to report the original Connally resolution. He felt that the position of the original Connally resolution was changed by the compromise, of which he had never heard until 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon. He voted against agreeing to that compromise. It may well be that the Senator from Minnesota has not had time to prepare his speech. I did not know that he intended to speak. I think it is only fair to state that the Senator from Minnesota has had his position changed by action subsequent to 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. Madam President——

Mr. WHEELER. Madam President, I have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. I was recognized by the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought I made the point of no quorum.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator did not make the point of no quorum until after I had obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Gillette	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the resolution and all amendments thereto take place during the session tomorrow—in other words, that the session tomorrow shall be prolonged until the final vote on all amendments and on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope Senators who wish to speak will be present and ready to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Madam President, may I inquire what the request was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was that the Senate vote on the resolution and all the amendments thereto sometime tomorrow, and that the Senate remain in session until the vote is taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I object to the request—not that I have any amendments to offer that in any way would interfere with it, but I object to it because I know there are some Senators who have amendments, substitutes, and other matters. They would be cut off by such an agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Perhaps I did not understand the situation correctly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Madam President, I have such a high regard and affection for the Senator from California that no request which he would make would be denied by me. However, this agreement would prevent no Senator from speaking or offering amendments. All it provides is that we shall remain in session tomorrow until the resolution shall be disposed of.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That may mean until 1 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. CONNALLY. Only three Senators have indicated a desire to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We can get through, then, fairly promptly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Madame President, would it be possible to arrive at an understanding that beginning at 2 o'clock tomorrow, which would mean after 3 hours, no Senator shall speak for more than 15 minutes?

Mr. McNARY. Madam President, I do not know that we can obtain such an agreement, but let us meet at 11 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. McNARY. After having been in session for a short time we shall understand the situation more clearly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator suggest that we vacate the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into be vacated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. That puts us back where we started.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest a vote on the Danaher amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the amendment which I offered, and which has been pending since the 25th of October, raised a series of questions with reference to the exact meaning of various important and moving words in the language of the committee resolution.

It had seemed to me important to direct the attention of our colleagues to the fact that when this language speaks, it should do so with comprehension on our part. In the course of the debate, a very general understanding has been established, in the resolution as amended, by the colloquies of Senators involved, and in the statements of Senators themselves who have given clear definition to their thinking and to the language of the resolution.

The parliamentarian gave to me a definition of the term "Senate resolution" and the effect of a Senate resolution, and I inserted it in the RECORD on October 29. Moreover, most of the Senators who have spoken have agreed explicitly on the effect of the Senate resolution and on the meaning and nonbinding character of such a resolution.

Because the purpose of most of my original amendment has thus been served, Mr. President, it is my desire to modify the amendment by striking therefrom, on page 1, lines 2 to 10, inclusive, on page 2, lines 1 and 2; on page 3, commencing with line 5, and running through to the end of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the fact that the yeas and nays have been

ordered, unanimous consent would be required to make the modification. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut for permission to modify his amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified as indicated.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment as modified be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment as modified for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 9 of the resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. As herein used, the term—

"peace" shall mean an agreement designed to result in a state of tranquillity to be enjoyed by political society, marked internally within the several nations by the good order which prevails among their peoples, and externally by a good understanding with all other nations. Such an agreement shall include provisions: (1) That no signatory nation shall seek aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise; (2) that no territorial changes shall be permitted which do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; (3) that all peoples shall have the right to choose the form of government under which they shall live, particularly to the end that self-government may be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived thereof; (4) that they will grant to all nations, great or small, victor or vanquished, access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity; (5) that they will undertake fullest collaboration among all nations in the economic field to the end that all may enjoy improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"constitutional processes" shall mean the course of procedure prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, particularly including regard for the powers of Congress stated in article I, section 8, and the limitations upon as well as the power granted to the President under article II, section 2, thereof.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, when Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt met in August 1941 and agreed upon the Atlantic Charter——

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the modification of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut involve any more than the deletion of some of his amendment? Does it add anything?

Mr. DANAHER. No; nothing is added, let me say to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I wished to be sure about. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I will state for the RECORD that there is repeated in the amendment, page 1, line 1; page 2, lines 3 to 25, inclusive; and page 3, lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

Mr. President, as I was about to say, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt met in August 1941 and agreed upon a declaration which was given out to the world under the title of "The Atlantic Charter," which stated the minimum objectives upon which the war was to be based, and hence, the minimum terms upon which a peace to follow could be predicated.

When the United Nations entered into their joint declaration, which was released by the White House on January 2, 1942, the joint declaration read—and I quote from a bulletin issued by the Department of State dated January 3, 1942:

DECLARATION BY UNITED NATIONS

A joint declaration by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia.

"The governments signatory hereto—

"Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter,

"Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world, declare:

"(1) Each government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

"(2) Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
Done at Washington, January 1, 1942.

Then follow the names of the other signatories.

Mr. President, at any peace conference to follow the dreadful hostilities now in progress, agreement must be attained. It is our hope that that agreement will be predicated upon such considerations as will insure a lasting peace. The whole purpose of the resolution before us is directed to that end. It expresses the hope and constitutes a declaration of the Senate of the United States favoring that objective.

Therefore, Mr. President, there should be embodied in our declaration a statement of the aims and aspirations of the United Nations, particularly to the end that there be common understanding, that if the causes for war can be eradicated, if the economic dislocations out of which disputes and turmoil hitherto have arisen can be corrected, then there will be some predicate, some hope, that the political structure to which the resolution directs our attention can be erected upon a solid foundation. Unless we can take some effective steps at the peace table to deal with the economic causes for war, this mere political advice, as stated in the resolution, will, indeed, be inane and meaningless.

Mr. President, with those thoughts in mind, the amendment states, therefore, that the minimum terms to be included in any agreement for peace, as the term is used in the resolution, shall include the declared objectives of the Atlantic Charter.

There has been much discussion here about the Senate's right to pass upon a treaty, its right to participate in the making of a treaty, and the requirements surrounding its advice and consent and concurrence by two-thirds vote of the Senators. There has been no mention adequately, in my judgment, of the fact that there are in the Constitution many provisions admitting the Congress to yet additional participation.

We may not safely ignore the fact that the term "constitutional processes" is undefined, and therefore lines 24 and 25, on page 2 of the amendment, and the first four lines on page 3, are intended to and will include as a definition all the provisions of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, as well as the limitations upon and the grants of power to the President under article II, section 2.

Mr. President, this amendment is vital; it is of the utmost importance; and when we are giving advice to the President in this situation, the very least we can do is to assert the Senate's view as to the basis for the agreement and the manner of its achieving binding effect.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that if we send "advice" to the President, he has the privilege of throwing any such resolution of advice into the nearest wastebasket and discarding it entirely. I say that, if he is to regard our advice and to rely upon our resolution as to the views he shall follow when he acts in our behalf in the exercise of his negotiatory powers, we should tell him also that minimum terms for peace shall include the economic protections for all nations which are set forth in the joint declaration of the United Nations which embodied the provisions of the Atlantic Charter.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is the equivalent of saying that "We agree that you are our general agent. We do, however, want you to understand that there are some limitations which you must regard." Those limitations are stated in the amendment which I offered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the junior Senator from Connecticut. Am I to understand that the definitions in the amendment are taken from the Atlantic Charter and the provisions of the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. MCCARRAN'S name was called). I have been requested to state to the Senate that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is detained on official business under Senate Resolution 241, which compels him to be absent from the Senate at this time.

I am advised by the Senator from Nevada that he is fully advised of the text

of the modified resolution before the Senate, that he heartily endorses it, and that, if present, would vote for the modified resolution. He has been kept in daily contact with the action on the resolution, both in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the Senate, and he fully endorses and earnestly approves the action of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations in toto. He asks that he be paired, and he wants it stated that he is opposed to the amendment now pending.

I have received a telegram from the Senator from Nevada, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My secretary has kept me advised of your fine cooperation and assistance. Be assured of my appreciation and gratitude. I am now fully advised of text of reformed Connally resolution now before the Senate. Please make full statement on floor of Senate of my endorsement of and vote for revised Connally resolution. Regret that official business under Senate Resolution 241 compels me to be absent from Senate at this time. Will greatly appreciate full statement of my position.

Kind regards,

PAT MCCARRAN.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who, I am informed, if present would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. BARKLEY. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is unavoidably and necessarily absent. He has asked me to announce that if present he would vote "nay."

I wish to make the same announcement regarding my colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. BYRD. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Chamber by illness. Were he present he would vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I have voted, and I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that if the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] were present and voting he would vote "yea." He is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "nay" if present and voting.

Mr. HILL. The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting they would both vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 70, as follows:

YEAS—15

Butler	Langer	Reynolds
Danaher	Maloney	Shipstead
Ferguson	Moore	Walsh
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wiley

NAYS—70

Aiken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hatch	Scrugham
Barkley	Hawkes	Smith
Bilbo	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Lodge	Tobey
Bushfield	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Connally	Millikin	Wherry
Davis	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	O'Mahoney	
Gerry	Overton	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Chandler	McCarran
Bailey	Downey	Pepper
Bone	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	La Follette	

So the amendment of Mr. DANAHER, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate has indicated that in our declaration and in our opinion we are not fighting for the Atlantic Charter, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun for November 3, entitled "Yanks in Africa Shrug Off News of Moscow Decisions."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YANKS IN AFRICA SHRUG OFF NEWS OF MOSCOW DECISIONS—SOLDIERS' ONLY CONCERN IS WHETHER THEY MUST REMAIN IN OCCUPATION FORCE AFTER VICTORY

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS, ALGIERS, November 2.—The American soldier in this war theater was too busy today trying to win the war and get back home to pay much attention to the results of the Moscow Conference.

The reaction of most of the G. I.'s was a shrug of the shoulders.

The American soldiers' one great concern is getting the war won and going back home and their one big worry is that after the war they may be kept in Europe as occupation troops.

NOTE BIG "EXCEPT"

Because of this they were quick to notice the assurance that after the war was over the Allies "will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states," but they were equally quick to note there was a big "except" after this statement, upon which a long occupation might be based.

"I don't care what they do to the Germans so long as they don't decide to occupy them and keep us here to do it," said one G. I., and his view was shared by many others.

At Allied headquarters the officers displayed scarcely little more interest in the Moscow Declaration than did the troops.

"I don't see that it says anything startling or very new," one high officer said. "I could have written it myself without going to Moscow."

HAVE FEW IDEAS

Efforts of the American Army to get the soldiers interested in what they are fighting for has not been very successful. The troops generally have few ideas on what ought to be done to the Germans after the war. Their conversation is revolved around other matters such as food, girls, or letters from home, and they seldom discuss international problems among themselves.

"No matter what they do to them there is going to be another war 20 years from now," commented one soldier.

The soldiers' apathy toward international affairs does not indicate low morale. On the contrary, the morale of the troops generally in the Mediterranean theater is high, perhaps higher than that of troops at home, in Britain, or in the other theaters.

NOW SEASONED ARMIES

Factors producing this high morale have no relation to politics or war aims. They are:

Both the American and British forces here now are seasoned armies of men who know how to look out for themselves on the battlefield.

They know they are on the winning side and see the end of the war in Europe next year and have confidence in their leaders.

Relations between the Allies are good.

Allied strength in the air gives the ground troops great confidence as they know their own planes generally can be counted on to protect them.

If asked what he is fighting for, the average soldier will regard the question with some suspicion, as though the interrogator was making fun or trying to trip him.

I'M IN THE ARMY

"Why do I fight?" said one. "I'm in the army. What the hell else can I do?"

Appeals to patriotism leave most soldiers cold. On the other hand combat troops have great pride in their units and each wants his division to be regarded as the toughest on the battlefield.

The main reason for a lack of interest in the affairs of the world is the soldiers here live in a world of their own, a world which has its own paradise—going home.

They aren't interested in Moscow Conferences, Atlantic Charters, or making the post-war world a better place to live in, but only in getting the war over by beating the Germans, then going home. In their present mood most of them believe the world they left to come here was plenty good enough and would like to find it just as it was.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I desire to offer an amendment to the committee resolution as modified. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the fourth paragraph of the resolution as modified, after the words "international peace and security," it is proposed to insert the following:

That participation by the United States of America in such an organization shall be by treaty only.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly to the amendment offered, for the purpose of explaining the amendment and pointing out why it is offered to the committee resolution, as modified. The language is but one

sentence, and that is that participation by the United States of America in such an organization shall be by treaty only.

The resolution, without reading it—it is familiar to each Senator—provides that the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The language which I have offered is to make more definite and more certain the manner by which our country, if we are to participate in a world organization, shall go about entering that organization.

I realize that the final paragraph of the resolution provides that before any treaty made shall be binding upon this country it must be concurred in by two-thirds of the Senate. However, we have been confronted in recent days, and even today, with the use of another method of dealing with foreign states, and that is by Executive decree or Executive agreement, as it is called.

The purpose of the amendment which I offer is to the effect, if the Senate today adopts the resolution, then we will say that we do not intend that this country shall be bound in any world organization except by treaty, and by a treaty which will be brought back to the Senate for study and ratification so that we may know the terms of it.

Time and again, Mr. President, it has been said that the resolution is vague. That has been admitted by the proponents of the resolution. It is vague. There is no question about it. It is not purposefully vague. That cannot be charged. It is vague because we do not have the facts at hand at this time, at this date, to say what kind of a treaty should be written.

There are many things that must be put into a treaty. There are many things that you and I will want to study before we consent to take this country into any organization or into any alliance with other nations.

Let me point out some of the items we must consider—certainly items I will want to consider before I consent or give my vote to taking this country into any organization suggested in this resolution. We will want to know what vote and what voice America may have in this world organization. We will want to know what contribution to it in men and money America is going to make. We will want to know how many men she must keep under arms and where they will be stationed. We will want to know who may order the armed forces of America into action in event provisions for such action is made in a treaty. We will want to know what commercial and trade restrictions will be laid upon this country. We will want to know how far this world authority will have power to limit the actions of the United States Government, which means limiting the sovereignty of this country.

Mr. President, the purpose and the sole purpose of the amendment composed of one sentence, that I offer, is that only by a treaty which must be brought back to the Senate for study and ratification may this country be taken into any world alliance or any organization.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. We have under consideration a resolution that has to be acted upon by the Senate only. The resolution does provide in its concluding clause that any treaty that is entered into by the Executive under this resolution shall be submitted to the Senate, and of course two-thirds of Senators present shall concur therein. The purpose of that clause is simply to show that the Senate is not giving a general power of attorney in advance. But if the Executive desires to enter into an agreement, as distinguished from a treaty, how can one body of the national legislative branch prevent him from doing so, and what effect would the Senator's amendment have on the power of the Chief Executive if it did declare that no agreement could be entered into with respect to any international organization? To do that, it would have to take the form of a treaty.

The question is one which is to be determined under the Constitution; and the resolution of the Senate, it seems to me, should have no effect which would change the Constitution or would have any effect on the power and authority of the Chief Executive. I should like to have an expression of the Senator's view on that matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should be very glad to answer the question which has been presented by the Senator. I think it is a very proper one. The amendment I have offered would have no more effect than any other provision of the resolution. The resolution is an expression of view by the Senate. It is advice. We have been told time and time again during the extended debate that the only authority the Senate has for adoption of the resolution is under the clause of the Constitution which provides that treaties shall be made with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chief Executive negotiates the treaties; then, with our advice and consent, the treaty becomes binding upon the country when two-thirds of the Senators present concur in it. We are supposed to be giving advice by this resolution.

The amendment would only have the force that anything else in the resolution would have. It would have the force of resolving that we do not want this country taken into any world alliance by an Executive agreement. When we say to the Chief Executive, in advising him in a general outline, that we desire this to be done, that we wish to have a treaty which will work toward some world organization for the purpose of peace, we say at the same time we want that done by treaty, that we insist that it be done by treaty, so that the terms of the treaty may be brought back to the Senate, and so that we may know them and pass upon them. That is the purpose of the amendment, and that is its binding force. It is just as binding and just as effective as any other part of the resolution.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, if we take the position held by most of the Senators who have spoken on the pending subject who believe that the resolution represents only advice, that it is not binding in any way, shape, or form, other than merely to advise the President, then certainly there cannot be any excuse for not advising him what our opinions are on agreements, and that we would like to have agreements come back to the Senate and be voted upon by the Senate if they are in the nature of treaties. If that is true, and if the resolution does not amount to anything except advice, there cannot be any reason why we should not advise the President in advance upon this matter or any other matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Montana. In fact, if we are to advise the President on this subject, unless the Members of the Senate really desire to have action by Executive agreements, I can see no objection to the amendment I have offered. It is a timely suggestion.

Let me refer to an article which appeared yesterday in the Washington Evening Star. It reads as follows:

> Controversy over the significance and effect of the Moscow Declaration gathered momentum today with State Department officials declaring that the pact was an effective executive agreement which did not require Senate ratification, and a number of Senators taking issue with that assertion. State Department officials said the Moscow Declaration had the same force on participating nations as a treaty, though they did not have to be ratified. In international law, they maintained, an executive agreement can bind a state effectively. They placed the Moscow Pact in the same legal class with the Atlantic Charter and with the destroyers-for-bases deal, both of which were carried out by Executive order, without Senate approval.

Mr. President, that brings directly forward the issue whether we shall ignore the threat and danger that the President may by Executive agreement effect a world organization on behalf of the United States.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It occurs to me that if we are to advise the President in this matter we might well wait until such time as the President is ready to act and desires our advice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the Senator. I feel the whole thing is untimely. But my hope is to strengthen the resolution so that whatever may be done will be done by a treaty that will be returned to the Senate for study and action, and not done by Executive agree-

ment which we will never see or have an opportunity to act upon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Tomorrow I shall express my views, with all due humility, but I have not heard that the President has sought the advice of the Senate thus far, and I do not think there is any need for us to act at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me inquire whether the Senator from West Virginia has before him the committee resolution as modified yesterday?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator please turn to page 2, lines 5 and 6?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. The language in line 5 reads:

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty

If after the word "treaty" the Senator from West Virginia were to insert the words "or agreement made to effect the purposes of this resolution on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur," would not the objective for which the Senator so ably argues be attained?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, Mr. President; it would not, I may say. The amendment I have offered distinctly and directly limits any action to the use of a treaty in taking us into a world organization. I think the Senate has the right to deal with treaties only. I doubt whether, according to the views of some, we have any right to ask for the power of ratification of an agreement.

Therefore, I desire to limit action upon the subject of this resolution to the use of a treaty; in other words, to say to the world and to the Chief Executive that "when we express this advice to you, we want you to know that any treaty to be made must come to the Senate for ratification." Any treaty, under the Constitution, will come back, and by the amendment I have offered it will be done only by treaty.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I think I understand the purpose of his amendment. However, he attempts to amend the closing paragraph of the present Connally resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that the amendment which is offered by me is only the one line at the first part of the printed copy.

Mr. GILLETTE. Perhaps I am misled by the copy on my desk. Will the Senator say what line he intends to amend?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment includes only line 6:

That participation by the United States of America in such an organization shall be by treaty only.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia, for in his answer to the question of the Senator from Iowa he answered the very question I was about to put to him, and I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator demands that the action taken be by treaty to be sent to the Senate for ratification. Is not that the Senator's view?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct—and by a treaty only.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. Of course, Mr. President, the President has sole authority to conduct negotiations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And in the absence of any advice from the President as to what his views are, we can assume, possibly, that he would say, "This is not a treaty. This is an executive agreement."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then we advise him that what we are saying in this resolution is that it must be done by treaty or it is not done according to the advice we give. That would be the sense of it, I feel.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What good would that do us?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may reply by inquiring what good would the entire resolution do us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have the Senator's construction of the language. If the organization of such international authority proceeds, so far as the United States is concerned, "through its constitutional processes," everything the Senator seeks would have been achieved, as I understand the amendment. Is that correct? In other words, the only thing the Senator is afraid of is that constitutional processes will not be followed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is true that I am afraid that constitutional processes will not be followed. However, that is not all I am afraid of; I go further than that. We have authority, discussed very ably by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], in which there is drawn a distinction between a treaty and an agreement, and wherein it is pointed out that a treaty must come back to the Senate for ratification, whereas an agreement does not come back to the Senate. I desire to have no doubt left that when the pending resolution is agreed to, if it is agreed to, we advise that if this country is taken into any world organization it must be taken by treaty, which will require the bringing back to the Senate of the terms of the treaty for action thereon by the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I understand the Senator's purpose. I am simply trying to indicate that, in the Senator's opinion, as well as in mine, this process could not go on except by treaty, if the constitutional process were followed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is my view, but a different view is expressed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think any different view is expressed by the Senator from Vermont regarding this type of commitment. What I am trying to emphasize—and I think it is very important that it be emphasized—is that many of us who will vote against the Senator's amendment will do so because we think the point is adequately covered by the existing language. I should certainly not wish to have my vote against the Senator's amendment construed as any disagreement on my part with the thoroughly sound attitude of the Senator from West Virginia that this sort of a commitment can be made only by treaty. I wish to make that very plain.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I regret very much to hear that the Senator will vote against my amendment. If he feels that I am right, he should vote with me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the language of the resolution already covers it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the two proposals are one and the same, why not put them both in? What harm would be done? If the Senator's amendment simply defines the constitutional processes, why not make it clear what is to come back to the Senate? The Senator's amendment consists of only one line. If it makes the point clear, what is the objection to it? Is there any difference between the Senator's amendment and the language "constitutional processes," except that the Senator's language emphasizes them and says how far they shall go?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his contribution. I think he is exactly right. Why leave the question in any doubt? Why not say that it shall be done by treaty and by treaty alone? We know that such a requirement would bring the agreement back to the Senate for its study and action.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The very able Senator from West Virginia was quoting from an article which appeared in the newspapers yesterday, and when reference was made to it on the floor of the Senate it was interesting to note that those who sought to dispel the possible public effect of that newspaper article did not deny that the statement was made by the Department of State or someone in it. They simply said that it was made by some unauthorized person or subordinate, and that if he is caught he will be punished. We all know that Mr. Hull, the Secretary of State, is not even here,

so he did not authorize the statement. Apparently Mr. Stettinius is quoted as saying—at least, it was so implied to us yesterday—that whoever made such a statement to the newspapers certainly was not authorized to do so. However, the fact remains that in the Department of State the very definite feeling prevails that the device of executive agreements can be relied upon in implementation of the President's powers in the field of external sovereignty.

Let me observe further that a couple of years ago Mr. McClure, Assistant Secretary of State, wrote a volume in which he sought to demonstrate the existence of that very power, the exercise of which the Senator from West Virginia, in my opinion, very properly inveighs against. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know whether the Senator from Connecticut was present in the Chamber yesterday when I made a statement on this matter.

Mr. DANAHER. I was present.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator seems to insist that the State Department authorized or issued some statement——

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, no.

Mr. CONNALLY. Evidently I failed to make myself clear yesterday. I said that the State Department stated that it had not issued any such statement. I do not know whether anyone privately told some newspaperman, off the record, or in any other way, the substance of the statement. However, the State Department did not issue any such statement, and did not authorize anyone to issue such a statement.

Let me suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that the last paragraph of the pending resolution is intended to cover the very thing about which the Senator is talking.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I beg to differ with the Senator. The last paragraph refers to a treaty. But it does not say anything about a treaty being required. The danger that lurks in this whole business is the possibility of the failure to use a treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says "any agreement." Three agreements were made at Moscow. Under the terms of the Senator's amendment, we would have to ratify them. Those agreements would have to be brought here for ratification.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator says "any agreement." That shows the ridiculousness of it when it is carried to its logical conclusion.

I am not out of sympathy with the Senator. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] suggests that even though the point is already covered in the resolution, we should say so again. Saying so again would not make it any stronger.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator is so much out of sympathy with me that he is opposing my amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am opposing it because it is futile and useless.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

Here is the question that is raised: The last paragraph of the resolution, as pointed out by the able Senator from Texas, provides that the agreement shall be returned to the Senate for ratification if made by treaty; but, as has been so directly and clearly pointed out here, and recognized by the State Department—by someone who made a slip and let out the policy of the State Department—it is contemplated that Executive agreements may be used to perfect such arrangements.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose an agreement were made to set up the proposed international agency. Would it be an agreement or a treaty?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would not be a treaty unless it were brought back here.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the Senator answer that question. Suppose our representatives should agree with representatives of foreign countries and enter into a compact. Does the Senator contend that that would be nothing but an agreement? It would be a treaty.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would not be a treaty unless it were ratified by the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be a treaty in process. It might not be a perfected treaty. The Senator knows that it would be a treaty; and if it were a treaty it would have to be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the question we are debating. In the past we have regarded such agreements as treaties. Today we talk about executive agreements, which do not come to the Senate for ratification. I should like to require that anything so serious as taking this country into a world organization be submitted to the Senate for ratification. I know that if this resolution should provide that it must be done by treaty, the treaty would be brought back to the Senate for ratification.

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment employs the word "treaty," and he is desirous of having any agreements made by any of our representatives brought back to the Senate for ratification, by two-thirds of the Senators present. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. My amendment deals only with the subject dealt with in the resolution, and that is a world organization, or anything pertaining to taking this country into a world organization.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does the Senator consider the agreement reached at Moscow the other day a treaty within the terms of his interpretation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not sufficiently familiar with every part of that agreement to say whether it would be an agreement or a treaty, or would have to be confirmed by the Senate. I would rather not debate that question. However, the very discussion which arose from it proves the need of my amendment in this resolution if it is to be adopted. What is done with respect to taking this country into some alliance with other countries should be submitted to the Senate for consideration and determination.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I merely wished to clarify the record. Does the Senator think that the agreement reached in Moscow the other day will have to be submitted to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that I have given no thought to that particular agreement. However, any agreement with a foreign nation which effects an alliance or places a duty upon this country is in fact a treaty, which should be ratified by the Senate, under the Constitution.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me ask the Senator one further question. Does the Senator think that the agreement reached at Moscow the other day ought to be submitted to the Senate for ratification or acceptance by two-thirds of the Senators present?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am inclined to take the view that it should be.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That being the case, I can readily understand that the Senator and I have the same objective in mind. Therefore I wish to advise him, for his information, and also to advise other Members of the Senate who are present, that I have already sent to the desk an amendment which I shall offer at the proper time, which calls for the employment of the words "pact," "compact," "agreement," and "understanding." Under the wording of my amendment, necessarily the agreement reached at Moscow the other day would have to come back here for acceptance by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me call the Senator's attention to a few facts. There is no decided case, and no authentic precedent, involving any purely executive agreement dealing with a subject matter affecting the highest interest of the country. Executive agreements go to this extent, and this extent only: When by a previous act of the Congress the President has been authorized to enter into executive agreements, such agreements, if made pursuant to that authority, have been upheld as such.

It seems to me that if there is anything which could affect the general welfare of the Nation and rise to the dignity of a treaty, it is an agreement setting up an international authority, or general international organization, such as is described in this resolution.

From the beginning the courts have always distinguished between a treaty and an executive agreement. They have explicitly said that some agreements do not rise to the dignity of treaties. However, matters going to the very vitals of the interest of the American people as a nation are matters which must be dealt with by treaties. Therefore, it seems to

me that the adoption of the Senator's amendment would be a very dangerous precedent. It would be an admission by the Senate, which is a part of the treaty-making power of the Government, that action of the kind contemplated might be effectuated by a mere executive agreement rather than by treaty.

It would be a tacit assent to the proposition that a President of the United States might enter into an agreement of this character and this kind by mere executive action, that is, by his mere act. I should not want to vote under any circumstances for an amendment which was predicated even upon the thought or fear that under our Constitution a President of the United States, by any mere executive agreement, could bind this country to any such international authority, or to a general international organization such as that referred to, or that within the contemplation of this resolution. When we consider an amendment which provides that the President must do that by treaty, it is tantamount to conceding that he might do it by executive agreement.

I do not think we get away from it by merely saying we are fearful of what might happen, because somebody in the State Department—I do not care who he might be, even if he were Secretary of State—had asserted that this kind of an international arrangement could be entered into by a mere Executive agreement. To do that is to deny that anything can rise to the dignity of a treaty, and we have very carefully taken care of the treaty in the resolution. Indeed, in the original resolution presented to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee, it is stated:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Can there be within human contemplation anything that in point of dignity, within the meaning of the explicit language of our Supreme Court, could rise above those objectives?

The second and added paragraph which was reported yesterday by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reads as follows:

> That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The language which I have read adds nothing whatever to the original Senate resolution. Everything contained in that language is clearly within the purview and scope of the original resolution.

In defining what is constitutionality, Mr. Marshall clearly pointed out that if the means selected were within the meaning of the Constitution, within its provisions, and not hostile to it, not offensive to it, and not antagonistic to it, it would necessarily be a constitutional enactment. So in applying that general definition of Marshall, which has come down from the very beginning of our Supreme Court decisions, the original declaration made in the pending resolution comprehends and does not exclude anything that is contained in the subsequent language which has been added to the resolution.

In the original declaration it was expressly stated—

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, will join—

The word "will" is omitted, of course, because of the grammatical construction of the entire resolution, but it means that the United States will join—

> with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance—

And so forth. Then we have the further recitation in the resolution, as modified, that it is essential that we shall get about this business as speedily, as early, as soon as practicable.

So I say that when the Senator offers his amendment, though he offers it in good faith, it must be offered on the basis that there is some foundation for the fear expressed by some clerk, probably, in the State Department—if anyone gave out any statement of that kind—that an international agreement such as is here contemplated could be less than a treaty. I hope that the Senator will not press his amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia, although I do not agree with him in the conclusion that he has reached. I will say that I am very earnest and very sincere about urging the amendment. I agree with the first part of his statement that there is no subject which could rise more nearly to the realm of the need of a treaty than the action of the Government of this country in taking the country into some alliance with other nations for some type of a world organization.

However, if that should be done by treaty, then I should like to ask the able Senator why it should not be explicit? Why should we fail to say that we want it done by treaty and treaty alone? I realize what the able Senator has said, that there is an inference that it might be done by executive agreement.

Mr. GEORGE. My answer, Mr. President, is that it can only be done by treaty, and when the Senator intimates through an amendment that it might be done by something which falls beneath the dignity of a treaty, I think we are treading on very dangerous ground.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator that I am apprehensive not that it may be done legally, but I am apprehensive, and I say this with candor—and I think this is the time for candor—that it may be attempted by a procedure that we do not recognize as legal, such as an executive agreement. Oh, that apprehension does not rise solely from some statement which has issued from the State Department. That, of course, makes us think of it. But we cannot escape—I cannot and I believe the Senate cannot escape it—that the executive department of the Government apparently has a desire to take unto itself powers which long ago and for years were vested in the Congress.

I wish to say that if we bring about, through premature passage of the pending resolution, a situation which would permit any Chief Executive, whoever he might be, to attempt to take this country into a world alliance upon his own terms without submitting a treaty to the Senate, then the Senate will have surrendered the greatest power that is vested in it. This body alone, under the Constitution, has the power to ratify a treaty. No other governmental body but the Senate has that duty and we must not surrender it or create such a situation that we might be deprived of it.

Mr. GEORGE. I very humbly suggest to the Senator that I realize always the danger of executive encroachments upon the powers of Congress, but there could be no happier battleground on which we could stand and fight that issue out between the Congress and any Chief Executive than that of the simple question of a so-called executive agreement which would endeavor, attempt, or, by its terms, profess to bind this Nation under an international agreement such as contemplated in the pending resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I ask the Senator how he would lay his hands on an executive agreement? It would not come back to this body.

Mr. GEORGE. By innumerable methods. Very few treaties are self-executing. They must come to this body for final support, and they might be directly attacked. But the point I am trying to make is that if there is to be a conflict between the Executive and the legislative branch of the Government, we could select no more favorable ground upon which to fight it out than that of an agreement which would seek, without Senate ratification, to bind this Nation to an international agreement of the character which has been described herein, because beyond all question of doubt it deals with the most vital relationships, and touches the most vital concerns, of the American people and of the Nation as a whole. If it is necessary to provide that such action can be taken only by treaty, then "treaty" has lost its significance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say, Mr. President, that I hope we can avoid any issue of that kind. I do not invite it upon any ground. The able Senator says this would be perhaps the soundest ground for such an issue, if such an issue were to exist. I want to prevent such an issue from arising. I want the declaration of the Senate to be clear that the action must be by treaty and by treaty alone.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether I correctly understood him to say he thought the agreement at Moscow should be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I said that from what I have read of the executive agreement, and from what I know about it, it

does deal with questions having to do with the relationship of this Nation to other nations, and therefore is in the nature of a treaty.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then I should like to ask the Senator another question. I see by the newspapers that there was probably an agreement as to how and when a second front should be established. Does the Senator think that should have been submitted to the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no; of course not.

Mr. TUNNELL. Where is the distinction?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The distinction is that in concert with other nations, as I recall, we were to do thus and so with respect to Italy and Austria, as I remember the agreement.

Mr. TUNNELL. Assuming that there was such an agreement, why should it not be submitted? Is not that pretty strenuous action, and does that not involve the United States in its relations with other countries?

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the point?

Mr. TUNNELL. Should it not be submitted?

Mr. REVERCOMB. What?

Mr. TUNNELL. Any agreement as to the second front.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly not.

Mr. TUNNELL. Why?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is a matter of military tactics, and has nothing to do with what I was discussing.

Mr. TUNNELL. Was that an executive agreement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. TUNNELL. I asked whether the Senator considers that an executive agreement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What, a military question or military tactics?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course not.

Mr. TUNNELL. What is it? Who has agreed to it, if it is not the executive department?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It relates to the military, which is under the Chief Executive in time of war.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the Senator thinks that the Executive does have some power in time of war?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, I admit the President has power.

Mr. TUNNELL. Without submitting it to Congress?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thought the Senator was serious. [Laughter.]

Mr. TUNNELL. I am serious. I am so serious that I thought I should call the matter to the Senator's attention, if he had not thought of it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, in view of the fact that what we are considering envisions a continuing organization for the maintenance of national peace and security, assuming that the able Senator's amendment should be adopted, providing that the participation of the United States in such an organization should be by treaty only, what would be the Senator's interpretation of participation? Would it be a temporary membership, or a continuing participation? Would it be the Senator's interpretation that every action in a continuing organization must be predicated on a treaty, to be transmitted to the United States Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. When obligations and duties were imposed upon this country that would be a participation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As a result of the question of the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, I believe it is somewhat important to point a distinction between what the President can do by virtue of his military powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and what he cannot do in the shaping of a post-war-world organization. The two things are entirely different. When the President enters into strategic arrangements with our allies he is acting under his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy which do not require our advice and consent. When he makes arrangements for a post-war world with our allies or with any other country, he is then making a treaty under the treaty-making powers of the Constitution and this requires our advice and consent. The two things do not merge into each other, they are separate and distinct, and arise out of different powers under the Constitution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to thank the Senator from Colorado for the contribution he has made.

Let me say at this time that we have wandered a little afield from the purpose of the one-sentence amendment which I offered. It deals with the organization which is contemplated by the resolution. I think we have discussed the effect of the amendment sufficiently to know what it is about, the purport of it, the intent of it. I am very earnest about it.

Mr. President, I do not want to be a party to the creation of a situation which may result in the surrender of the duty and the power of the Senate to ratify any treaty which affects the welfare of this Nation. So long as there is any doubt in my mind about it, so long as I feel that there may be a surrender of our power, so long as I feel in my heart and mind that there is even a chance that some great world structure may be built by the Chief Executive, according to plans he may think are right, whatever name he may give the instrument, whether it be agreement or treaty, and does not send it to the Senate in its form and detail to be passed upon by the Senate; so long as there is a chance of that happening, I shall keep my record clear, I hope, by my vote. I am earnest about the matter. I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and I submit it to the Senate with all earnestness.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who I understand would, if present, vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, free to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. MCCARRAN's name was called). The distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is unavoidably detained on official business under Senate Resolution 241, which compels him to be absent from the Senate at this time.

I am advised by the Senator from Nevada that he is fully advised of the text of the modified Connally resolution, now before the Senate, that he heartily endorses it, and if present would vote for it. He has been kept in daily contact with the action on the resolution, both in the foreign Relations Committee and in the Senate, and he fully endorses and earnestly approves the action of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee in toto.

If the Senator from Nevada were present and voting, he would vote "nay." He is paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

I have received a telegram from the Senator from Nevada, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO, NEV., *November 4, 1943.*

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My secretary has kept me advised of your fine cooperation and assistance. Be assured of my appreciation and gratitude. I am now fully advised of text of reformed Connally resolution now before the Senate. Please make full statement on floor of Senate of my endorsement of and vote for revised Connally resolution. Regret that official business under Senate Resolution 241 compels me to be absent from Senate at this time. Will greatly appreciate full statement of my position.

Kind regards,

PAT MCCARRAN.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WAGNER. My colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. BARKLEY. I repeat my earlier announcement as to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I wish to add that if present he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that

if present and voting, the Senators from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Tobey
Bushfield	Millikin	Walsh
Butler	Moore	Wheeler
Byrd	Nye	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Wiley
Danaher	Revercomb	Wilson
Hawkes	Reynolds	
Johnson, Calif.	Robertson	

NAYS—54

Austin	Gerry	O'Daniel
Ball	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Green	Overton
Barbour	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gurney	Russell
Bilbo	Hatch	Scrugham
Brewster	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Kilgore	Truman
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tydings
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Davis	McKellar	Van Nuys
Eastland	Maloney	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Willis

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Downey	Mead
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Bone	La Follette	Smith
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McNary	

So Mr. REVERCOMB'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is agreeable to having the Senate recess at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that I am agreeable to the Senate recessing at this time with the understanding that it meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very anxious that any Senators who desire to speak shall be ready to do so tomorrow. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] expects to begin at 11 o'clock, and I hope any other Senators who have speeches will be ready to follow, because it is earnestly desired that we vote finally on the resolution and all amendments thereto sometime during tomorrow's session.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2859) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3130) to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3130) to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Patents.

W. G. CORNELL CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 110)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 694, a bill for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.

This bill authorizes and directs the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to the W. G. Cornell Co. of the sum of $840.65 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the amount of the manufacturer's excise tax included in the cost of certain articles, designated in the bill as gas ranges and also as stoves, purchased by the said company for installation in the Highland Defense Dwellings Project of the Alley Dwelling Authority for the District of Columbia.

The W. G. Cornell Co. in August 1941 entered into a contract with the governmental agency entailing the installation of gas water heaters. The Revenue Act of 1941, approved September 20, 1941, amended the Internal Revenue Code so as to impose a tax, effective on October 1, 1941, equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which such articles are sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. The articles were delivered to the Cornell Co. after the tax became effective.

Under section 3442 of the Internal Revenue Code such articles are not taxable if sold for the exclusive use of the United States. Under section 3443 the manufacturer or producer may obtain a credit or refund against the tax paid by him with respect to such articles which are resold by any person for the exclusive use of the United States, upon a proper showing that it has repaid the amount of the tax to the ultimate vendor, or has agreed to do so.

In this case a claim was filed by the manufacturer but was rejected because neither section 3442 nor section 3443 was regarded as meeting the circumstances of the case. As construed by the Treasury, the exemption did not apply for the reason that the articles were not sold as such to the Government but were part of a general heating system which the contractor had undertaken to install in the project. Accordingly, the case is not essentially different for present purposes than if the articles had been furnished by the claimant to a private concern.

There are doubtless many instances in which a contractor, under similar conditions, has failed to anticipate a new excise tax and has thereafter been obliged to absorb an unexpected loss or expense without obtaining any relief from the Government. This bill would select a single case for special treatment. The body of taxpayers similarly situated is thus discriminated against and a precedent is established for the presentation of similar claims for special treatment by other persons in a like situation. I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 694, and I do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to relieve a single taxpayer from a condition common to many taxpayers.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Ralph E. Davison, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from November 17, 1942;

Capt. Samuel P. Ginder, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 23, 1942;

Capt. Carl H. Jones, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from October 7, 1942;

Capt. Timothy J. Keleher, to be a rear admiral in the Navy on the retired list, for temporary service, to rank from June 11, 1942;

Capt. Lawrence B. Richardson, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, to rank from November 15, 1943;

Capt. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from April 3, 1943;

Capt. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from October 19, 1942;

Sundry captains, United States Navy, to be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service;

Brig. Gen. Henry L. Larsen, to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service, from September 28, 1942;

Col. Graves B. Erskine, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service, from September 19, 1942;

Stanley S. Nicolay, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of law, to rank from April 10, 1941; and

Sundry citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester Bowles to be Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Chester Bowles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 5, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 4 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Chester Bowles, to be Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mae M. Bunyard, Lost Hills.
Harland G. Cox, South Laguna.
Berenice Wilson, Tehachapi.

INDIANA

John P. Mack, Elwood.
Pearl J. Lockhart, Fowler.

MAINE

Herman W. Crockett, North Haven.
Aubrey E. Kenney, Sebago Lake.

NEBRASKA

Joyce Hubbard, Ashby.
Claude J. Wright, Aurora.
Alma E. Rumsey, Bancroft.
Fred C. Buhk, Beemer.
Lulu M. Kennedy, Bradshaw.
Clair Grimes, Chambers.
Hjalmar A. Swanson, Clay Center.
Ferdinand S. Bogner, Crofton.
Inez G. Britt, Doniphan.
C. Arthur Scism, Edgar.
Helen W. Schneider, Elmwood.
Frances C. Rotherham, Ewing.
Jeptha D. Bishop, Gibbon.
Thomas A. Siefken, Harvard.
Charles Hynek, Humboldt.
Ray M. Guilford, Marquette.
Minnie M. Mason, Salem.
John J. Burns, Scotia.
Elta Evans, Shubert.
Eric Fredrickson, Wakefield.
William Stuart Campbell, Waterloo.
Orley E. McCallum, Wauneta.

NEW MEXICO

Melvin O. Shockey, Mountainair.

NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur E. Bean, Donnybrook.

OKLAHOMA

Louis M. Pace, Wilburton.

VIRGINIA

Joseph B. Murden, Londonbridge.
William G. Gwinn, Rich Creek.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Sovereign God of the Universe, under the canopy of Thy greatness and goodness, we gather in faith and humility, praying that we may be girded with wisdom and strength for all our duties and responsibilities.

Grant that this may be a day of unclouded vision for our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress as they courageously consecrate themselves to the tasks that challenge the investment of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

We pray that Thy special blessing and benediction may be given unto all who have gone forth to serve our country and the cause of freedom. May Thy protecting arms of love be around those whom they have left behind.

Fill our souls with a passionate longing for that glorious time when the kingdom of righteousness and peace shall be established everywhere.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 2, 1943, was read and approved.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 400) for the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, with a Senate amendment to a House amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

SEC. 8 (a) (1) following the words: "burial payments in the event of death, 6 months' pay (and allowances)"—strike out the words "and allowances."

2. SEC. 10, following the words: "Army, Navy, or Coast Guard, shall receive 6 months' pay (and allowances)"—strike out the words "and allowances."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This merely cuts out the words "and allowances."

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is all. They should never have been in there.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there any other change?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2859) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill and the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 15 inclusive.

Page 2, line 23, after "dependents", insert "and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support."

Page 2, strike out all after line 24 over to and including line 4 on page 3 and insert:

"SEC. 2. The act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy,' approved April 16, 1943 (Public Law 38, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That female physicians and surgeons appointed in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only and shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is merely restricting the activities of the WAVES overseas.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House last summer. It went to the Senate, and was passed by the Senate a few days ago. It relates to the WAVES. The Senate amendment does not permit them to go abroad. The bill as it passed the House permitted that, but the Senate amendment restricts them to duty in this country and I am asking the House to accept this Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that the only change?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The other change deals with the question of dependency. The Senate added an amendment that the children of a WAVE had to be actually dependent upon her to receive the benefits provided for dependents, and that a husband could not be dependent upon his wife who is a WAVE. Then the other amendment is that female doctors could not go outside of the country or serve on naval vessels or in combat aircraft.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the provision relating to the allowance for the wife of a soldier, where the wife is a WAVE, conflict with the allowance bill that we passed the other day?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. This relates to dependents of a WAVE, and provides that the husband of a WAVE shall not be considered a dependent. The husband of a WAVE is not dependent upon the WAVE, but the children of such a WAVE shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead, and they are in fact dependent upon their mother for their chief support.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is the gentleman certain that this does not conflict with the bill that we passed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. So far as I know, it does not conflict.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Does the restriction in respect to female doctors apply also to female nurses in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It deals only with the medical corps of the Navy.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then it applies to female nurses?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It says female physicians and surgeons. It applies only to the doctors and not to the nurses.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the nurses may go abroad?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some information received from the Budget Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESS RELEASES, MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably a privileged resolution (H. Res. 341), authorizing that the State Department press releases containing the declaration providing for the prosecution of the present war which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, together with other papers relating thereto be printed as a House document.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration providing for the prosecution of the present war to the complete subjugation of our respective enemies and for an eventual international organization for the maintenance of peace, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, by the Foreign Secretaries of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow, together with the Anglo-Soviet-American communique; the declarations regarding Italy and Austria issued by the three Foreign Secretaries at Moscow, and the declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin regarding atrocities, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASTE OF FOOD, EQUIPMENT, ETC., IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks by printing an order issued aboard one of our naval vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PHILADELPHIA ELECTIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the implausible impracticalists of the New Deal failed to fasten their foolish fantasies on Philadelphia last Tuesday.

The repudiation of outside meddling in the affairs of a city which prefers to govern itself was all the more pointed in view of the effort to save the New Deal machine ticket by a last-minute letter from the President; "too little, too late."

The only new Democratic success in more than twoscore candidacies was a councilmanic seat wrested from a soldier absent on active duty. If there is to be any rejoicing over that one lone success, the politicians who beat a soldier had better get their cheering done before the soldiers come back.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech I made to the Vermont State Grange at Burlington recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in yesterday's Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a telegram to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] signed by officials of 13 air lines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORDELL HULL AND THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the Appendix by including therein two tributes to Secretary Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BEET-SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st of October, Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, advised the people in my State that a program relative to sugar beets would be offered. Again, on October 20, a promise was made. There has been no order up to the present time. H. R. 3477, a bill now pending in this Congress, recently reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, dealing with subsidies, must be passed first. I was told this morning by two departments which I called that we could expect no answer to the sugar-beet program until this bill is disposed of one way or the other. Here we are in the planting season, beyond the planting season, and we have to wait until we dispose of this legislation before my people will know what crops they can plant.

I urge upon this House that this bill be placed before this body for consideration as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter addressed to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a table from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HARTFORD, CONN., ELECTS A REPUBLICAN MAYOR

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I reported to the House the results of the town elections in Connecticut. At that time I expressed the hope that on November 3 I would be able to report that Hartford, the capital city of Connecticut, was in the Republican column for the first time in 10 years. Today it is my pleasure to advise you that Hartford has elected Hon. William H. Mortensen as Republican mayor of Hartford, along with a Republican board of aldermen.

The Hartford election is of interest to many Members of the House because of the part played by our former colleague, Mr. Herman Kopplemann. Mr. Kopplemann urged the election of a Democratic mayor to put a smile on the face of the President the morning after the election. He even claimed that the defeat of his candidate would affect adversely the unity of the United Nations.

Compared to the returns from New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky, a local election in Hartford may seem unimportant. I trust that the smile will soon be restored to the face of the President and that his coattails can be pressed back into shape after the weight they have carried for the past few weeks; and, more important than that, that the United Nations will be able to carry on the war effort successfully, despite the fact that Hartford has a Republican mayor.

Of more than passing interest to the Members of the House is the fact that the C. I. O.'s joint action committee supported every defeated Democratic candidate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the unavoidable detention of my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD], I request that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by Mr. Wendell Willkie recently in St. Louis. The gentleman from Missouri has received word from the Public Printer that this will take two and one-half pages of the RECORD and cost $112. With this estimate of cost from the Public Printer, I renew the request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I will object, Mr. Speaker, until the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] can be here. I wish to ask him some questions about this bill. For the time being, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

WASTE OF PAPER BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand numerous complaints from school boards in Pennsylvania to the effect they are unable to get sufficient paper for the children in the public schools; yet here is an example of wastefulness in the O. P. A.: For instance, for every 100 gallons of gasoline, two sheets of paper are used for the application, and two envelopes, one for mailing the application and one for mailing the coupons. One sheet of gummed paper is used. One sheet of paper is used between two gummed sheets, one sheet on which one coupon is pasted.

Each applicant receives on an average 50 gallons of gasoline. So for every 100 gallons of gasoline sold in my county 10 sheets of paper are used and 4 envelopes. For the 26,000,000 gallons of gasoline sold in my county each year it requires 2,600,000 sheets of paper and 520,000 envelopes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOINT RATES OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS AND COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3366) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California tell us why a bill of this magnitude should be taken up by unanimous consent?

Mr. LEA. I shall be pleased to. As the freight forwarders existed before the Freight Forwarder Act was passed they commonly used joint rates with motor carriers for the delivery of their freight. The Freight Forwarders Act prohibited the use of joint rates after 18 months following the passage of the act. Because of the war situation the assembly and distribution rates provided for by the bill in lieu of joint rates have not been established generally and the present right to use joint rates expiring on the 16th of this month it is very desirable—and all the agencies concerned I think agree on it—that the time should be extended.

The bill under consideration proposes to extend the time for the use of joint rates 18 months. If this extension is not made by the 16th of November it will greatly disarrange the present practice in moving less-than-carload freight.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. LEA. It is; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "18 months" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "42 months."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (4) of the proviso contained in subsection (a) of such section 409 is amended to read as follows:

"(4) No new or additional joint rate or charge may be established under authority of this section for service from any point of origin to any point of destination with respect to any particular commodity or class of traffic unless at least one rate or charge for service from such point of origin to such point of destination with respect to such commodity or class of traffic, established by an individual freight forwarder or by a freight forwarder jointly with a common carrier by motor vehicle, is already lawfully in effect; but for purposes of this paragraph the making of a change in a joint rate or charge which has been established, or which has become effective pursuant to this section, shall not be deemed to constitute the establishment of a new or additional joint rate or charge."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "forty-two months" and insert "thirty-six months."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the Honorable Howard W. Jackson, former mayor of Baltimore, Md.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make this afternoon and to include two letters and one statement compiled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Clarion Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. POULSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

REAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the liberty-loving people of the world will take great hope in the elections that have been held in America. We have demonstrated that in the midst of a war we can hold elections, change officials, and still carry on. We have shown to the world that liberty consists not alone in choosing your own officials but in removing them as well.

I wish to make an announcement, Mr. Speaker, of a rumor that has now been confirmed. The gentlemen in the Press Gallery assure me that it is true that the Democrats carried Mississippi. The ability of some people to withstand punishment merits our admiration and we are reminded of those words of the Scripture, "How long, O Lord, how long."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial and a radio address delivered by me on November 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement by Beardsley Ruml on post-war plans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Baltimore News-Post of Tuesday, November 2, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY]?

There was no objection.

THE FALLACIES AND FALSE PROMISES OF THE NEW DEAL

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it would seem the people in all walks of life are beginning to realize in an effective fashion the fallacies and false promises of the New Deal.

They see the waste and extravagance for which they must pay in one way or another. They see rationing, regimentation, and exorbitant taxes extending indefinitely into the future after the war. They see that free labor, free enterprise, initiative, and opportunity are being destroyed. They see a giant Federal bureaucracy devouring their substance. They see labor, agriculture, and industry being placed in the same kind of political strait jacket that prevails among the dictatorships of Europe.

With the illusory promise of the "four freedoms" for the whole world, our people see that their own basic freedom, the right of every person to keep what he produces, is being destroyed.

They see the administration giving the United States away to foreign countries. In the name of international cooperation and everlasting peace they see the promotion of foreign schemes to bleed the United States.

JOHN L. LEWIS AND THE UNITED MINE WORKERS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, appeasement which many of us had supposed died with 3,000 American boys at Pearl Harbor, marches on as the official policy of the Government of the United States today. John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers have been responsible for the loss of more needed steel and other supplies since Pearl Harbor than was the treacherous Japanese attack, and the delays in delivery of supplies growing out of the recurrent coal strikes have probably resulted in the loss of more American lives than were lost on December 7, 1941. We are properly fighting Japan to the death, but we are rewarding John L. Lewis with a wage increase which the War Labor Board held just a few days ago to be unreasonable and inflationary.

From this day forward, let no apologist for subsidies tell this House that fair prices for farm products would be inflationary until they explain this blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, I have never condoned any appeasement policy at home or abroad. Particularly do I resent the practice of paying tribute to any hijacker who holds a gun at our industrial heart in time of war. I have no criticism of paying coal miners a fair wage. I think coal miners, farmers, white-collar workers, all should receive a fair income, but I do not think that any group should be allowed to get an increase in income by tying up our war effort. These coal miners have exhibited a callous disregard for the welfare of the Nation. They are today being rewarded for their unpatriotic acts. Let it be remembered that this is being done without the consent of Congress. Let it also be remembered that it is in behalf of the very beneficiaries of this ill-gotten gain that we are now told that the farmer should not be allowed to receive a fair price in the market place for his products. Is it not in behalf of this group that we are told that we must sell War bonds in order to pay subsidies to reduce the cost of food? Mr. Speaker, no nation can long endure if it deals unfairly with the masses of its people in order to bestow special favors on well-organized minorities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make today and include therein certain extracts from committee hearings and a Senate committee report, certain data furnished by agencies covered by the deficiency bill,

a survey sponsored by the Office of War Information, and certain newspaper comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 822), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to file a minority report and that it be printed with the majority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3598; and pending that motion, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if we cannot reach an agreement on time for general debate?

Mr. TABER. I feel that this is quite an important bill and that we should have at least all day to debate it. If we have all day today to debate it, we might be able to complete the reading of it tomorrow, in view of the fact that the House is to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the day, that the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises today, and that general debate be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WILSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the chairman of the committee explain why a supply of copies of this bill is not available to the Members during this debate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The usual provisions have been made to supply Members with copies of the bill. The gentleman can secure copies at the desk.

Mr. WILSON. I have just been informed that only two or three copies are available for the Members, and we have not been able to obtain copies of this bill until today and have not had a chance to study it and the appropriations and the validity of the appropriations. Therefore, I am inclined to object to the request of the gentleman until copies of the bill are made available for the Members of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman withhold that objection?

Mr. WILSON. I will withhold it for the time being, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in my objection a while ago to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] inserting Wendell Willkie's political propaganda, or campaign oratory, in the RECORD at Government expense, in the name of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD], I was not trying to be capricious.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] is not here, and he and the gentleman from New Jersey being the only two remaining Willkie advocates in the House, I thought they should both be present to join in the request, while the Willkie political obsequies are being held as a result of his being put out of the running for the Republican nomination for President day before yesterday, when Governor Dewey stepped out in front and took the flag away from him.

I do not object to putting material in the RECORD that is of vital interest to the American people, but to put in the RECORD a campaign speech of Wendell L. Willkie at the expense of the Federal Government, as announced by the gentleman from New Jersey, is something else; and I want both of his supporters in the House to be here and take responsibility for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WILSON. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4598, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me to make a preliminary statement, I shall then be glad to yield.

Mr. WILSON. How does the gentleman account for the fact that we have no minority report?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has declined to yield until he makes a preliminary statement.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

Andrews	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.
Barry	Leonard W.	O'Connor
Bates, Ky.	Halleck	O'Leary
Bates, Mass.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Neal
Bolton	Hart	O'Toole
Boren	Hartley	Outland
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Brehm	Hendricks	Pracht
Brooks	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hoeven	Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Holifield	Robsion, Ky.
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Calif.
Case	Izac	Russell
Celler	Jackson	Sabath
Chapman	Jennings	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Johnson,	Schuetz
Costello	Calvin D.	Schwabe
Courtney	Johnson,	Sheridan
Crawford	J. Leroy	Short
Cullen	Jones	Sikes
Davis	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Dawson	Kee	Slaughter
Dewey	Keefe	Smith, Maine
Dies	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Dingell	Kennedy	Smith, W. Va.
Doughton	Kerr	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas	Kilburn	Spence
Durham	Kirwan	Starnes, Ala.
Elston, Ohio	LeFevre	Stcagall
Fay	Luce	Stewart
Feighan	McGranery	Sumner, Ill.
Fernandez	McGregor	Sumners, Tex.
Fish	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Fitzpatrick	McLean	Taylor
Flannagan	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Fogarty	Maas	Treadway
Folger	Madden	Troutman
Fulmer	Marcantonio	Vincent, Ky.
Furlong	Martin, Iowa	Voorhis, Calif.
Gale	May	Vorys, Ohio
Gallagher	Merritt	Wadsworth
Gearhart	Miller, Mo.	Weiss
Gerlach	Monroney	Wene
Gifford	Morrison, La.	West
Gillie	Mott	White
Gore	Mruk	Winstead
Graham	Myers	Wolverton, N. J.
Green	Newsome	
Gregory	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3598, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 285 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman from Indiana will permit me to complete my statement. I shall then be glad to yield to any Member of the House.

Mr. WILSON. Then the gentleman refuses to yield at this time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I have concluded my statement.

Mr. WILSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against further consideration of the bill on the ground that it has not been printed and presented to the House, and that the majority hearings have not been printed and presented to the House 24 hours ahead of the time when the bill is called up. Further, the minority views have not been printed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The House has already committed the bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and the bill is now properly before the Committee for its consideration. The point of order does not lie at this time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-seven Members present—a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee presents today the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, for 1944. The bill marks a milestone in the history of congressional appropriations in that it reduces the estimates on which the bill is predicated by 82 percent, the most drastic reduction that has ever been made in any general appropriation bill in the history of the committee or of the House. This reduction is in keeping with the policy of drastic reduction and rigid economy which the committee has followed since the beginning of the war. Before the summer recess in this session, Budget estimates were reduced by $1,395,000,000. In this bill we make a record in reduction below the Budget estimates never made before in the history of this or any other parliamentary body in the history of the world. Credit for this is due both the majority and the minority members of the committee who have been largely in agreement on all appropriation bills reported since the beginning of the war. It is only here and there that there has been some difference of opinion on isolated items—and that is true of this bill. All members of the committee on both sides of the table are in complete accord on the provisions of this bill with the exception of one or two items.

The bill is unusual in another respect. The committee submits in reporting the bill the most voluminous and comprehensive report ever submitted within my knowledge.

Of all the innumerable reports prepared by the clerk of the committee, Mr. Marc Sheild—and they are legion—this is not only the longest, but may well be considered his masterpiece. Mr. Sheild came to the service of the committee in 1908. He has been with the committee something over 35 years. He has served for more than one-third of a century, for more than a generation—has served "sans peur et sans reproche"—without fear and without reproach. I believe I can say considerately that Marc Sheild knows more about Government budgets than any other living man. In my opinion he knows more about parliamentary budgets and procedure in their consideration than any man who has ever served the Congress in any capacity. I trust the Members will read the report with care. I am certain they will read it with interest. It is in effect, a textbook, not only on this bill, but on the war effort generally. I am glad to have this opportunity to express for the committee our appreciation of Mr. Sheild, one of the keymen of the Government. His comprehensive knowledge of appropriation affairs is exceeded only by his indefatigable industry.

The committee reports this bill, in consonance with its considered policy of submitting one bill between the adjournment for the summer recess and the opening of the second session of the Congress. It is not the intention of the committee to submit another general bill until the second session. That means that no further bill of this character can become a law prior to the approximate period from March 1 to March 15.

If other estimates require consideration, and are of sufficient importance, they will be considered in separate bills.

Already we have an estimate of this character pending in the committee; an estimate for an appropriation of $35,000,000 and unexpended balances, for farm labor supply, which the committee expects to bring out as a separate resolution before the holidays.

This bill has been a very difficult bill. The committee has had it under consideration for 6 weeks. Four weeks we have conducted continuous hearings on the departmental estimates. Much of the testimony has necessarily been off the record, but we submit to you a well considered, carefully prepared bill, dealing almost entirely with the war effort. Ninety-eight and one-half percent of the funds dealt with in this bill are directly connected with and directly in promotion of the war program. Only 1½ percent are nonwar items, and even some of them, on a strict interpretation, have an indirect connection with the prosecution of the war.

I will take up the salient items in the order in which they appear in the bill. The Office of War Information receives the full Budget estimate of $5,000,000. This money is to be used only in connection with actual or projected military operations. It is to be expended on the other side of the water in the immediate theater of the war. Its importance can hardly be overemphasized. From the earliest time military textbooks have recognized the importance of the psychological phase of warfare, the value of the use of propaganda to encourage friends and discourage enemies, as it has always been recognized as one of the vital agencies of warfare, as essential as gunpowder. And in this war, it is the undisputed and emphatic testimony of the commanders directly in charge of the war front that the use of funds for such purposes has brought about the surrender of the enemy, who otherwise would have had to have been dislodged at a heavy wastage of life and matériel and after long and critical delay. The expenditure of funds for this purpose has saved American lives and brought the war that much nearer to an early and successful conclusion.

Our forces have won notable victories in this war. There is no campaign in the history of the Republic in which, handicapped by such lack of preparation, taken so completely by surprise, American arms have won so consistently and so continuously as in this war—and against three of the greatest military powers of the earth. The striking feature of the war is that there have been no great debacles; no disastrous catastrophes; no instances in which we have suffered a material defeat or sustained the loss of large troop units. Never has a war been prosecuted with such credit and with such consistent success on every war front.

But the war is not over.

We are now at the crisis. And if the enemy maintains morale, the heaviest losses are yet ahead. If there ever was a time when we should employ every resource at our command that time is now. For us to deny funds for so effective a weapon at this time would be equivalent to denying planes or tanks or any other tested agency of warfare.

Hitler has, if his plans are not interfered with, a potential plan under which he is in position to swing 80 divisions against our Italian front. Eighty divisions of crack troops, well-equipped veterans—the finest fighting force that the world has ever seen. We must meet them with fewer men and at the disadvantage of having recently taken our position and of being thousands of miles from our base. Under such circumstances, who would deny the men at the front a weapon which our commanders have agreed unanimously has already brought in the entire Italian Fleet without firing a gun, the surrender of German and Italian units in Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy, and saved, according to this testimony, the lives of thousands of American soldiers, sailors, and marines? It is unthinkable.

In addition, we have positive assurance that a new front will be opened in the near future. That drive must be preceded by extensive propaganda. The way must be cleared. Friends in occupied territory must be notified and encouraged. The enemy must be apprised of the peril of their situation, and every effort made to prevail upon them to yield without the bloodshed and carnage of war.

This $5,000,000 is but a drop in the bucket as compared with the other vast expenditures of war, and yet is calculated, under assurances given to the committee by the military authorities, fresh from the field of battle, to secure

results which cannot be effected by divisions of troops and fleets of ships.

We also recommend an appropriation here for the War Manpower Commission. Manpower is one of the serious problems of the war. Armed forces are estimated to require 2,000,000 more men in this fiscal year; war munition industries another 2,000,000 men, or a total of 4,000,000. We estimate we will be able to get 2,600,000 of those from other nonagricultural industries, leaving a shortage of 1,400,000 which must be made up. The proposition to appropriate this money is to make that additional manpower available.

The net addition of this number of workers is slightly in excess of the net addition formerly estimated. The serious problems with respect to manpower, however, in addition to securing additional workers, is the proper distribution of that manpower, the proper referral to the critical industries needing it, the problem of keeping manpower already employed in essential industry from leaving that employment for less essential employment, and the greatest of all difficulties—that of intensive utilization of manpower already employed to avoid waste both in human labor and in the cost of munitions for the Government. This latter problem the committee regards as the most important and necessitous situation facing the Commission and the various committees and agencies cooperating with it.

The Commission has cataloged 72 labor market areas in the United States as critical from the standpoint of acute shortage of workers compared with 31 such areas 9 months ago. Typical critical situations outlined to the committee by Chairman McNutt comprise a need on the west coast within the next 6 months of almost a half million workers to meet the needs of industry and the armed forces, of which 200,000 are estimated to be necessary to be brought in from other parts of the country, 65,000 workers estimated for this month in Detroit, 15,500 in Baltimore, and 29,000 in Buffalo. These are cited as typical examples of the situations occurring in lesser degree in the 72 critical areas.

Maximum utilization of existing manpower resources in existing war plants is receiving the attention of the Commission. The additional funds provided by the bill will contribute materially to enable it to intensify its efforts in assisting industries to make the best use of labor already employed before additional forces are supplied.

We provide for the War Shipping Administration to use $2,350,000 more for administration. The War Shipping Administration operates and repairs practically all of the American merchant tonnage and also supplies repairs for lend-lease tonnage of Allied nations which make our ports. Under the present system we have very little control over the repair contractors, because no one can tell until they get upon the ship and complete the job, what the repair cost is going to be. The annual repair bill of this tonnage, including alterations, reconditioning, and war damage, is approximately $500,000,000. Approximately 550 vessels are in a repair status each week. The work is performed in some 83 major repair yards in the United States and much of it is rush work the extent of which is often indeterminate until damages have been ascertained. Repairs are made under a master agreement which is jointly used by the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. The agreement is not much more than a schedule of rates and charges to be paid by these agencies, based upon their audits of contractors' costs for other jobs, and officials admit that cost of Government repair jobs on ships under war conditions is at the mercy of the contractors except for provisions to exercise the right of recapture of excess profits, renegotiation, and change of rates based upon determination of costs of similar jobs by the same yard.

The War Shipping Administration has proposed the recruitment and training of a force of examiners to be stationed on each vessel under repair to check material and labor costs while the jobs are under way. Such a force contemplated two men for each ship during the period of repair, based on some 550 ships constantly under repair, allowing for extra shifts, leaves of absence, and so forth, a total of more than 5,000 such examiners at a cost of $4,950,000 for this fiscal year and $12,500,000 for a full year.

The committee is much impressed with the savings estimated to result from the establishment of such a procedure, placed by Vice Chairman Douglas at $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 a year. The program of recruitment and training of such a large force with the fiscal year so well advanced seemed to the committee impossible of accomplishment and upon restudy and revision of the plan, provision has been made for salaries and expenses of a force of 1,500, at a cost of $2,350,000 for this year. Some personnel has already been recruited and trained and is at work and has shown results.

The matter of Federal personnel is a matter of particular interest because at this time we hear constant allegations that the departments are overstaffed and that there is excessive Government employment. The peak of civil service employment reached 3,300,000 last June. There was a net decrease of 24,223 in July and the War Department in August reduced approximately 145,000. There will have to be increases on account of some war activities and there will be reductions in others. The Commission is now estimating that the employment will stabilize at an average of 3,200,000 for the fiscal year, which, if realized, means that with employment at the beginning of the year at around 3,300,000 it must reduce to below 3,200,000 before the end of the year to attain that average.

The committee has examined personnel requirements in connection with this bill and has eliminated wherever possible and shortened the period of employment in other cases.

The Lanham Act authorized appropriations for national war housing to the extent of $1,500,000,000. We have already made appropriations of $1,300,000,000. The proposition submitted for this bill was to provide the other $200,000,000. The committee, assailed by charges of overbuilding, thought best to hold the appropriation down to $50,000,000, which, with the $10,000,000 unexpended balance, would provide $60,000,000, with assurances that at any time additional funds were shown to be immediately necessary, consideration would be given to estimates for any additional amounts which might be needed.

Under the item for the Veterans' Administration we had requests for additional bed capacity for 3,950 neuropsychiatric patients from both wars, the last war and this war. We allowed the full amount of $10,356,000 because the load is very heavy and is increasing and undoubtedly will continue to increase, and additional facilities must be provided from time to time. Patients admitted to veterans' hospitals as veterans of World War No. 2 already total 7,149, and the number is increasing rapidly, a total of 1,476 coming from the armed forces in the month of July. A classification of the total of 7,149 by months commencing in March 1942, and divided between neuropsychiatric, tubercular, and general cases, is listed on page 69 of the hearing. These data are cumulative to the end of last August and show that 1,550, or 22 percent, are tubercular cases, 1,945, or 27 percent, are general cases, and 3,650, or 51 percent, are neuropsychiatric cases.

It is evident that additional construction will be required from time to time for hospitalization of World War No. 2 veterans. The expanding load of veterans of both wars is being given continuous study by the Federal Board for Hospitalization with a view to future construction, having in mind the many beds in service hospitals which may be surplus to the needs of those agencies at the conclusion of the war and bearing in mind the fact that certain of those recently constructed facilities are being designed for post-war use by the Veterans' Administration.

An estimate for the Farm Security Administration was submitted providing appropriations for both administration and loans. Consideration of the estimate was complicated by the fact that there had been some controversy over a similar item in the regular supply bill last spring. It will be recalled that at that time this committee collided wholly unintentionally with other committees of the House which objected to our exercising jurisdiction and making appropriations without authorizations of law. Unfortunately there is no law authorizing appropriations for Farm Security, but in view of the fact that the committee had been accustomed to bringing in appropriations for this purpose every year in the regular agricultural appropriation bill or relief bill, the committee, in conformity with the custom followed ever since the Farm Security Administration has been established, brought in an appropriation for that purpose in the

regular supply bill. As usual, we went before the Committee on Rules to ask for a rule to permit its consideration, but other committees of the House appeared before the Committee on Rules in opposition and objected to the rule's being granted. It was not granted, and, of course, and over the protest of the Committee on Appropriations, the item went out on a point of order. We had taken for granted that in the meantime authorization would be provided, but when the estimate came in this time we found ourselves in exactly the same position without legislative authorization to report the appropriation.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that for the past week I have been trying to get a copy of this bill or to find out something in regard to what was in the bill, but have been unable to do so or to get any idea of any appropriation in the bill before 12 o'clock today in order to study the appropriations asked for, and in view of the fact that bills were not made available for Members of the House even at 12 o'clock today, yet this committee is coming in here asking for a great deal of money, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 152]

Andrews	Gearhart	Marcantonio
Baldwin, Md.	Gerlach	Martin, Iowa
Barrett	Gifford	Merritt
Barry	Gillie	Miller, Mo.
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Monroney
Bates, Mass.	Graham	Morrison, La.
Bolton	Granger	Mott
Bonner	Green	Mruk
Boren	Gregory	Myers
Bradley, Pa.	Griffiths	Newsome
Brehm	Hall,	Norton
Brooks	Leonard W.	O'Brien, Ill.
Buckley	Halleck	O'Brien, Mich.
Burgin	Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Butler	Hartley	O'Connor
Byrne	Heffernan	O'Konski
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	O'Leary
Case	Hess	O'Neal
Celler	Hoeven	O'Toole
Chapman	Holifield	Outland
Chenoweth	Holmes, Mass.	Peterson, Ga.
Chiperfield	Izak	Philbin
Compton	Jackson	Plumley
Costello	Jennings	Pracht
Crawford	Johnson,	Rees, Kans.
Cullen	J. Leroy	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson	Jones	Rogers, Calif.
Dies	Kean	Sabath
Dingell	Kee	Scanlon
Doughton	Keefe	Schuetz
Douglas	Kefauver	Schwabe
Durham	Kelley	Sheridan
Elston, Ohio	Kerr	Short
Fay	Kilburn	Sikes
Feighan	King	Simpson, Pa.
Fernandez	Klein	Slaughter
Fish	LaFollette	Smith, Me.
Fitzpatrick	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Flannagan	McGranery	Smith, W. Va.
Fogarty	McGregor	Somers, N. Y.
Folger	McKenzie	Spence
Ford	McLean	Starnes, Ala.
Furlong	McMurray	Steagall
Gale	Maas	Sundstrom
Gallagher	Madden	Thomas, N. J.
Treadway	Wadsworth	Willey
Troutman	Weiss	Winstead
Vincent, Ky.	Wene	Wolverton, N. J.
Vorys, Ohio	West	Zimmerman

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3598, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 285 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Public Debt has a heavy burden. The amounts recommended comprise $1,300,000 for salaries and expenses, $45,000 for printing and binding, and $48,100,000 under the permanent appropriation "Expenses of loans," totaling $49,445,000. The items should all be considered as a group as their application relates to the same problem, namely, preparing, issuing, selling, redeeming, and otherwise servicing the entire public-debt operation of the Government. The original allowance for this service for the fiscal year 1944 was based upon estimates of appropriations formulated in the latter part of the calendar year 1942. The 1944 appropriation on that basis is $57,600,000. It was predicated upon the sale of 147,600,000 pieces of bonds and the redemption of 20,800,000 pieces. The revised estimate of 1944 business is based upon the issuance of 490,000,000 pieces and the redemption of 60,000,000. This enormous quantity will more than double the business of 1943 for which the expenses of loans appropriation required $68,000,000 for the issuance of 227,300,000 pieces sold and 26,200,000 pieces redeemed. The public bond sales for the present fiscal year are estimated at $45,000,000,000.

All of the money for the public debt service, with the exception of $5,800,000, was asked for printing, handling, issuing, redeeming, and otherwise servicing the debt. The $5,800,000 was for the War Finance Division, which is engaged in the promotion of bond sales through the paid and volunteer War Savings Staff. There has been previously allocated to the War Savings Division a total of $8,690,718 and the addition of $5,800,000 would bring the amount for the entire year to $14,490,718. While this appears to be a large sum, it should be considered in the light of the projected sale of approximately $45,000,000,000 in this fiscal year. Of this amount there has already been sold approximately $19,000,000,000 and additional drives are contemplated in January and June. The personnel of the War Finance Division in the Department and in the State organizations as recruited for the Second Bond drive totaled 1,890 full-time regular personnel, 842 temporary employees, 717 serving on a per diem or "when actually employed" basis, and 1,535 on a $1-a-year basis. This force is directing the effort and being supplemented by a volunteer organization of some 5,000,000 people.

A large amount of free service is donated in addition to that of volunteers. Free advertising by radio, newspapers, magazines, outdoor advertising, and car-card space has aggregated more than $200,000,000 in value since May 1, 1941.

Another agency that is carrying a heavy burden and a rapidly accelerating program is the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Current Tax Payment Act which was passed here a few months ago has increased its work very greatly. The main feature of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 changed the method of collection of income taxes by providing withholding at the source and the placing of income taxpayers on a current basis of paying such taxes instead of the former procedure of paying the tax in the year following that in which the income was earned and the tax liability incurred. The change has proven generally satisfactory to the public. It has, however, placed a much greater burden upon the tax collection organization, particularly during the transition period requiring the inauguration of new methods and the recruitment and training of new personnel. An enormous volume of returns and other documents have to be handled by the Bureau, particularly those involved in the returns by withholding agents—employers withholding tax from employees' pay—and the estimated returns required to be filed by taxpayers in the year of current income in advance of the regular return required to be filed in the year following.

Some idea of this volume of paper work and accounting can be gained from a comparison of tax returns for the years 1942 and 1943. During the fiscal year 1943, 57,300,000 tax returns and statements were received by collectors of internal revenue. During the fiscal year 1944—July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944; the withholding tax became effective July 1, 1943—the estimated returns are 111,500,000, divided approximately as follows:

Ninety-four million five hundred thousand income-tax returns, consisting of 54,500,000 income-tax returns; 30,000,000 estimated returns and declarations; 10,000,000 returns from employers withholding taxes from employees for the Government—quarterly returns from 2,500,000 employers; 9,500,000 employment-tax returns; 5,250,000 miscellaneous-tax returns; 1,500,000 special-tax returns.

The amount estimated to be withheld in the current fiscal year under the withholding tax is approximately $7,000,000,000 and on a full-year basis approximately $8,500,000,000. The cash collections are paid to the Government monthly, returns of collections are made quarterly, and annually the employer must furnish the Government and each employee from whom tax has been withheld—approximately 51,000,000—a statement of the amount of tax so withheld from each person.

Another feature of the new method of collection is that involved in making of

refunds. Under the law persons overpaying taxes either by paying them on the estimated basis in advance or through the withholding method are entitled to have any excess payment, as divulged by the final return, refunded. The Bureau estimates that approximately $400,000,000 will need to be refunded to about 16,000,000 individuals. The average of these refunds, it will be noted, is $25 and while the sums seem small it is important to every taxpayer who will expect a prompt return of the amount due.

The only other item which might be of interest is that for the Navy Department for supplementing the naval stock fund.

The naval stock fund is a working fund for the procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment in the main common to two or more bureaus of the Navy. Until recently it included materials and equipment in connection with shipbuilding operations, but these have now been excluded. The procedure involved consists in procurement of required supplies and equipment from the stock fund and carrying it as inventory in the naval stock account until drawn by the using bureau, and then reimbursing the fund by transfer from bureau appropriations. The extensive increase in the number of naval units, both vessels and stations, has required very heavy inventory, so that material and equipment would be available for use when and where needed. The necessity for additional funds at this time arises from the fact that there was disclosed a bookkeeping deficit as of last May, the last evaluation date, of approximately $553,000,000. The new amount in the bill will eliminate the deficit and provide additional working capital of approximately $200,000,000. Reimbursement from bureaus is a slow process, approximately $400,000,000 being normally in transit between bureau funds and the stock fund. No loss has been incurred as might be indicated by the deficiency. Procurements have been made by drawing funds under the Navy's general account of advances and their value is included in the naval stock fund as inventory. The committee has approved a provision in the Budget estimate, concurred in by the Navy Department, to limit the value of the stock in inventory and the outstanding unpaid procurement obligations to a total of $2,250,000,000 after June 30, 1944. This provision is designed to prevent accumulation of excess inventory and should have a salutary effect in that direction if it can be administered effectively.

The request of $750,000,000 in direct appropriation for addition to the naval stock fund is met by eliminating the direct appropriation and substituting therefor a like amount by transfer from the appropriation "Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, 1944." The effect of this transfer is to reduce the obligating authority of the Navy under one appropriation and increase it under another without any net increase in the drain on the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Navy has advised the committee that a surplus exists in ordnance appropriations due to changes in procurement and savings since the original appropriations were programmed earlier in the calendar year, and that this transfer can be made and still leave the Bureau of Ordnance adequate funds to meet present and anticipated requirements during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion recently in the newspapers, over the radio, and elsewhere, about the expenditures for this fiscal year. The Budget which came in last January placed expenditures for this fiscal year, that is, cash withdrawals from the Treasury, in the fiscal year ending June 30 next, at a total of $104,000,000,000, ninety-seven billion of which was estimated for war activities, $3,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt, and four billion for other activities of Government denominated "nonwar." These expenditure estimates were reviewed again in July of this year and on August 1 the President issued a summation of the 1944 Budget and the total of one hundred and four billion, with some minor changes in categories, was reaffirmed as an estimate with the ninety-seven billion for war activities standing without change.

This $97,000,000,000 total is in five items:

War Department	$62,000,000,000
Navy Department	24,000,000,000
Maritime Commission	4,300,000,000
War Shipping Administration	1,900,000,000
All other	4,800,000,000

Discussion of these estimated expenditures, recently, indicate that some feel that they can be cut down. I can find no one in authority now who will say that this $97,000,000,000 of war expenditures will not be attained in this fiscal year. The year is only one-third gone, 4 months have elapsed, 8 remain. It is true that our expenditures in these first 4 months for war activities have totaled approximately $28,000,000,000 or an average of $7,000,000,000 per month. It is also true that our production is rising, our armed forces are increasing, and the battle areas are enlarging and intensifying. It is my opinion that the expenditure rate per month will rise on the basis of normal expectancy if no adverse factors are encountered in connection with our plans. It might turn out at the end of the year to be $5,000,000,000 or even $10,000,000,000 less than the $97,000,000,000. I would incline to the belief that it would be less than the estimate rather than more. Granting that it might be $10,000,000,000 less than the $97,000,000,000 estimate, I would say that a miraculous job of estimating expenditures had been done. The $97,000,000,000 figure was first published in January 1943. It was based upon data that were long in assembly before that time late in 1942. The $97,000,000,000 is for a spending period which began July 1, 1943, and ends June 30, 1944. The period over which the estimate stretches, therefore, is 18 months or more from the date of the projection of the estimate until the time of withdrawal from the Treasury of the last dollar under that estimate. Never before in history has such a projection been made of spending for such a vast enterprise, for so long a period, and on such an extensive scale. If the estimate should prove too high when the year ends it will, in my opinion, not be more than 5 to 10 percent too high. A variance of even as much as 10 percent under the circumstances would be truly remarkable and the fact that it is on the "long" side instead of on the "short" side is likewise satisfactory. It is proving to be a most unusual "looking" into the future so far as predictions of war spending are concerned. If the war continues and if our pace is maintained, the forecast may prove to be better than is now indicated. In any event great credit is due to everyone who had a part in making it.

We also hear comment that the Army and Navy have excess funds, that they cannot use what they have, and that we have overappropriated. The committee has heard these assertions. The fiscal year is still new, the war grows in its fury, and programs and plans of military and naval authorities have to be shifted from time to time to meet the action in the war theaters. Those changes require shifts in production oftentimes that must be speedily made. The committee is mindful of this situation. It has recently instituted a study of Army and Navy funds, obligations, and programing. That survey will be conducted by the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative SNYDER, in relation to Army funds, and by the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California, Representative SHEPPARD, with respect to naval funds. Those subcommittees will obtain the facts, check the situations, and programs, and I think we can rest assured that departmental cooperation and advice will make the survey a helpful one all around. One thing can be certain—the committee and Congress do not want to interfere with or impede any necessary project or expenditure deemed by the military and naval authorities as essential for their conduct of the war. I believe clarity and mutual helpfulness will come from these studies.

War and Navy funds may indicate unobligated balances at this time. Only one-third of the fiscal year is gone, and obligations and commitments are being made every day. The funds are for the entire year and will continue to be obligated every day from now until next June 30. The committee is going to ascertain the facts, keep in touch with the situation, and if action is justified, not prejudicial to the war effort, the committee will consider it.

In this connection, I wish to submit to the Committee a tabulation of Federal expenditures and the trend in Federal expenditures since the fiscal year 1939, from 1939 down to 1944, estimating the total 1944 expenditures at this time. The Bureau of the Budget has prepared a graph, copies of which are available at the bill table. Members may obtain copies there. The chart cannot go in the RECORD, but I will insert the following table, which gives the data in tabular form:

Federal "war" and "nonwar" expenditures (excluding Government corporations and trust accounts) for fiscal years 1939–44

[In millions]

Classification	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943 [1]	1944 [2]
War activities	$1,230.7	$1,710.4	$6,301.0	$26,011.1	$72,108.9	$97,000.0
Interest on the public debt	940.5	1,040.9	1,110.7	1,260.1	1,808.2	2,700.0
OTHER ACTIVITIES ("NONWAR")						
RELATIVELY FIXED COMMITMENTS						
Refunds of customs and internal revenue	67.9	91.1	89.6	94.4	79.1	261.2
Veterans' pensions and insurance	457.0	449.5	459.3	448.0	487.6	764.2
Social security and highway grants:						
Social security grants	324.8	359.5	418.5	471.2	470.4	487.3
Highway grants	160.0	153.3	165.9	149.1	82.8	69.0
Total, social security and highway grants	484.8	512.8	584.4	620.3	553.2	526.3
Other fixed commitments:						
Railroad retirement—payment to trust account	107.1	120.7	124.4	140.8	214.8	262.7
Government employees' retirement funds—United States' share	75.1	87.2	92.7	102.9	107.3	177.3
Permanent appropriations:						
Customs earmarked to encourage agricultural consumption and export (sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935)	210.5	73.0	93.8	85.2	92.5	84.0
Other permanent appropriations	28.9	33.7	42.8	52.5	78.5	95.4
Miscellaneous grants and contributions	110.2	95.5	106.6	96.5	103.3	106.2
Total other fixed commitments	531.8	410.1	460.3	477.9	596.4	725.6
Total relatively fixed commitments	1,541.5	1,463.5	1,593.6	1,640.6	1,716.3	2,377.3
RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE ITEMS						
Work relief and aids to youth:						
Work relief	2,612.5	1,861.4	1,438.2	937.3	317.8	21.9
Aids to youth	368.5	377.8	347.3	250.5	17.9	----------
Total work relief and aids to youth	2,981.0	2,239.2	1,785.5	1,187.8	335.7	21.9
Aids to agriculture (excluding fixed commitments):						
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	477.9	605.1	465.1	473.7	458.1	395.3
Parity payments	----------	215.0	183.9	191.0	202.7	156.0
Other aids to agriculture	252.4	398.7	[3] −84.8	267.5	203.5	93.1
Total aids to agriculture	730.3	1,218.8	564.2	932.2	864.3	644.1
General public works (excluding highway grants):						
Rivers and harbor work and flood control	146.4	161.9	165.5	153.0	150.3	129.2
T. V. A., Bonneville, and Reclamation	90.4	130.1	146.6	239.6	188.6	137.2
Other public works	85.7	95.5	95.0	78.0	54.4	31.4
Total, general public works	322.5	387.5	407.1	470.6	393.3	297.8
Departments and establishments (not included above):						
Legislative establishment	22.0	23.1	24.2	27.3	26.7	28.3
The Judiciary	9.4	11.0	11.4	11.5	12.0	12.1
Executive Office of the President	2.4	2.7	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.1
Independent establishments	264.2	256.0	249.1	278.5	305.1	331.7
District of Columbia—United States share	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Cabinet departments:						
Department of Agriculture	180.2	176.6	185.5	126.5	118.0	140.6
Department of Commerce	51.4	69.9	71.5	57.6	61.8	56.1
Department of the Interior	127.9	82.4	70.3	63.7	55.9	58.7
Department of Justice	46.9	52.6	56.7	64.0	63.2	64.0
Department of Labor	6.0	9.9	12.6	11.5	10.8	9.1
Department of State	16.8	21.8	20.4	26.3	32.0	29.6
Treasury Department	109.4	108.3	129.2	134.2	178.9	177.3
War Department—nonmilitary functions	59.4	75.6	78.6	67.1	70.6	79.1
Post Office Department—deficiency	39.6	42.0	30.1	17.7	8.6	----------
Total Cabinet departments	637.6	639.1	654.9	568.6	599.8	614.5
Total departments and establishments	940.6	937.9	948.5	894.2	952.2	994.7
Total relatively controllable items	4,974.4	4,783.4	3,705.3	3,484.8	2,545.5	1,958.5
Total "nonwar" expenditures	6,515.9	6,246.9	5,298.9	5,125.4	4,261.8	4,335.8
Grand total expenditures	8,707.1	8,998.2	12,710.6	32,396.6	78,178.9	104,035.8

[1] Preliminary, subject to minor final adjustments.
[2] Estimated, Aug. 1, 1943.
[3] A minus item due to return of $315,000,000 of surplus funds by Government corporations.

The chart and the accompanying tabulation deal only with expenditures of the general and special accounts of the Federal Government in the fiscal years 1939–44; the figures exclude operations of Government corporations and expenditures of trust funds. The table covers all three broad categories of Federal expenditure—two of them, war activities and interest, in summary annual totals, and the third, other activities—nonwar—in some detail. The chart portrays only the nonwar part of the table.

WAR ACTIVITIES AND INTEREST ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

The first line of the table shows the violent recent upswing of war expenditures to $97,000,000,000 estimated for the current year. This total omits Government corporation net outlays estimated at $3,000,000,000. The war expenditures are restricted to items labeled "national defense" or "war activities" in the statutory appropriation language or obviously made for such purposes. The expenditures of almost every Federal agency are divided between "war" and "nonwar."

The second line of the table shows interest payments, which have risen from around $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1939 and 1940 to $2,700,000,000 estimated for this year. This great increase, of course, reflects the huge volume of war financing since Pearl Harbor, but interest payments have not gone up as rapidly as the debt. The average interest cost on new borrowing is now less than 2 percent; the net cost is even lower because income from new issues is fully taxable.

OTHER ACTIVITIES, NONWAR

The remainder of the table presents all other expenditures in some detail. As the President has indicated on several occasions, this residue is improperly called nonwar expenditures, since all activities of the Federal Government have been reoriented to the war effort. The so-called nonwar expenditures include many items directly associated with the war program, but so closely identified with regular peacetime activities that any detailed segregation would arouse endless debate over the formula for making the separation. Hence, the adjective "nonwar" is consistently shown in quotation marks.

TOTAL NONWAR EXPENDITURES

The top line of the chart shows the steady decline in total nonwar expenditures. Since the fiscal year 1939 they have dropped from $6,500,000,000 to $4,300,000,000, or 33 percent. The 1939 total was a peak, although it had been exceeded in 1936, when there were heavy adjusted-compensation payments to war veterans.

The slight rise in the current year does not mean that the economy wave has ended. The increase is occasioned entirely by much heavier tax refunds on account of tax overpayments under the current Tax Payment Act and the Revenue Act of 1942. Such refunds are treated as an expenditure item, but could just as logically be deducted from revenues. If they were, the first dotted line would be the topmost line of this chart, and it would be clear that the downward trend continues in 1944.

Not only has the total of nonwar expenditures gone down substantially, but an increasing part of the remainder is actually directed to war work or occasioned by war activities. The so-called nonwar expenditures this year include very nearly a billion dollars for a few major items closely and obviously related to the war. These are enumerated later.

RELATIVELY FIXED COMMITMENTS

The reduction in the nonwar total has been achieved in spite of a large and growing volume of expenditure for relatively fixed prior commitments, that is, for items which are not subject to substantial reduction through current administrative control or even through Congressional action on appropriations. The payments are made according to fixed statutory formula or contractual arrangements, or their change would otherwise require substantive legislation and revision of moral, if not legal, obligations.

These fixed commitments, plotted in the upper portions of the chart,

amounted to $1,500,000,000 in 1939. Factors such as this year's sharp advances in payments for veterans and for tax refunds have pushed them upward to a total approaching $2,400,000,000. The fixed items made up less than a fourth of all the nonwar expenditures in 1939. Now they comprise well over half of a total which itself has been cut drastically.

VETERANS' PENSIONS AND INSURANCE

The outstanding relatively fixed item is veterans' pensions and insurance—excluding administrative costs. At $764,000,000 for 1944, this is 68 percent above the average amount for the three prewar fiscal years, 1939-1941.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND HIGHWAY GRANTS

On the chart, social security and highway grants to States are combined to keep the presentation simple. Of the social security grants, the biggest category, old-age assistance, is now nearly 55 percent above 1939; aid to dependent children has doubled; aid to the blind has advanced more than 50 percent. These increases are somewhat offset by lower grants for unemployment compensation administration because of improved employment conditions.

Grants for highways have declined sharply. During the war, such grants are being made only for work necessary for war transportation purposes.

OTHER FIXED COMMITMENTS

The rise in the remaining fixed commitments, brought together in one band on the chart, is largely because of increased appropriations to retirement trust funds. Two kinds of retirement funds are included—those for Government employees and those for railroad employees.

Contributions to the railroad retirement fund have risen steadily and substantially, in line with the receipts from special taxes for this purpose. The item might logically be excluded entirely in measuring Government expenditures.

Appropriations to the Government Employees' Retirement Fund, on the other hand, are met from general revenues. The recent increase reflects to some extent the wartime rise in Federal employment, but more especially it represents current payment of a larger share of the accumulating Government obligation.

This residual category of fixed commitments includes various permanent appropriations. One of these provides for spending 30 percent of customs revenue on programs to encourage consumption and exportation of agricultural commodities—programs which now emphasize consumption among low-income groups and the leveling off of seasonal or local gluts of the market for various commodities.

Other permanent appropriations comprise a variety of items, such as grants to colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts and for vocational education. The largest present item is expenses of loans, covering administration and management of the public debt. This cost has risen with the amount of borrowing, particularly the wide sale of bonds in small denominations.

Also included in fixed commitments are miscellaneous grants and contributions. Chief of these are payments to sugar producers under the Sugar Act of 1937, payments to reduce interest rates on farm mortgages, and annual contributions of the Federal Public Housing Authority to local housing authorities.

RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE ITEMS

The four remaining categories, shown below the middle heavy line of the chart, are relatively controllable items in contrast with the relatively fixed commitments. The table gives details.

Less than $2,000,000,000 of Federal Government expenditures this year are for relatively controllable items. The comparable total in 1939 was two and one-half times as much. Many items are now at a bedrock minimum.

WORK RELIEF AND AIDS TO YOUTH

Reemployment has permitted elimination of work relief and aids to youth, with attendant huge expenditure reductions from $2,981,000,000 in 1939 to a very small liquidating expense in 1944.

AIDS TO AGRICULTURE

Although a few aids to agriculture are included among fixed commitments, most of these aids are shown as controllable items. The controllable items rose to a peak exceeding $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940. The total this year is estimated at $644,000,000, after substantial reductions in parity payments, payments for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources, and miscellaneous aids.

GENERAL PUBLIC WORKS

Expenditures this year for general public works—other than highway grants already noted—have dropped sharply below their peak of 2 years ago when the program comprised huge multiple-purpose construction projects at Central Valley, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and in the Tennessee Valley, flood control works, river and harbor improvements, and reclamation projects to provide water for thousands of acres of unused lands in the West.

Many projects which were suspended early in the war to release critical materials have had to be resumed in order to provide additional hydroelectric power, arable land, and navigable waterways.

DEPARTMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENTS

The category, "Departments and establishments," comprises expenditures for all activities of the Government not included in items already reviewed. This includes the legislative establishment and the judiciary as well as the Cabinet departments and independent establishments. As the chart shows, the total fluctuated between narrow limits, slightly below a billion dollars during 1939–44. As will be demonstrated later, this comparative stability of the total obscures extensive readjustments to war requirements.

Legislative establishment: The legislative establishment includes the Government Printing Office, Library of Congress, and Architect of the Capitol, as well as the two Houses of the Congress itself. The wartime increase has been mainly in the legislative printing costs of the Government Printing Office. Expenditures of the legislative branch are classified entirely as nonwar items.

Independent establishments: The 5-year increase of $68,000,000 for independent establishments is concentrated in four agencies: The Veterans' Administration, Federal Security Agency, General Accounting Office, and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. All four increases are intimately related to the war effort.

Cabinet departments: Total nonwar expenditures of Cabinet departments are somewhat lower now than before the war. The major reduction is in the Interior Department, where nonwar expenditures in 1944 are less than half the comparable expenditures of 1939. Agriculture Department expenditures, apart from agricultural aids, are down $40,000,000. The Post Office deficiency has been eliminated.

On the other hand, Treasury Department expenditures in the "relatively controllable" category have increased by $68,000,000, predominantly in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the fiscal services.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, with less than twice the administrative costs of 1939, is now collecting more than seven times as much revenue from a great many more individual taxpayers. The war has added innumerable complications to tax administration, for example, special treatment of servicemen. The cost of the fiscal services has doubled since 1939, even omitting most of the expenditures of the Bureau of Public Debt because these are covered by a permanent appropriation included among fixed commitments. Foreign funds control is a totally new nonwar activity nonexistent 5 years ago.

War Department expenditures for nonmilitary functions, exclusive of general public works, have advanced one-third since 1939. Most of the increase is for maintaining and operating the Panama Canal, and for sanitation and government of the Canal Zone. Operating expenditures for navigation and flood control are believed to be at the minimum necessary for war transportation and to protect completed works.

The four remaining Cabinet departments—Justice, State, Commerce, Labor—have shown in each case some increase in nonwar expenditures exclusive of general public works and permanent appropriations. Detailed examination reveals direct connections between the increase of spending and enlarged needs or new conditions created by the war.

WAR ASPECTS OF NONWAR EXPENDITURES

The preceding sections cover all categories shown in the chart and table. This section elaborates an earlier statement that almost a billion dollars of the nonwar expenditures for 1944 are for major items closely and obviously related to the war.

All expenditures of the Veterans' Administration are considered nonwar. Actually, about $313,000,000 this year are

occasioned by the present war directly, including $250,000,000 appropriated to the National Service Life Insurance fund, as well as Army and Navy pensions in cases arising out of the present war, war losses under the old system of Government life insurance, and the increase in hospital and administrative costs.

Wartime developments have added more than $380,000,000 to Treasury Department expenses. This includes increases in tax refunds, the costs of collecting taxes and administering debt, and other fiscal operations.

The General Accounting Office has had an increase of some $21,000,000. Appropriations to the railroad retirement fund have increased by $138,000,000 over the pre-war level

The few items enumerated, with several smaller ones of the same general character, account for 22 percent of so-called nonwar expenditures of the fiscal year 1944.

These are wartime increases or new items for activities clearly related to the war. They do not reflect the more numerous instances in which the nonwar expenditures have been cut below prewar levels and the remaining services devoted wholly or predominantly to a changed objective—the winning of the war. For example, the National Park Service still operates, but with expenditures reduced sharply, and the parks are used for military convalescents. The Office of Education, with reduced expenditures, is used to marshal the Nation's educational resources in support of the war effort.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the major facts presented above and the major conclusions to be derived from these facts are as follows:

So-called nonwar expenditures of the Federal Government have been cut sharply from $6,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to $4,500,000,000 in the present fiscal year. But this comparison does not begin to measure the depth of the real cut because, first, a large part of present nonwar expenditures is actually for war purposes or occasioned by war activities; and, second, a greatly increased part of the total is for relatively fixed commitments which are not subject to substantial current reduction through either administrative control or congressional action on appropriations.

Corrected to exclude the clearest war items, nonwar expenditures in this fiscal year are nearer $3,300,000,000 than $4,300,000,000. In other words, the real total of nonwar expenditures this year is only about half that of 1939.

Considered in terms of the relatively controllable items alone, there has been a reduction in nonwar expenditures from nearly $5,000,000,000 in 1939 to less than $2,000,000,000 this year.

But even this residue of expenditures—whether defined in terms of nonwar expenditures with clear war items deducted, or whether defined in terms of the more controllable items—cannot be thought of as unrelated to the war effort. The bedrock minimum of so-called nonwar expenditures includes activity after activity which has been fully reoriented to war. Agencies which show a decrease in expenditures also show a complete change in either the nature or the purpose of their services.

The facts demonstrate conclusively that nonwar expenditures have been cut sharply, that over half of the remainder cannot be cut much deeper without modifying existing commitments or revising basic legislation, and that the rest is down to bedrock in terms of both programs and their execution. In any event, it is important to remember that nonwar expenditures are now a very small part of total expenditures—less than 4 cents of every Federal dollar spent—and their volume has been greatly diminished in the face of war necessities.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I asked the question in view of the fact that I have been trying for several days to find out what was going to be in this appropriation bill. I was told that the committee was pledged to secrecy, and, therefore, could not reveal any of the amounts of the items included in the bill. I could not get a copy of the bill until I came to the House today when the bill was offered on the floor of the House. Then there was the further fact that when we came here there were only three copies that were available. I understand there has been a gentleman's agreement that no appropriation bill shall be brought to the House until it is in the hands of the Members for 24 hours, and in view of the fact that there have been no minority views issued or authorized to be prepared until today, why was the bill brought out to the House today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is aware that through the 150 years of the history of the House we have developed a system of procedure, as stated by the Parliamentarian of the House in his preface to the manual, to be the most efficient system of parliamentary procedure extant in any parliament in the world.

The Committee on Appropriations has followed in every detail the procedure of the House in reporting the pending bill. In conformity with that procedure the bill and report were delivered to members of the committee yesterday.

Mr. WILSON. Members of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the members of the Appropriations Committee. On Saturday the hearings were made available to any Member of the House who might call for them.

Mr. WILSON. Well, I beg to differ with the gentleman. I called and asked for the bill and was told yesterday and this morning, and also day before yesterday, that I could not have a copy of the bill until it was offered on the floor. I called your office.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman did not talk to me, of course.

Mr. WILSON. No; you were not there.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know to whom the gentleman talked, but everyone knows, and anyone could have told him, the hearings were available last Saturday.

Mr. WILSON. I am speaking of the report on the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will consult members of the committee or any of his colleagues on his own side, I am certain they will give him any information he may require.

Mr. WILSON. A further inquiry. Are there any copies of the bill available to anyone yet?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Anyone may have a copy of the bill. The gentleman says three were available when he entered the Chamber. If he wants more the clerks will be glad to supply them.

Mr. WILSON. I understand there are no copies available at this time. There is only the committee print available.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee print and the subsequent editions are identical. The gentleman says three were on the table when he entered.

Mr. WILSON. I was mistaken. There were no copies available.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RABAUT. There is the Clerk holding copies in his hand if anyone wants a copy.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Clerk there is holding an armful within 20 feet of the gentleman. He may help himself.

Mr. WILSON. Those are not copies of the bill. Those are copies of the committee print. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are identical word for word, and comma for comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment and yield to me?

Mr. WILSON. I do not yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN [after counting]. One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman regarding the diminution of nonwar expenditures of the Government. I think it would be interesting if the gentleman would give us a statement regarding what he regards as nonwar expenditures. In other words, would the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration and for the various national war agencies be regarded as war expenditures?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, they are. I would say that there is in this item of nonwar expenditures practically $1,000,000,000 that should be considered as connected with the war. So that this item, instead of being $4,336,000 should be $3,336,000, because they are indirectly connected with the war. But, in order

to avoid any controversy or any debate about the matter, we have included in war expenditures only those things that were directly and immediately connected with the war. We have not included in that category anything about which there could be any question as to whether they were war or nonwar expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 1 hour.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, just before I start on what I intended to say, I would like to call attention to the fact that notwithstanding the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget as to the amount that will be spent, the expenditures for the first quarter showed just a little under $22,500,000,000 and that the rate of expenditure through the month of October, insofar as the Treasury statements have appeared, shows a continuance of about that same rate of seven and one-half billion dollars per month. That means an annual expenditure in the fiscal year 1944 of $90,000,000,000 and not $104,000,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment when I get these facts out. That conforms to the statement that was given to us by the Chairman of the War Production Board as to what the possibilities were for governmental expenditures, and shows that the Budget estimates, in my opinion, are not based upon a careful analysis of the situation. I am just expressing that for what it is worth. I do not believe they will run $104,000,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman catalogs $7,000,000,000 for war expenditures. That includes $3,000,000,000 for the public debt, which, of course, is not classified as war expenditure.

Mr. TABER. On the other hand, it is a governmental expenditure.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The expenditure estimate consists of $104,000,000,000, $97,000,000,000 for war expenditures, $4,000,000,000 for nonwar expenditures, and, of course, $3,000,000,000 on the public debt, which is largely the product of war expenditures.

Mr. TABER. The fact is that the operations of the Treasury over the first 3 months and almost the fourth, as far as the returns show, indicate that the expenditure is going along at the rate of $90,000,000,000 instead of $104,000,000,000 altogether. I have based my idea that it would run 90 upon accomplished facts and upon a very careful study of the situation. I have been surprised that my own idea has been borne out more nearly than the Budget estimate, but that has been the situation, and I do not think we should be deceived by the Budget into a false position with reference to the probable expenditures.

I have noticed one thing in connection with this chart, that they have included an enormous amount of figures that are controllable in uncontrollable items and that it is nothing but a jumble. It is not, in my opinion, a credit to the Bureau of the Budget. There are a few things I wish to say with reference to the present situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman specify the controllable items listed as uncontrollable?

Mr. TABER. Certainly; refund of customs and internal revenue, an item that is based entirely upon the war operations and the fact that goods are coming in here to be manufactured which go out; it is not a regular item.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust the gentleman is not taking the position that we do not have to refund it. These are matters over which we have no control. We must pay the money back. There is no alternative.

Mr. TABER. But it is not a fixed item; it is not an item that is going along.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It could not possibly be further beyond control.

Mr. TABER. It is variable from year to year. As soon as the war effort is over, that is out; it is purely a war-effort item.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But it is beyond our control. We have no choice but to pay it.

Mr. TABER. That may be in that sense, but not in the sense that it is not a war expenditure nor that it is an item of law set up there regardless of what might happen in the future.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What about veterans and social security? Does the gentleman consider them as controllable or uncontrollable?

Mr. TABER. The veterans' item is very much variable. It is not an item that can be reduced beyond what the demands are figured out on an actuarial basis.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But can we reduce it?

Mr. TABER. While you cannot reduce the appropriation below what it figures, you can reduce it to the point of the figure.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. A soldier entitled to a pension must be taken care of. It is an obligation we cannot avoid—and would not avoid if we could.

Mr. TABER. Oh, certainly; I am not disputing that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. A man entitled to an old-age pension is entitled to his allowance. The gentleman would not repudiate that?

Mr. TABER. I am trying to show the gentleman the ones. I did not call off the veterans' items; that is one that I did not except.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then what are they?

Mr. TABER. What are they? I started to tell the gentleman, but he interrupted me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I should be glad to have the gentleman cite the controllable items listed as uncontrollable.

Mr. TABER. Here is one of $106,000,000 for miscellaneous grants and contributions.

Here is another: Customs earmarked to encourage agricultural consumption, $84,000,000.

Here we have highway grants, and on top of that——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of them fixed by law.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And no way to reduce them.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; those things are very largely controllable.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The customs duties under the law must be set aside for the purpose. We have no alternative; they are not controllable.

Mr. TABER. They have been controlled many times by the appropriation bills in the past and therefore I assume they are controllable. Maybe what has been cannot be again, but I really believe that it can be again. Now, I want to say a few words about conditions in general.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I take it, then, that the gentleman intends in the future to bring in legislation to reduce these amounts—legislation which would render them controllable. That is the only way they can be controlled.

Mr. TABER. I have given the gentleman a direct and positive answer with reference to these. Agriculture, this $84,000,000 customs item—the gentleman himself has brought in here appropriation bills where those were controlled.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman says they can be controlled. They cannot be subject to control unless he changes the law.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has specifically appropriated funds out of that particular item for a specific purpose and he has proved it is a controllable item. I do not need to go beyond the gentleman himself and the way he has handled his own agricultural bill to establish that.

Now, I am going to talk for a few minutes about what there is in this bill and some other things.

America today is on trial. Our troops are bearing the brunt of this trial on the field of battle and our sailors upon the high seas, and our fliers in the air.

When these men come home after the war is over, they are going to demand an accounting of those of us who are at home. They are going to want to know what the man in a position of responsibility did. They are going to want to know whether he kept the faith; whether he did a good job, or a rotten job. They are going to find out whether the President did a good job and they are going to judge the situation by whether or not the President put in power men whom he had a right to trust; men who had a record of ability and of character.

They are going to want to know whether the Congress was careful about the things that it did; whether it appropriated money that was not needed for foolish things; whether it kept as much of a rein over the Executive as it should keep; whether it stood up and fought

for the things that were right; and not only whether it provided the things that were needed, but whether it had the courage to expose and criticize the failures of the administration so that the administration might have an opportunity to correct them or so that it might force their correction itself by legislation.

I am going to mention some of the situations that are plaguing America today; some of the situations that are going to result in unparalleled disaster if they are permitted to continue; and some of the problems that we are now facing.

We all know about the tax bills. We all know about the size of the military appropriations. We all know about many things which so far we have not spoken about perhaps as plainly as we should.

Perhaps the most glaring total failure of the administration has been the O. P. A. Mr. Henderson, the first Director, loaded the O. P. A. up with a group of people whose sole object was to wreck the national economy, to destroy private business, and to establish socialism. The place was filled up with long-haired professors with no business experience, and with impractical young lawyers known as the smart boys, who knew how to get out regulations that neither they nor anyone else could understand, and whose ability to keep things in a state of utter confusion was the natural outgrowth of their total inexperience.

After Mr. Henderson's operations had aroused such antagonism that the people would stand no more, Prentiss Brown, a former United States Senator from Michigan, and a former Member of this House, was put in. He failed because he did not have the courage to fire the long-haired professors and the oily-tongued young lawyers.

Chester Bowles has now succeeded Prentiss Brown. He will fail unless he immediately gets rid of that crowd of highbinders.

I am going to give you a few illustrations of the way they have operated:

First. For 6 months after they knew that their operations were illegal they have continued to mess up the cattle situation and attempted to keep in force illegal orders. As a result they have wiped out most of the small butchers and put them out of business. The result is that in many of the smaller communities the people get no meat.

Together with the War Food Administration they have fixed the price of corn at $1.07 in Chicago, and the result is that the dairy farmers in the Northeast are being forced out of business. At the present time the dairy farmer cannot operate his plant and sell his milk for $3.25 a hundredweight in New York, even with a 50-cent subsidy which this outfit has provided.

In the first place, he cannot get the feed even if he has the money to buy it. In the second place, he cannot operate his farm and break even where he has to buy a part of his feed. If a farmer has dairy cattle and also has the feed for them on his own farm, he can make more money by selling anything in the nature of feed, except the corn, than he can by increasing his milk production operations. And what is the result? It is that dairy farmer after dairy farmer is going out of business. I have one small community in mind. It formerly used 1,000 quarts of milk a day. Three farms went out of business, two as a result of fires and the third as a result of the farmer selling his herd because he could not break even. Today that community has available 200 quarts of milk a day and only those families with sick people and babies are able to procure milk at all. All through my district they are fast getting into that same situation. As near as I can figure, 30 percent of the dairy farmers are unable to carry their herds through until the next pasture time in the spring, and they will be obliged to send their animals to the slaughterhouse and go out of business. Even the Secretary of the Treasury has announced that he is auctioning off his cattle down on the Hudson on the 1st of December because his dairy farm can no longer operate at a profit.

It is absolutely impossible to procure a price which will permit these people to continue in business from the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration. The subsidy business is used as a subterfuge to keep the price down and to force the farmer out of business just as the small slaughterhouse people were forced out by the illegal operations of the O. P. A. in connection with beef and cattle.

The object of this group which Mr. Bowles has so far failed to fire is the wrecking of the national economy and the destruction of our independent farmers. Their action can be interpreted in no other way. They conducted a campaign in these two organizations to persuade the farmer to raise more meat animals and more dairy cattle and now they have reached the point where they have not the corn, wheat, and oats and barley enough to take care of more than two-thirds of the animals that they now have on the farms. The result is that the dairy cattle are producing less because they are unable to give them the kind of feed they ought to have. The farmers who buy feed are also obliged to market pigs that weigh from 65 to 100 pounds when it is uneconomical to sell them weighing less than 175 to 200 pounds, and in a good many places it is absolutely impossible to find any market for the meat animals at all. The farmers are told by the O. P. A. that if they cannot market them, they must keep them on the farm and feed them. They will not permit them to butcher the animals and in that way much feed is wasted.

Second. After 4 or 5 weeks of very strenuous congressional pressure the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. finally fixed the price of No. 1 apples, but not until after the picking season was well advanced. It created difficulty in marketing the apples. Then the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration froze all of the No. 2 apples for the canners, but they did not fix the price that the canners should pay for the raw apples nor the price that the canners might receive for their canned apples and jellies. The result was that the canners were unable to operate. They did not dare rely upon the promise of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration to be fair, because they had had experience last summer with the bean and pea pack where the O. P. A. fixed the price for the canners at less than the cost of production without allowing any profit. Another result was that the farmers have been able to pick only the No. 2 apples which they could place in containers that they had on hand and have been unable to deliver them to the processors for canning. This is the most foolish method of operating that anyone could imagine and the only possible solution is that the O. P. A. and War Food Administration are deliberately trying to wreck the food system in the country.

These items that I have cited with reference to the O. P. A. are just two or three out of many of the attempts that these people have made in wartime to wreck the economy of the country.

Next we are going to have a proposal for some such dishonest outfit as the Farm Security Administration to take over the management of our farms. This would undoubtedly cut the agriculture production of this country in two.

I wish to call attention now to the operations of the War Manpower Commission. I do not know as much about that situation as I do about the O. P. A., but I do know this: That they talk about a manpower shortage in localities where the manufacturer or the shipyard builder all over the country has been hogging the labor market and keeping on his pay roll thousands and thousands of people who are not needed. This situation was shown up with reference to Dallas, Tex., by the Truman committee in the Senate. It was shown up along the whole west coast by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. It exists all along the east coast and at factory after factory, and it exists especially in those communities where housing projects have been asked by the Housing Authority. It is a situation that exists wherever we have cost-plus contracts and wherever we have in our procurement services a spirit of slackness. The War Manpower Commission is not doing its job when it permits those things to go along. It is not meeting its responsibility to the people of the United States and to the war effort. Before it is too late, I am warning this organization that the Congress is going to demand and expect results of it. It is time for them to become alert and to do their job.

Undoubtedly the War Manpower Commission has a big job on its hands, but it will not get the job done unless it takes a different and more thorough attitude of handling its work.

Perhaps one of the most outstanding cases where an official has failed to do his job has been in connection with the foreign rehabilitation program. The President has insisted on putting people in charge of this set-up whose record will not bear the light of day.

There is Charles B. Baldwin, better known as "Beanie," who was the head of

the Farm Security Administration, who made a total failure of it. This was thoroughly brought out before the Byrd committee and the hearings have been published. Such a record of waste and extravagance and total irresponsibility never has been equalled in the annals of government. Then the President has appointed Charles "Pardon Me" Polletti, the former Governor of New York State, to a position of high responsibility in connection with this work and he has appointed James M. Landis, the former head of the Office of Civilian Defense, notorious as an incompetent. I wonder if the President feels that the appointment of these three incompetents was a bid for bipartisan support of this so-called rehabilitation program? If we are going to have that kind of thing, we ought to have it honest and effectively administered and the best men we can find for that job.

The British are accustomed to pick the best men that they can find for that sort of job. As a result, my information is, that practically all of the burden of handling this situation is being carried by the British and we have no representation to look after the expenditure of the enormous funds that have been entrusted to this organization. I feel that this is a matter that the returning soldier is going to ask the President about.

The Office of War Information was a stench when it was being administered by Archibald MacLeish under the title of "Office of Facts and Figures." It has continued a stench under the administration of Elmer Davis.

The Domestic Branch was so apparently a stench and so dangerous to the war effort that this Congress in July wiped out the major portion of the appropriation for the Domestic Branch. They were still left with more money than they needed and that continued to keep them in trouble.

Within the past 2 weeks they have sent out to 239 Negro papers, pictures of the President and the President's wife to be used in spreading political propaganda throughout the Nation. They have propagandized the Negro from O. W. I. with an established Negro photographer going around to take pictures. They have told the Negro they have programmed 88,000 houses for him under the Housing Administration. The trouble with their propaganda has been that the Negro is smart enough to know where houses have been built for him in the communities where he is hauled in to work at the war effort and he knows while they have put up some in places where they were not needed they have put up none to speak of where they were needed.

At the present time there is an outfit in the War Department to take care of foreign propaganda and the propaganda in the military territory. It is headed up by Maj. Gen. Fred Osborn, who is the son of William Church Osborn, former Chairman of the Democratic Committee. They have direct charge of the foreign propaganda that has to do with the war effort. For instance, General McClure, who is referred to in the committee report, has charge of the propaganda in Algiers, north Africa, and Italy. He has had some men assigned to him out of the Office of War Information to work with him, but the Office of War Information is not in charge of that propaganda. I think it is only fair that we should tell the Congress just what the facts are and not permit it to be deceived.

Here is the picture with reference to the appropriation for the Office of War Information. We have appropriated already $29,000,000 for the Office of War Information, Foreign Branch, for the fiscal year 1944. Up to the end of September, the first quarter, they have spent $6,200,000. Four times $6,200,000, according to my arithmetic, equals $24,800,000, leaving a balance available to increase their operations for the rest of the fiscal year of $4,200,000. That means they could boost the expenditures at the rate of $1,400,000 a quarter.

It does not make sense to me, when they have only 1,700 in the foreign service—that is outside of continental United States—operating on their real foreign work, and 3,765 positions set up inside continental United States, and having such a margin of funds available with which to increase their operations, to have them come in here and ask for $5,000,000 more than was allowed in the bill last year.

The Foreign Branch was cut just a little—they were given over $29,000,000 to spend. In the first 3 months they have spent $6,200,000, or at the rate of $24,800,000 a year, indicating that they have about $4,000,000 of unobligated funds which they can use to increase their operations in foreign fields.

They have been guilty of enormous waste. A Budget estimate of $5,000,000 has been submitted for the war activities of this organization. They have 3,765 employees in the foreign-service outfit, most of whom are totally incompetent and are fooling their time away all day long. There is no executive head of the organization. They have gotten out campaign buttons to boom the President for a fourth term and distributed them amongst the soldiers. They have gotten out long articles glorifying Mrs. Roosevelt which they have distributed all over Europe where they would get into the hands of our troops. I have a copy of one of the releases in my hand at the moment—six pages long, single spaced. There is no need for this additional appropriation.

They have been running absolutely wild and building all sorts of short-wave stations and we are told by everybody who comes near the situation that the British organizations are the ones that are doing all the work, although we have 10 or 15 times the people over there as the British have. Under those circumstances what we need is effective and vigorous management and reorganization of this set-up and not more money.

I am sure that the House will take the proper action on this set-up when it comes to it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed to act as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 4, noes 79.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 153]

Anderson, Calif.	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Gregory	O'Brien, Mich.
Baldwin, Md.	Griffiths	O'Connor
Barrett	Hall,	O'Leary
Barry	Leonard W.	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Halleck	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Harless, Ariz.	Outland
Bolton	Hart	Face
Boren	Hartley	Peterson, Ga.
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	Pracht
Brehm	Heffernan	Randolph
Brooks	Hendricks	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Holifield	Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Holmes, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Rowan
Celler	Jackson	Sabath
Chapman	Jenkins	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Jennings	Schuetz
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Schwabe
Compton	J. Leroy	Shafer
Costello	Johnson,	Sheridan
Crawford	Calvin D.	Short
Cullen	Jones	Sikes
Dawson	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Dies	Kean	Slaughter
Dingell	Kee	Smith, Maine
Domengeaux	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Douglas	Kelley	Smith, W. Va.
Durham	Kerr	Somers, N. Y.
Elston, Ohio	Kilburn	Spence
Fay	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Feighan	LaFollette	Steagall
Fellows	Lewis, Colo.	Stewart
Fernandez	McGranery	Sundstrom
Fish	McGregor	Taylor
Fitzpatrick	McKenzie	Thomas, N. J.
Flannagan	McLean	Thomas, Tex.
Fogarty	McMurray	Tolan
Folger	Maas	Towe
Ford	Maloney	Troutman
Fulbright	Marcantonio	Vincent, Ky.
Fulmer	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Furlong	Mason	Wadsworth
Gale	May	Weiss
Gallagher	Merritt	Wene
Gearhart	Miller, Mo.	Wheat
Gerlach	Monroney	Whelchel, Ga.
Gifford	Morrison, La.	White
Gillie	Mott	Willey
Gordon	Mruk	Winstead
Gore	Myers	Wolverton, N. J.
Gorski	Newsome	Woodruff, Mich.
Graham	Norton	Worley

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3598, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 268 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill before us will be hailed with general satisfaction, if not delight, throughout the length and breadth of this land. I believe it will be an inspiration and a comfort to millions of our people who are expecting Congress to put thumbs down on extravagant, nonessential expenditures and chart a course of rigid economy in the administration of the Government. I cannot imagine any action Congress could take that would be more encouraging to the average taxpayer than the enormous cut our committee has made in this appropriation bill.

I believe that when our people read this bill and ponder over its import they will conclude that Congress is alive to its responsibilities and that they are not looking to Congress in vain. I believe that they will accept it as an earnest of the intention of their lawmakers to trim appropriations to the very bone and to open the way as rapidly as possible to an ultimately balanced nondefense budget, which, in the opinion of thinking persons, is a prerequisite of continued national solvency.

Whether we realize it or not, the people are alive to what is going on in Congress, and they are actuated by a most determined purpose to see that the men and women who represent them here hew hereafter to the line of economy. The people have an impression that money has been wasted without end; that tax-eating bureaus and agencies have been gorged with funds to the point of the satiation even of their ravenous appetites; that there are hordes of parasites on the Government's pay rolls, and that Congress has pusillanimously surrendered the purse strings by voting entirely too many blank checks to be filled out at the other end of the Avenue. In a plain and unmistakable manner, they are letting us know that the day of reckoning is around the corner. I repeat that I am sure the people will construe the unparalleled action we have taken on this bill by reducing it a billion dollars as evidence that Congress, in harmony with the popular will, is preparing to assert itself and to discharge its constitutional responsibilities, and that is very fine and very gratifying.

A test of public sentiment came to my attention a few days ago when I gave out a statement to the effect that there are two ways of facing the fiscal exigency that confronts the Nation, one way being to increase taxes and the other way to cut expenditures. The impact I received from those who favor the latter alternative was terrific. Another suggestion I made at the same time that all nondefense appropriations be embraced in one appropriation bill and that there be attached to the appropriation bill a tax rider covering the cost, so that Members, when they vote for appropriations, will vote for the taxes necessary to insure payment of the bill, brought an avalanche of letters from businessmen from my city and State approving the economic soundness of the proposal in the warmest terms. Never in our history have the people of America devoted as much attention to national financial problems as they are devoting at this time. They sense that all is not well, and they want us to find the remedy before the ship of state strikes the rocks. They believe that a strict and unrelenting application of the rule of retrenchment in expenditures will do more than anything else to restore a healthy condition in our national economy.

BILL CUT FIVE-SIXTHS

No one can gainsay the fact that the bill before us makes a good start in that direction. The record of performance by the Appropriations Committee on this measure is most extraordinary. The estimates that came to us from the Budget Bureau for inclusion in this bill totaled $1,196,428,749.32. The bill as it comes to you from the committee carries a total of only $215,368,442.32. In other words the bill that is brought to the House by the committee is $981,060,307 below the Budget estimates. A bill that is cut five-sixths in committee, leaving only one-sixth remaining, stands forth in bold outline as immutable proof of the most convincing character that the members of our subcommittee on deficiencies have heard the economy call and that we used sharp pencils in pruning down the estimates. When I say that all of us on the subcommittee—Democrats and Republicans alike—worked together to cut down expenditures and that only on one single solitary point was there a final disagreement, I state a fact which must be impressive to the people of America as to our unity of purpose.

We had weeks of exhaustive hearings; and the great ability, thoroughness, and ingenuity of our chairman, Mr. CANNON, never shone to better advantage than in leading the examination of the witnesses who, day after day, came before us. The hearings in printed form make a pretentious volume of 1,638 printed pages.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman from Indiana is making a splendid statement. The people are alive. They are alive to what is going on, and I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana feels that our Hoosiers would approve of bringing in an appropriation bill before the House and asking that it be considered without its having even been printed and the membership knowing anything about what is in it.

Mr. LUDLOW. Oh, I think the procedure in this case is the procedure always followed. I do not know how we can differentiate it from any former procedure. My colleague is one of the most valuable Members of this House and ordinarily I like to follow him, but I am afraid I cannot give him much comfort in this case. I believe we are following the precedents.

Mr. WILSON. This dry rot exists around here, and I do not think this ancestral rheumatism should set a precedent which we ought to follow, especially in the emergency. There are $2 in this bill for every taxpayer, every man, woman, and child in the United States, and every boy on the fighting front. We have a public debt of $148 for every family, and an interest charge of $37 for every breadwinner of the United States. We should consider these appropriations very carefully before we pass an additional tax of $2 onto every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Mr. LUDLOW. I hope my colleague has taken notice of the fact that there is not nearly as much in this bill as there was before our committee finished its consideration and applied the pruning knife.

CHIPS AND WHETSTONES

The final product in the measure before us is what I would call a chips and whetstones bill—little chips and big chips, little whetstones and big whetstones. In its many items the bill almost embraces the perimeter of the earth, touching many activities and many lands, and is a reminder of how far we have gone and how many new interests we have assumed in this era of our global expansion. The gamut of subjects treated ranges all the way from jeeps to battleships, from prenatal care to salmon fisheries, and from manpower to meteorological phenomena.

I shall not attempt to discuss the provisions of this bill in any orderly or comprehensive way. I could not begin to perform that task half as well as it already has been performed by Chairman CANNON. He has given you the over-all picture. I shall refer only to a few of the details of the items that came before us and our reaction thereto, mainly for the purpose of pointing a moral or two.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not think that I have the time to yield. I will not be able to finish in my time.

Mr. BURDICK. Does the gentleman feel that the committee has impaired the efficiency of any Government agency in this bill?

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not think so. I do not think that we have seriously or indeed in any way impaired at all any essential activity.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman does not feel that the cut of nearly three-quarters or four-fifths of the sums asked for by the Budget is not at least a partial reflection upon the way that the Budget has been operating? If we cut $900,000,000 out of a request for $1,108,000,000, it seems to me at least that it is a partial reflection on the Budget.

Mr. LUDLOW. Of course, the gentleman may feel that way about it, but I do not think so. We are living in most extraordinary times and there are no guideposts or precedents. I think the Budget on the whole does a very good job.

There was submitted to us a deficiency estimate for $15,000 to set up an organization to find out what the jeeps can do, and I am speaking moderately when I say that it got a cold reception. The war has produced an enormous crop of jeeps and

there is a prospect that the post-war period will open with a princely inheritance of these unprepossessing but highly serviceable vehicles on hand. The theory of the estimate was that an investigation should be made to find out how these jeeps can be used in agricultural work after the war is over. As a starter on this bureaucratic enterprise the Treasury was to be tapped to the tune of $15,000 to find out what the jeep can do. The way practical-minded JED JOHNSON hopped onto that estimate was a caution. He demanded to know from the Department of Agriculture witness whether this idea was his and the abashed witness acknowledged the soft impeachment and defended himself by saying:

The jeeps have a popular appeal, everybody is interested, everybody is asking us questions about them.

To this the gentleman from Oklahoma replied in his plain, straightforward manner of speaking:

Did it ever occur to you that the eight or ten million boys in uniform, many of whom will have an opportunity to try out jeeps, under every condition and circumstance imaginable, will learn a whale of a lot more about a jeep than you could possibly have an opportunity to learn? Don't you think that when they come home they will be able to give more information about what a jeep will do than all the information you could acquire behind a mahogany desk or in a laboratory, or even on the streets of Washington?

A BAD DREAM

Following the hearing on that jeep investigation estimate I had a bad night. I rolled and I tossed and dreamed that I was writing a poem on jeeps. I jumped out of bed, turned on the electric lights, grabbed a pencil and wrote down, as nearly as I could remember, what came to me in my dream. Here it is:

THE JEEP NEEDS NO FEDERAL AID

A wonderful contraption is the Army jeep.
It can scoot like lightning, or it can creep.
It is the ugly duckling in the automotive field,
But in practical results it pays a big yield.
It rides the waves and it tears up the land,
And either place it can travel to beat the band.
It runs headways and rearways, on its back and its tummy,
Its performance record is perfect—nothing cheesy or rummy.
Its star is beyond the reach of envy or pelf,
As an instrument of service it speaks for itself.
To set up a bureau to see what the jeep can do,
Is a bureaucratic fantasy that is entirely new.
All friends of economy will insist this should not be,
For everybody knows the jeep can do anything but climb a tree!

The jeep appropriation was tossed out of the window in framing the bill and it is now up to the jeep to demonstrate itself. Those who know the jeep best believe it is perfectly capable of doing so, without leaning on the Treasury.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. I just wanted to congratulate the gentleman upon his literary masterpiece. I think it is splendid, and everyone agrees with me. Did I understand that the Bureau of the Budget approved of this particular item?

Mr. LUDLOW. I am very sorry to have to say that the Budget did.

Mr. CURTIS. Could the gentleman tell me on what basis the Bureau of the Budget makes up its mind about these things.

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not know the mental processes of the Bureau of the Budget.

CULTIVATING GOOD OPINION AT $5,000 PER MAN

Another item which we disapproved, I think very properly, was an estimate of $45,000 to send nine "cultural relations" officers at an average salary of $5,000 each, to the Near East, to tell the people of Syria, Turkey, Egypt, Iran, and Iraq what a fine people Americans are and to improve their good opinion of us. It seemed to some of us, at least, that we are going pretty far in world penetration when we take on such an activity as that. While I may have a provincial viewpoint, it seemed to me that instead of spending $45,000 a year for high-paid personnel to persuade the people of Iraq and Iran that we are "good fellows" I would prefer to spend the money for milk and hospital care for sick babies in this country or for some other worthy enterprise at home. If our purpose is to cultivate the good opinion of the Iraqi and the Irani, my belief is that they will have a better opinion of our common sense if we have the good judgment to keep out of such activities.

To my mind and speaking for myself alone it seemed to me that the most disquieting aspect of this matter was that such a proposal could emanate from our State Department. I do not know in what bureau of that great Department it had its birth, but I did not believe, and I still do not believe that it comports with the pure Americanism and the straight thinking of Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and Edward R. Stettinius, the Under Secretary of State, for both of whom I have the most profound respect. I prefer to think that it was another case where an under official took a little too much leash.

PLANS OF WORLD-WIDE SCOPE

I was amazed when our questions brought out the contemplated scope of this so-called cultural activity. So far we have no cultural-relations officers outside of the Western Hemisphere. I can understand why, during this period of stress, it is in the interest of hemispheric solidarity for us to have such representatives in some of the Latin-American countries. But here in the estimate before us was the beginning of an expansion to world-wide proportions. In reply to my question "Is this cultural-relations activity to be a global activity all around the world to give people a better idea of the United States?" the witness replied, "It is expected that as the demand for such work arises that it would be carried on in additional countries."

Replying to a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the witness said:

We are going into those types of activity which have proven to be best in South America and as the demand in each country arises.

THE CAMEL'S NOSE

So it was obvious that this appropriation of $45,000 was to be only the beginning. It was the camel's nose trying to get under the tent and it was equally certain that before the camel ceased growing it would be a great big camel. It was apparent that if we approved this appropriation we would be putting our imprimatur on a cultural activity of world ramifications whose alimentary requirements would call constantly for more and more tax money in order to keep it in a thriving and growing condition. I think we should remember the fundamental fact that we are only one nation in a world with other nations and that we cannot hope to leaven the whole world at the expense of the American taxpayers who already have about all the burdens they can stand. I do not for a moment question the high patriotic purpose and altruistic motives of the originator of this estimate, whoever he may be, but I think our committee did the right thing and the sensible thing in stopping the expansion of this activity and holding it to the Western Hemisphere.

M'NUTT'S PROBLEM PARTIALLY SOLVED

In a few respects, but only in a few, this bill fails to meet my expectations. I thought the Farm Security Administration should be continued because of the information which has come to me of the help it has given in innumerable instances to poor farmers who otherwise, I am afraid, will not be able to get on their feet financially. Paul V. McNutt has given a perfectly admirable accounting of himself in the toughest job ever conferred on mortal man—that of War Manpower Commissioner. I would like to have seen him given some encouragement by full approval of all of his estimates, which I thought were moderate, well-considered, and reasonable. I was especially impressed by the glaring maladjustments in the pay scales of his personnel, as exemplified by the wide differentials in the salaries paid to persons in the same offices, sitting side by side, doing exactly the same kind of work. This condition greatly adds to his administrative difficulties, as there has been a turn-over of more than 100 percent during the last year in the miserably paid personnel he inherited from the State employment offices. It was my privilege to offer a motion in subcommittee which put into this bill the sum of $1,584,000 to meet the increases which some of the States have recently given to similar personnel, so that these employees of Mr. McNutt are hereafter to be paid at the new State levels. While this mitigates, it does not entirely correct the injustice that is causing Mr. McNutt much distress of mind.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

I have stated that there was only one point on which our subcommittee could not agree. That was in respect to the appropriation for the Office of War Information. We were asked to appropriate $5,000,000 to carry on the foreign service work of that office during the remainder of the current fiscal year. This would be in addition to the $24,000,000

heretofore provided for the fiscal year 1944. The $5,000,000 would be used exclusively for propaganda and political warfare activities overseas. A majority of our subcommittee agreed to allow the amount requested. A minority dissented and the matter now comes to the floor for the determination of the House.

The rapid advance of our victorious armies is constantly opening new fields for propaganda and political warfare work and, in my judgment, it is vitally necessary that the Office of War Information shall have an adequate appropriation in order that its Overseas Branch may keep pace with its rapidly expanding opportunities.

WARS NOT WON ENTIRELY BY COLD STEEL

Wars are not won entirely by bullets and cold steel. Propaganda and political warfare may be a great contributing factor in achieving substantial and important victories.

We of the United Nations have two powerful weapons which we can use in winning this war—

First. The weapon of military might.

Second. The weapon of propaganda.

We are making effective use of the former weapon, the weapon of military might. The products of our war factories are on every front. Our men are giving a splendid accounting of themselves in every theater of war.

Of the latter weapon—the weapon of propaganda—we are making no adequate use compared with the possibilities such a weapon really affords. The weapon of military might is limited by manpower, natural resources, and technological equipment. The weapon of propaganda is limited only by the validity of our cause and the range of our ingenuity.

Prisoners captured in the north African and European theaters of war have given eloquent testimony to the value of O. W. I.'s overseas propaganda. In the Tunisian and Sicilian campaigns over 400,000 enemy prisoners were taken and more than 80 percent who were interrogated stated that they were influenced to surrender by broadcasts and leaflets put out by the Office of War Information. Many of these still had leaflets on their persons. One sentence of impelling appeal that ran like a refrain through nearly all of these leaflets was—

Why die for Hitler when you can live for Italy?

In all of these leaflets the idea that the Germans had betrayed Italy was hammered home and this undermining of Italian faith in their Nazi ally had a most devastating effect on Italian morale.

WHY FOREIGNERS ARE EMPLOYED BY O. W. I.

During the hearings complaint was made that a great many foreigners are employed by the O. W. I. and inferentially, at least, a question was raised as to the loyalty of these persons to the United States. One has only to scan the list of names printed in the hearings to be convinced that it is true that many of these are nationals of other countries or else are of foreign ancestry. There is no secret about this, however, as it was freely admitted by those who appeared in support of the estimate. The Office of War Information broadcasts in 35 languages every day, and some days in as many as 48, including dialects. Many American scholars have a knowledge of languages, of course, but as a rule they do not speak well enough over the radio to be clearly understandable to the peoples of foreign countries in their own dialects and tongues. To supply the speaking talent required to meet this demand foreigners are necessarily employed.

RUNS GAUNTLET OF FIVE INVESTIGATIONS

But every person who is hired by the Office of War Information has to run the gantlet of a series of grueling investigations, first by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and then by the Civil Service, the intelligence services of the Army and Navy, and finally by O. W. I.'s own security committee. These investigations go into the most intimate details of personal history, affiliations, and habits of the applicants. A person with any taint of guilt of subversiveness could hardly come through that scorching fire of investigations without being exposed. If you will turn to the Congressional Directory and run your eye down the list of names of Members of Congress you will find numerous names of foreign origin, but no one believes that these colleagues of ours are, or possibly could be, subversive. It is hardly fair, therefore, to condemn an employee of O. W. I. just because he may happen to have a foreign name.

TESTIMONY OF TOP GENERALS

Who could be better qualified to give testimony on the importance of O. W. I.'s overseas service than the high-ranking generals who are in charge of the military operations in the theaters of war? We had before us Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, who joined General Eisenhower's staff in north Africa the middle of last December and was given the assignment to organize a staff section to handle psychological warfare, public relations, and censorship—all three of which activities he has under him at this time. I quote the following colloquy found on page 1253 of the hearings—

Mr. LUDLOW. At the expense probably of being repetitious, I should like to ask you this question because I think it is important and is information we would like to have. I would like to ask General McClure what he thinks of what O. W. I. is doing in reference to its foreign activities—as to its value to the essentialities of the service.

General MCCLURE. I can only speak for the north African theater. Their foreign activities there have been very helpful to us, and at the present time we are quite satisfied with them, and we certainly wish them to continue.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would you suffer a great loss if you were deprived of those services?

General MCCLURE. I think we would, sir.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The thing I wanted to call attention to is that on pages 1259 and 1260 of the hearings it appears that General McClure was in charge of all those operations, and that the O. W. I. has simply furnished some help to General McClure, and that the O. W. I. has not charge of them at all.

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot go back of General McClure's statement.

Mr. TABER. I am calling attention to General McClure's testimony.

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot go back of his enthusiastic endorsement.

What does General Marshall think of the overseas work of the Office of War Information? I have heard a good many Members of Congress say that General Marshall's opinion of O. W. I. would be very persuasive, if not controlling, with them. Well, what he has to say is found on page 1264 of the hearings:

On November 22, 1942, General Marshall wrote to Mr. Davis and said:

"The efficiency with which the personnel of the Office of War Information cooperated with the War Department in connection with the operation in north Africa contributed directly toward its success, and is deeply appreciated."

On August 30, 1943, General Marshall again wrote to Mr. Davis and said:

"I desire to express my appreciation to the members of your organization for their excellent work in the field of psychological warfare during the Sicilian campaign."

After the fall of Naples, General Eisenhower sent a cable to the Combined Chiefs of Staff in which he paid very high tribute to the work of O. W. I. and the other agencies involved in the Psychological Warfare Branch of his headquarters during the campaign in Tunisia and later in Pantellaria and Sicily and then in the invasion of Italy. General Eisenhower's cable could not be quoted verbatim in the record for code security reasons.

General Eisenhower stated that the psychological warfare unit has made a definite contribution as an integral part of the armed forces in the actual fighting and he looks forward to further valuable contributions by this unit in the battles that are to come.

General Eisenhower emphasized the additional value of "base propaganda" in such regions as north Africa, Sicily, southern Italy, where these propaganda efforts have contributed greatly to the cooperative and friendly attitude of the peoples of those regions. He stated that the propaganda units had worked in closest liaison with the civil administration in north Africa and with the Military Government Section in Sicily and Italy.

FIGHTING WITH ONE BARREL

We are fighting the enemy with only one barrel when we fail to make the very best use of all of our propaganda and political warfare facilities and it is difficult for me to understand the opposition to this appropriation to carry on the overseas activities of the Office of War Information. If I could have my way I would double the appropriation for this purpose. We are in the most critical period of the war and propaganda is approaching its maximum usefulness. Large areas are being evacuated and the peoples of those countries need to be cemented in bonds of friendship to America and our allies. More important still, the psychology of the peoples of enemy and neutral countries is at a stage which makes them particularly impressionable to our propaganda advances. If we can crack the morale of enemy peoples and split them away from their rulers by propaganda we will accomplish the equivalent of a whole series of major

victories. We do not gag when it comes to appropriating billions upon billions for the Army and Navy and Lend-Lease.

Let us not refuse the Office of War Information this relatively insignificant amount, less than the cost of one small naval unit, when the opportunities are beckoning and so much can be done toward winning the war by the proper use of propaganda and political warfare. To cripple the foreign activities of the Office of War Information would paralyze one arm of the Government in the prosecution of the war. Believing as I do that the Office of War Information, if given this small appropriation, will contribute to hastening the conclusion of the war and perhaps to saving the lives of many of our precious boys, I refuse to be a party to hamstringing its Overseas Branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. In view of the fact that it is quite late in the day and that all of the general debate on this bill is drawing near a close, and that no copy of the bill as yet has been presented to Members of this House, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-six members present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 154]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Fish	Keefe
Andresen, August H.	Fitzpatrick	Kelley
Andrews	Fogarty	Kerr
Baldwin, Md.	Folger	Kilburn
Barrett	Ford	Kleberg
Barry	Fulmer	LaFollette
Bates, Ky.	Furlong	Lambertson
Bates, Mass.	Gale	Lewis, Colo.
Bolton	Gallagher	McGranery
Boren	Gavin	McGregor
Bradley, Pa.	Gerlach	McKenzie
Brehm	Gibson	McLean
Brooks	Gifford	McMurray
Buckley	Gillie	Maas
Bulwinkle	Gore	Madden
Burch, Va.	Gossett	Magnuson
Butler	Graham	Maloney
Byrne	Green	Marcantonio
Cannon, Fla.	Gregory	Martin, Iowa
Capozzoli	Griffiths	Mason
Carter	Hale	May
Case	Hall, Leonard W.	Merritt
Celler	Halleck	Miller, Mo.
Chapman	Hart	Monroney
Chenoweth	Hartley	Morrison, La.
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	Mott
Costello	Heffernan	Mruk
Courtney	Hendricks	Myers
Crawford	Hess	Newsome
Cullen	Hoeven	Norton
Dawson	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Dies	Holmes, Mass.	O'Brien, Mich.
Dingell	Izac	O'Brien, N. Y.
Douglas	Jackson	O'Connor
Durham	Jennings	O'Konski
Eaton	Johnson, Calvin D.	O'Leary
Elmer	Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Neal
Elston, Ohio	Johnson, Ward	O'Toole
Fay	Jones	Outland
Feighan	Kean	Peterson, Ga.
Fellows	Kee	Phillips
Fernandez	Keogh	Ploeser
Flannagan	Kilday	Pracht
Flood	Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.	Sikes	Troutman
Rees, Kans.	Simpson, Pa.	Vincent, Ky.
Robinson, Utah	Slaughter	Vorys, Ohio
Robsion, Ky.	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Rodgers, Pa.	Smith, Va.	Weiss
Rogers, Calif.	Smith, W. Va.	Wene
Rowan	Somers, N. Y.	Wheat
Sabath	Spence	Whelchel, Ga.
Sadowski	Starnes, Ala.	White
Scanlon	Steagall	Willey
Schuetz	Sundstrom	Winstead
Schwabe	Taylor	Wolverton, N. J.
Shafer	Thomas, N. J.	Zimmerman
Sheridan	Tolan	
Short	Towe	

Thereupon the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3598, the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 260 Members answered to their names, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its session.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the outstanding fact in connection with this bill is the fact that recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget amounting to about $1,200,000,000 have been reduced to about $215,000,000. In other words, items aggregating almost a billion dollars have been eliminated by the committee in charge of this bill.

This fact raises squarely the question of whether the Bureau of the Budget is functioning or is not functioning for the purpose for which it was created.

It is not the first time that this question has been raised. I have myself raised the question before on the floor of this House, suggesting congressional investigation.

Some 15 months ago, the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, made a powerful report dealing with this among other questions. You will find that report as Senate Report No. 1554, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session. The report has never received the attention that it deserves in these times of wasteful extravagance, squandering of the people's money, and menacing inflation.

Mr. Chairman, that committee found specifically, among other things, that the Bureau of the Budget had both the authority and the duty to accomplish efficient management in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I continue, and later I will be glad to yield.

That the Bureau of the Budget was failing to perform its mandate under the law.

That certain officials of the Bureau of the Budget had been carrying on discreet but pernicious propaganda to the effect that there must be greater deficit spending after the war than in the decade preceding it. Three officials in the Bureau of the Budget were specifically named as leading proponents of that philosophy.

The committee further found that the lack of interest or willful avoidance, as it called it, on the part of the Bureau of the Budget in bringing about coordination and efficiency in the executive branch of the Government could only be attributed to the fact that many officials of the Bureau of the Budget were committed, beyond any doubt, to ideologies and theories looking forward to greater governmental expenditures and greater deficits during the post-war period.

It found that if the managers of Government expound the policy that it should always spend more than it receives, the purpose of the law is defeated, and that only an ever-growing, ever-willful, autocratic bureaucracy, resisting every impediment to self-seeking operation, creating, as it does, accompanying bureaucratic power and self-sufficiency could result from such fiscal policies.

It found that the Bureau of the Budget, although set up to keep stringent control over expenditures, and to relate those expenditures to income, was in fact being used to unrelate expenditure to income and to make a policy of mounting debt, not only as a policy desirable now, but as an indefinite policy.

It found that the lack of coordination and efficiency in the executive branch of the Federal Government was due primarily to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget had failed to execute the duty imposed upon it by law.

It recommended to the Senate that it call upon the Committee on Appropriations to make a thorough investigation of the Bureau of the Budget, covering the fitness of its personnel, its methods of operation, its failure to take prompt action looking toward placing the Federal Government on a streamlined, all-out war basis, and whether the Bureau should be made independent of the Executive and responsible only to the Congress.

I commend the report of the Tydings subcommittee to the Congress and to the country.

I urge that its recommendation for a thorough investigation be carried through by this House.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I am curious, in that I am not familiar with the procedure, as to whether or not any record is made of the transactions of the business between the respective department heads and the agency known as the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You mean whether a written record is maintained?

Mr. ROWE. That is right.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not able to answer the gentleman on that point. I have never seen such a record.

I do not know whether the proceedings are verbal or in writing.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman does know this, as a member of the committee; has he had an opportunity to look at any record that may have been taken between the heads of the respective departments and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No. The only record that the committee normally has before it is the official budget estimate, a small printed document, signed by the President, and such justifications as the individual agency may submit to the committee.

Mr. ROWE. Has that already been approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The estimate has been approved.

Mr. ROWE. Then what the gentleman receives as a member of the committee, or the committee itself, constitutes the conclusion of the Bureau of the Budget after investigating through its representatives the departments involved.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct. We almost invariably have before us the conclusions of the Bureau of the Budget before taking action.

Mr. ROWE. If the gentleman will please permit me to pursue this thought just a little further, then the committee's final action comes along after it has had hearings of the respective department heads to corroborate what the Bureau of the Budget has given the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will yield briefly to my chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is it the intention of the gentleman to insert in connection with this excerpt from the report of the Tydings committee an excerpt from the report of the other Senate committee—the Byrd committee—on the same subject?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe the chairman has already taken steps to insert the excerpt in the committee report, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would the gentleman care at this particular time to insert it in connection with his statement?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe it is already in the committee report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But it is not in the RECORD.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I should be glad to have the gentleman insert it in his own time, if he will; I would rather not break up my remarks just now.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to say something about the Solid Fuels Administration for War and the tremendously important coal problem that confronts the Nation and the world at this time.

I had intended to speak briefly about the testimony of the National Labor Relations Board, which is particularly interesting, I think.

I had intended to deal somewhat with the War Manpower Commission's record and the tremendous problem which confronts the Nation in this field of activity.

In view of the fact, however, that the time available for discussion of this important measure has been so greatly curtailed I am going to confine the balance of my remarks to the Office of War Information.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

This agency, Mr. Chairman, has received for its overseas branch during the current fiscal year the sum of $29,000,000. It now comes before you and requests a further appropriation of $5,000,000. To my mind this request has not been justified.

The agency's own figures indicate an expenditure during the first 3 months of the fiscal year in enemy, neutral, and Allied countries, of something over $6,000,000, leaving almost sufficient to meet the additional demand at this time. Its own figures indicate an intention to spend in neutral and Allied countries some $13,200,000, any part of which can be made available by allocation for use in enemy countries. Its receipts on account of reciprocal lend-lease will add substantially to its available funds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make my position clear. I disagree with the conclusion reached by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]. I agree with much that he said but I think that much of what he said had little or nothing to do with the point at issue.

There is not a man on the committee who is not in favor of giving every one of our overseas commanders every dollar that he needs for psychological warfare purposes at the front. No one disputes the value of this work in enemy countries or enemy-occupied countries, so why talk about it.

The point is that there is an enormous expenditure contemplated in other countries overseas, in neutral countries, in Allied countries. For my part I am not sold on the work of the O. W. I. in those countries. For my part, in view of the serious charges made in respect to that work, I am opposed to further funds in respect to neutral countries and Allied countries until the charges have been gone into and thoroughly explored.

It is difficult to appraise the value or lack of value of the work of the O. W. I. in neutral and Allied countries without detailed information. Since April 1 we are told that to north Africa alone O. W. I. has sent almost 8,000,000 publications, 7,500 reels of motion pictures, and nobody knows how many broadcasts. The picture elsewhere does not appear in the record.

There is ample evidence, however, Mr. Chairman, to cast grave doubt on the value of the work done by the O. W. I. in neutral and Allied countries.

Five Members of the United States Senate have recently returned from a world tour very critical of the work of this character which they observed at first hand, notably in Australia, notably in India. The question has been raised as to whether some of the work done has not been more harmful than helpful.

Serious criticism has been directed at the Ukrainian desk, the Italian desk, the Polish desk, and at the Yugoslav desk.

Serious criticism has been leveled at the publications, campaign buttons, and other items of propaganda produced by O. W. I. I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] will deal with this particular aspect of the matter at greater length in due course.

Very serious criticism has been made of O. W. I. overseas broadcasting.

All of us recall the famous broadcast at the time of the fall of Mussolini. That broadcast, as you will remember, through the mouth of a nonexistent commentator described as John Durfee, in the face of specific assurances by Mr. Sherwood to the Congress that all news would be both authentic and on the level, characterized King Victor Emmanuel as a little "moronic King" and Marshal Badoglio as a "high-ranking Fascist," an insult to many Italian people. It attempted to create the impression that the change of government in Italy was considered of no concern by the American people. It surely must have tended to embarrass General Eisenhower in his negotiations and to prejudice high State Department policy without authority.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman have any facts to back the statement that James Warburg was responsible for that particular broadcast regarding the "moronic King"?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked Mr. Sherwood in the hearings that specific question. Mr. Sherwood evaded the question.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I include at this point as a part of my remarks the very able article by Arthur Krock appearing in this connection in the New York Times of July 31, 1943:

CONGRESS REACTION LIKELY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—Of the $27,000,000 which the Office of War Information in June asked Congress to appropriate for its overseas department, $24,000,000 was granted, although the domestic departments of O. W. I., which sought $8,000,000, were reduced to $2,700,000. The much more favorable treatment received by the overseas department was founded on these reasons:

Congress knew a great deal at first hand about the blunders and partisanly motivated activities of the domestic branch and felt it could safely cut down O. W. I.'s opportunities to do these things without interfering, or being reasonably accused of interfering, with the vigorous prosecution of the war. But Congress knew of the overseas operations only what it was told by O. W. I. witnesses before the Appropriations Committee; it was impressed by the story of a leaflet dropped in great quantities among Italian groups, urging them to surrender and announcing that the leaflet could be used as a safe-conduct pass; and, because the overseas branch works in the

war zones, Congress feared that military setbacks might be blamed on its parsimony.

Moreover, Members do not hear the short-wave broadcasts and are obliged to rely on what O. W. I. tells them. But the committee members, after listening to Robert E. Sherwood, head of the division, were especially led to give this branch the benefit of their doubts by a minute description of the care with which the broadcasts are prepared, checked, and steadily subject to daily and weekly directives on foreign policy, and by this statement made by Mr. Sherwood:

"[Our] the news must be authentic, it must be on the level because the honor and integrity of the United States are at stake. If we lie, then America is a liar. Enemy propagandists, the world's champion liars, have been compelled to learn the strength of the strategy of truth. They have learned the force of the ancient truism that truth is mighty and shall prevail."

THE ITALIAN EPISODE

The episode of last Sunday night, after the fall of Mussolini, does not conform to this and other parts of the portrait of the Overseas Division that was painted before the committees, and the trustful attitude of Congress in June is not likely to obtain in September.

It was disclosed that, instead of keeping its news authentic and on the level, Mr. Sherwood's division deliberately invented an independent news commentator whom it called John Durfee. From his nonexistent mouth and out of his composite office brain came the views on events and policies of O. W. I. itself, represented abroad (even to our allies) as those of an unofficial, real person, writing for a free press. On previous occasions these views have been closer to the Moscow than the Washington-London line.

It was disclosed that, despite the regulations described by Mr. Sherwood, his division could and did recklessly launch its own foreign policy without the approval of any high official, including himself, into a most critical situation, affecting the lives of our troops, the length of the war, and the repute of the American Government.

What happened was this:

A press commentator—actually existent, but a doctrinaire representing no views but his own—came to a hasty judgment on the meaning of the fall of Mussolini and rushed to the radio soon afterward to express them. In effect they were that the change of government in Italy meant nothing save that fascism had put on a false face with which to cozen the Allies. King Victor Emmanuel was styled the moronic little king and Marshal Badoglio was assailed as a high-ranking Fascist.

OTHER OPINIONS AVAILABLE

Though the comments of better-informed speakers and editors were abundantly available, the Overseas Division broadcast this viewpoint as typical of American public opinion. And once again it chose an inveterate critic of the President's and Mr. Hull's foreign policy. Then O. W. I. brought to the microphone its own private Charlie McCarthy, John Durfee, and quoted him as saying that in this country the fall of Mussolini was not regarded as a matter of great importance. These views, put forth officially for 2 days by the propaganda agency of the Government, were more heavily weighted with apparent official sanction to foreign listeners by the introduction: "This is the voice of America."

At this same time the press of the entire articulate world was dealing with the changes in Italy as events of first consequence. The statesmen of this country and Great Britain and General Eisenhower in north Africa were standing by for developments leading to the unconditional surrender of the Italians through their accredited spokesmen. These happened to be the very King and Marshal against whom the O. W. I. was channeling abuse as typical American public opinion through the official voice of America. Statements made later in the week by the President, the British Prime Minister, and General Eisenhower made it clear that they would enter into surrender parleys with the King and the Marshal.

THREEFOLD MISCHIEF

The mischief of what O. W. I.'s overseas division did, therefore, was threefold. It incited criticism of any negotiations by the Government with Victor Emmanuel and Badoglio from those whose outcries against the President's Vichy policy and General Eisenhower's expedient arrangement with the late Admiral Darlan imperiled our arms in north Africa. It made a chart of high policy without the slightest authority from those in charge of that. It manufactured public opinion.

The President sternly rebuked the overseas division of O. W. I., saying that there had been no prior consultation with himself, Secretary of State Hull, or even Mr. Sherwood, that the broadcast should never have been made, and that Mr. Sherwood was engaged in vigorous reprimand. This dispelled the faint hope of some friendly persons that O. W. I., aware—as it should have been—of the problems before the new Italian regime of getting the Germans out of Italy and their troops and workmen back from Hitlerized Europe, was subtly making a protective cover for the King and Badoglio on instructions of the architects of our foreign and military policy.

PENITENT AT FIRST

At first the responsible O. W. I. officials were penitent. Mr. Sherwood said "We won't be caught off the beam again." James P. Warburg and Joseph Barnes, of the New York office, assumed the blame. But in a short time Mr. Sherwood was heard complaining that vain efforts had been made to get in touch with directing officials "on a summer Sunday night," an implication that the high command was off the job, when, instead, it was observing that caution which O. W. I. should have. And so far there have been no resignations.

In the opinion of this correspondent, there should be a number of them, voluntary or required, and for several reasons. There is no good administrative excuse for an organization that rushes into such an adventure without every check and authority, including that of a chief who at all times has access to the President. The device of "John Durfee" was official and known to all concerned, and it was violating Mr. Sherwoods rescript before the committees when he made it. Those administrators of the foreign propaganda division who are not confused, or deliberate undercutters of the State Department, are incompetent. Competent management, such as several other experienced and responsible persons could give, exists in plenty outside the O. W. I.

It has been stated repeatedly that material broadcast overseas by the O. W. I. at the taxpayer's expense has been sheer communism. It is difficult to establish to what extent this is true without a thoroughgoing investigation of the broadcasting work of the agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I call as witnesses in this connection the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. I refer specifically to an article appearing recently in the World-Telegram. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] put the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and you will find it in the RECORD of Tuesday, October 12, 1943. I shall not reinsert it, but here is the original of that article. You will notice the headlines. The leading headline is "Unions label O. W. I. radio program communism."

That article very briefly asserts that the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations made a joint protest over 10 months ago to Elmer Davis to the effect that the O. W. I. overseas branch had been regularly broadcasting Communist propaganda in its daily short-wave radio programs.

It states further that after months of futile negotiation the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. liquidated their labor short-wave bureau set up to collect nonfactual news to be turned over to O. W. I. as broadcast material.

It states further that the reason for closing the bureau, as they informed Mr. Davis late in August, was that they could reach no basis of agreement with O. W. I. in eliminating the alleged Communist influence, and, therefore, the labor short wave could no longer perform a useful function.

The article states finally that they acted after Joseph Barnes, one of Mr. Davis' top men in the O. W. I. Overseas Branch, assigned to the O. W. I. labor desk a man whom the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. considered entirely unsatisfactory because of his association with the Communist faction in American labor.

These are serious charges.

There are many other charges, Mr. Chairman, but time does not permit detailed discussion of them. It has been charged, for instance, that O. W. I. has attempted to control the personnel and the program content of all foreign broadcast stations in this country. It has been charged that their zeal for censorship went so far as to forbid the Polish Ministry of Information in this country from broadcasting a statement by the Polish Foreign Minister simply because the Minister included a statement to the effect that the Polish Government stands firm for the integrity of Polish territory.

All of us are familiar with the recent lecture tour of the mayor of Portland, Oreg., and others to let the English people see what typical Americans are like. I have here the comment of Donald Mackenzie, writing from London, in which he says that the announcement of this project provided the British with one of the best laughs of the war. I also have the comment of Frank Kent, in which he expresses the view that undoubtedly the intentions of O. W. I. were highly patriotic and noble, but that there ought to have been someone somewhere in the organization to point out its silliness and exercise a little judgment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these comments:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July, 10, 1943]

O. W. I. WOWS 'EM IN LONDON WITH PLAN TO EXHIBIT YANKS

(By Donald Mackenzie)

LONDON, July 9.—Some master mind in Washington's O. W. I. has provided the British with one of their best laughs of the war. This gentleman plans—according to an official hand-out here—to send a party of typical Americans to tour Britain and let Englishmen see what they're like.

Still rocking under the impact of this startling bulletin, your correspondent picked at random an inquiring photographer's panel out of the London telephone book to see what the typical Briton thought of this bit of lend-lease.

PROBLEM FOR DAVIS

All wanted to know first how Elmer Davis' boys would catalog the tens of thousands of young men walking about this country now and for the last year or so, wearing khaki uniforms with insignia bearing the letters "U. S." on the lapels.

When those questioned were convinced that this inquiring reporter wasn't a bit daft, they suggested that some lucky Yanks were in for a sweet junket and that it was a pity some clever guy up at the British Ministry of Information didn't get a brain wave like that and go through the telephone book with a pin, picking a galaxy of typical Englishmen with, of course, a balanced number of ash blondes, for exhibition in the United States.

Miss Myra Burton, of Hamilton Court, Edgeware Road, London, who is going out nowadays with a gob from San Diego, Calif., said her boy friend was a typical enough Yank and suited her fine. She said she could just picture his face when she slipped him the glad tidings that he might be asked to risk his life convoying this picnic party across the Atlantic. And who was going to pick the types—Orson Welles, John Powers, or Joe Doakes?

ZOOT SUIT QUESTION

John Flowers, of Nell Gwynne Apartments, Chelsea, wanted to know if the O. W. I. party would be wearing zoot suits, cowboy chaps, or Indian blankets, and, if not, how were its members to be recognized? Would they wear a sash emblazoned "I am an American," or have cards in their hats as all reporters simply must have in the American movies? Or would an exhibit from the land of plenty be posted in each West End cocktail bar buying good-will whiskies at a dollar a nip on the cuff while the suckers at home weighed in with their weekly 20 percent (withheld) and kept the party going?

Mrs. Fred Barnes, whose husband is in the fruit business in High Street, Putney, said she wouldn't mind seeing some real Georgia peaches—not the edible kind we are just now getting here at $3 each under lend-lease or something—but she supposed they would not come under the heading of typical Americans. Or would they?

A party of enlisted men, asked to comment, said: "These guys just think up the dingdest things, don't they? Yeah, we'd like to see this bunch of typical Americans come over—wearing uniforms."

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 8, 1943]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

In a letter to Senator BYRD, Mr. Elmer Davis, head of the O. W. I., justifies sending to England a small army of lady and gentlemen orators with the statement that there is a great demand over there for American speakers to "interpret" America to the British. The London O. W. I. officials assert that the objective of these speakers is to "stir reciprocal enthusiasm for an accelerated war effort."

The first account of the way in which Mr. Davis' "carefully chosen" orators are interpreting America and stirring reciprocal enthusiasm was given by the London correspondent of the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Thomas O'Neil, who reported the initial speech of Mayor Earl Riley, of Portland, Oreg., just arrived in England, fresh from the home of O. W. I. Briefly, Mr. O'Neil reports the chief points made by Mr. Riley as these—that Portland is one of the three great world centers of rose culture; that nearly one-third of all American ship production comes from Portland; that everybody loves everybody else in Portland; that flashlight bulbs and batteries are more plentiful in London than in Portland.

HOME-TOWN SPEECH

In addition, the mayor declared that all energies in Portland are bent upon a quick conclusion of the war of the Atlantic so that Britain and America can get on with the war against Japan. He then pointed out that Portland submits to rigid restrictions on clothing, food, and fuel; that Portland is now host to the war workers from the South and West, and these workers have boosted the city's population by 50 percent; that when he gets back to Portland, in December, roses will be growing right beside his porch.

This is the speech which he is repeating in all parts of the British Isles on a 6 weeks' tour. One can imagine the enthusiasm which his inspiring words must have aroused among the British journalists to whom they were addressed. Particularly, one can imagine how they who for 4 years have lived under a relentless and complete black-out were stirred by the news of Portland's dim-out. And with what emotion they heard of the noble manner in which Portland bears up under meatless days and the cruel cuffless-trouser regulation.

Seriously speaking, when it is considered that Mayor Riley, though regarded as a star, is only one of a large group of these American speakers whom the O. W. I. is sending to England, it is not surprising that those who feel the vital need of a permanent British-American alliance should be somewhat concerned.

CAUSE FOR IRRITATION

At this time to unloose upon England a flood of such interpretive American oratory does not seem the best way to cement friendship and promote understanding—at least, if Mayor Riley's oratory is typical of the output. On the contrary it is possible that what really will be promoted is friction and irritation.

Exactly who conceived this bright idea has not been revealed, but it is pretty certain that the British acquiesced in but did not originate it. It is, of course, natural for the British to agree to almost any suggestion made by our officials, but if, as alleged, the British information authorities really made a demand of this kind, then they must feel like kicking themselves pretty hard now.

Undoubtedly, the intentions of those responsible for this O. W. I. project are highly patriotic and noble—but there ought to have been someone somewhere in the organization to point out its silliness and to exercise a little judgment.

After considering the speech of Mayor Riley, one is inclined to shudder at the thought that he has a dozen and more colleagues over there, exuding the same sort of stuff. The one comforting reflection is that if British-American relations can stand this they can stand practically anything.

There is one other matter I would like to refer to hurriedly. Although it is not the responsibility of the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I., it is an O. W. I. responsibility and is typical of some of the things that the agency has embarked upon. I refer to the well-known questionnaires sent out last August to the Polish-American people of this country.

The sending of this questionnaire infuriated many of our American citizens of Polish descent, as I can testify. Mr. Davis says he is unable to state what the purpose was. Mr. Davis says he is unable to see what possible good the questionnaire could have done. He says it was done for another agency, which agency he prefers to keep off the record.

The best estimate that I can make in reading the questionnaire is that it was designed to place those interrogated in the uncomfortable position of appearing either anti-American or pro-Russian. I confess that to me the whole project appears to have been a sheer waste of time and the taxpayers' money.

I am informed there was another similar questionnaire sent to another racial group in this country.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Regarding that questionnaire sent to the Polish-American citizens of this country, did not the instructions on that questionnaire specifically state that the agents circulating that questionnaire were to tell the people in interviewing them that it was a particular study made at the request of the Office of War Information? That is on the first page of the questionnaire.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have a copy of the questionnaire and the instructions here. On page 1 of the instructions appears the following sentence:

> If anyone asks what will be done with the results, tell them that this particular study is being made at the request of the Office of War Information.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield briefly.

Mr. RABAUT. I notice that the gentleman has used these expressions: "It has been charged," "It has been said," "It is alleged," and "Headlines, biggest laugh of the war." Who is charging this? Who is alleging it? What are the facts and what are they alleging? Does the gentleman make the charge, or who is making the charge, and what charge is being made? I am speaking particularly of the reference to Communists.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am going to deal with that at greater length, if the gentleman will permit. I think if the gentleman has followed me closely he will see that I have stated that in view of the charges which have been made I

am opposed to further funds being appropriated for operation in Allied and neutral countries until those charges are thoroughly gone into. I think I have detailed very specifically charges that are typical of what I have in mind.

Mr. RABAUT. I have great respect for the gentleman. It would certainly affect me a lot if I figured that he was making any of these charges. However, I have noticed particularly that he never has said, "I make this charge," and the gentleman has heard all of the testimony.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have given the authority in each instance, and I think the record will speak for itself.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word on the subject to which the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has just referred. I refer to the personnel carried on the rolls of the Office of War Information. The testimony of the agency in June was to the effect that there were no less than 417 aliens on the rolls of the Office of War Information. The testimony today is that that number has increased to 486. Many of these aliens were refugees from abroad, were obtained through a private corporation known as Shortwave Research, Inc., an organization created to circumvent the law, an organization which received over half a million dollars from Uncle Sam, an organization which took 10 percent for its own services, paying the bulk of the balance in salaries to refugees and others, and turning over on liquidation the sum of about $30,000, to so-called charities in this country, such as the Friends of German Freedom, probably without authority.

It has been repeatedly charged, Mr. Chairman, that there are included on the rolls of the Office of War Information people of extremely radical backgrounds, activities, or associations, who should not be on the rolls of the Federal Government, particularly in confidential positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I point out that the record in June indicated that there were no less than 1,235 people on the rolls of O. W. I. who had not been investigated for loyalty by the Civil Service Commission. The record today indicates that the number of those who have not been investigated is not 1,235, but 1,729. The Civil Service Commission advise that 78 people have been removed from the rolls of O. W. I. on their recommendation, either for lack of loyalty or lack of proper moral or physical standards.

Mr. RABAUT. May I ask the gentleman how many were removed for lack of loyalty?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot break the number down as to the three categories.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman does not have the number of those who were discharged for lack of loyalty?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The number is 78 for lack of loyalty or lack of required moral or physical standards.

Mr. RABAUT. I think in justice to the House they ought to be divided.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have stated to the gentleman the exact facts as given me by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman talks about this arrangement. The original arrangement was made with Colonel Donovan.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further. My time is very short.

In the June hearings I brought to the attention of O. W. I. the names of 45 specific individuals in respect to whom information had come to me leading me to feel that their qualifications should be thoroughly examined. The record today indicates that 15 of those individuals have been removed from the rolls, 3 of them, incidentally, by transfer to other agencies of the Government, that 15 have been cleared, that 15 are still on the waiting list, so to speak, not having been investigated, despite the fact that I brought the matter to the attention of the agency some 4 months ago.

I do not want to go into names at this time. I do not say that the representations made to the members of this committee are true or are false. In order to give the House and the country some idea, however, of the character of the information which has come from time to time to members of this committee from sources believed to be reliable, I may say that it has been represented that among those who have been eliminated from the rolls of this agency are a former Vienna Communist, a former officer in Mussolini's army, an employee formerly expelled from another country by reason of his communistic views, an employee affiliated closely with Communist front organizations, a former contributor to the Daily Worker and other Communist front organizations, a Hungarian Communist, a German Communist, another employee with Communist front affiliations, a contributor to the New Masses, a well-known fellow traveler, and a participant in the May Day parade carrying the banner of the coordinating committee.

It has further been represented, whether rightly or wrongly I do not know, that among those now on the rolls of this agency who have not yet been investigated are a well-known fellow traveler with a conviction for embezzlement against him, an Austrian Communist who has indulged in Communist intrigues in both Europe and America, another employee with Communist-front affiliations, a notorious Polish Communist, a moral degenerate, a contributor to the Daily Worker, a fellow traveler, a German Communist, one in whose home was found a lot of Communist literature, a Hungarian formerly a member of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, a fellow traveler, a refugee fined for smuggling gold, a Soviet agent who worked for the Soviet in the Baltics, said to have forged press credentials, an employee with a Communist record in Europe, an employee with a Communist background and falsified citizenship status, an Italian refugee with a Communist background, a former editor of a Communist newspaper, and a Communist agent speaking no English.

Mr. Chairman, these are but examples. I repeat that I have named no names and make no assertion that these charges are true or untrue; I do say, however, that where there is so much smoke there is apt to be fire. I do say that there has been an interminable delay in investigating certain of the cases which have been brought to the attention of O. W. I. I do say that in my opinion the O. W. I. owes it to itself and to America to see that these investigations are completed at the earliest possible moment and that its house is in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Briefly.

Mr. KENNEDY. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not any of these men on the pay roll of the O. W. I. have been recommended or endorsed by a Member of this House or of the Senate?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot give the gentleman that information.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is there any way that we can find out who did endorse these people for these confidential positions?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Perhaps the gentleman can find out from the agency better than I can.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the Senators who have returned from their world tour recently have indicated an intention to go thoroughly into this matter of the work of the O. W. I. in countries abroad other than enemy and enemy-occupied countries. I sincerely hope that this will be done and that it will be done promptly, so that we may have the facts before us and be able to see the picture as a whole. The record of O. W. I. to date is far from satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I asked a question of the last speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], how many names of men there were who were guilty of disloyalty or charged with disloyalty. I have here a letter, excerpts of which later I shall ask to put into the RECORD, where it says the gentleman was notified there were six who were declared ineligible because of disloyalty.

Extract from a letter of November 3, 1943, from Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, to Chairman CANNON, of the House Committee on Appropriations:

> I understand, also, that Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked the Commission for the number of cases in which employees of the O. W. I. had been held ineligible. The Commissioner reported 37 such cases. In response to a request from Mr. WIGGLESWORTH for the number of persons held ineligible because of questionable loyalty, we submitted for the transcript of the hearings a list of 6 such

cases. We have checked with the Commission and ascertained that of the 37 which they reported only 6 were declared ineligible because of disloyalty; the others having been held ineligible for some other reason. The apparent discrepancy between our report and that submitted to Mr. WIGGLESWORTH by the Commission is due evidently to the fact that Mr. WIGGLESWORTH phrased his question to the Commission in a different way from the question he put to us.

The gentlemen on the minority side have had placed in the hearings names, other than Anglo-Saxon names, for no apparent reason, as follows—page 1295:

Mr. TABER. Now, I would like to ask several questions of different types. I have a list of people here whom I would like to know whether or not they are employed by your organization; and, if so, what their position is and what their present salary is:

Maria D. Biasio; Maurice English; Bill Strickler; Robert Lopec; Premo Raddi; Vito Magli; Nicolo Chiarmonte; Pio Sterbini; a woman named Talamo Padovano; a person named Squadra; another one named Brunelli; another one named Fubini; Anna Maria Granatti; Gunzbourg; Ettore Rava; Sylvio Minciotti; Giuseppe Lupis; Edward Wintermitz; Peter Levi, also known as Levi Sandy, also known as Sardi; Orelio Natoli; Louis Navara; Elmer Baccanelli; and C. Corte.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman giving both the first and the last names there?

Mr. TABER. Wherever I could.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, I take for granted it would be very difficult, unless you have the complete name, to locate them. Are the names, as given by Mr. Taber, sufficiently explicit for you to locate them in your files?

Mr. HAMBLET. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Do you recognize any of them as people who work for you?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I recognize two or three.

Mr. BARNES. The most of them are working for us in the Italian language section in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what information does the gentleman want?

Mr. TABER. Whether or not these people were currently employed by O. W. I., in what capacity, and at what salary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be furnished for the record.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

"Gerbi, Juliano, staff announcer, $3,800.

"English, Maurice, Chief, Italian Section, $5,600.

"Giovanola, Luigi, script editor, $3,800.

"Lopez, Robert, terminated September 30, 1943.

"Raddi, Primo, assistant script editor, $2,600.

"Chiaramonte, Nicolo, terminated August 26, 1943.

"Sterbini, Pio, assistant language editor, $2,600.

"Talano, Anna Maria, senior translator, $2,000.

"Padovano, Georgio, script editor, $3,800.

"Squadra, Enrico, associate script editor, $3,200.

"Brunelli, Gilbert, associate script editor, $3,200.

"Fubini, Elsa, assistant script editor, $2,600 (on leave).

"Granata, Yole, junior script editor, $2,000.

"Gunzberg, Jules, assistant script editor, $2,600.

"Rava, Ettore, associate announcer, $3,200.

"Minciotto, Silvio, staff announcer, $3,800.

"Lupis, G., terminated March 8, 1943.

"Wintermitz, Edward, associate script editor, $3,200.

"Maurio, Levi, script editor, $3,200.

"Natoli, Aurelio, purchase order script writer ($10 per script).

"Navarra, Louis, assistant script editor, $2,600.

"Baccanelli, Elma, senior translator, $2,000.

"Corte, Clelia, senior translator, $2,000.

"Magli, Vito, military furlough, February 1, 1943.

"New York Office of Control:

"DeBlasio, Maria, control editor (CAF–11), $3,800.

"Stricker, Bill, control editor (CAF–7), $2,600."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts says he will quote no names. I am anxious to quote a few of these foreign names today, and I call them with reverence. They are as follows:

Harry F. Belobraidich, Orlando H. Romano, Robert Zatzke, Stanley Bocianowski, Alfio Benevenuti, Max Bernstein, John Bielanski, Erich Rennhack, Robert Poschke, Francis Cychosz, Lawrence Schuberg, Benedick Lemanski, Veikko Leivo, Theodore Figurski, Frank Idziak, Edward Juskowski, Herman Keller, Edward Kowalewski, Leonard Kowalski, Edward Lewandowski, Clarence Lipke, John Pennazoli, Stanley Romanowski, Eli Simantz, Alphonse Brzozowski, Rudolph Olesnevich, Stanley Czarnecki, Earl Petrimoulx.

Now, prepare to bow your heads. These are the names of those who have given their all in battle. If you had nothing else against them but their names, then withdraw some of this talk that is going on in this room, for it cries to shame, and thousands of others with similar names will have a golden star in the window of some of the humble homes of this Nation for having given not words but their all for America. Let us get serious and drop some of the hate for some individual at the price—the supreme price—of human life.

I want to talk now about this shortwave matter. The Shortwave Research, Inc., was used by the Coordinator of Information, Colonel Donovan, usually very highly respected over there and elsewhere. So, if you want to know when it started, that is when it started—primarily as an economy for the Government—since it permitted them to secure foreign-language talent on a piecework basis before its output was large enough to warrant language staffs, especially in minor languages. This war is not being fought in the English language, nor in English countries only. Get that in your mind. There are 35 fronts and several languages, and you cannot walk in with a half-baked idiom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. I say that you cannot walk in with a half-baked idiom, nor with some peculiar twist to your pronunciation. This service of the O. W. I. has had the approval of the commanding generals at the front. Every member of the O. W. I. has had an investigation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, he has had a preliminary investigation. I say he has. He has had an investigation by the F. B. I., and an investigation by the intelligence departments of the Army and of the Navy and he has had an investigation by their own intelligence department. Oh, he has not had a final investigation by the Civil Service. Do you want the war to stop and wait until somebody catches up with these fellows? We are moving. But there has been an investigation—all words to the contrary notwithstanding. So you have the intelligence bureau of the Army, the intelligence bureau of the Navy, the F. B. I. investigation of these people, and the Civil Service, but we must yield to the supreme investigation of someone in the House who does not like Elmer Davis. That is all there is in this thing, that is all and nothing else. The Army wants them, the Navy wants them, General Marshall has approved them in an open letter which you can find right there in the report. Other officials have praised them. They said, "We want more of them. They are doing a grand job." But some there are who do not like Elmer Davis. So, this service will all have to go out the window, regardless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], that in connection with his citation to the report of a Senate committee I include an excerpt on the same subject from another Senate committee. I include the following quotation from Senate Document No. 152 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, a report from the Byrd committee:

Of course, the committee does not claim sole credit for these reductions. Some of the agencies themselves have cooperated in bringing them about. The Budget Bureau has worked diligently in reducing nonessential expenditures and paring down Budget recommendations. Many Members of Congress, as individuals and as members of committees, have made invaluable contributions. And, of course, Congress has been the final authority.

The Byrd committee, consisting of six Members from the House and six from the Senate, after exhaustive hearings reported that the Bureau of the Budget had not only cooperated effectively in the economy program but had worked diligently in reducing expenditures.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, during my tenure of office as a Member of this body, I have seen bill after bill rammed, jammed, and steam-rollered through the processes of legislation by the present administration. However, what has happened here today is a rank disgrace to the country. The very method of presenting this appropriation bill is an insult to our honesty.

The administration is asking for, even demanding, approval for an appropriation bill calling for more than $215,000,000 to be added to the heavy load of the people of this country. As a representative of those people, I have been trying for 2 solid days to find out what is listed in that bill as calling for any part or all of that money. I was able to learn absolutely nothing, because the members of the committee were sworn to strict secrecy. I was told that copies of the bill would be available to Members when the House was called to order today, and that piece of legislation presented to them for vote.

When the bill was brought up today, I found that no copies of the bill in question were available for Members and that there are only three copies of the full committee print to be had. Not a copy of the minority report is available; in fact, the minority report was not even authorized for printing until this morning. I personally resent being asked to cast a vote in blind confidence.

Is there a man in this House who would dare to try to defend his position to his constituency if he voted in favor of such a bill?

Do any of you represent a group of American citizens stupid enough to send you back to the House of Representatives if you would cast a vote for a bill, any bill, sight unseen?

I can tell you here and now that they do not "raise 'em" that dumb in southern Indiana! We know what we buy out there, and if we do not know, we do not buy. I would think that all of us could read the trend of the times after yesterday's election returns. Maybe it has not soaked in yet that the people are sick and tired and mad and tough about the clipping that Washington seems bent on dishing out to them.

Gentlemen, I will not, I flatly refuse, to spend $2 from the pockets of every man, woman, and child in this country and to take $2 from the pay of every soldier, sailor, and marine in uniform, without knowing what the money is to be spent for. Our people are already staggering under a national debt of fantastic proportions, not to mention the $148 to be paid in interest by every taxpayer on his share of the obligation when it reaches $300,000,000,000. At this rate, in a couple of years the interest chargeable will be approximately 2 hours of his pay per day just to keep up the interest on our debts. I not only will not, I cannot vote for this bill. The past black record of the administration in money matters has failed to inspire that kind of confidence in me.

I realize that some of you are afraid to vote your conscience because the "boss" would not like it. I want it straight in the RECORD now that my boss would like it, and I am bossed only by the voiced sentiment of the people of the Ninth District of Indiana. As long as I deserve to represent my employers in the Halls of Congress, I will buy no "pigs in pokes" with their hard-earned money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Is the gentleman voting against the bill because it is a reduction of 82 percent of the Budget estimate, or is he voting against it because it saves a billion dollars? Is the gentleman voting against it because it provides beds for the wounded soldiers?

Mr. WILSON. Is the gentleman attempting to justify this appropriation bill simply because they asked for a billion dollars and you are giving them $225,000,000 only? Suppose they had asked for a hundred billion, then you could have boasted of cutting them down to two-tenths of 1 percent. Mr. Chairman, how can I know what is in the bill when it has not even been printed? Does the gentleman mean to infer that I should blindly support any appropriation?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised with the tactics resorted to by my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] in his attack by innuendo on the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. I resent and I believe every fair-minded man in the House resents the type of attack that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] launched against the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

At no time during the course of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] was there the slightest suggestion that those against whom he directed criticism were the subject of his critical approach by reason of their names. At no time did he either by direct statement or innuendo evidence any prejudice, bias, or ill will against any man because of his name. He very properly called into question individuals who had been on the roll of O. W. I. and who were under suspicion by reason of the reports of a committee of the House or from other authentic sources.

It seems to me that a cause must be a losing cause when resort must be had to the waving of the name of men who have given their all in service as a means of protecting those whom the F. B. I. and other organizations have thus far failed to clear. I have always taken the position that no defense is better than a palpably poor one.

If any of the observations that I have made about my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] have been an exaggeration or a misstatement of fact, I will yield, and I will accept correction. In the absence of such correction, I shall assume that there is agreement that the indictment I have drawn of the unwarranted attack upon the gentleman from Massachusetts, who commands the respect and affection of all, was without foundation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I opened my remarks by saying no names were mentioned here, but that I wished to mention those names. Moreover, the gentleman has been present at the hearings——

Mr. DITTER. Now I am yielding for a question.

Mr. RABAUT. All right. I will give you the question. The gentleman did not yield for a question when he started.

Mr. DITTER. I will yield for a denial of the indictment that I have drawn.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I just deny it.

Mr. DITTER. Now I would like to hear the amplification of the defense.

Mr. RABAUT. You may prove your indictment.

Mr. DITTER. When a matter is self-evident, the production of evidence to prove a point is simply a waste of time.

I repeat what I said before: There was no foundation for the tactics resorted to by the gentleman from Michigan when he implied that the gentleman from Massachusetts was critical of anyone because of their name or ancestry.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Take a look at the hearings, page 1295, and see what the gentleman thinks about those names and the questions that were asked about them—pages 1295 and 1296, and the questions asked. A number of these names were spoken in committee.

Mr. DITTER. I do not have the hearings before me but I shall say this now——

Mr. RABAUT. I will give the gentleman a copy.

Mr. DITTER. I do not need it. My confidence in the gentleman from Massachusetts prompts me to make the declaration that no matter what the hearings may show as to names, he bears no ill will, no prejudice, no bias, no intolerance in his heart against any man by reason of his name. That he very properly continues to criticize the employment of persons by Government agencies whose loyalty to the United States has not been definitely established.

Were I to yield to temptation at the moment I would recount the happenings of the last few days. It is probable that my friend from Michigan would not have resorted to the tactics that he did were he in a less disturbed state of mind. I know my friend from Massachusetts will excuse him, and I certainly will excuse him because I know my friend from Michigan would never have gone to the lengths which he did had he not been disturbed and distressed over the results of last Tuesday's elections. With that usual charity which the minority has always shown to the shortcomings of the majority, and speaking for my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, I forgive my friend from Michigan. The sorry effort which he made, I know, was due entirely to his disturbed state of mind as he read the election returns.

According to the latest figures as I have them, I believe Kentucky is safely on the right side of the ledger with not only the governorship but with other State offices in the Republican column. If my friend from Michigan can find any comfort in them, I volunteer the information to him that the New Deal has

been rejected in Kentucky by a majority of better than 8,000.

Mr. RABAUT. May I offer some solace to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DITTER. I have not yielded at this point.

Mr. RABAUT. I am going to ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. DITTER. Well, I must be charitable to my friend in his distress. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I am sorry to see the gentleman bring politics into something as serious as this, but since he has, I want to recite to him four lines I ran across:

Born for the universe,
So narrow his mind!
And to party gave up
What was meant for mankind.

I would not want to inject that at this time, but that is what the gentleman is trying to inject upon me.

Mr. DITTER. My friend from Michigan has served a long time in the House. He has established a reputation. If he is attempting at this time to put on either a pontifical air or a robe of righteousness to impress anyone in the House or in the galleries with a nonpartisan approach, I would suggest that he be natural. Neither the pontifical air nor the robe of righteousness become him.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. TABER. The question which was referred to on page 1295 of the hearings was asked by me. I feel, therefore, that I should call attention to the fact that many of those names were of people who were not doing a good job according to the evidence that I had and were not very loyal to the United States. I do not believe, and I should like to have the gentleman from Michigan realize, that reading a list of those who have served in the armed forces is any excuse or any cover-up for another group of people who happen to have somewhat similar names who do not meet that extent of devotion.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman mentioned my name. Will he yield to me?

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman from New York, of course, cannot yield.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I am asking the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he will yield.

Mr. DITTER. In fairness to the gentleman from Michigan I will yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could interject at the moment that this is all coming out of my time.

Mr. RABAUT. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that in asking these questions, in setting forth these names that he did on page 1295, what was his purpose outside of just reciting the names?

What charges does the gentleman make against them?

Mr. TABER. It is all in the record.

Mr. RABAUT. There is nothing in this record except a list of these names.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes. There is the job they hold and their salary. I wanted them so they could be pointed out on occasion, just what they were being paid and so forth.

Mr. RABAUT. And what was the information that the gentleman wanted?

Mr. TABER. I wanted to know the type of job and the amount of money that was being paid to these people and what their position was.

Mr. RABAUT. All people with foreign names, were they not?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, they were. Read the list.

Mr. TABER. One of them was Maurice English.

Mr. RABAUT. One of them. There are quite a few names there that got in here by error then.

Mr. TABER. If a group of people with foreign names is in a position where they are not rendering service or where they are not doing a job or stand up to the rack, they cannot be covered up nor that situation justified by reading the names of boys who have inherited foreign names and who serve in the Army.

Mr. RABAUT. That was not suggested at that time. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would permit me to put the list of names in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. DITTER. I hope my distinguished friend from Michigan will not overstep the bounds of propriety. If he cares to have those names publicized, I suggest that he use his own time.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman. I will put them in in my own time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the purpose of keeping the record straight, let me suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that it has been only a few months since this floor resounded with an attack on what we deemed to be the disloyalty of certain people and their names were Watson and Lovett. There was not any distinction as to names. The only measuring rod we used was their loyalty to this Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield to me inasmuch as the gentleman referred to me?

Mr. DITTER. There is a limit beyond which human endurance cannot go.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would like to make this observation: Reference has been made here to foreign names. I would like to have any Member of the House define what is a foreign name and what is an American name, with the exception of the American Indian names.

Mr. DITTER. I am so happy to know that my distinguished friend from New York supports the position I take. That is exactly the point I make. I feel it was so unfortunate for the gentleman from Michigan to take this matter of foreign names and inject them. It tends to show an intolerance and a lack of understanding of America's mission. I thank the gentleman from New York for his confirmation of the position I take.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentlemen from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman from New York has stated my question exactly. Removed just one generation, one side of my family came from across the sea and I resent any statements about foreign names. I would like to have it defined.

Mr. DITTER. Now, let us get away from seriousness for a moment. It is a late hour and we need a bit of pleasantry. Since we are talking about names and O. W. I., and as we think of the Bergens that may be abroad at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that Charlie McCarthy is on the rolls of O. W. I. I have it here before me. He is included with the personnel list. According to this Charlie McCarthy is getting $2,328.84 a year.

Mr. RAMEY. You mean of taxpayers' money?

Mr. DITTER. Of taxpayers' money, yes. I would suggest in fairness to the taxpayer, that the gentleman from Michigan or some other courageous soul on the majority side now tell the taxpayers who the Bergen is that talks through this mouthpiece of Charlie McCarthy? I might suggest who they are. Some of us on this side of the aisle are rather suspicious. We would like the suspicion removed by a frank admission of who the Bergens are.

Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration the O. W. I. foreign service, not its domestic branch. I have in my hand a bundle of releases prepared by O. W. I. for distribution to the foreign correspondents in New York. These are but a few of the many, many, many documents that are ground out by the printing presses of O. W. I. Time will not permit me to go into all of the questionable and criticizable quotes but I want to ask in all fairness of those on the majority side, whether they feel it is good taste to send to the foreign correspondents a release called "New South Rises in the United States"? Mark you, this is submitted to a group of foreign correspondents so that they in turn can take it as is or build a story around it for the consumption of the folks on the other side.

I want to ask those men who still believe in the fine traditions of the South, who still believe that the South has a contribution to make to this Nation of ours, whether you are proud of a declaration in this new South release by which it is charged that the South is still retarded by the aftermath of feudalism. I repeat, by the aftermath of feudalism. To me the suggestion of feudalism as ever having been a part of our way of life is extremely distasteful to me. I rebel against the very idea. Feudalism has nothing in common with the chivalry of

the South—with the courageous independence of the southerner.

To charge that we are retarded by the aftermaths of feudalism, and to tell that to the people of every nation in the world shows an incompetence which cannot be explained or excused. O. W. I. is boasting to other people that the remnants of feudalism persist here. Shame on it all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I am not yielding.

This is written by a well-known American author and editor who lived in Richmond, Va. All well and good; but I still question whether the war effort is going to be furthered by having the folks over there told that any of us, whether we come from the South or the North, from the East or the West, are retarded by the aftermaths of feudalism.

My distinguished chairman feels that I had forgotten that this is in the record. I had been reluctant to mention it because I did not want to give it any more advertising; but since he has forced it upon me, since he has forcibly thrust it in your face, this whole article is in the hearings. There are other things beside the retardation of a feudal ancestry. I quote from this O. W. I. release:

With slave labor, the planter's family lived as feudal barons.

Where is the man from Georgia, where is the man from Virginia, where is the man from the Carolinas who wants to have it spread abroad in Europe, Africa, and Asia, as a part of O. W. I.'s money-spending scheme, that we are living in the aftermaths of feudalism?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. No; not at the moment, if my distinguished friend will be patient for a moment.

No; that is not what I want to see sent to the far corners of the earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I want to see go to the far corners of the earth the story that I love to think about, of strong men and courageous women.

Is the story of America's mission so lacking in interest that resort must be had to a recital of feudal survival?

Feudalism? No; we have nothing of feudalism here. I am opposed to a foreign policy on the part of an agency that feels that one thin dollar should be spent for either the preparation or the dissemination of material such as this. I challenge every southern Member to denounce this unwarranted reflection on their people.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. No; I do not yield.

"Working Woman of the White House." My friends on this side will be interested to learn that here are six pages about the First Lady of the land. I may not agree with the First Lady of the land in her political philosophy, but I do say that she stands for something that has challenged the affection of many people.

I could go on with all of these releases. In this foreign release foreigners are told we are "Galluped" into elections. It is not what people think, it is what Gallup says, according to this three-page brochure. That is money wasted. And let those who say that the $5,000,000 is for the carrying on of psychological warfare place a value on psychology of this kind. Remember, part of the $5,000,000 now requested by O. W. I. is to be used for the psychology of feudalism and the Galluping of elections. Who can justify such needless expenditures?

I want to say just a word about Marshall Field's villa in passing. You all know about the training centers we have established for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. We have a new one. O. W. I., not to be outdone, not wanting the Army to be a step ahead, or the Navy, or the Marine Corps, decided that it needed its own peculiar training center, so they went over into Long Island, lovely spot that it is, and found Marshall Field's villa. It is a retreat for O. W. I. psychology. It is a retreat for pay rolling favorites. It is a retreat of waste and extravagance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. May I have 1 minute so I can yield to the chairman?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is aware, I take for granted, that none of the material he has discussed has any connection whatever with this appropriation?

Mr. DITTER. I quite disagree with the chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. None of the $5,000,000 we propose to appropriate here has anything to do with this, because that will be used on the other side and has no connection with the domestic situation.

I also wonder if the gentleman objects to the statement in the article to which he refers that if there ever was a medieval, feudal condition existing in the South it has long since disappeared, and that it existed in the far-distant past.

I should also like to know if the gentleman is aware of the fact that the man who wrote this article was not on the Office of War Information pay roll at all, he was not on the Government pay roll in any respect. The gentleman doubtless is aware of the fact that O. W. I. did take every opportunity to extol and sing the praises of the gallant women in Corregidor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. No, I do not yield now. I must answer the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield after that?

Mr. DITTER. I take issue with the chairman of the committee and the statement he makes, that this $5,000,000 has nothing to do with this item. This item before us is for foreign service, $5,000,000. The papers which I read from were prepared in New York for foreign distribution. Aside from that, any agency of the Government that shows such poor judgment as to use one penny from Uncle Sam's coffers for the distribution of material of that kind, does not merit the confidence of Congress. I quite agree that this article was prepared by somebody else, but I definitely know that Government money was used for the preparation and distribution of the article, and I know that it has the imprint of O. W. I. on it. Doubtless if I had the opportunity to examine more of these effusions, I could find others that might be just as subject to criticism. The gentleman says, whether I know it or not, that we do know things moved out of this feudalism. I deny that we were ever in the grip of a feudalism.

I do not believe that we were ever feudal in our make-up. As a northerner I refute the charge that the South was a feudal territory. I deny the charge that we are still retarded by the aftermath of feudalism. If the majority wants to put its stamp of approval on material of that kind, if you want it known back in your districts that you are approving an agency that tells the world that we here are retarded by feudalism, then follow the lead of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] who apparently approves the article. I do not condone it. I resent it. I deny it. In my opinion it brands O. W. I. as inefficient and entirely lacking in good judgment.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I find it in the hearings and I ask whether this is correct. I would like to know who is the head of the Outpost Division of the O. W. I. Is it not agreed that the head of this division is Mr. Linnen, and several others connected with Time magazine. My observation of Time magazine is that it has been a pretty accurate recorder of facts in this Nation.

Mr. DITTER. Am I to assume that my friend puts his stamp of approval on the charge that we are still retarded by the aftermath of feudalism?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not read the whole article.

Mr. DITTER. Read it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to.

Mr. DITTER. But irrespective of the text, does my friend approve it? I certainly hope that he will not be led into an admission of that kind. The great West does not want to say that America is still retarded by the aftermath of feudalism.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to say that I know some of these gentlemen.

Mr. DITTER. Undoubtedly some of these gentlemen are splendid gentlemen, and able to carry on the work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Has the gentleman any explanation for it? These are gentlemen who have charge of it.

Mr. DITTER. I think of the agency itself because of its purpose. Its motive was to build a gigantic machine rather than to build an efficient organization.

The action of the majority in approving the request for an additional $5,000,000 for the Office of War Information provides a glaring example of New Deal economy in Government. It brings into sharp relief the difference between form and substance. It shows a total disregard of the penalty imposed upon the taxpayer as a result of mismanagement and the flagrant abuses of power by an arbitrary and defiant Federal agency bent upon the exploitation of an unsuspecting public. It indicates that the blanket approval of the requests of Federal agencies for funds, regardless of their justifiableness or their real value and regardless of the burdensome load which they saddle on the taxpayer, is the majority's conception of its duty. No better signpost of the road plotted by the majority for the future welfare of our people can be found than its surrender to the demands of an agency which has heretofore violated the confidence of the people by stooping to the distribution of political propaganda under the guise of war information.

The advocacy of economy in Government, to be of any value, must be something more than an idle gesture—something more than a window dressing—something far more substantial than the hypocritical beating of the breast or the shedding of crocodile tears. It must have the courage and the common honesty to strike and strike hard at extravagances and wastes—at mismanagement and maladministration—at the excessive and unconscionable padding of the public pay roll. The operations of O. W. I. have nothing in common with economy in government. The two are as far apart as the poles. An examination of the personnel of O. W. I. establishes beyond the shadow of a doubt that its chief ambition has been to build a machine which would make its claim for fame solely on the number of employees that it could take under its wings. Nothing could be more crippling and demoralizing, nothing could be a more fatal blow to the war effort than the majority's blanket approval of O. W. I.'s latest raid on the pockets of the taxpayers.

Every impartial observer is aware of the frantic efforts being made by the majority to impress upon the people its support of economy measures. Without doubt, the events of the last few days have materially intensified the desire of the majority to appear as champions of economy. Ballots were cast and their significance cannot be lightly tossed aside. The concern of the majority for the welfare of the taxpayer, even though long delayed, is a wholesome sign. It will be welcomed by every man and woman who is struggling to make both ends meet after the tax collector has been satisfied. The tragedy, however, is that the majority in approving the present request of O. W. I. for an additional $5,000,000 is dissipating the high hopes which have been stirred by professions and promises. Here, right at hand, the majority has the opportunity to implement the demands of the people for economy in government by reducing the exorbitant request of O. W. I. for funds which have not been justified and which are not needed.

The weakness of the justification of O. W. I. is palpably apparent when one contemplates the lengths to which it has gone to prove its case. Mindful of the criticism directed against it when it last appeared for an appropriation before the Congress, O. W. I. decided to buttress its claims by calling on the War Department for support. In opposing the present request for funds, I do not underestimate the value of a psychological warfare waged on the battle fronts. It can be of inestimable value. But, this in itself does not mean that an unlimited amount of money should be placed at the disposal of O. W. I. for this purpose. An army may have an ample supply of ammunition for possible targets and every dollar needed to make such ammunition should be provided. But, would this mean that the army should be encouraged to shoot aimlessly and without purpose and with no regard for value, round after round of ammunition into the air—shooting just for the joy of spending ammunition or of hearing the explosions? And that is exactly what O. W. I. has been doing—wantonly wasting money and effort.

I am confident that funds are now available for a very substantial part of the project in the foreign field which has been approved by the War Department. A very small addition to the funds for O. W. I. will be more than ample to carry on this work. But there is no justification for the raid on the taxpayers' pockets, such as that now urged by the majority. Our task is to be economy-minded in deed as well as in word.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I trust every member of the committee will read the article to which the gentleman has referred. It makes no reflection on the South. On the contrary, it pays a very high tribute to the men and women of the South, both in the Civil War and in this war. It is an old adage that you can prove anything from the Bible by choosing a sentence at random. The gentleman seeks to condemn the article by quoting one word. Of course, the purpose is to divert attention from the real issue presented by item. What is the issue here? American commanders, newly back from the front, tell us—and you will find their testimony in both the hearings and the report—that this activity is saving the lives of American soldiers, and tends to shorten the war. Yet the gentleman quotes one sentence—one word—from an obscure article—out of the flood of effective literature daily issued by the American Government, and devotes half an hour to a discussion of its effect at home upon the South rather than on the Asiatic area, in which it was used—and from which we have had none but the most favorable reports. He entirely overlooks the testimony of United States Army and naval officers, cited in the record, to the effect that the expenditure of this money in the past has saved the lives of American soldiers and contributed favorably to the war effort.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take 1 more minute to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, it had been my impression that the gentleman from Missouri had so completely sold this Army endorsement, parading the generals, from General Marshall on down, that any effort on my part would be surplusage and futile.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to "General" DITTER, if he is better qualified to speak on this than General Marshall or General McClure, or the ranking Admiral of the British Navy, who testified that this service had done more in one day in bringing about the surrender of the Italian Fleet than he had been able to accomplish with the entire fleet in 3 years.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 more minute, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman from Missouri will allow a correction. I much prefer the Navy service to the Army, and if he would make that "Admiral" rather than "General," it would be appreciated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. DITTER. I would appreciate it more.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman does seem to be much at sea.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and the thought ran through my mind when he was making such a powerful defense of the alleged attack upon the South, how peculiar his position was today, when through the years I have served with him in the past he has so vigorously condemned the South. The thought that entered my mind was that it would be very interesting if he would take——

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, attacked the South.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the majority leader will yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought in my mind is: What were the real motives of the gentleman in his position today?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, that 2 minutes was mine.

I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I should like to ask the majority floor leader whether he can cite at any time any observation of mine which referred in any way to the feudalism or "aftermaths of the feudalism prevailing in the South" or in any other place. If the gentleman can show a citation of mine that gave that impression, then I shall stand corrected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman get the significance of my observation, that I was rather amused to read his mind when he was undertaking to defend the South against an alleged attack, when I had in mind the position he has consistently taken in the past of—and I used the word "attack" or "condemn"—I will take that out and say, of opposing every piece of legislation in the past 15 years I have been here, that was beneficial to any part of the South?

Mr. DITTER. And should we not follow the suggestion of the majority leader of unity at this time? And the unity that I am urging is that there is no South, no North, no East, no West and that we should not parade the suggestion of disunity to the other nations of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall retire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to talk on this appropriation bill from just a little different angle than any from which it has been approached. There has been much discussion here today regarding the loyalty of certain people on the pay roll of O. W. I., and reference has been made to Communists. I should like at the outset to say that we ought to get firmly planted in our minds what a Communist might be. Many people are under the erroneous impression that a Communist is only a Communist when he holds a red card in the Communist Party. Nothing could be further from the truth. Whether or not a man is a Communist depends entirely on the ideology to which he subscribes, and it is a trick and part of the game of the Communists—the so-called intelligentsia, liberals, and left-wingers of this country—to attempt to smear anyone who has the courage to take issue with communism in the United States, and he is immediately labeled as a Fascist. What they really mean when they call a man a Fascist is that he is against communism. I am against communism, I am against fascism, and I am against nazi-ism.

It is a ridiculous thing for the Appropriations Committee to come before this body and ask us to pass this appropriation bill, particularly in regard to the O. W. I., with such limited information as reported in the hearings before the subcommittee. I say that for this reason: I read the hearings pertaining to the O. W. I. on the first appropriation bill. I have read the hearings on this particular bill before us. What do I find? The only men who appeared before the committee to testify were men from the Office of War Information, the very men who were asking for this appropriation. The only man outside of O. W. I. who appeared was General McClure, who happened to be in Washington at the time. Not one single man was called before the committee who had the evidence on what the O. W. I. is doing, and the way in which they are working with the Communist groups in foreign countries as well as the United States.

Reference has been made here today regarding the letters from General Marshall and General Eisenhower, as to the value of O. W. I. The questions I would like for any member of the Appropriations Committee to answer are these: Under what circumstances were those letters submitted and furnished? Did someone ask them to prepare those letters especially for the record? Or did they do it of their own free will and accord?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman will note that almost without exception those wires from General Marshall and the others referred to in respect to work done in this or that campaign on the actual fighting front had nothing to do with whatever they, the O. W. I., may be doing now behind the lines in neutral countries or enemy countries.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Reference was made early in this debate to the fact that O. W. I. was given credit for the surrender of the Italian Fleet, because of the feat of a radio engineer in changing the wave length of the transmitter. There is not one iota of evidence in the hearings that the Intelligence Department of the Army could not carry on this work of the O. W. I., and I want to say this for the RECORD: Since we passed the last appropriation bill for O. W. I. last spring I have made it a point to talk to some of the officers in the Navy and the Army, and without exception the general impression was, "My God, can't Congress get the O. W. I. out of our hair?"

The Members of this House and the people of the United States will never know the truth about the O. W. I. until the President removes the muzzle he has placed on the officers of the Navy and Army, and they feel free to testify before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the question was raised earlier today from the majority side as to why the names of individuals suspected of being disloyal to the United States and with communistic associations were not named. The only way the Members of this House will ever get information regarding these men in O. W. I. is to authorize a special House committee to investigate them, and bring it out in testimony taken under oath. It is for that reason I have today introduced a resolution asking for the creation of a special committee to investigate the O. W. I., all its personnel, and the work it is doing. No one will ever know the truth about these men in O. W. I. and what they are doing unless and until such an investigation is made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel it is unfortunate that adequate appreciation cannot be shown for the intelligence work done by the Navy and Army, and does not the gentleman also feel that we should have the strongest and best intelligence forces in both services in the world?

Mr. BUSBEY. I certainly do. I may say that I was on the battle front in the last war and we got along very well without the O. W. I. distributing leaflets or anything else. The intelligence forces of the Army handled it and did a splendid job.

Mr. Chairman, on October 28 I wrote the following letter to the editors of several of the best known foreign language newspapers in this country to ascertain their opinions and experiences with O. W. I.:

> On Thursday of next week the House of Representatives will be asked to pass upon appropriations for the Office of War Information. As a Member of the House I am deeply interested in obtaining a detailed estimate of the character of the propaganda carried on by this agency in your native country.
>
> Would you be kind enough to send me as quickly as possible a memorandum on this subject with specific details, names, dates, official texts of broadcasts (with translations), official statements (with translations), etc. I should appreciate also your analysis and opinion regarding the effectiveness of such propaganda among your people.
>
> While I realize that you must have many demands upon your time, I nevertheless would appreciate receiving your reply before Thursday, November 4, when we consider the appropriations for the Office of War Information.

Mr. Chairman, I have the replies from these editors, and in every instance they condemned the activities of the Overseas Branch of O. W. I. especially in respect to the broadcasts to their native countries. In many instances they complained of the apparent cooperation with the Communist elements in their native countries, instead of their governments in exile, which are cooperating with the United Nations for victory.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman mind giving me the names of the papers that replied from New York? Would that be too much trouble?

Mr. BUSBEY. It would not be any trouble, but I am withholding the names at the present time, because I hope the House will pass my resolution to authorize a special committee to investigate O. W. I. and bring these men to Washington to testify under oath.

Mr. Chairman, I have reasons to believe that if a special investigation committee is authorized by the House of Representatives, they will be able to substantiate the following information regarding certain individuals who now are or have recently been in the employ of the Office of War Information:

Barnes, Joseph Fels, Deputy Director, Atlantic Operations, New York office, salary $8,000 a year. Well known for the past 10 years or more as a writer on the Soviet Union, whose attitude has been consistently favorable.

Carson, Saul, Eastern Press and Radio Division. Reputed alias Frank Leonard. As Saul Carson contributed to the New Masses, Communist magazine, January 26, 1937, page 27; February 15, 1938, page 15; member of the League of American Writers, which was cited as subversive by Attorney General Francis Biddle

Chi, Kung-Chuan, Overseas Publication Division. Formerly employed by the Communist-controlled China Daily News of New York City. His son, Chao-Ting Chi, has numerous connections with Communist front organizations.

Dale, Edgar, head of Creative Section, salary $6,500 a year. Supporter of the following Communist front organizations: American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America.

Eliasberg, George, Eastern Press and Radio Division, salary $3,800 a year. Arrested in Germany on a charge of kidnaping. Member of the Neu Beginnen group, an organization which is frankly revolutionary in its claims and antidemocratic.

Evans, Ernestine, Overseas Publications Division, New York office, former wife of Kenneth Durant, director of Tass, Soviet News Agency. Contributor to the following Communist publications: New Masses and Daily Worker. Former director of the American Society for Cultural Relations With Russia.

Grayson, Mitchell, associate program director, salary $3,200 a year. Also known as Gresppsky and Gresen. Writer for the Daily Worker. Program director for the following Communist-front organizations: American League for Peace and Democracy and Jewish People's Committee. Wife, Hildegarde Dyer, listed as a signer of a Communist Party election petition in New York City, 1939–40.

Halsz, Piroska C., senior translator, Hungarian Unit, Program Preparation Division. Writer of Communist songs and poetry for the Hungarian Communist movement led by Bela Kun. Salary $2,000 a year.

Hanna, Mrs. Rose Laddon, principal research clerk in charge of subversive files, salary $2,300 a year. Worked in Moscow for a number of years. Former secretary of the American Russian Institute. Representative in Russia for the Open Road, a travel agency, 1927 to 1935. Member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Kinkead, Robin, Eastern Press and Radio Division, New York office. Writer in Russia in 1929 or 1930. Married to Angela McCann, twice registered as a Communist Party voter. Beatrice Kinkead, his mother, was a member of the California State Executive Committee of the Communist Party in 1940. J. A. Kinkead, his father, was a member of the Communist Party of California.

Klinesberg, Ohio, eastern press and radio, senior script editor, salary, $4,600 a year. Signer of statement in defense of the Communist Party in 1941. Lecturer at the School for Democracy, founded by public school teachers ousted for Communist activity in New York City.

Kraber, Tony, eastern press and radio announcer, salary $3,800 a year. Entertainer for the following Communist front organizations: American League for Peace and Democracy, American Musical Alliance, American Artists School. Member of the executive board of the theater arts committee, popularly known as Stalin's fifth column on Broadway. Member of the League of American Writers, which was cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Lania, Leo, eastern press and radio division. Real name Lazar Herrmann. Signer of a protest in behalf of Matthias Rakosi, Hungarian Communist. A publicist in the Soviet Union for many years. Editor of the Hungarian Communist paper, Rote Fahne (Red Flag).

Lee, Canada, performer in radio dramatizations Entertainer at the Lenin memorial meeting (Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1943, p. 4). Supporter of the American Peace Mobilization which picketed the White House. Active in the theater arts committee. Real name Lionel Canagata. Salary, $3,800.

Martin, David Stone, artist, Graphic Division. Active in the Tennessee Valley as a Communist. Frances Martin, his brother, was secretary of the Communist Party of Knoxville, Tenn. He attended Communist meetings with his wife, Thelma Martin, also employed by the O. W. I.

McMillan, George, assistant chief of the news bureau, salary $5,600. Now in the United States Marine Corps but not discharged. Member of the Communist cell in the Federal writers project.

Ray, Nicholas K., eastern press and radio program director, salary $3,800 a year. Member of the League of American Writers, which was cited as subversive by the Attorney General. Discharged from the W. P. A. community service of Washington, D. C., for communistic activity. Also known as Raymond Michelas Juebzke.

Rosenberg, Harold, Eastern Press and Radio. Contributor to the New Masses, a Communist magazine. Writer of revolutionary poetry.

Rosskam, Edwin G., photographer. Honorary chairman, May Day committee (Daily Worker, March 22, 1941, p. 5). Member of the Washington Book Shop and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, both cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Saxe, Alfred, Eastern Press and Radio Division. Adapter of the play "America Today—Lenin Lives" for the Lenin memorial meeting. (Daily Worker, January 28, 1935, p. 5.) Associated with the following revolutionary theater groups: League of Workers Theaters, Theater of Action, New Theater League. Contributor to the Daily Worker, April 19, 1933, page 6; May 11, 1941, page 7.

Lerner, Irving, chief film editor, salary $5,600 a year. Contributor to the Daily worker on films: August 14, 1933, page 5; August 15, 1933, page 5; August 23, 1933, page 6; August 28, 1933, page 5; and many other issues. Contributor to the New Masses, June 19, 1934, page 29. Supporter of the following Communist-controlled fronts in the theater field: League of Workers Theaters, Workers Film and Photo League.

Gebert, Boleslaw K., broadcaster to Poland in October or November 1942. Otherwise known as Bill K. Gebert, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party.

In further substantiation of my contention concerning the Communist complexion of the Office of War Information, I wish to state that the July 15, 1943, edition of the Daily Worker, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the United States, on page 7 devotes three columns to an article entitled "We Need the O. W. I."

Mr. Chairman, I now show you a poster put out by O. W. I. At the top of the poster it says, "Strong in the strength of the Lord, we who fight the people's cause will never stop until that cause is won."

On the poster is a picture of an arm with a wrench and another arm with a gun, and another arm with anotner wrench, showing the Communist interpretation that the only ones who are doing anything in this war effort are the soldiers and labor. I cannot give too much praise for the wonderful work of our men at the battle front, and also labor on the home front in producing munitions of war. Management and capital might be contributing something to the war effort, in fact a great deal, in cooperation with labor and the armed forces for victory. No one but a Communist would make such a poster.

This poster, incidentally, was drawn for O. W. I. by one David Stone Martin.

The following record of David Stone Martin is to be found in the executive hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, pages 659, 664, 676, 684, 686f, 689f, 692ff, 695f, 701, 706, 709, 711, 714, 716, 721ff, 724ff, 733f, 739, 743, 1006, 1014, 1024f, 1029, 1042, 1269, 1274, 1285, 1290, 1294.

Various witnesses employed in the Tennessee Valley Authority testified as follows regarding David Stone Martin: That he attended meetings of the Communist Party held in Knoxville, Tenn.; that he was employed in the graphic arts division of T. V. A.; that Francis Martin, a brother, was secretary of the Communist Party of Knox County, Tenn.; that meetings of the Communist Party were held at the home of David Stone Martin at 3006 Wimpole Street, Knoxville, Tenn., as well as meetings of the American League for Peace and Democracy; that David Stone Martin distributed Communist literature to proselytize other employees of the T. V. A.; that employees of the T. V. A. were solicited for the Communist Party at the home of David Stone Martin, 3006 Wimpole Street, Knoxville, Tenn.; that some meetings of the Communist Party in Knoxville, Tenn., attended by David Stone Martin, were held on T. V. A. property; that Thelma Martin, wife of David Stone Martin, attended Communist Party meetings in Knoxville; that David Stone Martin at times displayed a picture he had made of Stalin; that David Stone Martin was in charge of distributing Communist Party membership books to applicants; that Martin was an enthusiastic supporter of Harry Bridges; that Martin's home was also used for meetings of the Knoxville Committee for Spanish Democracy, a Communist-front organization; that Martin published and was active in the publication of White Collar, organ of the United Federal Workers of America, a Communist-controlled union; that Communist Party literature was stored at his home, 3006 Wimpole Street.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID STONE MARTIN, JULY 17, 1940

That he knew his brother Francis Martin to be an avowed Communist; that he is in sympathy with parts of the Communist Party program; that he lived at 3006 Wimpole Street; that he attended meetings of the Communist Party; that he received the Daily Worker and the New Masses; that he attended a meeting addressed by Earl Browder; that he knows Paul Crouch, Communist Party southern organizer; that he did illustrations for a Communist magazine published by Crouch called the New South; that he lived at the same address with his brother Francis for a time and that Communist literature was stored there.

Resigned voluntarily April 29, 1943.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] mentioned the questionnaire sent out to the Polish-American people of this country. The Poles who are not affiliated with a communistic organization resent this questionnaire very much.

Mr. Chairman, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD today an editorial appearing in the Baltimore News-Post of November 2, entitled "Are the Reds Running the O. W. I?"

I now show you a photostat copy of the Daily Worker of October 21, 1943, and call your particular attention to the article entitled "Whitey, the O. W. I.'s Typical Youth, Comes Back From the Missing." This article goes on to state that Whitey addressed the Young Communists convention in New York on October 17, 1943. This young man goes by the name of Whitey Goodfriend, and is a member of Local No. 43 of the Marine and Shipyard Workers of America, C. I. O. An award of this kind is a disgrace, and an insult to the millions of outstanding, loyal, patriotic youth of the United States. This is just another one of many things that should be investigated by a special House committee.

I also wish to call your attention to another copy of the Daily Worker of Thursday, July 15, 1943, where there appears a three-column article entitled "We Need the O. W. I." Yes; believe me, the Communists do need the O. W. I. because so many of its activities are so helpful to their cause.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield? In what respect is O. W. I. going along with communism?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would like to have that information. That is the first intimation I have had to that effect. There is nothing in the hearings on the subject.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wonder if it has any particular significance that in the last few days various officials of the O. W. I. have been going around the country talking to meetings of newspaper men and women, trying to get their story over just before this appropriation bill was to be considered by the House. For instance, Robert Sherwood and Percy Winner, of the O. W. I. staff, had a meeting with the National Press Women's Club at the Willard Hotel here in Washington last week.

Mr. Ferdinand Kuhn, Deputy Director of the Overseas Branch of O. W. I., spoke before the West Virginia Journalism Conference at Morgantown, W. Va., October 29.

Elmer Davis, Director of O. W. I., spoke in New York before the Overseas Press Club on October 27. I have in my hand United Press releases regarding the situation on the front where General Mihailovich is fighting that have been suppressed. These releases do not go out on the air nor do they go out on the wires, because they are playing down General Mihailovich in favor of the so-called partisan group that is closely associated with the Communist group in that sector.

Here is a situation in which you should be interested. Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division of O. W. I., according to Common Ground, which is the official organ of the Common Council for American Unity, edited by Louis Adamic, is a member of the staff of the Common Council for American Unity. Let us look at the record of Louis Adamic for a minute, because he is a rather important individual in this picture. He attacks General Mihailovich, who has the support of the United Nations. He is associated with many Communist-controlled front organizations, and many of his writings condemn the Government of the United States while he eulogizes the Government of the Soviet Union.

Alan Cranston, the Chief of the Foreign Language Division of O. W. I., had an article in Common Ground the summer of 1941 opposing the alien registration bill, which in the minds of many was a very necessary war measure. He came out in support of the Communist, Harry Bridges. His article, in many respects, parallels the program of the Communist Party.

I hold in my hand a letter on the stationery of the Common Council for American Unity. The members of the Committee on Appropriations may be interested in this one paragraph written by Read Lewis, executive director, soliciting funds for the Common Council for American Unity:

When Mr. Elmer Davis appeared before Congress to appeal for continuing funds for the O. W. I., he displayed a photographic montage of one of his releases that had appeared in newspapers published in 27 different languages. Ninety percent of those clippings were directly traceable to our organization which had translated and sent out the original story to each foreign-language press.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

A RECORD FOR ECONOMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, before entering a general discussion of the pending bill, known as the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1944, reported today by the Committee on Appropriations, let me say that the Deficiency Subcommittee which considered this bill held daily hearings for approximately 1 month. During those extended hearings many witnesses appeared before our subcommittee and gave much valuable information both on and off the record. The printed hearings cover some 1,638 pages. The gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, who spoke earlier today, mentioned the fine spirit of cooperation that existed at all times between the minority and the majority members of the subcommittee considering the multiplicity of the Budget estimates, not only for the Army and the Navy but also for many other departments and agencies of the Federal Government. I am delighted to concur in that statement, although speeches of some members of our committee this afternoon would leave the impression that there was everything but cooperation and unanimity on the part of members of the committee.

I am sure that Members will understand that the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations does not handle any of the regular annual appropriations for any of the permanent departments or agencies of the Federal Government, but only those deficiency or supplemental appropriations arising from time to time as the necessity or alleged necessity may call for. Thus we have endeavored to impress on heads of departments who appear before this particular subcommittee that they must show beyond the peradventure of a doubt that any supplemental request made by them is for an emergency that could not be foreseen at the time the regular annual appropriation bill was being considered.

Some departmental heads, I regret to say, in their anxiety to secure additional appropriations, have evidently attempted to create "emergencies," where, in fact, the committee was strongly of the opinion that no actual emergency existed.

As a glaring example of one so-called emergency item that the committee was called upon to grant was a request for $15,000 by the Department of Agriculture to investigate jeeps. The very suggestion sounds absurd on the face of it and appears more absurd when one reads the hearings before our committee. With millions of young men in the service, many of whom were driving jeeps under all weather conditions, through all kinds of roads and areas where there are no roads, over hills, valleys, and through swamps, in deep sand and mud, for representatives of the Department of Agriculture to convince themselves that such an item was an emergency is positively astounding. To give one an idea of that request, I quote from the hearings:

Mr. SALTER. We are asking for this supplemental appropriation of $15,000 to determine the value of the jeep for agricultural work as a substitute for tractor power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Salter, how long have you been with the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. SALTER. Since October 1, 1941.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Have you ever appeared before this committee before?

Mr. SALTER. I have not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And, on your first appearance, you ask this committee, seriously, to appropriate $15,000 to investigate jeeps?

Mr. SALTER. That is right, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is this your own idea or the brain child of somebody else?

Mr. SALTER. It was not my idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Whose idea was it? Can you tell this committee, either on or off the record, who in your Department or elsewere had such a fool idea as this?

Mr. SALTER. The need for this work was first brought to my attention by Mr. Boyd, acting head of the Agricultural Engineering Division.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me ask Mr. Boyd. How long have you been with the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BOYD. Well, I have been here a long time. I came just after the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Was the idea of investigating jeeps yours?

Mr. BOYD. The jeeps have a popular appeal, everybody is interested, everybody is asking us questions about it. Everybody is asking, "What are they good for, what can they do, what can we expect to get out of the jeep in the way of power unit, that will help us over the gap while manufacturers are changing over from war production to tractors?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Did it ever occur to you that with the eight or ten million boys in uniform, many of whom will have an opportunity to try out jeeps, under every condition and circumstance imaginable, that they will learn a whale of a lot more about a jeep than you could possibly have an opportunity to learn? Don't you think that when they come home they will be able to give more information about what a jeep will do than all the information you could acquire behind a mahogany desk or in a laboratory, or even on the streets of Washington? Do you in fact know anything at all about a jeep?

Mr. LUDLOW. It will do everything except climb a tree, I think.

Of course, it is needless for me to add that the committee did not regard this request for funds as an emergency, even though I am ashamed to say that they had a Budget estimate for same, and, therefore, did not make the appropriation available.

Still another example:

A representative of the National Park Service appeared before the committee in support of another so-called emergency. Our committee was asked to appropriate $10,000 to move the bronze statue of Sir William Blackstone about 200 feet from where it now stands in the lobby of the Court of Appeals Building in Washington. Some $5,000 was to be expended in polishing off a piece of granite on which the statue was to be placed and a thousand dollars was included for the ceremonies. The gentlemen sponsoring this proposal evidently have not found out that we are at war, a desperate war, a long, hard, uphill fight, the result of which will determine the lives and liberties of our children and our children's children for generations to come. The appropriation was disallowed. The following is an excerpt from the testimony with reference to this item:

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you give us at this point a break-down of the proposed expenditure of the $10,000 fund.

Mr. GILLAN. Yes, sir. The foundation would be $1,000, the pedestal, in polished granite, would be $5,000, the preparation and development of the ground surrounding it would be $3,000, and the cost of its dedication ceremonies would be $1,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This bronze statue is now in the Court of Appeals Building in Washington?

Mr. GILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You propose to move it only a few feet to a spot in Judiciary Square?

Mr. GILLAN. The Court of Appeals Building is in Judiciary Square.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. How far would you have to move it?

Mr. GILLAN. Two hundred feet. It would be taken out of the building and erected in the open.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then this proposal is to move the bronze statue out in the open rather than leave it inside, where it could be protected from the elements?

Mr. GILLAN. The statue is too large for the building. It has an appropriate setting in the building, but has no base at all. It would be very inappropriate to leave the complete statue there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, evidently someone thought it fit into its present surroundings or else it would not have been placed there.

* * * Now, getting back to the Blackstone memorial, do you think it would seriously impair the war effort to let this thing wait for the duration?

Mr. GILLAN. I would say no.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You think then that the learned judges as well as other citizens, including the taxpayers of the Nation, might be able to struggle along for another year or two without moving the bronze statue of the great Blackstone a couple of hundred feet, at the expense of $10,000?

Mr. GILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, for my part, it will remain where it is. Let's leave this white elephant on the inside. I think that is all at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The Budget requests as compared with the amount recommended by the committee speak more effectively than anything I might say at this time. Here are the figures: The total Budget request for direct appropriations amounted to $1,108,828,749.32. The amount recommended for direct appropriations by your committee was $167,268,444.32, a reduction of $941,560,305. If we include, in addition to those direct appropriations, other obligating authority proposed by the Budget we find a grand total of $1,196,428,749.32 proposed by the Budget estimates, and $215,368,444.32 recommended by the committee, a reduction in the estimates totaling $981,060,305.

It is needless for me to say to Members that this is almost an unheard of slash in any bill ever to be presented to this House. I do not recall during my rather extended service here of any bill which has been cut to the extent of over 80 percent below the Budget estimates. That is what this bill proposes to do. A few months ago I brought the Interior bill for the fiscal year 1944 slashed approximately $120,000,000 below what the Department had operated on during the previous fiscal year. The House showed its appreciation of that brand of slashing by passing the annual Interior Department appropriation bill in the record-breaking time of about 3 hours. But here is a bill slashed $981,000,000 below the Budget estimates, out of a total of $1,196,428,749.32. Let me suggest that this bill ought to be passed unanimously and in record time.

Of course, I have no illusions about this bill passing both Houses and becoming a law slashed as it is today. The fact is that chambers of commerce, businessmen and citizens generally are attempting economy in a general way, and I am frank to confess that the only telegrams I have received today in connection with the pending appropriation bill have urged not further cuts but millions of dollars additional in appropriations. For example, several Members of Congress and others appeared before the committee requesting several million dollars for the construction of some twenty-odd airfields, some of which had been begun by the W. P. A. Others had not been started but local towns and cities had voted bonds for those airfields and Members felt that it was the duty of the Federal Government to finish them. I am told that an amendment will be offered for that purpose. Now, there is no question but what these are desirable projects and would be a splendid idea in a post-war program, when aviation really comes into its own. From my viewpoint we cannot have too many well laid out airfields. But the committee felt that the proposal could not be properly called a war emergency, and, therefore, refused to include the appropriation requested. As a result of our action many telegrams have come to our desks criticizing the committee and urging that an amendment be offered on the floor of the House.

So it is quite obvious that by the time this bill gets to the body at the other end of this Capitol there will be sufficient telegrams and pressure brought that there is likely to be millions of dollars added to this bill before it is finally enacted into law. I appeal to Members of this body, however, to hold the lines and not vote to add one single dollar to this bill as it passes the House.

This measure is not altogether to my liking. If I had had my way there would have been a substantial amount in the bill for the Farm Security Administration. Despite its many mistakes in the past, Farm Security has its feet on the ground and is doing a most excellent job. There are only about two phases of the F. S. A. program left—the rehabilitation program and the so-called tenant-purchase program under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Purchase Act. Under the parliamentary situation, however, an amendment would be subject to a point of order because of the fact that there is no substantive law for that worth-while agency of government. I am of the opinion, however, that Members of Congress will have an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of this agency before this bill is finally enacted into law.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. What conclusion does the gentleman draw from those figures? I refer to the saving of $900,000,000 from the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The conclusion is that the Bureau of the Budget is not infallible. There are some items in this bill that are cut too drastically. One item mentioned is Farm Security, which, against my judgment, was eliminated altogether.

Mr. BURDICK. In other words, both branches can be mistaken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman feel that the elimination of Farm Security caused the Democrats to lose the election in Kentucky?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, no. And frankly, I am not now concerned with political elections anywhere. There is only one issue that all patriotic Americans are really interested in and that is the winning of the war. All other issues sink into insignificance. Yet, one would think from the tenor of several speeches and general attitude of some here today that nothing is quite as important as the winning of a political election.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Do you not think the boys on the fighting front have a right to expect us to win the war here at home while they are fighting to win it abroad?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Absolutely. I know that many of our men on the various fighting fronts are sorely disturbed about some conditions on the home front. I agree there are a lot of disturbances on the home front that ought to have been eliminated long ago. I have had a part in helping try to eliminate some of them. The gentleman must bear in mind, however, that there are three branches of government and that Congress cannot exercise the functions of the other branches of government. It is our solemn responsibility to make or refuse to make appropriations. That is the language all departments of government will understand. Let me add further that I offered an amendment to cut $50,000,000 from one agency of government in the last annual appropriation bill because I felt that it was overstaffed with impractical bureaucrats who did not know what it was all about; they were not doing a very good job on the home front. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have cut and slashed wherever it was humanly possible to do so in nondefense activities.

Mr. WILSON. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me then that in winning the war at home, since this bill carries a request for $50,000,000 for housing for war workers, in order to make those workers more comfortable, in order that they may do their job better, then had we not better produce coal to keep the people warm in the houses that we already have? Is that not part of the war at home?

It would not cost us 1 red penny to win that war at home for those boys who are fighting abroad, and keep those houses warm that we already have, that those boys who are working may have comfortable homes in which to live, without spending man-hours and a lot of money and strategic materials in building houses with no coal or oil to heat them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, the gentleman has made a very good speech. If the gentleman wants to offer an amendment to the housing item that has already been slashed to the tune of $150,000,000 he may do so. It is obvious, however, that in many of the industrial centers housing is still a real problem. If the gentleman is talking about the trouble we are having in the coal mines, that is a very deplorable situation. My record speaks for itself on that. I voted for an antistrike law long before Pearl Harbor. So I have nothing to apologize for as far as that is concerned. I am glad that the coal strike is ended and I hope it will remain ended.

Mr. WILSON. The fact that this coal is not being produced simply means to me that there were some people at home more interested in winning the elections than they are in mining coal and winning the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I do not know just exactly what the gentleman means by saying that there is no coal being produced. I hold no brief for the mine workers but let us be fair even about that. The evidence before the various committees is that coal is being mined in tremendous quantities and must be continued to be in a whale of a lot greater quantities.

Mr. WILSON. There is a lot of coal that is not being produced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is always a potential shortage, and it is a deplorable thing that there might be a shortage of coal or fuel of any kind. There is a potential shortage of oil, but the oil men of Oklahoma and Texas and Kansas and California and Illinois are not out on strike. They are not going out on strike, even though they have been denied a fair and reasonable price for crude oil.

Mr. WILSON. That is the war that I referred to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman's questions and comments are very interesting but with your kind permission and indulgence I would now like to talk more about this pending bill.

It is my personal intention to offer an amendment to this bill, not to increase it, but to effect a reduction of $25,000, by eliminating entirely the item to purchase the estate known as Red Hill, all or part of which was once owned by the immortal Patrick Henry. Ordinarily I might not raise any objection to a reasonable amount being appropriated to purchase a few acres of the estate for a memorial to Patrick Henry. But these are not ordinary times and this appropriation has no connection whatever with national defense and the war effort. Members who desire further information concerning this matter would do well to read the testimony of Director Drury of the National Park Service, who disclaimed credit for initiating this appropriation and who told the committee very definitely that the Park Service did not need or desire 960 acres for that purpose. I would also invite Members' attention to the testimony of Mr. Smith, one of the National Park Service appraisers who appeared before the committee and who stated that "if he felt especially rich" he might pay as high as $25,000 or one-half the sum proposed to be expended for the property. The following brief excerpt from the hearings is self-explanatory:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. You were a member of the committee that made the appraisal?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And even though $100,000 was authorized, you could not conscientiously say to this committee that it was worth half of that money, could you?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Are you sure that it is worth the $45,000? Do you know anybody who would pay anything like $45,000, except Uncle Sam?

Mr. SMITH. I would not put my $45,000 in it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. How much cold cash would you put in that 960-acre tract if you had plenty of money, no debts, and lots of sentiment?

Mr. SMITH. It might be, if I wanted to run along and live there, where Patrick Henry had died—something like that—I might go as high as $25,000, if I felt especially rich.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who is a member of the Subcommittee on the Interior Department of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am glad to say a very valuable, fair, and hard-working member.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. As I remember, this very question came up in the Interior Subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. And the subcommittee put thumbs down on it unanimously.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. Although our committee refused unanimously to stand for that proposal, we find this same white elephant back once more on our doorstep.

Mr. JENSEN. It is rather disturbing to see this $25,000 item come back into this bill and be brought on the floor after the Interior Subcommittee has spent considerable time in going into the matter and kicking it out unanimously. And let me say right here that the gentleman from Oklahoma who is now speaking is our chairman and has done a wonderful job in keeping down all unnecessary expenditures and the Subcommittee on the Interior Department is most appreciative of the outstanding work that the gentleman from Oklahoma has done on that committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman most sincerely for his very gracious statement.

I have no doubt that this item will go out of the bill when my amendment is offered to eliminate this appropriation. And it will in no wise change the place in the hearts and minds of the American people, for the respect and admiration of one of America's early patriots and statesmen.

The only item of controversy when we left the committee room that the minority and majority were unable to agree on was for the Office of War Information. I hold no brief for that Office. I never had the pleasure of meeting Elmer Davis until he appeared before the committee a few months ago in support of the O. W. I. I had known, of course, of

his reputation as a responsible and intelligent newspaperman and had listened with interest to his broadcasts as a radio commentator. I have not been in sympathy with some of the policies of the O. W. I. so far as its domestic policies were concerned. I am sure that Members understand that there is no appropriation in this bill for that purpose, that every dollar proposed to be appropriated in this bill is directly or indirectly for its overseas operations. Of course, much of the script and other work is actually being done in the Washington and New York offices.

It is well known by all members of the committee that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], for whom I have great respect, and whom I generally agree with so far as his ideas of economy are concerned, is extremely bitter toward the O. W. I., but frankly, I am somewhat surprised at the outbursts and flank attacks of others. The performance just sounds as if someone has given the attack order. The distinguished gentleman from New York stated repeatedly in the full committee today, in the subcommittee previously, and I believe on the floor of the House this afternoon, that O. W. I. is a menace to the war effort and is hindering rather than helping the war effort. That is a bold statement to make, and I challenge it here and now. If he has any such evidence, let him produce it. Just who in O. W. I. is hindering the war effort? This House has a right to know. If I thought the gentleman from New York was correct in that serious charge, I would join him in his fight to eliminate all funds for O. W. I. But I heard the testimony of high Army officials, in whom I have the utmost confidence, who told the committee, both on and off the record, that the Office of War Information is of vital importance and that it is an essential and important part of the war effort. They went further than that. In answer to a question by a member of the committee these high-ranking Army officers stated that O. W. I. had been responsible for the saving of the lives of our men and boys in the armed forces. To me, that is the test. What does an appropriation of $5,000,000 amount to as compared with the lives of our brave and gallant soldiers, sailors, and marines? What is the difference whether it be $5,000,000 or $50,000,000? If it will have a beneficial effect in shortening the war a single day, the taxpayers of America will not begrudge this appropriation that we are told by those in authority is desperately needed at this time.

Of course, much of the testimony in support of this program was, of necessity, off the record, but if you will examine the hearings and the report you will find letters and statements from General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General Devers, and others warm in their praise of this part of the war effort.

Now the O. W. I. may not be popular on the home front. A long, carefully planned, well-organized, and determined effort has been made to discredit the O. W. I. in the minds of the civilian population of the United States. No doubt, that effort has succeeded to a certain extent. It may not be popular to defend it, but I tell you, and I weigh my words when I say it, that in my judgment it would be a catastrophe to liquidate that organization as its enemies are bent on doing. If the Germans and the Japanese did not have a propaganda campaign, if they were not spending dollars where we are spending dimes for the same purpose, then there would be some excuse or reason for also eliminating our propaganda phase of warfare, but under modern war conditions propaganda is not only a secret weapon but it is a mighty weapon and must not and cannot be ignored.

No one in the United States can speak with complete accuracy as to the amount of money or the numbers of personnel employed by enemy nations in foreign propaganda. It is apparent, however, that this function of government is considered by the enemy as of more importance than Americans think it. For example, it has been estimated on the best authority available through intelligence sources that Germany at the moment is employing between 50 and 60 high-powered shortwave transmitters, mostly 200 kilowatt. Japan operates 51 high-powered stations. At the moment the United States has a total of 18, to be used both against the Germans in Europe and Africa and the Japanese in the Far East. Most of these are low-powered transmitters. They must be shared with the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, which beams information and entertainment programs to the Latin-American Republics. They also are shared by the Special Services Division of the Army, which uses a substantial amount of transmitter time for news and entertainment to American troops serving overseas. In addition, it is painful to note that the United States does not even aspire to match the enemy in this branch of international communications. The total program which will be available, and that only if appropriations are forthcoming—appropriations which have been bitterly fought every step of the way by a minority of this Congress—contemplates only 36 shortwave transmitters, of which only two will be 100 kilowatt and the others 50.

Our allies, the British, take a more practical view of the situation. They have at the moment a total of 36 transmitters averaging 100 kilowatts each.

It has been estimated by competent observers that during the past 5 years, beginning long before the war, the Germans have expended on foreign propaganda not less than two hundred and fifty millions a year in our money. The Japanese have set up a tremendous department of government, headed by officials of full cabinet rank, which, under the name of Greater Eastern Asia Ministry have the single purpose of organizing the peoples of immensely rich and popular part of the world they now occupy against any present or future cooperation with the United States or the United Nations.

Throughout occupied Asia, the study of Japanese language is being enforced in the schools, Japanese culture is stressed on the same scale and with the same intensity of Reichskultur. The theme of "Asia for the Asiatics" is constantly drummed into the native population outside Japan, by radio, by newspaper, films, and publications. The Greater Eastern Asia Ministry finances frequent visits by puppet leaders of the occupied countries to Japan. It finances exchange of students and teachers. It subsidizes every university that is opened and sees to it that every professor is under pressure to be converted to the Greater Eastern Asia sphere of cooperation.

If Elmer Davis is not the man for the job, if he is not doing the kind of job he ought to do, then I would say that he should be fired and let others have that task. But, certainly, there is no rhyme or reason for all this smear campaign emanating from Washington and elsewhere against the Office of War Information. It is clearly a well-organized, deliberate smear campaign against O. W. I. Of course, I am convinced Mr. Davis and his staff are doing an excellent job and I have formed my conclusions after hearing high authority whom I know to be in a position to have the true facts. I have seen the cables and letters, as have other members of the committee.

The clever and astute gentleman from Pennsylvania very dramatically holds up the little white paper and reads not all of it but a paragraph making some disparaging remark about the South and asks if we agreed to that. Suddenly the gentleman from Pennsylvania becomes very solicitous about the welfare of the South. Of course, none of us from the South, West, or elsewhere would agree or condone such reference regardless from whence it comes. The clever gentleman is, of course, evading the real issue. There is one thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania cannot laugh off or ridicule; neither he nor any of the others who are lambasting O. W. I. can scoff at the evidence of General Eisenhower, General Marshall, General Devers and the O. K. of General MacArthur. Why do not they scoff at that? They know they dare not do so.

Gentlemen may scoff at the long list of foreign names they place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but when the generals say they are saving lives, you cannot smile that off, you cannot laugh it out of court. Oh, they put great emphasis on the fact that in the New York office there is a long list of names that do not sound American. They are not good old Irish names or Scotch names like yours or mine, but they are the names of Americans. Somebody said that if you were to read the list of the football teams of some of the universities like Notre Dame, there are several foreign names that may be difficult to pronounce.

Mr. Chairman, I would not stoop to such argument as that. I will tell you why I would not. You might find a list of the war casualties of today, and all of those gallant men who are fighting

and dying for our liberties do not have old Irish, English, or Scotch names. I am frankly surprised and amazed, yes, I am actually ashamed of such so-called argument. Here is the real test I tell you. Is the O. W. I. aiding the war effort on the various foreign fronts? Will it help shorten the war? Or is it hindering the war as has been repeatedly charged.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma would advise us as to just how we can kick these individuals out if they were guilty of these charges?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, of course, I realize that is not an easy thing to do, but I would think that with all the ingenuity and wealth of information you gentlemen insinuate that you have, and with that great consuming desire you undoubtedly have to kick all of these gentlemen out, that you could give some authentic facts; that you would be able to do some name calling. General Marshall, in whom the world has confidence, one of the most able military men of his day, would, I am sure, like to have that information. Surely he is entitled to the full facts if any in the Office of War Information, with whom his officers must work, are in fact not loyal Americans. Not only is the War Department entitled to such facts, but so is our great Navy, and then, incidentally, the gentleman could also advise this Committee on Appropriations. Why, you might even give names of any whom you have reason to believe to be disloyal to the F. B. I.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman must know that General Marshall has no authority over these men whatsoever.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; the general has more authority than you think. The moment one of these fellows gets into foreign service the Army has sole authority, and its foreign service is all that is left of O. W. I. There is virtually nothing left of the domestic set-up of O. W. I. Oh, there are men in New York who write stories. Maybe a few of the critics think that the men in O. W. I. ought to rush over to Sicily or Italy or Tunisia and write their propaganda on the typewriters there. But, no, the job is not done that way.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am still trying to find out how you are going to kick these men out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have endeavored to tell the gentleman. Incidentally he has suddenly become deeply interested. The gentleman had an opportunity to come before the Committee on Appropriations. It had four long weeks of hearings on this one bill. The fact is, we are in session nearly all the time. The Deficiency Committee has been in session almost every day since September 6, 1939, except for holidays and brief periods during the summer. If the gentleman has any information about any employees to the effect that they are not loyal American citizens, I will not only join with him but I will go with him to see that they are fully and properly investigated.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to pages 1332 and 1333 of the hearings before the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is a member, where there are listed some names that the committee wanted kicked off last spring and they have not been kicked out yet. There is no report back on them. In many cases they say they cannot kick them off now because they have been in the service of O. W. I. for more than a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it the gentleman's contention that because out of several hundred people who are engaged in this work there appears to be a few either in the foreign service or elsewhere who have not been able to prove that they are good Americans with good old American names that we should eliminate the foreign activities of O. W. I.? Is that the position of the gentleman? I cannot follow that line of thinking.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, I have consumed too much time, but I yield once more to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. still in operation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is virtually out. This committee eliminated the appropriation of the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. in the last appropriation bill. Frankly I was not satisfied with some phases of domestic policies of O. W. I.

Mr. WILSON. On April 19 I drove up to a housing project in San Francisco. It was raining. Right alongside the curb was stacked a heap of papers done up in bales. I asked, "What is all this about?" They seemed to want to steer me away. I opened up one of the bales and took out a pamphlet of slick paper printed in color pertaining to the relations and the activities of the colored people in these housing projects. I just wonder how that is aiding the war effort. There were 2,000 pounds of slick paper, all printed up in color.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I must confess that I am not familiar with these housing projects except through the information furnished the committee at the various hearings. There are still some areas where housing is a very serious problem.

Mr. WILSON. This is O. W. I. This information was put out by O. W. I.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know what O. W. I. has to do with housing. If it has made mistakes, and no doubt it has made many of them, then those mistakes should be eliminated. I believe that a major part of them have been eliminated, but I go back to my original proposal, regardless of the mistakes they have made, regardless of any white paper that some nincompoop might have written about the South, regardless of any crazy cockeyed philosophy somebody connected with O. W. I. may have, if the Army officials in authority say that it is an important and vital part of the war effort, if those in authority who are now or have been on the various far-flung battle fronts say it is important and urgently needed, I shall not assume that I know more about how to run the war than do the men who have that grave responsibility. I stand on that proposition and that alone.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Oklahoma made mention of someone's writing an article. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] used many hundreds of words and a good many valuable minutes of the time of the House in trying to give the impression not only to the Members of the House but the country at large that this particular article spoke in derogation of the South and that the southern Members of Congress should resent it and all the people from the South should resent it.

I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this article in its entirety expressed the utmost praise for the people of the South. That was the entire intent of the article. To prove that, I want to read just three short paragraphs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. All right; that might be very informative.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think this should go in the RECORD in view of the time the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my good friend and colleague, took, and the impression he tried to give.

When the present international war for the liberties of man came, the South was ahead of the rest of the country in its desire to meet and destroy the world's enemy. Southerners were truly represented by Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, who denounced Adolf Hitler. When the United States armed forces were growing, before entrance into the war, the South led in voluntary enlistments in proportion to population, and now, in actual war, it has a higher percentage of men in the armed services than any other section.

Much of this is explained by their own war. They know what war is. Always they have been of martial traditions, accentuated by their war, which produced their greatest hero, Robert E. Lee, who led the southern armies.

Then, having no great wealth to protect and being largely agricultural, they live closer to things of the heart than of the head. They believe fundamentally in the concept of man's rights, and for them to believe is to act.

This shows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] used an old trick in picking out one small sentence in order to give a wrong impression to the Members of the House and to this country as to this particular article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I have not seen the white paper. Of course, it is sometimes to the convenience of some people to read just the part of an article or a speech that suits their convenience. But, of course, the charge

as made goes far afield of the real issue involved here today.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman, and then I must yield the floor. I really did not intend to take so much time.

Mr. MUNDT. I was interested in the colloquy the gentleman from Oklahoma had with the gentleman from Illinois about the procedure by which men could be removed from departmental pay rolls if they were found unworthy or unwanted. If I understood the gentleman correctly, I believe he said, "If you find that some of these men are faithless or inefficient or undesirable, if you will report them to the Committee on Appropriations, you will see that they can be kicked off."

I wonder how the gentleman can say that with so much assurance in view of the fact that as to those three gentlemen, Mr Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett, the Dies committee recommended that they be kicked off, the Kerr committee recommended that they be kicked off, the Appropriations Committee, including the vote of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, voted with only one dissenting vote that they be kicked off, the House of Representatives voted that they be kicked off, the United States Senate voted that they be kicked off, and the President signed the bill saying they should be kicked off, and Mr. Ickes put them back on. How are you going to get them off?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement, but he evidently misunderstood what I said.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from South Dakota is just a little bit in error in his facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is what I was about to say.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. November 15 is the dead line.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct that the dead line is November 15, but Secretary Ickes has already said, "I am not going to be bound by those mere Congressmen, I am going to appoint Mr. Lovett to a new position." The appointment has been made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No action has been taken because not until November 15 comes can action be taken. I take it for granted that on that date the action will be in consonance with the enactment of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the gentleman speak with great confidence in that prediction?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman that the question he raises, even though it is beside the issue, is not at all embarrassing to me. I was one of those who voted to eliminate those three gentlemen from the Federal pay roll.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. One of them happens to be on the pay roll of the Interior Department. That committee has advised the Secretary of the Interior of our action. If an attempt is made to keep one of those gentlemen on the pay roll after the 15th of November, it will be done over the vigorous protest of our committee. I may say further that if it is done or attempted, I think I can speak the sentiment of that committee and of the distinguished gentleman here in front of me representing the minority on that committee, that there will not be any appropriation for the salary of that gentleman next year, even though that is a poor and sloppy way to legislate.

Mr. MUNDT. But the only way we have under the circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It may be the only way we have; if so I will say to the gentleman that my committee will not run from or dodge the issue. I assume the gentleman understands what I mean.

Mr. MUNDT. I was sure the gentleman would take that position. I know the House and the country are reassured by having that reaffirmation of the gentleman's stand.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Nothing would please me more than to yield further but I promised myself that I would close after I yielded to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota.

In conclusion, let me emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not altogether to my liking. I would have added some funds that were slashed and would have slashed still further some items in the pending measure if I had written the bill. All in all, however, it is by far the best example of real, practical economy that has been presented to the House by any committee for many years. For any committee to cut and slash a bill more than 80 percent below Budget estimates is a hitherto unheard of accomplishment. May this be only the beginning of further slashes and drastic reductions, especially in nondefense spending in future appropriation measures. The whole country will applaud and sigh a breath of relief at this somewhat belated action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes, and I do this so that the RECORD will contain it tomorrow. The matter I have in mind is a matter of legislation, a matter of violation of House rules and putting legislation on appropriation bills. However, it is something that has to be done, and has to be done quickly as possible. I have talked to both the majority and the minority sides. The members of my committee have agreed to it, and the matter has been discussed with them. I think the membership of the House ought to be apprised of what we are trying to do tomorrow. When the Japanese took Wake Island they took 1,146 civilian employees as prisoners. They are, so far as we know, prisoners of Japan. They were working on Wake Island in divers capacities all the way from foreman to laborer. The contracts for their employment provided that they would be paid from the time they left continental United States until they returned. The contractor was working under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. He is perfectly willing, of course, to pay these men their salaries while they are prisoners, but the Navy Department thinks that, as long as the men are not working and are prisoners of war, that they legally cannot authorize the payment to be attached to the cost plus fixed fee. The Navy realizes their moral obligation. There is no doubt about that. Since the capture of Wake Island they have done this about these employees: They have put these employees under the workmen's compensation law. Under that law they call them longshoremen. It is "getting around the matter," I know, and there are some legal difficulties there. That pays the dependents of these people who are prisoners of war a dribbling amount, which is not sufficient.

In March of this year Congress passed a bill providing that prisoners of war, military and civilian prisoners of war, shall be paid their salaries from the time they are prisoners. I think everybody in the House agrees that if we do not do this now it will be many months before it will be done, and many families are in dire distress. I think it is something that we should do. Many of these men are probably dead. We do not know, but until we find that out we should take care of their families. I shall offer it as an amendment tomorrow. It will be legislation on an appropriation bill, but in view of the circumstances, it is the only thing that we can do. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I will discuss the matter with the Budget Bureau tomorrow, as to whether or not the bill, so far as the language is concerned, adequately covers the situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman's committee approve of this?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. We are all unanimous on it. However, unfortunately half of our committee are at present on the west coast, and we cannot confer with them at this time for the purpose of this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. So long as the chairman of the committee gives us positive assurance that his committee approves it, I think it would be all right. Of course, we do not feel warranted otherwise in permitting legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Should this amendment be adopted, will these men then be taken off the rolls of Social Security and their families deprived of their benefits under that bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The only reason they are under the workmen's compensation is that there was no way we knew how to take care of them. As a matter of fact, we are calling them longshoremen in order to give their families a dribbling amount, so that they can keep their homes going.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly I am in favor of taking care of these families, but I am concerned about the fact that I do not want them to be getting their money part from Social Security.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no. As a matter of fact I discussed this at great length with Admiral Moreell and we are only treating them in the same way as civil-service employees. This amendment does not go as far as it should because there were three or four foremen and some others on Wake Island who were getting $500 or $600 a month.

We are going to leave it within the discretion of the Secretary, and there is a limitation that they can only be paid what would be a comparable salary in the community, by the Navy. That is the least we can do for these unfortunate people.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is the contractor who is figuring this on a cost-plus basis out of the picture under your amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, he would be. He is out of the picture now anyway. Of course, he says he would pay it if the Navy would allow him to do it and add it to the cost of his contract, but the contract has never been completed. They were in the midst of making the installation on Wake Island when the Japanese showed up.

Of course, he simply says he would pay it, but the Navy said, "You cannot pay it and add it to your labor cost, because they are not employed." Of course, when those men do come back they would have a right of action anyway against someone. If they brought it against the contractor, he would have a right in equity against the Government, because their contract says they shall be paid from the time they leave continental United States until the time they come back.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What I wanted to be sure was that the contractor would not be able to figure it in as cost plus.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Navy Department will see that that is properly taken care of.

I dislike to bring in legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not see any other way out of it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this afternoon some of the Members of the House have attempted to becloud the real issue that is before this committee and before this House for decision tomorrow or within a few days, I want to make a short statement with respect to the very complete and thorough investigation which is made of every employee of the O. W. I. In my statement I will present some facts which I think should convince everybody that there is no issue whatsoever before the House insofar as the personnel of the O. W. I. is concerned. The only issue before the House is whether or not this fund for the waging of psychological warfare should be granted to those people who have done such a wonderful job in the past.

LOYALTY OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. Chairman, the Office of War Information employs no one whose loyalty to the Government of the United States is in doubt. Precautions even more elaborate than those required of Federal agencies are taken by O. W. I. to prevent the employment of disloyal persons.

All procedures established by the Civil Service Commission for determining the loyalty of Government employees are followed in O. W. I. No person can be hired without clearance by the Civil Service Commission, following a spot check of his background. If the spot check reveals no reason for rejection, the person is hired pending an intensive investigation by the investigative staff of the Commission. If the intensive inquiry reveals adequate evidence of disloyalty or disloyal tendencies, the Commission recommends the employee's dismissal.

In addition, as a further precaution, the Office of War Information has established an internal security committee under the chairmanship of Rear Admiral Richard P. McCullough, O. W. I. security officer, to examine and pass upon the suitability of any actual or potential employee regarding whom there is even the slightest question of loyalty. This committee has access to the files of all investigative agencies of the Government, including Civil Service, F. B. I., Military and Naval Intelligence.

Of 3,654 employees on September 30, 1,934 had been fully investigated; 929 had been given a spot check; and 791 had not been investigated at all. The latter group consists largely of employees who have been in the O. W. I. since its formation, having been previously employed in 1 of the 4 agencies which were merged to create O. W. I. At the time of their employment, no loyalty investigation was required. They are now being investigated as rapidly as the facilities of the Civil Service Commission will permit. All new employees of O. W. I. must now receive a spot-check clearance before they can be hired.

Thus far, out of more than 2,000 employees fully investigated or spot checked, only 6 have been recommended for dismissal by the Civil Service Commission; 9 others have been dismissed on the recommendation of O. W. I.'s own security committee.

The nature of O. W. I.'s personnel can be judged by the results that they produce—and these results are known to the world at large. The scripts prepared by the various Foreign Language Sections of O. W. I. are broadcast—millions of words a week—on some 24 short-wave transmitters. O. W. I. leaflets in various languages are spread all over Europe and Asia. In fact, more than 70,000,000 of these leaflets were produced for the Tunisian, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns.

The nature of these broadcasts and leaflets, and of the publications, motion pictures, news releases, and so forth, which O. W. I. distributes overseas, are well known to the commanders of our armies in the field and to our diplomatic representatives in all regions where O. W. I. operates.

I submit the question: If O. W. I. were harboring disloyal or subversive elements in its production offices here at home, would not that fact have become apparent long since to our Army and Navy and to our Ambassadors abroad? Would our generals and admirals and Ambassadors tolerate the continuance of propaganda from this country which was not 100-percent American and 100-percent loyal in its spirit and in its content?

Today radio programs prepared by the German Section of O. W. I., the Italian Section of O. W. I., and other foreign-language sections of O. W. I. in their New York office are being rebroadcast to Europe by the powerful transmitters of the B. B. C. in London—they are being rebroadcast by radio transmitters under General Eisenhower's control—the United Nations radio at Algiers, the radio station in Tunis, the Palermo radio in Sicily, the Naples radio in Italy.

Radio broadcasting specialists who have been developed and trained in the O. W. I. New York office are being sent to England at the request of General Devers and to north Africa at the request of General Eisenhower to broadcast direct from those points in German, Italian, French, Yugoslavian, Greek, Dutch, Norwegian, and other languages. If there was any question of loyalty of these men, do you imagine that General Eisenhower or General Devers would request their services in their theaters? Do you imagine that the State Department would issue passports to these men to represent this Government abroad?

I repeat—it is easy to bring all sorts of charges against any servant of this Government—but it is not so easy to support them.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have asked permission to revise and extend my remarks because, due to the lateness of the hour I do not desire to prolong our activity this afternoon. But I want to approach this problem from a little different angle from the way it has been approached today.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a request from the Office of War Information for a deficiency appropriation of $5,000,000. O. W. I. has been provided in recent months with $29,000,000 for its overseas activity alone. Before voting additional appropriations it would be well for us to see what has been done with money already provided.

I do not believe there is a Member of Congress who would deny the importance of psychological warfare and propaganda in this streamlined era of global war. Personally, I feel that the O. W. I. has done some good work along this line. I have not come to this conclusion by acting on hearsay evidence. I have been curious enough to go down to the offices of O. W. I. and to see for myself what they are doing. It is all too often we are called upon in Congress to vote huge sums of money without sufficient evidence on which to base our action. The mere label that it is "necessary for the war effort" is not sufficient for me. There has been too much monkey business going on under the cloak of that slogan.

At the Office of War Information I found some hard-working, sincere, and able citizens. They are courteous and even supplied me with samples of some of their work. There has been a lot of criticism of the O. W. I. It is not necessary to burn down the barn to get the rats. I hope to continue to support reasonable O. W. I. appropriations as long as the war lasts. However, I have some constructive suggestions to offer. My remarks will be confined largely to the activities of the O. W. I. Overseas Operations Branch which employs over 4,000 people.

O. W. I. PROMOTES REVOLUTION

It is my considered judgment that some of the activities of O. W. I. are beyond those intended by Congress when the agency was supplied with its original funds. For instance, there is no useful purpose which will serve the war effort in the activity of O. W. I. distributing literature in neutral countries when that literature tends to promote revolution. Everybody believes in the "four freedoms" but Congress has not said the United States is going to extend those freedoms to the peoples of other lands whether they want them or not. If that is to be our objective we will shortly find ourselves in war with our allies. Yet, the O. W. I. has been going around the world acting on the assumption that Congress has given it a mandate to do just what I assume we do not want it to do.

In some countries of the world, including India, O. W. I. is distributing booklets entitled "Children of the U. S. A." These booklets are very attractively prepared in colors and show how fat and healthy American children are how many nice things they have to play and work with, and what nice homes most of them have. What is the effect of such literature? One of the Senators who was in India and saw the effect it has had pointed out it was like the kid bragging about a new pair of shoes he has that the other neighborhood kids do not have. Instead of creating friendship it is promoting jealousy and rubbing salt in the wounds. It causes fights. It promotes revolutions against authority which does not provide new shoes for everybody else. What are we trying to do in India? Promote a revolution against the British? The O. W. I. thinks so, to judge by its activity there. It is taking too literally the provisions of the Atlantic Charter guaranteeing self-government to each nation. The charter is purely a propaganda instrument without relation to reality. Has not O. W. I. heard that Prime Minister Churchill said, "I haven't become the King's first minister to preside over liquidation of the British Empire"? Has not O. W. I. heard that Joe Stalin has frankly indicated his territorial ambitions? Has not O. W. I. heard that President Roosevelt remarked only last week, in discussion of the Moscow Conference, that "We are not quibbling about who is going to run this or that piece of territory"?

On the subject of O. W. I.'s activity in India the following newspaper article by John O'Donnell appearing in the Washington Times-Herald for November 2, 1943, is in point:

Mr. Elmer Davis' Office of War Information has taken up the problem of India in a serious fashion—so serious, in fact, that their broadcasts on F. D. R.'s program of freedom from want to the famine-stricken terrain of Calcutta is causing both irritation on Capitol Hill and a bit of eyebrow raising from Great Britain.

This Thursday the Congress is voting on Elmer's request for an additional $5,000,000 for its overseas work because O. W. I. has already overspent its budget.

O. W. I. has overspent its budget on such items as 15,000 short-wave receiving sets for India, so that the politically divided millions of that nation could listen to Elmer's overseas broadcasters hired here to preach the doctrine of the "four freedoms."

There seem to be a few flies in the O. W. I. propaganda goose-grease squirted at India. Among the flies are (1) the followers of Gandhi don't quite understand how Elmer's stooges can square their observations with the facts of political life as they observe them from the hoosegow, (2) the British, naturally, honestly, but privately think that both we and they have enough headaches in the world without O. W. I. creating another one by horning into the India political problem without invitation, and (3) it's rather difficult to satisfy the bellies of starving millions with an F. D. R. freedom-from-want radio broadcast, even if it is done in the most expensive Indian dialect that O. W. I. can buy.

The O. W. I. propaganda for India suggested that Elmer's highly paid experts have just been graduated with honors from a refresher course in befuddlement. The grade of propaganda intelligence demonstrated by the $30,000,000 a year and up organization blazed out when the boys sounded the call:

"Now is the time for O. W. I.'s invasion of India."

The psychological assault on India was launched with posters. And the carefully drawn O. W. I. propaganda poster for India was one that would chill a Christian's blood. There on the crucifix was the Saviour—machine gunned by Nazi and Fascist enemies. It was in O. W. I. language, an "emotional sockeroo."

Unfortunately, after the beautifully colored posters had been printed on very expensive paper, with the intent of inflaming to battle the brain of native India, some smart boy discovered that the posters were to be distributed among 239,000,000 Hindus, 78,000,000 followers of Mohammed, and 13,000,000 Buddhists—none of whom looked upon the crucifix, even presented with O. W. I. art, as a symbol to arouse them to fighting fury.

To most of the millions of India, the crucifix, of course, meant absolutely nothing. But there were a few ancients among the millions of Indian Mohammedans who recalled a bit of folklore handed down from the distant past, an ancient tale passed from lip to ear through the generations that had something to do with knights who wore this symbol and did their best to knock the brains out of the followers of the Prophet with mace and battle-ax.

The O. W. I. poster was not a thumping success. And neither have been their broadcasts.

CAMPAIGN BUTTONS

I am aware that due to several causes the activity of O. W. I. in the novelty line has somewhat decreased. The most important reason for this is that our generals have pointed out this type of activity has not produced such good results. Yet, money appropriated by Congress has actually gone into lapel clips with the President's picture on them. These campaign buttons have been given to troops to distribute to citizens of other lands. I was told by an O. W. I. official that the Arabs beg our troops for these Roosevelt campaign buttons. It is all too obvious. These buttons are distributed for a twofold effect. First, to promote the fourth-term campaign among our troops. Second, to promote the campaign to be first president of the United Nations of the world. I am interested in seeing this Nation sold to other peoples in terms of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution rather than in terms of any one man.

OUR SECRET WEAPONS

I also question the advisability of the O. W. I. distributing pencils, candy bars, soap, paper, mirrors, and so forth. One O. W. I. item which has proved popular among children of foreign lands is John's Book. This book is done in colors and has a pencil attached with which children can color, with blue or red lead, the pictures in the book. Let me quote to you a passage from John's Book:

This little book was thought up by a boy named John. He lives right in the middle of the great United States of America. John's father gave John the pictures which are on the next pages so he could color them, and John asked if copies could be made for his friends all over the world.

Now does not that just sound like the New Deal? Shades of the W. P. A. What a weapon against the blitz. I want to see the kids happy but do not see why the American taxpayers should have had to shell out the $6,095.85 in taxes and War bond money it took to publish 180,793 of these booklets in the English, African, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages. John's Book has fluttered down like manna from heaven to the starving peoples of foreign lands. I doubt, however, that it has satisfied their hunger. I doubt if it has scared Hitler very badly. I don't think so much of it as our secret weapon.

Uncle Sam is the No. 1 publisher of the world. The Federal Government now prints more newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals than all the private publishers of any single State put together. The Federal Government now

edits 4 daily papers, 8 weeklies, 8 biweeklies, 110 monthlies, and 15 quarterlies. Scores of other periodicals are issued during certain seasons of the year by the Government. Private publishers have suffered what amounts to a 15-percent cut in paper since last year. But there has been no apparent cut in the publications of 2,241 Federal Government agencies.

SUPERMAN COMIC BOOKS

Much of the O. W. I. literature is full of political propaganda. I have one O. W. I. booklet, 7 by 10 inches, done on the comic superman book style and devoted exclusively to promoting the political fortunes of the perpetual candidate for reelection to the Presidency. It has 74 cartoons relating to the President on only 10 pages. That must be some kind of a world record. This little campaign booklet cost the taxpayers of this country $13,951.95 for 561,491 copies, all distributed abroad to our troops and foreigners.

Victory Magazine in each issue carries some propaganda for the New Deal. This is a slick-paper magazine done in the style of Life magazine, only better. It is also exclusively for foreign distribution. The first issue cost our taxpayers $63,929 for 250,000 copies, which were distributed in the following places: Syria, Egypt, Hawaii, England, Turkey, Spain, north Africa, India, Iraq, North Ireland, Eire, New Zealand, Palestine, Portugal, New Caledonia, Eritrea, Alaska, Madagascar, Iran, French Equatorial Africa, South Africa, Nigeria, Iceland, Australia, and the Gold Coast. The second issue cost $95,000 for 406,000 copies. The third issue varies a little from the first two in that it is supposed to sell for 10 cents per copy on foreign newsstands in competition with the magazines of our private publishing houses, although thousands have been distributed free. It also contains $30,000 worth of advertising sold to firms with war contracts. It is not hard to sell this advertising because the firms just add the expense of it to the cost of their product, and John Q. Taxpayer pays for it.

Here are some quotations taken from these magazines, which are illustrated in each issue with several pictures of the fourth-term candidate and his palace guard.

> Liberty under God! That is what Franklin D. Roosevelt pledges the United States of America to insure for all the future of all mankind. On the foundation of the "four freedoms," of speech, of worship, from want, and fear, this future will be built and forever maintained.

That is a pretty big promise and binds a lot of Americans for all time to come. It is a promise the people's Representatives in Congress have not authorized the President to make. It is a promise which if made at all should be made by the Nation and not by one man, because it will take more than one man to make it good.

Here is some more modest propaganda from these O. W. I. publications:

> There are really two Franklin Delano Roosevelts. There is the forceful war leader of his country in the most perilous period of its history; a brilliant statesman of great sincerity, of deep perception, and a visionary whose social and economic philosophies once before saved this country in a crisis. The second Roosevelt is a warm-hearted, kindly, and companionable man whose personal charm has won him the love of millions of his loyal countrymen.

I have no objection if the fourth-term candidate wants to picture himself as a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, but he ought to campaign at his own expense. Yet, the 1944 Budget calls for six more Victory Magazines at an average cost of $76,400 per issue, or a total of $450,000.

The first issue of Victory magazine compares the President, in the tenor of many of his own speeches, to Washington and Lincoln. It pictures both the President and First Lady at home at the same time with Eleanor darning his socks in a very domestic scene. It quotes Vice President WALLACE speaking to the wife of the Communist Ambassador for the Soviet Union, Madame Litvinov, in these words:

> The object of this war is to make sure that everybody in the world has the privilege of drinking a quart of milk a day.

Madame Litvinov is quoted as replying:

> Yes; even half a pint.

I do not know anyone in uniform fighting for those objectives. This magazine also pictures the President's political opponents—with their own money—as "reactionaries." It infers that they are small-time Fascists just beyond the reach of indictment. Each edition of this magazine weighs 135 tons. It takes that much space in ships which could be carrying desperately needed weapons of war to our troops.

A ONE-MAN WAR

One of these O. W. I. publications, entitled "The Life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Thirty-second President of the United States of America," makes the following statement:

> Millions of people are praying for release from the slavery into which the tyrannical aggressors have bound them. That this yoke will be lifted is the promise of America and its President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Then the statement, casting some doubt, by inference of omission, on whether or not America will make its promise good, continues:

> Assurance that this promise will be kept may be found in ample measure in his life record.

I am not so sure that investigation would disclose his promises are always kept. In fact, I have trouble remembering any that have been kept. But, the booklet continues:

> Franklin Roosevelt is a man who never shirked a task, and will not lose this, the greatest battle of his life.

Well, it is a fortunate thing for the President that he has some country boys from the Sixth Missouri Congressional District who are fighting to make certain that this battle is not lost, although it is by no means the personal battle O. W. I. literature pictures it. This is no one-man war, and no one man or political party will be entitled to credit for winning it.

There is a little O. W. I. magazine similar to Reader's Digest, except that it has about 16 illustrated pages. It is called U. S. A., and is beautifully done in colors. Over $64,284 has been spent in publication of over 1,203,000 copies of this magazine.

SEEDS FOR EVERYBODY BUT AMERICAN FARMERS

Congressmen used to be able to send the farm folk in their districts vegetable seeds. Now that for over 10 years the United States has had the benefit of the New Deal's more abundant life, our farmers no longer get these free seeds. They are being sent abroad by O. W. I. in gaily colored packages. Powdered bouillon is also being sent overseas to citizens of foreign lands. Each package has some of Roosevelt's speeches inside of it. I do not know which will make these foreigners more bilious, the bouillon or the speeches.

FREE—ONE-HALF A BATH

If it is necessary for the taxpayers of this country to supply the citizens of foreign lands with bath soap as O. W. I. has been doing, then the soap should be in larger bars than the three-quarter-ounce bars being handed out now. That is not enough for half a bath. And, I am advised those thin 4-inch square sheets of soap paper are not being used for the purpose intended. Even most Americans have never seen soap paper.

SOME DOMESTIC ACTIVITY

O. W. I. has a booklet, Battle Stations for All. One hundred and forty thousand copies of this booklet have been distributed in the United States. The booklet criticizes Congress, endorses the work of the War Labor Board, maintenance of membership and check-off, endorses subsidies and is full of New Deal phrases striking at groups opposing the New Deal. It promotes class hate. It gives the impression, also, that the war is between supporters and opponents of the New Deal. This book was the work of O. W. I.'s domestic branch and I only mention it here to show the overseas branch of O. W. I. is not the only branch afflicted with propaganditis.

QUESTIONNAIRES

One other activity of O. W. I. in the domestic field might well be referred to here. Just recently O. W. I. took a poll of Polish Americans. It asked nine typewritten pages of questions of each individual. The man asking the questions had six pages of instructions to follow. One thousand and thirteen of these forms were used for personal interviews at a cost to our taxpayers of $3,000. This poll will be most helpful to New Deal orators in 1944 because in certain sections of the country they will know what to say to please their audiences. A questionnaire was also prepared and used on American Slovaks. These questionnaires put those being questioned in a position of either being un-American or pro-Russian. It is a scandalous thing for the Government of the United States to be engaged in.

Another gift distributed by our taxpayers, through O. W. I., to foreigners, is a little rubber stamp with inking pad attached. The recipient can have all

sorts of fun stamping things on the back of his hands, or neck, or some other place, with this gadget.

NEW DEAL'S PIGGLY-WIGGLY PLAN

All of this stuff is building up the impression abroad that the United States will supply the world with knick-knacks if the rest of the world will just pitch in and help us win the war. This stuff is creating the impression that this Nation is flowing with milk, honey, vegetable seeds, soap, and pencils and that it is all going to be given away under a plan whereby the United States will become a grocery store run on the Piggly-Wiggly help-yourself basis, to which the peoples of the world will be invited to come and fill their pockets and bellies and return home fattened by the substance of our people. It is global boondoggling. It is the philosophy of the W. P. A. This war cannot be waged as if it were another relief project. But, what can you expect when the same outfit from Harry Hopkins, first W. P. A. Administrator, on down, or up, is running it?

FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIX ALIENS ON O. W. I. PAY ROLL

Now, I have said some kindly things about some of the O. W. I. personnel. I have done so in sincerity. But there are 486 aliens on the O. W. I. pay roll, and I regret that I cannot say much in their favor. I regret to have to point out that even the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. have objected to the communistic affiliations of some of the O. W. I. employees who have been broadcasting to foreign people certain data about the American labor movement which is not in accord with the facts, and material to which no good American can subscribe. Many pledges have been made in the name of the American people in these broadcasts, and no one in Congress knows what they all are. Thousands of broadcasts are beamed each week from the United States to foreign peoples at a cost of millions of dollars.

HAVING A WONDERFUL TIME

Mr. Speaker, some of the boys in O. W. I. are having a wonderful time. Three hundred and thirty-one thousand dollars has been provided them for entertainment purposes. If you will read the printed hearings on the O. W. I. appropriation bill, you will find that this fund was justified by O. W. I. officials on the ground it is necessary to wine and dine foreign officials, including the news and radio people, to get them to tell the truth about this country. The boys are also having a wonderful time because there is a fund O. W. I. has set up out of its appropriation under which those upon whom it smiles with favor—professors, labor leaders, and others—can and are being sent to London, and elsewhere, to deliver lectures on the American way of life. The most recent of these lectures reported in the newspapers was one given by a mayor from the west coast of this country who blasted the Congress of the United States in remarks before the London public. The O. W. I. overseas branch is also putting out newsreels, which, like the rest of their stuff, is so carefully concealed from the American public that not even Congress has seen it. If it is as loaded with political propaganda as the newsreels the O. W. I. domestic branch is putting out here at home in the neighborhood theaters, it must be pretty bad.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, the O. W. I. stinks. Of course, anyone who says so is bound to be smeared as anti-New Deal and, therefore, a Hitler-loving, unpatriotic, carping critic seeking to undermine the Commander in Chief. But the facts must speak. It will not help Hitler, Tojo, and company to make public the facts and thus make possible their correction through the democratic processes of public opinion. It will help Hitler infinitely more to keep these facts secret and permit the war effort to become so rotten at the core that the war will be prolonged and victory will exact a higher price in American blood and treasure. I respectfully submit that Office of War Information can get along without this extra $5,000,000 by trimming its sails.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not also a fact that the O. W. I. might be engaged in some activities that those generals know nothing about?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Indeed. Those generals have been very general in their reference to the activities of O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, that would be out of the question, because O. W. I. abroad is under the control of the military officers. They must consult the Chiefs of Staff, who make out the program and who direct the program, and they are at all times under the commanders of the military zone in which the operations are performed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman does not mean to intimate that the personnel in the New York office of the overseas branch is under the military control of General Eisenhower, for instance?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. In the Overseas Branch everything is under the direct control of the Army officers. The program must be submitted and it is made up by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is at all times under the control of the commander of the military zone.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman would not leave the impression that General Eisenhower or General Marshall who appeared before our committee has all the information as to what goes on in the New York office?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This money is not for the New York office. It is for the overseas branch, every penny of it. It is for the overseas branch. It is all under the supervision of the officers in that area.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has indicated that the military leaders in Europe are in complete accord with the activities of the civilian employees of O. W. I. operating in that theater.

I have in my hand a United Press despatch dated October 24 and bearing a London date line reporting activities of a distinguished representative of O. W. I., the mayor of Portland, Oreg., who proceeded to criticize five Members of the other body because of their report upon their global tour and this distinguished representative of the O. W. I. predicted that President Roosevelt will run again and probably be reelected.

I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would have us infer that the military leaders in Europe approve of such political activities on the part of representatives of O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the gentleman from Idaho I may say that that man is not a representative of O. W. I. at all and has no connection whatever with it.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has made a tremendously impressive speech and a very important one. I was intrigued by the fact that the President's agency is distributing rubber stamps throughout the world. I wish that the gentleman, if the limitation of time had not prevented, could have read the legend which goes with it. I wonder if it says, by any chance, that this is the President's idea of a symbol for a perfect parliamentary body.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Apparently they think that, this country having been made into a rubber stamp, the same principle can be extended abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague from Missouri who has just spoken betrays an utter misapprehension of the purposes for which this appropriation is made. He also evidences unfamiliarity with the history of our own country and our early experiences in dealing with the Indians.

In going into these foreign countries there are large, illiterate populations. We must deal with them as William Penn and his contemporaries dealt with the Indians. We must assure them of our friendship and win their support. It can best be through the medium of gifts.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the chairman does not realize that this terrible waste of money and this vicious propaganda the O. W. I. have put out has destroyed very largely their influence and the effectiveness of what might be done. If they would cut out this foolishness and get down to doing the things they ought to do with the extra $4,000,000 they will

have in the last 9 months of the year, they would not need any new appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman's statement does not gibe with the reports from the military leaders in the front-line trenches. The military leaders over there, to whom both gentlemen have referred, have urgently requested this material.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman realize that the military authorities have taken this direct wartime propaganda over themselves, and that the O. W. I. is just delegating men to serve, for instance, in Italy under General McClure, and that the same thing applies everywhere? These people are not carrying the load; they are just a part of the situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is definitely in error there.

Mr. TABER. That is General McClure's testimony.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The purpose of this appropriation is to provide the very service the gentleman says somebody else is performing.

The gentleman from Missouri does not understand this item and he is not familiar with early American history. The island of Manhattan was bought and the original owners pacified by just such gifts as these or their equivalent.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman I am familiar with current history.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When Stanley went into another section of the same continent on his search for Livingstone the largest part of his baggage was made up of this sort of material. In important areas of both Asia and Africa it is today as effective as it was then. We have won over the Arabs in north Africa by such gifts, and likewise the friendship and cooperation of the people of every country into which our troops have penetrated. Not only have we won the friendship of the native peoples by this means but we have familiarized them with the symbol of the American people, the American Nation, the American Army, the American flag, so that when our paratroopers or our commandos, or our airmen land, as soon as they are seen by the natives these symbols are recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Specialty items are extremely effective propaganda items where literacy is low. Examples of these specialty items are matches, soap, mirrors, sewing kits, soap-paper leaflets, packets of seeds, and so forth.

The United States Government in its conquest of the West made appropriations to buy exactly this sort of material in order to placate the Indian tribes.

Token gifts customarily have been employed to gain the friendliness of native populations in all such areas and acquaint them with American insignia. For example, in Burma, and on the islands of the Pacific, it is extremely important that we acquaint the natives with American symbols to protect American pilots who make forced landings in these areas.

The statement that American officers are not committed to this policy is a mistake. Here are the facts:

At General Stilwell's request there is now in transit an initial order for 2,000 mirrors, 1,000,000 match boxes, 50,000 "firegrams," 5,000 soap cakes, 1,000 sewing kits, and a sample order for 10,000 soap-paper leaflets. Much heavier requests are expected from General Stilwell.

General MacArthur has requested that we ship an initial 2,000,000 papers of matches, 50,000 sewing kits, 500,000 small boxes of cigarettes, and 10,000 mirrors.

The expenditure of this money will win the friendship of both neutral and hostile tribes; it will save American lives and save the expenditure of vastly larger sums, which otherwise must be used for firearms and munitions.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that I am in agreement with him 100 percent, that we should acquaint the peoples of foreign lands with the things of this Nation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not ask the gentleman to be in agreement with me. I ask him to get in agreement with General Stilwell and General MacArthur.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. That information does not appear in the hearings.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We do not like to publish information of this kind but the gentleman's attitude forces us to. If the gentleman has any doubt about it, I ask him to communicate with Army headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if you attempt to analyze any agreements made between this Nation and other nations you run the risk of being called anti-British, anti-Russian, or otherwise antipathetic. That is a form of coercion. It may, to be sure, help decrease the newsprint shortage since it decreases news. Still it results in the hoarding of information concerning blunders which, if uncovered now, might save some lives.

It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to scrutinize the agreement recently made in Russia immediately and thoroughly. It is nothing short of intellectual laziness to assume that other nations, however friendly, put the interest of the globe before the interests of their own countries or that they consider the interests of their own countries identical with the interests of the United States.

It is an old saying, that when Uncle Sam starts to a diplomatic conference he begins taking off his hat, coat, necktie, vest, shirt, and so forth. We shall not be surprised if our distinguished and beloved Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, comes home without his illusions. Trying to cure Europeans of their gory form of machine politics, like trying to cure American cities of their mechanical political chicanery, requires rather more than exegetics.

Remember, this is it! This Moscow agreement is what we and our allies are offering the world as our blueprint for the post-war world. This is offered, subject to our approval, as our concept of the brave, new, and better world for which our leaders have told our soldiers they are fighting and, many of them, dying.

This Moscow agreement provides for the forming of another League of Nations. Do we have to go through that again? I had the Congressional Library send me the roll calls on that question last time. The list I had them send me gives the vote on the question whether or not America should adopt without reservation the treaty providing for a League of Nations. It gives the names of the Senators, the names of the States they represented, and the population of each State at the time. Thirty-eight Senators voted for it, 53 voted against it. Only 3 of the Senators who voted for it came from fairly large States, the others came from sparsely populated States. The big bulk of the people were represented by the Senators who voted against it.

Let us hope that this question will not be regurgitated in the Senate until after the war, when we can all say and write what we think. Plenty of disclosures which might pop open the eyes cannot be made until after the war.

An instrument as momentous as the Moscow agreement should at least be consistent with the principles for which the agreement itself says that we are fighting. Even a common, insignificant promissory note between individual citizens is supposed to look fair on its face in order to be negotiable. But take a look at these Moscow documents. A casual glance is enough to make you wonder if it would not have been better if, instead of signing it, the American representative had contracted writer's cramp and come home without signing anything.

For example, one of the documents places emphatic emphasis upon the intention to recognize the independence of Austria if and when Austria shall be liberated. Austria, one recalls, was invaded by Germany. After the invasion Germany held a plebiscite and annexed Austria. Thereupon the State Department immediately, officially, and formally began acting as if Austria were legally part of Germany. The belated recognition in this document that we should not have treated the extermination of Austria as legal is, of course, laudable.

This same document, however, inconsistently and shockingly refrains from mentioning the three Baltic republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuana, which, after the fall of Austria, were invaded and annexed by Russia by means of a plebiscite while the country was under

military occupation in precisely the same manner as that by which Austria was exterminated by Germany.

The United States, moreover, is in a still more embarrassing position with respect to these three republics than it is with respect to Austria, because soon after Russia exterminated the Baltic republics on July 23, 1940, Sumner Welles, speaking in behalf of the United States, issued the following clarion pronouncement to the effect that America would never stand for such violations anywhere in the globe. I quote:

> The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter where they are carried out by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak. This principle constitutes the very foundation upon which the existing relationship between the 21 republics of the new world rests. The United States will continue to stand by these principles in all sections of the globe because of the convictions of the American people that, unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, justice, or law—in other words the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

A globe-circling, all-time statement like that is a broad statement. Whether or not it did any good to make that statement then, it does no good now to sign an agreement giving the impression we have forgotten that we made it. It makes other allies to whom our diplomats have given promises stop and wonder if promises given them may, when the time comes, be ignored.

Yugoslavia, for example, is our ally. The American Ambassador to Yugoslavia, Mr. Lane, in the spring of 1941 persuaded the citizens of Yugoslavia to depose their pro-Nazi ruler and join the Allies by promising that if they did so the United States would give them Lend-Lease supplies and, in case they were conquered by the Nazis as they seemed certain to be, return their government to power after the war. The Army of Yugoslavia, called the Chetniks, is now fighting under their Minister of War, General Mihailovic, on the side of the Allies. Meanwhile, however, a communistic army called the Partisans has been organized in Yugoslavia under "Tito." The Partisans not only fight the Nazis; they are also waging war against the Chetniks.

Now if America had not signed this Moscow document the official government of Yugoslavia under King Peter might still rely faithfully upon the original promise of America. Unfortunately, however, there is evidence on the face of this document which may cause nations like Yugoslavia to wonder whether they will be able to get the usual justice which, in the past, was considered characteristically American. An example of the kind of justice which is more esoteric than American appears in the document dealing with Nazi atrocities. Though it neglects to mention such memorable Nazi atrocities as the massacre of Lidice, it does refer to "wholesale killings of Polish officers" by Nazis.

We recall that incident. The first news of the killing of the Polish officers came from the Nazis, who stated that these officers who were against Communism were killed by Russia. The Poles, accusing nobody, merely suggesting that the officers were missing, requested that the International Red Cross at Geneva make an investigation. The Russians protested against the investigation and prevented it. We heard nothing more until these Moscow documents appear stating that the Nazis have killed the Polish officers.

The Moscow document pronouncing this verdict unfortunately, unlike other documents which together constitute the Moscow Agreement, is not signed by any subordinate official but by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Mr. Stalin, head of Russia. Now, should we let our American President be used thus? In America we even, you recall, permitted a handful of Nazi invaders to enjoy complete trials with successive appeals through and including the United States Supreme Court, though I for one feel that in that case too much comfort was given the enemy. We in America do not let any judge or set of judges, where one of the judges is accused of the crime, act as grand jury, trial jury, and judge, who in one proceeding dismisses the charge against one defendant and condemns another.

This, I submit, is a poor time to sign any document which sounds like the debunking of grandiloquence in the beautiful statement of Welles when he truthfully reminded the world in our behalf that America upholds the rule of reason, justice, and law between nations which is the basis of modern civilization and without which civilization cannot be preserved.

The expressions upon the face of the Moscow Agreement are enough to make us want to repudiate it. As one Cabinet member, meeting with three House committees in executive session a few weeks ago remarked, "Unless we are fighting for a better world I do not know why we are fighting. I really don't."

The Congress, having voted the billions of dollars and millions of precious lives now fighting in Europe, has not only a legal but also a moral obligation to investigate the secret commitments which, because they are referred to in this Moscow agreement are legally a corporal part of the agreement. We Americans cannot expect our Secretary of State and our President to withstand foreign pressure to abandon American rights and principles if we continue to sit back and let it seem that nobody in America cares what becomes of American rights and principles.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I did not hang around all day just to speak now, but you had me in a position where I had to stay, because I am going to make a speech when you get through with this general debate.

In regard to the pending matter, I am sure that unless some of the Members revise their speeches so that they entirely rewrite them, many of them will be ashamed of the RECORD when they read it tomorrow morning. I have heard more nonsense to the square yard this afternoon in regard to the war effort than I ever thought possible in the greatest deliberative body in the world. There seems to be only one item of contention and that is in respect to the Office of War Information. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] stated the proposition correctly when he stated that if this office is doing a job that satisfies the generals and is saving men's lives, and will help win the war, is not that all there is to it? What is the use of holding up a package of seeds and saying that should not be done? That simply exposes the ignorance of the man who held it up. I have had experience on the western frontier. I have had experience when we had to meet wild tribes, and that is one of the things that is necessary, and that is the reason why General MacArthur calls for fifteen or twenty thousand mirrors. That is a thing that gets any wild tribe. That is the thing that will get any Indian in America—a mirror. Making fun of soap, making fun of sewing kits! Nothing could be more effective among the people of Italy, for example, than to distribute those little packages. My God, if we can only win this war with the degree of intelligence that we have demonstrated this afternoon, we are indeed a great country. That seems to be all there is to this question, and when you come to vote, how many of you are going to vote against this bill? It is said that the Bureau of the Budget recommended over a billion dollars and through the great scrutiny exercised by this committee you have reduced it to $215,000,000. There is a difference between these two bodies of about a billion dollars. You cannot expect me to say that the committee is right, or that the Bureau of the Budget is all wrong.

It is very possible that this committee may be wrong. It is very possible that the Bureau of the Budget may be wrong, and it is more likely that they both are wrong. I am not going to condemn anybody. I do not have to inject any politics into this thing at all, because I am not serving in this Congress in the interests of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I am doing my best to win this war, and I am not putting myself up as any general to tell the people of America how this war should be conducted. I am perfectly willing to take the word of the men at the front, the men who are doing the job. I am going to follow that, because I do not know anything about the conduct of a war. But I know enough to know about what this Office of War Information is doing, to resist any criticism such as was made this afternoon about giving out these little tokens of friendship. Nothing

could be more effective. Suppose the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] was a general in the war over there. Criticizing seeds! My God, the thing that is going to win this war is food, and everybody knows it. If they cannot starve the Chinese people and they can become armed, they will drive the Japs into the ocean. It is a question of food, as with every war in the history of the world. If you can supply these people with just a few seeds, see what that would do. It is a gesture of friendship. It is a thing of value.

I did get some valued information from both the majority and minority leaders on this bill. I listened with attention to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], and I thought I was on the way to understanding this bill. But when general debate opened up, filled with politics and the feudal system in the South and everything else, I lost my way. But I have got enough common sense to know that whatever the committee brought out I should vote for it. I do not know any more about running the Appropriations Committee than I do about running this war. I have to depend upon the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Indiana, just as I depend upon the generals and the admirals in this war. They say that is what we should do. We should vote $215,000,000. That is what I am going to vote for. I do not see anything more difficult about it than to follow the advice of the men who know.

It is not very often I know much about any subject, but when you come to a subject that I do know something about I trust there are some Members in this Congress who will pay some attention to what I say. But, I do not like this ridicule, making fun of a great effort. This is bringing us nearer to victory. It is simply an exposition of the man's own ignorance in dealing with people under conditions that we meet in Africa and in India.

Now by this time I suppose I have made as big a fool of myself as some of the rest of them and I will stop where I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota, has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a matter of grave national concern for your consideration. The Japanese in this country, as you know, have been placed in concentration camps since the outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Japan. Many of these are well behaved and take the fortunes of war with good grace. Others do not.

At Tulelake Camp, located in California, approximately 6 miles from the Oregon border, is a segregation center made up of disloyal Japs. Klamath Falls, Oreg., a city of some 20,000 people, is the business center of this area. I was called on the phone from Klamath Falls on Tuesday afternoon and told of the following disturbing facts:

On Monday afternoon, November 1, at the Japanese concentration camp at Tulelake, there was a demonstration by 7,000 or 8,000 Japs. Mr. Dillon S. Myer, Director of the War Relocation Authority here in Washington, had gone to the camp on an official visit, and the Japs gathered in front of the administration building, at which time a committee of 20 or 25 Japs went in to make certain demands. What these demands were, I do not presently know.

The reports I have received from reliable sources are that the mob held as prisoners the National Director, Dillon S. Myer, officials, civilian employees, including some elderly women and school teachers, about 100 in all, from 1:15 p. m. until about 5 o'clock. Mr. N. C. Wilkinson, farmer at Tulelake, went down to the Jap camp to collect a debt from an employee and to ask for a job on a housing project. The Japs came out and he tried to back up his car and get away, but they succeeded in stopping him, turned his car over and damaged the fenders and headlights. They held him a prisoner, along with the others, until about 5 o'clock, when they were released. I am also distressed to learn that Dr. Reese M. Pedicord, head of the hospital, was beaten up by about 12 Japs. Incidentally, Dr. Pedicord is a good friend of our Surgeon General.

The gentleman from California, Representative ENGLE, in whose district this camp is located, today informed me the Japanese raised the Japanese flag on the pole and it remained flying over this camp the remainder of the day. Also, that Mrs. Wanda Stark, the postmistress at the camp, has reported to the post office authorities in San Francisco that the Japanese have barricaded the post office and up until 11 p. m. last night would allow no mail to come or go. The gentleman from California, Representative ENGLE, and I have been in complete accord and cooperation in our concern of this deplorable situation.

The Army stood at the edge of the camp with its tanks and machine guns lined up, but was not called in to discipline this riotous mob. The project manager denied that there was any unfriendly demonstration of any kind, that they did no intentional damage to automobiles, denied that Dr. Pedicord was attacked, said no one was held a prisoner—no one wanted to leave—and the Army was not called in as it was not necessary.

There are more than 14,000 disloyal Japs interned in this center. Since October 27 they have passively refused to work on a camp-controlled farm of 2,500 acres of foodstuffs planted and cultivated by the Japs interned in this center. The War Relocation Authority is the authority for a statement that the reason for refusing to harvest these crops is that a truck accident, which resulted in the death of an internee and injuries to several others, was seized upon as an excuse for the strike. The officials said they could recognize the strike as being the work of experts, and that the agitation began soon after an estimated 7,500 disloyal Japanese were brought in a few weeks ago under the segregation plan. They further stated there is no apparent leader or spokesman for the group, who are passively resisting demands to do farm work. There is evidence, however, that intimidation and display of power is being made.

Ray Best, director of the camp, stated that a committee of 8, claiming to represent the entire population of the center, had notified him no further harvest work would be done. The crops grown on this 2,500 acres of farm land, adjacent to this center, were grown for use at the Tulelake Camp and nine other relocation centers. By this strike of the Japanese, it was plainly apparent that they do not wish to aid this country in any way, for by refusing to work, and if the crops are not harvested, it means that food for their use must be produced elsewhere. They are, therefore, proceeding on the theory that anything of a productive nature they do will aid the American war effort. Fourteen thousand people sitting in idleness is very conducive for the production of trouble.

Last April I wrote the Attorney General of the United States about the Japs buying and leasing the rich agricultural lands in Oregon, and asked what jurisdiction or authority the Federal Government had to put a stop to this practice. His undated reply is as follows:

> This will acknowledge your letter of April 29, 1943, referring to the letters you have received from your constituents regarding the buying and leasing of lands in Oregon, with particular reference to certain lands in the Owyhee project north of Ontario, Oreg.
>
> This Department has no information relating to this matter. I suggest that you may be able to learn what the situation is by inquiring of the War Relocation Authority.

You will note the vagueness of his response, and no place in his letter does he refer to the serious Japanese problem, but lightly says, "This Department has no information relating to this matter." But I tackled him again, and the result of this blast was an attorney from the Department of Justice was sent down with some figures written on a piece of plain white paper and some verbal information which did not help to solve the problem.

In view of the foregoing facts, and many other events that have occurred of an unsatisfactory nature in these concentration camps, I firmly believe that the War Relocation Authority is no longer able or fitted to attempt control of so dangerous a situation and one so full of international importance.

It is my opinion, and the expression of public sentiment that has come to me shows plainly that in the interest of national safety the supervision of these camps, and most certainly this one, should be immediately placed in the hands of the United States Army, and the Congress should take action at once.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAVENS. I do not mean to say anything against what the gentleman has stated, but we have two camps in Arkan-

sas and have had no such experience as the gentleman relates. Does the gentleman have any ideas as to why there should be the distinction?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I believe the main reason is that this is a concentration of disloyal Japs; Japs singled out from other camps and brought to this one.

Mr. CRAVENS. This is a camp where the disloyal ones have been taken?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAVENS. We have had very little trouble with our camps.

Mr. STOCKMAN. These are the disloyal Japs.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. If my memory serves me correctly a committee made an investigation of these war relocation camps not so long ago.

Mr. STOCKMAN. I think the Dies committee did.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am wondering if the gentleman has any information as to the report of this particular Tuelake camp?

Mr. STOCKMAN. No, not that I know of particularly on the Tulelake camp.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was a member of that investigating committee. At the time we made the investigation the program of segregating the disloyal Japanese from the loyal had not gotten under way; they were all intermingled in one camp. The Tulake camp was the one in which the disloyal Japs were concentrated. The situation developed since the investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read down to and including page 2, line 2.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Speaker pro tempore, Mr RAMSPECK, having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill this afternoon may have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, be allowed to extend his own remarks and include therein a radio broadcast he recently made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain excerpts from letters and editorials and other material pertinent to the subject on which I spoke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] may have permission to revise and extend the remarks he made this afternoon and to include therein excerpts from various editorials and articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the House today and to insert some excerpts pertinent to the subject which was before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING CLERK OF HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 4, 1943.

The Honorable, The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the report of the President's emergency board which supports the railroad employees in this difficulty and also to include the concise statement of the position of the railroad employees of this country, so that the people of America will understand just why there is a strike, if one is called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

A DEVASTATING STRIKE CAN BE AVERTED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most devastating strikes in our history can be averted if this Government will act promptly. For many months now the railroad employees of the country have had their petition for an increase in wages shunted about from place to place. They came to an agreement with the railway companies themselves for an increase in wages in the amount of 8 cents per hour. This agreement was approved by the President's emergency board under date of May 24, 1943.

Historically, the Railway Labor Act was passed by Congress and became a law in 1926, it was amended in 1934 and has since stood as the most useful and important law with respect to railway-labor disputes of any labor law on our statute books. For nearly 20 years there has been no railroad strike which has impaired the public service of railroads.

Under this law, whenever a dispute as to wages, hours, and so forth, cannot be settled, the President is authorized to appoint an emergency board to take up that particular matter and adjust it.

There are over 1,000,000 railroad employees concerned in this case. In September 1942 the employees, through their unions, demanded an increase in wages to meet the constantly rising cost of living. Therefore, from September 1942 to the present time, this case remains unsettled and the demands of the workers refused.

I am sure that the leaders of these 15 unions cannot much longer hold their membership in line, and unless action is taken promptly this membership will vote a strike and our transportation system will be tied up and general confusion ensue. Men will not work when they cannot make enough to live and care for their families. The reason they have worked all these months, while their demands have been refused, is because they would be the last to fail the people in our war effort. There comes a time, however, when a condition cannot be endured. That time has arrived when workingmen cannot clothe their children and send them to school.

That you may know just how this case has been handled, I will state it in order as it actually took place.

The petition of the 15 unions, embracing more than a million workers, was submitted to the carriers on September 15, 1942. The petition asked for a raise of 20 cents per hour and a minimum of 70 cents per hour for any class of the 73 classes of workers involved. No agreement was reached with the carriers and the services of the National Mediation Board was invoked December 18, 1942. Mediation began on January 7, 1943, and ended January 15, 1943, without an agreement.

On June 20 the unions requested the appointment of an emergency board authorized by the Railway Labor Act. This board was appointed by the President from the national railway labor panel. The emergency board held hearings at Chicago covering a period of 44 days. This board duly filed with the President their report May 24, 1943. This was a 15-page report and recommended, among other things, an increase of 8 cents per hour.

On May 27 the union officials met with the President, and while the unions were disappointed in the small raise granted of 8 cents per hour they yielded to the request of the President to accept the findings of the emergency board. The railroads agreed to the findings. This, then, should have ended the matter. The unions then arranged with the carriers' conference committee to meet in New York on June 24 and formally write the findings of the emergency board into an agreement.

Just the day before this agreement was to be executed the Economic Stabilization Director stepped into the picture. On June 23 he issued the following order:

> That the recommendations of the emergency board for a general 8-cent increase in rates of pay of nonoperating men now employed, contained in paragraph 54 of the report of May 24, 1943, shall not become effective.

There the matter stands and I am advised and from such advice allege the fact to be that the Stabilization Director will seek the appointment of a new emergency board that will carry out his wishes. In the meantime the officials of the unions are fast losing control of their membership and there is not a doubt in the world but what a general strike will be voted.

It is apparent that the Stabilization Director rests his case upon the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942. When we examine this act, there is nothing in the present case which conflicts with that law. While generally wage increases are forbidden there are two notable exceptions. Increases may be made, first, to correct gross injustices, and second, to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

That we may have the full record in regard to these gross injustices I quote the comparative wage scale of railway workers with other employees in manufacturing. I respectfully refer you to the report of the emergency board of May 24, 1943, and especially to paragraphs 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and especially to paragraph 43, which reads:

> The existence of gross inequities in the compensation of 73 classes of railroad employees is supported by all of the wage findings above.

This board, after 44 days of hearings, with all of the evidence before them, came to this conclusion. But that conclusion has no effect upon the Economic Stabilization Director. This Director has waived aside the purposes of the National Railroad Labor Act, the National Mediation Board, the Emergency Board, and the agreement reached between the unions and the railroads themselves.

If this strike comes, is there any possible chance to fasten the blame upon these million railroad workers? If this strike comes, it is the absolute responsibility of the Government itself acting through the Office of Economic Stabilization and not supported by any law passed by Congress.

Are we acting with a single purpose in this war? Is it possible that we can scatter billions around to every country on earth and at the same time drive our own laborers to a substandard wage scale? Generous abroad but miserly at home does not seem to be found in the "four freedoms."

We either have too many bureaus, departments, agencies, directors, and what have you or we do not have enough. I do not know which. I doubt if anyone else knows. My judgment is that we should make further appointments—one more in particular and that is to create an office big enough to keep all these bureaus and directors in their proper place. What is the use of attempting to carry out orderly processes of government, if we have one director who can ignore our whole system of government under an act of Congress that gives him no such power? After all the Office of Economic Stabilization Director is merely an executive agency, created to aid and assist the President. The Director is responsible to the President, and therefore, the duty of the President to untangle this situation is plain and unequivocal.

I realize the situation of the President. I can imagine what difficult matters he has before him constantly pertaining to the war first of all, and to our own affairs, but perhaps he can find time to round up this loose bunch of directors and potentates and find out what they are doing.

While in this Congress I expect to remain free to speak in behalf of the least of our citizens, regardless of race, religion, or anything else. I want the people of the United States to know what the merits of this railroad-labor case is. I want to do my small part in averting what I consider a serious tie-up in transportation and most dangerous to our war effort. We are in this war to the finish. We have a complete understanding with our allies, so it seems we should have wisdom enough to straighten out our own domestic affairs, and keep all supply lines open to back up our heroic fighting men.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE EMERGENCY BOARD APPOINTED FEBRUARY 20, 1943, PURSUANT TO THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS 9172 AND 9299

TO INVESTIGATE AN UNADJUSTED DISPUTE BETWEEN CERTAIN CARRIERS, INCLUDING RAILROADS, THE RAILWAY EXPRESS AGENCY, REFRIGERATOR-CAR COMPANIES, AND STOCKYARD COMPANIES, AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES REPRESENTED BY 15 COOPERATING RAILWAY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, CONCERNING REQUESTS FOR A UNION-SHOP AGREEMENT AND FOR INCREASES IN RATES OF PAY

This dispute involves approximately a million employees and virtually all the railroads in the United States, as well as the Railway Express Agency, five refrigerator-car companies, and two stockyard companies.

All the employees, embracing 73 classes of nonoperating employees on the railroads and a considerable number of groups of employees of the other carriers, were represented by the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations. Each of the carriers involved had an unadjusted dispute with one or more of these labor organizations.

Most of the railroads were represented by the eastern, southeastern, and western carriers' conference committees and had their cases presented jointly, as a group; a number of members of the American Short Line Railroad Association and a few other railroads, the Railway Express Agency, the refrigerator-car companies, and the stockyard companies had their individual cases presented separately.

The demands of the unions were made on or about September 25, 1942. Notices were then served on the various carriers requesting a union-shop agreement and an increase of all wage rates by 20 cents an hour, with no rate to be paid to any employee of less than 70 cents an hour.

After negotiation on the properties, mediation by the National Mediation Board, and failure of the parties to agree to arbitration, this Emergency Board was established to investigate the unadjusted dispute and to report thereon to the President.

Forty-four days were devoted to public hearings. Careful study was given to the testimony, exhibits, arguments, and briefs of the parties. An earnest effort was also made by this Board to settle the dispute.

This report is based on the entire record. A full analysis of the evidence will be submitted in due course.

1. The railroad industry, which constitutes the heart of our transportation system, is indispensable to the effective functioning of our national life, even under normal conditions; in these critical days, the entire war effort of the Government and people of the United States is dependent upon uninterrupted, efficient, and vigorous performance by the railroads.

2. The record of the railroads during the war emergency, including the period of defense activity, has been a magnificent one. Despite the swift and enormous growth in the total traffic burden, the large shift of alternative transport agencies, such as water carriers and air carriers, to direct war services, the restraints upon the use of motor transport springing from the curtailment of the rubber supply, and inability to achieve necessary expansions of railroad equipment and facilities because of shortages of materials and pressures upon manpower, the railroads have performed every task assigned to them and have met every responsibility placed upon them, with unprecedented effectiveness.

3. This outstanding performance of the railroads has been the result of the constructive, self-denying, and patriotic attitudes of both the managements and the men. The managers of the railroads have been alert, enterprising, and resourceful; and as far as

necessary, both independently and in conformity with the suggestions and directions of the Office of Defense Transportation, have subordinated the interests of individual carriers to the needs of the transportation system as a whole, in order to achieve, through all these means, full, efficient, and flexible utilization of all available facilities. The labor force of the railroads has encouraged and supported every reasonable effort in these directions, has increasingly adjusted its working habits and arrangements to the needs of the emergency situation, and has used its skill and industry without stint in the interest of attaining these objectives. Fundamentally, a spirit of cooperation has vitalized the efforts of the managements and the men. Without free and complete and wholehearted cooperation between the carriers and their employees the magnificent record of the railroads, as made thus far, could not have been achieved.

4. It is of the utmost importance that this spirit of cooperation be not impaired. The most severe tests of our war effort and the most grave sacrifices that must be endured still lie ahead, in both the European and the Asiatic spheres of operation. It is unthinkable that the essential services of railroad transportation should be interrupted even in the slightest degree during the war emergency; and we are firmly convinced that the deep sense of duty and responsibility of both parties to this dispute removes such a tragic happening from the realm of possibility. But it is no less imperative that the cooperation required to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, through the exertion of utmost vigor and the achievement of utmost efficiency in the conduct of railroad transportation, be fully maintained and wherever possible further extended. The attainment of such an objective necessitates effective preservation of the morale of the workers in the railroad industry. Every care must be exercised not to weaken or endanger this morale either through indirection or through outright injustice.

5. With antecedents running back as far as 1888, the Railway Labor Act, adopted in 1926 and amended in 1934, has contributed in marked degree to the establishment and maintenance of just, reasonable, and orderly labor relations in the railroad industry. Despite such weaknesses as may have emerged in the practical administration of its provisions, it has constituted an advanced and extraordinarily effective instrument for the implementation of collective bargaining and the settlement of labor controversies.

6. As a result of the influence of this legislation as applied to the rail carriers, railroad wages have maintained a degree of stability, entirely apart from the anti-inflation measures of the war emergency, that has been equaled or surpassed by few industries. Wages on the railroads have moved more slowly, both up and down, than in industry as a whole, and the level of railroad wages, both up and down, has changed more moderately than in other industrial spheres.

7. While there have been numerous labor controversies on the rail lines, continuity of railroad operation has likewise been maintained in outstanding measure For a period of two decades these has been an almost complete absence of strikes or other interruptions of railroad service. The profound significance of this record can best be appreciated when it is contrasted with the work stoppages in the nonrailroad field that have marred the defense and war effort of the past 3 years.

8. It is a matter of great public concern that the integrity of these orderly processes, with their fruitful results, be safeguarded in every way possible. If railroad employees were to find themselves unjustly penalized because of their reliance upon these orderly processes or the considerable lapse of time necessarily incident thereto, strong impetus would be given to the disruptive practices which frequently flow from the exertion of economic power or the performance of work in justifiable discontent. The pressures in these directions, springing from the impairment of morale, would be difficult to allay, and the effective prosecution of the war might be seriously obstructed.

9. Such consequences would threaten the maintenance of the stabilization program as well as our productive power as the arsenal of democracy. The stabilizing elements inherent in the established processes of railroad wage determination must be scrupulously conserved; the moderation and restraint of responsible governmental agencies operating under the Railway Labor Act must continue to mold the adjustments in dispute.

10. This Emergency Board was established pursuant to the Railway Labor Act and certain Executive orders. Only one of these orders, Executive Order 9172 of May 22, 1942, antedated the submission of the requests of the employees on September 25, 1942; and this Executive order merely changed the procedures for the establishment of emergency boards, by eliminating the need of taking strike votes or setting strike dates. Executive Order 9299, which first prescribed substantive policies for the guidance of emergency boards, was not issued until February 4, 1943, after the processes of negotiation, mediation, and arbitration in this proceeding had been exhausted and a request had been submitted by the employees for the designation of an emergency board. Executive Order 9328, which imposed far-reaching restrictions upon these earlier policies, was not issued until April 8, 1943, toward the end of the sixth week of hearings in this dispute and after the data in the major wage case had been fully presented. Finally, the policy directive of the Economic Stablization Director, which constitutes the latest authoritative pronouncement with respect to the wage stabilization program, was not issued until May 12, 1943, after the record in this case had been closed and the proceeding was under consideration by the Board. These changes of rules in the course of the pendency of this proceeding cannot in fairness be completely disregarded in the settlement of an unadjusted dispute.

11. Since this Emergency Board was established to investigate an unadjusted dispute and to report thereon to the President, it is not only its legal right, but its clear duty and affirmative responsibility, to lay before the President all the essential facts of the dispute and to submit to him its considered judgment as to what would constitute a fair and reasonable settlement of the controversy. In these circumstances such general policy restrictions, expressed or implied, as may be involved in the stabilization program do not destroy this right nor relieve the Emergency Board of this duty and responsibility.

12. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that neither the authority nor the obligation to proceed in this manner permits or justifies complete freedom of action on the part of the Emergency Board. The policies prescribed for its guidance by the Stabilization Act and the Executive orders issued pursuant thereto differentiate this Emergency Board from previous boards created exclusively under the Railway Labor Act. The stabilization program constitutes an integral part of its functioning environment, and the relevancy of the stabilization program to the adjustment of the dispute cannot be ignored or minimized.

13. The threat of serious inflation—or, more concretely, the frantic race between wages and prices in relation to mounting living costs—probably constitute the most basic and the most potentially explosive problem on the home front with which the American people are faced. If the Government's attack upon this problem were to prove of no avail, every element in the population would be subjected to the impact of devastating repercussions, and even the successful prosecution of the war might be gravely endangered. The hosts of labor—with wage levels that would almost inevitably lag behind price changes, and with money savings in a variety of forms that would almost inexorably be dissipated—would be among the severest sufferers. Apparent gains would be transformed into real losses. Collective bargaining would be turned into make-believe. Government intervention would be beset by helplessness.

14. The stabilization program, then, is a matter of vast national importance. It transcends the interests of either the carriers or the employees, and it must necessarily exert a significant influence upon the adjustment of the dispute here involved. It is imperative that the stabilization program be firmly safeguarded, but that it be applied, as intended, to the distinctive circumstances of the unadjusted dispute committed to the determination of the Emergency Board.

15. The Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, sought to stabilize wages, as far as practicable, on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. It did not, however, freeze all wages as of that date. It authorized the President to provide for such adjustments as might be found necessary "to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."

16. The first Executive order issued pursuant to this act, Executive Order 9250 of October 3, 1942, as interpreted by the National War Labor Board, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Economic Stabilization Director, likewise recognized authority "to correct gross inequities, or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war," in addition to making provision for the correction of maladjustments or inequalities and for the elimination of substandards of living.

17. The first Executive order prescribing policies for the guidance of emergency boards, Executive Order 9299 of February 4, 1943, required that proposed changes affecting wage and salary payments conform with the standards, program, and policies made effective under Executive Order 9250. It thus confirmed once more the propriety of wage adjustments designed to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

18. Executive Order 9328, which was issued April 8, 1943, and was made applicable to all agencies exercising authority over wage and salary changes, directed that no increases be authorized "except such as are clearly necessary to correct substandards of living," with the proviso, first, that cost-of-living adjustments within the Little Steel formula might still be made, and second, that adjustments incident to promotions, reclassifications, merit increases, or incentive wages might also be made, "provided that such adjustments do not increase the level of production costs appreciably or furnish the basis either to increase prices or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in prices." But this order also authorized and directed the Economic Stabilization Director "to take such action and to issue such directives * * * as he deems necessary to stabilize the national economy, to maintain and increase production and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

19. The policy directive issued by the Economic Stabilization Director on May 12, 1943, for the guidance of the National War Labor Board returned once more to the express provisions of the Stabilization Act and authorized the National War Labor Board "to make

within the existing price structure and within existing levels of production costs, minimum and noninflationary adjustments which are deemed necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.'" This directive is presumed to reflect the latest authoritative view of the requirements of the stabilization program and to constitute, in addition to the stipulations of the Stabilization Act and the authorizations of the Executive orders previously noted, a relevant and supporting basis for the determinations of the Emergency Board.

20. The wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees, on the basis of a careful study and analysis of the entire record, are designed to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. We certify that they conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder. They are the minimum and noninflationary adjustments necessary for these purposes. They are within the existing price structure; that is, they do not provide a basis for increases in railroad rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in such rates; and they are within existing levels of production costs; that is, they do not provide a basis for increasing production costs in comparable industries or occupations. The correction of the gross inequities disclosed by the facts of record is indispensable to the effective prosecution of the war.

21. The average earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees involved in this dispute, embracing skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers, as of October 1942, were 73.8 cents an hour. The prevailing minimum wage for these employees is 46 cents an hour.

22. The total number of railroad workers in these 73 classes in October 1942, a month of higher than average employment, was 1,097,180. About one-half of these workers—544,106 or 49.6 percent—received less than 70 cents an hour; 411,684 or 37.5 percent received less than 60 cents an hour; 255,813 or 23.3 percent received less than 55 cents an hour; 160,438 or 14.6 percent received less than 50 cents an hour; 104,269 received the prevailing minimum rate of 46 cents an hour, and 16,871 received less than 46 cents an hour—this bracket of those receiving 46 cents and less comprising more than 11 percent of all the workers.

23. Various crafts or classes of railroad workers involved in this dispute, including, for example, carpenters and machinists, receive sharply lower wage rates than those paid to comparable groups in nonrailroad industries. Even when the high rates paid in swollen war industries and in such seasonal industries as building construction are entirely eliminated, railroad employees still receive substantially lower wage rates than comparable groups of employees in outside industries. The range of these unfavorable differentials is illustrated concretely in the full analysis of the evidence. While the miscellaneous character of the data renders it impossible to arrive at a precise over-all measurement of these differentials, the hourly wage rates in these comparable outside industries, even after the exclusion of the exceptionally high rates, are on the average probably 10 cents higher than in the railroad industry.

24. As of July 1942, more than a quarter (26.2 percent) of all common laborers were paid at starting rates of 75 cents or more per hour. Thus, one out of every four adult male unskilled workers received an entrance rate of pay which was higher than the average hourly earnings of the 73 classes of railroad employees, which include skilled and semiskilled workers as well as common laborers. In addition, there has been a general upward trend in wage rates since July 1942 (straight-time average hourly earnings for all manufacturing industries advanced from 80.9 cents in July 1942 to 86.3 cents in February 1943), and this trend has further increased the entrance rates of common labor.

25. On July 16, 1942, in the Little Steel case, the National War Labor Board fixed the minimum rate in the steel industry for common labor at 78 cents per hour, which is substantially in excess of the average hourly earnings of the 73 classes of railroad employees.

26. On a craft or class basis, 40 of the 73 classes of railroad employees, embracing in the aggregate slightly more than 400,000 workers, have not received the full 15 percent increase in straight-time average hourly earnings since January 1941 provided for under the Little Steel formula as a cost-of-living adjustment.

27. The 73 classes of railroad employees have an established 48-hour workweek. If these employees were to be compensated at time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours per week; that is, on the basis that is being increasingly applied in industry as a whole—and adjustment of 8.33 percent on basic rates of pay would result. This would mean an increase in pay of slightly more than 6 cents an hour, independently of any change in basic rates of pay.

28. It has been generally assumed that by the end of 1940 a period of approximate equilibrium in wage levels and wage structures had been achieved. In point of fact, however, as far as the 73 classes of railroad employees are concerned, data of comparative wage trends disclose the survival, as of that date, of numerous unfavorable differentials. These data deal exclusively with trends—that is, with comparative net increases or decreases over a period of time—and not with absolute wage levels.

29. As compared with 1920, the unfavorable differentials of these railroad employees in 1940 was 14.4 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in 24 manufacturing industries and 9.8 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries combined.

30. As compared with 1925–29, the unfavorable differentials of these railroad employees in 1940 was 7.1 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in 24 manufacturing industries, 3.2 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing industries, 4.3 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in bituminous coal mining, and 6.9 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries combined.

31. As compared with 1936, the unfavorable differentials of these railroad employees in 1940 were 6.2 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in 24 manufacturing industries, 5.8 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing industries, 3.1 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in bituminous coal mining, and 8.2 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries combined.

32. Of much greater significance, however, in relation to the existence of gross inequities, are the facts disclosed by comparative wage trends during the years 1941 and 1942. These unfavorable differentials are in addition to those noted above as of the end of 1940. The comparisons are confined to the interval between December 1940 and December 1942.

33. The 73 classes of railroad employees received during this period an increase of 10 cents an hour in basic wage rates. In manufacturing industries the closest approximation of the change in wage rates is the change in straight-time hourly earnings. The increase for all manufacturing industries in straight-time earnings was 19.4 cents per hour, or 9.4 cents more than the rate change for these railroad employees.

34. One-fourth of the factory workers employed in December 1942 were in industries in which straight-time hourly earnings had increased by amounts ranging from 20.1 cents to 33.7 cents between December 1940 and December 1942, as contrasted with the increase of 10 cents for the 73 classes of railroad employees; one-half of these workers were in industries in which the increases ranged from 16.9 cents to 33.7 cents; three-fourths of these workers were in industries in which the increases ranged from 13.1 cents to 33.7 cents.

35. In December 1942 the straight-time hourly earnings in 63 of the 97 manufacturing industries were higher than the corresponding earnings of the 73 classes of railroad employees, and these higher earnings in manufacturing industries prevailed for 69 percent of the factory workers.

36. For the year ending October 1942 the 73 classes of railroad employees received average weekly earnings of $36.40; the average weekly earnings for factory workers in 25 industries for the year 1942 were $40.03. The weekly earnings of the railroad employees had increased 21.3 percent over the year 1940; the weekly earnings of the factory employees had increased 40.3 percent over the year 1940. The unfavorable differential of the railroad employees is all the more striking because the average weekly hours of the railroad workers were substantially greater than the average weekly hours of the factory workers.

37. The index of general wage trends, embracing not only manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries but certain other employments, including railroad transportation, discloses that between December 1940 and December 1942 the wage level has increased on the average by 16.7 cents per hour, as compared with the 10-cent hourly increase for the railroad employees.

38. Most of the industries in which comparatively small increases have occurred during this period are industries not primarily affected by ups and downs of business activity and not primarily engaged in meeting wartime demands. Many of the industries with comparatively small increases in wages employ types of workers significantly different from those embraced by the 73 classes of railroad employees—such as the workers in retail trade, for example, which constitutes the largest of the nonmanufacturing industries.

39. During the years 1941 and 1942 the annual earnings of farm laborers increased by 53.0 percent as compared with an increase of 28.5 percent for maintenance-of-way workers on the railroads. Farm labor rates of pay increased during this period by 79.8 percent, as compared with 20.6 percent for the maintenance-of-way workers.

40. The 15 cooperating railway labor organizations have requested an increase of 20 cents an hour in all basic wage rates for the 73 classes of nonoperating employees. They are not seeking to differentiate between these classes of workers, and the record before the Board is not adequate for any differentiation in its recommendations. Such data as have been submitted with respect to particular crafts or classes were merely designed to support, by way of illustration, the general contention that comparative wage levels and comparative wage trends disclose the existence of gross inequities in the compensation of the railroad workers. The only special treatment requested by the labor organizations is that all employees be raised to a minimum of 70 cents an hour; that is, all employees of whatever craft or class now receiving less than 50 cents per hour be given an increase greater than the 20 cents requested for other employees in order to establish a minimum of 70 cents for all.

41. In these circumstances the fact that 40 of the 73 classes of railroad employees have not received the full 15 percent cost-of-living adjustment permitted by the Little Steel formula becomes irrelevant. The wage requests of 1941, like those now before this Board, were part of a concerted movement of the nonoperating employees. The average straight-time hourly earnings of all the 73 classes as of January 1941 must be taken as a base in computing the percentage increase, as a cost-of-living adjustment, which resulted from the 10-cent wage increase of December 1941. On this basis the full 15 percent increase has been made. Not only would any differentiation between the various crafts or classes in this regard run counter to the requests or the desires of the labor organizations and the employees whom they represent, but it would do violence to the Little Steel formula. The Little Steel formula constitutes an integral part of the stabilization program as it now prevails, and the Board is recommending no departure from it.

42. It may well be that the 121,140 railroad employees (about 11 percent of the total) who are now receiving hourly wages of 46 cents or less, or the 160,438 (14.6 percent of the total) who are now receiving hourly wages of less than 50 cents, are entitled to wage increases "clearly necessary to correct substandards of living." There are insurmountable difficulties, however, to the determination, in the midst of war and without opportunity for extensive investigation, of what would constitute a minimum budget for health and decency under the widely diverse circumstances of our far-flung domain. For a Nation-wide industry like the railroads it is virtually impossible to establish a minimum as such, above the prevailing 46-cent minimum, which would not create serious maladjustments in particular localities and occupations and would not tend to endanger the stabilization program. Since these low-paid workers, like all the 73 classes of railroad employees, are the victims of gross inequities in their compensation, as established by an analysis of comparative wage levels and comparative wage trends, a general wage increase is calculated to meet their situation in reasonably satisfactory measure, and without the complicating repercussions that might result from the promulgation of an absolute standard. The minimum wage in the railroad industry will be substantially raised thereby, and percentagewise the low-paid workers will receive larger increases than the higher-paid workers.

43. The existence of gross inequities in the compensation of the 73 classes of railroad employees is supported by all of the wage findings summarized above. This does not mean, however, that the recommendations of the Board seek to remove all of the differences disclosed, singly or in combination, or that all these types of evidence are accorded equal weight.

44. The 48-hour workweek in the railroad industry, for example, has been referred to as representing a departure from the prevailing method of payment for overtime which operates to the distinct disadvantage of the railroad employees as far as their effective rate of compensation is concerned. There is no demand, however, for the substitution of a 40-hour week for the 48-hour week, with time and one-half for hours worked in excess of 40, and no recommendation is made to this effect. The Board merely recognizes that these railroad employees have not benefited by the wartime trend toward overtime compensation.

45. Similarly, the wage disparities existing prior to the end of 1940, as disclosed by wage trends dating from 1920, 1925-29, and 1936, constitute inequalities which provide additional support for the findings of gross inequities arrived at independently of these data. The Board deems it contrary to public policy, in the midst of war and in face of the stabilization program, to authorize the elimination or correction, as such, of these more or less firmly established inequalities, and no recommendation is made to this effect.

46. The dominant source of the gross inequities in the compensation of the 73 classes of railroad employees is to be found in the marked accentuation of preexisting wage disparities during the years 1941 and 1942. Prime reliance is being placed upon comparative wage trends from December 1940 to December 1942. All indices point to the creation during this period of very substantial differentials unfavorable to the railroad workers. The comprehensive comparisons, embracing, for example, all manufacturing industries are particularly significant. The wage increases recommended below fall within the range of the differentials there disclosed. These wage increases, moderate in amount, compensate in reasonable measure, in light of the stabilization program, for the lag in railroad wage adjustments that inevitably springs from the requirements of the Railway Labor Act for the orderly settlement of labor controversies in the railroad industry.

47. The year 1942 constituted the peak year in all railroad history with respect to virtually all important aspects of railroad operation—freight traffic, passenger traffic, operating revenues, net railway operating income after taxes, net income after fixed charges. The figures for the first quarter of 1943, insofar as they are available, show sharp increases in all these directions over the corresponding months of 1942. The operating ratio for 1942 was the unusually low one of 61.6; the operating ratio for the 12 months ended February 28, 1943, was further reduced to 60.5. Net railway operating income for the year 1942, after an unprecedented tax bill of $1,202,443,297, almost two-thirds of which covered income and profit tax accruals, amounted to $1,480,940,760. Net income for the year 1942, after all fixed charges and including interest accruals on properties that are in receivership or trusteeship, amounted to $958,860,655. The Interstate Commerce Commission has estimated that class I railroads earned, during the year 1942, 9.94 percent on investment in road and equipment before provision for Federal income and profits taxes, and 6.57 percent after deduction of all railway tax accruals; and that on the value of their properties for rate-making purposes, the class I railroads earned 11.20 percent before provision for Federal income and profits taxes, and 7.40 percent after deduction of all railway tax accruals.

48. On the basis of the straight-time equivalent of the total hours paid for by class I railroads during the year 1942, the cost to the carriers of the wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of railroad employees, inclusive of pay-roll taxes of 6¼ percent on the increases in wages, is estimated to amount to about $204,000,000. After making due allowance for the claims of the carriers that their financial showing for 1942 is overstated, and after taking into acount the decreases in freight rates that became effective May 15, 1943, it is the considered judgment of this Board that the recommended wage increases do not, under prevailing circumstances, provide a basis for increases in railroad rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in such rates.

49. The Board gave individual consideration to the case of every railroad that so requested and that furnished information regarding itself. There is no basis for treating these railroads as a group, whether or not they style themselves "short lines." Whether large or small, urban or rural, independently owned or subsidiaries of large railroads or industrial corporations, they all operate where the big railroads also operate. There is no such difference between the qualifications, occupations, and living conditions of the employees of each of these roads and those of the employees of the big roads as to justify treating them differently. Applying to all railroad employees the same number of cents increase will not eliminate the differentials with which some of the shorter roads have heretofore been favored. The weak financial condition of some of these roads is immaterial to the issues in this case. Regardless of the question of the amount of weight to be given, in a wage dispute, to the financial condition of the railroad industry as a whole, the precarious financial position of any particular carrier is no reason for requiring that its employees be paid less than the employees of other carriers that are in other respects similarly situated. In view of the fact that the Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad made a contract with the union covering its dining-car employees within 30 days before the demands in the present case were made, it would be inequitable to recommend increases for them in this proceeding; but the Board sees nothing improper in the union negotiating with the railroad for any changes in rates of pay that might be reasonable in the light of the general result in this case. With the exception of this one railroad, the Board concludes that the employees of all the individual railroads before it should be accorded the same treatment as that recommended in this report for the employees of carriers in general.

50. Study and analysis of all testimony, exhibits, and argument bearing upon the dispute between the Railway Express Agency and its employees fail to disclose sufficient grounds for recommending any different adjustment for the employees of the Express Agency than the wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of railroad employees. In this case, as in that of the railroads, the Board does not seek to alter established differentials. Gross inequities are corrected, in aid of the effective prosecution of the war, primarily on the basis of the unjust wage disparities created during the years 1941 and 1942. The comparative wage data for this period presented above with reference to the railroads are equally applicable to the Railway Express Agency.

51. The refrigerator car companies, all owned by various railroads that are parties to the case, contend that their situation requires special treatment. They are not railroads, but furnish refrigerator cars to the railroads. The occupations and rates of pay of their employees are generally similar to those of comparable crafts and classes of railroad employees. The business of the companies is an integral part of the railroad business. Their employees should be regarded as railroad employees and treated in this case in the same manner as railroad employees are treated. Existing wage differentials will not be disturbed by the recommended wage increases.

52. The Denver Union Stock Yard Co. and the Ogden Union Stockyards Co. do not ask special treatment because they are stockyards but because they had made contracts with the clerks' organization shortly prior to the demands made by the union in the present case, and without contemplating those demands. Under the circumstances disclosed it would be inequitable to recommend increases for these employees in this proceeding. These carriers express a willingness to negotiate with the union regarding any changes in the contracts that might be reasonable in the light of the general result in this case.

53. As to the parties to the dispute, the Board deems itself bound by the certification of the Chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel of all carriers and employees involved in National Mediation Board Case A-1350, as set forth in the designation of this

Emergency Board and its supplement; and the Board's jurisdiction extends to all such employees and carriers, except in the two instances about to be noted. It does not embrace the Iowa Transfer Railway, because there is no evidence that proper notice was served upon that carrier; nor the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad, because the Federal Government has the right not to be made a party to this dispute, and has asserted this right through the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation and the Federal manager of that railroad.

54. On the basis of all these findings and in light of all these circumstances, the Board recommends that all the carriers that are parties to this dispute, except those that are specifically excluded above, increase the basic wage rates of their employees represented by one or more of the 15 cooperating railway-labor organizations by 8 cents per hour.

55. The processes of negotiation, mediation, and arbitration in this dispute were concluded January 16, 1943. This Emergency Board was designated February 20, 1943. The intervening period elapsed, through no fault of either party, because of the need of affirming or clarifying the jurisdiction of the National Railway Labor Panel in relation to the National War Labor Board. This Emergency Board recommends, therefore, that the wage increases specified above become effective as of February 1, 1943.

56. The retroactive pay involved in this proceeding, on the basis of the above recommendations, is estimated to amount to about $68,000,000 up to June 1, 1943, and to about $85,000,000 up to July 1, 1943. Lump-sum cash disbursements of this character tend to exert a strongly inflationary influence. In the interest of the stabilization program, it is desirable that these accumulated sums be not added to the immediated purchasing power of the workers, in addition to the increases in wages to which they will become currently entitled. The Board recommends, therefore, that all retroactive wages due to these employees shall be paid in United States War Savings bonds, except such balances as amount to less than $18.75, which shall be paid in cash. All employees who were on the pay rolls of the carriers on February 1, 1943, or who were hired subsequent thereto, and regardless of whether they are now in the employ of the carriers, shall receive the war bonds and/or cash balances to which they are entitled.

57. The request for a union-shop agreement, if granted, would compel the carriers to violate clear provisions of the Railway Labor Act, to proceed in disregard of their not unreasonable interpretation of the unexpired moratorium agreement against changes in rules, and to acquiesce in the adoption of this policy in the railroad industry without an adequate showing in the record as to its need or utility or implications. The Board, therefore, does not approve the request for a union-shop agreement and recommends its withdrawal by the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations.

Respectfully submitted.

I. L. SHARFMAN, *Chairman.*
WALTER T. FISHER.
JOHN A. FITCH.

REPORT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF 15 COOPERATING RAILWAY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN MOVEMENT TO SECURE AN INCREASE IN WAGE RATES OF 20 CENTS PER HOUR, NO EMPLOYEE TO BE PAID LESS THAN 70 CENTS PER HOUR, AND A UNION SHOP AGREEMENT

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Monday, October 25, 1943.

To All Employees Concerned:

GREETING: On or about September 25, 1942, the duly authorized representatives of each of the 15 participating railway labor organizations served notice on substantially all carriers in the United States where they represented the employees. The pertinent part of this notice read:

"Please accept this as formal notice, served in accordance with the Railway Labor Act as amended, of our desire to execute an agreement as hereinafter stated and to increase all rates of pay for all employees we represent as hereinafter stated, effective October 25, 1942.

"We propose that you agree: that all employees represented by this organization and who are eligible to membership in this organization shall become members in good standing of this organization within 60 days from the date this proposal is accepted and made effective and shall remain members in good standing of this organization as a condition precedent to continued employment: *Provided,* That these conditions shall apply to employees hired after date they are effective, but these employees will be allowed a period of 90 days from the date hired to secure such membership.

"The increase in rates of pay we propose and request is: that all wage rates now in effect be increased 20 cents an hour: *Provided,* That no employee shall be paid a rate of less than 70 cents an hour. Piecework, tonnage, or other methods of payment to be adjusted to give effect to these proposed increases."

This request was progressed in accordance with provisions of the Railway Labor Act. System conferences did not produce agreements. National conferences were held on December 15, 16, and 17, 1942, without an agreement. The services of the National Mediation Board were invoked on December 18, 1942, and on January 7, 1943, mediation began and ended on January 15, 1943, without an agreement. The board thereafter was unable to secure an agreement to arbitrate and terminate its handling of the case on January 16, 1943. The labor organizations on January 20, 1943, requested the appointment of an Emergency Board from the National Railway Labor Board.

On October 2, 1942, Congress passed an act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living. The first paragraph of this act reads:

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities: *Provided,* That no common carrier or other public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless it first gives 30 days notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to the timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority having jurisdiction to consider such increase."

A further pertinent provision of this law reads:

"The President may suspend the provisions of sections 3 (a) and 3 (c), and clause (1) of section 302 (c), of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to the extent that such sections are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, but he may not under the authority of this act suspend any other law or part thereof."

On October 3, 1942, the President issued Executive Order 9250, notwithstanding the fact that this Executive order provided that "nothing in this order shall be construed as * * *, affecting the adjustment procedure of the Railway Labor Act." There was serious misunderstanding among Government officials and others as to whether disputes involving wages in the industry subject to the Railway Labor Act were required to be submitted to the War Labor Board. It was not until February 4, 1943, that these misunderstandings were resolved by the issuance by the President of Executive Order 9299. The President had, on May 22, issued Executive Order 9172 creating the National Railway Labor Panel. Pertinent parts of that order read:

"1. There is hereby created, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, a national railway labor panel of nine members, hereinafter referred to as the Panel, to be appointed by the President, and to be qualified as to membership thereon in the same manner as provided in section 10 of the Railway Labor Act for membership on emergency boards. The President shall designate a chairman from the members of the panel and shall fill vacancies thereon as they may occur.

"2. Whenever a dispute between a carrier or carriers and its or their employees concerning changes in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, or whenever any other dispute not referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, is not adjusted or settled under the provisions of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Railway Labor Act, the duly designated and authorized representatives of employees involved in such dispute may, prior to notice by the National Mediation Board to the President of a threatened interruption to commerce, notify the chairman of the panel of the failure of the parties to adjust the dispute and of their desire to avoid the taking of a strike vote and the setting of a strike date. If, in the judgment of the chairman of the panel, the dispute is such that if unadjusted, even in the absence of a strike vote, it may interfere with the prosecution of the war, he may thereupon select three members of the panel to serve as an emergency board to investigate such dispute and to report thereon to the President. Subject to the provisions of section 10, such board shall have exclusive and final jurisdiction of the dispute and shall make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute."

Taking up now pertinent provisions of Executive Order 9299, issued February 4, 1943, we quote:

"1. No increases in the wage rates or salary of any employee subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, whether granted as a result of voluntary agreement, collective bargaining, conciliation, arbitration, or otherwise, and no decreases in such wage rates or salary, shall be made except in accordance with the provisions of this order: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this order or Executive Order No. 9250 shall be construed as affecting the procedure or limiting the jurisdiction of either the National Mediation Board, as defined in the Railway Labor Act, or the National Railway Labor Panel, as defined in Executive Order No. 9172, except as herein specifically set forth.

"4. Emergency boards, whether designated pursuant to the Railway Labor Act, Executive Order No. 9172, or section 3 of this order, in reporting to the President shall certify that their recommendations in regard to any proposed change affecting wage and salary payments conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order No. 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder.

"5. Copies of the report with recommendations made to the President by any

emergency board under section 4 of this order shall be filed by the Board forthwith with the Economic Stabilization Director, the National War Labor Board, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Economic Stabilization Director may on behalf of himself or other departments and agencies concerned, report to the President the effect of the recommendations on the general stabilization program. Unless and except to the extent that the Economic Stabilization Director shall otherwise direct, the recommendations of the Emergency Loard in regard to proposed changes affecting wages and salary payments shall, upon the expiration of 30 days after the report is filed with the President, become effective."

Following the issuance of this order, the chairman of the national railway labor panel appointed an emergency board on February 20, 1943, composed of Messrs. I. L. Sharfman, chairman; Walter T. Fisher, and John A. Fitch. This board began its hearings in Chicago on March 1, 1943, and they were closed on May 7, 1943. There were 44 days of hearings. There were 6,338 pages of record taken and the parties presented to the board a total of 234 exhibits. Many of these exhibits were voluminous. While these hearings were in progress, the President issued Executive Order 9328 on April 8, 1943. The pertinent sections read:

"2. The National War Labor Board, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and other agencies exercising authority conferred by Executive Order No. 9250 or Executive Order 9299 and the regulations issued pursuant thereto over wage or salary increases are directed to authorize no further increase in wages or salaries except such as are clearly necessary to correct substandards of living, provided that nothing herein shall be construed to prevent such agencies from making such wage or salary readjustments as may be deemed appropriate and may not have heretofore been made to compensate, in accordance with the Little Steel formula as heretofore defined by the National War Labor Board, for the rise in the cost of living between January 1, 1941, and May 1, 1942. Nor shall anything herein be construed to prevent such agencies, subject to the general policies and directives of the Economic Stabilization Director, from authorizing reasonable adjustments of wages and salaries in case of promotions, reclassifications, merit increases, incentive wages, or the like, provided that such adjustments do not increase the level of production costs appreciably or furnish the basis either to increase prices or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in prices.

"5. To provide for the consistent administration of this order and Executive Order No. 9250, and other orders and regulations of similar import and for the effectuation of the purposes of the act of October 2, 1942, the Economic Stabilization Director is authorized to exercise all powers and duties conferred upon the President by that act, and the Economic Stabilization Director is authorized and directed to take such action and to issue such directives under the authority of that act as he deems necessary to stabilize the national economy, to maintain and increase production, and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. Except insofar as they are inconsistent with this order or except insofar as the Director shall otherwise direct, powers and duties conferred upon the President by the said act and heretofore devolved upon agencies or persons other than the Director shall continue to be exercised and performed by such agencies and persons."

The labor unions vigorously protested this order and the Director of Economic Stabilization on May 12, 1943, issued a policy directive which reads:

"1. In order to provide clear-cut guides and definite limits as a basis for correcting substandards of living, and as a basis for permitting the Board to make within the existing price structure and within existing levels of production costs, minimum and noninflationary adjustments which are deemed necessary to 'aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities' within the meaning of section 1 of the act of October 2, 1942, the Board is authorized to establish as rapidly as possible, by occupational groups and labor-market areas, the wage-rate brackets embracing all those various rates found to be sound and tested going rates. All the rates within these brackets are to be regarded as stabilized rates not subject to change save as permitted by the Little Steel formula. Except in rare and unusual cases in which the critical needs of war production require the setting of a wage at some point above the minimum of the going wage bracket, the minimum of the going rates within the brackets will be the point beyond which the adjustments mentioned above may not be made. The careful application of these wage-rate brackets to concrete cases within the informed judgment of the War Labor Board will strengthen and reinforce the stabilization line to be held. Maladjustments between wages and the cost of living will be considered by the Board only for the purpose of correcting substandard conditions of living, or determining adjustments within the 15-percent limit of the Little Steel formula. In connection with the approval of wage adjustments necessary to eliminate substandards of living or to give effect to the Little Steel formula or in connection with the adoption of a longer workweek, the Board may approve wage or salary adjustments for workers in immediately interrelated job classifications to the extent required to keep the minimum differentials between immediately interrelated job classifications necessary for the maintenance of productive efficiency.

"2. All wage adjustments made by the Board which may furnish the basis either to increase price ceilings or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in price ceilings, or if no price ceilings are involved which may increase the production costs above the level prevailing in comparable plants or establishments, shall become effective only if also approved by the Economic Stabilization Director. The Board shall cooperate with the Office of Price Administration or such other agency as the Economic Stabilization Director may designate with a view to supplying the Economic Stabilization Director with the data necessary to judge the effect of any proposed wage adjustment on price ceilings and the levels of production costs."

Because of increased volume of rail business and profits the Interstate Commerce Commission, on April 6, 1943, ordered that the rate increases which they had authorized on March 2, 1942, amounting to approximately 4.8 percent, be suspended for 7½ months from May 15, 1943, to January 1, 1944.

The Emergency Board filed its preliminary report with the President under date of May 24, 1943, and its supplemental report under date of May 29, 1943. These two reports together contained 182 pages. These reports extensively summarized the record made by the parties before the Board, the provisions of applicable laws, Executive orders and directives. We have already widely distributed the report of May 24, 1943, so that it does not appear necessary to reproduce herein all of the report, but we do reproduce certain parts thereof. We quote:

"1. The railroad industry, which constitutes the heart of our transportation system, is indispensable to the effective functioning of our national life, even under normal conditions; in these critical days, the entire war effort of the Government and people of the United States is dependent upon uninterrupted, efficient, and vigorous performance by the railroads.

"2. The record of the railroads during the war emergency, including the period of defense activity, has been a magnificent one.

"3. This outstanding performance of the railroads has been the result of the constructive, self-denying, and patriotic attitudes of both the managements and the men. * * * Fundamentally, a spirit of cooperation has vitalized the efforts of the managements and the men. Without free and complete and wholehearted cooperation between the carriers and their employees the magnificent record of the railroads, as made thus far, could not have been achieved.

"4. It is of the utmost importance that this spirit of cooperation be not impaired. * * * Every care must be exercised not to weaken or endanger this morale either through indirection or through outright injustice.

"6. As a result of the influence of this legislation as applied to the rail carriers, railroad wages have maintained a degree of stability, entirely apart from the anti-inflation measures of the war emergency, that has been equaled or surpassed by few industries. Wages on the railroads have moved more slowly, both up and down, than in industry as a whole, and the level of railroad wages, both up and down, has changed more moderately than in other industrial spheres.

"8. It is a matter of great public concern that the integrity of these orderly processes, with their fruitful results, be safeguarded in every way possible. If railroad employees were to find themselves unjustly penalized because of their reliance upon these orderly processes or the considerable lapse of time necessarily incident thereto, strong impetus would be given to the disruptive practices which frequently flow from the exertion of economic power or the performance of work in justifiable discontent. The pressures in these directions, springing from the impairment of morale, would be difficult to allay, and the effective prosecution of the war might be seriously obstructed.

"9. * * * The stabilizing elements inherent in the established processes of railroad wage determination must be scrupulously conserved; the moderation and restraint of responsible governmental agencies operating under the Railway Labor Act must continue to mold the adjustments in dispute.

"15. The Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, sought to stabilize wages, as far as practicable, on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. It did not, however, freeze all wages as of that date. It authorized the President to provide for such adjustments as might be found necessary 'to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.'

"17. The first Executive order prescribing policies for the guidance of emergency boards, Executive Order 9299 of February 4, 1943, required that proposed changes affecting wage and salary payments conform with the standards, program, and policies made effective under Executive Order 9250. It thus confirmed once more the propriety of wage adjustments designed to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"16. Executive Order 9328, which was issued April 8, 1943, and was made applicable to all agencies exercising authority over wage and salary changes, directed that no increases be authorized 'except such as are clearly necessary to correct substandards of living,' with the proviso, first, that cost-of-living adjustments within the Little Steel formula might still be made; and, second, that adjustments incident to promotions, reclassifications, merit increases, or incentive wages might also be made, 'provided that such adjustments do not increase the level of production

costs appreciably or furnish the basis either to increase prices or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in prices.' But this order also authorized and directed the Economic Stabilization Director 'to take such action and to issue such directives * * * as he deems necessary to stabilize the national economy, to maintain and increase production, and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.'

"19. The policy directive issued by the Economic Stabilization Director on May 12, 1943, for the guidance of the National War Labor Board returned once more to the express provisions of the Stabilization Act and authorized the National War Labor Board 'to make within the existing price structure and within existing levels of production costs, minimum and noninflationary adjustments which are deemed necessary to "aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."' This directive is presumed to reflect the latest authoritative view of the requirements of the stabilization program and to constitute, in addition to the stipulations of the Stabilization Act and the authorizations of the Executive orders previously noted, a relevant and supporting basis for the determinations of the Emergency Board.

"20. The wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees, on the basis of a careful study and analysis of the entire record, are designed to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. We certify that they conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder. They are the minimum and noninflationary adjustments necessary for these purposes. They are within the existing price structure—that is, they do not provide a basis for increases in railroad rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in such rates; and they are within existing levels of production costs—that is, they do not provide a basis for increasing production costs in comparable industries or occupations. The correction of the gross inequities disclosed by the facts of record is indispensable to the effective prosecution of the war.

"21. The average earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees involved in this dispute, embracing skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers, as of October 1942, were 73.8 cents an hour. The prevailing minimum wage for these employees is 46 cents an hour.

"22. The total number of railroad workers in these 73 classes in October 1942, a month of higher than average employment, was 1,097,180. About one-half of these workers—544,106 or 49.6 percent—received less than 70 cents an hour; 411,684 or 37.5 percent received less than 60 cents an hour; 255,813 or 23.3 percent received less than 55 cents an hour; 160,438 or 14.6 percent received less than 50 cents an hour; 104,269 received the prevailing minimum rate of 46 cents an hour, and 16,871 received less than 46 cents an hour—this bracket of those receiving 46 cents and less comprising more than 11 percent of all the workers.

"25. On July 16, 1942, in the Little Steel case, the National War Labor Board fixed the minimum rate in the steel industry for common labor at 78 cents per hour, which is substantially in excess of the average hourly earnings of the 73 classes of railroad employees.

"26. On a craft or class basis, 40 of the 73 classes of railroad employees, embracing in the aggregate slightly more than 400,000 workers, have not received the full 15 percent increase in straight-time average hourly earnings since January 1941, provided for under the Little Steel formula as a cost-of-living adjustment.

"27. The 73 classes of railroad employees have an established 48-hour workweek. If these employees were to be compensated at time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours per week—that is, on the basis that is being increasingly applied in industry as a whole—an adjustment of 8.33 percent on basic rates of pay would result. This would mean an increase in pay of slighly more than 6 cents an hour, independently of any change in basic rates of pay.

"28. It has been generally assumed that by the end of 1940 a period of approximate equilibrium in wage levels and wage structures had been achieved. In point of fact, however, as far as the 73 classes of railroad employees are concerned, data of comparative wage trends disclose the survival, as of that date, of numerous unfavorable differentials. These data deal exclusively with trends—that is, with comparative net increases or decreases over a period of time—and not with absolute wage levels.

"29. As compared with 1920, the unfavorable differentials of these railroad employees in 1940 was 14.4 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in 24 manufacturing industries and 9.8 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries combined.

"30. As compared with 1925–29 the unfavorable differentials of these railroad employees in 1940 was 7.1 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in 24 manufacturing industries, 3.2 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing industries, 4.3 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in bituminous coal mining, and 6.9 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries combined.

"31. As compared with 1936, the unfavorable differentials of these railroad employees in 1940 were 6.2 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in 24 manufacturing industries, 5.8 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing industries, 3.1 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in bituminous coal mining, and 8.2 cents per hour on the basis of the wage changes in all manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries combined.

"32. Of much greater significance, however, in relation to the existence of gross inequities, are the facts disclosed by comparative wage trends during the years 1941 and 1942. These unfavorable differentials are in addition to those noted above as of the end of 1940. The comparisons are confined to the interval between December 1940 and December 1942.

"33. The 73 classes of railroad employees received during this period an increase of 10 cents an hour in basic wage rates, in manufacturing industries the closest approximation of the change in wage rates is the change in straight-time hourly earnings, the increase for all manufacturing industries in straight-time earnings was 19.4 cents per hour, or 9.4 cents more than the rate change for these railroad employees.

"34. One-fourth of the factory workers employed in December 1942 were in industries in which straight-time hourly earnings had increased by amounts ranging from 20.1 cents to 33.7 cents between December 1940 and December 1942, as contrasted with the increase of 10 cents for the 73 classes of railroad employees; one-half of these workers were in industries in which the increases ranged from 16.9 cents to 33.7 cents; three-fourths of these workers were in industries in which the increases ranged from 13.1 cents to 33.7 cents.

"35. In December 1942 the straight time hourly earnings in 63 of the 97 manufacturing industries were higher than the corresponding earnings of the 73 classes of railroad employees, and these higher earnings in manufacturing industries prevailed for 69 percent of the factory workers.

"37. The index of general wage trends, embracing not only manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries but certain other employments, including railroad transportation, discloses that between December 1940 and December 1942 the wage level has increased on the average by 16.7 cents per hour, as compared with the 10-cent hourly increase for the railroad employees.

"39. During the years 1941 and 1942 the annual earnings of farm laborers increased by 53 percent as compared with an increase of 28.5 percent for maintenance-of-way workers on the railroads. Farm labor rates of p[illegible] increased during this period by 79.8 percent, as compared with 20.6 percent for the maintenance-of-way workers.

"40. The 15 cooperating railway labor organizations have requested an increase of 20 cents an hour in all basic wage rates for the 73 classes of nonoperating employees. They are not seeking to differentiate between these classes of workers, and the record before the Board is not adequate for any differentiation in its recommendations. Such data as have been submitted with respect to particular crafts or classes were merely designed to support, by way of illustration, the general contention that comparative wage levels and comparative wage trends disclose the existence of gross inequities in the compensation of the railroad workers. The only special treatment requested by the labor organizations is that all employees be raised to a minimum of 70 cents an hour—that is, all employees, of whatever craft or class now receiving less than 50 cents per hour be given an increase greater than the 20 cents requested for other employees in order to establish a minimum of 70 cents for all.

"41. In these circumstances the fact that 40 of the 73 classes of railroad employees have not received the full 15 percent cost-of-living adjustment permitted by the Little Steel formula becomes irrelevant. The wage requests of 1941, like those now before this Board, were part of a concerted movement of the nonoperating employees. The average straight-time hourly earnings of all the 73 classes as of January 1941 must be taken as a base in computing the percentage increase, as a cost-of-living adjustment, which resulted from the 10-cent wage increase of December 1941 On this basis the full 15-percent increase has been made. Not only would any differentiation between the various crafts or classes in this regard run counter to the requests or the desires of the labor organizations and the employees whom they represent, but it would do violence to the Little Steel formula. The Little Steel formula constitutes an integral part of the stabilization program as it now prevails, and the Board is recommending no departure from it.

"42. It may well be that the 121,140 railroad employees—about 11 percent of the total—who are now receiving hourly wages of 46 cents or less, or the 160,438—14.6 percent of the total—who are now receiving hourly wages of less than 50 cents, are entitled to wage increases 'clearly necessary to correct substandards of living.' There are insurmountable difficulties, however, to the determination, in the midst of war and without opportunity for extensive investigation, of what would constitute a minimum budget for health and decency under the widely diverse circumstances of our far-flung domain. For a Nation-wide industry like the railroads it is virtually impossible to establish a minimum as such, above the prevailing 46-cent minimum, which would not create serious maladjustments in particular localities and occupations and would not tend to endanger the stabilization program. Since these low-paid workers, like all the 73 classes of railroad employees, are the victims of gross inequities in their compensation, as established by an analysis of comparative wage levels and comparative wage trends, a general wage in-

crease is calculated to meet their situation in reasonably satisfactory measure, and without the complicating repercussions that might result from the promulgation of an absolute standard. The minimum wage in the railroad industry will be substantially raised thereby, and percentagewise the low-paid workers will receive larger increases than the higher-paid workers.

"43. The existence of gross inequities in the compensation of the 73 classes of railroad employees is supported by all of the wage findings summarized above. This does not mean, however, that the recommendations of the Board seek to remove all of the differences disclosed, singly or in combination, or that all these types of evidence are accorded equal weight.

"44. The 48-hour workweek in the railroad industry, for example, has been referred to as representing a departure from the prevailing method of payment for overtime which operates to the distinct disadvantage of the railroad employees as far as their effective rate of compensation is concerned. There is no demand, however, for the substitution of a 40-hour week for the 48-hour week, with time and one-half for hours worked in excess of 40, and no recommendation is made to this effect. The Board merely recognizes that these railroad employees have not benefited by the wartime trend toward overtime compensation.

"45. Similarly, the wage disparities existing prior to the end of 1940, as disclosed by wage trends dating from 1920, 1925–29, and 1936, constitute inequalities which provide additional support for the findings of gross inequities arrived at independently of these data. The Board deems it contrary to public policy, in the midst of war and in face of the stabilization program, to authorize the elimination or correction, as such, of these more or less firmly established inequalities, and no recommendation is made to this effect.

"46. The dominant source of the gross inequities in the compensation of the 73 classes of railroad employees is to be found in the marked accentuation of preexisting wage disparities during the years 1941 and 1942. Prime reliance is being placed upon comparative wage trends from December 1940 to December 1942. All indexes point to the creation during this period of very substantial differentials unfavorable to the railroad workers. The comprehensive comparisons, embracing, for example, all manufacturing industries, are particularly significant. The wage increases recommended below fall within the range of the differentials there disclosed. These wage increases, moderate in amount, compensate in reasonable measure, in light of the stabilization program, for the lag in railroad wage adjustments that inevitably springs from the requirements of the Railway Labor Act for the orderly settlement of labor controversies in the railroad industry.

"47. The year 1942 constituted the peak year in all railroad history with respect to virtually all important aspects of railroad operation—freight traffic, passenger traffic, operating revenues, net railway operating income after taxes, net income after fixed charges. The figures for the first quarter of 1943, insofar as they are available, show sharp increases in all these directions over the corresponding months of 1942. The operating ratio for 1942 was the unusually low one of 61.6; the operating ratio for the 12 months ended February 28, 1943, was further reduced to 60.5. Net railway operating income for the year 1942, after an unprecedented tax bill of $1,202,443,297, almost two-thirds of which covered income and profit tax accruals, amounted to $1,480,940,760. Net income for the year 1942, after all fixed charges and including interest accruals on properties that are in receivership or trusteeship, amounted to $958,860,655. The Interstate Commerce Commission has estimated that class I railroads earned, during the year 1942, 9.94 percent on investment in road and equipment before provision for Federal income and profits taxes, and 6.57 percent after deduction of all railway tax accruals; and that on the value of their properties for rate-making purposes, the class I railroads earned 11.20 percent before provision for Federal income and profits taxes, and 7.40 percent after deduction of all railway tax accruals.

"48. On the basis of the straight-time equivalent of the total hours paid for by class I railroads during the year 1942, the cost to the carriers of the wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of railroad employees, inclusive of pay-roll taxes of 6¼ percent on the increases in wages, is estimated to amount to about $204,000,000. After making due allowance for the claims of the carriers that their financial showing for 1942 is overstated, and after taking into account the decreases in freight rates that became effective May 15, 1943, it is the considered judgment of this board that the recommended wage increases do not, under prevailing circumstances, provide a basis for increases in railroad rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in such rates.

"50. Study and analysis of all testimony, exhibits, and argument bearing upon the dispute between the Railway Express Agency and its employees fail to disclose sufficient grounds for recommending any different adjustment for the employees of the Express Agency than the wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of railroad employees. In this case, as in that of the railroads, the Board does not seek to alter established differentials. Gross inequities are corrected, in aid of the effective prosecution of the war, primarily on the basis of the unjust wage disparities created during the years 1941 and 1942. The comparative wage data for this period presented above with reference to the railroads are equally applicable to the Railway Express Agency.

"51. The refrigerator car companies, all owned by various railroads that are parties to the case, contend that their situation requires special treatment. They are not railroads, but furnish refrigerator cars to the railroads. The occupations and rates of pay of their employees are generally similar to those of comparable crafts and classes of railroad employees. The business of the companies is an integral part of the railroad business. Their employees should be regarded as railroad employees and treated in this case in the same manner as railroad employees are treated. Existing wage differentials will not be disturbed by the recommended wage increases.

"54. On the basis of all these findings and in light of all these circumstances, the board recommends that all the carriers that are parties to this dispute, except those that are specifically excluded above, increase the basic wage rates of their employees represented by one or more of the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations by 8 cents per hour.

"55. The processes of negotiation, mediation, and arbitration in this dispute were concluded January 16, 1943. This Emergency Board was designated February 20, 1943. The intervening period elapsed, through no fault of either party, because of the need of affirming or clarifying the jurisdiction of the National Railway Labor Panel in relation to the National War Labor Board. This Emergency Board recommends, therefore, that the wage increases specified above become effective as of February 1, 1943.

"56. The retroactive pay involved in this proceeding, on the basis of the above recommendations, is estimated to amount to about $60,000,000 up to June 1, 1943, and to about $85,000,000 up to July 1, 1943. Lump sum cash disbursements of this character tend to exert a strongly inflationary influence. In the interest of the stabilization program, it is desirable that these accumulated sums be not added to the immediate purchasing power of the workers, in addition to the increases in wages to which they will become currently entitled. The Board recommends, therefore, that all retroactive wages due to these employees shall be paid in United States War Savings bonds, except such balances as amount to less than $18.75, which shall be paid in cash. All employees who were on the pay rolls of the carriers on February 1, 1943, or who were hired subsequent thereto, and regardless of whether they are now in the employ of the carriers, shall receive the War bonds and/or cash balances to which they are entitled.

"57. The request for a union shop agreement, if granted, would compel the carriers to violate clear provisions of the Railway Labor Act, to proceed in disregard of their not unreasonable interpretation of the unexpired moratorium agreement against changes in rules, and to acquiesce in the adoption of this policy in the railroad industry without an adequate showing in the record as to its need or utility or implications. The Board, therefore, does not approve the request for a union shop agreement and recommends its withdrawal by the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations."

At conferences on May 27, 1943, between the President and your representatives the President requested the employees to accept the increase in wages recommended by the Board. Your representatives expressed their disappointment over the inadequacy of the Board's recommendations and also pointed out the discrimination against railway employees in the matter of compensation for overtime. However, in view of the national emergency the employees' representatives agreed to accept the recommendations of the Board and the dispute over wages was regarded as closed. Your representatives concluded from these discussions with the President that this discrimination in respect to overtime compensation would in due time be adjusted to our complete satisfaction.

In furtherance of these understandings we made arrangements with the carriers' conference committees for a meeting with them in New York on June 24, 1943, for the purpose of writing the recommendations of the Emergency Board into an agreement. But on June 23, 1943, we were advised that the Economic Stabilization Director, Fred M. Vinson, on June 22, 1943, had issued an order in which he said:

"That the recommendations of the Emergency Board for a general 8-cent increase in rates of pay of the nonoperating men now employed, contained in paragraph 54 of the Report of May 24, 1943, shall not become effective."

He further said that he would issue an opinion within the next 10 days in support of this decision and on June 30, 1943, he addressed the following letter to—

JUNE 30, 1943.

Messrs. I. L. SHARFMAN, *Chairman;* WALTER T. FISHER, *Member;* JOHN A. FITCH, *Member; Emergency Board, National Railway Labor Panel, Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: I am addressing you as the Emergency Board, appointed February 20, 1943, from the National Railway Labor Panel, to investigate an unadjusted dispute between certain carriers, including railroads, the Railway Express Agency, refrigerator car companies, and stockyard companies, and certain of their employees represented by 15 cooperating railway labor organizations, concerning requests for increases in rates of pay. This

is the memorandum opinion referred to in the order of June 22, 1943, in this case.

That order directs that the recommendation of your Board, for a general increase of 8 cents per hour in the wage rates of nonoperating railroad employees, shall not become effective. I do not believe that the proposed award of your Board conforms either to the President's hold-the-line order (No. 9328) or to the directive of May 12, 1943, issued by the Economic Stabilization Director pursuant thereto.

1. There is no overtime issue in this case. No request came before the Board for a change in the existing arrangement for premium payments for overtime. Supplemental Report, page 183.

When the President issued Executive Order No. 9328 (hold-the-line) he stated:

"The only way to hold the line is to stop trying to find justifications for not holding it here or not holding it there. No one straw may break a camel's back, but there is always a last straw. We cannot afford to take further chances in relaxing the line. We already have taken too many."

The Emergency Board bases its award primarily upon the existence of a "gross inequity" allegedly demonstrated by a comparison of the wage rates now paid to the employees here involved with rates paid to other workers deemed generally comparable. In its comparisons, your Board takes account both of specific rates paid at a particular time, and of wage rate trends. (Supplemental Report, pp. 53–70, 170–182, 193, 200–201, Report, pp. 13–15, 1609, 23–24.)

2. As has been stated by the emergency board:

"The threat of serious inflation—or, more concretely, the frantic race between wages and prices in relation to mounting living costs—probably constitute the most basic and the most potentially explosive problem on the home front with which the American people are faced. If the Government's attack upon this problem were to prove of no avail, every element in the population would be subjected to the impact of devastating repercussions, and even the successful prosecution of the war might be gravely endangered. The hosts of labor—with wage levels that would almost inevitably lag behind price changes, and with money savings in a variety of forms that would almost inexorably be dissipated—would be among the severest sufferers. Apparent gains would be transformed into real losses. Collective bargaining would be turned into make-believe. Government intervention would be beset by helplessness.

"The stabilization program, then, is a matter of vast national importance. It transcends the interests of either the carriers or the employees, and it must necessarily exert a significant influence upon the adjustment of the dispute here involved. It is imperative that the stabilization program be firmly safeguarded, but that it be applied, as intended, to the distinctive circumstances of the unadjusted dispute committed to the determination of the emergency board." (Supplemental report, pp. 41–42, Repts. 9, 10, pars. 13, 14.)

The power to correct "gross inequities" is allegedly drawn from the language of the act of October 2, 1942, which permits the adjustment of wages designed "to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war." This authority, however, is delegated by the statute to the President, and is vested in other agencies of the Government only as the President may direct or delegate.

The President did not, however, write a blank check. In the hold-the-line order (No. 9328) he provides standards for these adjustments. This order directs the agencies exercising authority under Executive Order No. 9299 (the emergency boards) to approve no further increases in wages except adjustments—

(1) Clearly necessary to correct substandards of living.

(2) In accordance with the Little Steel formula.

(3) For job reclassifications or merit increases if they do not—

(a) Increase production costs.

(b) Provide a basis for increases in prices.

The hold-the-line order, moreover, authorized the Economic Stabilization Director to exercise all the power conferred upon the President by the act of October 2, 1942. Exercising this power, the Director issued his directive of May 12, 1943, which provided that—

(1) Tested going-rate brackets for recognized categories of employments in various labor markets may be established, and adjustments may be made to the minimum in these brackets;

(2) Maladjustments between wages and the cost of living are to be considered only under

(a) The Little Steel formula.

(b) The correction of substandard conditions of living;

(3) If adjustments are made under (2), then adjustments in immediately interrelated job classifications to keep minimum differentials for productive efficiency may be considered.

Under both the Executive order and the directive, adjustments may be made to those workers who have not received the full benefits of the Little Steel formula. That formula permits appropriate groups of employees to receive 15 percent more in their basic rates of pay than they did in January 1941. The Emergency Board concludes that the 10-cent increase given these workers in December 1941 exhausts all of the increase in pay that is permitted under the Little Steel formula. In its report the Board states:

"In those circumstances the fact that 40 of the 73 classes of railroad employees have not received the full 15 percent cost-of-living adjustment permitted by the Little Steel formula becomes irrelevant. The wage requests of 1941, like those now before this Board, were part of a concerted movement of the nonoperating employees. The average straight-time hourly earnings of all the 73 classes as of January 1941 must be taken as a base in computing the percentage increase, as a cost-of-living adjustment, which resulted from the 10-cent wage increase of December 1941. On this basis the full 15-percent increase has been made. Not only would any differentiation between the various crafts or classes in this regard run counter to the requests or the desires of the labor organizations and the employees whom they represent, but it would do violence to the Little Steel formula. The Little Steel formula constitutes an integral part of the stabilization program as it now prevails, and the Board is recommending no departure from it" (Rept., pp. 20–21, par. 41).

This office considers the above application of the Little Steel formula to this case proper.

It is believed that the Emergency Board has not exhausted the possible applications of other tests recognized in the Executive order and the directive as above outlined. On this record it appears that the substandard test might well be considered. It is recognized that the substandard test is often difficult to apply. If this test is applied, not only must it be decided which rates are to be changed because they promote substandard living conditions, but also it must be decided what adjustments are necessary in the immediately interrelated job classifications to keep the minimum differentials required for productive efficiency. The substandard test must not become futile, however, simply because it is difficult to apply.

It is true that the substandard test generally requires a consideration of local circumstances which bear upon accustomed wage levels. The reason for this general approach to the problem of substandard wages is quite plain. If wage levels were judged by comparison with the financial requirements of a minimum standard of living, a considerable percentage of prevailing wages would be found inadequate. The adjustment of such wages in a general upward direction, tending toward achievement of a national minimum standard of living, is a difficult and complicated process. Too swift an adjustment, particularly in regions and areas subject to general economic disadvantage, might seriously cripple important sectors of a regional or area economy, thereby destroying or materially impairing employment opportunities and the living standards of the very workers whose conditions were sought to be improved.

In ordinary cases, therefore, it is necessary to consider the improvement of substandard living conditions in the light of economic conditions prevailing in a particular region or area. For this reason, it is generally deemed impractical to set a national figure and arbitrarily to determine that any wage below that figure is substandard, even though such a determination might be factually correct.

However, such localized treatment might not always be necessary. A particular industry, a particular segment of an industry, or even a particular employer may call for Nation-wide treatment. This is to say, because of facts peculiar to a particular case, it may be practical to determine that, with reference to a particular industry, all wages paid below a determined level are substandard or should be increased.

Such special treatment has, on occasion, been accorded by the National War Labor Board to the employees of a particular employer or a particular industry. When it has long been the practice, as in the case of the railroad industry, to adjust wage scales by Nation-wide agreements, treatment on a national rather than a regional basis would be especially justified. In such exceptional cases, the substandard test may be adjusted to the national agreement rather than the regional method of treatment.

In view of the particular situation with which the emergency board must deal, I think the board might fairly determine that all workers receiving less than a designated rate per hour are eligible to receive wage adjustments to eliminate substandard living conditions. In view of the difficulty in determining with exactitude which wage rates under a stated rate per hour should be adjusted because they are directly substandard and which rates under that stated rate should be adjusted because they are in immediately interrelated job classifications, I think that the board may be justified in increasing all rates under a stated rate the same number of cents per hour.

Such an adjustment will naturally maintain existing differentials on all job classifications now under that stated rate. Such an adjustment, however, would require some upward revisions in rates for immediately interrelated job classifications above that stated rate. But in accordance with the directive of this office such revisions should be tapered off so as to obviate the need so far as practically feasible for revision in the higher wage brackets. This tapering must be done in a rigorous fashion so as to reflect actually the minimum increase necessary for productive efficiency in the interrelated job classifications and not to reflect a general wage increase under that name. The exact methods and steps in the tapering off process is left to the board to determine on the basis of its study of the interrelated job classification.

Therefore the emergency board may reconsider its recommendation and may make a revised recommendation in conformity with the standards of Executive Order No. 9328 and the directive of May 12, 1943.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director of Economic Stabilization.

We learned after Director Vinson's order of June 22 that the Carriers' Conference Committees had filed with him on June 9 without our knowledge an extensive brief urging that the recommendations of the board be disapproved. Director Vinson took this arbitrary and capricious action without previous conferences, intimation, or notice, to your representatives, although we understood that this matter was finally disposed of on May 27th by the President of the United States. Following the issuance of Judge Vinson's opinion of June 30, 1943, we discussed the matter with the President of the United States, Mr. James Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, and Mr. Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, endeavoring to preserve the understanding we had with the President. These discussions continued until July 29 when Mr. James Byrnes, representing the President, requested representatives of the carriers and ourselves to meet and reach an agreement. Your representatives agreed to this request with the clear understanding that if an agreement was to be made it must provide for the same amount of increase in wages as recommended by the emergency board, and in keeping with earlier understandings reached with the President, your representatives proceeding upon this understanding together with representatives of the carriers, conferred with Mr. Vinson on August 3 and made necessary arrangements for a meeting on August 6 between the three Carriers' Conference Committees and the Employees' Conference Committee for the purpose of making an agreement.

These meetings were held on August 6 and 7 in Washington, D. C., and an agreement was signed on August 7 providing for a general increase of existing rates of pay of 8 cents per hour retroactive to February 1, 1943, payable in cash. This agreement provides it is "subject to any existing requirements of law" and is in settlement of the disputes growing out of the notice served by the labor organizations on the carriers on or about September 25, 1942, and will remain in effect until changed or modified in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, amended.

Although this agreement fully implements the earlier understanding with the President and other Government representatives, they have been unwilling to give formal approval to the agreement and in the absence of such approval the carriers have been unwilling to carry out the terms of the agreement. Government officials do not now object to the granting of an increase which would amount to approximately $204,000,000 per year, the amount recommended by the Emergency Board, but they have objected to a uniform increase of 8 cents per hour.

These discussions culminated in a conference between your representatives and the President on September 16, 1943, when an understanding was reached.

We understood the President would cooperate with us in securing legislation to dispose of the overtime matter.

The President insisted that the lower paid groups must have a larger increase in wages than those in the higher wage brackets. Therefore an understanding was reached in order to do this and to settle the matter that day that the increase would vary from an amount necessary to establish a 56-cent minimum down to 7 cents per hour increase to employees in the higher wage brackets, all with the understanding that the intermediate wage increases would be distributed so as to confine the total increase in wages to $204,000,000 per year.

Pursuant to this understanding we submitted the following scale of intermediate wage increases: Wage rates of 46 cents or less per hour to be increased to 56 cents, the 47-cent rates to be increased by 9 cents per hour, rates of 48 to 75 cents per hour, inclusive, to be increased 8 cents, rates of 76 cents per hour and above to be increased 7 cents; this scale would confine the cost of the wage increase to $204,000,000 per year.

At the President's request we met Mr. Byrnes later that day and discussed this proposed scale of wage increases with the understanding he would discuss same with Director Vinson, to the end that they would both be informed when they attended a conference which the President was to have with them later that day. We heard nothing further from the President that day but on September 17, 1943, the President's Secretary telephoned us and read a memorandum from the President to the effect that later on the 16th in reviewing the matter with Messrs. Byrnes and Vinson certain matters had come up that had caused the President to conclude to defer further action on our wage case until the Emergency Board which was handling the dispute of the train, engine, and yard service employees, filed its report. This report was filed with the President September 25, 1943, and the Board recommended a general increase for these employees of 4 cents per hour, effective April 1, 1943.

Immediately after this report was filed we began efforts to secure another conference with the President to dispose of our case and conference was held with him on October 12, 1943, when the following letter was presented to the President:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 12, 1943.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We most respectfully suggest that you now immediately take such action as you feel is necessary to implement the understanding reached between us in our conference on September 16, 1943, in the disposition of the wage adjustment dispute of the more than 1,000,000 nonoperating railway and express employees.

The national welfare and the effective prosecution of the war requires prompt disposition of this matter.

Most respectfully,

E. E. MILLIMAN,
H. J. CARR,
A. E. LYON,
GEO. M. HARRISON,
B. M. JEWELL,
Committee Representing Fifteen Nonoperating Railway Labor Unions.

In this conference we were informed that, since the Emergency Board had recommended an increase of 4 cents per hour for the engine, train, and yard service employees, that part of the understanding of September 16 providing an increase of 7 cents per hour to the employees we represent in the higher wage brackets could not be carried out and that such employees could only be given an increase of 4 cents per hour. This was wholly unacceptable and the President was so advised.

On October 16, 1943, the President issued the following Executive order:

"ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL EMERGENCY BOARD TO REPORT ON THE CLAIMS FOR WAGE ADJUSTMENTS OF NONOPERATING RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

"Whereas the Director of Economic Stabilization found the report on May 24 and May 29, of the Emergency Board set up to consider the wage adjustment claims of the nonoperating railway employees to be inconsistent with the stabilization program established under the act of October 2, 1942, and the Executive orders issued thereunder, and directed that the claims be reconsidered in light of the opinion filed by him on June 30, 1943, and

"Whereas the Emergency Board originally constituted to consider the claims of the nonoperating railway employees has been dissolved and it is necessary to provide further machinery for adjusting these claims in accordance with the act of October 2, 1942, and the stabilization program established thereunder: Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the Statutes, and particularly by the First War Powers Act, 1941, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered as follows:

"(1) There is hereby established a special Emergency Board of three members to be selected by me from the National Railway Labor Panel to reconsider the claims for wage adjustments of the nonoperating railway employees, and to recommend to me such wage adjustments which should be made, within the limitations of the act of October 2, 1942, and the Executive orders thereunder, and in conformity with the opinion of the Economic Stabilization Director of June 30, 1943. In making its recommendations to me, the Board may give such consideration as it deems appropriate to the report filed with me on September 25, 1943, by the Emergency Board appointed to consider the claims for wage adjustments of the operating railway employees.

"(2) The parties before the special Emergency Board shall be the same as those included within the recommendation of the Emergency Board which reported to me on May 24 and May 29 in this dispute.

"(3) The Special Emergency Board shall report to me on or before November 15, 1943. Copies of the report shall be filed at the same time with the Economic Stabilization Director, the National War Labor Board, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"The recommendations of the special Emergency Board in regard to proposed changes affecting wage and salary payments shall become effective 15 days after the date of the filing of its report with me, unless and except to the extent the Economic Stabilization Director otherwise directs.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

On the same date Mr. Vinson issued an opinion in the case of the Engine, Train and Yard Service Employees, and in that opinion he also discusses our wage case. This opinion reads:

"There is before me the report including the recommendation of the Emergency Board selected from the National Railway Labor Panel on May 21, 1943, in a case involving most of the Nation's railroads and the five transportation brotherhoods. The Board recommends an increase of 32 cents per minimum basic day or 4 cents per hour for the employees involved in the National Mediation Board Case No. A–1400.

"This recommendation is predicated upon the Little Steel formula. That formula permits wage adjustments to the extent of 15 percent over average straight-time hourly earnings on January 1, 1941. These employees received in December 1941 an increase amounting to approximately 10.5 percent. Thus 4.5 percent remains under the permissible limit of Little Steel which figures about 4 cents per hour for these employees.

"As an original proposition the point could well be taken that the Little Steel formula should be applied to the average hourly earnings on January 1, 1941, for both operating

and nonoperating employees. If this were done the increases of December 1941 to both employee groups would practically exhaust the permissible wage adjustments under Little Steel for railway employees. In the nonoperating case, however, as in the case here Little Steel has been figured on the basis of each group. This results in no Little Steel increase to the former, and as stated, 4 cents per hour in the instant case. This will not mean that the operating employees who have higher earnings will receive a wage increase while the nonoperating employees will receive none. Under my opinion of June 30 the nonoperating employees are entitled to a wage adjustment based upon the substandard and interrelated job classification criteria. In determining appropriate rates for interrelated job classification, the Special Emergency Board created by the President to reconsider the nonoperating case in light of my opinion is authorized by the order creating it to take into account the wage increase recommended for the operating employees. The Board consequently should be in a position to see that the adjustments to the nonoperating employees bear a fair relation to the adjustments given to the operating employees.

"Therefore, I will not disapprove the recommendation in this case."

Under the expressed terms of the Executive Order of October 16, 1943, this so-called Emergency Board has not been created under the Railway Labor Act and has not that freedom of judgment to be exercised by a board under the Railroad Labor Act. This Board can only make an advisory report which is required to be in conformity with the opinion of June 30, 1943, of Director Vinson and its recommendations are expressly made subject to disapproval by Director Vinson. We have no reason to expect that any recommendation of this Board, which would meet with the approval of Director Vinson, would provide the basis for any agreement which would be satisfactory to those we represent and acceptable as a substitute for the existing agreement of August 7, 1943.

From the above recital of facts it is clear that these 15 cooperating chief executives have exhausted every reasonable effort to secure an acceptable wage increase for the employees represented. They have secured an agreement with the carriers which is acceptable, but for reasons which are made clear above, the carriers have not yet put this agreement into effect.

Workers in other industries comparable to the railroad employees we represent have received three and in some cases four increases, while in a similar period of time railroad employees have only secured two increases. The increase of 8 cents per hour provided for in the agreement of August 7, 1943, will not increase the rates of pay of the employees we represent over the same period of time by as much as has been granted to comparable workers in other industries.

All these facts have been reported from time to time throughout the period of these proceedings and from this detailed report, it should be clear that we have exerted every effort to satisfactorily dispose of this controversy without responding to the increasing demands of the membership that the chief executives carry out the laws of the organizations and issue a strike ballot. We regret our inability to otherwise adjust the difficulty and have concluded a strike ballot will be issued today, October 25, 1943, to each and every employee involved. The ballot is returnable not later than November 25, 1943.

It is urgently requested and expected that each and every involved employee will cast a vote on the strike ballot so that such procedures as may be necessary to secure a satisfactory settlement of this wage increase dispute may be taken strictly in accordance with the laws of these respective cooperating railway labor organizations.

We regard it as our duty to the employees involved, as well as to the country, to restore and maintain the morale of the employees in the hope of securing satisfactory wage increase. It would be a neglect of our duty if, by failure to take concerted action and to allay growing dissatisfaction, we permitted the interest of the employees and the public interest to be injured by increasing individual discouragement which results in the drifting of large numbers of employees out of the service of this essential war industry and also results in sporadic unauthorized strikes harmful alike to the employees, the carriers, and the effective prosecution of the war.

Fraternally yours,

H. W. Brown, international president, International Association of Machinists; J. A. Franklin, international president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America; Roy Horn, general president, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; L. M. Wicklein, general vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; J. J. Duffy, international vice president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Felix H. Knight, general president, Brotherhood Railway of Carmen of America; George Wright, vice president, International Brotherhood of Firemen, Oilers, Helpers, Round House, and Railway Shop Laborers; V. O. Gardner, president, The Order of Railroad Telegraphers; George M. Harrison, grand president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees; E. E. Milliman, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; A. E. Lyon, grand president, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; James J. Delaney, president, National Organization Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America; Samuel J. Hogan, president, National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; Jos. P. Ryan, president, International Longshoremen's Association; Edward Flore, general president, Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America; B. M. Jewell, chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein certain excerpts and tabulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 5, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 9, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS—NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING

The executive session scheduled for today by the Committee on Patents was postponed until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. Proposed legislation by the National Patent Planning Commission will be discussed.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

897. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

898. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a copy of the report submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the personnel requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

899. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3598. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3408. A bill to amend chapter

7 of the Criminal Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 823). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3449. A bill to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 177. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day and urging that it be properly observed throughout the Nation; with amendment (Rept. No. 838). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin; with amendment (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 248. A bill for the relief of Louis Courcil; with amendment (Rept. No. 826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Paul Barrere; with amendment (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; with amendment (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Roberta Ramsey; with amendment (Rept. No. 831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Ethel Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby; without amendment (Rept. No. 834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the Board of Trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Commitee on Claims. H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons; without amendment (Rept. No. 836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3413) granting a pension to Reuben Evarts, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3599. A bill to provide that veterans be appointed in the selection of personnel for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3600. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3601. A bill to authorize the use of space in the Old Post Office Building in Portland, Oreg., by the State of Oregon for its use as a museum for relics from the battleship *Oregon*, together with all other historical documents, objects, and relics of Oregon and the old Oregon country held by the State for public display; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3602. A bill to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3603. A bill regulating the commitment of insane persons to veterans' and other United States institutions and making applicable to Federal reservations certain State laws pertaining to administration of estates of decedents, guardianship of minors and insane persons, commitment of insane persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 3604. A bill authorizing the appointment of chaplains as general officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3606. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3607. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3608. A bill relating to certain overtime compensation of employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3609. A bill to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 3610. A bill to provide a program of research, in universities, colleges, and other institutions of higher learning, for the prevention of the pollution of the waters of the United States, to establish the Water Poliution Control and Sewage Utilization Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 3611. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3612. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the use of private vehicles for official travel; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BELL:

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution endorsing the Joint Four-Nation Declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second aniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution relative to extending certain social-security benefits to persons in the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. Res. 42. Resolution expressing appreciation of the House of Representatives of the statesmanlike manner in which the Honorable Cordell Hull represented the United States at the Moscow Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 343. Resolution making H. R. 1732, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, or citizenship, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 344. Resolution providing for an investigation of the Office of War Information; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 345. Resolution to provide for expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 344; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3613. A bill to expedite the naturalization of Monica Warfield; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3614. A bill for the relief of the Queen City Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3615. A bill for the relief of Dorthy Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 3616. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for

the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Fred Lower; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Lee Thornton and Josephine Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3618. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3395. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Grant Cowan and other citizens of Buchanan County, Iowa, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3396. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Joseph A. Christoffel, of Aurora, Ill., and 23 others, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3397. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of St. John, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3398. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of F. B. Walker, of Tacoma, Wash, and 112 others, claiming that the war has been used speciously as an excuse for certain citizens to attempt to perpetrate prohibition upon the United States, declaring that prohibition has proved a failure when it was adopted in recent years; and, therefore, insisting that Congress, and especially the congressional delegation from the State of Washington, work and vote against all legislation, under whatever pretext, seeking to bring back prohibition; and further urging strongly that House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860 be permanently laid on the table; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3399. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Lucy Campbell, of Wilburn, Wash., favoring passage of all prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3400. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of 31 citizens of Union County, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3401. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of O. R. Rockway, of Olympia, Wash., and five others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3402. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 32 voters of the city of Butler, Pa., urging the adoption of House Resolution 117 to permit shipment of food to those unfortunate children residing in occupied countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3403. Also, petition of 36 members and adherents of the Pulaski (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, urging the passage of all bills now before the House to prohibit the advertisement of alcoholic beverages, to ban beer and liquor sales at military and naval centers, to make it unlawful to furnish alcoholic beverages to anyone in uniform, and to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3404. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ed. Tossick and 46 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3405. Also, petition of Rudolph C. Eggemann and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3406. Also, petition of Fred J. Hehner and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3407. Also, petition of Edward Wedel and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3408. Also, petition of Conrad Majino and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3409. By Mr. KING: Petition of the United Brewery, Cereal, Flour and Soft Drink Workers of America, Local No. 7, Branch 4, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3410. Also, petition of the Patman Corporation, El Segundo, Calif., protesting against the enactment of any legislation which would return prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3411. Also, resolution of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, opposing House bill No. 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3412. Also, resolution of the California Commission on Interstate Cooperation, relative to the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

3413. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the West Virginia Motor Truck Association, Inc., Charleston, W. Va., urging the Congress to present a bill freezing the present levels of social security for an additional year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3414. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of congregations of the Bellaire, Ohio, churches urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3415. Also, petition of Irene Hendon, of Adena, Ohio, and 69 other citizens of that vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3416. Also, petition of Carolyn A. Johnson and 10 other residents of St. Clairsville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3417. Also, petition of Mary Santrock and 62 other residents of Tippecanoe, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3418. Also, petition of 160 citizens of Bergholz, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3419. Also, petition of Anna A. Robbins and 66 other citizens of Bergholz, Augusta, Stratton, Kensington, Irondale, and Hammondsville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3420. Also, petition of Auta A. Worley and 60 other citizens of Cadiz, Moorefield, and Harrisville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3421. Also, petition of Mrs. Harold Fisher and 60 other citizens of Belmont, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3422. Also, petition of Gertrude Bowman and 61 other citizens of Columbiana, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3423. Also, petition of Earl L. Kuckuck and 48 other citizens of Martins Ferry, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3424. Also, petition of Robert S. McCutchen and 87 other citizens of Toronto, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

3425. Also, petition of Alberta Snyder and 19 other citizens of Conotton and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3426. Also, petition of Pearl McClain and seven other citizens of Scio, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3427. Also, petition of Ida M. Griffith and 16 other citizens of Deersville, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3428. Also, petition of Clark M. Floor, of Washington, D. C., and 46 other citizens of East Palestine, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3429. Also, petition of Floyd Doan and 45 other citizens of Mount Pleasant, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3430. Also, petition of Myrtle L. Johnson and 158 other citizens of St. Clairsville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3431. Also, petition of Olive McCauley and 52 other citizens of Bowerston, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3432. Also, petition of Mrs. J. E. Boggs and 29 other residents of Carrollton, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3433. Also, petition of Mrs. Otto W. McCommon and 99 other residents of Shadyside, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3434. By Mr. EATON: Resolution of the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs, opposing Wagner Act for socialized medicine to be administered by someone outside the professional medical field; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3435. Also, resolution of the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs, supporting international cooperation for peace and post-war planning, and expressing its conviction that international machinery must be created for the establishment of a just peace and the prevention of future aggression and that the United States in its own self-interest must participate therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3436. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Local Dairymen's Cooperative Association, Inc., of Providence, R. I., expressing great concern over the overlapping of Government agencies in the handling of the milk situation and urging that a central authority in this area be established to the end that inequalities, conflicts, and confusions might be eliminated; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3437. Also, resolution of the Local Dairymen's Cooperative Association, Inc., of Providence, R. I., expressing great concern over milk subsidies established October 1, 1943, and disapproving of milk subsidies and favoring the increasing of prices as a method of increasing milk production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3438. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Apartment House Association of San Francisco, Inc., that the proposed tax legislation now before Congress, which would broaden social security to include health insurance and raise pay-roll deductions to 12 percent is, in the judgment of the Apartment House Association of San Francisco, Inc., untimely, impractical, uneconomic and unsound, and definitely against the best interests of the country as a whole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3439. Also, resolution of the Associated Home Builders, San Francisco, Calif., on resuming civilian home building; that the National Housing Agency program allocations of civilian new homes to sell up to ceiling prices of $7,500; that the immigrant war worker directive be set aside for these homes; and that the War Production Board release materials and grant priorities for their construction in accordance with the civilian needs of critical metropolitan centers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in changing and troubled days we pray for conceptions big enough and spirits strong enough to match the awesome time in which we live and serve. We come with our minds startled by the swift march of world-shaking events. Hidden fires are flaming forth, consuming the old habitations of men. We hear voices that challenge all that men have counted fixed and final and sure. Men in chains are chanting a new song of expected freedom. For social systems which have sentenced the masses to grinding poverty, for arrogant overlords of government and industry who have held human life more cheap than merchandise, the ax is at the root of the rotted tree, the judge is at the barred gate.

May the very melody and march of life in this epic hour lead us and all nations to the great day of God, when the shining sword of universal freedom shall be lifted against all that denies and enslaves brotherhood, when all men shall stand side by side in equal worth and real freedom, all toiling and all reaping, masters of nature and brothers of men, exultant in the tide of the common life, and jubilant in the adoration of Thee, the source of all their blessings and the Father of all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND RESOLUTIONS FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the right of petition is a constitutional right. I receive petitions every day, some in favor of and some opposed to measures pending in the Senate. I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that certain petitions and resolutions I have before me be noted in the RECORD and referred. The first petition was sent to me by citizens of my home town of Chippewa Falls, Wis., expressing their views in favor of the enactment of bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition of citizens of Chippewa Falls, Wis., will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the other petitions and resolutions presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and appropriately referred.

The petitions and resolutions presented by Mr. WILEY were referred as follows:

The petitions of Hon. S. E. Squires, assemblyman, and sundry other citizens of Mason and Drummond, and Mrs. Belle Ripley Cole and sundry other citizens of Kenosha, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the State convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union held in Chippewa Falls, Wis., October 14–16, 1943:

Resolution favoring acceleration of the rural electrification program in aid of the war effort; and

Resolution favoring the making of corn and protein feeds available as essential in the production of dairy products, eggs, and poultry in aid of the war effort; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolution favoring an appropriation to aid in the production of potatoes, flax, beans, and canning crops;

Resolution favoring the appropriation of $5,000,000 to be added to the tenant-purchase fund to be set up in connection with a veterans' farm-bonus program under the Farm Security Administration; and

Resolution endorsing the soil-conservation program and favoring adequate appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Resolution favoring the adoption of a dairy subsidy plan to be continued for at least 1 year; and

Resolution opposing the promotion of margarine after the rationing of any dairy product may be discontinued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolution opposing the imposition of a Federal sales tax; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolution favoring retention by the Government of various aluminum, steel, and munition plants taken over by it to be used as yardsticks, so that the people may be acquainted with the true cost of producing steel and other materials alleged to be controlled by monopolies; to the Committee on Manufactures.

Resolution favoring the issuance of a postage stamp to honor the memory of Dr. Stevens Moulton Babcock; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—PROBLEMS OF CONVERSION FROM WAR PRODUCTION (PT. 12 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I request leave to file with the Senate on behalf of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, of which I am chairman, a report outlining certain problems connected with conversion from war production, the solution or lack of solution of which will greatly affect the real cost of the war program.

In carrying out the direction of the Senate to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the war program, the committee has realized that the real cost of the war will depend not only upon the extent to which we succeed in eliminating wasteful procurement practices, but also upon whether prompt action is taken to anticipate the time when we will have sufficient of the various different articles of war matériel so that our producers can be notified to make plans for the conversion of their production to civilian goods.

The War and Navy Departments have already had occasion to cancel contracts aggregating approximately $6,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000, respectively, and from now on we may expect an ever-increasing volume of such cancelations.

The purpose of this report is to outline some of the problems which will have to be solved if this reconversion is to take place in an orderly fashion with a minimum of waste and of dislocation to the economy. If these problems can be solved quickly, the reconversion can proceed expeditiously and smoothly, the cost of the war will be much less than it would otherwise be, and our post-war problems will be much less numerous and difficult.

This report outlines the necessity:

First. That we determine now the rules regulating the termination of contracts, a subject now being extensively studied by other committees in both the House and the Senate.

Second. That procurement agencies determine their needs as far in advance as possible and notify war contractors of the dates when they may expect a termination of war business.

Third. That inventories of unprocessed materials and partially processed materials be reduced to a minimum.

Fourth. That methods be determined for the distribution after the war of surplus materials;

Fifth. That procedures be agreed upon for the prompt removal upon the cessation of war production of Government property from the private plants, so that private plants will be able to take prompt action to convert;

Sixth. That means be provided by which private corporations can obtain working capital; and

Seventh. Finally, that the terms upon which the Government will sell or lease the plants and facilities owned by it be stated so that the private producers now operating such facilities can determine whether it would be possible for them to acquire and operate the plants.

The committee is calling attention to these problems, not only because the failure to settle them would greatly increase the costs of the war, but because uncertainties with respect to them prevent business from making plans necessary to facilitate a transfer of production from wartime to peacetime articles and thereby to assure jobs for war workers and the soldiers and sailors upon their release from the armed services.

Some of these problems are already the subject of study by legislative committees of the Senate and House, because their solution may require legislation. Some of the problems can be

solved or greatly alleviated without further legislation. The interrelations of the problems are such that they should be studied together.

The committee does not propose any short-cut solutions to these problems. It proposes instead to hold a series of public hearings at which leaders of Government, business, and labor will be asked to discuss these problems and to state the action which they are taking or believe should be taken to solve them.

Mr. President, if we succeed in having economic problems properly settled, we will not have so much trouble settling political problems. I believe we shall have to consult economic experts with respect to the solving of economic problems in order that we may succeed in solving the political problems which go along with the economic problems. I shall appoint a subcommittee which will go into this question in some detail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the additional report of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted by its chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], will be received and printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1447) to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 521) thereon.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 106—REPORT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 202) to authorize the printing of additional copies of the report by Senator O'MAHONEY to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 106, current session, being the report of Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 2,000 copies for the use of the special committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. 1515. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Kanosh Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1516. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a), as amended, to make further provision for the education of honorably discharged World War No. 2 veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 95, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a judicial nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT IN ASSOCIATED PRESS CASE—STATEMENT BY GILBERT H. MONTAGUE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the decision of the Supreme Court in the Associated Press case by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York Bar, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL PIONEERING IN ACCIDENT PREVENTION AND RELIEF—ADDRESS BY JAMES A. EMERY

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Industrial Pioneering in Accident Prevention and Relief," delivered by James A. Emery, general counsel, National Association of Manufacturers, at Harrisburg, Pa., October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A TRIUMPHANT HOMECOMING FOR MR. HULL—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Triumphant Homecoming for Mr. Hull," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of November 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FIGHTING SOUTH—BOOK BY JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Fighting South—A Good Book for Americans," published in the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., for November 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RADIO AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FREE SPEECH—ADDRESS BY C. J. DURR

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Radio As An Instrument of Free Speech," by C. J. Durr, Federal Communications Commissioner, at the McAlpin Hotel, New York City, October 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAGUE OF FREE PEOPLES—STATEMENT BY DR. ARTHUR E. BRIGGS

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "League of Free Peoples," by Arthur E. Briggs, of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JUSTICE BLACK TO GRADUATES OF OFFICERS' CANDIDATE SCHOOL

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Hugo Black, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, to the graduating members of the Officers' Candidate School, Miami Beach, Fla., August 21, 1943, together with the introductory remarks, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND SOVIET UNION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on the subject of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, before the American-Soviet friendship meeting, on November 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DIPLOMATIC SITUATION IN NORTH AFRICA—ARTICLE FROM PORTLAND (MAINE) EVENING EXPRESS

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fiction Is Disrupting Our Franco-American Relations in North Africa," from the Portland (Maine) Evening Express on November 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3366) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3366) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Truman
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Wallgren
Davis	Moore	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in addressing myself to the Senate on the pending resolution, I desire to say that I voted to report the original resolution from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I did so for several reasons. One reason was that while the resolution had been prepared and considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations—there had been no hearings—the first I saw of the resolution was when I came to the final meeting of the committee, and there appeared there several Senators for whom I have a high regard, who made a proposal for a substitute resolution. They were heard. They stated their views with great earnestness. No record was kept at that time. The final outcome was that the pending resolution was reported to the Senate. I thought it should be brought out here, where there could be full discussion in the Senate of that very important question which had been discussed over the radio and in newspapers and on the speaking platforms, one of the most important questions, that of peace after the war is over, which could possibly face this country; and I thought that, rather than keeping still about it, so long as there was so much discussion, and in view of the fact that the committee had taken jurisdiction of the matter, it should be discussed in the Senate. I felt it could not bind any succeeding Senate. Now, however, I fear it will be considered as an advance ratification of a treaty or that whatever agreement is made will be considered as an executive agreement that will not be sent to the Senate for ratification. The first section of it dealt with the fact that we were at war and were going to continue it. That was more or less a second declaration of war, repeating the action the Senate took on the 8th day of December 1941. The second paragraph suggested that we have a just and honorable peace. The third paragraph deals with some kind of an international organization to maintain the peace in the future; and, of course, as usual, history repeats itself, as it has done through the ages: "It shall be done by force."

In the debate in the Senate the emphasis has been that the peace, no matter what it is, shall be enforced by force—by police force. That is the kind of peace we always have had in history, and therefore every peace treaty in history has sown the seeds for the next war.

The other day I said that the only just and honorable peace which had been offered to any belligerent, I thought, had been that offered by General Grant at Appomattox, when he told the defeated men of the South, "Take your horses and go home and get busy with the plowing." There were men then in the Capitol who had different views. They felt they had to have the peace enforced by the military, so the Congress sent the military down there and sent a lot of carpetbaggers to the South to enforce the peace. The fanatics of the North in Congress wanted to "punish the aggressor." The effect of sending those carpetbaggers is still not yet eradicated from the South. That is one of the blackest pages of American history.

The pending resolution says that we shall have a just and honorable peace. If the peace is just and honorable, there is an opportunity for peace so long as nations will conduct themselves in relation to each other in a just and honorable manner, and there will be very little need for any police force to subjugate people who are dissatisfied with economic conditions, social conditions, and political tyranny. However, I have no hope for such a treaty.

When the last treaty of peace was made a man by the name of Keynes, a financial adviser to the British delegates, was at the conference at Versailles. He left the conference and went home and wrote a book entitled "The Economic Consequences of the Peace." If the representatives of the various governments at that peace conference had listened to his expression of his views at that time before he went home, the chances are there would not now be the war in which we are engaged.

The most important thing for the United States to do after winning the war is to see to it that our country takes the position that there shall be a just and honorable peace. Otherwise there will be no peace. The weight of our advice, counsel, and argument should be upon that subject, rather than upon a police force and a political organization backed by troops to enforce a treaty of peace which is likely to be the same kind of treaty as those which have ended all wars and sown the seeds for the next wars.

It is not necessary to review the pages of history to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the past is prologue. While we mouth the old, worn-out phrases, "History repeats itself" and "Man cannot learn from history," the fact still remains that man cannot learn from history. Human beings are born into the world ignorant, uneducated. They spend a few years learning a little something by experience and a little something by thinking, and then they die. What little we have learned we have not been able to pass on to the new generation. The members of the new generation have to go through the same experience and make the same mistakes, and they in turn can leave very little in heritage to those who come after them. Humanity ignores the beacon lights of history even if pointed out for its attention.

Because I bear these things in mind, I desire to discuss today an example which I think will explain most of the peace treaties which have been made in human history. I shall not go into the matter as extensively as I had intended to do, because in this morning's Wall Street Journal I find a very excellent article by Felix Morley which will make the matter plain. He states the matter much better than I could, and it will save the time of the Senate and my time if, after I have finished my remarks, his article may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. I so request. The article appears in the Wall Street Journal for November 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, as an example of what I think is typical of the mistakes of the centuries, I desire to discuss some of the economic consequences of the peace treaty after World War No. 1, the consequences which John Maynard Keynes had in mind when he left the peace conference. At that time he wrote a book entitled "The Economic Consequences of the Peace." I have not read it since those days, but I remember very well that the general tone of it was that this peace will bring on a worse war than the one we have just concluded.

I shall not discuss, for they have already been discussed, the various balances of power and the associations of nations to keep the peace and to prevent war. I need only recall to Senators' minds that the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente were peace societies to keep the peace of the world. A very vivid picture has been painted by Tolstoy in his book on Christianity and patriotism, wherein he shows that they had banquets and drank wine and made long, eloquent speeches to the goddess of peace and about how they were going to keep the peace of the world. On the other hand, the Triple Alliance had the same kind of an organization to keep the peace.

They had banquets, and they visited from one capital to another, with delegations of citizens and statesmen patting each other on the back and making speeches for peace. As Tolstoy said, everyone who had any sense knew, when they were making those speeches, that what they really meant was, "We are going to make war." He mentioned one of the eloquent statesmen of France, who made a very eloquent speech, stating that France loved everybody and every other nation, and was for peace. Tolstoy said that if someone had announced a German delegate, the roar would have been, "Throw him out." Everyone knew that the Triple Alliance was getting ready for war with the Triple Entente and that the Triple Entente was getting ready for war with the Triple Alliance in the name of peace.

So we have these organizations in every country. In their operations on the

mind of humanity, they remind me of Ibsen's story of Peer Gynt. Peer Gynt was quite a typical character. His prototype is to be found in every nation. He came to the United States and made a great deal of money importing slaves. Then his conscience bothered him, and, to assuage his conscience, for every slave he imported he exported a Bible to Africa. So he assuaged his conscience and made money.

At one time he was in the mountains of Norway, where he saw a very beautiful girl. He became infatuated with her. He thought she was very wonderful. She invited him to her home to visit her family. She was the daughter of the Mountain King of the Trolls. He met her people, the royal family. He was invited to a banquet, and thought it was wonderful. The King thought, "The blood of the Trolls has been thinning out. We ought to have some human blood in the royal family of Trolls. So he offered Peer Gynt half his kingdom if he would marry his daughter. Peer Gynt agreed. However, the King said, "If you are to be happy with us you must be able to see reality. You have been associating with human beings, and their eyesight has been perverted so that they do not see reality. If you are going to be happy and one of us, it will be necessary for me to operate upon your eyes."

Peer agreed, so the King took his knife and slit his eye. Then he saw reality. The girl who he thought was such a beautiful creature became a very repulsive thing. She was half woman and half sow, and he would not marry her, even though he would receive half the kingdom. The King said, "That is all right. You had better go back to your people, because I am sure you will not be happy here. But before you go back, you must let me restore your eyesight so that you will have the same point of view and the same sight that your people have." So Peer Gynt permitted the King to operate upon his eyes and restore his sight. Then the King said, "Now you can go back to your people and be happy. The most vile things will now look beautiful." So, in the name of peace, we make war. It looks beautiful. The vile thing about it is that we do not see the reality.

I said that I would discuss some of the economic consequences of the peace following the last war. There is no point in going into the history of the origin of the war, and the reasons for it. That would be imposing upon the time of the Senate, and it is not necessary.

The United States entered the war, and following the war we had a peace program. The Fourteen Points were announced by Woodrow Wilson. On the 8th of January 1918 he announced to the world that the Allied and Associated Powers had accepted and approved them. I call this to the attention of the Senate because of the fact that, as usual, Uncle Sam has been blamed, even by some of his own people, for most of the troubles of the world. The Senate which repudiated the treaty has been spoken of in scorn. It has been said that we double-crossed our allies, and that the United States is to blame for the present war.

Who was double-crossed by the Treaty of Versailles, as history will show? President Wilson, with his Fourteen Points, which had been agreed to by the Allied and Associated Powers, went to the peace conference. The first thing that was done before the treaty was considered was to eliminate most of the delegates, until only four were left, who were to prepare the treaty. After the Italian delegate found that he was not going to get for his country what the Allied Governments had promised Italy for coming into the war, he went home, so there were three left—Clemenceau, Woodrow Wilson, and Lloyd George. They proceeded to write the treaty of peace.

They got the American President in a position where his eyes were opened, and he threatened to go home. The European newspapers were attacking him very viciously, because they said he was stubborn and would not yield. Finally he yielded and remained. After that he had very little to say about the treaty.

What did that treaty provide? The first thing President Wilson discovered was that there were some secret treaties by which certain countries had been bought. Evidently it was necessary to buy them to join France and England in the war. There was the secret treaty with Japan, and the secret treaty with Italy, of which we knew nothing.

When President Wilson came back from Europe the first time there was a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The record of it was printed. He was asked when he first heard of the secret treaties. He said it was when he came to Paris. He had preached the doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at. But we now know that they were in the State Department. They were brought there by Mr. Balfour in 1917. The President of the United States, according to his own word, left the United States to go to Versailles to write a treaty, and he said he knew nothing about the secret treaties when he left home.

The secret treaty with Japan gave Shantung to Japan, with 30,000,000 people. When Wilson protested about dividing up the world and giving it to the victors, Clemenceau is quoted as having said, "We had to buy Japan. We needed some cruisers in the Mediterranean. We are going to keep our word." All we succeeded in doing was having a promise made by Japan under that treaty that at some time Shantung would go back to China. At a time prior thereto Germany had taken Shantung from China, when China was unable to defend herself. It was highway robbery, which was quite common in international affairs. When the Disarmament Conference came in 1920 Japan was finally compelled to give Shantung back to China. As a result we incurred the enmity of Japan.

Italy was double-crossed—at least so Italy claims. The secret treaty provided that Italy should have both sides of the Adriatic, the large port of Fiume, Trieste, and other advantages. Wilson's Presbyterian conscience revolted. He thought that was unjustified, and protested. To a large extent he had his way. That sent Orlando home from the peace conference, and he never went back. That alienated Italy.

The treaty writers proceeded to cut up Europe and the world, the victorious powers taking the natural resources as loot of the war. I have before me a tabulation showing the territory taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a tabulation showing the territory acquired by the Allied and Associated Powers as the loot of the war. The United States had said that the peace was to be a peace without victory and not a punitive peace—a peace without indemnities or loot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, with paeans of sanctimonious oratory we announced to the world that we were fighting merely for democracy and peace, and in that way we made even our own people believe that the most vile things can be made beautiful.

I said that Europe was cut up into a group of small segments for political purposes. We loaned them money to start in business, and they never paid us back. In order to start in business, Uncle Sam made loans to almost every country that was created by the Treaty of Versailles. The countries were small, very nationalistic, and each of them had to maintain a government. They had to have armament plants, they had to have industry to sustain the people, and so they established high tariff walls to maintain their positions, all of which were based on loans.

So long as they could borrow money they did pretty well for the first 10 years. Uncle Sam furnished a great deal of the money. Bankers of France and of England also floated loans. As a result, when their industries were built and their tariffs established they started an intensive program of agricultural production, and that affected American agriculture. We had been exporting food, but now we had competition, which had a great deal to do with the fall of prices in the United States because we could not export anything. I say "anything," but that is an exaggeration. We could not export to the extent to which we had been exporting.

Europe could not produce enough wealth to pay loans.

What took place as a result of the loaning of money, not only by the United States but by England and France as well? At the Treaty of Versailles France created what was called the Little Entente, that is a buffer state against Germany and Russia. French interests financed its munition plants, and the Credit Anstalter of Vienna made loans. All of its economy having been built on borrowed money, production could not be had to yield income to pay off the loans.

The first crash precipitated the worldwide panic of 1929. By 1931 as a

result of the condition of Austria, which in turn was due to what had been done with Austria at the Treaty of Versailles the big Vienna bank was in trouble. At Versailles agricultural portions of Austria were cut to pieces and given to several satellites to build new and so-called independent governments.

To show the connection between the political life of a nation, and its economic and financial life, we have a very excellent illustration in the fall of the Bank of Vienna, the Credit Anstalter. It got into trouble in 1931. France had joined the Credit Anstalter in financing the Little Entente. The Bank of Vienna asked the French Government, through the Bank of France, which was, of course, a political bank, for a loan of $20,000,000, and the Austrian Ambassador was told that the Credit Anstalter could have the money provided it complied with the terms, namely, that the Austrian Government must not make a tariff agreement with Germany. The Austrian Government thought that was going a little too far. At that time England, playing the balance of power as usual, although having a treaty of peace with France, was playing the other side of the game, and through the Bank of England loaned $20,000,000 to the Credit Anstalter Bank. As a result the Bank of France called several hundred million dollars of call loans in what is called the City, that is the financial district of London, as a punitive action because England in engaging politically in handling the loans, had interfered with the policy of France.

It spoiled a very interesting vacation for me because I had been invited to come in August to Scotland and visit Ramsay MacDonald when Parliament adjourned, and I had promised to do so. But, in the meantime this financial battle over political matters which had precipitated this crisis, precipitated also another crisis, which was a political one, in England. The Parliament overthrew the cabinet. It was called back into session, formed a new coalition cabinet, and forced England off the gold standard. It was all based on political action as the result of previous economic action growing out of the Treaty of Versailles.

Why do I call this to the attention of the Senate? Because it is typical of what took place down through the ages after peace treaties had been signed. Of course, Uncle Sam gets the blame. Up until that time Uncle Sam had been called "Uncle Shylock," and when we could not make any more loans they called him "welsher." The tragedy is that so many of his children have also called him "welsher."

I call attention to the political aspects of the so-called World Court of the League of Nations which was created to settle by judicial action international controversies. The tariff action of Germany and Austria was finally sent to the Court. Every judge which England controlled voted for it; every judge which France controlled voted against it, and France won by one vote, and the newspapers very voluminously hinted that there had been bribery of the judges. So it became plain it was a political Court. Before the decision was made—I mentioned this matter the other day but I do so now to keep the record consecutive in this regard—Judge Loder, who wrote the constitution for the League of Nations Court and was its first president, resigned from the Court. I spent a good deal of time with him in Holland. I asked him why he resigned, and he said, "I tried to make it a judicial tribunal, and I could not do so. It is a political Court." He said, "There is not a magistrate on that Court. It is a political Court." He said, "The Court has taken jurisdiction of the German Anschluss, the tariff agreement between Germany and Austria." He said "That is a political question. The Court has no business taking jurisdiction of that." He told me that before the decision was made, but they had just taken jurisdiction.

I said to him, "Can you tell me what kind of a case can come to this League of Nations Court which cannot be taken to the Court of Arbitration at the Hague, of which the United States is a member?" He replied, "I cannot think of any kind of a case that cannot be taken there. Any nation that wants to settle a difference can go there, two or three or more can settle differences by going there and resorting to arbitration, freely, willingly, and voluntarily, but the trouble is they do not want to settle their controversies peacefully, they do not want them settled at all until the time comes when the condition gets so bad that the bubble bursts, and then they settle the controversies politically, by force."

While this situation was being built up in the Little Entente—and how it affected Austria I have explained—English and French bankers and munition makers were financing Hitler, building armaments for Hitler. Of course, they were interested in French and English armament plants, but they financed Hitler, joined with industrialists of Germany, the economic power of industry, the international monopoly, the international cartels. They joined together to make some money out of rearming Germany, and they made these loans with the consent of their own governments. These institutions do not make foreign investments or loans without the consent of the governments, and in this case the governments must have known that they were arming Germany. Uncle Sam gets the blame for that, too.

Morgan floated a loan of $100,000,000 in the United States to set Mussolini up in business, with the consent of the Government of the United States. When I say "consent," perhaps that is not just accurate. When loans are made, the bankers consult the State Department, and the State Department says, "We can see no objection." That is really giving consent. Instead of saying "Yes," they say, "We do not know of any reason why we should say 'No.'" Here was international capitalism acting under the noses of governments who were pledged to peace, being made pawns by international cartels, the steel industry, the electrical industry, and the like.

I am reminded of a story an old sailor told me. His name was Andrew Furuseth, a man with one of the finest minds with which I have come in contact in my life. His bust is now in the Department of Labor.

Andrew Furuseth said that many years ago he took a trip to Alaska, and while he was there he bought from an Indian squaw a tobacco pouch. He said that she had made it out of the skin of an unborn seal, and had sewn beads on it so that it was quite beautiful. Around the top was a string of beads. He said it was so beautiful that he wanted it and bought it. He took it to San Francisco, and he considered it such a treasure that he wanted to preserve it, so he put it in an old chest. Then he went to sea, and was gone for 5 months. When he returned and opened the chest to get out some papers, to his surprise in the bottom of the chest he saw a pile of dust, and in different directions from the pile of dust were empty maggot skins. He could not understand how they got there. He said, "I took a match and scratched in the dust, and there found the beads that had been on my tobacco pouch. The idea came to me that I bought the pouch to carry tobacco in it, but I did not use it for the purpose for which it was created. The larvae were there; they came to life; they were hungry; they had a complete monopoly of this tobacco pouch. They could produce nothing to eat, but they were monopolists; they had everything under their control except food; so they started to eat, and the only thing they could eat was the tobacco pouch."

Mr. Furuseth continued, "I am sure that if while they were eating that pouch I had come along and asked them what they were doing, they would have said, 'We are here to preserve and defend and protect the tobacco pouch.' They protected and defended it until there was nothing left of it except the beads, which they would not eat, as reminders to whoever should find them as to what becomes of tobacco pouches when they are not used for the purpose for which they are created, when they are turned over to the maggots and given into their control." He continued, "That applies to governments, civilizations, and nations. Archeologists all over the world are digging down under the dust, finding ruins of cities, left just as warnings to succeeding generations that they shall be destroyed if they do not remain true to the purpose for which they were created." I say, therefore, that these international cartels, international banking houses, playing the economic game and subjecting the sovereignty of nations to their own selfish gain, are the maggots in the governmental tobacco pouch, which no government has been willing to control.

Of course, these international bankers and industrialists make money out of war. Why should they be for peace? Their newspapers talk peace in order to get war. War is always made in the name of peace. Those who write the peace have always been the war makers.

While these international banking houses were financing Mussolini and

Hitler, all these countries had their own war lords in China financing groups and armies in order to have a foothold and a preemption right to certain portions of China if and when the international politicians could be gotten together, whenever the financial war lords at home were ready to crack the whip and divide China. While they were talking peace and sending missionaries with Bibles to China, they had their war lords there to exploit the Chinese. There are a thousand million individuals in exploited areas of Asia in revolt against the white race because of 150 or 200 years of economic exploitation and pressure. There is revolt, and the end is not yet in sight.

After the crash in 1931 these international forces started immediately to see the political consequences of their economic peace, so they begin to form all kinds of peace societies and peace organizations to keep the peace between nations, such as the Locarno Pact, and the like. Seldom a week passed in Europe but there was some new peace agreement formed between certain nations. For instance, there was one at Stresa, which I mentioned a few days ago. Mussolini complained to Flandin and Laval that Italy had remembered that she had not been paid for her activity in the last war, so she was given a tip to go in and take Ethiopia, and when the consequences of that move became apparent, the Labor Party of England, and the Liberal Party, who controlled most of the papers, started an attack upon the Government. The British Government had to double-cross Italy and send the fleet to the Mediterranean, and that won them the reelection. Laval publicly charged the British Government with "welshing" on their agreement to win the reelection. There was not any trouble when Mussolini took Ethiopia.

That was the result of a "treaty of peace."

Then there was the case of Japan and Manchuria. Under the treaty of 1920 Japan was compelled to give Shantung back, so she went into Manchuria. Appeal was made to the League of Nations. Stimson, our Secretary of State, asked the League to come and protect the integrity of China, as it was pledged to do under the League of Nations, but the League did not come. It sent a committee to investigate. The saying is that when the devil wants nothing to happen, he always appoints a committee.

Uncle Sam has been blamed for killing the League of Nations when the Senate repudiated the Treaty of Versailles.

The representative of China, Mr. Soong, was quoted in the press as having made a speech some time ago in New York in which he stated who killed the League of Nations. He said it was killed at the time of the Manchurian incident by the two great powers who controlled the League of Nations. Those nations could have been none other than England and France. It was not economically or politically to their interests to keep their pledge, as they did not keep their pledge after they gave a tip to Mussolini to take Ethiopia. But Uncle Sam gets the blame. Politicians make speeches pouring verbal vitriol on American citizens, and Uncle Sam is blamed for the chaotic economic and political conditions resulting from the Treaty of Versailles.

Mr. President, I have enumerated a few political results arising from the economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles. I am sure it was not necessary to do so, but I shall mention another incident of like character. I said France established and armed and financed the Little Entente. Czechoslovakia was one of the nations composing the Little Entente. In 1938 I asked one of the best informed statesmen of Europe, "When is war going to begin?" He said, "It will not be this year.". I said, "Well, what about Czechoslovakia?" He said, "No one has any sympathy for the Czechs." I said, "Why?" He said, "Look at their record." He said, "When they were under Austrian rule the Austrians rode them boot and spur, and the Czechs did not like it, and I do not blame them. When the war came they were forced into the army to fight Russia, and they deserted by brigades. They fought against Austria." He said, "I do not blame them for that. At the peace treaty," he said further, "the Czechs had to be paid, and that was all right. And to reward them for their help to the Allies, a part of Germany, containing 3,000,000 German inhabitants, was cut off and given to the Czechs; a part of Hungary, containing something like a million inhabitants, was cut from Hungary and given to the Czechs; a part of Poland, containing something like 800,000 inhabitants, was cut off from Poland and given to the Czechs. And the Czechs were also given a lot of Slovaks." He said, "At the time the Treaty of Versailles was drafted the promise was made that these various peoples would be given the local cantonment system of government such as exists in Switzerland, but that has not been done." He said, "The Czechs have in their turn ridden these peoples boot and spur, as they were formerly ridden by the Austrians, and," he said, "these people are ready to revolt."

That, Mr. President, was early in the summer. He further said, "I understand England has Runciman over there to examine the question, find out just what can be done." A little later some of our people who had traveled quite a bit through Europe told me, "We understand that Runciman is going to report to Britain that there is danger that all these people will be in revolt, and we understand that an agreement has been reached; that the Sudeten Germans are to go back to Germany, because the Czechs cannot hold them, and England and France will not fight to keep them there."

That, Mr. President, was what I was told before the crisis. The crisis came. France had guaranteed the integrity of Czechoslovakia and promised to come to her aid in case she was attacked, and England had a treaty with France which provided that if one went to war the other would go along. So if there were an attack made upon Czechoslovakia, of course, France was expected to keep her pledge.

Litvinov at that time spoke before the League of Nations and called attention to the fact that just before the crisis was precipitated Czechoslovakia had asked Russia if she would keep her pledge in case Czechoslovakia was attacked, and he announced that Russia had said, "Our pledge will be kept." Russia was the only nation that promised to keep its pledge.

Another way out was found, so the Munich Conference took place, and it is interesting to note that Russia was not asked to be present, although she had signed a treaty. She was not asked to come to Munich. The upshot was that these people who had been incorporated into Czechoslovakia were so dissatisfied with being under the Czechs that they were given a plebiscite, and if they did not want to stay they could vote accordingly. Whether that was right or wrong is another matter; at any rate, they voted to get out. I am simply explaining how these things come back to pester the nations.

Mr. President, Czechoslovakia, which was a small country, contained a large ammunition plant financed by France and had $100,000,000 in the bank. Hitler went in and took it all later, like any other highway robber. There were in existence agreements for peace, such as the Locarno agreement, providing for the use of the police force which was in the background to enforce a peace which in its economic consequences was bound to create confusion, economic collapse, and the wreckage of social, financial, and political institutions, and lay the ground for revolution of one kind or another, a condition of which Hitler could take advantage, as well as Mussolini or anyone else who promised relief to a people who were hungry and lacked employment.

Mr. President, I was in Germany in 1931. The Socialists and the Communists were shooting each other in the streets. That was personal warfare on account of political differences of opinion. But what gave Hitler his power was unemployment and hunger, and by changing a few phrases he made the Communists believe that he had the same idealogy, only that he used a different language to express it. So the Nazi Party which he had formed got most of the Communists in Germany to join. They called it a Fascist revolution. Of course, being one of force, it was cruel, unjust, unmerciful. As a result of the Treaty of Versailles the Weimar republic was wiped out.

Mr. President, we sent some of our bankers to England and they framed the Dawes plan and the Young plan to raise some more money to pay reparations. When the Dawes plan was announced I was scolded in the press because I said it is a "gold brick loaded with dynamite," and that it is going to blow up and drive the United States into greater financial difficulty than we are already in. That was in 1924.

Then came the Young plan. Here was economic action with the consent of governments. Permission was given to

float the Young and Dawes plans bonds in this country. As usual, Uncle Sam had to pay the price.

I have called these things to the attention of the Senate because, though it may not be necessary to do so, I wanted it for the RECORD to show that the dishonesty exhibited by statesmen, politicians, the Metternichs of history, in making the most vile thing look beautiful in the name of peace.

So when the Senate comes to consider a peace treaty at the end of this war, if we want to do something good for the world, I do not think it is so necessary to provide a police force to make it effective as it is to insist upon a just and honorable peace so that all people of all nations can live together and have something to eat and have work, rather than impose a punitive peace which so many persons advocate. After all, when the war is over it is time to talk about peace, and we should not permit the carrying on of the previous system of economic exploitations through political power, backed by the police power and the army, because in the long run it will simply be the cause of the next war.

Mr. President, I have been thinking that since our Secretary of State went to Russia we have had nothing but newspaper reports concerning the things that were done there. Here is the Senate of the United States, a coordinate body to the making of treaties with the Chief Executive, which is being asked to sign a blank check based on some newspaper reports, on the basis of some laudable thing we wish to do toward permanent peace. I do not like to sign blank checks. When the time comes and we know what the treaty is, what we have to sign, then we can find out whether we can afford to sign it or not. I do not find any fault with anyone who disagrees with that point of view.

Mr. President, it is almost fantastic to suppose that this body can be called upon to engage and bind in solemn language any future government of the United States on the strength of a few telegrams from Moscow, and almost before the Secretary of State has left Russian soil. The very least that Members of this body have a right to expect is that the responsible subordinate of the Executive, the Secretary of State, dealing with foreign affairs, should appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and make a report on what he learned, and give the Senate of the United States, before it acts on such an important question, some idea as to where our consent to a matter of this kind will lead us.

Of course, I have always taken the view that no Senate or Congress could bind a future Senate or a future Congress. But, as has been pointed out, we have new systems of legislation—legislation by Executive orders. Over 3,500 have been issued in the last 10 years, and 80 percent of them before we entered the war. Thus, we have legislation by Presidential decree. It is said that will not do. To show whether it will do, let me observe that after the President signed the bill relating to the fixing of prices on farm commodities, the Office of Price Administration fixed the prices of farm products with entire disregard to the act of Congress. When we had Mr. Henderson appear before our committee, he brought with him Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Wickard. They were asked—in fact, I asked them; it is a matter of record—where they got authority to disregard an act of Congress in fixing farm prices. They said, "Well, we have higher authority."

They were asked, "Where from?"

They replied, "From an Executive order."

I asked, "Where does the President get authority to nullify an act of Congress by Executive order?"

Mr. Byrnes, who had been a member of the Supreme Court said, "We are the administrators. It is not for us to question the President's authority." He said, "The Attorney General approved the order, and that is enough for us."

I asked, "May we have a copy of the opinion of the Attorney General?"

He said, "I do not know whether he wrote an opinion." He said, "He does not have to."

Now we have executive agreements which in foreign affairs operate very much in the same way that Executive orders are operating in domestic affairs.

So, Mr. President, before the Senate signs anything—I say this with all due respect to those who do not agree with me—I think it should know from the Secretary of State on what basis the Moscow agreement, whatever it is, was founded, and what it is, before we take any action, if we should take it now, or wait until the treaty is signed. Of course, Mr. President, the President has the only authority to negotiate, through his Secretary of State; and I have not heard that the President had asked the Senate for any advice. It seems almost presumptuous that at this time we should offer what is called advice to the President of the United States.

If the point be made that the resolution as it stood before the Moscow agreement paragraph was grafted onto it, was in fact in the hands of the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations for some weeks and was considered in various meetings of the subcommittee. I have no doubt that the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] labored very earnestly; of course, I have no fault to find. It was not necessary to have a hearing so long as the resolution came before the Senate for discussion, but I think a matter of this kind should have had some discussion in committee. When the Senators who opposed the original resolution appeared before the committee and offered another resolution in place of it, I called attention to the fact that no stenographer was present. I think a record should have been made of the proceedings which were had at that time. The Senators who proposed the substitute resolution spoke earnestly and eloquently, and that was the only discussion I heard in the committee.

The Seventy-eighth Congress has enacted a substantial amount of legislation and has expressed opinions on a number of important matters, but none more important than the present one, and I do not know of any matter on which we have less knowledge, because we cannot foretell the future. There is only one thing of which we feel sure, and that is that we are going to win the war, and that we shall have to write a treaty of peace. But when will the peace treaty be written? Perhaps it will not be written until 10 years from now. Although the war may cease, no treaty of peace may come to the Senate for 10 or 15 years. The Chief Executive does not have to send any treaty to the Senate until he is ready to do so. If we are going to police the world and to keep peoples in subjection, there can be no peace, and therefore there can be no peace treaty.

Nothing with which this Congress has dealt approaches in importance the subject matter of the pending resolution in its significance for the life and welfare of the citizens of this country who now are living or those who are destined to be living during the rest of the present century. This body is asked to formulate and to declare the policy of the United States with respect to international association and cooperation and with respect to the maintenance of peace and security throughout the earth. On subjects of far less significance, on many occasions the Chief Executive has seen fit to come to the Capitol and address a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, or has seen fit to send at least a Cabinet member to notify some of the congressional committees in order that Congress might have some idea relative to what was taking place or what would take place. But this time, so far as I know, there has been no request by the President. There has been no enlightenment except from some newspaper stories.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was interested in the remarks the Senator made a few moments ago relative to the fact that up to the present time the Secretary of State, who was representing our Government at Moscow, has not returned to this country.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The only things we have to guide us as to what happened at Moscow are some releases which have been placed on our desks and some newspaper reports.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am wondering if we are "jumping the gun" a little in going ahead, as we say, and in advising

the executive department, as we do in the pending resolution. I am wondering if we are not "jumping the gun," because we are not waiting until the Secretary of State returns to this country. When the Secretary of State returns, he may come to the Senate and say, "Here is what has been done in Moscow." He may even ask us to ratify what has been done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. But for some reason or other that I am a little unable to understand, we are going away out in front and, in a sense, are ratifying as actions of our Government negotiations carried on by the Secretary of State before they have even been submitted to us by the formal action of the Secretary of State.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course. I should say that the Senator is eminently correct. If I have not made it clear that I agree with him, then my effort in speaking to the Senate has been in vain. I had not intended to make these remarks to the Senate; but when I found that an agreement had been entered into, I thought it was so important that it seemed to me I should express my view that the matter should go back to the Committee on Foreign Relations, there to await the arrival of Mr. Hull. It cannot be very long before he will return to this country. Of course, the war will end some day, and we shall have plenty of time to get Mr. Hull back here and to have him come before the committee and tell us what the agreement is all about. There will be plenty of time to do that before we have to write a treaty of peace.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am not at all criticizing anything the Senator has said. I have enjoyed every word he has given the Senate today, and I thought I had come to a conclusion about the same as that to which the Senator from Minnesota has come. If we await the return of Secretary Hull it may be that he will lay before us what he has done in Moscow, and he may ask us for ratification of it. That seems to me to be the proper parliamentary or congressional procedure. I do not say that in any spirit of criticism at all of what the Committee on Foreign Relations has done. I am ready to vote, and will vote, for the pending resolution; but if I had my way about the matter I would have the Senate wait until Secretary Hull returns to this country. I think the Senate could very well await the return of Secretary Hull; and we could expect that, under constitutional procedure, what has been done at Moscow would be laid before us for ratification.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And it might then be that we could ratify it in good conscience.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Now we go blindly. We do not know what it is, and we do not know what effect it will have. Some persons will say, "Well, the Senate promised this and promised that." Others will say, "Well, of course, the Senate did not know what it was doing." Others will say, "The Senate cannot bind future Senates," and so forth. All that only adds to the confusion.

It was suggested that there should be no debate or controversy in the Senate on this question. When matters of this character are brought before the Senate, or before any other legislative body, it cannot be expected that they will not be discussed, debated, and probed, if we keep in mind from time to time our oaths under the Constitution. We have some responsibility which we cannot delegate. We cannot shift the responsibility which each Senator must discharge according to his best judgment and conscience. But our function should be exercised only after we have exhausted the best possible sources of information.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I call attention to the statement by Felix Morley, in the Wall Street Journal, in which he says:

> President Roosevelt's optimism in regard to the Moscow Conference has been justified by publication of its declarations and covering statement. These exorcise the specter of a separate Russo-German peace. Beyond this they lay foundations for a functioning international organization in the shape of the permanent European advisory commission to be established in London.
>
> The achievement is certainly as much as could be expected from a political conference held while the outcome of the war still hangs in the balance. It is far more of an accomplishment than was generally anticipated.

He further states:

> For those with a sense of history the Four-Power Declaration at Moscow evokes memories of the promising start made by the quadruple alliance of Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia which eventually overcame Napoleon. This "concert of Europe" designed "to guarantee Europe from dangers by which she may still be menaced" was cemented by formal treaty after the Congress of Vienna. Only gradually did it become clear that the primary purpose of some of its participants was to repress the rising forces of democracy and nationalism, so greatly stimulated by the French Revolution and Napoleon's consolidation of German and Italian principalities.
>
> Against this purpose, as it clarified, the public opinion of Great Britain rose in protest. Englishmen were then as dubious of the desirability of international policing as are many Americans today. The result was that England eventually dealt the deathblow to the quadruple alliance, at its fourth formal congress, held at Verona 7 years after the Battle of Waterloo.

I call attention to this because of the great clamor, "This is the thing we want. It will do this, and it will do that." As the Senator says, we do not know the details of what took place. All we have are the headlines in the newspapers, and only a bare outline. Many persons say, "We must approve what took place."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We do not know how much of what we read in the newspapers is true.

Mr. WHEELER. We do not know any of the details. We do not know anything about it; and yet there is a clamor in the press for immediate approval, before we know what the facts are or what the intentions of the parties are, or whether or not they agreed to anything with reference to the post-war world except as to Italy and Austria. We do not even know the details with reference to that agreement. We do not know whether anything was done with respect to Poland, or any of the other countries.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator. The Senator recalled to my mind a very interesting thing when he mentioned the Treaty of Vienna. The treaty became the Second Treaty of Paris. It will be remembered that when the Congress of Vienna was in session Napoleon came back from Elba. That adjourned the congress; but the result of that congress was fixed later in the Second Treaty of Paris.

The interesting thing in that connection was the negotiation between Castlereagh, Metternich, and Alexander the First, who, according to history, was a very idealistic man.

In the letters which Pitt wrote to Castlereagh, his agent at the time, he told him how to win the assistance of Alexander the First by playing upon his liberalistic tendencies and love of humanity. He has a reputation for being very idealistic. It is even believed by some that he abdicated his power and sought seclusion because of disappointment. Pitt bluntly wrote to Castlereagh just how to manipulate his remarks and his treatment in order to get Alexander the First to "come across" with certain things which Pitt wanted to have done. The correspondence reveals the sarcasm and humor in which Pitt indulged in framing Alexander. They were allies, of course.

Mr. President, if I may proceed, I shall be through in a few minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The other day the Senator spoke about what the Treaty of Versailles did to Austria, by setting up the city of Vienna without any territory around it by which it could live economically. I think we all recognize Felix Morley is a very learned gentleman and also a student of world affairs. He is the president of Haverford College. He says:

> As a step toward the overthrow of Hitler and the complete elimination of the Nazi organization, the separation of Germany and Austria can, of course, be wholly justified. But to decree this as a permanency would be like saying that the Baltic States must never be reunited with Russia, which the Moscow conference definitely did not proclaim.
>
> A popular union of the German and Austrian Republics, if it had not been expressly prohibited by the Treaty of Versailles, might well have strengthened the forces of democracy in both those countries and thereby averted the rise of Hitler. Only the threat of military force was able to prevent that natu-

ral union after the last war, and it is quite possible that only military force, British, Russian, or American would be able to prevent it again at some future date.

Certainly all who know anything of the dreadful difficulties which confronted the topheavy Viennese republic after the last war will be baffled by the assertion of the Moscow declaration that through independence pauperized Austria will be able "to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace."

As I said the other day, frankly I was for the League of Nations until I went to Europe in 1923. I visited every country in Europe, including Russia. When I found that it was intended by the League of Nations to fasten upon Europe the status quo of many of those nations which could not possibly live from an economic standpoint—particularly Austria—it became very clear to me that so far as I was concerned I was not going to agree to a League of Nations which pauperized the peoples of various countries. In a day of mass production it seemed to me perfectly idiotic to cut them up and then set up quotas and tariff barriers around each one of those countries. That is why I stated the other day that in my judgment, if we are to have peace in Europe, we must arrange at least an economic union of those countries so that they can exist from an economic standpoint. If we do not do that, and put ourselves on record as favoring countries, we shall not have peace in Europe. Eventually no army, no navy, or any other force can keep starving people from going to war for the things they must have.

So when we talk about what we are going to do with the Lague of Nations, or with a resolution before the Senate, it seems to me preposterous for us to say that we will agree to such an arrangement before we know what is going to happen to those countries in Europe. It is proposed that we commit ourselves and put ourselves on record as favoring something when we do not know what the facts will be.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator. Earlier in my remarks I asked to have the article of Felix Morley placed in the RECORD. I should like to have the article printed in full in the body of the RECORD, including the portion which the Senator read.

Mr. WHEELER. I think it should be printed in full. I think it deserves to be read by every thinking person.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I agree with the Senator. It is a very logical argument and statement from a man whose judgment and knowledge are entitled to the respect of every Senator. He has a profound knowledge of matters of this character, and his integrity is unquestioned.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has such a magnificent grasp of history that I should like to carry just a little further the theme which he so ably pursued a while ago, to the effect that the principal powers of the League of Nations themselves daggered the League of Nations into impotence.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If I may interrupt the Senator, as I stated, the Chinese Ambassador, in a speech which he made in New York, said that the League of Nations was killed by the two great powers which controlled it. They did not come to the assistance of China, which was a signatory to the League, in the Manchurian incident because, he said, they did not think it was necessary to their own safety.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Chinese Ambassador is a good authority.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very fearful that this orgy of penitential self-flagellation in which the Senate has been indulging, unless completely answered as the Senator is answering it on the floor of the Senate, will strike us in the face again and again as an admission of this country's guilt for this war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We are already being charged with guilt for this war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In addition to the incidents which the Senator has mentioned—Manchukuo, Ethiopia, and the scuttling of the proposed anchluss between Germany and Austria—let me ask the Senator whether it is not equally true that through the actions of the principal powers in the League of Nations Germany was permitted to rearm.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not equally true that she was permitted to occupy the Rhineland?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; with the agreement of England and France, and with the aid of their financing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not equally true that at each stage in the development of the impotency of the League of Nations the principal powers of the League of Nations had adequate power to assure the proclaimed objects of the League?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator will permit, I will ask him one more question. Despite all the talk that we have heard to the effect that our failure to go into the League of Nations caused its collapse, has the Senator ever heard or seen a demonstration, or an attempted demonstration, of the proposition that had we been in the League of Nations we would have been able to prevent any single one of the successive steps which the Senator has outlined, and which led to the collapse of the League?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I would advise the Senator in answer to his question, to refer that query to the people who blame us for being in this war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have not heard it demonstrated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It cannot be demonstrated.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder whether the Senator, with his enormous knowledge of history and familiarity with these matters, has ever seen or heard such a demonstration.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I would answer a question like that by asking another question of the questioner.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall do my best to answer it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I would ask him what would have happened if we had stuck to our neutrality and kept out of World War No. 1.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If we had done that we would have stayed out of World War No. 1.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And perhaps World War No. 2. As a matter of fact, some English statesmen have reproached the United States for coming into the war. They have said that it lengthened the war, and that if we had not come into the war it would not have lasted so long, that there would have been a negotiated peace, and that Europe would be in far better shape than it now is as a result of our entering the war and prolonging it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator agree with me that when the League of Nations covenant was first presented to the Senate perhaps 90 percent of the vocal opinion of the United States favored it?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But that during the debate in the Senate, and during the debate on the hustings in the campaign of 1920, the high peak of vocal opinion rapidly declined until the people—not the Senate—repudiated the League of Nations in the election of November 1920?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator is correct. The people are always right if and when they are given the facts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, it dawned upon the people, as it certainly dawned upon the Senate, that there was an armed coalition under article 10 to keep the peace by force, and when the Senate and the American people discovered that it was a politically armed force of an association of nations to enforce the Treaty of Versailles, and when they found out what the Treaty of Versailles provided, they refused to allow the United States to be used to enforce a treaty which every statesman in every country since has denounced as being unjust and dishonorable and full of seeds for another war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REVERCOMB in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true that there was also a strong segment of opinion in the Senate, and certainly in the country, to the effect that under the

League as proposed there were very unfair voting discriminations against the United States?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course. The British Empire had six votes to our one.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And that the League as set up was an instrument for preserving the status quo?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Or for preserving the plunder of powerful nations?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And for repressing the efforts of nations seeking liberty? Is that not correct?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. There was even a refusal of an amendment offered at the peace treaty to abolish human slavery. It was voted down.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true that under the development of the debate in the Senate, and upon the hustings, the people became alarmed for fear that the proposed instrument had within it the power of committing our soldiers to war without the consent of Congress?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is true.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for allowing me to interrupt him.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator for the interruption and valuable contribution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I will yield in just a moment.

I wish to express my appreciation to all Senators who fought that battle, among whom none was more eloquent, more brave, or more patriotic than our colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. The service which he, as well as other Senators, rendered to the United States in the debate on the Versailles Treaty is entitled to be, and will be, permanently spread upon the pages of history. People of all nations will some day learn what is the cause of war, and when they know its cause they will remove it. Then there can be eternal peace. Until the cause of war is removed there will be eternal peace and democracy only in one place—namely, in the cemetery. There is equality; there is peace. But so long as human beings are merely human beings, and must so remain until further notice—God help us—we shall have economic action and political action as a result of economic exploitation, and we shall have struggle and war. It is too bad, but that is history.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the interest of accuracy, I do not think it is altogether fair to say that the result of the election in 1920 was due entirely to the issue of the League of Nations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we may look to Britain, where Lloyd George lost power; we may look to France, where Clemenceau lost power; and we may look to Italy, where Orlando lost power. We could even look to Germany, where the Kaiser fled from the throne. We saw the Romanoffs put off the throne during the Russian Revolution. Indeed, the election of a few days ago is an illustration of what I am saying—namely, because of something inherent in human nature, the party, or the group, or the government which conducts a war is seldom popular and is seldom maintained in office after the war is over. I do not believe—and I say this without disputing the importance of the issue in the 1920 campaign—that it would be fair to state that solely on the issue of the League of Nations the American people repudiated the war administration and put into office another. I merely make that statement in the interest of accuracy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad to have the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland in connection with my remarks. I did not say it was "altogether" due to the issue of the League of Nations that the result was as it was in November 1920.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Colorado is always very accurate. I know he did not make the statement which I may have seemed to have attributed to him, but an inference was left which I knew he did not intend be drawn from his remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad the Senator from Maryland made his statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The issue of the League of Nations certainly was a contributing cause. One of the reasons why we read so much propaganda at the present time in some of the international press, and hear it from others who are internationally minded, for the Senate to take action now is the fact that they fear that when the peace treaty is written, and the people know what the details of it are, and what will be done to the various countries in the world, they cannot then get the Congress of the United States and the people of this country committed to an international policy, even though it be one which will do justice to the various countries of the world.

That is why propaganda is coming out of New York and from various international groups. They want to commit us now, before we have the facts.

If in the next campaign the Democrats or the Republicans are afraid to meet the issue, they will make a very serious mistake. If we get the idea for one moment, either on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle, that the people of this country are internationally minded, and that they think more of Europe than they do of the United States, we shall have a sad awakening when election time comes around.

Something has been said about isolationists. I wish to say that if by the word "isalationism" various groups in New York, and internationalists generally, mean that we tried to keep out of war, that we were for America first before we were for some other country, if that is the interpretation they place upon the term "isolationist," then I say that to be called an isolationist after this war is over will be a badge of honor.

These cheap small-minded internationalists who are trying to solve all the problems of the world and saying, "To hell with the United States," will wake up and find that they are the ones who will be looked down upon.

So far as I am concerned, I repeat what I have said before on this floor. Someone rises and talks about isolationism, and reference was made to Secretary Hull a few days ago having made a statement about that subject. The newspapers in New York carried a story to the effect that he had reprimanded the isolationists. Among them he included, of course, the President of the United States and Mr. Willkie, because he said they vied with one another. Why do they vie with one another? It is because they know that the overwhelming sentiment of this country is for keeping out of war. Of course, they wanted to be elected, and they vied with one another for popular support at that time. The overwhelming sentiment after the present war will be to keep this country away and out of international embroilments.

Someone has said that we voted for war. Certainly we did, because we were attacked. But the overwhelming sentiment of this country was against our getting into this war, and when Mr. Hull says that the isolationists did not want us to get into the war, I say that if we would mind our own business and take care of this country, and not try to meddle in every other country's business, we would be less apt to get into war than we were before. So far as I am concerned, if anyone wants to make that an issue with me, he is welcome to do so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am not sure that the Senator quoted Secretary Hull correctly. Did he say they vied with each other time and again?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. During the course of the many remarks which have been made during the debate in defense of the League of Nations as submitted to the Senate, I noted one very significant omission. Those who are using the honored sepulcher of Woodrow Wilson as a "wailing wall" have neglected to point out that the basis of his view for a successful association of nations was that the world had to be made "safe for democracy." We Republicans had much sport with that phrase of President Wilson, but what he was telling us was that

the existence of any powerful dictatorship holds the potentiality of war. When we get to talking about permanent peace, and when we get to indulging in evangelical fervor over permanent peace, I invite the followers of Woodrow Wilson to come back to his own doctrine, that to have a successful organization in permanent world peace, we have to make the world safe for democracy. A glance at the composition of the Allied Nations will make my point abundantly clear.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator. I think it has been quite generally understood that the American people would always welcome a real association of nations to keep the peace, if such a thing were possible.

Before we heard of the League of Nations, eminent men in the United States were advocating an association of nations to keep the peace. The trouble was that when the Senate found that this association of nations, or league of nations, was to be used to enforce the Treaty of Versailles, when they found what that treaty was and what it meant, there was an entirely different picture of the League of Nations. That was not the kind of a league of nations the American people wanted.

Woodrow Wilson having been repudiated in everything at Versailles except as to an association of nations to keep the peace, he made a mistake in remaining there; he should have returned. It has been said it was an American idea to have the League of Nations. Perhaps it was, but the record of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, as printed, shows that when the President returned from Paris, there was a meeting at the White House between the President and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President was asked where he got the idea of a league of nations. The first copy, he said, was from Lord Fillmore, the First Secretary of the Foreign Office of Great Britain, and the second copy was from Jan Smuts, and out of the two drafts was evolved the League of Nations Covenant.

President Wilson was not only repudiated in all the idealistic programs he presented but he was handed a program for an association of nations, based upon force, to enforce the Treaty of Versailles, and when he tried to force that upon the American people, I think he made a sad mistake, undoubtedly with good intentions and in good faith.

We are told that we double-crossed and repudiated Wilson. The Allied and Associated Powers who joined in the peace treaty repudiated every principle and every idea Wilson had advanced, and put the world in chains for continued exploitation, and of course, as with other treaties of that character in the past, the Treaty of Versailles blew up, and the stage was set for another war.

If I may continue, I shall conclude in a few moments. I do appreciate the contributions Senators have made.

Any attempt to foreclose the discussion of the foreign policy of this country by a measure such as we now have before us is a challenge to each Member of this body. It is a challenge not merely to the reason and judgment of each Member, but to his conscience and his sense of self-respect and of reverence for the sanctions which he invoked when he took his oath of office. He swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and he pledged his will and his intelligence to sustain the life and vigor of the Constitution so as to safeguard the untrammeled and unmortgaged liberty of the people of this country. I refer to political mortgages. We have already mortgaged them financially.

It is a challenge which can be met honorably and without in any sense whatever jeopardizing the conduct of the war against Germany and Japan if each Member of this body will cooperate in protecting the constitutionally established rights and obligations of the Senate.

If the Senate cannot see its way clear to wait until the Secretary of State has returned to Washington and has testified before the Foreign Relations Committee, or, better still, in an executive session of the entire Senate, with respect to the matters properly pertinent to the consideration of this resolution, then at least it should see to it that the resolution carries with it no embroidery of implication. The world should be put definitely upon notice that no Executive arrangements, agreements, or expressions of view can possibly produce the effect of binding the United States until there have been submitted to the Senate some tangible and concrete proposals, which other responsible governments have prepared themselves to regard as binding commitments if and when ratified by the United States and by themselves, proposals submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and the formally established practice of this body.

It is not a question now whether any one of us in the Senate may have a majority of his colleagues adhere to the point of view which he regards as soundest with respect to the principles of foreign policy.

I know there are the votes to adopt the resolution today, if the Senate decides to do so. I am merely asking that we wait until Secretary Hull returns, in order that we may have the benefit of his knowledge and his judgment.

The question is rather one of our willingness to look squarely in the face the responsibilities which rest upon us in consequence of our oaths of office. Those responsibilities involve our willingness to have the subject of foreign policy squarely and openly debated on this floor. When the issue has been settled fairly and openly here, those whose views have not prevailed may bitterly regret it and may feel that the majority have made a great mistake. But at least the subject will have been dealt with here. That is all I seek to accomplish, that we get the facts from the Secretary of State, and bring the subject up and debate it, and take the consequences, no matter what the vote may be.

It is not important to decide this matter at this time. In my opinion, the disposition that should be made of the resolution at this time would be to refer the whole matter back to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and await the arrival of the Secretary of State from his trip to Russia. The committee would then be favored with his views and a statement of the facts, so vital to action of the character we are asked to take. For the Senate to act otherwise is a move contrary to good practice, good legislation, and good policy.

Mr. President, the whole world is put on notice that the Moscow agreement has been made. We have had some kind of report of it in the newspapers. The Senate of the United States, however, is asked to take precipitate action on the basis of newspaper reports, to make the Moscow Declaration an official document of the Senate, without awaiting the benefit of the judgment and knowledge of the Secretary of State, who has been in Russia negotiating the agreement. It would seem that it could almost be said that the Senate had no respect for the Secretary's views if we were to do what we are now asked to do.

Mr. President, it is anticipated the war will continue for some time—how long we cannot say at this time, but certainly it will last long enough for us patiently to await the return of the Secretary of State so that we may have the benefit of his knowledge of the decisions arrrived at in the conference, rather than adopt a resolution as the Senate's policy on the basis of newspaper reports from Moscow. The only information we have at all with respect to what may have been one of the most important conferences in American history is based on newspaper reports. We ought to have exact knowledge before we act.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE MAY HAVE RESERVATIONS REGARDING MOSCOW DECLARATION ON POST-WAR INDEPENDENCE OF AUSTRIA

(By Felix Morley)

President Roosevelt's optimism in regard to the Moscow Conference has been justified by publication of its declarations and covering statement. These exorcise the specter of a separate Russo-German peace. Beyond this they lay foundations for a functioning international organization in the shape of the permanent European advisory commission to be established in London.

The achievement is certainly as much as could be expected from a political conference held while the outcome of the war still hangs in the balance. It is far more of an accomplishment than was generally anticipated. Because of earlier skepticism the greater popular tribute is now owing for the cooperative efforts without which there could have been no reconciliation of divergent national ambitions.

Abundant evidence of success, however, must not blind American eyes to the magnitude of the issues still unsolved, wholly aside from the fact that German resistance is by no means shattered and that Japan, 23 months after Pearl Harbor, has yielded only the more easily detachable fragments of her enormous conquests.

The Moscow Conference was the opening gambit of the epic chess game in which the major Allies seek attainment of a world securely organized for peace. To exaggerate the significance of this opening move would be to invite later disillusionment. To analyze its implications is to help in resolving difficulties ahead.

For those with a sense of history the Four-Power Declaration at Moscow evokes memories of the promising start made by the quadruple alliance of Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia which eventually overcame Napoleon. This concert of Europe, designed "to guarantee Europe from dangers by which she may still be menaced," was cemented by formal treaty after the Congress of Vienna. Only gradually did it become clear that the primary purpose of some of its participants was to repress the rising forces of democracy and nationalism, so greatly stimulated by the French Revolution and Napoleon's consolidation of German and Italian principalities.

Against this purpose, as it clarified, the public opinion of Great Britain rose in protest. Englishmen were then as dubious of the desirability of international policing as are many Americans today. The result was that England eventually dealt the death blow to the quadruple alliance, at its fourth formal congress, held at Verona 7 years after the Battle of Waterloo.

At the Verona Congress the French Government announced its intention to intervene in Spain in order to restore absolute monarchy in that country. Three members of the quadruple alliance approved the French request for moral support in this dubious venture. The British Government, however, instructed its delegate, the Duke of Wellington, to insist upon "a rigid abstinence from any interference in the internal affairs" of Spain. "Things are getting back to a wholesome state again," wrote Canning, then Foreign Secretary. "Every nation for itself and God for us all."

A year or so after this rupture, when Canning decided to support our own Monroe Doctrine against the wishes of the European concert, the collapse of the quadruple alliance became complete. "England," said the Foreign Secretary, "is under no obligation to interfere, or to assist in interfering, in the internal concerns of independent nations."

Today it is the United States which is doubtful, as was England a century and a quarter ago, as to the desirability of providing men and money for any permanent policing of Europe. Any parts of the Moscow Declarations which might have to be maintained indefinitely by force will, in consequence, be subjected to particular scrutiny in this country.

Close attention, in this connection, should focus upon the "Declaration on Austria."

This announces, in the names of "the governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America," that the German annexation of Austria, originally recognized by both Great Britain and the United States, is now regarded as "null and void." The clear intimation is that any future Austro-German union, regardless of the character of the governments in both countries, will be expressly prohibited by the future peace treaty, as it was by the Treaty of Versailles.

The political and economic reasons for a permanent separation of Austria and Germany are perhaps more clear today than was the case in 1919. In the future, as then, an independent Austria under continuous international surveillance could be made an impediment to German penetration in southeastern Europe. But whereas France and Italy stood to gain most from the previous prohibition of Anschluss, that policy would now give Russia opportunity to become dominant throughout the Balkan Peninsula.

As a step toward the overthrow of Hitler, and the complete elimination of the Nazi organization, the separation of Germany and Austria can, of course, be wholly justified. But to decree this as a permanency would be like saying that the Baltic States must never be reunited with Russia, which the Moscow Conference definitely did not proclaim.

A popular union of the German and Austrian republics, if it had not been expressly prohibited by the Treaty of Versailles, might well have strengthened the forces of democracy in both those countries and thereby averted the rise of Hitler. Only the threat of military force was able to prevent that natural union after the last war and it is quite possible that only military force, British, Russian, or American, would be able to prevent it again at some future date.

Certainly all who know anything of the dreadful difficulties which confronted the top-heavy Viennese Republic after the last war will be baffled by the assertion of the Moscow Declaration that through independence pauperized Austria will be able "to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace."

By a curious inaccuracy the declaration on Austria was proclaimed in the name of "the Government of the United States." As a former member of the Senate, which body must advise and consent, by a two-thirds majority, in the ratification of any treaty, Secretary Hull might well have avoided this slip.

For both Russia and Great Britain, where the power of the executive in the conduct of foreign affairs is practically unlimited, the Moscow declarations are to be regarded as announcements of governmental policy. But so far as the United States is concerned these declarations are more accurately statements of executive intent, subject to the closest Senate examination before any international obligation is established.

When the Moscow declarations are thus examined it is not improbable that there will be some reservations on the one pertaining to Austria. The reason is not because it permits the Nazis to argue that German surrender will mean dissolution of the Third Reich. Dr. Goebbels has already worked that propaganda overtime.

The Declaration of Austria needs Senate clarification because of its intimation that the German-speaking people are permanently to be kept apart by force, regardless of the form of government which may succeed the Nazis. And if some portion of that force is to be provided by American soldiers, the fact under our system of government must be understood by the Senate, in addition to the administration, in advance.

In 18[illegible] an earlier quadruple alliance failed because the English people refused to support continuous military intervention in order to maintain a dictatorial status quo in Europe. It would be the negation of statesmanship to ignore the moral implicit in that chapter of relatively recent history.

EXHIBIT 2

TERRITORIAL ACQUISITIONS OF THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS UNDER THE TREATIES SIGNED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE WORLD WAR [1]

A. TERRITORIES LOST BY GERMANY

Under the stipulations of the Treaty of Versailles Germany ceded to various European nations a considerable part of what formerly was Germany proper. She also lost a" of her colonies which were distributed among certain of the victorious nations under the mandatory system. The names of the territories acquired by the Allied and Associated Powers, their chief resources, and the number of square miles contained in them are as follows:

Territory ceded	Chief resources	Square miles
1. TO BRITISH EMPIRE		
German East Africa.	Rubber, copra, ivory, coffee, sisal, wax.	365,180
German Southwest Africa.	Diamonds, copper, guano, animal products.	322,450
Cameroon, part of.[3]	Palm oil, palm kernels, rubber, cocoa, coffee.	34,236
Togo, part of [3]	Palm oil, palm kernels, cocoa, kola nuts, cotton.	12,600
Kaiser Wilhelm's Land (New Guinea).	Cocoa, copra, coconuts, cattle, goats.	70,000
Bismarck Archipelago.[3]	Copra, cotton, coffee, rubber.	21,660
Nauru Island [3]	Phosphate, copra	8
Samoa Islands [3]	Copra, gold, shell, cocoa	4,100
Do	Copra, cacao, bananas	1,130
Total		831,364
2. TO FRANCE		
Alsace-Lorraine	Iron, coal, potash, salt, petroleum, grain, wine.	5,607
Saar Basin	Exploitation of coal only [4]	
Cameroon, part of	Tobacco, palm oil, rubber, cacao, ivory.	273,730
Togo, part of	Palm oil, coco, kola, rubber, copra.	21,893
Total		301,230
3. TO BELGIUM		
Moresnet (small area).		
Eupen and Malmedy.	Timber and various industries.	382
German East Africa, part of.	Copper, cotton, rubber, palm oil.	19,000
Total		19,382
4. TO POLAND		
Eastern Prussia, Posen, Upper Silesia.	Grain, lumber, mining, timber.	17,816
Memel [5]	Shipping, commerce	1,026
Danzig [6]	do	739
Total		19,581
5. TO PORTUGAL		
Kionga triangle		160
6. TO DENMARK		
North Schleswig	Agricultural products	1,542
7. TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA		
Upper Silesia, part of.	Mining (chiefly coal)	122

[1] References: The various treaties signed at the conclusion of the war of 1914-18 by the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, that is, the Treaties of Versailles (June 28, 1919), St. Germain (Sept. 10, 1919), Trianon (June 4, 1920), Neuilly (Nov. 27, 1919), and Lausanne (July 24, 1923), respectively. The Statesman's Year Books for 1914 and 1931. Bowman, I., The New World Problems in Political Geography, New York, Chicago, 1928. Wright, Q., Mandates Under the League of Nations, Chicago, 1930.

[2] Western Africa.

[3] Islands in the Pacific.

[4] The area is about 751 square miles with a population of 657,870. "The district at present is administered by a Commission of Five, appointed by the League of Nations. At the end of 15 years the people are to vote as to whether they desire (1) the continuance of the rule set up by the treaty, (2) union with France, or (3) union with Germany.

[5] Now part of Lithuania.

[6] A free city-state; but its foreign relations are conducted by Poland.

Territory ceded	Chief resources	Square miles
S. TO JAPAN		
Kiaochow (China)	Silk, coal, beans	200
Caroline, Marshall, Marianne, and Pelew islands.	Copra, sugar, cotton	960
Total		1,160

	Square miles
Germany's total loss of territory:	
1. Territory in Europe	27,112
2. Colonial territory	1,147,276
Grand total	1,174,388

B. THE DISSOLUTION OF THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE

Austria-Hungary prior to the World War comprised an area of more than 250,000 square miles with a population of 51,000,000. As a result of the war the dual monarchy was dissolved into various states. Austria at present consists of an area of 32,369 square miles with a population of less than 7,000,000; while Hungary now comprises 35,875 square miles with a population of about 8,000,000. The remainder of the territory of the empire was divided among the following states: Czechoslovakia (54,207 square miles); Rumania (51,650 square miles); Poland (30,767 square miles); Yugoslavia (49,033 square miles); and Italy (7,358 square miles).[7]

C. TERRITORIES LOST BY BULGARIA

Bulgaria's area prior to the signing of the Treaty of Neuilly was 47,750 square miles. Owing to her participation in the World War on the side of the Central Powers, Bulgaria suffered a territorial loss of a little over 7,000 square miles. Of these 6,059 square miles were lost to Greece and 961 square miles to Yugoslavia.

D. TERRITORIES LOST BY TURKEY

On August 10, 1920, the Allied and Associated Powers and Turkey signed at Sèvres, France, a treaty which, however, Turkey refused to ratify and which was subsequently superseded by the Treaty of Lausanne, signed on July 24, 1923.

Turkey's signal victory over the Greeks in 1922 had changed conditions in the Near East considerably. On September 23, 1922, when the struggle between the Turks and Greeks had come to an end, the Allies invited the Turks, who in the meantime had set up a new government at Angora, to consider the basis of a new treaty on the following terms: (a) restoration of Turkish sovereignty over Constantinople and Thrace up to the Maritza River; (b) exclusion, until a final agreement had been reached, of Turkish military forces from Thrace. It also was stipulated that the Turks were to respect certain zones bordering on the straits which the allies had declared neutral during the war between Turkey and Greece.

Under the provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne which came into force on August 6, 1924, Turkey practically regained all the territory in Europe which she held in 1914. However, the Arab provinces of Asiatic Turkey were not restored to her. These were distributed under the mandate system to France and Great Britain or were set up as independent states. The Aegean Islands, however, were ceded in full sovereignty to Italy.

Distribution of Asiatic Turkey

To Italy: Aegean Islands, 1,037 square miles, ceded outright.

To Great Britain: Trans-Jordan, 12,000 (estimated), mandated.

To Great Britain: Iraq, 143,250 square miles, mandated.

To Great Britain: Palestine, 10,000 square miles, mandated.

To France: Syria, 60,000 square miles, mandated.

Made independent: Hedjas, 150,000 square miles.

Made independent: Asir, 35,000 square miles.

Made independent: Yemen, 75,000 square miles.

Turkey's total loss of territory: 486,287 square miles.

E. FORMATION OF NEW STATES AND TERRITORIES SEPARATED FROM THE FORMER RUSSIAN EMPIRE

In March 1917, while the World War was still in progress, Russia was declared a republic following a series of internal uprisings. After a prolonged struggle Russia came finally under the rule of the Soviet Government. Various independent states, however, have evolved from the old empire. Moreover, considerable areas of Russian territory have been transferred to Poland and Rumania. But the greater part of Russia was divided into a number of socialist soviet republics.[8] The largest of these convoked an All-Russian Congress of Soviets and on July 10, 1918, adopted a new constitution. This new state was termed the "Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic" (R. S. F. S. R.), and comprises about seven-eighths of the territory of the former Russian Empire.

Subsequently, on December 30, 1922, delegates of the R. S. F. S. R. and of three other Russian republics concluded at Moscow a treaty establishing a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (U. S. S. R.), comprising (1) Russia proper and united territories (R. S. F. S. R.); (2) Ukraine (Ukr. S. S. R.); (3) White Russia (W. R. S. S. R.); and (4) the Transcaucasian Federation (T. S. F. S. R.). This Union was joined in September 1942 by the Uzbek S. S. R. and the Turcoman S. S. R.; and in December 1929 by the seventh autonomous republic, Tajik (T. S. S. R.). The number of square miles of Russian territory transferred to the Baltic States and to Poland and Rumania is given below.

Russian territory transferred to other than Soviet states

	Square miles
Estonia	18,353
Finland	132,608
Latvia	24,440
Lithuania	37,000
Poland	49,150
Rumania	17,146
Total	278,697

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Thomas F. Woodlock entitled "Thinking It Over," published in the Wall Street Journal of November 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINKING IT OVER

(By Thomas F. Woodlock)

A century and a quarter ago the Holy Alliance, having brought to an end (with England's invaluable aid) Napoleon's foray on the European order, undertook two tasks. One was to establish a lasting peace. The other was to dam up the waters of the revolution's flood, and restore the principles of the Ancien Régime. For a time it succeeded in both, but only for a time. Behind the dam it built the revolution's waters piled up. The Treaty of Frankfort in 1871 followed by the Congress of Berlin in 1878 marked the end of the peace established at Vienna in 1815 and the opening of what Burckhardt called the era of great wars. In 1918 there vanished the last vestiges of the Ancien Régime and the dam "went out."

This week witnessed the birth of a second "Holy Alliance" to grapple with much the same tasks as its predecessors; that is, first, to smash another and far more dangerous attack, this time on not merely the order of Europe but on civilization itself, and, secondly, to establish a lasting peace. The great difference between the first and second alliances is that this one instead of attempting to dam the waters of the revolution is undertaking to canalize them into an irrigation system to fertilize the world plain of human life. The Revolution of 1789 has now entered its second stage after a century's pause. The agreements reached at Moscow inaugurate an experiment of incalculable importance to the future of the world. There is no possible doubt as to that fact. What they express is the will to seek peace and justice by consent of what we call the common man, that is, by the process that we seem to have agreed to call democratic. What it involves is the establishment of law, and the banishment of force, both to be achieved by consent of all concerned. The great question that only the future can answer is—what is to be the law under which men expect to live in freedom, peace, and justice? What is to be its source and what its sanctions?

All "politique," said Proudhon a century ago, is at bottom "theologie"—an honest and intelligent saying from a man who hated "theologie." All questions as to the law that the United Nations hope to establish turn ultimately upon questions of "theologie." One way to state the main question is to ask whether the "law" that we envisage is a matter of morals or of mores. The distinction is fundamental and is not generally recognized. Morals has its origin in a power above man—"a power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," as the nineteenth century liked to describe it. Mores have their origin among men. A law which bases on morals is a law of right and wrong, while a law based on mores is a law theoretically of wise or foolish, as the law-maker happens to judge the matter. Now the all-important fact is that the freedom that we are all seeking depends upon the existence and recognition of a law of right and wrong, and under no system of laws based purely upon mores—"folkways," as a current cant has it—can freedom long exist. In a word, the very notion of human liberty is profoundly theological. Nor is it only freedom that is in question; peace and justice are at bottom equally linked to theology. If that word "theology" frightens anyone, all he has to do is to look at its etymology, which will tell him that it simply means talking about God. So that in saying that freedom, peace, and justice are all notions ultimately theological, we say no more than that they depend for their existence upon the existence of God and the nature of man as created by God.

The present writer is aware that to mention the name of God thus simply is to come perilously near to breaching social conventions, and to talk of a law of right and wrong (natural law) is to talk of something which our best intellectuals have long since relegated to the scrap heap of outworn superstition. But a fact is a fact and the clear fact is that if human freedom is to rest upon what

[7] Including Fiume.

[8] For more detailed information concerning the structure of the Russian Soviet Government, see Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law, Third Series, Vol. X, part 4, p. 286ff.

a king or a dictator or a majority happen at a given time to suppose is wise to do, it ceases to exist and is a monstrous humbug. And to suppose that peace among nations can rest upon the same base is an equally obvious absurdity. Unless, of course, having eliminated God from our thinking, we put in His place a "god" of our own imagination, a "god" made in the "image and likeness of man," give to it the worship that is due to the Creator of man, and suppose that what it tells us is right. Which, by the way, a good many of us here and elsewhere have in fact done. Nothing less realistic (to borrow the curious phrase of article 8 in the Atlantic Charter) could well be imagined.

To sum up the whole business in a couple of sentences: The fate of the great experiment begun this week in Moscow, and the fate of all of us who are concerned in that experiment in our life on this earth, depend upon whether morals or mores are to be the base of that law which we hope will give us the freedom, the peace, and the justice that we desire. We cannot have the fruits of morals under a reign of mores.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make the unanimous-consent request that during the further consideration of the pending resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes upon the resolution, or more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from North Dakota sees fit to object.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, war is humanity's greatest scourge. It is the dragon in whose insatiable maw are devoured all the material blessings of mankind, and all the cultural achievements of civilization. It digs the graves of nations, of cities, of cathedrals, of works of art, of education, and strews the sands of time with wreckage of man's supreme endeavors. It lets loose the basest passions of mankind, and leaves delinquency, depravity, disease, and death in its slimy pathway. It gorges itself with the finest youth of every age and spews out a wreckage of mangled, crippled, blinded, insane human bodies, while blood drips from its frightful jaws. War has been best described in three one-syllable words by one who was intimately associated with its horrors: "War is hell."

But war does not probe the depth of human misery—man's lowest estate comes only in the loss of freedom. From the day that he first stood erect and started on the long journey toward a goal where he should become in likeness and in spirit the image of his Creator, man has battled every step of the way with those who would destroy this progress by enslaving his freedom. Without freedom the material accomplishments of mankind afford no satisfaction. Freedom is the eternal spring out of which flow all comforts, all achievements, all progress. It enriches and enlarges man's spiritual being and spurs him on to the sublime goal established by his Creator. The rise and fall of civilization is charted by the rise and fall of freedom.

It is a strange complexity of human nature that man is prone to forget the value of his greatest blessings. The record of the past shows that ofttimes when freedom has been attained, men have gone about carelessly offering to exchange bits of freedom for temporary ease until they find themselves shackled with restrictions by which freedom is destroyed. And again and again, throughout the ages, it has been shown that when freedom is lost, it becomes a precious jewel for which men are willing to lay down their lives.

We of this day believe that freedom has attained its greatest fulfillment in America. We know what it has cost in tears, in sweat, and in blood. We know that many a hillside, and many a plain have been enriched by the blood of heroes who have died here that we might have freedom. Today, above the din of battle and the noisome pestilence of war, there rings in our ears the warning of our countrymen of old, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Mr. President, we have debated for nearly 2 weeks now upon the form of a resolution which will express our best judgment of what we are willing to do to try to prevent the recurrence of this terrible scourge of war.

The objective is universally desired—there is no contention over the objective. The long debate which has attended the pending resolution and the several amendments which have been proposed indicate the earnest desire of every Member of this Senate, not only to save this country from untimely recurrence of war, but also to protect by every possible means the freedom which our form of government affords. The concern that confronts us is whether in an effort to attain the higher good, we shall lose the blessings we already enjoy.

I was opposed to the foreign policy of the administration from the Chicago bridge speech to Pearl Harbor, which to my mind meant intervention in the war when I hoped—although no one could be sure—that a different policy would have kept us out, and I have no apology for my pre-Pearl Harbor views. I do not think that those who took the steps which led directly to war can pride themselves on their pre-vision when war resulted.

But, rightly or wrongly, we are now in the war and must see it through to a satisfactory conclusion and must see to it that every possible benefit for mankind and for our country be obtained by the terrible price which we are paying.

The sole test of whether any proposition with respect to post-war settlement is sound or not is whether or not that proposition conduces to a just and durable peace. If it does, it cannot but be for the ultimate advantage of the United States.

The whole history of mankind shows the trend to larger and larger governing units which must logically ultimately result in some form of international organization, some kind of a federation of the world.

Wise counsels may accelerate and bad judgment may delay this trend toward world unity, and to go too fast is just as dangerous as to proceed too slowly.

The experience of 1914–18 and 1939–41 shows that, whether we ought to have done so or not, we have intervened in two world wars and renders it to my mind highly probable that rightly or wrongly we will continue to intervene in world wars if world wars continue.

From all the foregoing premises I am driven to the conclusion that we ought to seize the opportunity which victory in this world war, if and when it comes, will present to make a definite but modest advance toward world organization for the purpose of preserving world peace. To my mind this does not mean "union now" or "common citizenship with Great Britain" or an offensive and defensive "alliance with Great Britain," or any other single nation or any ambitious attempt to set up a world government. It means only the creation of the minimum machinery for preserving the peace for perhaps at least half a century in the hope that the world can use that half century of peace to perfect world organization to a point where it can deal not only with international breaches of peace—that is, war—but with the causes of war.

Those well-meant ideas for raising the standard of living for the whole world get the cart before the horse. What we need now is simply the minimum organization which will keep the peace. If we can keep the peace the nations of the world can be trusted to raise their own standards of living until such time as we are ready for international action along that line. If we attempt to do too much now we shall end as we did after World War No. 1, in doing nothing.

If Woodrow Wilson had confined himself to the relatively modest plan of the League to Enforce Peace at the end of the last war instead of attempting the far more ambitious project embodied in the Covenant of the League of Nations, he would more likely have succeeded. The platform of the League to Enforce Peace simply provided for the use of force by its members to compel a nation to resort either to a court or to conciliation before going to war. It made no attempt even to enforce a judgment of an international court or of a mediator.

In time, perhaps, the world will come to an international force handed over to some international organization beyond the control of any member nation, but, in my judgment, that will be a long time, and ought to be a long time. The world is not yet good enough to be ready for a united states of the world with a federal army to enforce peace in Washington and Moscow as well as Honduras and Haiti. In my judgment an attempt to set up such a Frankenstein now would inevitably fail; and if I am wrong in this, and if it succeeded, it would probably mean a totalitarian world government and a despotism more widespread than the world has ever known.

> From lower to the higher next,
> Not to the top, is Nature's text.

I am ready to agree that it will be necessary to provide for force as a step

toward world order; but I think that such force will have to be supplied by the respective member states when each has determined its own responsibility, that is to say, for practical purposes, by a very few of them, and that for practical purposes for quite a while after the war the peace of the world will depend upon the ability of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and, shortly, China to work together harmoniously for the benefit of mankind.

The United Nations are too heterogeneous and conflicting a group to make a safe nucleus for a world organization. A number of the United Nations are at present only nations on paper; that is, governments in exile. Some are at war with one of our enemies, some with another, and so forth.

The pending resolution commits us to the general principle of a step in the direction of international organization and a minimum step; that is, the creation of "international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." This much, it seems to me, we must attempt in one way or another. More than this I do not think we can promise. Just how we are to do this I do not think it is wise to attempt to promise now, and, of course, whatever is done must be done through constitutional processes.

In view of the fact that the words "constitutional processes" can be the subject of debate and perhaps of varied interpretation in the minds of experts, I believed it to be the part of wisdom that we should include in the resolution a restatement of the constitutional requirement for consent of the Senate before a treaty becomes binding on the United States.

I offered such an amendment to the original Connally resolution. The context of that amendment has been added as the last paragraph of the modified resolution. In my original amendment I used the words—

> That any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

The point was raised that the Executive has certain constitutional authority for making certain agreements without the consent of the Senate. Manifestly, it could not be expected that we could delay the progress of the war or the initial terms of peace by referring the agreements therefor to the Senate for consent. I therefore asked on Tuesday that my amendment be modified by substituting the word "treaty" for "agreement," as I desire to keep the amendment wholly within the Senate's constitutional prerogatives, just as we shall insist that the Executive keep wholly within the limitations of his constitutional prerogatives.

I was in heartiest accord with the objective of the amendment advocated yesterday by the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], but I voted on that amendment in accord with my conviction that the Congress cannot interpret the Constitution for the Executive.

Of course, the terms for a continued and enduring policy come within the purview of a treaty and must be referred to the Senate for consent. According to my interpretation, the present reading of the resolution, in effect, says to the world, "We believe in some form of world cooperation to maintain peace. Go ahead, and draw up a plan and submit it to the Senate for consideration. At that time we will decide whether the plan devised is for the best interests of the United States and for the peace of the world."

That does not bind our final vote on the treaty that is to be submitted; that does not bind us to any organization set up to maintain an unjust peace; that reserves to us the right to act wholly for the welfare of our country at the time when we have all of the facts available, and when we have time to consult with the men who are doing the fighting for our freedom on the several fronts of the war and are paying the price which can never be returned to them in terms of material comfort.

Of course, I repeat, in the final analysis, the determination of whether we can maintain peace for any extent of time depends on whether we can achieve a just and honorable peace. No organization or association can be devised which can for long enforce an unjust peace. The most that such an association can do is to provide the machinery which will harmonize the injustices which arise during the changing years. Its success will depend wholly on the spirit of justice, of honor, and of cooperation which exists within the hearts of the individuals who are associated together in national endeavor. It goes back to character in citizenship. Without character, no peace can long survive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator on the resolution has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall speak on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment is pending.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall speak on the amendment I have proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana offer his amendment?

Mr. WILLIS. I speak on the substitute which has been proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I shall require only approximately 3 minutes in order to conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the substitute was incorporated into and made a part of the original resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Fulbright resolution is pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a House resolution is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment is pending. Does the Senator from Indiana desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator can offer it and later can withdraw it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did not the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] yesterday offer a substitute for the resolution?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the resolution it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

> That any treaty concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such treaty shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, it is a fundamental error of mankind to place too much reliance on force. Americans are too prone to fall into this common error. We pass a law or set up a police authority and smugly believe the problem is solved.

There is a trend in America today toward that same error. We must be realistic, we must use our best and coolest judgment in charting our course.

When Elihu Root was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1912, the citation proclaimed him as the foremost living authority on the problems pertaining to world peace. In his acceptance speech he gave voice then to these solemn truths:

> Recognition of the horrors of war and the blessings of peace * * * are so universal that upon the surface it seems only necessary to state a few incontrovertible truths and to press them upon the attention of mankind in order to have war end and peace reign perpetually.
>
> The limitation upon this mode of promoting peace lies in the fact that it consists in an appeal to the civilized side of man, while war is the product of forces proceeding from man's original savage nature.
>
> To deal with the true causes of war one must begin by recognizing * * * the fact that civilization is a partial, incomplete, and superficial modification of barbarism.
>
> War is the natural reaction of human nature in the savage state, while peace is the result of acquired characteristics.
>
> In attempting to bring mankind to a condition of permanent peace in which war will be regarded as criminal conduct, just as civilized communities have been brought to a condition of permanent order, broken only by criminals who war against society, we have to deal with innate ideas, impulses, and habits which became part of the cave man's nature by necessity from the conditions under which he lived; and these ideas still survive more or less dormant under the veneer of civilization.
>
> To eradicate or modify or curb the tendencies which thus survive among civilized men is not a matter of intellectual conviction or training. It is a matter primarily

of development of character and the shifting of the standards of conduct—a long, slow process in which advance is to be measured, not by days and years, but by generations and centuries in the life of nations.

The attractive idea that we can now have a parliament of man with authority to control the conduct of nations by legislation or an international police force with power to enforce national conformity to rules of right conduct is the counsel of perfection. The world is not yet ready for any such thing and it cannot be made ready except by the surrender of the independence of nations, which lies at the basis of the present social organization of the civilized world.

Such a system would mean that each nation was liable to be lawfully controlled and coerced by a majority of alien powers. That majority alone would determine when and for what causes and to what ends the control and coercion should be exercised. Human nature must have come much nearer perfection than it is now, or will be in many generations, to exclude from such a control prejudice, selfishness, ambition, and injustice.

An attempt to prevent war in this way would breed war, for it would destroy local self-government and drive nations to war for liberty.

Mr. President, the counsel of that wise and good statesman is sound today. Let us make certain that what we do now is motivated by the processes of reason, and not by the heartthrobs of a war-weary people.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senate is now rapidly approaching an anticlimax to the dramatic proceedings of the Moscow Conference, fraught, as we all hope, with such import for the future of mankind.

The so-called Connally resolution was originally designed for the purpose of strengthening the hands of that great American and great statesman, Secretary Hull, at the then impending Moscow Conference. The subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee labored long and intelligently and with great fidelity to evolve a resolution which would meet the views of an overwhelming majority of the Senate. It agreed upon the resolution with only one dissenting vote in the subcommittee. It was reported to the Senate without amendment by a very large majority of the full Committee on Foreign Relations, of which majority I was glad to be able to form a part.

Most Senators realized that this resolution could not be binding in its effect. This Senate cannot under the Constitution bind the next Senate or even bind itself as to future action in this regard except by the process provided by the Constitution itself, that is to say, by formal ratification of a formal document. The committee resolution as I see it is merely an expression of the present views of the Senators who support it and a declaration of our wishes and hopes as to the policies which may be formally adopted in the future relationship of nations.

The resolution was purposely made sufficiently broad in the hope that all who hope for and desire greater and more effective cooperation between nations of good intent for decent international relations and the prevention of future wars could support it and that it could be passed without long and acrimonious debate by a sufficiently large majority to indicate a unanimity in our counsels which would greatly strengthen the position of Secretary Hull in the very difficult task which he faced at Moscow, one of the most delicate and arduous which has ever confronted any statesman in our entire history.

These hopes proved futile. I have no word of criticism for the little band of Senators who took a contrary view and who have labored with such zeal and devotion to amend the Connally resolution by incorporating their own ideas on more specific matters. They are sworn on their own oaths of office as we all are, and I freely attribute to them the same motives of high patriotism which we assert for the vast majority of their colleagues who adhered to the resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I recall only the undeniable fact that the Senate did not act in time for its action to be of any assistance in the deliberations of the Moscow conference. For nearly 2 weeks the Senate has been engaged in a debate, sometimes acrimonious, for the most part dreary, in which the charge was freely made that the Connally resolution was a vicious measure, calculated to do more harm than good.

In that connection, Mr. President, let me say that if that charge, as made in the Senate, was good against the Connally resolution, it is also good against the Moscow Declaration, which is so nearly identical with the original Connally resolution.

Fortunately, while the Senate was debating, Secretary Hull and his conferees were acting. Fortunately, while the Senate was exhibiting a striking lack of unity, Secretary Hull was achieving a great triumph for American statesmanship by establishing unity among four great powers by the adoption of substantially the language of the committee resolution. Fortunately, while oratory still held sway on this floor the conference successfully accomplished its great purposes, ended its momentous labors, and the conferees are now returning home. Being denied the blessing of the Senate, Secretary Hull has made shift to accomplish his high purposes without it.

Mr. President, I regard Cordell Hull as one of the greatest of Americans. The American people have full confidence in his patriotism, his ability, and his devotion, and his common sense. An attempt has recently been made on the part of a clique of newspaper writers and radio commentators to belittle this man to paint him falsely as suffering from doddering senility and incapacity to guide the affairs of our great State Department. Such contemptible and sinister propaganda has found no response in the hearts of the American people at large. It is completely refuted forever by the triumph of his successful efforts at Moscow.

As Roscoe Conkling said of General Grant, Mr. Hull's fame will rest not so much on things written or things said as upon the arduous greatness of things done.

I do not know what information Mr. Hull has had as to the progress of this debate in the Senate. I do know that he was fully apprised of the text of the Connally amendment and of the fact that it would in all probability pass by an overwhelming vote without amendment. I do know that the pertinent portion of the Moscow agreement is substantially identical with the third paragraph of the original Connally resolution.

Necessarily, Mr. President, anything which the Senate may do at this late date, after the adjournment of the Moscow Conference, comes in the nature of an anticlimax. All the damage that can be done has been done. Nevertheless, it is desirable that the debate be concluded with as great unanimity.

It was represented to the Foreign Relations Committee by representative of the group of 14 or 15 or 20 Senators who have been supporting the Pepper amendment that if the fourth paragraph of the Moscow agreement and the substance of the so-called Willis amendment reaffirming a portion of the Constitution were included, they would not only vote for the resolution, but would cooperate in ending the debate and would unite in opposing all further amendments of any kind.

I must say for those Senators, Mr. President, that they were as good as their word. As soon as the modification was reported by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee the Senator who had been one of the leaders in the filibuster, or tedious debate, or whatever one may choose to call it, who had himself spoken for nearly a day, rose and called for an immediate vote.

To this the committee agreed. This amendment, Mr. President, does not change the Connally resolution in any particular. It is not even in addition to it. It is mere repetition, since paragraph 4 of the Moscow Declaration is substantially identical with paragraph 3 of the Connally act, which remains intact. We have not even changed a comma in the original resolution; we are merely repeating a few of the punctuation marks. And so we find, Mr. President, that our new found unity is achieved at no greater cost than a certain degree of redundancy and repetition.

In the committee day before yesterday when the modification was under consideration, I remarked that in my opinion the suggested compromise addition was merely a face-saving measure for the quondam supporters of the Pepper amendment. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] was inclined to take exception to that remark, and I repeated that it represented my view of the situation. Then the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] suggested that since it was mere repetition we might as well omit the same purport as contained in section 3 of the Connally resolution. To this I replied that it was necessary to retain this provision to save the face of those of us who had been supporting the original Connally resolution without amend-

ment. Some prolixity and verbosity is a small enough price to pay for unity.

But let no Senator delude himself that he can preserve his name to posterity by the further repetition of any portion of the original resolution. Our brethren of the B2-H2 persuasion and the supporters of the original resolution now stand united, a common phalanx against any additional dotting of i's or crossing of t's.

Apparently all the unity that is needed has now been achieved, and we shall witness a high and determined resistance even to the underscoring of any more commas or semicolons. I predict that even the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] will not be able to preserve as much as an exclamation point to represent the well meant effort of the able and erudite Representative FULBRIGHT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator, on the amendment, has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I will take time on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his motion to recommit?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will do so, if necessary, at the proper time. For the present, I shall proceed to debate the motion to recommit.

Mr. President, I supported the original resolution drafted by the subcommittee because I thought that it was an admirable declaration of policy, upon which, I believed a great majority of the Senate could unite. I support the modified version because I do not believe that it changes the original text in any regard save verbosity. I indulge the earnest hope that the Moscow Declaration may be properly implemented by treaties which, while preserving the sovereignty and interests of the United States, will contribute mightily to the peace and prosperity of the world.

I support the modified version because I do not believe that it changes the original text in any regard whatever, save verbosity. It is the earnest hope that the Moscow Declaration may be properly implemented by treaties which, while preserving the sovereignty and interest of the United States, will contribute to the peace and prosperity of the world.

Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to recommit.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. Is the Willis amendment still pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is still pending.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement I am limited in my time, even though before the agreement was entered into I had indicated my intention to speak. I shall speak 15 minutes on the bill and 15 minutes on the amendment. For the sake of continuity I ask that I not be interrupted. After having finished I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. President, Senate Resolution 192, as originally presented, read:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved;

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace;

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The following two paragraphs were added during the debate by way of modification:

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That pursuant to the Constitution of the United States any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. President, when the original resolution was presented I felt that it was incomplete because it did not sufficiently announce the intention of the Senate not to commit itself in advance on any agreements or treaties by the adoption of this resolution. That defect, in my opinion, will be corrected by the inclusion of the last paragraph, which reads:

That pursuant to the Constitution of the United States any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

This, in my judgment, and certainly as far as I am concerned, announces that the Senate expects that the creation of or participation in any international authority or organization will be authorized only through constitutional processes, by presenting it to the Senate for ratification. If this were not so, I could not vote for the resolution.

The people of the United States have experienced such a steady encroachment by the executive department into the legislative field in the last few years by the issuance of several thousand Executive orders that we have had confusion and chaos in much of the domestic economy and daily affairs of our country. The people are speaking out against this procedure every day in every way in which it is possible for them to register their protest.

Many shared the fears I held that this procedure would be further extended into international affairs. We realize, of course, that war must be conducted on all sides by powerful leaders, but the sacrificing, the bleeding and dying, and the ultimate debt will be paid by the common people. While the American people are sacrificing their blood and treasure to combat the evil results of orders and agreements made by individual leaders throughout the world today, they want to be sure that we safeguard here the fundamental procedures and protections of representative government. We have seen in recent years flagrant evidences of contempt for constitutional processes, as evidenced by the attack that was made upon the Supreme Court and the attempt to make the Congress subservient by sustained smear campaigns.

I say again, the people have registered their protest against attacks made upon their system of government and made on those who adhere to it rigidly, and it is our duty to safeguard it with greater diligence, both in domestic and foreign affairs.

The trend in recent years to make executive agreements instead of treaties has increased until we have many more executive agreements than we have treaties with foreign countries. At the present moment, while the Congress has passed the lend-lease law and appropriated $18,000,000,000 for its purpose as a war measure, there is genuine concern over the fact that more than $50,000,000,000 in addition have been transferred to that fund by Executive order for purposes which have not and will not be submitted to the Congress for vote or to the people for expression of their opinion. This creates a gigantic financial instrument in the hands of the Chief Executive which may in many respects be shaping international affairs long before the people will know about them, or their representatives will have a chance to consider them.

The stories that have come concerning extravagant uses of lend-lease moneys from various sources have given our people genuine concern. The people of the United States are aroused, and we, as their representatives, should conduct a thorough investigation of the expenditure of this lend-lease money immediately because of the effect it will have upon the world of tomorrow. The American people are dedicating themselves, their sons and daughters, and their treasure, to the winning of the war, but they want to know that their interests, present and future, are constantly protected, wherever they may be.

Many people honestly feel that the pending resolution should be adopted and that it would strengthen the hand of the President, particularly in the event of his meeting with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin. I believe that such a meeting would be of tremendous value, provided Mr. Roosevelt entered such a conference with the same dogged determination to protect all of the rights and interests, present and future, of the American people, as vigorously as Mr. Churchill will protect the rights of the British Empire and Mr. Stalin will protect the rights of the Russian people and the Soviet Union. I do not believe that up to this time this has been adequately done.

We have had ample evidence, through the reports of the Members of this body who toured the world and through other sources, that in our anxiety to help our

allies, our proper interests in bases and airports, built and paid for throughout the world with American men, material, and money, have not been protected. Proper consideration has not been given to the protection of our natural resources, especially petroleum. Full and adequate information concerning our contribution to the war in the actual theaters of war has not been presented, but rather it has been totally excluded from the people of some countries or limited in others, including some of our allies, by rigid censorship throughout the world. Our vast supplies of foodstuffs and materials, paid for by the sweat, sacrifice, and finance of the American people, have not been properly credited to the American people, and thus our future influence and prestige abroad has been weakened.

All these things can and should be corrected through a realistic attitude being taken at once by our Chief Executive and his assistants in all their dealings with foreign powers. It is our duty to demand that these interests of the American people, whom we represent, be fully protected. Such action would materially help the war effort now and lay a firmer foundation for a lasting cooperation to prevent future aggression and preserve the peace of the world.

Never in the history of the world have so many millions of people prayed for peace. Likewise, never in the history of the world have so many millions of people been dominated, and their actions dictated and determined, by so few individuals.

This resolution, in my judgment and so far as I am concerned, is notice to the world, and to our Chief Executive, that the creation of any agreements for any international authority or international organization, and participation therein by the United States of America, is to be determined finally by the people of the United States themselves through their representatives in the Senate of the United States.

Many extravagant promises have already been made to the distressed and enslaved people of the world. Through the Atlantic Charter the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and a dozen other enslaved countries, are trusting in the assurance of the Atlantic Charter, which declares that the signers—

> Respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

That assurance was given to these people in our name, and they are relying upon us to support that assurance.

The returning Senators told us that everywhere they found people who were already expecting far more from us than our physical and financial resources could possibly supply.

It is high time for those who speak for America to be cautious in any promises they make which may be construed as commitments that will bind the people of the United States. The idea that we can buy firm friendships and lasting loyalties by the lavish dissipation of American natural resources and wealth is a snare and delusion.

If we are not careful, and this becomes a prolonged war, we may find ourselves a bankrupt and depleted Nation, utterly despised because of our extravagant promises, and the failure of the people of the world to know how much we did contribute and how much we did to aid them.

Mr. President, I think the first step toward continuous collaboration and cooperation to win the war and reach and maintain a just and honorable peace is for the United Nations' leaders to make a frank and full disclosure to their people, and all other peoples concerned, of the vast sacrifices and contributions made to their cause by the people of the United States. It is not enough that the leaders know, for leaders come and go, but people move on forever.

Never before has any nation done so much for others. We have been, and are, sending our daughters and sons, ships and guns, planes and treasure, thousands of miles to fight, and drive the ruthless enemies off the soil of others, and out of the skies over people who want to be free.

We have not failed to tell our people fully of the contribution of our every ally. From the White House, the Halls of Congress, over the radio, through headlines, news columns, and editorials of our daily press, from the pulpits, and across the plains of America we have heralded the heroism of the Russian people, the British people, the Chinese people, and all others who stood courageously against the aggressors. Indeed, Mr. President, some have gone so far in proclaiming the sacrifice, devotion, dogged determination, and the magnificent contribution of these other people that we have condemned ourselves, even to the point of blaming the American people for this war.

Time and again it has been intimated in the debate on the floor of the Senate that if we had only joined the League of Nations this war could, and would, not have happened. We have apparently forgotten that Europe has been in constantly recurring wars for centuries, resulting in the memories of the Europeans being filled and clogged with ancient hatreds and animosities. For centuries it has been the plan and purpose of leaders of all the European powers to play power politics, always seeking to have a buffer state between them and a possible enemy. So far as I know, nothing thus far has happened to change their ancient customs in this regard.

We have apparently forgotten that 25 years ago we sent our sons, daughters, munitions, and supplies to Europe to help stop aggressors, that we stayed there until Germany was totally disarmed, and that our allies of that day—the French and British people—could have stopped Hitler in his tracks in this present aggression, which has finally resulted in a world-encircling conflict, if they had maintained good faith and cooperation between themselves.

I remember distinctly, shortly after Pearl Harbor, in a conversation with one of the highest accredited representatives of the British Empire in our Capital, I asked, "What was the matter with your military intelligence system? Did you not know that Germany was building this tremendous military machine under your very eyes?" He replied, "Our information was good, Senator, our judgment was bad; we did not dream they would go so far."

Are we to blame our predecessors in this body and blame the American people for the admittedly bad judgment of our allies? Mr. President, I am not one who will blame or condemn my own country for the mistakes of others.

Whether we could have prevented this war by joining the League of Nations I do not know. I do know that Britain and France could have stopped Hitler if they had continued to have mutual faith and courageous devotion to a mutual cause.

Incidentally, it has seemed strange to me that I have heard so much condemnation lately of the action taken by our Government, and by our own predecessors in the Senate 25 years ago, as being responsible for this world-encircling conflict breaking out in Europe, but not once have I heard a word of criticism of our present Government's action in sending huge and vast amounts of scrap iron to Japan, which finally came raining down on the heads of, and killing, our sailors, soldiers, and marines, sinking our ships, and destroying our planes at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines.

The important fact that is known to all of us, and which will become more violently impressed upon every family in America from now on, is that we are engaged in a war throughout the entire earth which will literally try the souls and spirits of our people as they have never been tried before. The extent of the sacrifice of our precious flesh and blood, of our natural resources, material, and money, will be so great that only recently the administration decided that the press and the Congress should be prepared by confidential information before the people are to be told the uncolored and unvarnished truth about the struggles and the sacrifices which lie ahead.

The brutal fact is that no one can with any degree of accuracy or certainty even predict just how or when the war will end. The cold fact is that it will not only take the best that we have, but that it will take all that we have, to meet and conquer our enemies, and to destroy the evil forces that attempted to wipe out our freedom and our way of life.

Mr. President, in my judgment this war may be a long, bitter, and bloody series of battles. There will be ample time to assess and determine the degree of devotion and continued cooperation and collaboration which we will receive as we go on in the fight to death with our vicious enemies. The War Department has publicly stated that they will be returning to civil life at least 750,000 men each year, for various reasons. Many of those men will return from the battle fronts bringing with them the benefit of their first-hand, uncensored knowledge, through personal contact with Allied and enemy countries alike. They will have tasted the tragedies and

absorbed the truths through experiences unimaginable in this comfortable Chamber. We will have ample time to take counsel with these brave and brainy women and men before we commit ourselves to the terms of any final treaty.

No one can tell the number of years or the sacrifice in flesh and blood that will be required before complete victory is achieved. No matter how enthusiastic or devoted to difficult duties we are during this conflict, those of us who are fortunate enough to remain in safety and comparative comfort at home are paying the least possible price for our precious freedom. This unprecedented and world-encircling conflict has already called many of the very best in brains, blood and body of our entire Nation into military and naval action on the seas, in the skies, and on the shores of the entire world. I prefer to and will take counsel with them before I make any final commitments.

In supporting the pending resolution, I do so in the hope that it may help in the disintegration of our enemies, and in the consolidation of our allies and that it may contribute to an early victory, at the same time protecting the future rights and future commitments of the American people. I support this resolution, reserving any definite future commitments so that we may truly and fully preserve and protect the representative government of the United States, its rights and interests, during and through the war, so that our American people may have the widest range of choice, and that they may decide finally the course we should take in our universal and unanimous desire to preserve peace throughout the world.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, on an occasion such as this, I cannot do other than state my beliefs as clearly as possible, and I hope my colleagues will believe in my sincerity. The philosophy behind my approach to the problem before us is a part of my profoundest convictions. It indicates the direction in which I believe this Government must move sooner or later in the interest of peace.

We are approaching at tremendous pace, as measured by the yardstick of the centuries, the most momentous peace making of all time. This war is being fought as a people's war. It cannot be fought to an honorable conclusion in any other way. Never before has war called for such great effort and high sacrifice from all the people. As surely as this is true, we must make the peace a people's peace. The people can and must determine that the outcome of the world battles shall be a glorious triumph for the right.

It is the will of right-thinking and right-living people everywhere that the years of world conflict be followed by centuries of undisturbed peace, in which humanity can repair the damage done by the folly of our generation, and rebuild in more substantial form than ever before the broken structure of our civilization.

The world was charted into this war. We cannot drift out of it. The normal force of all the people of all the nations must be mobilized for peace. Peace is not merely the negation of war. It is not merely the maintenance of the status quo. It is a pattern of life of such definite form and so firmly supported that war is unthinkable. Peace is not something to be put on paper and signed by a few leaders, but a conviction and a purpose deeply rooted in the hearts of the people.

I have lived all my life in a State that has been during all of its hundred years singularly loyal to the eternal principles of freedom and liberty on which our Nation was founded and has endured.

The people I know best are not far removed from the days of the frontier, and they carry into their daily life the pioneer traditions of brotherhood at its best, the tremendous power of community cooperation for the common good, and the purifying and stimulating usefulness of candor, honesty, freedom, and the truth in making for progress in all human relations.

In the making of this war, all these things were lacking. The compelling evidence that those who expect to prepare the blueprints for peace will follow the age-old and outmoded ways of that so-called diplomacy which is carried on behind closed doors, completely ignores the most important element in planning for enduring world peace. That element is the inspired will of peace-loving people to peace. It proceeds from the hearts of millions of toilers who create the wealth and conserve the culture of the world. It is the very soul of civilization and Christianity.

War too often has been the plaything of kings and others in high authority. Peacemaking, like war making, has been and is today in the hands of the few. It is time to stop all of that.

America is of age. We are a long way from the colonial times. The American people, 135,000,000 of them who inhabit our States, are an integral part of the great body of mankind desirous of pursuing the arts of peace.

We are conscious of the place America has in the family of nations. We can assert tremendous moral strength. The people of the United States are willing to take their part and cooperate in a new order for peace. We proclaim to the rest of the world our peaceful desires with the blazing zeal of crusaders for liberty and justice. We must do much more than voice promises and intentions.

This problem has received great effort and the fullest debate. For this I am glad. A step of this importance should not be undertaken without full discussion. In making my small contribution, if any, to that discussion, I do so from the view of one who loves and believes in the principles and methods outlined in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, and to the preservation of the principles outlined therein I have pledged my constant efforts.

The longer I am in the service of my fellow citizens, the more certain I am that the great secret of our success in governing ourselves is our repugnance for secrecy in the processes of government.

Sovereignty rests with the people. The people are entitled to know the doings of their public servants. No action should be taken which will not stand the full light of the midday sun. Candor, frankness, and honesty should be the rule.

I call that the open-door policy. I have always believed in it. It is my firm conviction that where secrecy prevails, bad government results; and where the open-door policy is accepted, the people bring about good government and friendly relations.

We have succeeded, reasonably well, in adhering to the open-door policy in local, State, and National affairs. Where the principle of the open door is violated, we should always exercise our constitutional right to bring about a change of personnel.

When we deal with other nations, however, we deal in secret. We deal behind closed doors. In such a system the will of the people all too often is thwarted by the forces of stealth, intrigue, treachery, cunning, and double dealing. History records that too often liberty-loving people are the losers. Our freedom-loving people must come to realize that a midday nation can see better in the noonday sun than when groping in the darkness.

Secrecy in the conduct of international relations is an age-old process. It was invented by the kings and princes of the past, who ruled their people at home with an iron hand, and who were banished and succeeded by the first person who commanded, in the attempt, greater strength. In such a system the primary purpose of international relations was not the welfare of the people but to keep rulers in power.

Is it not apparent that in following the methods devised by those kings and princes we retain the invitation to the exercise of the same motives, the same purposes, the same controlling element under which the interests of the people are placed secondary to the continuation in power of the various regimes which engage in these secret practices?

We ought to take action now for that which we believe will lead to the moral and spiritual association of peoples and the cooperation of the peoples of all nations in such a manner as will forever render war impossible.

Nowhere in the world is there more general desire than right here in the United States to assist the people of every race and clime who desire to make effort to reap from their own sowing the benefits of progress in peace and industriousness.

This nobility of purpose is the common property of all. It is not of one State or another. It admits of no sectional or other dividing lines. It is exclusive of all class distinctions.

The people of Iowa share in this common purpose along with millions of others and are proud of the fact. We desire that this shall become and be a better world in which humanity can be unfolded in accord with the plans for time

and eternity. This is our ideal. The sponsors and proponents of the resolution have, in the course of this debate, described it as an expression of desire, of sentiments, of intentions, of attitude, of faith, and of purpose.

In the consideration of this resolution I make plain my own position that in no way does the resolution prejudice any future vote by myself, nor do I delegate to the executive branch any powers conferred on the Senate by the Constitution with respect to the making of any treaty.

As the expression of an ideal, the resolution is intended to command instantaneous and favorable response. It was purposely drawn to be as broad as possible, as general as the English language would permit, and unquestionably a memorial or petition of advice, and in no sense to be considered a constitutional action on any treaty heretofore or hereafter written.

To my way of thinking, the legislative branch should not be primarily a body for the consideration and adoption of memorials and petitions. It should receive them, not issue them. To this body is delegated by the people a rightful authority to exercise a portion of the sovereign and supreme power, and that is done and should be done by action, not by expressions of intent.

A wise man of another day observed that the idealist should beware, lest while walking along with his eyes upon the stars, he should suddenly fall into a well. It is just as true today that the course to the ideal is uncharted. It is covered with pitfalls and littered with the tragedies of the human race. We all see quite clearly the beacon light in the distance. That which we so sorely need is guidance across the rocky and forbidding in between.

The President and the Congress, in cooperation, should keep in view the people's high purpose, to move in all possible ways into the urgent task of determining a settled course to be adopted and followed.

If one branch of this Government surrenders at any time its responsibilities to the other, then in the same degree the people lose their right to republican system of representative government, the greatest bulwark of peace.

It is for the legislative and the Executive to be frank and open in all associations one with the other, and with the people, and in all their associations with our international neighbors, for candor is the essence of strength of any policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I shall take 15 minutes on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, it would strengthen the hand of the President in immeasurable manner should he assert leadership to find the means to such cooperation with the legislative branch.

No action by the Congress at this time could so fortify its high resolve and its inspired intention as to assert leadership and find the means to that same cooperation.

The great decision of today can be made, and must be made, not alone by one great man, not alone by several great men, not by any select group of conservators of all wisdom, but by those who sit around humble firesides and speak through their chosen representatives.

The world will live in peace when the people of the world find the way to express their will for peace. We will not enjoy peace until that is a reality. We will take the first real step toward peace when we demonstrate the craftsmanship to establish political machinery responsible to the people for arriving at a full understanding between nations, small or large, on their mutual problems.

I cannot speak competently relative to other forms of government; but under our own form of government, the accomplishment of this objective requires that the Congress be advised and that there be open sessions with frequent and full reports back to the people.

If the Senate of the United States can devise no step further than an expression of a will, so designed that it can be subject to interpretation ranging all the way from the South Pole to the North Pole, if we are unwilling to place in the resolution definite directions, and if those who favor it insist that it not be clarified, then we should not be entitled to surprise should the executive branch step into the vacuum so created and chart our course in any direction between those all-inclusive limits.

Likewise, if the executive branch can devise no system better than a prerogative guarding which borders on jealous diligence, and a calculated effort to keep the Congress and the people in the dark while the boat is building, then when it is christened in glistening paint and with flags flying, there should be no surprise if there are those who refuse to ride because they question whether a vessel so constructed will be seaworthy.

Foreign affairs have become more vital in an invention-shrunken world. Their impact upon the life of the individual grows steadily stronger. It is the compelling duty of those in authority, the legislative and executive branches alike, to provide the means by which the people can have a voice in the conduct of those affairs.

The foundation of representative government should always be complete and frequent reporting back to the people.

The United States is a republic. Its sovereignty rests with the people, and they have set out their supreme law and their high purposes in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. The underlying philosophy of those instruments and our form of government lies in the tenets of the Christian religion.

This great Republic and all the separate units of the federation over which the banner of liberty flies are firmly grounded upon the doctrines that are set forth in the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sermon on the Mount.

Where man has progressed, he has given attention to the commands recorded by Moses and the inspired teachings of Christ; and where man has taken the backward trail, he has turned away from these eternal truths.

We are supplying our money, our resources, and the fruits of our labor. Is it ignorance to think ahead to the day when the pot may be dry, when the smell which comes from the kettle may have lost all of its substance, and like those who stalked our lands centuries ago, we may have to rub together dry sticks if we are to have either light or heat?

If, when the day comes—and God forbid that such a day will ever come—there be others who have matches which can be struck, who then will be the master of man's destiny, and what will be our lot if we have ignored the Golden Rule?

The Bible teaches us that the way of peace is the way of love, and of good will, and of brotherhood. The Divine teachings at Gethsemane and the Golden Rule cannot be imposed under the use or threat of force. They cannot be imposed by international deals to limit the ways of force. They cannot be imposed by centralization of power. They cannot be imposed by any deals to limit power. They cannot be imposed in secrecy by those in high authority.

Days and weeks, months and years can be taken in the drafting of a written peace plan behind closed doors, a plan designed to confer upon us the society in which all is perfect; yet this will still be a world populated by men and women, they who love and they who hate, the workers and the shirkers, the same kind of people as our ancestors and as our neighbors.

Within the breast of every human being there is a glowing spark of goodness that responds to the call for brotherhood under the fatherhood of God. That is the key which unlocks the door to peace.

The greatest influence for brotherhood and peace springs from the hearts of men, women, and children who counsel around the family hearthstone, and who carry into their everyday lives the homely virtues of honest dealing and frank statement.

We witness today a great groundswell for peace; and if we respond to it and give inspiration to it, we can bring to fruition a great moral upsurge for a people's peace.

We all know something of human nature. One of the things we know from our everyday lives is that apparent differences dissolve into the mists of the unseen when we sit down at the same table and discuss frankly and candidly those differences.

This thought should be carried into our international relations. We should face our neighbors across the open council table, and should discuss frankly and openly matters that are of mutual concern and interest.

If right and justice are to prevail in this world following the present holocaust, and if we are to take our proper place in the establishment of such a pattern for humanity, we can well start with a declaration of our own firm resolve to follow certain cardinal principles. Let us proclaim so that all can hear—

First, that when this Nation, acting through its constitutional processes, enters into any formal negotiations with any other power or powers, involving agreements proposed for ratification, it will make known publicly and promptly that such negotiations have begun.

Second, that this Nation, acting under its constitutional processes, will entertain subjects for discussion and negotiation only when the representatives of all nations having a primary interest in those subjects are present.

Third, that when this Nation enters into formal international negotiations of any character whatsoever, there will be open sessions with full reports back to the people. Then the greatest influence for good that ever existed, the opinion of the sovereign people, may make itself heard.

Ideologists have attempted to project into our thinking in recent years that the people cannot be trusted to govern themselves and that some form of centralized control is needed to carry on. That ideology has come out of Europe. The people are to be led by dictators or supermen, and the proper place for the great mass of the people is in the long lines of followers. That philosophy of government is very old. It is captivating to those who do not care to think for themselves.

A different concept of social and political relations gave birth to the United States of America. We renew our faith in democratic ideals put into practice under the pattern of a republican system of representative government.

It is for us to renew our faith in the capacity of the people to govern themselves, our faith in the patriotism of the people, our faith in the final victory for righteousness everywhere in the world.

The victory that we are all thinking about must not be merely the overcoming of evil-minded might by right-minded power. It must be the victory of the spiritual over all that is base and degrading.

The new peace will be lasting only as it embodies the considered will of the people concerned, and not as an agreement for the punishment of some nations and a reward for others.

When this war is fought to the victorious end, and when we give our total effort that victory may come as soon as possible, the forces of unity and disunity will again be at odds.

My plea is that when the delegates gather around the peace table there be evidenced no greed, no lust for power, no intolerance, and no selfishness.

All who are charged with this important trust must recognize that a stable peace must be predicated upon the principles of right and justice for all men.

May the peace table be large enough so that there will be a place for the Book of Books, opened so that the Golden Rule may shine forth in letters of living light.

We in America know what we are fighting for. We intend that our heritage of liberty and justice shall prevail. In the pursuit of a world peace, we will permit no compromise with any proposals to change the American system of representative government over into something different.

The Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States must not be set aside, whether by legislative enactment, judicial interpretation, or Executive order.

The United States was born of the love of freedom. Its soil was consecrated to the doctrine of human equality. Its institutions were planted on the solid ground of the divinity which should reside within every human body.

We have gone into war and we must go into peace on that basis. We do not plan to impose our way of life upon anybody at any time. We have no ulterior motive. We intend that all people everywhere should share with us the freedom we intend to have for ourselves.

It is my hope that at the peace table there will be those of all races, those who worship God and those who bow down to images, and mothers whose sons have made the sacrifices. May all at the peace table open their hearts, so that the Prince of Peace may enter. If that is done, Mr. President, we shall have a just and lasting peace.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I agree with very much of what the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa has just said. Like him, I also believe in the brotherhood of man; and I hope, with him, that at the peace table there will be the candor, frankness, and honesty which he so very much desires. I believe that the world is moving on to its destiny, and that just as surely as all the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled, just so surely are the prophecies of the New Testament being fulfilled also. I am not a preacher or the son of a preacher, but I exhort the Senate today to right action on this matter, which will not only affect us individually, but along with us our children and our children's children, and above all, our Nation under God. I believe in the spiritual truth of the brotherhood of man. I deeply desire, from the bottom of my heart, to have some small part in bringing about the new earth spoken of in the Book of Revelation. But, Mr. President, we will accomplish nothing but heartaches for ourselves and our children and our children's children if we try to go too fast.

During the last war, Mr. President, during the absence of our fighting men, we voted in prohibition. Millions of our soldiers and sailors were never consulted any more than we are today consulting the heroic soldiers and sailors and the brave fighting men of the Air Force and the Marine Corps. Today it is proposed by the Senate to vote on a question a thousand times more serious than that which was voted on while our fighting men were away in the last war, just as they are today, fighting for the preservation of ourselves and of our beloved country.

Mr. President, I simply cannot in good conscience vote for a measure of this kind in the absence of those men, and by our vote say that we are adopting a policy which, after the peace is written, we shall be called upon to follow. By this resolution we are being asked today to ratify something of which, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] said a few moments ago, we know nothing. All the information we have consists of newspaper reports. Our Secretary of State has not yet returned from Moscow. He has not yet laid anything before us, nor has he asked us to ratify anything. As the distinguished Senator from Utah said, "Why should we jump the gun?" What is the occasion for all this hurry? Is England again getting us into a poker game in which she holds the winning hand? We do not know anything about any secret agreement that England or any other country may have, and we are placing ourselves in the same position as in the last war, when President Wilson arrived at Versailles to find his Fourteen Points scrapped and the peace written in accordance with secret treaties, of which even President Wilson had been kept in absolute ignorance.

Mr. President, we have with us in the Senate today a man who has had a great deal of experience, Senator JOHNSON of California. Ever since this resolution has been before us I have been so much concerned with it that I have sat up night after night reading the debates on the League of Nations, which was debated 25 years ago upon this very floor. I feel entirely confident that if some of the Senators whom I have heard speak on this resolution had read those debates they would not vote in the way they have indicated they intend to vote.

Mr. President, we do not find the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who has graced the Senate for nearly 30 years, voting for this resolution. Twenty-five years ago, when the League of Nations was being debated in this Chamber, HIRAM JOHNSON said:

> I want no international banker control in this country. I want no international labor control in this country. I want no international imperialistic control in this country. I want to preserve the promise of American life, preserve it in its prestine purity, because of all that it has done in the past and all of its promise for the future. I want no international control of America. I want to be just American again.

At that time, Mr. President, we had a great Senator from North Dakota, perhaps the greatest Senator who ever represented our great State here in this body. He was one of those fine, square-jawed, bull-headed Vikings who have to be shown before they vote for anything. I refer to the late Honorable Asle J. Gronna. On the same day when Mr. JOHNSON spoke thus, this great Senator from North Dakota, on page 8719 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 18, 1919, said this:

> Mr. President, I think all of us are interested in knowing the facts with reference to the disposition of territory. We have heard stated in specific terms the reasons which impelled the Allies to enter this great war. In every instance, so far as I know, and I believe that I heard all the speeches delivered

in this Chamber, it was said by the representatives of the Allies that their entry into the war was made for one purpose only, that of freeing all the peoples of the earth from the military autocracy of Germany.

Have we not heard the same thing for months and months?

Senator Gronna continued:

Before we finally dispose of a measure of such great importance as this treaty, I believe, sir, that we ought to know the facts, and I believe it is due the Allies that we should know what disposition has been made of the territory. The Senator from Wisconsin has just stated that he has given this very question constant study and thought, and I wish to ask the Senator to give us this information and to give it in my time.

It was said that the war which was fought 25 years ago was a war to end all wars. It was said that we were fighting for democracy. When that war was over and Woodrow Wilson went to Versailles, he became disillusioned. He found that his Fourteen Points had been scrapped. He found that England and other countries had secret treaties. What did that great President of the United States say? When he spoke at St. Louis, Mo., on September 5, 1919, this is what he said—and I prophesy that if Franklin Roosevelt lives he will say someday what President Wilson said on September 5, 1919, when thousands of our boys lay buried in the soil of France. Mr. Wilson said:

Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here, or any woman—let me say is there any child here—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? The real reason that the war we have just finished took place—

He was not then speaking of a war to end all wars. He was not then saying, as he said at the time our boys were being enlisted and drafted, that we were fighting a war for democracy. When it was over, and when those boys were dead, President Wilson told the truth. He said:

The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them.

Profits. Profits. Profits.

Mr. Wilson continued:

The seed of jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred, was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry. This war—

He was talking about the war 25 years ago, Mr. President—

This war in its inception was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war.

Mr. President, we have there the statement of the President of the United States during the last World War.

I come now to the statements of another great American, the great Senator Robert La Follette, Sr. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statements by Senator La Follette, Sr., found between page 8720 and page 8729 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 18, 1919.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a few days ago I called the attention of the Senate to the territorial spoils of the Allies, other than Great Britain, which we engage to defend under the terms of the pending treaty. These territorial changes were principally upon the continent of Europe, but by this treaty our guaranties are to go beyond Europe. They are to extend to Asia, to Asia Minor, and to Africa. They are to extend into every corner of the earth where money can be made by exploiting weaker people and monopolizing the resources of their country.

With a view to portraying graphically the changes involved in this world settlement growing out of the war, I have caused to be prepared maps of Asia and Africa, including Asia Minor, and those are now before the Senate. The territory which formed a part of the British Empire before the war is colored red. The territory which falls to Great Britain as a result of the war is colored red with a black border.

It is at once obvious that with the exception of limited areas in Asia Minor which are divided between France and Italy and Greece, and excepting likewise the German islands in the northern Pacific and Shantung, which go to Japan, all other territory outside of Europe which changes hands as a result of the war is acquired by Great Britain.

The Senate is urged to concur in this treaty and bind the American people by the most solemn obligation to respect and preserve the territorial integrity of Great Britain. It is my purpose, therefore, to present to the Senate and to the country, insofar as my limited time under the "gag" rule will permit, the extent and character of Britain's share of the spoils under this treaty, the people bartered and chatteled, the menacing political problems that go with them, and the far-reaching economic effect of this vast territorial transfer to Great Britain upon her ultimate control of the trade routes and the commerce of the world—to all of which we are asked not only to consent but also to guarantee and to defend.

BRITISH SPOILS IN AFRICA

I direct the attention of the Senate first to the map of Africa. Before the war Great Britain was the predominant power in Africa. Her colonies, exclusive of Egypt and the Sudan, comprised an area two-thirds as large as the United States, of about 2,000,000 square miles, with a population of 30,000,000 people.

Germany was Great Britain's principal competitor in Africa. Her colonies were in the aggregate about one-half as large as the British territory and about one-third as populous. In spite of her overwhelming predominance, Great Britain's position in Africa was by no means satisfactory to British imperialists. German East Africa, if Senators will note the map, separated the British colonies in the east. German Southwest Africa cut off the Union of South Africa from the Atlantic coast. The British colonies in the west were separated by Togo and Cameroon.

The status of British control in Egypt was likewise unsatisfactory to the ambitious men who dictated the policy of the British foreign office.

Beginning with the occupation of Egypt in 1882 Gladstone, Salisbury, and succeeding Prime Ministers gave unqualified pledges to Egypt, to the English people, and to the world that British troops would be withdrawn as soon as order was restored, that the "territorial integrity and existing political independence" of Egypt would be respected, and that under no circumstances would a protectorate be established over the country.

That is the pledge that England made through Gladstone to the Egyptian people and to the world; and yet the majority of the Senate yesterday voted in violation of that pledge to extend the protectorate of Great Britain over Egypt against the protest of 13,000,000 people.

Gladstone made the position of Great Britain clear on August 9, 1883, when he said:

"If one pledge can be more solemn and sacred than another, special sacredness in this case binds us to withdraw the British troops from Egypt."

Gladstone's promise was many times repeated, and Egypt was recognized down to the beginning of the war as an independent country under the suzerainty of Turkey, and the British occupation was understood to be temporary.

On December 18, 1914, 4 months after the outbreak of the war, Great Britain suddenly deposed the Khedive, appointed and established his successor on the throne, and announced that "the suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt is terminated," and "Egypt will henceforth constitute a British protectorate."

A wave of protest swept Egypt at this announcement, but the British foreign office was prepared for the emergency. A personal letter was sent by King George—now follow this step by step—to the native government, giving assurances that Great Britain would lend aid to "overcome all influences which are seeking to destroy the independence of Egypt."

Senators, is there anything left in kingly pledges? Are they also to be treated as "scraps of paper" and is the United States Senate to endorse and ratify their violation? You did it yesterday. Will you do it when the roll call comes after this document passes into the Senate for final ratification?

But, taking King George at his word, and relying also on other assurances, Egypt submitted to the protectorate, believing it was a temporary war measure. And, Mr. President, why should they not have believed it? They had the word of all the prime ministers from Gladstone down, and now came the royal pledge of George V, the present imperial head of the British Government.

Trusting that pledge, Egypt, during the 4 years of war, enlisted more than 1,000,000 men to fight in the British Army for the Allied cause.

President Wilson's announcement of America's war aims in 1918 gave further assurance to the Egyptians, who saw in the acceptance by the Allies of the principle of self-determination, the restoration of Egypt's independence.

Mr. President, I shall not review here the sordid story of Egypt's betrayal at the peace conference.

How four men chosen by the Egyptian people to represent them at Paris were seized by the British authorities without warning, deported to Malta, and held in a military prison; how more than 1,000 unarmed natives were brutally shot down and killed by British machine guns on the streets of Alexandria and Cairo; how President Wilson refused to give the Egyptian envoys a hearing after they finally reached Paris, are facts too well known to all of us to require recital.

It is enough to say that the Treaty of Versailles recognizes a permanent British protectorate over this unfortunate country. It makes Egypt, with her 13,000,000 inhabitants, all of one race, speaking the same language, and occupying 350,000 square miles of fertile territory, as much a part of the British Empire as India or her colonies in Africa. It gives to Great Britain, in addition, the immense area known as the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, which is one-third as large as the United States. She acquires this domain, Mr. President, against the will of every one of its inhabitants, in violation of British pledges to Egypt and to the world, and in wanton disregard of the fourteen points sponsored by the United States and specifically accepted and agreed to by Great Britain.

The balance of the territorial spoils in Africa, consisting of the German colonies, are also to go to Great Britain.

It is asserted by the defenders of this treaty that there are to be no annexations,

but that all territories formerly under the rule of the Germans or the Turks are to be distributed under mandates to the "advanced nations."

But before Germany signed the treaty on June 28, 1919, renouncing in favor of the "principal Allied and Associated Powers" her overseas possessions, the council of three met May 6, and distributed her colonies in accordance with the secret treaties between Great Britain, France, and Japan.

I read from the official report of the meeting of the council (published October 18 in the Nation):

"The disposition to be made of the former German colonies was decided at the peace conference in Paris on May 6, 1919, by the council of three—Mr. Clemenceau, President Wilson, and Mr. Lloyd George. * * * The official statement in detail is as follows:

"'Togoland and Cameroon: France and Great Britain shall make a joint recommendation to the League of Nations as to their fate.

"'German East Africa: The mandate shall be held by Great Britain.

"'German Southwest Africa: The mandate shall be held by the Union of South Africa (Great Britain).

"'The German Samoan Islands: The mandate shall be held by New Zealand (Great Britain).

"'The other German Pacific possessions south of the Equator, excluding the German Samoan Islands and Naura: The mandate shall be held by Australia (Great Britain).

"'Naura (Pleasant Islands): The mandate shall be given to the British Empire.

"'The German Pacific islands north of the Equator: The mandate shall be held by Japan.'"

Following this partition of Germany's colonies, Belgium filed a protest with the peace conference, demanding that her aid in conquering these districts should be recognized. Great Britain has since made a small cession of German East African territory in favor of Belgium. Agreements are known to exist between Great Britain and France whereby the latter is to receive only a small slice from each of the two colonies of Togo and Cameroon.

As a result of the war, the most ambitious plans of British imperialists are made secure in Africa. The British possessions on the "dark continent" now have an area of about 4,400,000 square miles and a population of nearly 60,000,000 of people. This area is about the size of Canada and Mexico combined and is capable of supporting as large a population as our own country.

Great Britain now has a continuous stretch of territory, linking the extremities of the continent, and the imperialist dream of a British railroad from the "Cape to Cairo" is realized as a result of this war, waged to protect the rights of the weak against the strong.

This is the vast empire, Mr. President, which the United States is about to pledge her aid in maintaining on the continent of Africa, for the benefit of Great Britain.

BRITISH SPOILS IN TURKEY

The dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire constitutes one of the most lurid chapters in the history of secret diplomacy and international double-dealing, and it is but fair to say that in this drama English diplomats have played the leading role.

The partition of Turkey has followed the lines originally laid down in the secret treaties.

By the Treaty of London, Italy was bribed to desert her allies and joint the Entente by the promise of Adalia, on the Mediterranean. Greece was promised Trebizond, on the Black Sea, and Smyrna, one of the chief harbors on the Mediterranean. Russia was to be given Constantinople and Armenia as her share of the spoils and the balance of the territory, after 20,000,000 Turks had been limited to the district of Anatolia, with an area about the size of the State of Nebraska, was to be divided between France and Great Britain.

Following the Russian revolution, Great Britain and France negotiated a new treaty, the secret Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916. By its terms Great Britain recognized France's claim to the Syrian coast while Great Britain was to take over the richest of the Ottoman lands in Mesopotamia.

A few months after the negotiation of this underground agreement, Great Britain occupied Syria and, in the most populous and valuable portion of that region, set up the independent state of Palestine, which she now claims as a mandate. Another slice was carved from France's sphere by the creation of Hejaz as an independent state, under British tutelage. France has filed formal protests against Great Britain's violation of the Sykes-Picot treaty and the King of the Hejaz has also complained that Great Britain has failed to keep promises of territory to his state. But Britain holds fast to her spoils.

In the midst of these conflicting claims Great Britain has firmly established herself in Mesopotamia and Palestine and is now administering the affairs of both countries. She has thus appropriated the most desirable portion of the Ottoman Empire, at the same time setting her rivals at each other's throats.

BRITISH SPOILS IN ASIA

Mr. President, if it be thought that the spoils of Great Britain in Africa and Asia Minor satiated the greedy ambition of English diplomats, that assumption is erroneous.

While the Senate has been debating the fragment of the peace settlement, submitted to it by the President, Great Britain has negotiated three treaties which add important links to the British Empire in Asia.

During the month of August 1919, within a period of a few weeks, Afghanistan, Persia, and Tibet were reduced substantially to protectorates of the Empire as a result of agreements which have been but partially disclosed.

The treaty with Afghanistan was concluded August 8. By its terms the Afghans were put on probation for 6 months. The aftermath of this agreement was seen November 4, when a London Times dispatch reported "six infantry brigades" of British troops marching on Afghanistan as a result of alleged "Afghan aggressions." Afghanistan is thus in process of becoming a British dependency.

By the terms of a treaty concluded with Persia August 15 Great Britain was given control of the finances, army, and foreign affairs of that country, which is now completely under the influence of the British Empire. The collapse of Russian imperialism has given Great Britain a free hand in both Afghanistan and Persia.

News dispatches of August 18 reported a treaty between China and Great Britain by which Tibet, one of the principal divisions of China, about nine times as large as Shantung or England, becomes a British protectorate. Its status, according to semiofficial advices, is said to be similar to that of Outer Mongolia, which by treaty negotiated in the early months of the war, was practically ceded to Russia.

Great Britain now controls, as a result of the war, a continuous strip of territory stretching from the Sûez Canal to the Malay Peninsula. She has filled in every gap in her empire in Asia. Palestine, Mesopotania, Persia, Afghanistan, India, Tibet, and the Straits Settlements are the links in a chain of British-controlled states which cover the southern third of Asia.

In China, Great Britain holds, in addition to Tibet, exploiting privileges along the valley of the Yangtze-Kiang River, and controls the port of this great waterway, Shanghai, a city of 1,000,000 population. When Germany seized Kiaochow in Shantung, Great Britain seized Wei-hai-Wei, and she still holds that port, threatening Japan's position in Shantung. Great Britain likewise controls Hong Kong.

Mr. President, to sum up British territorial gains from the war: Great Britain has added to her empire, either by annexation or by protectorates and mandates, a territory of 3,972,000 square miles—larger than continental Europe—with a population of more than 51,725,000 people, 99 percent of whom are natives.

Great Britain stands today the dominant power in Asia and Africa, and, in Canada, holds dominion over more territory along our northern boundary than is represented in the combined area of the United States and Alaska.

The aggregate area of the British Empire is one-fourth of the land surface of the globe, totaling 15,000,000 square miles, and her population of 475,000,000 souls represents one-fourth of the total population of the world.

The government of the British Empire is imposed upon 400,000,000 subject peoples, against their will, by 65,000,000 people of the English-speaking race, over a territory nine times larger in extent than the Roman Empire at the height of its glory. It is the boundaries of this empire which the United States, under the League of Nations, will be obligated to defend against external aggression or internal disturbance which, in the opinion of the council, amounts even to a "threat of war" affecting the "peace of nations."

I ask leave to print in the RECORD certain data explanatory of the maps, and tables connected therewith, without taking the time of the Senate to read them, under the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

British territorial gains

	Area, in square miles	Population [1]	Control
Africa:			
Cameroon	300,000	3,540,000	Mandate.
German Southwest Africa.	322,000	150,000	Do.
German East Africa.	384,000	7,650,000	Do.
Togo	33,000	1,000,000	Do.
Egypt	350,000	13,000,000	Protectorate.
Sudan	1,000,000	3,400,000	Do.
Ottoman Empire:			
Mesopotamia	140,000	2,000,000	Mandate.
Palestine	10,000	700,000	Do.
Syria (¼)	30,000	1,000,000	Do.
Asia:			
Tibet	460,000	2,000,000	(2).
Persia	600,000	10,000,000	(2).
Afghanistan	245,000	6,385,000	(2).
Islands:			
Cyprus	3,000	300,000	Annexed.
(Kaiser Wilhelm Land and islands of Pacific south of Equator.)	95,000	600,000	Annexed and mandates.
Total	3,972,000	51,725,000	

[1] The populations given include only the native inhabitants. The European population is negligible, being not more than 1 percent.

[2] Tibet, Persia, and Afghanistan are substantially British protectorates as the result of treaties negotiated in August 1919.

BRITISH CONTROL OF TRADE ROUTES

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, Great Britain's enormous territorial gains were not the sole prize won at the peace table by the English diplomats.

Modern empires do not rest upon territorial possessions alone. The bases of

modern world power are control of trade routes, raw materials, and foreign markets. Of these three, Great Britain, by the peace settlement is left with a practical monopoly.

Sir, if the object of this war was to prevent one nation from acquiring world dominion, and to end the rule of force, the war has been lost

Great Britain stands today in undisputed possession of the mightiest empire in history, maintained by the right of might, with her rivals pledged to assist her in retaining her grip upon every foot of her vast dominions, and in enforcing her law upon every one of her rebellious subjects.

Before the Senate ratifies the Treaty of Versailles, it is our plain duty to inquire carefully into the nature of the peace we are setting up. Waiving for the moment the natural right of all nations to equal opportunity for commercial development, what will be the effect upon this country of guaranteeing to an aggressive foreign power control of the trade routes, raw materials, and markets of the world? Will such an arrangement redound to the benefit of the American people, or will it be advantageous solely to the international bankers of the city of New York, which has now become the financial capital of the world? Is it to the interest of the American people for the United States to bind this country to defend that world empire.

I intend first to consider that question from an economic standpoint. I shall later touch upon its political and its moral aspects.

I take up first Great Britain's control of trade routes both by sea and by land. The acknowledged mistress of the seas before the war Great Britain's control of ocean routes is now absolute. Every important strategic point on the globe, with the exception of the Panama Canal, is now a British possession.

Of course, it is not possible for Senators across this Chamber to see the map which hangs upon the west side of the main entrance, but it shows the naval stations of Great Britain as they were at the time we entered the war. None of them has been surrendered. By the arrangements made at Paris by the peace conference others have been added. This map was prepared, in the form in which I present it to the Senate, by the War College. It shows that the United States cannot ship goods anywhere overseas without the sufferance of Great Britain. It shows an utter and an absolute and a total command of all the trade routes of the world by Great Britain. I say that that map does not truly represent the present condition, because it does not show the naval bases that Great Britain has acquired as a result of the war, but it ought to be enough to put Senators upon their guard and upon their inquiry. It ought to be enough to deter Senators from concurring in this treaty

Asia embraces about half of the human race and is consequently the richest market for foreign trade. Here Great Britain's control of trade routes is most marked.

I cannot stop, within the limited time that is now imposed upon me under the ruling of the Senator who occupies the chair [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to read, and therefore I ask permission to print without reading, in connection with my remarks, the comments of Mr. Herbert Adams Gibbons and other data upon the economic results of the deliberations of the peace conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"It requires only a glance at the map to see that the British have succeded in establishing themselves in places where they control the paths of the sea. Without the strongest navy in the world, their hold on southern Asia would be precarious. Mistress of the seas, Great Britain fears no rival. She commands: Europeans and Asiatics and Americans alike must obey. The commercial advantage of this thorough Asiatic extension of British eminent domain is incalculable. Lucky are the manufacturers and merchants born Britons—if they desire to trade any here. In southern Asia the handicap in their favor is greater than elsewhere. And that is saying a great deal!

"Cyprus keeps guard over the eastern Mediterranean Syria, and Egypt. Perim Island and Aden control the Strait of Beb-el-Mandeb at the outlet of the Red Sea. The islands of Adb-el-Keru and Sokotra, off Cape Guardafui, are sentinels at the entrance of the Gulf of Aden. On the southeastern side of the Arabian Peninsula, the Kuria Murix Islands and Bay make a precious coaling station of a kind that the British were willing to fight to prevent France from obtaining. The Bahrein Islands dominate the Persian Gulf, with Koweit at the upper end of the gulf. Possession of the Laccadive and the Maldive Islands, the Chagos Archipelago, and Ceylon makes India secure. The Andaman Strait while the Federated Malay States and Singapore give Great Britain control of Malacca Strait. Sarawak, Brunei, and British North Borneo are on the strategically important side of the Dutch Island of Borneo. British North Borneo is close to the Sulu Archipelago and other islands of the Philippine group. Hong Kong is the great port of southern China, Wei-hai-wei, near the end of the Shantung Peninsula opposite Port Arthur, stands ready to dispute with Japan the control of the exit to the sea of the most important and populous portion of the Chinese Empire."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in brief, by the terms of the peace we are asked to guarantee, Great Britain may train her guns upon every ton of shipping upon the high seas. Out of this war Great Britain has won the island of Cyprus, controlling the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. She has transformed the Red Sea, a great highway to the East, into an English lake by establishing a protectorate over Egypt, and by setting up Hejaz in Arabia. The Persian Gulf, as a result of the war, washes the shores of territory completely under British control.

THE BAGDAD RAILWAY

But, Mr. President, the extension of British control over trade routes by sea is less remarkable than her newly won control of the highways of trade on the land.

The most striking gain of Great Britain from the war is the control of the "oldest trade route of the world"—the "royal road" from Europe to Asia, coveted by world conquerors for thousands of years, the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers in Mesopotamia, now traversed by the Bagdad Railway.

Today, British troops occupy Mesopotamia, amidst the ruins of the ancient empires of the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Greeks, the Persians, the Romans, the Arabs, and the Turks. The city of Bagdad, with a population in ancient times of 2,000,000 souls, is administered today—a city of 250,000—by Great Britain. The Bagdad Railway, since January 1919, has been under the administration of British military authorities.

The new state of Palestine, which is to go to Great Britain as a mandate, is now occupied by a British army. Upon the completion of the unfinished section of the Bagdad Railway, the Suez Canal will be linked with the Persian Gulf. Great Britain thus emerges from the war in possession of this great commercial highway, giving her unchallenged domination over the commerce between Europe and Asia, both by sea and by land.

BRITISH NAVAL SUPREMACY

Great Britain's control of the seas has been strengthened by another circumstance. The war has left continental Europe without a great naval power. The German Navy, which checked British supremacy, has been sunk, Russia's Navy has been disorganized and crippled. Austria, with what was once a formidable naval force, is left by the Austrian treaty without an outlet to the sea. The net result of the war, so far as naval strength is concerned, is the elimination of all rivals of Great Britain. Even the combined Navies of the United States and Japan would be greatly inferior to that of Great Britain.

What is true of naval strength is likewise true of the merchant marine. But I stop here for a moment to introduce the opinion of the greatest naval expert that the last generation produced as to the effect upon the commercial and industrial destiny of a people of the naval control of the seas.

Put any single nation in control of the seas, and I lay it down as a maxim that you have given to that nation the arbitrary power to control the commercial and industrial development of the world; and in support of that statement I offer the opinion of Admiral Mahan, universally accorded first position among the naval authorities of modern times. Listen to what he says in his great work on Sea Power:

"The world has long been accustomed to the idea of predominant naval power, coupling it with the name of Great Britain, and it has been noted that such power, when achieved, is commonly often associated with commercial and industrial predominance, the struggle for which is now in progress between Great Britain and Germany."

He wrote before the German war, and he wrote with an understanding as to what caused the World War which has occupied the stage of human events for the last 4 or 5 years. He understood it was not a question of civilization, but a question of industrial development and commercial control.

"Such predominance," that is, naval predominance, "forces a nation to seek markets and where possible, to control them to its own advantage by preponderant force, the ultimate expression of which is possession * * * From this flow two results: The attempt to possess and the organization of force by which to maintain possession already achieved. * * * This statement is simply a specific formulation of the general necessity stated; it is an inevitable link in the chain of logical sequences—industry, markets, control, navy bases.

"Given those, you have the domination of commercial power. Given those, to the extent that you can control the world, you can control the trade and commerce of the world."

Mr. President, the man in whose hands fate had placed the destinies of this Nation without a question, without argument, without reservation, at once yielded, on the eve of the writing of the terms of the armistice, to the demands of Great Britain that the control of the seas should be reserved to her.

By this act he made good the boast of Lloyd George in his speech at Glasgow, June 29, 1917, when he said: "Britain will rule the wave through the war and after the war."

After he had taken his country into the war on the ground that our rights on the sea had been interfered with, and that they must be maintained; that there must be open pathways on the sea; that the rights of neutrals on the sea were sacred; President Wilson sat down at the peace table and surrendered to Great Britain the absolute control of the seas. In God's name, is there to be found anywhere in the history of the nations of the world such a betrayal? And you who are supporting the confirmation of the pledges made in this treaty are endorsing that action, and will be held to account for it some day by the American people.

I wanted, if possible, to save out of this discussion a few minutes to discuss some reservations that I have presented here that I think have something in them which, if they could be argued and debated and considered by the Senate—well, I do not know. I will

withdraw that. I will not say that any discussion of them would appeal to some consciences and some minds here. Arrangements have been concluded. Argument does not count. Moral questions, national honor, vital interests, are all thrown into the discard and onto the dust heap in order that we may be members of a league that makes us the tool of Great Britain.

You may foreclose debate here, you may pass your clotures and shut out discussion on this floor, but you cannot stop debate before the American people. We have, it is true, measures pending here looking to that end. We have several of them. We have one reported from the Judiciary Committee that, construed by some of the courts, will stop criticism of administrations.

Mr. FRANCE. They will so construe it, too.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It will be so construed by some of the courts. Some of the Federal courts have shown themselves to be the abject tools of the special interests. I say that and I mean it, and I am going to take the floor one of these days and review the decisions of that judge at Indianapolis who issued the injunction against the coal miners, an injunction that cannot be sustained for a minute by any decisions of the courts or by any construction of the law.

BRITISH CONTROL OF RAW MATERIALS

Mr. President, I have said that control of raw materials is one of the bases of modern world power. By the peace settlement, Great Britain acquires control over vast natural resources and unlimited supplies of raw materials.

Before the war England was not at a disadvantage in this respect.

She had Canada, with an area of 4,000,000 square miles, 30 percent of which is suitable for agriculture, supplying wheat, oats, and other foodstuffs; with immense resources of coal and oil, both as yet untouched, and with rich deposits in nickel, zinc, lead, tin, copper, silver, and gold.

She had India, with 225,000,000 out of a total population of 315,000,000 engaged in agriculture, producing wheat, rice, tea for the English table, and wool, cotton, jute, and other raw materials in huge quantities for the English factories.

She had Australia, with an area of 4,000,000 square miles, supporting only 5,000,000 people, importing to England great quantities of meat, wool, wheat, dairy products, copper, tin, lead, timber, and coal.

She had South Africa, with a monopoly on the diamond supply of the world, importing over $30,000,000 in stones to England in 1918, and supplying wool, coal, hides, and skins.

Now, Mr. President, can it be argued that it is conducive to the peace of the world and of the general welfare of the nations for one power to extend its control over the raw materials of the earth? Is it true that Great Britain follows a benevolent policy of sharing her advantages with other countries?

Fortunately, some information is available on this point. In March 1918 the Dominions Royal Commission, which had spent 5 years touring the British Empire, made its report to the British Government. It reminded the English people—

"That the Empire had substantially a monopoly of the world's product of certain most valuable commodities of commerce."

And it gave this significant advice:

"It is not difficult * * * to imagine conditions even in times of peace, in which it might become desirable to use the possession of these assets as an instrument of commercial advantage. The principal monopoly of potash which Germany possesses, has enabled her to assert pressure on other countries in the past, and the controversy between Germany and the United States in 1911, may be mentioned as an example of the influence which the possession of a raw material monopoly gives in negotiations between two powers. The possession of assets such as the Canadian asbestos and nickel supplies could be used by the British Empire as a powerful means of economic defense."

The commission recommends that Canada supplant American capitalists in the manufacture of asbestos and nickel products, in both of which industries Canada holds a monopoly over the raw material. The commission commends the existing Canadian legislation which prohibits foreigners from obtaining title over petroleum lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and other Dominion Provinces. On page 183 of the report, the commission sums up its main conclusions and recommendations on this subject as follows:

"We regard it as vital that the Empire's supplies of raw material and commodities essential to its safety and well-being should be, as far as possible, independent of outside control. As the first step toward ascertaining how such independence can be secured, we recommend that an immediate survey should be undertaken of the relation between Empire production and Empire requirements of these materials and commodities, such survey to be made by an imperial development board."

Mr. President, I have quoted at length from this important document because I anticipate the argument of those who favor the support by this country of Great Britain's imperial ambitions, and who would bind the United States to aid in maintaining the status quo of the Paris peace settlement. These gentlemen believe, so close are the natural ties between Great Britain and the United States, that the two nations will work hand in hand and that whatever gains accrue to the British Empire will be shared by the United States.

Ah, Mr. President, that hope finds no support in the frank recommendations of this commission. Suggestions that monopolies of raw material may be used as "instruments of commercial advantage;" that they are valuable in "negotiations between two powers;" warnings to Canada that she must eliminate "foreign control" of her nickel ores, and recommendations that stringent regulations against foreign investments in petroleum, coal, iron, wood pulp, and other natural resources be enacted in every part of the realm—are these the words upon which we are to base our hope for future favors?

The gentlemen overlook the fact that the United States is now Great Britain's principal competitor in commerce, manufactures, and finance. They forget that the British Foreign Office, acting without restraint from Parliament, and often without the knowledge of that body, as to the policies it pursues, is eternally vigilant for the protection and aggrandizement of British trade interests throughout the world.

If there were not more vital political and moral considerations at stake, our selfish interests should restrain us from guaranteeing another nation's claim to the natural wealth of the earth. Monopoly does not breed generosity or regard for the rights of others. Monopolies are acquired, maintained, and exploited for one object, and that object is self-aggrandizement.

WHY AN AMERICAN MANDATE IN ARMENIA IS DESIRED

If any man is in doubt as to what the United States may expect under the peace settlement, he has only to look beneath the surface of the proposed mandate in Armenia. The American mission sent to Armenia has, it is true, reported against the acceptance of a mandate by this country. But Great Britain is determined to have us accept it, and I doubt not if we continue in our present course, in a few more months we shall find American soldiers in Armenia. It was only a few days ago that Lloyd George, A. Bonar Law, and other leaders in the House of Commons expressed great impatience with this country for not immediately taking over the Government of Armenia.

A competent American authority, Frank H. Simonds (Review of Reviews, September 1919, p. 266), declares that the occupation of Armenia would—

"demand an army which at the outset could hardly be estimated at under 100,000, and might have to be double that size. We should find ourselves in the East forever in the presence of a Russian resumption of that press southward which was only interrupted by the revolution. Between the Cilician Gates and the Upper Euphrates we should stand in an area where British and French claims conflict, while about Constantinople we should find ourselves face to face with Russian, Bulgarian, and Hellenic aspirations."

Senators and citizens who favor the acceptance of a mandate in Armenia might devote a profitable hour to a study of the map. Armenia is the buffer between Mesopotamia and Caucasia. It obstructs the only possible avenue of attack by land against the Bagdad Railway. With an American army of 100,000 men in Armenia, the power which controls the Bagdad railway might breathe easily and maintain her dominion of this great artery of trade for decades to come.

An English writer, a few month ago (H. Charles Woods, Contemporary Review, June, 1919) reflected the hope of our friends across the water when he suggested that—"if America could be persuaded to undertake this responsibility" the mandate should include, "not merely just such an area as Europe might consider a disencumbrance," but the little Republic of Ararat, bordering on Russia and Persia, and a port on the Mediterranean Sea as well.

It is significant, Mr. President, that the richest territories disposed of in the peace settlement lie in the neighborhood of Armenia, and that all of them have fallen to Great Britain.

By the withdrawal of Russian influence from Persia, Great Britain acquires full control over the Persian oil lands, practically untouched and among the most valuable in the world. British troops now occupy the Caucasian region, west of the Black Sea, near Baku, also rich in oil. While the oil reserves of the United States are fast being exhausted, Great Britain now has within her grasp the great petroleum fields of the globe.

South of Armenia lies Mesopotamia, described by Maj. T. Alexander Powell, United States Army, former American vice consul general in Syria (Review of Reviews, April 1919, p. 407), as—

"The richest of these Asian lands. * * * This Mesopotamian region has almost unlimited agricultural possibilities. Though it is today the most sparsely populated part of the Turkish Empire, it was in ancient times the most densely populated part of the world. * * * According to the painstaking and conscientious investigation of Sir William Willcocks, the irrigable area of Mesopotamia is from two to three times as large as that of Egypt. Cotton, sugarcane, corn, cereals, opium, and tobacco will flourish on the banks of the Euphrates as they do in the valley of the Nile."

The writer states that Mesopotamia is capable of supporting 30,000,000 people, and suggests that this land will be used by Great Britain as an outlet for overcrowded India.

The new British dependencies in Africa are also rich in natural resources. Togo produces cotton, oil, rubber; Cameroon produces rubber, ivory, cocoa, palm oil, hard woods; southwest Africa, cattle, sheep, and rich resources of iron, copper, tin, gold, and diamonds; east Africa, rubber, ivory, coffee, coal, iron, lead, copper.

BRITISH TARIFF POLICY

I have shown, Mr. President, how Great Britain controls the raw materials of the world. I have sketched roughly her control of the trade routes by land and by sea. That she controls the markets of the world as the result of her vast political empire can hardly be questioned. I shall not take time to prove the obvious fact of her supremacy in Africa, Asia Minor, and Asia, where the most profitable markets are to be found.

Now, Mr. President, if we are to guarantee to another nation a world monopoly of trade routes, raw material, and markets, the responsibility is upon the Senate to take into account the obvious results of that policy.

I recommend to Senators who have shown themselves zealous in the protection of American business interests a study of the tariff policy of Great Britain.

Since 1897 the system of "preferential tariffs" has been extended throughout the British Empire. To quote a British authority (J. Watson Grice, The Resources of the Empire, p. 52):

"In large measure the maintenance of the trade of the mother country with the dominions, and the steady expansion in the trading relations of each of the dominions with other portions of the Empire, reflected in the adjoining tables, have been assisted and encouraged by the preferential treatment which has been accorded by each of the dominions to certain products and manufacturers of various parts of the British Empire."

The same authority notes that, under the revision of the Canadian customs tariff of 1907, with the enactment of a preferential tariff, a general tariff, and an intermediate tariff, American goods "pay the general tariff rates on importation into the Dominion, and that from April 1903 to February 1919, German goods were subject to a surtax of one-third of the duties under the general tariff."

Since the close of the war, plans have been laid to revise the preferential tariffs of the British Empire and to heighten the tariff wall surrounding the colonies.

Before the war Germany was England's rival for foreign trade. The preferential tariffs of the British Empire were levied with that fact well in mind.

President Wilson, speaking at St. Louis, Mo., September 5, 1919, declared that the war itself was the result of the fierce competition between these two nations. He said on that occasion:

"Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here or any woman, let me say is there any child here, who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry * * * This war, in its inception was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war."

Now, Mr. President, as a result of the war, the United States has succeeded Germany as England's commercial rival. She will inherit, as time passes, the same jealousy, the same deep-seated hatred, that inevitably results, as Mr. Wilson says, from "commercial and industrial rivalry."

In revising her preferential tariffs, Great Britain will not overlook the fact that America is her chief commercial competitor. She will extend her tariff wall around her new dominions—as she extended it early in the war around the captured German colonies in Africa—and American goods will be excluded from the lands we are guaranteeing to Great Britain, just as American goods are being excluded today from German southwest Africa, and other territories where, before the war, our goods entered upon an equal footing with the commerce of the world.

The Senate must reckon with this result of the peace settlement, as well as with the effect upon American commerce of giving Great Britain power to levy prohibitive shipping and freight rates on the great trade routes and in the great ports of entry over which she has recently extended her control.

BRITISH EXPLOITATION OF SUBJECT PEOPLES

I have heard it stated in this Chamber that Great Britain is the one great colonizing nation in the world. In justification of her wide dominion, it has been argued that she is peculiarly fitted to administer the government of distant territories.

Senators who advance that doctrine ignore the fact that the day of colonization is past. There has been no effort—and there will be none—to colonize India, Egypt, or Mesopotamia, as Canada, Australia, and South Africa have been colonized. Out of a total population in India and her dependencies of 360,000,000, there are to be found only 170,000 Europeans and Americans, of whom two-thirds are British subjects. Great Britain holds these immense territories and administers the affairs of the native populations, not for purposes of colonization, but for the sole object of exploitation.

Under the pretense of altruism, with much talk of bestowing the blessings of Christianity and civilization upon the "backward peoples," the imperial nations of Europe have ruthlessly exploited the rich resources and vast populations of Africa and Asia.

The Covenant of the League of Nations provides that in the future this exploitation shall be carried on under the authority of a mandate. No provision is made whereby the dependent countries may safeguard their natural resources. It is not even provided that a "backward" nation may refuse a mandate which it knows is prompted by selfish interest.

A native Hindu, writing of the subjection of his race and of western domination of Asia, has aptly described the conditions the treaty of peace will perpetuate:

"There are four main incentives for the subjection of Asia: (1) Rich natural resources; (2) unlimited amounts of human material (cheap labor); (3) raw material for feeding the looms and factories of Manchester and Lancashire; (4) markets—a place on which to dump the cheap manufactured trash of Europe."

That is the analysis, Mr. President, of this keen eastern mind of the reasons why Asia is now held fast under foreign rule.

The writer now describes the real purpose of the governments maintained by foreign powers in Asia:

"In return for the possession and exploitation of natural resources and human beings, the exploiting nation establishes and forces upon the unwilling, unarmed, and defenseless people a political despotism the chief aim of which is to render economic exploitation more efficient.

"Under this system of political and economic exploitation, Asia has endured three centuries of torture. Countless millions have starved to death while food which they have grown has been shipped from their country; railroads and strategical harbors have been built for this purpose. Not only were railroads built with private British capital but the British Government in India guaranteed a profit to all investors, such money to come from the Indian revenues if the railroads did not pay for themselves.

"Their industries have been destroyed that they might not compete with Manchester and Lancashire and that they might remain producers of raw materials; their self-governing, democratic village communities have been destroyed and authority centralized in one hand that exploitation might be more thorough; their schools have been destroyed and education denied them, save that which fitted them for subordinate clerical positions under European masters; opium and liquor have been forced upon them by cannons with a fourfold purpose: revenue, easier economic subjection, easier political subjection, racial and cultural destruction."

That is the system which is being forced today upon the unwilling races of Asia and Africa.

It may be said that this picture is overdrawn. It is my own belief that it tells the ugly truth of the white man's penetration in China, India, Egypt, and other defenseless countries.

I shall not review the results of that system. Wherever it has been imposed, it has brought famine, misery, and rebellion. The average income of a native worker in India today is less than $10 a year, and $1.50 of that amount is wrung from him annually in taxes levied by an alien government. The statement before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that 6,000,000 natives died during the last 3 months of 1918 because of the "drawing of resources out of India, making it impossible for her to maintain an adequate food supply," has not been denied.

Wherever the British flag flies over a subject people today, revolution is brewing. Ireland is an armed camp. Three hundred and fifty millions of Indians are stirring. The Egyptians, betrayed into the passive acceptance of a protectorate, are in open revolt. Egypt was called by Napoleon "the most important country in the world." Bismarck referred to it as "the nerve center" of the British Empire. British ascendancy in Persia, Afghanistan, and China meanwhile, depends upon the maintenance of her rule in India. If she should lose either India or Egypt, most of the subject peoples whom she exploits would gain their freedom.

LEAGUE FORMED TO PRESERVE STATUS QUO

Mr. President, there is one agency to which Great Britain may look for aid in holding her rebellious subjects in check, and that agency is the League of Nations.

I care not what reservations or amendments we attach to this Covenant. In the final analysis it is an instrument for the preservation of the status quo. Like the Holy Alliance of 1815, it is couched in the language of idealism and peace. But, like the Holy Alliance, it will be used for the suppression of nationalities and for the prosecution of oppressive warfare.

This Covenant closes the door in the face of every people striving for freedom. Not one of the races now held in bondage had a voice in the making of the instrument. Not one was granted an opportunity to be heard at Paris. This Covenant was so cunningly conceived that the first act of revolution in India, Korea, Egypt, or Ireland will be interpreted as a "threat of war" and a disturbance of the "peace of nations." Patriots of India, Egypt, Ireland seeking external aid for their countries as Franklin sought aid in France for the struggling American colonies, and as Kossuth, Kosciuszko, De Valera, and many others have sought aid in the United States for the cause of human freedom, by the terms of this treaty become international outlaws. No ingenuity of interpretation of the articles of this document can remove from my mind the conviction that it destroys everywhere the right of asylum.

If we are to disregard every principle of our free institutions and every tradition of

the past, there are yet other reasons why we should withhold our support from this new alliance.

We should not deceive ourselves into believing that there can be a permanent enforcement of the present system of exploitation in Asia. The civilization of these Asiatic countries is more venerable than our own. Asia's contribution to the world has been the principle of human brotherhood. Asia has produced the great moral teachers of history — Confucius, Buddha, Mohammed, Christ.

To these great teachers may be traced the nonresistance and pacifism of the Asiatic peoples.

The races of Asia have now suffered for three centuries under European exploitation. Off the east coast of China they see the smallest of the Asiatic nations, Japan, holding a place of power in the councils of the world. They know that Japan owes her present ascendancy to the military and naval strength which she built up in a decade. With this example before them, is it likely that the millions of Asia will continue long under foreign rule? China has already awakened under the stimulus of a revolution and the theft of Shantung. India is approaching revolt. Should the League of Nations attempt to maintain indefinitely the status quo in Asia, the world will witness a more terrible war than the one from which we have emerged. It will be a continental war—a race war, in which the white races will be hopelessly outnumbered.

If we ratify the treaty with Germany we are leading this country farther into the shadow of that menace.

Mr. President, I do not speak of Great Britain's mighty Empire in a spirit of covetousness.

I do not covet for this country a position in the world which history has shown would make us the object of endless jealousies and hatreds, involve us in perpetual war, and lead to the extinction of our domestic liberty. I, for one, harbor no ambition to see this country start upon the path which has lured other nations to their ruin.

Mr. President, we cannot, without sacrificing this Republic, maintain world dominion for ourselves. And, sir, we should not pledge ourselves to maintain it for another.

Where are Great Britain's boundaries likely to be assailed? Certainly not in Australia, Canada, South Africa, or New Zealand. These self-governing dominions—colonized and peopled by Englishmen—have given ample proof of their loyalty to the mother land and their Anglo-Saxon populations need no League of Nations to guarantee the integrity of their territories.

It is the vast native populations, held in bondage for the enrichment of a small class of imperialist aliens—the millions of India, Egypt, and the Ottoman Empire—who are apt in the future to disturb the status quo created by this peace.

It is these peoples that the League of Nations must hold in check. It is to maintain this part of her Empire that Great Britain must keep her mighty navy and burden the English people with taxes.

It is my conviction that the English people residing in the dominions and the British Isles would benefit most if this illicit portion of the Empire should crumble and fall away.

If the British Empire were limited to the dominions, with its government founded upon the consent of the governed, and hence requiring no guaranties from other nations, the peace of the world would rest upon a sounder basis.

Mr. President, I know the argument will be advanced here that the 400,000,000 unwilling subjects of the British Empire enjoy better government than they would enjoy if left to govern themselves.

Senators, that is an argument which, even if it were based on truth, should have no place in the American Congress. We owe our national existence to the courage of a handful of men who proclaimed to the world the self-evident truths that—

"All men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

A controversy arose in this country 60 years ago as to the application of those great principles. In that contest, Abraham Lincoln contended that the Declaration of Independence applied not alone to white men, or to the descendants of the English settlers in the colonies, but to all men, white and black, yellow and brown, and he declared that Declaration the "sheet anchor of American republicanism."

LINCOLN ON SUBJUGATION OF WEAKER PEOPLES

When the arguments were advanced in this country for the enslavement of the Negro which are now advanced for denying the natives of India and of Egypt self-government, Lincoln replied (Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1858):

"Those arguments that are made, that the inferior races are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge (Douglas) is the same old argument that says, 'You work, and I eat; you toil, and I will enjoy the fruits of it.' Turn it whatever way you will, whether it come from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent."

In the same speech, Lincoln said:

"Now, I ask you in all soberness if all these things, if indulged in, if ratified, if confirmed and indorsed, if taught to our children and repeated to them, do not tend to rub out the sentiment of liberty in the country, and to transform this Government into a government of some other form?"

In that same great contest, on another occasion (Edwardsville, Ill., September 13, 1858), Lincoln said:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Mr. President, when Abraham Lincoln contended for the right of self-government, as the heritage of all men in all lands, everywhere, who can say that he would have excluded the people of Egypt, of India, and of Ireland?

These people do not ask that we send armies to Europe or Asia to aid them in gaining their freedom. They ask, simply, that we shall do nothing to hinder them in their struggle for independence from the power which once held sway over the American Colonies.

The hope expressed here, that by entering the League of Nations we can best serve these subject races is, in my opinion, a forlorn hope.

If we were powerless to serve oppressed peoples at Paris, by what logic can it be argued that we shall be better able to serve them at Geneva?

At Paris our enemies, our allies, and the neutral nations of the world had accepted the Fourteen Points which we were pledged to write into the peace.

How the representatives of the United States compromised those principles, how they set aside the doctrine of self-determination, how they abandoned open covenants openly arrived at for the secret treaties of the Allies, are now matters of history. Can it be hoped that at Geneva, with the confidence of the world blasted in the stability of our purposes and ourselves bound to a covenant which pledges our support for the status quo, we shall be a powerful advocate for Korea, India, Egypt, and Ireland?

Mr. President, when the American people were committed to this war, the great mass of them were led to believe that they were suffering and fighting for the destruction of arbitrary power, exercised by strong nations over weaker people—fighting to carry democracy to all parts of the world.

The war ended. We sacrificed a quarter of a million precious American lives, incurred a war debt of thirty billions, disorganized industry, engendered class hatred in our social order, created a new crop of profiteering millionaires, overturned a German autocracy and built up a British autocracy infinitely stronger to rule the world, and we are now engaged in creating a league of nations to perpetuate its power and bind this Government to respect and preserve its extended boundaries.

Look at the map of the world as Great Britain's boundaries were fixed before the war. British possessions—widely scattered, outlying, detached, isolated—waiting to be united, bound together, and made secure.

Look at the map today, with British boundaries reaching out over the earth to embrace her spoils of war.

The map of the world has become the map of Great Britain. It is not the work of chance. On its face it is the written confession of the guilt of British imperialists for their full share in the years of diplomatic intrigue which inevitably embroiled the world in war.

How puny appear the ambitions of Germany compared to the imperial power now actually attained by Great Britain.

In spite of the protestation of Lloyd George that England did not seek "1 yard of territory," Great Britain has made capital of the sacrifices of the United States, of France, and of the English people, to bring a vast new territory under her flag, and British bankers and traders are preparing for a new era of exploitation.

I do not believe that the British Empire, in which the missing links were neatly fitted at the Paris Conference, is an accident of events.

It is plainly the consummation of the long-considered and well-planned program of the imperialists who dominate the British Foreign Office, at the expense of the English people. To this source, in my opinion, may be traced many of the minor irritants which led up to the war.

It was this force which built up in the United States by subtle propaganda hatred of Germany. It is this power which now seeks American support for a treaty visiting upon the German Republic a peace more crushing, more harsh, and pitiless in its terms than any peace threatened to be imposed upon the German Empire under the rule of the Kaiser and the Junker.

That this venomous and unreasoning hatred of Germany still persists in some parts of our country will not restrain me from raising my voice in protest against the crushing of the German Republic and the German people, who, according to the President's own statements, were not responsible for the war.

If we ratify the Treaty of Versailles, after pledging ourselves to a peace based upon the Fourteen Points—which had been approved by the Allies and accepted in good faith by the Central Powers—we shall stand convicted before the world as a Nation without honor and unworthy to be trusted to fulfill the pledges it has made.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we now come to a statement by another distinguished American, former Senator George Norris, who until a few short months ago sat in this Chamber with us. On the 18th day of November 1919, Senator Norris said:

Mr. President, a million Egyptians went into this war. I have never yet heard of any dissent among the Egyptian people in their loyalty to our side of the war. They believed, as the record shows without dispute, that at the close of the war they were going to be an independent nation, and that Great Britain was going to make her word good. When they appointed representatives to go to Paris and meet with the representatives of other nations, those emissaries were arrested by the British Government and put in prison, without any charge of crime or anything, but simply to prevent them from going to Paris; and when, on account of the excitement in Egypt that it aroused, they were finally released and they did come to Paris, they never were able to obtain admission into the council where the treaty was made. Their petitions were ignored, their voices were unheeded, and we have a treaty before us which, in substance, turns over Egypt to Great Britain.

It seems to me that we ought to consider what has been shown among other things that have come out in this debate that after all this treaty is turning over a great portion of the world to Great Britain, giving her jurisdiction over a great portion of the civilized world, the greatest portion, as has been shown and is undisputed. When this treaty is ratified, if it is, with the exception of the Panama Canal, there will be no great trade route in the world not covered by British guns. With that one exception we cannot send our own commerce anywhere without going within the range of British cannon.

Thirteen million people have been promised their independence. They are able to govern themselves. They have a civilization older than ours, and it seems to me that we ought at least to agree to the reservation that the Senator from Oklahoma has offered, and make good to these people who were loyal to our cause through the struggle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LANGER. I will speak on the resolution.

Mr. President, 1,000,000 of the Egyptian people fought in the last war. Is the situation of the millions of Egyptian people, whose representatives they refused even to hear, any different from what we are face to face with today?

Suppose the masses of India rebel against their British masters—

After we adopt this resolution—

shall America, child of revolutionary democracy, spill the blood of her men to keep India under the British yoke?

Suppose China goes to war against Great Britain over Hong Kong, as Lin Yutang threatens in his newest book.

Will Americans in the world police force be compelled to fight the Chinese for preservation of Hong Kong as a British colony?

Suppose the natives of the Indies decide to throw the Dutch out and work their mines, oil fields, and plantations for their own benefit and profit.

Will Americans participate in a police force to crush the rebels and keep them subjects of the Queen of Holland?

There are other questions asked here—by whom? Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article from the Progressive, dated October 18, 1943. The article was written by Morris H. Rubin in the old La Follette Magazine, now the Progressive. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESSIVES AND THE PEACE

(By Morris H. Rubin)

The preliminary showdown on foreign policy is close at hand. I use the word "preliminary" because certainly no amount of resolving by the present Congress can bind the next Congress, which will doubtless have to grapple with the peace settlement; nor can all the honeyed hokum peddled by stay-at-home editorial writers and women's club orators commit the 10,000,000 men and women under arms to a course of action which does violence to the truths they are soaking up on battlefields around the world.

Watching the lines form in Congress and throughout the Nation for this preliminary showdown, one is struck by the moral and intellectual decadence of what we know as liberalism—the escape of men and women who once fought the good fight, into a sham world, a world in which their weary minds can play with symptoms rather than causes, with panaceas rather than cures.

They are haggling, these tired liberals are, over whether it shall be the Churchill-Dewey dual alliance for Britain and the United States, or Walter Lippmann's sugar-coated triple alliance, or Ely Culbertson's multiple World Federation, or Clarence Streit's Union Now, or Henry Luce's American Century. They are engaged in verbose debate over the clauses and commas of the Fulbright resolution and whether it is more or less ambiguous than the Ball, Burton, Hill, and Hatch resolution and the substitutes being offered.

ESCAPE IN A DREAM WORLD

All this chatter about resolutions, which are designed to conceal rather than convey meaning, is, of course, Tory talk. This is the kind of haggling and bickering among liberals which delights the reactionaries because this kind of argument over foreign policy never gets close to essentials, never comes to grips with realities; this kind of argument was made to order for the Tories who want the rest of us to chase rainbows in the sky while they organize and exploit the real estate and raw materials here on earth.

Nothing pleases the smart imperialist more than to have the service clubs, the women's clubs, the classrooms, the radio forums, and the newspapers and magazines debating whether we shall have world federation or a federated world; whether we shall have an international army or a world police force. For as long as people are busy debating the nature of the alliance to be formed and the nature of the armed force which is to police the world, their attention is distracted from the nature of the peace treaty itself.

Nothing could be more tragic for progressives than for them to become addicts of these phony peace cures. If you're tired of fighting imperialism, if you're resigned to the restoration of all the pre-war injustices, if you no longer respond to the challenge here at home—why, help yourself to a lusty drag of the internationalists' peace pipe and you, too, will find escape in a dream world where all the pimples on the face of the earth are cured by simply having the world police force of a super state shoot them off. Never mind what caused them, and never mind how often they come back.

Nothing can more easily destroy the hope of attaining everything that progressives and liberals have been fighting for, nothing can more surely guarantee a new lease on life for the old imperialism, and nothing can more surely wreck the hope of lasting peace than for the United States to commit itself now to participate in the enforcement of a peace treaty whose terms we do not know.

A PIRATE'S PEACE?

Consider this for a moment:

The liberal press, such as it is, has denounced virtually every move made by the Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill during the past 2 years of war, and that same press is beating the drums for a world police force which will enforce those political mistakes and freeze them into permanence.

From everything that has happened thus far and from many things said by Mr. Churchill, it is all too clear that our actual goal in this war has become the restoration of the status quo as it existed the day before the guns went off.

Instead of holding out for concessions from the British imperialists, instead of making American participation in policing the post-war world dependent on the willingness of our allies to make deep-going changes in their past conduct and future demands, the internationalists in America are demanding a flat, unconditional promise by the Government of the United States to participate in a post-war scheme of collective security, regardless of the terms of the peace settlement itself.

Mr. Churchill demands the retention intact, if not the actual expansion, of the British Empire. He demands the restoration of King George of Greece, whose late General Metaxas' Fascist regime was only somewhat less brutal and intolerant than the Hitler variety. He has announced that the pre-war dynasty must return to the throne of Yugoslavia in spite of public resentment. He is determined that Hong Kong must go back to the British Empire, even though Lin Yutang has asserted that this would produce war with China.

These are only a few of Mr. Churchill's publicly stated demands, and Mr. Churchill has a habit of getting his way. And yet the boys and girls who run the nation and the new republic, to mention only two, make a great show of holding their noses with one hand at Mr. Churchill's determination to make this a Tory war, while with the other hand they beckon American liberals to get on the bandwagon for an international police force which will make Mr. Churchill's piracy legal and perpetuate his restoration policy.

Mr. Churchill is not only a good poker player (he carries home with him a pair of American trousers whenever he sits in with the boys at Washington, Casablanca, or Que-

bec), but he is also an avowed imperialist. The liberals pretend to a certain pained surprise whenever Mr. Churchill discusses war aims. His plans to keep the Empire alive and expanding, to restore Tory regimes throughout Europe, and to suppress by force of arms any revolutionary move which shows itself, are perfectly consistent with his character and background, great old pirate that he is.

Mr. Churchill has been a great war leader—doubtless one of the very greatest in all of Britain's proud history of conquest. He will stand, I think, as an orator, imperialist, and England Firster almost without parallel in British experience.

IT WOULD BE TRAGIC FOLLY

But what on earth does this have in common with liberal, progressive objectives, or with a genuine program for lasting peace?

Remember, when you are asked to endorse a world police force to support Mr. Churchill's version of the post-war settlement that it was this same Winston Churchill who said in his book, Great Contemporaries, that he admired Hitler's "courage" and "vital force." Remember that it was this same Winston Churchill who said once that he was charmed by Mussolini's "gentle and simple bearing," by his "triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism."

I am not here calling him to account for false judgments but merely pointing out that basically Hitler and Mussolini were thoroughly acceptable leaders to Winston Churchill until—and here is the key to his public career—until they dared to challenge the world leadership of the British Empire.

These qualities make Winston Churchill a great warrior and a great imperialist, and we are properly thankful that he rallied the British at the moment of their supreme crisis and led them out of the valley of despair to fight with a courage and devotion which have won them the admiration of the world. But appreciation of his dramatic qualities must not blind us to the fact that it would be tragic folly to write out to him and his kind that blank check demanded by the internationalists and the so-called liberals.

The deep-going aspirations of people everywhere—aspirations for freedom, for economic opportunity and security, for political democracy, and for peace among nations—all these would be crushed to dust if we established a world state and a world police force dedicated to the restoration of the pre-war balance of power, the pre-war dynasties, and the pre-war lack of freedom and security which characterized much of the world.

WE HAVE A RIGHT TO ASK

We have a right to ask, and ask now, for guaranties that the world leviathan we are urged to create will not be used to crush the revolutionary impulses of men and women who hunger for the "four freedoms," and not just for speeches and editorials about those freedoms.

Suppose—and these are no far-fetched possibilities—

Suppose the masses of India rebel against their British masters.

Shall America, child of revolutionary democracy, spill the blood of her men to keep India under the British yoke?

Suppose China goes to war against Great Britain over Hong Kong, as Lin Yutang threatens in his newest book.

Will Americans in the world police force be compelled to fight the Chinese for preservation of Hong Kong as a British colony?

Suppose the natives of the Indies decide to throw the Dutch out and work their mines, oil fields, and plantations for their own benefit and profit.

Will Americans participate in a police force to crush the rebels and keep them subjects of the Queen of Holland?

Suppose Poland objects forcibly to any settlement which gives Russia part of her pre-war territory.

Will Americans consent to stand guard over a new partition of Poland?

Suppose the people of Greece and Yugoslavia revolt against Mr. Churchill's scheme to restore the old national dynasties.

Will Americans be asked to shed their blood to preserve unpopular and reactionary monarchies?

These are only a few of the questions Americans must ask themselves before they consent to bind their future and the future of their children to the enforcement of a peace treaty which has not yet been written, but which, if it follows the pattern of our words and deeds up to now, will pledge our lives and resources to preserving, protecting, and policing the old imperialism and the old order.

It is important to remember that despite all the turgid oratory and breast-beating editorials, the issue which confronts us today is not that of isolation versus cooperation.

Progressives who oppose writing a blank check now to persons unknown to accomplish goals unspecified believe just as strongly in genuine cooperation among the nations of the world as hysterical internationalists who would claim for themselves a monopoly on morality and peaceful purpose.

Where progressives differ from the Tories and the liberals is here:

Progressives would emphasize the causes of war and deal with them first. They would stress the terms of the peace before they haggle over means of enforcement. They would insist, while we still have left some of our fast dwindling bargaining power with our allies, that we exact certain conditions looking toward the establishment of a humane peace settlement, instead of waiting until we have promised away our freedom of decision and action.

GUARDING THE SWAG

Progressives oppose resolutions which are a compound of weasel words, hidden meanings, and vague promises.

Progressives favor a resolution which would make it crystal-clear that America will participate in the enforcement of a peace treaty which strikes at the causes of war, and which guarantees to all nations, great and small, and all peoples, whatever their color, creed, or race, access to the riches of a generous and abundant earth.

Such a resolution, of course, would be torpedoed by the internationalists in and outside of Congress because it would raise irritations and vexations which would embarrass our allies, especially Mr. Churchill and his program of preserving and extending the British Empire and restoring the dynasties and inequalities of pre-war Europe.

It was precisely such a resolution which the founder of this magazine, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., introduced a quarter of a century ago—in the midst of World War No. 1. Seeking to prevent what was to become the tragedy of Versailles, he sponsored a measure which would place Congress on record against a peace settlement which would provide for annexation of new territory and the payment of harsh and hate-creating indemnities.

"Resolved, further," that resolution read, "that Congress declares that there should be a public restatement of the Allies' peace terms, based on a disavowal of any advantages, either in the way of indemnities, territorial acquisitions, commercial privileges, or economic prerogatives, by means of which one nation shall strengthen its power abroad at the expense of another nation as wholly incompatible with the establishment of a durable peace in the world."

Here was a resolution which proposed to commit America to rooting out some of the major causes of war—harsh indemnities, territorial expansion, monopoly, and economic privileges, and imperialism.

But this resolution was swept aside then, as it would be today. Although he was an advocate of world cooperation, the senior La Follette opposed the League of Nations because the Versailles Treaty it was created to enforce was a violation of the terms of the armistice, a betrayal of China, Egypt, and India, a mockery of the Fourteen Points, a callous trading of territories—and the League itself was designed to "stand guard over the swag."

THE PATH AHEAD IS CLEAR

Senator La Follette also saw then, as do many far-sighted progressives today, that America can make its greatest contribution to world peace and world democracy—economic as well as political—by putting her own house in order, by solving the economic problems and resolving the racial issues, which when left unsolved, lead to fascism which in turn leads to war.

If one-tenth the energy and oratory expended on schemes to enforce our way of life on the rest of the world could be used in making our way of life succeed here at home, we will have done more to bind up the world's wounds than we can by passing a trunkful of resolutions of the Fulbright and B2-H2 variety. Justice William O. Douglas expressed it this way in The Progressive last week: "We cannot expect our prestige throughout the world to rise above the level of our own accomplishments at home."

For Progressives, the path ahead is clearly marked:

1. We must fight every effort to commit the United States to police and enforce a treaty which has not been written.

2. We must resist every effort to make the peace treaty a vehicle for the restoration of pre-war dynasties, imperialisms, and inequalities.

3 We must work affirmatively for world cooperation if there can be world agreement on peace terms consistent with our principles of political and economic democracy.

4. We must put our own economic house in order and make our own democracy a model for all mankind before embarking on any global assignment to reform the rest of the world.

Mr LANGER. Mr. President, when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations introduced his resolution, we were urged to vote for it because it was said to be so elastic that it could be construed to mean anything.

That had a familiar sound to me. It reminds me of one of those smooth, slick salesmen we men in the West are so familiar with, who in the old days used to get some farmer behind the barn and give him a drink of rot gut, and get him to sign a contract to buy a $7,000 or $8,000 threshing machine and threshing engine. They would get him to sign the contract; and when the farmer said, "There is some fine print on the back of this contract," the smooth, slick salesman would say, "Oh, that does not mean anything." When I was Governor, we finally got rid of those practices, by North Dakota statute.

So, Mr. President, for days the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] fought off all attempts of the little band of Senators which the junior Senator from Missouri described

a while ago. Certainly no one reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listening to the debates which have taken place on the resolution, as I have listened to them, can fail to be impressed with one outstanding fact, namely, that the 14 Senators led by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] have fought hard, persistently, desperately, and untiringly to amend the original Connally resolution by what they call "strengthening" it so as to include provision for an international military force.

Mr. President, I know these 14 Senators. I know how determined they have been in the months during which they have been traveling all over the United States to get a provision for an international military force into this resolution, and, Mr. President, they have it there. It is there. After it is there, of course, they rejoice because the paragraph adopted by the Senator at their insistence reads as follows:

> That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. President, the only way it will be possible to maintain international peace will be by fighting for it, as the late Senator La Follette said in the quotation which I have read into the RECORD. He said:

> If you adopt the League of Nations—

And the same thing is true of the pending resolution—

> you will not only have an occasional war but you will have perpetual war.

Mr. President, this question is not a new one. It has been debated on the floor of the Senate time and time again.

As I said a moment ago, on November 13, 1919, the late Senator La Follette said:

> I shall show before I get through that if we ever become a member of this proposed League of Nations we will be perpetually in a state of war.

When some Senator said that the original Connally resolution meant nothing, he could not have read the third paragraph, which says:

> That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Under the Connally resolution, Mr. President, we pledge ourselves to prevent aggression. Either we are going to do specifically that or we are not going to do it. If we are not going to do it, we have no business in adopting this resolution. Certainly we cannot promise to preserve political independence and territorial integrity of some of the members who will enter under paragraph 4, and not of others. We cannot promise to preserve the territorial integrity of the members of this association on some occasions, and refuse to do it on other occasions.

Shall we fight? Shall we send our soldiers to fight, Mr. President, to help England maintain her power over 300,000,000 people in India, and then not send our troops to help England keep possession of Hong Kong?

We cannot be permitted to preserve the territorial integrity of a member of this association of nations, when it is to our interest to do so, and seek to destroy the independence or the territorial integrity of a member of the association when it is to our interest to take another course.

I assume that if we go into the organization or association of states provided for in paragraph four we shall go into it with the honest intention of fulfilling our obligations, and that we shall join with other free and sovereign nations to prevent aggression.

Mr. President, it is not often that a great statesman has a great son, but the late Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, was succeeded by his son, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., in this body. Only a few days ago he sent the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the following telegram:

> In order that there may be no doubt in the mind of other committee members as to my position, wish to say with all due respect to other members of the committee that I think a great mistake is being made by the committee in its present efforts to commit the United States to a future course in world relationships when the committee and the people of the United States are still in the dark as to the peace-table demands and the post-war policies of the other United Nations, including Great Britain, China, and Russia.

Mr. President, in this battle I am perfectly willing to take my stand alongside of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The people of my State know what they stand for, and out of the hundreds of letters I have received from the State of North Dakota only 3 asked me to vote for the resolution sponsored by the 14 Senators. The letters have been almost unanimous in their demand that I vote "no" on the pending or any other similar resolution.

Mr. President, I very respectfully call the attention of the Senate to the fact that only a few weeks ago my State led the entire region in the sale of War bonds, the 10 national leaders being:

	Percent
North Dakota	128
Montana	127
South Dakota	112
Iowa	112
Wyoming	108
Minnesota	108
Colorado	103
Mississippi	103
Oklahoma	103
Nebraska	103

Very frankly, I intend to follow the wishes of the people of my State. I subscribe to very nearly every newspaper published therein, and I have had hundreds of letters on the subject before us. The people of my State are all out to win the war. They are all out to protect the Western Hemisphere. They are all out for the proposition that we not only want to win the war, but we want to win the peace.

The people of North Dakota, and I believe of this Nation, are not interested in Mr. Winston Churchill retaining possession of India, a country so poorly administered by them that last week an article appearing in a Washington newspaper carried an item saying that 100,000 Indians are starving each week. That is the kind of rule we are asked to perpetuate. Certainly, the people of this country, in my opinion, will not be interested in continuing to maintain that kind of a status quo, and certainly I believe the people of North Dakota, and the people in this country generally, have not been impressed by the fact that our Government in Washington has had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in the purchase of Blair House so that the President could adequately entertain royalty.

So far as I am concerned, I think the whole world would be better off if the ex-dukes and the ex-kings and the ex-queens were barred from ever coming to Washington at all, and if those in authority were barred from spending the money of the taxpayers in entertaining this motley crew, who never have worked, who do not know how to work, who never will work. Yet the Government has purchased Blair House in which to entertain them at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars. They flocked to Washington, both just before the war started and since the war started, and, of course, they think themselves so far superior even to any Member of the Senate that not one of them would deign to think of marrying the son or the daughter of an average American. They are "royalty," and they flock to this country, hoping that we will adopt some measure to help them out. So far as I am concerned, I shall not vote to help that kind of an outfit. In my opinion, the American people simply have no time for that kind of foolishness.

Mr. President, in talking with some of my colleagues who are going to vote for this measure I find some strange answers. Some say they are going to vote for it because they do not want to offend our allies, others say it will help the war effort, but I am going to vote against it because I believe it will help our soldier boys everywhere. Many of the boys in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force write me, in spite of the censorship, and I know they feel the same way that many do who have come to see me, who say they are glad to help preserve our country, that they are glad to risk their lives for it, but they want to come back to a country which is the kind of a country it was when they left it.

Some Senators talk about the debts of World War No. 1, and the slogan that might and not justice is right, and there are those who talk of other things, as did the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who a short time ago said that nothing had been said about the

matter of shipping scrap and petroleum to Japan. I say to the distinguished Senator that of course that question was discussed, but no Senator introduced measures prohibiting shipment of scrap iron to Japan.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I am very sincere in my opposition to the pending resolution, and oppose it because I have become thoroughly convinced, after reading the debates on the League of Nations, that we should take up a resolution like that now pending only when we have more information as to what took place in Moscow, when Secretary Hull asks us to take it up and when our fighting men are back home. We can debate it more profitably when we find what each country sitting around the peace table wants, and we can certainly debate it better when we find what secret treaties are in existence.

Mr. WALSH obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Massachusetts starts his remarks, I wish merely to observe that I hope we may be able to conclude the consideration of the resolution this afternoon, and I think the prospects are good, but in the event we do not do so, it will be necessary to hold a session tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is almost universal recognition today of the interdependence of nations and peoples in both hemispheres if peace and post-war security are to be secured—and surely desire for lasting peace is in every heart. There can be no doubt that the American people today are wholeheartedly in favor of moral and economic collaboration with all other free nations in the post-war world, with mutual good will.

The resolution before the Senate, in the form originally reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, aimed to give formal expression to this viewpoint and to these sentiments, and to give notice to the world that the United States stood ready to join with other nations to preserve a just and honorable peace, and in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression against such a peace.

Americans in recent weeks have watched with anxious eyes the Moscow Conference, and are encouraged by the announcement that complete unanimity prevails for prosecution of the war to speedy and final victory, and that an appropriate agreement for post-war collaboration has been achieved.

A further paragraph which has now been added to the resolution concerns the establishment of an international organization, and is said by some to be intended as a tacit endorsement of the Moscow agreement.

The final paragraph of the resolution prudently reaffirms the constitutional principle that international agreements pertaining to United States adherence to any international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security are treaties not binding upon the United States unless and until they are submitted to the Senate and approved by the Senate in accordance with constitutional provision. It is well that this affirmation is incorporated in the resolution.

I intend to vote for the resolution. It is obvious that a vote against the resolution would be tantamount to a denial of any willingness to cooperate with other free nations in the post-war world. Such a denial would in my opinion misrepresent the sentiments of the American people, and would misrepresent my own sentiments.

But let there be no misunderstanding of the nature of the resolution and of my position in supporting it. The resolution is an offer—not a commitment. It is expressive of a desire for a just and honorable peace, and of a willingness to cooperate in its maintenance. But as to what is a just and honorable peace and as to ways and means for its maintenance, those are questions which cannot possibly be decided until the terms and conditions are resolved, and until the post-war international organization is translated from the realm of theory to the realm of fact.

We cannot—even if we wished to do so—commit our Government or the country to these things until the time comes when we know the terms and our obligations. I, for one, most emphatically do not wish to try to do so. We are not signing any blank check, governing our participation in the post-war international set-up, and placing a mortgage on the next generation to redeem it.

The resolution at best is but a well-meaning generalization, and, in my judgment, little is gained by its adoption. I regret that it is here. Obviously, any resolution on the subject of post-war collaboration which undertook to specify the exact character and extent of that collaboration, or which involved a commitment in specific terms to specific alliances, would have precipitated acrimonious controversy highly prejudicial to the war effort. On the other hand, the generalized statements to which we are now subscribing may serve to raise illusory hopes and sow the seeds of future misunderstandings, both at home and abroad.

Stated briefly, the resolution indicates our belief in and desire for international cooperation. At the end of this war the discussion will very properly be over something not now under discussion, namely, the kind of cooperation. Shall it be moral, or physical? Shall it consist of resolutions, covenants, charters, treaties, or shall all such documentary protections be reenforced by the Army and the Navy? Will we agree to dismantle our Navy as we did after the last World War? Will our Government favor an offensive or a defensive peace, not with one or two, but with all our allies? The time for all these momentous decisions has not yet come. These questions are not now under consideration.

No Member of the Senate, therefore, is foreclosing his right and his duty to searchingly and dispassionately scrutinize whatever peace treaty subsequently comes before us for ratification, and to challenge it if need be. No Senator is foreclosing his judgment with respect to whatever international organization or plan is hereafter proposed in which our participation is sought. No Senator or American citizen will be obliged to accept any post-war proposals that do not take into account the continued freedom of small nations, of which Poland, Estonia, and Latvia are some conspicuous examples.

If the peace treaty is not founded on justice, then its terms can never be carried out except by force, and perhaps not even then. Certainly America will never join hands with other nations to enforce a treaty that fails to accord with the principles of justice and freedom.

Finally, we need to realize that it is the millions of men and women now in the armed forces who will have, and should have, the deciding voice in determining the post-war policies of our country. It is they who will shape American destiny in the years to come.

CONTINUATION IN STATUS QUO OF THE PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I apologize to my colleagues who are anxious to bring the pending resolution to a decision, but only the importance of a matter which I will briefly relate and conclude within 5 minutes causes me to introduce another subject into the discussion.

Under the Philippine Constitution the term of the President expires on the 15th of this month. There is some question about succession, and obviously it is necessary for many reasons that need not be discussed that the Philippine government, now domiciled in Washington, be in a continuous state.

However, Representative BELL, of the Insular Affairs Committee of the House, and myself as chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, were reluctant to undertake this matter except upon the request of the office holders and the cabinet of the Philippine Islands now in Washington. They have written us a letter and signed it in full inviting us to take such action. I shall not take the time to read it, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES,
November 5, 1943.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs,
Representative JASPER BELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We respectfully call to your attention and to the attention of the Congress of the United States conditions affecting the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines upon which you may wish to take action.

Under the provisions of our constitution, adopted by our people with the approval of

the United States Government, the present incumbent of the office of the President will cease on November 15, 1943, and on the same date the Vice President will assume the Presidency.

Due to invasion and occupation of the Philippines by the Japanese, constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been interrupted in the Philippine Islands. While this condition prevails, the question of the presidential succession under our constitution comes up for consideration.

If we were in the Philippines and our constitutional government there were functioning regularly, there would be no problem. But we are not in the Philippines, we are in the midst of a global war, and our constitutional system and democratic institutions are seriously jeopardized. The operation of the legislative and judicial branches are suspended by enemy occupation and only the executive branch which remains free from the enemy's action and is now temporarily established in Washington is able to continue.

Obviously constitutional government and democratic processes will not again function in the Philippines until law and order are reestablished.

Therefore, we, the President, the Vice President, and the other members of the war cabinet of the Commonwealth of the Philippines respectfully submit this matter to the President and the Congress of the United States with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency. Congress may feel free to consider whether it would be to the best interest of both peoples to allow changes in the direction of the commonwealth government during the emergency to continue the status quo until such time as the constitutional and democratic processes are fully reestablished in the Philippines, or to follow such other course of action as in their opinion is required by the circumstances.

In the event that emergency legislation is enacted we are confident that it will be made effective only for the duration of the war and to cover such period of time as is necessary to reestablish our constitutional processes in the Philippines when we may proceed again under our own constitution.

We would be most thankful to the President and the Congress of the United States for whatever attention they may give to this matter.

We have the honor to remain,
Faithfully yours,

M. L. QUEZON,
President.
S. OSMEÑA,
Vice President.
J. M. ELIZALDE,
Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States.
BASILIO J. VALVEX,
Chief of Staff, Secretary of National Defense.
CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Secretary of Information and Public Relations.
ANDRES SORIANO,
Secretary of Finance.
J. HERNANDEZ,
Auditor General.
A. B. ROTOR,
Secretary to the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, likewise I have had prepared a brief showing whether or not we have the power to take the action which they request, and without reading that brief in full I shall read three lines from it:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States provides—

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Mr. President, obviously the Philippines are still a part of the United States, but the brief goes on to give additional legal grounds for action should Congress deem wise to pass the joint resolution which I will shortly submit. I ask unanimous consent that the brief be printed in the RECORD for information of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The brief is as follows:

AUTHORITY OF THE CONGRESS TO ENACT STATUTES IN CONFLICT WITH THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH

The authority of the Congress to legislate in matters respecting the Philippine Islands is derived from the Constitution of the United States. Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States * * *."

The Philippine Constitution limits the service of any person as President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines to not more than 8 consecutive years. It would clearly be within the power of the Congress to repeal this provision or to suspend its operation.

The Philippine Constitution was adopted pursuant to authority contained in the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456). This statute provides for the ultimate and complete independence of the Philippine Islands at a future date, but pending such independence the statute also provides that the United States has not surrendered its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Philippine Islands. Section 2 (a) of the Philippine Independence Act provides in part:

"1. All citizens of the Philippine Islands shall owe allegiance to the United States.

"2. Every officer of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall, before entering upon the discharge of his duties, take and subscribe an oath of office, declaring, among other things, that he recognizes and accepts the supreme authority of and will maintain true faith and allegiance to the United States.

"6. The public debt of the Philippine Islands and its subordinate branches shall not exceed limits now or hereafter fixed by the Congress of the United States; and no loans shall be contracted in foreign countries without the approval of the President of the United States.

"9. Acts affecting currency, coinage, imports, exports, and immigration shall not become law until approved by the President of the United States.

"10. Foreign affairs shall be under the direct supervision and control of the United States.

"12. The Philippine Islands recognizes the right of the United States to expropriate property for public uses, to maintain military and other reservations and armed forces in the Philippines, and, upon order of the President, to call into the service of such armed forces all military forces organized by the Philippine Government.

"13. The decisions of the courts of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in paragraph 6 of section 7.

"14. The United States may, by Presidential proclamation, exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands and for the maintenance of the government as provided in the constitution thereof, and for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty and for the discharge of government obligations under and in accordance with the provisions of the constitution."

Identical provisions are contained in the ordinance appended to and made a part of the Philippine Constitution.

Section 9 of the Independence Act provides that there shall be no obligation on the part of the United States to meet the interest or principal of bonds and other obligations of the government of the Philippine Islands hereafter issued "during the continuance of United States sovereignty in the Philippine Islands." Section 14 of the Independence Act contains provisions for the application of immigration laws of the United States "upon the final and complete withdrawal of American sovereignty over the Philippine Islands." Finally, section 10 (a) of the Independence Act declares that "all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands" shall be surrendered when the final independence of the Philippine Islands is recognized and proclaimed by the President.

The above provisions clearly show that pending complete independence of the Filipino people, the United States retains sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Philippine Islands.

The exercise of such sovereignty and jurisdiction is evidenced by the enactment by the Congress, following the passage of the Independence Act, of a number of statutes which apply to the Philippine Islands. Among such statutes may be noted the following: Act of June 14, 1935, c. 240, 49 Stat. 340; act of August 7, 1939, 53 Stat. 1226; act of May 28, 1941, c. 134, 55 Stat. 206; act of December 22, 1941, 55 Stat. 852; act of June 25, 1942, c. 447, 56 Stat. 390.

It may be argued none of these statutes repeals or supersedes the Philippine Constitution without the consent of the Filipino people. But they do show that the Congress has exercised jurisdiction over the Philippine Islands and has legislated with respect to them.

Attention is invited to the act of August 29, 1916, c. 416, section 5, 39 Stat. 547 (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 1003), and to the act of July 1, 1902, 32 Stat. 711, as amended (U. S. C., title 48, sec. 1147). These two statutes were enacted prior to the 1934 Philippine Independence Act, but they are still in effect. In the former act the Congress has recognized that the statute laws of the United States would be applicable to the Philippine Islands unless exception is made. It has, therefore, in this statute declared that laws of the United States enacted subsequent to August 29, 1916, shall not apply to the Philippine Islands "except when they specifically so provide." The latter act provides that the silver Philippine peso, which is made legal tender in the Philippine Islands, and the subsidiary and minor coinage authorized for the islands shall bear inscriptions expressing "the sovereignty of the United States." There are few things closer to a people than its money.

The plenary power of the Congress to legislate for the Territories and possessions of the United States has been upheld by the Supreme Court. In *National Bank* v. *County of Yankton* (101 U. S. 129, 133), the Court stated:

"All territory within the jurisdiction of the United States not included in any State must necessarily be governed by or under the authority of Congress. The Territories are but political subdivisions of the outlying dominion of the United States. Their relation to the General Government is much the same as that which counties bear to the respective States, and Congress may legislate for them as a State does for its municipal organizations. The organic law of a Territory takes the place of a constitution as the fundamental law of the local government. It is obligatory on and binds the Territorial authorities, but Congress is supreme, and for the purposes of this department of its governmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States, except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

"In the Organic Act of Dakota there was not an express reservation of power in Congress to amend the acts of the Territorial legislature, nor was it necessary. Such a power is an incident of sovereignty and continues until granted away. Congress may not only abrogate laws of the Territorial legislatures, but it may itself legislate directly for the local government. It may make a void act of the Territorial legislature valid, and a valid act void. In other words, it has full and complete legislative authority over the people of the Territories and all the departments of the Territorial governments."

In *Mormon Church* v. *United States* (136 U. S. 1. 42), the Court stated:

"The power of Congress over the Territories of the United States is general and plenary, arising from and incidental to the right to acquire the Territory itself, and from the power given by the Constitution to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States. It would be absurd to hold that the United States has power to acquire territory and no power to govern it when acquired."

In accord, see *Murphy* v. *Ramsey* (114 U. S. 15); *Dorr* v. *United States* (195 U. S. 138); *Posadas* v. *National City Bank* (296 U. S. 497).

The Commonwealth of the Philippines is not one of the States of the Union. Its status is that of a Territory. As a Territory it is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. It is therefore within the power of the Congress to repeal, should it see fit to do so, the Independence Act of 1934 and legislate completely for the government of the Philippine Islands. In that event the present Philippine Constitution and the government established thereunder would fall with the enactment of such legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Thirdly, there is a short joint resolution which I shall immediately introduce, and which Representative BELL will also introduce in the House of Representatives, which resolution carries out the request of the Philippine representatives here within our constitutional limits for a continuation of the terms of the Philippine President, Vice President, and Cabinet members until such time as civil processes are again established in the Philippine Islands, when it will be possible, through the Philippine Constitution, to deal with the matter from that time on.

I ask consent to introduce the joint resolution, Mr. President, and request that it be printed, and also be printed in the RECORD. I am not reading any of these documents because the Senator from Nebraska was kind enough to yield me these few minutes in his time. I have only interrupted the debate because the 15th of November is not far off and the hiatus in the officeholding of the officials in the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines would not be a fortunate thing from any viewpoint at this time.

I desire to thank the Senator from Nebraska for his courtesy.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to provide for the continuation of the government of the Philippine Islands was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Philippine Islands have been invaded and the government of the Philippine Commonwealth transferred to the continental United States; and

Whereas the welfare of the United States and the Philippine Islands requires the continuation in office of that government until the enemy is driven from the land he has seized and until the Filipino people can reconstitute their government as they desire: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of article VII of the amended Constitution of the Philippines, the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States proclaims that their successors have been duly elected and qualified in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Philippines.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, during the Senate debate, much has been said as to the effect the adoption of Senate Resolution 192 would have upon the morale of our allies. Certainly it is apparent to all Americans that the membership of the Senate believes in the prosecution of the war to a complete victory over the enemy. This Congress has supported all appropriations without a dissenting vote. We have complied with the requests of the military leadership, and Congress will continue to do so until the enemy is completely conquered.

With declarations one and two of the committee resolution, we all agree. These paragraphs are very brief. Paragraph 1 requires that the war against our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved. Paragraph 2 provides that the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace. There is no divided opinion on these declarations. We are in unanimous accord.

But it is on declarations three and four that sharp issue has arisen in the Senate. One issue centers around constitutional processes. What constitutes advice and consent? Where is the line of demarcation drawn between advice and consent? Where does advice end and where does consent begin? Certainly that line has not been clearly drawn, for me at least, in the debate in the Senate on the pending resolution. The constitutional provision set out in article II, section 2, of our Federal Constitution provides:

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Thus the passage of any resolution on post-war relationships, properly, legally defined, merely advises the Chief Executive, and does not give consent. Only is consent given a treaty when it is brought to the Senate for ratification.

Resolutions are declarations. Declarations contain only advice given to the President of the United States and are not binding on the Senate as to any future action. This is borne out by the fact that a declaration requires only a majority vote for passage, whereas the Constitution specifically requires that ratification of a treaty shall be by two-thirds concurrence. An interesting point, however, has been raised by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], wherein he asks the question, Why should not a two-thirds vote be required for advice as well as consent?—because of the fact that it is almost impossible to draw the line of demarcation.

In the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright* (U. S. Repts., vol. 299, p. 319), the opinion written therein clearly points out that the President is charged with the responsibility of negotiating treaties, but it also makes it clear that the substance of treaties shall come before the United States Senate for ratification.

In the light of this opinion, the President not only has assumed responsibility in reaching an agreement with Winston Churchill on the Atlantic Charter, but also with the countries in the Moscow Pact just completed. Since the President has assumed this responsibility, it is unnecessary for the Senate to give any further advice to the President. But if the adoption of this resolution will in any way encourage the morale of our allies, then, even though the advice has not been asked by the President, and he has already assumed the responsibility, nevertheless the Members of the Senate should go along with those who have sponsored the resolution, if for no other reason than to cooperate in the war effort.

It should be strictly understood, however, by the membership of the Senate and by the President that this resolution means only one thing—advice—not consent, nor advance consent. We are not morally nor legally bound to ratify, in the future, any treaty that the President might negotiate, growing out of the declarations of this resolution.

I do not agree with the definition of the broad terms by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who said in response to a question asked by the able junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] that the terms set forth in the declarations three and four of the original Senate resolution were as follows:

We used the word "authority" because it was broad enough to cover the utilization

of the World Court, the League of Nations, if necessary or practicable, and the Hague conventions.

Then, as if that were not broad enough, he said:

And broad enough to cover a further authorization to create a new and additional organization to effectuate the broad objectives of preventing aggression with power.

Then, in answer to the question asked by the junior Senator from Ohio, "What is power?" the senior Senator from Texas turned around and said:

Let us look to the lexicographers and not to the perfervid oratory of Senators. What does the dictionary say?

Power includes mental power. There is the World Court and there are other agencies for discussing and settling problems by mental processes. Power includes moral power. It includes physical power. Everyone knows what physical power is. It is a sword, a cannon, a piece of artillery, or a navy.

Certainly, if we were to accept the definition of the terms of the senior Senator on declarations 3 and 4, in our instructions and advice to the President, then the President is authorized to negotiate any kind of a treaty, setting up any kind of international authority, with power to prevent aggression, which, to my mind, would be the quickest way to involve us in World War No. 3.

In accordance with this view, many Senators stated on the floor of the Senate that they felt they were giving ratification in advance to any treaty negotiated by the President arising out of the terms of this declaration. Further, they said they felt they would be morally and legally bound to ratify any treaty negotiated by the President which was sent to the Senate for ratification. On this point I desire to quote again from the remarks of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who said on the floor of the Senate on Thursday, October 28, in response to a question I asked him:

From the legal, technical point of view, of course, each Senate is legally and technically entitled each time to vote as it sees fit. From the moral point of view, those who were not Members of the Senate at the time the resolution was passed would have a lesser moral obligation to be bound by it than those who were Members of the Senate at the time the resolution was passed. But what is the moral obligation upon which in international relations we must rely?

The Senator asked the question, and then answered it:

It is this, as I see it: To the extent that the President does conform to the things to which we state in the resolution we will consent, as a matter of moral obligation to him, to the country, and to the allies we should stand by those points.

A question arose from that answer, in my mind; and so I was particularly interested in the amendment of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS]. Now that difficulty has been overcome, I think, by the action of the Senate committee in adopting the so-called Willis amendment, which in effect prohibits Executive power from overriding legislative authority in the ratification of treaties.

The able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has made this plain, on page 9066 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where he requested unanimous consent to annex to the committee resolution the general terms of the Willis amendment. The senior Senator from Texas said the following by way of explanation:

With respect to the second paragraph, which refers to the necessity for the Senate acting upon any treaties, we do not think that that was legally necessary, because in the original resolution we used the language, "United States, through its constitutional processes." When that language was used, we used it with the specific intent of saying that this Government could act only through its constitutional processes, one of which is that any treaty negotiated by the Executive must be negotiated with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is still our view. We do not think it was necessary to add this supplement; but certain Senators were rather disturbed by some fear that this might be construed as a ratification in advance. We have seen fit to recognize their views in that respect, and to make perfectly clear what we intended in the original resolution.

Because of that fact, Mr. President, I was one of the Senators who felt that the Willis amendment should be adopted in order to make certain that we preserve the legislative authority in the ratification of a treaty.

I think the Senate should have adopted the amendment of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] which provides a further safeguard of our constitutional processes. It specifically charges that the President shall participate only in setting up an international organization, the instrument for which shall be sent to the Senate for ratification. I agree with the junior Senator from West Virginia that the time to debate that issue is now, right on the floor of the Senate, and not after the President has negotiated a treaty on which there might be a wide divergence of opinion as to the broad terms of the declarations on which the Senate has advised him, particularly as to the representation——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall speak for 2 or 3 minutes on the resolution.

I say that I agree with the junior Senator from West Virginia that the time to debate that issue is now, right on the floor of the Senate, and not after the President has negotiated a treaty on which there might be a wide divergence of opinion as to the broad terms of the declarations on which the Senate has advised him, and particularly as to the representation the United States will have in such an organization, as to what the police power of the international court shall be, and as to how far the organization might go to prevent aggression.

An outstanding example of what might arise is found in the amendment of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], offered on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon. The junior Senator from Connecticut offered as an amendment to the committee resolution the substance of the Atlantic Charter. His amendment was defeated by an overwhelming vote. That is convincing evidence in support of the argument of the junior Senator from West Virginia, who attempted to set out specifically that America's participation in setting up any international authority should come back to the Senate for ratification.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to make my position absolutely clear. I shall support the amended committee resolution, and that is the Willis amendment, but I am not subscribing to an international authority which has such police powers, to enforce peace and prevent aggression, as could override the sovereign rights of the American people. I am not unwilling to cooperate internationally in order to preserve the peace of the world, provided that in that cooperation we do not recognize the authority of an entity superior to the Government of the United States.

In supporting the modified committee resolution I am joining with the other Members of the Senate in advising the President that we are ready and willing to cooperate with our allies to win the war; but I am not giving advance ratification of, and neither will I ratify at any time in the future, a treaty which goes beyond my interpretation of the admonitions contained in the declaration.

Finally, Mr. President, I am not in favor of delegating to the President legislative power to permit him to circumvent or bypass the Senate in the matter of treaty ratification.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I intend to vote for Senate Resolution 192 as revised by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I desire to make it perfectly clear that I know just what I am voting for. It is a simple resolution which does nothing more than express the idea that the Senate favors the establishment of a just peace throughout the world and is willing that the United States shall assume a fair share of the responsibility for the maintenance of such a peace. It does not bind any Senator to vote for or against any treaty, in whole or in part, which may hereafter be submitted to the Senate to implement this general declaration. And above all, even though adopted by a unanimous vote, the resolution does not amend the Constitution of the United States by merely repeating some of the words of the supreme law of the land.

My remarks are directed to the final paragraph of the revised resolution, which reads:

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] on October 25, which was the inspiration for this change in the Connally resolution, substituted the word "agreement" for the word "treaty," with the evident purpose of asserting that any international agreement of this character cannot be made binding upon the Government of the

United States except by a two-thirds majority of the Senate. I am glad to know that the Committee on Foreign Relations rejected any such assumption, which certainly is not true, as is shown by the words in the body of the resolution, "that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes." The plural word "processes" is used, and properly so, because, as I shall demonstrate, there is more than one perfectly constitutional way to bring about "the establishment of an international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world," or, as later stated in the resolution, to formally approve and firmly adhere to the plan agreed upon at Moscow of establishing "a general international organization * * * for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The intent of both of these very similar declarations can be carried into effect, so far as our Government is concerned, by either of two entirely constitutional methods. The first and generally accepted way to go about it would be for the President to exercise his constitutional "power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." A treaty is a formal agreement or compact duly concluded between two or more nations. The usual way for the United States to become bound by the terms of a treaty is ratification by a two-thirds majority of the Senate. If the President calls the instrument which he sends to the Senate a treaty, that is the customary process.

But if the President should decide not to designate as a treaty any international agreement which he has negotiated, there is not one word in the Constitution which requires the concurrence of a two-thirds majority in the Senate. This is conclusively proven by a very large number of such agreements which have been put into full force and effect by the adoption of acts or joint resolutions by a majority vote in each branch of the Congress, and subsequently approved by the President in exactly the same manner as any other bill is enacted into law.

In every case the use of the word "treaty" has been carefully avoided. Just call them international agreements, compacts, conventions, understandings, or by any other name, and any and every thing which could possibly be accomplished in the wide field of international relations by means of a treaty ratified by "two-thirds of the Senators present" can be just as well and just as effectively done by a majority vote in each branch of the Congress, when followed by Presidential approval. All that is required is cooperation between the President, the House of Representatives, and the Senate in the usual and customary way.

A complete list and detailed description of the various binding agreements made in this manner by our Government with other sovereign nations during the past century and a half would fill pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I need cite but a few important instances to clinch the argument.

Nothing has had a more lasting effect upon the American Nation than acquisitions of territory. History records that President Jefferson called a special session, not of the Senate alone, but of the entire Congress to consider the treaty with Napoleon which provided for the Louisiana Purchase. He had intended to submit the treaty to both the House of Representatives and the Senate but, being assured of the required two-thirds vote for ratification, finally decided to ask for prior senatorial action. He did, however, furnish the House with all the information about the treaty which was supplied to the Senate, because it was perfectly obvious that money must be appropriated by the entire Congress in order to consummate the purchase.

Another large acquisition of territory came about by the annexation of Texas in 1845. In that instance President Tyler submitted to the Senate a treaty negotiated with the independent Republic of Texas proposing admission as a new State into the Union. This treaty the Senate rejected by a vote of yeas 16 to nays 35 in June 1844. The following December the President recommended that the same results which could have been accomplished by the rejected treaty be attained by the enactment of "a joint resolution or act to be perfected and made binding on the two countries when adopted in like manner by the government of Texas." The House adopted such a joint resolution by a vote of 132 to 76, and Senate approval was given by the narrow margin of 27 to 25. The final effect was exactly the same. Texas was admitted into the Union.

John C. Calhoun, the then Secretary of State, who attained his fame as a Member of this body, made the following statement in connection with the annexation of Texas:

> It is now admitted that what was sought to be effected by the treaty submitted to the Senate, may be secured by a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress incorporating all its provisions. This mode of effecting it will have the advantage of requiring only a majority of the two Houses, instead of two-thirds of the Senate.

President Tyler stated the case with these words:

> The power of Congress is fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that a formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished.

McKinley was another President who successfully appealed from the Senate to the entire Congress in order to bring about the annexation of territory. He had submitted to the Senate in 1898 two treaties with the independent Republic of Hawaii providing for annexation. No action was taken on the first one and it was withdrawn. Consideration of the second was delayed or ignored until the President lost patience with the Senate, with the result that the treaty which had been previously adopted in Hawaii was ratified upon our part by a joint resolution passed by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring. By that method the same identical result was accomplished as though the Senate had approved the treaty when it had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator not recognize the difference between the three instances which he has now cited, in each of which one of the parties to the agreement in effect passed out of existence as an independent sovereignty as a result of the action, and an instance in which the integrity of both of the contracting parties continues after the contract is made? Before the Senator answers, let me call his attention to the fact that in the case of the acquisition of the Territory of Louisiana the doubt of President Jefferson was not as to whether the acquisition was or was not within the treaty-making power, but whether, under the Constitution of the United States, he had any authority whatsoever to acquire additional territory, by purchase or otherwise. In the case of the acquisition of Texas and in the case of the acquisition of Hawaii the contracting parties went out of existence.

Mr. HAYDEN. Whether independent nations who made treaties of annexation went out of existence or not, they could have become parts of the United States by the adoption of a treaty. There is no question about that. A treaty is defined in the dictionary as an agreement between sovereign nations. Texas was a sovereign nation. Hawaii was a sovereign nation. If the Senate had adopted the treaties, Texas would have been annexed, and Hawaii would have been annexed. The only point I am making is that what was sought and could have been accomplished by a treaty—and the Senator will not deny that—was accomplished by the alternative constitutional method.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. In the two instances to which the Senator refers, that is true.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us take the instance of the Treaty of Versailles, which was debated for so long in the Senate with no result. That was a peace treaty. Failure to adopt it left the United States still in a state of war against Germany. The Senate failed to act. There was no other recourse than for the Congress as a whole to act, and that is exactly what the entire Congress did in 1921, by adopting a joint resolution, which was approved by the President, and which declared a state of peace to exist between Germany and the United States. Peace could have been made by a treaty but it was just as well made by a joint resolution in a perfectly constitutional manner.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was in no sense a treaty. That was a declaration of peace by the Congress. It was the reverse of the action of the Congress in declaring war. Congress merely declared peace.

The reason I venture to interrupt the Senator is that his argument seems to

indicate his belief that it is within the power of the Chief Executive to determine, by his own discretionary use of terminology, whether or not a particular international agreement is a treaty, a compact, an agreement, a convention, or what not. That seems to me not to be altogether within the bounds of common sense.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will admit that the normal and regular way of making a binding international agreement would be, of course, for the President to submit it as a treaty. There is no question about that. But what I am saying to the Senator is that if the other method is adopted, he will not deny that, whatever the nature of the agreement may be, the American Government is just as firmly bound to keep its word and carry out the agreement as though a treaty had been ratified. The Senator will not deny that passage by the House and Senate of a joint resolution approved by the President of the United States committing this Nation to perform any act in cooperation with another country binds our Government to carry out the bargain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can conceive of only one difference. It is that when a treaty is ratified it becomes, along with the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. I will concede that an unconstitutional action undertaken by the adoption and approval of a joint resolution would not be binding; but so long as the action taken is not violative of the Constitution of the United States, then the entire Congress has made just as binding a promise as two-thirds of the Senate otherwise could.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may trespass further upon the time of the Senator at this point, let me say that in my opinion an international agreement between this country and another independent sovereignty, dealing with political relations between the two, if enacted, or attempted to be enacted by the President without submission to the Senate in the manner prescribed by the Constitution governing treaties, would be an unconstitutional exercise of power, and therefore within the acknowledgment which the Senator has just now made.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Senator is saying is that there is only one way in which the United States can be committed to any agreement with a foreign country, and that is by a treaty, which must be sent to the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. For example, postal conventions are properly recognizable as Executive agreements, because all that they are may be stated in the phrase itself—"Executive agreements." They are intended to carry out an Executive policy which has been determined upon in advance. But when the agreement is political in character, and commits two countries to a course of political action, then I believe the agreements are treaties, and ought to come within the constitutional requirements.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me quote to the Senator from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Many Senators will remember Senator Sutherland of Utah——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will take time on the resolution, Mr. President.

Senator Sutherland was recognized in this body as a very distinguished lawyer. In a case affirming the validity of a joint resolution which delegated certain powers to the President in the field of foreign relations, Mr. Justice Sutherland, speaking for the Court in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright* (299 U. S. 318) said:

> The investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. Neither the Constitution nor the laws passed in pursuance of it have any force in foreign territory unless in respect of our own citizens * * *; and operations of the Nation in such territory must be governed by treaties, international understandings, and compacts, and the principles of international law.

That is a very broad and well-reasoned opinion, which I shall supplement by reading a statement made at a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in May 1932, by Hon. David J. Lewis, a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland, which conveys the same idea:

> I am going to briefly refer to some of the instances in which Congress has taken control of such matters, not as a matter of appeal from the Senate, but in the assertion of its natural power and jurisdiction over the mass of our international relations.
>
> Mr. TEMPLE. You mean the House of Representatives?
>
> Mr. LEWIS. I mean the Congress.
>
> Mr. TEMPLE. Both Houses.
>
> Mr. LEWIS. I am speaking now not of the power of the House as compared with the power of the Senate. I am speaking of the power of Congress as compared with one of its bodies. The Senate under the special treaty-making power may enjoy some of the legislative power of Congress with regard to foreign affairs. The Congress enjoys all the power the Senate possesses and reserved and general powers besides. The powers of Congress are plenary and without exception and may be exerted by a majority vote. I will give some examples of the exercise of this plenary power.

After citing a great many of the instances to which I have heretofore referred, Mr. Lewis said:

> These examples make it clear that there is power in the Congress to look out with its own eyes over the earth's surface and declare and protect our international relations. The treaty function, far from being an exclusive power in the Senate, as clearly neither exclusive nor adequate in this field.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for permitting me to interrupt him, because I merely wished to express the other point of view. In my judgment his statement should not be permitted to pass without comment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point I wish to make is this: In the cases of Texas, Hawaii, and the Treaty of Versailles, the Senate fumbled the ball. This body could have acted on a treaty in each case, and there would have been no question about it. Then, under the inherent power which the whole Congress possesses—a power which it possesses because the United States of America is a sovereign, independent nation—the Congress as a whole picked up the ball and carried it over the goal line for a touchdown. I say that if the entire Congress could pick up a fumbled ball and carry it over the goal line, it could take the ball in the first place and make the score.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have only a few minutes left and I should like very much to complete my remarks.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the Senator allow me to add that I completely disagree with him on these cases, and that some time in the future I shall discuss them and dispute his view. I am sorry that he will not permit me to ask him a question.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am very sorry, but my time is very limited. I do not expect all Senators to agree with me, because this is bound to be a subject for dispute.

It is perfectly obvious that to accomplish the main purpose expressed by the Connally resolution there must be a clear understanding among the nations as to what each shall be prepared to do in the event of a serious threat that the peace of the world may be broken. Whatever obligation our Government may assume in that regard can only be made effective by the long-continued concurrence of the entire Congress. The Senate by itself cannot perform America's share in maintaining world peace. The help of the House of Representatives will always be required.

That is why, in my opinion, it would have been much better if the Committee on Foreign Relations had given consideration to the Fulbright resolution which has passed the House of Representatives and in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested. Except by unanimous consent, which I know is impossible to obtain, there is no way in which House Concurrent Resolution 25 can be substituted for Senate Resolution 192. If that could be done, with all after the enacting clause of the Fulbright resolution stricken out and the words of the Connally resolution substituted, I am quite sure that in conference an even better statement of the American attitude toward world peace could be devised than is to be found in the text of either resolution. I say this particularly in view of what has so recently happened in Moscow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of the Senator's statement, I shall offer the Fulbright resolution as a substitute for the third paragraph of the Senate committee resolution. The Senator will then have a chance——

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I shall not have a chance to vote on the House concurrent resolution, and I doubt if I should vote for the text of that resolution as an

amendment to the Connally resolution, as I have said.

It would have pleased me to have the Senate use the Fulbright resolution as the basis for an agreement by the entire Congress upon a post-war peace policy, but that was not done. But as a general proposition common sense dictates that the House of Representatives should have just as much to do as the Senate with making and sustaining world peace. The Senate alone cannot declare war, so why should it monopolize the power to bring it to a conclusion.

Our Government has an excellent record of faithful performance of its international obligations, but any treaty approved by the Senate which requires annual appropriations of funds to carry out its terms can be voided by the House of Representatives. By denying the use of money for the pay of soldiers or for supplies to war ships, the House can completely destroy the effectiveness of any American pledge to enforce peace.

To keep out of another world war within the next 25 years will be a tremendous job. Instead of arrogating to itself all of the wisdom required to carry on such an unprecedented undertaking, the Senate should be happy to share that burden with the House of Representatives. Despite the combined efforts of both branches of the Congress wars in which our country may be compelled to participate may not cease, and therefore any help that can be obtained from the House of Representatives in putting off the evil day should not be ignored.

What disturbs me most is that one vote more than one-third of the Senate can prevent the adoption of any practicable plan to assure peace. A substantial number of those who will make up the one-third plus one may still be convinced that America is a nation which can live by itself and that great wars in other parts of the world cannot so affect the lives of the American people that they should make any effort to prevent their occurrence. With all due respect for the sincerity of their convictions, it is safe to predict there will still be Senators whose isolationist views will remain unchanged when the time comes to vote on any treaty which contemplates joint action by nations large and small to enforce peace.

In all candor, I ask why should the power to defeat a peace treaty be granted to one-third plus one of the Senators here present, or who may be present, when such an international agreement is submitted to this body. Is it fit and proper that a stubborn, irreconcilable, willful minority should be given any such opportunity? Certainly if simple majorities at each end of the Capitol can be trusted to do all other things affecting the welfare of the American people, there can be no sound reason for a failure to apply the same legislative procedure to the consideration of peace agreements of whatever character which may be negotiated by the President with foreign governments.

What I am trying to impress upon the Senate is that we cannot, by a simple resolution, tell any President of the United States how he shall submit an international agreement to Congress. I say that under the Constitution the President could submit any such agreement to the two Houses and it could be ratified by a majority vote of each House. It would then be just as binding upon our Government as though it had been adopted by two-thirds of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield me 10 seconds?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. With great respect to the Senator I wish to make it totally plain that if I accepted his interpretation of the resolution correctly I would not vote for it, and if any President accepted the interpretation which the Senator has given I would favor his impeachment.

Mr. HAYDEN. How can the Senator say that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I think.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 seconds?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, the whole opinion is based on the fact that if a majority vote is obtained in the House and in the Senate it would be impossible to impeach the President, and that is the force of his argument.

Mr. HAYDEN. I say that if it is the intention of those who insisted upon the adoption of the last paragraph of the revised Connally resolution to serve notice upon the President, the Secretary of State, and all others who may be engaged in negotiating a treaty designed to preserve the peace of the world that whatever they do can be made wholly ineffective, so far as the United States of America may be concerned, by the vote of one-third plus one of the Members of the Senate present, then the sponsors of that paragraph are only fooling themselves.

The President, whoever he may be, when an international agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of the revised Connally resolution is ready for ratification, would be a pluperfect political blunderer if, regardless of such an unmistakable warning, he fell into that trap. Sound judgment would clearly indicate that the only practical course for the President to pursue would be to follow the precedents set by John Tyler and William McKinley by submitting the peace agreement to both the Senate and the House of Representatives where by a majority vote of each body, followed by his approval, it could be put into effect with exactly the same force as though ratified by two-thirds of the Senate.

There is no doubt in my mind in that respect at all, because the only difference between the two methods is that some unconstitutional thing may be done by a treaty ratified by the Senate. Certainly it is constitutional to make peace by the combined action of the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. Let me repeat, why should one-third of the Senate insist that it possesses the only wisdom on this subject?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Because we are sworn to support the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Constitution of the United States does not provide that the ratification of a treaty by the Senate is the exclusive way in which an international agreement can be made binding upon the American Government. If that were not true, how is it that through all the years this Government has made agreements and compacts by the other method and they have never been challenged? As I have shown, the Supreme Court has sustained such agreements. I can be done.

The advantage of what I am talking about is that it works, and has worked in instance after instance, during over 150 years of American history. Every time it has been done in that way the international agreement could not be successfully questioned in any court or anywhere else. A machine which will work, one which has no "bugs" in it, can be used whenever it is necessary to use it.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not say that submitting treaties to the Senate is not a convenient way to have them ratified. If they involve minor agreements it is expeditious to handle them in that way; or when matters of secrecy are involved it may be highly desirable to ratify them in that manner. But when the Senate falters and fails to reach a decision as it has in a number of instances, and then the same identical result is accomplished by a joint resolution, I say that this conclusively proves that the Congress as a whole can accomplish the same result by acting in the first instance.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's contention, restated in my own words, that the term "constitutional processes" is broad enough to say that if a joint resolution is constitutional, then the results contemplated by the resolution can be achieved through a joint resolution, and that that would be an exercise of the constitutional process?

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Senator says agrees with my construction of the term "constitutional process," and I will also say that we cannot, by a simple resolution of the Senate, change the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it further the Senator's contention that if in fact a joint resolution is a legal and constitutional exercise of the constitutional process, the restriction or purported restriction contained in the last paragraph of the committee amendment would not operate as a limitation upon the exercise of that process?

Mr. HAYDEN. All that the last paragraph of the resolution does is to repeat just exactly what the Constitution of the United States says. I have already insisted that we do not add to or take away anything from the Constitution by repeating some of its words in a resolution.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. So, if we should pass the pending resolution containing the word "advice" and assume that the resolution were to be adopted by a vote at least equal to two-thirds of the Senators present, the President would be authorized to rely upon that advice and thereafter to execute an Executive agreement. Is there any argument about that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I said in the beginning of my remarks that whether the Connally resolution were adopted by a unanimous vote or by a two-thirds vote would not make any difference. The Constitution remains as it is, and as it has been interpreted by the courts. Under the interpretation of the courts and under the practice which goes back many years, it is entirely constitutional to make international agreements in two different ways, and whether made one way or the other, they are equally binding.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask leave to append to my remarks certain quotations from the writings in justification of the position which I have taken.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

(By Wallace McClure)

In short, the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, gives ample authority for an alternate procedure for other international engagements that seems in every consequential respect the equivalent of the procedure laid down in the provision that authorizes the President to make treaties by and with the advice and consent of the Senate on condition that the vote is 2 to 1 in favor thereof. It follows that the two methods of accomplishing the same or similar ends are comparable to alternative but parallel roads between which the statesman may usually, indeed invariably provided the assent of Congress is assured, take his choice without being required to present explanations regarding his decision.

The power of the President, combined with the power of Congress, thus reaches fruition in a process that is the full equivalent of treaty making without being a denial of democracy.

As President Searcy has remarked, "the substitution of legislation for treaties is not a question of giving the Executive more power; it is rather a matter of making greater use of a more democratic measure of control."

The President, acting with Congress, where simple majorities prevail, can, in the matter of international acts, legally accomplish under the Constitution anything that can be legally accomplished by the treaty-making power as specifically defined in the Constitution. This result is believed to be inescapable in view of the nature of the Executive power, the essential prerequisites of conducting international relations in a chaotic world, the power of Congress to implement executive acts, and the Supreme Court's positive and unequivocal interpretation of the Constitution. The will of the majority need not ever have been frustrated by a willful minority; no international act need ever again be defeated by the two-thirds rule.

There is nothing that can be done by treaty that cannot be done by Congress-confirmed executive agreement, which viewed as an instrument of national policy, is simply a democratic treaty—a treaty enacted through democratic processes. Thus this book seeks democracy in treaty-making in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. It is a plea for the abolition of minority control.

[From American Journal of International Law for July 1935]

ACTS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF CONGRESS AS SUBSTITUTES FOR TREATIES

(By James W. Garner)

The conclusion of the whole matter would seem to be that if it is within the constitutional competence of Congress by means of acts or joint resolutions passed by a simple majority vote of both Houses and approved by the President, to make the United States a member of such institutions as the International Labor Organization, to annex foreign territory to the United States, terminate war with foreign countries, to authorize commissions to conclude foreign debt funding agreements, to authorize the Postmaster General to conclude postal conventions and to empower the President to enter into trade and tariff agreements with foreign countries, it could certainly by either of these processes make the United States a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice and possibly also a member of the League of Nations.

Indeed, it is believed, that Congress might, with the approval of the President, create a relationship or undertake an engagement on behalf of the United States with a foreign state or states, in respect to any matter which is a proper subject of international regulation, or it might authorize the President to do so, provided it were within the constitutional competence of the Congress to deal with such matter at all.

The delegation by the Constitution to the President and the Senate of the power to make "treaties" does not exhaust the power of the United States over international relations. The will of the nation in this domain may be expressed through other acts than "treaties" and such acts do not necessarily need to be ratified by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate in order to be valid and binding, unless they so expressly provide by their own terms. In short, the power of the President and the Senate to regulate foreign relations is not an exclusive power; it is only when an agreement takes the form of a "treaty," as that term is used in the Constitution, that this power belongs exclusively to them.

There is no inconsistency between the authority of the President and the Senate to regulate foreign relations through agreements in the form of "treaties" and the power of the President and Congress to deal with matters of foreign policy through legislative action. Which of the two procedures shall be employed in a given case is a matter of practical convenience or political expediency rather than of constitutional or international law. If the procedure of treaty regulation proves ineffective in a particular case because of the constitutional impediment relative to ratification, there is no reason of constitutional or international law why recourse to the easier alternative of legislative action cannot be had, if the President and a majority of the two Houses of Congress so desire, as has been done with success on various occasions in the past.

EXCERPTS FROM DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

In reply to the objection that American entry into the International Labor Organization pursuant to a joint resolution of Congress rather than by means of a treaty was invalid, Secretary Hull wrote:

"I see no reason to doubt the validity of the Joint Resolution of June 19, 1934, authorizing the President to accept membership in the organization, or of the action of the President on August 20, 1934, in accepting the invitation to become a member of the organization extended by the director of the International Labor Office on behalf of the International Labor Conference. There exists a long line of instances where the President of the United States has entered into international engagements on behalf of this Government in pursuance of joint resolutions or acts of Congress" (p. 407).

The agreement with respect to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway signed at Ottawa on March 19, 1941, provided that it should be subject to approval by the Congress of the United States and by the Parliament of Canada. In connection with the agreement Secretary Hull sent the Attorney General a memorandum prepared by the Legal Adviser of the Department of State wherein the conclusion was reached that the arrangement could be effected by a simple agreement between the two countries and the approval of the agreement by legislation in the United States and in Canada (p. 409).

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, to my friends here, and to those who 25 years ago made the fight with me, as well as to those outside who are now writing me in numbers letters which I cannot answer, I wish to make a personal explanation.

I was taken sick a few months ago. During the course of my illness I received attention from the doctors at the hospital which I cannot adequately describe. If it had not been for them, I feel that I could not now be standing here today, nor could I be walking about this Chamber. To them I wish to pay my debt of gratitude, though, indeed, I never can fully repay. I want them to understand how very kind they were, and how very attentive. In the course of my difficulty these men, at all hours, showed me an attention which beggars description, and they have earned my everlasting and undying gratitude.

We came, then, recently, to the particular matter now before us. Of course, I was anxious to participate in the consideration of the resolution in the committee. With but half my voice and half my hearing, I would have been glad to have spoken and to have done what I could in behalf of the hearing in the committee. But all the doctors, five in number, forbade my indulging in any exercise whatever emotional in character during the time to which I have alluded.

Beyond that, there was another who, night and day, gave to me a devotion which no words of mine could paint, and that other one begged that I obey the injunction which had been put upon me by these doctors. I yield to her, and I should yield to her, because she gave to me a kindliness which no one could exceed, and which none has thus far exceeded.

So the time has passed. I am on the way to recovery. All tell me I must not indulge in any dispute here for fear I should retard the recovery. No doubt they are right. At least my dear wife

is right, and I cannot refuse to accede. So I wish to explain to the people of this country, and to my fellows here, why I am quiet during this discussion, and why I have naught to say; I have naught to say in this great moment, which deals with the country which I love and the country which has been mine ever since I was born. Seventy-seven years I have passed, and in those 77 years I have known no allegiance but to the United States of America.

God save the United States of America! God give to her all she should have. God preserve her in the days to come. I know what they will bring. I have been through such days. But God be good to us and permit us to resist, and permit us to be the country we have ever been.

My friends, I thank you for permitting me these few moments. I thank every one of you for permitting me to speak to you as I speak now, not as I used to speak, but as I can now address you with those capabilities which God gives to men to empower them to think and to speak.

So, with the prayer for our country that it may be protected and preserved in the days to come as in the days which have passed, I exhort my colleagues and my fellow countrymen that we all be just Americans. God bless America.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the distinguished and esteemed Senator from California is the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to say for myself that I entertain for him the greatest admiration, and a deep personal affection. I feel that I voice the sentiment of all the members of the Committee when I say that we are deeply regretful he has not felt disposed, because of the reasons he has given, to take a larger part in the discussion and in the consideration of the resolution now before us. He has always brought to the discussion of any public matter great intellect, indomitable courage, and the finest qualities of American statesmanship.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is my purpose to speak for just a few minutes on the pending resolution, which has become, in my judgment, one of the most important subjects of legislation in a quarter of a century.

It is not so important as to what the exact wording of a resolution of this nature should be. It is most important that we serve notice to the world that we want to join with all peaceful nations to avoid wars, and thus show where we stand. The world is again looking toward the United States as the arsenal of democracy to lead in winning not only this world-wide war, but to use its influence to help establish some definite permanent authority with power to insure that peace shall be won and maintained. This can be done best in collaboration with those nations which have already demonstrated that they are willing to join and work for this common and worthy cause.

The resolution presented by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is the result of many days of thoughtful, careful, and tireless effort on the part of the respective members composing that Committee. We have since learned from the debates on this floor that Committee members differed on some of the vital clauses and phrases contained in the resolution, and that it now represents compromises designed to reach a common accord if possible.

It has long been my belief that our form of government will endure as long as all do not believe alike on vital subjects; it will become dangerous when all are of one accord, and particularly if that accord be brought about by overpersuasion or lack of understanding.

Those of us who have the honor of participating in debating a resolution of this important nature will always feel a personal satisfaction that we have tried to do our part in bringing about a better chance for peace and good will among peace-loving people of all nations.

The committee resolution is very brief, and reads as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

The resolution offered as a substitute for the third paragraph by 14 of our distinguished colleagues reads as follows:

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with the other United Nations and such free and sovereign nations as may be duly admitted, in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization to promote cooperation among nations, with authority to settle international disputes peacefully, and with power, including military force, to suppress military aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

Wednesday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations added the following paragraph, involving in substance declaration 4 of the agreement reached in Moscow at the Joint Four Nations Conference:

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Another paragraph was added which I need not quote, which it seems to me was unnecessary, as the Constitution well takes care of the method in which a treaty must be ratified.

This I understand is acceptable to those of us who have felt that a stronger and somewhat more explicit declaration should be substituted for the third paragraph of the committee resolution. I had favored in substance the Ball-Burton-Hill-Hatch resolution months before the committee resolution was submitted by the committee's distinguished chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. It shall be my purpose to support the committee resolution as now modified by the Foreign Relations Committee on Wednesday last.

It is of supreme importance that we, as representatives of the people of the United States, show our colors. Most of the democracies showed theirs by joining the League of Nations 25 years ago.

Our servicemen who are now giving their lives on the five continents and seven seas, in order that we may have a happier and more secure world in which to live, have a right to know what principles and ultimate objectives they are fighting for. We must let them understand now that it is not just another bloody struggle to defeat Hitler's Germany or Hirohito's Japan, to be followed by another armistice until the next generation is ready for another supreme sacrifice.

Experience has taught us much during the years since the Versailles Treaty. Patrick Henry spoke a self-evident truth when, in his historic speech, he said—

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging of the future but by the past.

We have learned we cannot avoid a world war by isolating our country.

Soon we will be celebrating our twenty-fourth Armistice Day. We celebrate it, however, during another world war. November 11, as a national holiday, has been correctly named an Armistice Day. It turned out to be simply a cessation of world hostilities for less than a generation, and mainly due to our failure to join our comrade-nations-in-arms to win the peace.

During the closing days of World War No. 1 the American people were undoubtedly in accord with the essentials of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points plan for world peace, but after the stress and the smoke of battle died away, our own United States refused to confirm the treaty signed and approved by our other comrade-nations-in-arms. We made a separate but worse peace with our common enemy. The League of Nations was doomed to failure from that day, because the leading democracy on earth—the United States—refused to throw its great power into the balances.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill cannot state our war or peace aims more nobly or better or more eloquently than did Woodrow Wilson.

If the Fourteen Points do not inspire the establishment of a permanent international league or authority to enforce peace, may we then expect the high ideals and noble principles set forth in the eight-point Atlantic Charter to do better? May we hope that the resolution we are now debating will be adopted and become the preamble of the declaration of rights of freedom-loving nations around the world.

Statements of war aims and peace aims will, however, mean but little if not backed by the people themselves. Some feasible and workable declaration of policies should be formulated and sanctioned definitely by the members of the United Nations before an armistice is signed in this war. Otherwise it may be

another case of winning the war but losing the peace.

No one can successfully deny that, at the time of the announcement of the so-called Atlantic Charter by President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill, the nations over the world, and especially the men entering the Army and Navy in the United States, were entitled to know for what ultimate objective they are fighting—whether merely to defeat Germany and her satellites again and then return home until another world war is ready for the slaughter of the next generation, or whether we, in collaboration with the other members of the United Nations, shall stick to that noble task which has become the most important since the advent of history—that of forming a basic international charter of cooperation for free, independent nations whose duties it shall be to participate, upon a proportionate basis of men and material and expenses, as real guardians of the peace of the world.

We have learned a useful lesson—that among the democratic peoples of the world there should be a closer bond than the mere possession of a common enemy for the war's duration. The only way to cement our common interest is to cooperate as closely in peace as when the emergency of war is upon us. Especially must this apply to our loyal pan-American neighbors, who, the same as we, have fought and died for their liberties. There must be a resolute and pledged participation in any sustained peace aims to guarantee the Western Hemisphere and the world against another world war.

It will be infinitely easier to reach a common agreement on the vital measures required to carry out the essentials of the present resolution, as amended, the Atlantic Charter, or any other declaration of policy, while the United Nations are joined together in the common struggle, than if the search for that agreement be postponed until after the war is won and the uncertain blessings of peace have returned.

Lord Halifax recently asserted that:

> Mankind will march to little purpose unless we try to achieve a better way of life in the future for all men.

Very recently Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Chinese Ambassador, expressed the view that:

> When victory comes after the present war, we must continue to hold together, steadfast and unwavering, in order to win the peace.

Now that we know it, why can we not tell the American people that we, the people, and not the League of Nations Covenant, were mainly responsible for the collapse of that plea for world peace? History must ultimately record the truth that a sufficient number of the members of the United States Senate were not willing to risk the trouble and expense necessary to see that the League of Nations Covenant should succeed before the world.

It is infinitely more practicable and economical to assume our share in effectively sponsoring a plan for insuring world peace than again to underwrite the costs and suffer the horrors of another useless war of blood, sweat, and tears, for no apparent purpose than to defeat Germany again.

People of all countries know Americans are not a warlike people. We covet not the lands nor the possessions of any nation; we expect no reparations nor additional territory at the close of this war. We have not only favored international justice; we have shown our faith by working for it in principle, but unfortunately without assuming our share of the obligations to insure world peace.

Through modern methods of communication and transportation, countries are now closer commercially, socially, and economically than were the Thirteen Original States when Washington cautioned us against foreign entanglements. The world has thus grown so small that we are our "neighbor's keeper" whether we admit it or not.

President Harding favored entry into the World Court. Coolidge made special efforts against dangers of future conflicts through the Kellogg treaties. Hoover made his position clear on that subject repeatedly, both before and during his Presidency. Roosevelt's "good neighbor" policy was one of the great accomplishments of his first administration. Each one of them went as far as the United States Senate would approve at the time; and what kept them from going further at the time was the feeling that the people would not sustain them if they did.

When four Presidents, of different political parties, all felt that if they went very far in the direction of sustaining and enforcing international order, that our people would not back them, it is highly improbable that they were all wrong.

The answer, of course, is that our country almost from its birth has been pervaded by what some call isolationist sentiment. Impressive portions of Washington's last address are often cited as prophetic and historic reasons for avoiding what is termed "foreign entanglements."

At the time Washington uttered this warning, it took our ships, propelled only by the uncertain winds, many weeks and even months to reach Europe from America. In 1815 the Battle of New Orleans was decisively though uselessly fought between America and the British, 15 days after the treaty of peace ending the War of 1812 had been signed in Paris. During the past century the distance between continents and countries has almost been eliminated through mechanical inventions. Our great transocean liners can now make the trip from England to the United States in less than 5 days, while our American air clippers can take off at dawn from the coast of Europe and land for lunch the same day on American soil. Daily we converse by telephone and by radio with any part of the civilized world about events taking place from hour to hour in the present world war. By means of the telegraph, cable, and the wireless we can get confidential information from across the oceans on any of the five continents. Those engaged in commercial enterprises in America may daily ascertain the condition of foreign markets and immediately needed materials in any part of the world.

We will defeat Nazi Germany, and infamous Japan later. Indeed, Hitler has defeated Hitler. He has committed slow suicide by his policies of ruthlessness in subjugated countries and recklessness in Germany. He cannot even negotiate a conqueror's peace with any nation that would last any longer than the time necessary for the conquered nation to mobilize against him. No nation ever kept another nation permanently conquered by force of arms. Military victories, as history has shown, have only endured when men of reason have liberated defeated nationals from the yoke of military conquest itself. Hitler has demonstrated that he does not know even the rudiments of psychological or moral conquest in France or elsewhere in Europe. His "New Order" is already doomed.

Mr. Roosevelt has said that we are fighting for the "four freedoms." Mr. Wilson in 1918 declared that we were fighting "to make the world safe for democracy," yet when the fighting was over and we were victors we did not proceed to make democracy safe for any nation except our own—and that proved unsafe. America finally signed a separate peace treaty with our common enemy—Germany. The League of Nations thus "died aborning." Our Nation, though conceiving the plan for peace, disowned its own child before the world. It did not have a chance. Upon the answer of our people to that paramount question hinges the permanence of the peace that will follow this war.

The phrase, "to make the world safe for democracy," is usually construed to mean "to make the world democratic." Sometimes it is stated "to make the world subject to democracy." What Wilson did say definitely was that we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy—a guaranty that democracies and free self-governing nations, however small, would remain safe in their self-government. Woodrow Wilson could have consistently assumed the continued existence of kingdoms and even autocracies, or dictatorships, so long as they offer no threat to democracies or free nations where they exist. All he sought was security for self-governing nations and democracies and not dominion over other nations or peoples.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The time of the Senator on the pending amendment has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. I will take time on the resolution.

Mr. President, the death sentence to Wilson's slogan was pronounced when a minority of the United States Senate, clothed with veto on treaty-making power, in the greatest democracy in the world, refused to accept our share of the responsibility for maintaining the peace and security of the world; and in thus avoiding that responsibility, we thereby forfeited our own.

Those favoring a world compact of free, sovereign nations pledged to the maintenance of international peace are frequently described as impractical idealists, but why should it be impractical for sensible people to take reasonable precautions against being destroyed by bombs? Most of us regard the city police force or fire department as highly practical even though expensive. Impractical idealism would be a proposal to scrap the police or fire department on the theory that no one could be careless enough or criminal enough to commit a crime or set a house on fire.

We have already learned that our own country's safety depends upon the maintenance of orderly government over the greater part of the world. Since Pearl Harbor he is an ignorant American, indeed, who does not realize the immensity of our stake in the maintenance of peace. Another lesson we have definitely learned is the fact that the duty of maintaining peace devolves upon the nations who have the power to see it through. We know we have the power, but we are still loath to admit that we acquired the duty along with the power. When our neighbor is in trouble, we are in trouble, for if he is subdued by a ruthless Nazi or Fascist enemy we have to suffer with him, win or lose.

Perhaps there are some Americans who are isolationists out of prejudice or mere obstinacy; many no doubt take that attitude through indifference as to the true nature of our responsibility. This certainly accounts for the isolationism of most Americans. In peacetimes the average American—secure in his own freedom—is naturally indifferent as to how other nations or peoples may govern themselves. He wants to be let alone.

Since the birth of our Nation, the American people have acquired political and economic powers faster and easier than they had ever been acquired before by any other peoples. What we either did not know, or chose to ignore, was that vital political power is never acquired without the simultaneous acquirement of a commensurate responsibility.

In our world of the future we must know that those who have the power to keep the peace have the responsibility to keep the peace, regardless of personal preference of individual officials and citizens. The power alone imposes the responsibility. Those on whom it is imposed may try to deny it or evade it, but they cannot abolish it. If they do, their own and our punishment is as inevitable as that the night follows the day. If they avoid the responsibility to keep the peace, there will be no peace for our people or for the world. If there is no peace, there can be no freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, or freedom of religion.

Peace will reign in this world only where and when the preponderance of the free independent nations of the world is definitely associated and committed to the support of law and order. The United States, when this war is over, will no doubt possess the largest share of all the military power remaining in the world. If that power is not committed to the support of international law and order, it will be our fault and we may look for another World War within the next generation.

National self-complacency as we have known it in the twenties and thirties must not become dominant in this country again. The old idea that we are so removed from international strife and dictators that nobody will attack us, was blown up at Pearl Harbor. The pound of cure is now costing us 16 times more than the ounce of prevention. Let us apply the "ounce of prevention" at the inception, so we will not have to resort to the costly "pound of cure."

War must be stopped at its source. Democracy is not property. It is not a shoreline, nor an island possession, or maritime commerce. It is an ideal founded on centuries of trial and error in attempts at self-government and orderly intercourse between nations. For u democracy is the basis of our American way of life; and when that is no longer safe, nothing we have is safe.

We have our faults, and they are many, but the obsession that we are a master race is not among them; but once the people of America decide that it is their duty to support and aid in enforcing law and order throughout the world, they will have the power to do just that. The world will be waiting for our answer.

History has indelibly recorded that we failed to keep the faith with our men who fought to make the world safe for democracy on the soil of France and Belgium in the last World War, and our sons may soon sleep with their fathers who fell in Flanders field.

The American people have demonstrated that they are not afraid of the Axis Powers. We were not afraid of the Kaiser 25 years ago. We were not afraid of the combined forces of Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini. We must assume the responsibility that definitely rests upon us and our fighting allies to make the world safe for freedom-loving people, and to keep it so. The responsibility may be both dangerous and expensive. Nevertheless, it is ours. We can try to repudiate it, but we cannot avoid it. Repudiation will inevitably bring a repetition of more blood, sweat, and tears, which we and our sons are enduring now for having repudiated our responsibility more than 20 years ago.

Col. John D. McCrae, who received mortal wounds in the battle of Flanders, gave us these words, which have become immortal and burn in our minds and souls today:

IN FLANDERS FIELDS

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amidst the guns below.
We are the dead. Short days ago
We loved, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Lived and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe!
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch. Be yours to hold it high!
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

In a brave effort to try to reassure those who later fell in the World War, C. B. Galbraith, penned in poetry our reply:

THE REPLY

In Flanders fields the cannon boom
And fitful flashes light the gloom,
While up above, like eagles fly
The fierce destroyers of the sky.
With stains the earth wherein you lie
Is redder than the poppy bloom
In Flanders fields.

Sleep on, ye brave; the shrieking shell,
The quaking trench, the startled yell,
The fury of the battle hell
Shall wake you not, for all is well.
Sleep peacefully, for all is well.
Your flaming torch we bear;
With burning heart on oath we swear
To keep the faith, to fight it through,
To crush the foe, or sleep with you
In Flanders fields.

We are again fighting for peace—a sustaining peace—not alone for our own America, but for peace-loving peoples everywhere. A nobler cause never sprang from human breast, and a nation dedicated to such a holy cause can never die.

A few months ago a young soldier from a country home in my State, while on a short furlough in Washington, called at my office on his way to a port of embarkation.

As he left he turned to me and said, "Senator, I am proud to go and do my part, but I am wondering if this awful war is another useless search for the end of the rainbow of world peace, to be forgotten after the war is over and we are left on the field of honor thousands of miles away from home; or shall we find the treasured goal of lasting peace; or will my little boy have to face another death struggle when he reaches manhood? My father lies in Flanders' fields."

Later, unable to dismiss the soldier boy from my mind, I talked with one of my colleagues. He said I should have assured the soldier that if we Americans can view it from a position high enough, the ends of the rainbow meet forming a perfect circle. We hope that, in this war, we are fighting for a sustained peace around the world, and that we will find the goal of our efforts where the ends of the rainbow of our hope meet at the peace conference.

We failed to keep the pledge and the faith, and many of our brave sons in this useless war are already sleeping forever with their fathers who fell in Flanders' fields.

Hundreds of thousands of our fighting men overseas would, in substance, make the same statement. They want to know if their sacrifice will mean that they and their sons will not have to face another bloody and totally useless conflict forced upon them by another Hitler or Hirohito.

Let us resolve that the awful sacrifice we are making in the present war shall not be bargained away at the peace table, or blocked by a minority vote of this Senate. Let it not be said that we failed to keep the faith with those who fell at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Salerno.

The Covenant of the League of Nations still lives. It is an integral part of the existing treaty structure of 45 nations—some of which are now overrun by the Axis Powers. We are the only great democracy on earth that still remains outside that Covenant. If we really desire to associate this Nation with others in the "maintenance of an international authority" to "preserve the peace of the world," as stated in the committee resolution as modified, all we have to do is sign the Covenant of the League of Nations. That instrument is far from being perfect but it provides for its own amendment or revision.

If we become a member we apparently would experience but little trouble and delay in amending the Covenant to comply with the resolution which we are now considering, to include the "power to prevent aggression" and preserve the peace of the world—even "with military force."

Every one knows that the greatest defect in the Covenant is that, while the League Council could issue orders and the World Court could issue findings, judgments, or decrees, yet they were without power to enforce them. If we do not set up an organization which will have power to enforce its findings and its decrees, there will be no use in forming any organization.

Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a very excellent article written by that most able writer, Robert C. Albright, and published in the Washington Post October 24. The article is entitled "International Force for Peace."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FORCE FOR PEACE

(By Robert C. Albright)

Buried in the dusty records of the Sixty-second Congress is the forgotten story of an effort by Congress to set up an international police force more than 33 years ago.

The Senate this week, shying at military enforcement of the post-war peace, may find it difficult to believe that another Congress adopted a joint resolution contemplating just such a force long before World War No. 1.

Stranger still, the resolution passed both Houses of Congress unanimously, with little or no debate. Even stranger, it was signed by a former Republican President—William Howard Taft.

The joint resolution, approved June 25, 1910, resolved:

"That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of Government for military purposes, and to lessen the probabilities of war."

NO ACTION TAKEN IN TIME

The commission was never appointed. President Taft discussed the project with Elihu Root, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, and others. He was about to name a commission when the 2-year life of the resolution expired.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee hustled out another authorization in 1912 but the second move died in its tracks.

Seeds of the war that was to break 2 years later were already well planted.

The joint resolution was forgotten, chaff from the fine mill of history, until researchers for the Foreign Affairs Committee dug up the old House report.

THE FIRST ROOSEVELT RECOMMENDATION

The report based its recommendations on arguments for an international police force advanced in a speech by former President Teddy Roosevelt.

Said former President Roosevelt, more than 4 years before World War No. 1 and 8 years before President Wilson's doomed effort to put teeth in a world league:

"It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves but to prevent, by force, if necessary, its being broken by others.

"The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work of The Hague arises from the lack of any executive power—of any police to enforce the decrees of the court.

"In any community of any size the authority of the courts rests upon actual or potential force; on the existence of a police, or on the knowledge that the able-bodied men of the country are both ready and willing to see that the decrees of judicial and legislative bodies are put into effect.

"Each nation must keep well prepared to defend itself until the establishment of some form of police power, competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations. As things stand now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be secured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on November 3 I sent to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Resolution 192. My amendment was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table. It is my present purpose to ask consent to withdraw the amendment, for the reasons previously stated. The amendment contained verbatim the joint declaration of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics, and China, and concluded with the paragraph:

That the agreement expressed in such joint four-nation declaration constitutes the basic policy of the United States for the further prosecution of the war and, following its conclusion, for the maintenance of lasting peace and security.

It had been my hope that the amendment might be agreed to, because in it I saw a comprehensive display of ideas and thoughts which I think are necessary to guide us at this time, and will be necessary to guide this Nation in the afterglow of the war. For a good many days the resolution of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] have been debated. During the course of the debate the representatives of the four great Allies in this war met at Moscow and issued the joint four-nation pact or declaration which I included in my amendment. It is my thought, Mr. President, that if America is actually to participate as we expect her to do in the affairs of the world after the conclusion of the many conflicts in which she is now engaged, she cannot participate merely by word of mouth, but it will be necessary to set up what has been referred to, I believe, in the resolution now pending, as an international organization. I believe that organization will necessarily have to be clothed with authority and with power of some kind or character.

But, Mr. President, since the Connally resolution has been modified so as to include in part paragraph 4 of the Joint Four Power Declaration at Moscow, I am quite willing to accept it, because I think the modification adds strength and vitality to the resolution, because it expresses, at least in part, additional words which I feel have added to the strength of the resolution.

Mr. President, I therefore intend to withdraw from the table, or to ask consent to do so, if that is necessary, the amendment which I had intended to call up and offer.

In concluding my statement—and this is all I shall have to say, because I made a statement at the time when I submitted the amendment—I desire to add that I think that, even though he is not yet back within the borders of these United States, from the conference at Moscow there has emerged a man who, if such a thing is possible, has become even greater than he was prior to the meeting of the four nations, the four great Allies—a man who has grown even in stature. I refer to none other than our great Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, a great Tennessean, a great American. He has performed, I repeat, a feat which many considered well-nigh impossible. While we were debating upon a resolution which would declare the aims and the hopes and the beliefs of this country, Mr. Hull, in conference with those who speak other languages, brought forth a resolution which declared every principle for which we have been debating here for the past 2 weeks, and has committed our allies and our country, insofar as it is possible to do such a thing, to the purposes expressed in the Four Power Pact. I am proud to be a Tennessean, proud to have fought with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], in representing in the Senate a State which can claim so great a citizen as the Honorable Cordell Hull.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, one of my reasons for speaking on the floor of the Senate at the present time is because of something I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, which I desire to make clear. It was in connection with the remarks of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who yesterday said the question of our entrance into the war with Germany was a debatable

one. I have before me, in connection with those remarks, our declarations of war against both Italy and Germany, which were entered into on the 8th day of December, and which recite, of course, that both those governments had declared war on us. I have talked with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has assured me that his remark was an unfortunate use of language; and he does not mean to say, I am sure, that our entrance into the war was a debatable question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I have corrected the RECORD so that it expresses my doubt as to the wisdom of pursuing a policy of active participation in the war against Germany before Pearl Harbor. That is what I thought I said, and I am glad the RECORD has been corrected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator made that statement, because I did think it was unfortunate that the expression should appear in the RECORD in the language referred to.

Mr. President, presently, and I hope quickly, the Senate will adopt the resolution submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the modifications which have been agreed to by those of us who sought a stronger and a better expression from the Senate.

The debate, which has continued for almost 2 weeks now, on the whole has been constructive. I believe it has been beneficial. To those who may think it has been wearisome, or that the agreement reached is only in the nature of a face-saving device for anyone, I have nothing to say, and no comment thereon is necessary. I am willing to let the results of the 2 weeks' debate speak for themselves. I hope the results will be happy and beneficial to the country.

But, Mr. President, as to the decision which the Senate will shortly make, while I say it is a happy one and a most fortunate one, and that I personally am gratified at this decision, for which many of us have worked patiently and long, and perhaps with some degree of patriotism, as well, I must say that the resultant measure is, at least in part, the consequence of fortunate accident. The splendid work done by the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, at Moscow is bearing its fruit in the Senate, today, in our vote on the resolution. Had it not been for his splendid work and for that far-reaching agreement, which, I am sure, was largely brought about by the magnificent endeavors of the Secretary of State, I gravely doubt whether the Senate would be able to reach the accord and understanding which are present here today.

Naturally, I am glad that the executive branch of Government, through the Secretary of State, has worked so faithfully and with such splendid accomplishments. These thoughts, though, Mr. President, remind me and every other Senator, I am sure, that we should not trust to fortunate accident in the future.

Pleased as I am, or will be at the passage of the pending resolution, which will be by an overwhelming vote, I realize the steps we have taken are very short steps on the long road toward a permanent and lasting peace. We have only commenced the journey here in the Senate, and the goal lies far distant in the future. The things we say in this resolution and the agreements which were reached at Moscow are only the preliminaries. They hardly constitute a strong framework for the structure which must be built. Much more remains to be done. Necessarily greater, stronger, and more far-reaching agreements and understandings with other nations of the world will have to be reached. We here in the Senate cannot speak for other nations, but we can, and I think we might well now, in this solemn hour—for I consider this indeed a solemn hour—think for a moment about our own country and the peculiar situation which exists under our Constitution as between the executive branch of Government and the Senate.

On more than one occasion, Mr. President, I have said that the framers of the Constitution have created between the executive branch of the Government and the Senate a kind of partnership, at least so far as the treaty-making power is concerned. I think that relationship created by the Constitution is similar to a partnership, and I think that all of us will agree that to conduct the affairs of any partnership successfully there must be close relationship and complete understanding between the partners. No business partnership, no professional partnership, not even a domestic partnership between husband and wife, can exist without close association of the members of the partnership. If antagonism exists between the members of the partnership its failure is certain.

So, forgetting just now the achievements which we accomplish in this resolution—and I believe them to be achievements—let me point out again that if we are to work out plans and programs in connection with other nations of the world, there must first exist harmony, accord, and understanding between the members of our own constitutional partnership. I mean, of course, the executive branch of government, the President, and the Senate. I do not mean that either member of that partnership should surrender to the other member. I mean exactly the contrary, for surrender would be bad. It would mean domination and control of one partner by the other, and that domination and control, or dictatorship, if we may call it such, could result only in more discord, more lack of unity, and eventually in the failure of whatever course or enterprise the partnership might be engaged in.

I make these statements to point out at this time that in the months to come, when these momentous questions are to arise as to whether there shall be peace or war in the world, depending largely upon agreements and understandings which are yet to be made, there must be complete unity, accord, and harmony between the two members of the partnership which our Constitution creates.

Mr. President, I have previously urged that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate should be the arm of this body by which the Senate could deal with the executive branch of government, by which the Senate could be drawn more closely into that harmony and unity which will be necessary if permanent and beneficial results are to be achieved. I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I think I can therefore insist and urge that that committee, the President, his Secretary of State, and other advisers in the months to come work together as closely as is possible to carry on the business of this partnership, the welfare of this Nation, which the Constitution places with equal responsibility upon the shoulders of both branches of government.

I make this suggestion at this time, Mr. President, only in the hope that we will not again in the future have to trust to fortunate accidents in order to make right decisions. I hope, Mr. President, that the unity between the executive branch of government, the President, and the Senate, in the discharge of the treaty-making powers will be brought closer as a result of what we do here today.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few minutes.

I have listened with interest to Senators who have spoken during the extended debate on Senate Resolution 192, and the several amendments proposed thereto.

When committee assignments or other official work have prevented my presence in the Senate Chamber, I have read in the RECORD what was spoken here during my absence.

One cannot help being impressed with the deep sincerity of Senators who have spoken here; but likewise the people of America everywhere are intensely interested in our action on this resolution.

To me, one of the most important facts developed during the debate is that there is no partisan division of this body or of the American people on the objective hoped for by a statement of this kind.

We all want a more permanent peace following this war than was the case following the First World War.

Neither this Nation, nor any other nation, can endure with a war like this one every 25 years—or even every 50 or 100 years.

Somehow, someway, we must preserve the peace of the world, once it has been restored.

I am of the opinion that the Senate by adopting Senate Resolution 192, as modified, is paving the way for winning the peace following the winning of the war.

I am hopeful that when the time comes for the appointment of a peace commission, some of the ablest and best qualified Members of this body from each side of the aisle will be appointed as members of that group.

If we can proceed in this spirit of fairness, I feel certain of the approval of the people of America and of the world.

I believe the passage of Senate Resolution 192 is one constructive step toward a lasting peace, and for that reason I shall support it with my vote.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since it is apparent that Senate Resolution 192, as modified, which has been sponsored by the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, has differing meanings to each of my colleagues, I shall briefly state the meanings that it holds for me.

In numerous talks during the last campaign in Colorado, and repeatedly since then, with explanations and immaterial variations, I have declared my views with respect to an organization for maintaining peace in the post-war world, as follows:

> Only a person not handicapped with knowledge of the problems involved would attempt a blueprint for the organization of the post-war world. But some of the outlines of our desirable international cooperation on the one hand and of the things not to be done on the other, seem to me to be fairly clear.
>
> Since we do not intend to bail out any more wars of foreign origin, and since we do not succeed in avoiding them, we are going to have to take an important share of the job of preserving world peace by force if necessary.
>
> We, of course, should cooperate under acceptable forms of organization, the nature of which will have to be determined when we are in position to know the scope of our problem, to encourage world trade, sound monetary relations between the nations, better standards of living, access to materials, the development of basic freedoms, advancement of knowledge, and elimination of causes of international disputes. We shall play a most important part in the distribution of foodstuffs to starvation areas. Our gold and silver reserves, beyond those required to back our own money, will give us the opportunity to aid in the establishment of sound cooperating monetary systems.
>
> There are some things, however, which I am confident we will not do. We are not going to join any scheme that would deprive us of the essentials of our independence, freedom, or security. We are not going to toss our sovereignty into an international jackpot or give any other nation a blank check on our country's future. We are not going to sacrifice our domestic producers to world free-trade areas. We are not going to join plans to make everybody happy and prosperous by sharing everybody's misery.

I believe that I may fairly assume that my election was an endorsement by the people of Colorado of that statement, and that, therefore, the statement has the force and effect of a pledge.

Briefly, I find much in the resolution, as modified, that accords with this pledge and nothing that conflicts with it. Therefore, I shall vote for the resolution as modified.

In so voting, let me emphasize that I am reserving, so far as my own further actions and votes are concerned, full right, without prejudice or embarrassment by anything that is done here, to judge whether any treaty submitted to the Senate for advice and/or consent bearing upon the subject matter of this resolution meets the resolution and meets my pledge to my constituents. Moreover, my vote here also expresses the reservation inherent in it of my right to depart, in whole or in part, from the resolution if in my judgment additional information or changing events should require this for the protection of my country.

Before taking my seat, allow me to say that I would not want the RECORD to show my presence here and not to show my objection to the theory of the very distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, for whom I have the greatest admiration, that the Congress by joint action of the Senate and House can exercise any part of the treaty-making function. I shall not indulge now in any elaborate argument—I will simply say that on the argument of the senior Senator from Arizona, every provision of the Constitution could be nullified, every provision of the Constitution could be amended by that sort of action. That conclusion, which to me seems to follow inescapably from the doctrine of the Senator from Arizona, is obviously unsound and undesirable.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the substance of the amendment which I submitted to Senate Resolution 192, which is now the pending business, has been incorporated in the final paragraph of Senate Resolution 192. This paragraph of the resolution expresses our deepest concern and our deepest conviction in regard to the joint responsibility of the Senate and of the Chief Executive in jointly taking part in the final determination of a treaty of peace. It is my conviction that no Chief Executive will ever flout the good faith of the Senate or the good faith of the American people by refusing to return to the Senate for final approval a treaty of peace or a treaty of continued international policy. If that day shall ever come, it will be the day of doom for our free America.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend Senate Resolution 192 by striking out all of lines 5 to 9, inclusive, and inserting the following:

> That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I spoke on the amendment yesterday when I announced that I would submit it. I shall not consume the time of the Senate by a lengthy discussion of it today. I know that we are all anxious to move on to a final vote. I shall not, therefore, discuss the amendment further than to say that I want it to be clear in the minds of all Senators before they vote that the amendment is not offered as a substitute for the entire pending resolution, but only for the third paragraph of the Senate resolution which, in large measure, and I think in purport and effect, has identically the same object as the Fulbright resolution. I have pointed out what in my judgment I conceive to be the importance and necessity of incorporating this amendment as a substitute for that paragraph.

The greatest objective in our deliberation, and in the attempt to bring out a resolution which declares the hopes and aims and aspirations of the people of this Nation, is to find the greatest unity. It is true that whatever we may do today, the House of Representatives first spoke officially and by a vote on this major question. It gave expression to its views in the form of a resolution, and asked the Senate of the United States to concur in it. The Senate will concur in fact, in the adoption of the pending resolution, because the sentiments expressed, the principles embodied, and the policy incorporated therein, in my humble judgment, are identically the same.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to consider well the advisability of adopting this amendment in lieu of the third paragraph of the pending resolution.

I hold in my hands an article published in the Arkansas Gazette in the issue of November 3, 1943, entitled "From Fulbright to Connally to Moscow." Whatever we may do, Mr. President, that is truly the course which we are taking in the formulation of the foreign policy which we are about to promulgate in the passage of this resolution.

Therefore I submit that inasmuch as the two proposals have the same meaning the adoption of my amendment would definitely give more force and carry to our allies and to the countries of the world a greater impression of unity of the American people, of the foreign policy we expect to pursue in the post-war period.

Mr. McCLELLAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks the editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of November 3, to which I referred a few moments ago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM FULBRIGHT TO CONNALLY TO MOSCOW

It is noteworthy how closely the substance of the Moscow agreements parallel in extended form the pattern of the Connally resolution now pending in the Senate. The declarations make explicit what is implicit in the resolve that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved; that the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just peace, and join with free and sovereign nations in establishing international authority with power to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world. And the Connally resolution in its turn simply makes more explicit the substance of the Fulbright resolution, which the House of Representatives, closest branch of Congress to the people adopted by overwhelming vote.

For the United States, the Moscow Declaration constitutes public renunciation of the lone-hand policies that go by the name of isolationism, as for Russia they represent the breaching of a wall that has hitherto stood between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American democracies.

When they were signed, the world's four mightiest nations in point of numbers, re-

scurces, and potential power for good or ill, clapsed hands on behalf of peace on earth and justice among earth's peoples.

Their value is twofold. For the signers, and for the countries that look to them for deliverance, they provide a basis for mutual confidence and set up a working agreement on general principles to be jointly followed in fighting the war to a victorious finish and continuing this cooperation in the period after the end of hostilities.

Against the Axis enemy they have forged a new weapon—a moral weapon terrible as any flaming sword. Gone are the hopes of Berlin and Tokyo that they may save something from the wreck of their blood-drenched adventure through splitting the Allies.

Popular reaction in this country to the news from Moscow showed unmistakeably that isolationism is dead as a major issue. The American people understand at last that in this modern world no peace-loving country can live to itself alone, or can afford to fail to do its part in quenching aggression and safeguarding peace and international justice and right. The risk is too great.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations had this matter before it, and I trust the Senate will vote the amendment down.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas offered in the nature of a substitute for paragraph 3 of the resolution.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago I sent to the desk an amendment and asked that it be printed and lie on the table. I now request that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend Senate Resolution 192 in line 4 after the word "peace" by inserting a comma and the following, "including a guaranty of the independence and territorial integrity of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, and other subjugated nations."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I shall not presume on the time of the Senate now to discuss the amendment, in view of the fact that I have discussed it previously. However, I wish to have noted that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and other Senators have expressed their support of it. I now wish to read one of many telegrams which I have received in regard to the resolution. The following telegram comes from New York:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

American friends of Poland commend your decision to inject into congressional discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of invaded and occupied countries. The Atlantic Charter unequivocally defined at this time expressed the ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our valiant men are giving their lives. May this sacrifice not result in a different form of slavery to the living.

COUNCIL OF POLISH AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK,
FRANCIS X. WAZETER, *President.*

I have before me several other telegrams of a similar nature, all expressing interest exclusively in reference to Poland. In view of the fact that my amendment to the Connally resolution mentions the Baltic countries, I wish respectfully to submit several telegrams which I have received in regard to the Baltic states, one of which reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 5, 1943.*
Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Profound thanks for your amendment for independence of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other subjugated nations. Acceptance of your amendment will redeem pledges of Atlantic Charter given without exception to all peoples that have suffered aggression at the hands of other more powerful states. Latvians throughout the world will hope and pray for your success.

GUIDO TRUCE,
Chairman New York Latvian Lutheran Congregation.

Without taking further time of the Senate, I ask that the remainder of the telegrams to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLINT, MICH., *November 4, 1943.*
Senator REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Poland was first to fight for her and the world's freedom, and strong, independent Poland is the solution and key to the world's peace. Your amendment to the Connally resolution demanding liberty and territorial integrity of Poland is most honorable, human, just, and foreseeing. Twice has the world paid the horrible price of the war for the discrimination made against Poland. Your amendment insures a future peace and security of the United States and the peace of the world.

DOMPOLSKI OF FLINT, INC., AND ASSOCIATED ORGANIZATIONS,
STANLEY CZERWINSKI, *President.*

BUFFALO, N. Y., *November 3, 1943.*
Senator REYNOLDS,
United States Senate:

In the name of our 300,000 readers we earnestly support your amendment to the Connally resolution.

EVERYBODY'S DAILY.

CHICAGO, ILL., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

American citizens of Polish ancestry are grateful to you for your introduction of an amendment to the Connally post-war foreign-policy resolution in which the Senate would guarantee the independent and territorial integrity of the Baltic states, of Poland, Greece, and Yugoslavia. You are to be congratulated for your staunch defense of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and, specifically, for your stalwart advocacy of the sovereign right of the subjugated nation.

POLISH DAILY NEWS,
MITCHELL STARZYNSKI, *Editor.*

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate:

We are deeply gratified to learn of your honest and straightforward defense of those ideals which produced the greatness of America by introducing your amendment to the Connally proposition.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC., CHAPTER 25,
WACLAW PILCH,
President.
ALEXIS BUDZEN,
Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator from North Carolina,
Washington, D. C.:

Your noble, truly American in spirit, and sound proposition to amend the Connally bill convinces us that we will emerge victorious out of the mortal struggle with the forces of darkness and evil.

LOCAL CHAPTER NO. 3, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,
S. GAWKOWSKI,
President.
K. BAZANOWSKI,
Secretary.

PASSAIC, N. J., *November 3, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator from North Carolina,
United States Senate:

The future world is taking on a truly democratic character after your introduction of the true American amendment to the Connally proposition.

LOCAL CHAPTER NO. 5, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,
W. ZAMECKI,
President.
J. KAACPEROWSKI,
Secretary.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator from North Carolina,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

All true Americans, irrespectively of lineage must back you for introducing your Connally bill amendment, because you alined yourself with all that is true and noble in America.

ANDREW KNRUCINSKI.

DETROIT, MICH., *November 2, 1943.*
United States Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

We are in full agreement with the amendment to Senator CONNALLY'S resolution. Safety of all countries attacked by aggressor nations should be guaranteed.

POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE COUNCIL, No. 167,
LOUIS KOWAL, *President,*
JOHN WOZINSKI, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 3, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator from North Carolina, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your amendment to the Connally resolution is being viewed by us as the voice of conscience of true merican democracy.

LOCAL CHAPTER 12, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,
A. S. KWIATKOWSKI, *President,*
J. KRAINSKA, *Secretary,*

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., *November 3, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS,
United States Senator from North Carolina, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

No greater service would be rendered to weakened democratic hopes than by your noble and sagacious amendment to the Connally proposition, which reflects the true spirit of America fighting for the preservation of decency and human rights.

CIRCUIT 3, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,
M. A. REKUCKI, *President,*
ADAM STEPHEN, *Secretary.*

DETROIT, MICH., *November 2, 1943.*
United States Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Chamber:

We noticed your amendment to Senator CONNALLY'S resolution integrity of all countries attacked by aggressor countries should be guaranteed; we wholeheartedly support your point of view.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, CIRCUIT NO. 1,
HENRY KOGUT, *President,*
ARTHUR F. RECLAW, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

It is with appreciation that we learned about your defense of Poland's inalienable rights to integrity sovereignty and independence.

POLISH SOCIALIST ALLIANCE,
JOHN TRZASKA, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

It is with deep appreciation that we learned about your defense of Poland's inalienable rights to sovereignty and independence.

POLISH WORKMEN'S AID FUND, INC.,
FELIX POPLAWSKI, *President.*
FELIX SIEKIERSKI, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The League of Polish Women in New York votes sincere thanks to you for your noble defense of Poland's right to her land and her people.

M. FUTUYMA, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

You have our sincere admiration and appreciation for your fight to inject a real meaning into the bill now under discussion.

POLISH AMERICAN COUNCIL,
DISTRICT 5, OF NEW JERSEY,
JOSEPH ONKA, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

American Friends of Poland commend your decision to inject into congressional discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of invaded and occupied countries. The Atlantic Charter unequivocally defined at this time expressed the ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our valiant men are giving their lives. May this sacrifice not result in a different form of slavery to the living.

CENTRAL OF POLISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend your outright decision to forcefully bring into open Senate discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of Poland and the invaded and occupied countries. The ideology for which a host of brave sons of Poland have fought and died are exemplified in the Atlantic Charter. Fair play and justice are an attribute of an American. Let us not lose the victory by receding from enunciated principles.

POLISH NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEW YORK,
FRANCIS X. WAZETER, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

American friends of Poland commend your decision to inject into congressional discussion proposal to guarantee independence and territorial integrity of invaded and occupied countries. The Atlantic Charter unequivocally defined at this time expressed the ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our valiant men are giving their lives. May this sacrifice not result in a different form of slavery to the living.

CENTRAL OF POLISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES OF NEW YORK,
FRANCIS X. WAZETER, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Your decision to inject into the so far academic discussions a concrete proposal that the independence and territorial integrity of those countries that sacrificed their all in defense of our and their security be guaranteed is a courageous step in the direction of a clear and unequivocal definition of the Atlantic Charter. If we permit other powers to distort the very ideology for which hundreds of thousands of our soldiers and sailors are dying we shall win the war but lose the victory or at best have the repetition of our failure to answer the call of destiny after the First World War.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT,
M. F. WEGRZYNEK, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 2, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We highly appreciate the importance of your amendment to the Connally bill. It is a plain and true interpretation of what America stands for in this war. Our country has always been guided by ideal and moral principles and therefore was, and is today, the hope of many enslaved nations. We must not destroy their faith in us nor should we change our noble tradition of not recognizing changes brought about by force. This tenet of our attitude is the essence of our historical role in this war.

Respectfully,
ASSOCIATION OF POLISH PUBLISHERS AND EDITORS IN AMERICA,
PETER P. YOLLES, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 5, 1943.*
Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of progressive citizens of New York Latvian Benevolent Society, I wish to thank you for introducing section of your amendment guaranteeing independence and territorial integrity to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and other democratic nations. The suffering peoples of the Baltic States rely on America to uphold the pledges of the Atlantic Charter. The fate accorded to the small peoples of Europe will be symbolic of the justice and durability of the coming victory and peace. Please continue on your path of righteousness and justice for independent Latvia.

NEW YORK LATVIAN BENEVOLENT SOCIETY,
JOHN LENOW, *President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 4, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We thank you for your brilliant defense of Estonian independence. Your efforts are a real consolation and relief to the Estonian people in their present distress.

ESTONIAN RELIEF COMMITTEE, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 5, 1943.*
Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Latvian Christian Men's Society expresses to you deep-felt gratitude for your amendment on behalf of independence of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and other countries. Your amendment is in accordance with American traditions of justice and international law, and it fulfills the repeated pledges made by American statesmen. Please continue work for its acceptance.

LATVIAN CHRISTIAN MEN'S SOCIETY,
CHARLES CAROL, *President.*

MALVERNE, N. Y., *November 4, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of the world association of Estonians, I thank you for your outstanding contribution in defending the cause of our country of origin, Estonia. We wholeheartedly support your effort.

WALTER BRUNBERG,
Vice President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 4, 1943.*
Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

First New York Latvian Baptist Church members sincerely thank you for amendment providing for Latvian independence and integrity together with independence for other countries which have been forcibly deprived of their freedom. We will continue to pray for every blessing and success of your work on behalf of Latvia.

FIRST NEW YORK LATVIAN BAPTIST CHURCH.
CHARLES DRAWNEEK, *Treasurer.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *November 1, 1943.*
Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

Your amendment plan to provide for integrity of Baltics and other subjugated nations voices the opinion of all America, rest assured you have the support of all freedom loving people.

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF LITHUANIA.
STANLEY PIEZA, *Chairman.*

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *November 1, 1943.*
Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS,
United States Senate:

The Americans of Baltic Scandinavian and other origins are rejoicing for the first time since the peace discussion started in our Congress by your peace plan suggested in your resolution.

J. KRIPAS.

NEW YORK, *November 5, 1943.*
R. R. REYNOLDS,
Senator from North Carolina,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As one whose forebears fought in our Revolutionary War for the inalienable rights of men and nations I wish to thank you most sincerely for introducing amendment guaranteeing independence and territorial integrity of Latvia, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, and all nations that have been deprived of their independence. I believe the time has come to reassert unequivocably our pledges favoring reestablishment of sovereign selfgovernment for all nations that have suffered the cruel fate of lawless invasions. Lest our own tremendous sacrifices in this war be of no avail to reestablish lasting peace and justice in the world we must adhere unwaveringly to our policy of refusing any comfort to any and all attempts to enslave freedom-loving, peaceful nations that have abundantly proved their capacity for independence.

HELEN HOTCHKISS LIELNORS.

FORT MADISON, IOWA, *November 2, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS:

The Moscow Three-Power Pact announcement this morning is a living example of the determination of the administration to abandon all ideals and go into straight power gang. It has no safeguard whatever for India or any other people seeking self-government; it legalizes the tyranny by armies occupying small border states and makes possible big states gobbling up of smaller states by merely declaring smaller nations not sovereign. The pact is either a treaty, in which case it is not binding unless United States Senate ratifies it, or it is not a treaty, in which case it is not binding at all. This should be made clear at once to all concerned nations. The pact does not put even the slightest moral disapprobation on the nation which perpetrated the Pearl Harbor atrocity upon us. Above all, the pact leaves Americans entirely in the lurch in their major war in the Pacific. Japan could even hypocritically ask to join the new group before giving up territories seized by violence. The Japs must be grinning gleefully this morning. There are free uses of China's name but no official statement from Chungking. Such is the result of a pact without standards and which is the exact betrayal of the Wilson principle which first set up standards and then asked adherence. The pact shows greatest lapse of moral conscience and ignoring of American interest combined in whole history of American statesmanship.

UPTON CLOSE.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In addition, Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the concluding paragraph, appearing on page 19, of the little book entitled "What Latvia Wishes From This War," which reads as follows:

To our understanding the peoples of Europe, also of eastern Europe, will not submit to Bolshevik rule or preponderance. Only the restitution of the frontiers of Europe before the occupation of Austria by Germany presents a real solution to the post-war situation in Europe, which has to be conditioned by a complete disarmament of Germany and the actual neutralization of the Kiel Canal in order to make the Baltic Sea free again. The Baltic States as the natural guardians of the freedom of the Baltic Sea must also be reestablished. Their independence is the necessary equilibrium in northern Europe, much as is independence of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. In the same way Poland's independence is the condition of an equilibrium in central Europe. Poland should have restored to her the Polish inhabited territories of East Prussia on the Vistula estuary and southwest Prussia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, for myself and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to change the period at the end of the resolution to a semicolon and to add the following: "and since it is recognized that trade and economic collaboration are necessary to assure the maintenance of peace, the United States will cooperate with other nations to promote trade and to remove impediments and restraints which tend to hinder the prosperity of the United States and other nations, and which prevent nations from access upon fair and equitable terms to the raw materials and trade necessary to their national well-being."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, day before yesterday I spoke on this amendment. The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] also devoted part of his able remarks to an argument in its favor. I do not intend to take the further time of the Senate in discussing it except to say that the amendment is intended solely to remove the causes of war. It will make the resolution much stronger, and I seriously think it should be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, yesterday I sent to the desk for printing and to lie on the table an amendment which I now send forward and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 6, after the word "treaty", it is proposed to insert the words "agreement, pact, compact, or understanding."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to say in reference to the amendment that the Connally resolution, which was modified by the Committee on Foreign Relations by adopting the Willis addition, merely employs the word "treaty." I would add thereto the words "agreement, pact, compact, or understanding," so that the declarations of any meetings, such as that held in Moscow a few weeks ago, would have to be adopted by this body, two-thirds of the Members present approving.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, some days ago I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was printed, and has been on the desks of Senators. I believe it was Tuesday when I addressed myself to the Senate relative to my proposed substitute. I now send it forward and offer it as an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert the following:

1. That it is the intent of the United States of America in concert with her allies to wage war to a successful conclusion against her enemies.

2 That it is the declared purpose of the Senate of the United States of America, as the final treaty-making power of the United States Government, to insure, by every constitutional means, against the recurrence of international clashes, and particularly the break-down of good faith and mutual trust between nations.

3. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the United States join with other sovereign nations on a basis of world cooperation and understanding on the following principles:

A. No aggrandizement, territorial or other.

B. No territorial changes not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

C. Restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them; and recognition of the right of all peoples to choose the forms of government under which they will live.

D. Universal right to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Provided, That the policies and attitudes of other nations agree with these principles so that cooperation of nations on these fundamental principles would be effective in actual practice.

4. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the duly constituted authority of each Allied Government should declare, now, clearly and definitely, whether or not it accepts these principles as the governing standards of such post-war cooperation.

5. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that the government of each ex-enemy enjoying de facto recognition by the United States and its allies should be invited to declare on a date after the armistice with such ex-enemy whether it accepts these principles as a preliminary to future collaboration.

6. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America that when these declarations have been made by the aforementioned nations and they have given evidence of their desire for sincere collaboration, then the United States of America, through its constitutional processes, shall collaborate and cooperate with other free and sovereign nations to preserve world peace.

7. That the Senate of the United States of America believes in the dignity of American moral leadership, based on the continuance of humanitarian policies, in a large sense illustrated by—

A. The American principle of the federation of the 48 States.

B. The freedom of the individual and the guaranty of the rights of individual enterprise.

C. The good-neighbor policy in this hemisphere.

D. The American championship of the sovereignty and independence of nations and peoples throughout the world.

E. The open-door policy in the Pacific.

F. The American attitude toward minorities.

8. That the Senate of the United States of America declares, in making this statement of hopes and policy, that it in no way sets itself up as a judge of the kind of government of any civilized nation.

9. That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States of America, constituting the final treaty-making authority of this Government, that it should stand firmly upon this solid basis, offering continuously the hand of fellowship to any nation or nations in accord with these ideals and principles.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that, in my opinion, rather than adopt the Connally resolution, we should first set forth the declaration of principles upon which we are willing to proceed with other nations. Therefore my desire to inquire into the minds of our allies as to what their objectives and attitudes are before we adopt any resolution. I argue that by the adoption of the Connally resolution before setting forth the declaration of principles on which we would be willing to proceed, we would be putting the cart before the horse.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I have not consumed any time during the consideration of the resolution, I wish to make a brief observation before the final vote.

We are about to adopt what I believe is a very historic resolution, expressing not only the purpose and the viewpoint of the Senate of the United States, but I believe the overwhelming conviction of the American people.

Many things have contributed to the consummation of this purpose over many months. A number of Senators have submitted resolutions of various kinds dealing with the subject. The House of Representatives adopted a resolution on the question. Religious organizations of various types have passed resolutions with reference to the matter. All over the United States newspapers, without regard to political complexion, have editorialized on it.

Whether all these outside activities were necessary in order to focus the attention of the Senate upon the importance of the problem it is not necessary now to say. Undoubtedly they had their effect. Whether the Senate without any influence or discussion on the part of these various groups would have acted independently ft is not necessary now to discuss.

The Senate has acted through its constituted committee, and now is ready to take final action upon the resolution. I suppose it would be immodest for me to pay any compliment to the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations because of my membership on it, but I take the liberty of saying that I do not recall an instance, during my service in the Senate, when members of a subcommittee approached a subject with more single-mindedness of purpose, or with less partisan or personal animosity or pride, than did the members of the subcommittee in this case, and when the subcommittee made its report to the full committee, the same condition prevailed.

Some weeks ago it was felt by many that it might be embarrassing, in view of the approaching Moscow Conference, if the Senate entered upon the consideration of the resolution, because of the character of the debate which might ensue; but those who were in charge of the Moscow Conference and those in charge of the resolution in the Senate agreed that no such embarrassment would follow if the resolution were brought before the Senate.

It has been suggested that it was regrettable that we did not act upon this resolution prior to the consummation of the work of the Moscow Conference. It has been suggested that while we have been debating, the Secretary of State and his associates of the four nations have traveled well-nigh around the world, have conferred and negotiated, and have announced the completion of their work—all while we still debate.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that it is material whether the Senate should have acted upon this resolution in advance of the Moscow Conference, or whether the Moscow Conference should have announced the completion of its deliberations before the Senate acted. We are now ready to act, a few days following the action of the Moscow Conference. Both these actions come in juxtaposition sufficiently close to make them integrate with each other, and the two together constitute, in my judgment, a great chapter in the history of our country, in the history of the world, and in the history of world relations.

I believe the resolution is all that any reasonable person has any claim or right to expect. I believe that it will give hope to all our people in this country that our Nation will play its part in the tremendous, tragic responsibilities that rest upon us as a people. I believe that the adoption of the resolution will give heart not only to our allies in this great struggle for liberty and democracy, but throughout the world it will be instrumental in causing the millions upon millions of people who are now downtrodden and overrun to look up with hope to a new rising sun in international relationships.

I believe it will be instrumental in strengthening our cause and in weakening the cause of our enemies, and, believing that, it would well be my hope that it might receive the unanimous support of the Senate. I presume that is too much to hope, and I, of course, recognize the right of every man and woman in this body to vote according to his or her own conscience.

I wish to pay a tribute in a word to all the Senators who have contributed to the final meeting of our minds upon the subject, and I include especially the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Due in no small part to their earnestness and their energy, their intensity and their sincerity, and to the effort which they have made to bring this matter forcibly before the people of the United States, we have reached this happy hour.

I wish to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was also chairman of the subcommittee of that committee, which dealt for many months with this subject. He has been wise in his counsel, strong in his determination, far-sighted in his grasp of the entire problem.

To all these and to all others in and out of the Senate, without regard to party or religion, color or condition, I wish to pay my tribute of respect and admiration, of appreciation and gratitude, that through all these instrumentalities we have reached an hour when this body will do what it has never done before in its history in advance of the conclusion of hostilities between us and another nation, that in advance of the writing of the blueprint containing the details of any treaty between us and another nation or any other group of nations, we are willing to go on record expressing our faith in ourselves, in our country, and in the high purpose of humanity, and voicing our hope that our faith is not misplaced.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from ex-President Hoover's address made on October 28, 1943, in Kansas City, as reported by David Lawrence in the Washington Star of October 30, 1943. I shall read the last paragraph of the article by Mr. Lawrence, as follows:

The theory that America has had no foreign policy but that Britain has had a foreign policy has for years gone unrefuted. If by "foreign policy" is meant the imperialism and commercialism that has dominated Britain's external relations, then it is true America has had no such foreign policy. And, what is more, Americans do not want one like it either.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by David Lawrence be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Hoover did put down his foot hard on the idea of military alliances such as have been proposed for America and Britain, and he deserves applause for his splendid description of the true American foreign policy of the last several decades.

"We are told," he says in his latest address, "that we have had no foreign policy. Perhaps future historians, studying this last 130 years, will say that America had the most powerful of foreign policies. That is helping other nations to gain freedom and independence and protecting those who have secured it.

"Those historians would point to the War with Mexico to free Texas and California, securing for them self-government within our Union. Again the historians would point to the War with Spain to free Cuba and the Philippines. They would point to the World War to establish the independence of 9 new nations in Europe. They would point to the present war where our men are fighting to preserve the independence of Britain, France, Russia, China, and 16 little nations.

"And has not the United States been the actuating inspiration for freedom for all nations through all these years? If this is not a foreign policy, it certainly is a century-long crusade. Generations of Americans have died for it."

The theory that America has had no foreign policy but that Britain has had a foreign policy has for years gone unrefuted. If by foreign policy is meant the imperialism and commercialism that have dominated Britain's external relations, then it is true America has had no such foreign policy. And, what is more, Americans do not want one like it, either.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, for the one reason, without more, namely, that the pending resolution repudiates our age-old policy, I shall vote against it.

Furthermore, those of my friends on the Republican side who think that the adoption of the resolution will take foreign affairs out of the 1944 elections are, it seems to me, laboring under a misapprehension.

The resolution as it stands attempts to look in opposite directions at the same time. On the one hand it is directed through paragraph 3 toward the worst kind of power politics. On the other hand it looks toward a world league of nations. These alternate policies are not differences in degree, but differences in kind. The two conceptions are incompatible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement before we vote on the resolution. I shall cast my vote in favor of it. This is one world, and we in America are a part of it. The most pressing problem before us

is the winning of the war, and it should be vigorously prosecuted until victory is won. After that the most pressing problem confronting mankind will be how to prevent war. This can be solved only by the nations of the earth acting in concert, and if we fail to take proper action now we may contribute to other wars in other generations. I believe that peace can best be won and kept by America using its full weight and power and might in support of peace.

During our recent trip around the world we encountered criticism of Mr. Hull, our great Secretary of State. Accusations were made that he was anti-Russian. I think he has, by his action at Moscow, completely confused and confounded his critics, and that because of his magnificent conduct there he is entitled to the respect of people not only in our country but all over the world. He has proven that he is a magnificent and a real American.

I subscribe to the principles which have been laid down by him and others, that all persons who have a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and have qualified themselves to assume and discharge the responsibilities of liberty, are entitled to its enjoyment; that all nations, great and small, are entitled to protection of their rights and freedom; and that protection can only be gained by America taking a realistic, positive position, and guaranteeing the peace of the future, with the full weight and might of this Nation acting in concert with other nations who are able and willing to give aid, when necessary, to stop aggression.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

Mr. VANDENBERG and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I crave the indulgence of the Senate for only 2 or 3 minutes. Now that we are about to approach a vote on the resolution, I, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, desire to express my very deep appreciation for the cooperation and help and aid which we have received from both sides of the aisle.

The criticism has been leveled at the committee from time to time that it did not act more speedily and with greater haste. I leave it to the judgment of the future as to whether, in view of the developments and the situation, the course of the committee was not a wise one, and justified and vindicated by events.

Mr. President, the resolution has been criticized and denounced in many of the newspapers of the country. The committee has been assailed. I wish to state briefly what we are undertaking to do by the resolution. I shall refer for the moment only to paragraph 3. I wish to suggest that in paragraph 3 we express the willingness to "join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority." The phrase "international authority," Mr. President, was chosen because it is broad enough to include all existing peace agencies and the utilization of their services, and the creation of such additional agencies as may be created by treaty or otherwise.

It is to be an "international authority with power"—to do what? "To prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." These are the two great objectives of the resolution—"to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The resolution contains the words, "with power" to do that.

The resolution has been assailed on the ground that it has no force, that it is not strong enough, that it does not carry any conviction with respect to means. But, Mr. President, the word "power" is a broad term, and it comprehends the exercise by the international agency of whatever power is necessary—to do what? "To prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, some criticism was made as to Moscow. There is a degree of harmony and cooperation between the language of section 4 of the Moscow Declaration, which we have inserted in the resolution, and the remainder of our own resolution, that is hardly subject to criticism.

So far as contact between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Department of State are concerned, I will say to Senators who are not members of the committee that there has been contact, and I can call as witnesses the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—not contact once, but contact repeatedly with the Department of State on this whole subject matter; and Mr. Hull, when he sat at Moscow, had a copy of the resolution in his files. He knew what was in it. He knew the predictions of its adoption by this body.

Mr. President, it is said by some that the resolution has no power, that it has no teeth. Let me say that the resolution has in it the teeth of bayonets, if necessary to accomplish the prevention of aggression and the preservation of the peace, if that is the ultimate remedy. It has in it the teeth of airplanes that bite with bombs and with machine guns. It has the teeth of great navies and artillery, if need be.

But, Mr. President, its purpose is pacific. These are extreme remedies, only to be employed if peaceful measures and conciliation and diplomacy fail, and, if necessary, they may be invoked, provided always their use is limited to the preservation of the peace and the prevention of aggression.

Mr. President, I look forward with the hope that the resolution may obtain an overwhelming vote in favor of its adoption. The resolution evidences a great stride in national policy by the United States. Not only will it bring cheer to our own people whose sons are fighting on far-flung battle lines, but it will bring cheer and satisfaction to the peace-loving peoples of all the world. I trust that the Senate may adopt the resolution by an overwhelming vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. BAILEY's name was called). Mr. President, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has instructed me to announce to the Senate his absence on account of an unavoidable situation which is beyond his control, but that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHEELER (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and that if present, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

Mr. MCKELLAR (when Mr. MCCARRAN's name was called). Mr. President, I have been requested to state to the Senate that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is unavoidably detained on official business under Senate Resolution 241, which compels him to be absent from the Senate at this time.

I am advised by the Senator from Nevada that he is fully advised of the text of the modified resolution before the Senate, that he heartily endorses it, and that, if present, he would vote for the modified resolution. He has been kept in daily contact with the action on the resolution, both in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the Senate, and he fully endorses and earnestly approves the action of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. If present, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay." I am further authorized to state that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is absent on account of illness.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is absent because of illness. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote, and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are absent on account of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, both those Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 5.

YEAS—85

Aiken	Brooks	Chavez
Andrews	Buck	Clark, Idaho
Austin	Burton	Clark, Mo.
Ball	Bushfield	Connally
Bankhead	Butler	Danaher
Barbour	Byrd	Davis
Barkley	Capper	Downey
Bilbo	Caraway	Eastland
Brewster	Chandler	Ellender

Ferguson	Maloney	Taft
George	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Gerry	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Green	Moore	Tobey
Guffey	Murdock	Truman
Gurney	Murray	Tunnell
Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Hill	Overton	Wagner
Holman	Pepper	Wallgren
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Walsh
Kilgore	Reed	Wherry
Lodge	Revercomb	White
Lucas	Robertson	Wiley
McClellan	Russell	Willis
McFarland	Scrugham	Wilson
McKellar	Smith	
McNary	Stewart	

NAYS—5

Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds	Wheeler
Langer	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—6

Bailey	Bridges	La Follette
Bone	Glass	McCarran

So Senate Resolution 192, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, having been one of the first to suggest publicly that the Moscow agreement be used as a basis for the modification of the Connally resolution, I am grateful to find the Senate at this hour concurring in that thought. This is the end of a glorious day in the Senate of the United States. Happy am I to be a Member of this great legislative body, at a time when I could give my wholehearted support to a resolution which carries so much significance to the theaters of war and the fields of peace.

The resolution, as modified, is a declaration of the American people, speaking through their duly constituted representatives. It is not only the official expression of our people, but now that we have included in the resolution that part of the Moscow Pact which deals with the future peace of the world, it also becomes an expression of the Russian, English, and Chinese peoples.

The Moscow Pact is a declaration by four great world powers. It comes none too soon in this troubled world. Through united action they pledge an all-out effort in the total destruction of tyranny and despotism of the common enemy. They solemnly declare that the time has at last arrived to set forth at the earliest practicable time an international organization based upon the principles of sovereign equality for all peace-loving states. In that noble expression the Senate of the United States has just concurred.

Mr. President, the principles on which the Moscow agreement are based have long been the credo of millions of American people. However, this is in reality the first time that their conclusions have found expression in the United States Senate. Through this declaration of good faith the Senate of the United States, as now constituted, advises the world that it is ready to assume its responsibility in helping chart a course which will bring lasting peace to the suffering peoples of a tortured world. It is our duty to tender this humanitarian advice to the President of the United States; but the real strength and power of this far-reaching resolution lies in the fact that we tender peaceful advice to the people of the United Nations and to conquered countries, large and small.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to finish my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

We tell them with dignity, character, resolution, and certainty that we stand ready to join with them in using the Moscow Pact as a basis upon which to carve out an indestructible temple of liberty, justice, and peace for all the world.

The adoption of this resolution as modified writes victory at the end of the last chapter of the diplomatic phase of this global war. The psychological war of the Axis has failed. "Divide and conquer," the weapon upon which Hitler depended virtually as much as upon his planes and tanks, has been utterly destroyed by the accomplishments of the historic meeting in Moscow, and the approval of this epoch-making resolution by such an overwhelming majority.

Mr. President, the resolution is in harmony with the views of the President of the United States. In fact, it might be said that this is the first effective blow which has been struck for the cause for which he has struggled and labored so long in the field of international diplomacy.

Lastly, I bow in reverence and humility as I pay tribute to the truly great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. For years he has labored side by side with President Roosevelt, using his talents, ingenuity, and foresight in warning the American people of the menace of Old World tyranny and aggression. Through his herculean efforts at the Moscow Conference the war has been shortened and human lives have been saved. In my humble opinion, a just peace has been assured. Cordell Hull was bitter medicine for Tojo and Hitler. The part played by the brilliant Tennessean at Moscow is the crowning achievement in a long and honorable political and diplomatic career.

In conclusion, I reverently say, God bless Cordell Hull!

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. At one point the Senator referred to the resolution as advice to the President of the United States. I do not suppose that he intended to imply that it was advice under the Constitution, in the constitutional sense of advice and consent.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all. He can use it if he wishes to do so, or he can dismiss it if he wishes to do so.

Mr. TAFT. What I mean is that it is not the kind of advice which perhaps might relieve him from any necessity of obtaining consent under the terms of the Constitution.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all. I will go as far as will any other Member of the Senate in saying that any treaty resulting from the Moscow Pact must, beyond any question of doubt, be submitted to the United States Senate for ultimate ratification.

Mr. TAFT. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that a pair was announced on the vote—an equal pair, which assumes that the resolution required only a majority vote. Fortunately it obtained a very overwhelming vote; and when the announcement of the vote was made, it was made simply as to the adoption of the resolution. There was no mention of any requirement of a two-thirds vote, so I assume that the resolution required only a majority vote.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. The Senator and I have no disagreement on that question.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I merely wished to observe that these late explanations and interpretations of the resolution are merely expressions of the Senators making them. Possibly I concur in everything that has been said; but under the circumstances we are not prepared to discuss or consider such interpretations. I think they are merely interpretations of the Senators making them, and not necessarily the interpretation of the Senate itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my interpretations are mild compared to some of the interpretations which have been stated in the debate long before the adoption of the resolution. I have no intention of attempting to inflict upon this body any interpretation other than those which have been discussed from time to time in the debates of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I very much regret that the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in the qualification which he suggested with respect to the resolution, was so eager to dispel any possible doubt that the Senate might have meant some-

thing. I hope that now that we have adopted the resolution we will not, by one innuendo and another, begin to imply that it is only a pious sentiment, and not something which has official dignity and is entitled to affirmative respect. I hope it may at least have some value and persuasive power upon the subsequent conduct of the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution. What he suggests is what I am attempting to do at this late hour. I am attempting to demonstrate to the world the overwhelming vote of confidence which the Moscow Pact in reality received, so far as the peace portion of those declarations is concerned. That is the fundamental and basic thing in which we are all interested, so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and a number of other Senators have suggested the propriety of having Senate Resolution 192 printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the vote. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Also, inasmuch as the resolution may be regarded as in the nature of advice to the President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of its adoption, and sent a copy of it for his information.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to suggest that the unanimous-consent agreement include the instruction that the Secretary engross a copy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is assumed.

Mr. PEPPER. What was the statement made by the able Senator from Texas?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object very strongly to the request of the Senator from Kentucky. The resolution is not advice to the President in any constitutional sense. It is an expression of the opinion of the United States Senate. The question was debated at length before the Senator returned to the city. It was pointed out that if it were construed as advice to the President, there are precedents for the President proceeding along the outlines of the resolution without further submission to the Senate, and perhaps doing some things other than the creation of an international organization, which is limited by the Willis amendment. Incidentally, if we advise the President of the United States in a constitutional sense, a two-thirds vote is required. It is very clear that the adoption of the resolution did not require a two-thirds vote. I, therefore, object to the request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not construe the resolution as being advice to the President in any sense that he is bound by it.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, he is never bound by advice.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no harm in giving him official notice of the passage of the resolution, for whatever effect it may have upon negotiations which he himself must inaugurate and probably consummate.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to the request if the Senator is not suggesting that it is advice to the President of the United States under the terms of the Constitution. If the Senator will disavow any suggestion of that kind, of course the President will be influenced by the opinion of the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not insist that the word "advice" be used. I simply wish to have an official copy of the resolution sent to the President for his information. If the Senator objects to the use of the word "advice," I withdraw it.

Mr. TAFT. With that explanation, I have no objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCES ON DEATH OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of COLORADO, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 400. An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2859. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

CONSTRUCTION OF DEMONSTRATION PLANTS TO PRODUCE SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until Tuesday. On that day it is desired that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 451, Senate bill 1243, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances in order to aid the prosecution of the war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Calendar No. 451, Senate bill 1243, is now made the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is made the pending business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is now the pending business.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the amendments to it which were agreed to by the Senate when the calendar was last called, be reprinted for the advice of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the bill was called on the calendar a few days ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] objected to its consideration. I have consulted with the Senator from Connecticut, and also with the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and they have no objection to the bill being taken up on its merits.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Tuesday it proceed to the consideration of Calendar 451, Senate bill 1243, authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuel from coal and other substances in order to aid the prosecution of the war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Did the Senator say he had consulted with the minority leader?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, I consulted with the Senator from Oregon, and it is agreeable to him. I think the request should be that the bill be made the unfinished business, with the understanding that it may go over until Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate proceeds to consider the bill it will be the unfinished business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I merely desired to have it made the unfinished business now.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, vice Rufus E. Foster, deceased, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be forthwith notified.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I make the same request, that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 5 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, vice Hon. Rufus E. Foster, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 5 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Lawrence B. Richardson to be a rear admiral while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

To be rear admirals

Carl H. Jones	Ralph E. Davison
Samuel P. Ginder	Arthur D. Struble
Forrest P. Sherman	Timothy J. Keleher

To be commodores

Cortlandt C. Baughman	George H. Mills
	William M. Quigley
Benjamin V. McCandlish	Wallace B. Phillips
	James Fife, Jr.
Campbell D. Edgar	Byron McCandless

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be major general

Henry L. Larsen

To be brigadier general

Graves B. Erskine

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be second lieutenants

Stanley S. Nicolay	Ernest T. Savignano
Frederick W. Riggs, Jr.	Hugh W. Breakenridge
John W. Southworth	Robert "E" McDowell,
John F. Paul	Jr.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Lucy H. Contreras, Bellemont.
Nellie Moss, Marana.
Lenore Hoopes, Sacatan.
C. Herrold Higgins, San Carlos.

ARKANSAS

James A. Bruce, Garfield.

DELAWARE

Lena C. Poore, Hartly.
Pauline M. Hamp, Hollyoak.
Mattie J. Greenly, Lincoln.

IOWA

Edward Van Zante, Pella.

NEW JERSEY

Harry Marvin Riddle, Jr., Asbury.
Anna T. Heus, Demarest.
Rose F. Ricci, Murray Hill.
Karl H. Schlupp, Westwood.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ella Skorr, Colman.
Hilda J. Gross, Doland.
Iva M. Bowen, Egan.
Gustave I. Honsey, Hecla.
Anna Mellinger, Olivet.

VERMONT

Mabel M. Hemenway, Jeffersonville.
Rosa M. Stewart, Tunbridge.
Timothy J. Murphy, Windsor.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cora Fisher, Sabraton.

WYOMING

Carl W. Hornbeck, Shoshoni.
John W. Powell, Superior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, in simplicity and sincerity we would thank Thee for the many blessings with which Thou dost fill our days. Thou art ever placing at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

We rejoice in the noble heritage of freedom which is still ours because of the men and women who are responding so courageously to the call of God and country.

Grant that we may possess this heritage more worthily and strive with increasing tenacity of purpose and devotion to build a better world for our own and succeeding generations.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of War.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Boston Sunday Post of October 31, by Robert L. Norton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy to the officer candidate graduating class at the Quantico marine base on Tuesday, November 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on sundry subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a bill of rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the address of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Dr. W. R. Stovall, medical director of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 155]

Allen, Ill.	Gerlach	Mruk
Andrews	Gifford	Myers
Arends	Gillie	Newsome
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Green	O'Connor
Bell	Gregory	O'Leary
Bland	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Bolton	Hébert	Pracht
Boren	Hendricks	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hoeven	Rizley
Brooks	Izac	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley	Jackson	Sabath
Byrne	Jeffrey	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Jennings	Sasscer
Case	Johnson, J Leroy	Scanlon
Celler		Sheridan
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Short
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ward	Sikes
Costello		Slaughter
Courtney	Jones	Smith, Maine
Crosser	Kee	
Cullen	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Curley	Kerr	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	Kilburn	Spence
Dies	Lesinski	Starnes, Ala.
Dingell	Luce	Steagall
Douglas	McGranery	Sullivan
Drewry	McGregor	Taylor
Durham	McMillan	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McMurray	Vincent, Ky.
Elmer	McWilliams	Vorys, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Weiss
Fernandez	Magnuson	Wheat
Fish	Martin, Iowa	Whelchel, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Willey
Fogarty	Monroney	Winstead
Fulmer	Morrison, La.	Winter
Gallagher	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

ALLOWANCE TO WIDOW OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to tne Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that does not affect the insurance policy?

Mr. MAY. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SHORT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts, and also an address by the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, and also a statement by Mr. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the stat of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3598, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contested-election expenses: For payment to Luther Patrick, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Denson versus Patrick, as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 3, $1,500, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, accurate information is essential to good legislation. To attempt to legislate on erroneous data is to attempt to plot the course of a ship on uncharted seas by a faulty compass. Some statements were made on the floor yesterday, evidently under misapprehension as to the facts, and to keep the record straight and in order that the Members may be thoroughly informed, may I call attention to one or two such instances.

For example, there was the statement made by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. sent out photographs of President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt to 239 Negro newspapers to be used in spreading political propaganda. I have looked into the matter and find that on October 15 photographs were sent, not to 239 Negro newspapers, but to 24, and that the photo was not the photo of President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt but was a photograph of President Roosevelt and President Elie Lescot of Haiti, who recently visited the United States, and that it was sent only at the request of the editors of those newspapers. Otherwise the gentleman's statement was correct.

Also, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from New York made a statement which is published in this morning's New York Times to the effect that the O. W. I. "was a stench when it was being administered by Mr. Archibald MacLeish under the Office of Facts and Figures." Apparently there was some misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I would point out to him that this request is for the Overseas Branch of the Office of War Information, which prior to the creation of O. W. I. in June of last year was known as the Foreign Information Service of the Office of the Coordinator of Information. The O. C. I. was then under the direction of the distinguished Colonel, now General, Donovan. At no time has the overseas work had any connection whatsoever with the Office of Facts and Figures.

During the debate yesterday a statement was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] that editors—unnamed and uncounted—of foreign-language newspapers in this country had made a 100-percent unanimous reply in 4 days to an undisclosed questionnaire attacking the effectiveness of O. W. I. propaganda overseas. In response to that statement, I place in the RECORD the names of American Ambassadors, Ministers, and chiefs of diplomatic missions abroad, who unquestionably are in better position than any foreign newspaper editors in this country to judge the effect of this foreign propaganda going over there and the importance and the desirability of the continuation of it by the O. W. I. Here are the names of those in the Diplomatic Service:

Ambassador Winant in England.
Ambassador Hayes in Spain.
Ambassador Steinhardt in Turkey.
Ambassador Phillips in India.
Former Ambassador Fish in Portugal.
Counselor Gauss in China.
Minister Johnson in Sweden.

Minister Kirk in Egypt.
Minister Gray in Eire.
Minister Morris in Iceland.
Minister Wilson in Iraq.
Consul General Wadsworth in Syria.
Minister Harrison in Switzerland.
Minister MacVeagh in South Africa.

Considerable emphasis was placed yesterday upon a statement to the effect that campaign buttons had been issued to the soldiers with political intent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are told by the O. W. I. that absolutely no campaign buttons were issued at any time under any circumstances by anybody connected with the United States Government; that the service does not countenance in the least any political activity of any character. The charge might have had its origin in the fact that a small number of lapel clips had been distributed abroad as token gifts to less literate native populations, such as was discussed yesterday, tokens which have not only won the friendship of the local people whose friendship is exceedingly important under the circumstances, but which has familiarized them with American insignia, so that paratroopers, airmen, and other troops either intentionally or accidentally landing in the hinterland would meet with cooperation, sympathy, and friendship instead of hostility and opposition.

I include a list of insignia and the character of insignia issued.

Instead of the natives acquiring these lapel clips as souvenirs from the soldiers, the only ones known to have fallen into the hands of soldiers are those acquired as souvenirs from the natives:

Quantity	Language	Requested by—	Shipped
10,000	Arabic (shows Franklin D. Roosevelt and American flag).	Cairo	September 1942.
10,000	do	Baghdad	March 1943.
17,000	English and Arabic (shows Franklin D. Roosevelt and American flag).	Beirut (10,000) Asmara (2,000) Baghdad (5,000)	January 1943. February 1943. Do.
7,000	English and Portuguese (shows American and Portuguese flags).	State Department, for Cape Verde.	Awaiting transportation.
5,000	English (shows British and American flags)	State Department for Fiji Islands.	Do.

Also on yesterday, Mr. Chairman, reference was made to Mr. Alan Cranston, reflecting seriously upon him and his qualifications to serve in his present position. I have here a statement by Admiral McCullough, of the United States Navy, Security Officer of the O. W. I., in which he says:

> In response to your inquiry, Mr. Alan Cranston was cleared by the Civil Service Commission September 3, 1942. There is nothing in the records of the Security Office which would warrant his termination.

Mr. Cranston is Chief of the Foreign Language Press Section, O. W. I. News Bureau, which supplies Government information to the foreign-language papers of this country. Prior to his employment by O. W. I. he was Washington representative of the Common Council for American Unity, a free-lance writer for the American Mercury and other magazines, and a United Press correspondent in Rome.

I make that statement in justice to Mr. Cranston, as well as in justice to the service.

Also yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], one of the ablest members of the committee, made the statement that O. W. I. had sent 7,000,000 pamphlets to Algiers since last March, with the inference that this use of O. W. I. funds had no direct military connection.

The facts are that there were over 7,000,000 pamphlets—almost 8,000,000—shipped to north Africa, but each and every one was shipped at the request of General Eisenhower.

Each and everyone of the nearly 8,000,000 pamphlets was shipped in valuable cargo space which might have been carrying military supplies, but General Eisenhower thought the pamphlets were sufficiently important to give them Army priorities for immediate shipment. Every pound of these pamphlets was requested by cable from Allied Force Headquarters and was carried to Algiers in Army ships by Army priorities.

The earlier shipments were designed for distribution in north Africa to the French and Arabs while it was important to make friends to insure that our supply lines and lines of communication were protected. A very large percentage of these pamphlets were in Italian and were distributed at the time of the landings on the beaches of Catania and Palermo and Reggio and Salerno and have since been distributed in Sicily and in Italy. I think this pretty well establishes the military importance of such pamphlets. You might be interested in some of the titles. They are:

Basic Facts About the U. S. A.
Americans of Italian Origin.
Message From Sicilian Americans to Sicilians.
Educaton for Death.
Italian-American Friendship.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There was no such inference as the gentleman suggests in the remarks which I made on the floor yesterday. The details were submitted to show the number of publications, moving-picture releases, and radio broadcasts that were being sent here and there in Europe. I specifically stated that the picture in other Allied and neutral countries in which I was interested did not appear in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement, because the inference on the part of any casual listener or reader would have been otherwise. I take it for granted then that the gentleman has no objection to our shipping this material to General Eisenhower upon his request.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no objection to shipping it to General Eisenhower or General MacArthur or any other commanding officer overseas if he wants it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri I am glad the gentleman accepts their word to the purpose and effect of these expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I merely make these corrections because I know that the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle are anxious to have accurate information on the activities covered by the bill. I take this opportunity to assure the gentleman who gave us this information that any forebodings which they may have entertained with reference to these matters are wholly without foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I asked the privilege of the gentleman yielding at this time in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if there was anything that I said on the floor of this House yesterday regarding Mr. Alan Cranston that is untrue.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What was it that the gentleman said yesterday about Mr. Cranston?

Mr. BUSBEY. It is in the RECORD, if the gentleman wishes me to read it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What does the gentleman think of Mr. Cranston? Is he satisfied with the services rendered to the Government?

Mr. BUSBEY. I made the statement in the RECORD yesterday, and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if there is anything in that statement that is untruthful.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri The only thing in which we are interested here is whether or not the gentleman has any charges against Mr. Cranston. He singled him out yesterday and referred to him in a disparaging way. I would like to know if the gentleman is now satisfied with Mr. Cranston and his discharge of his official duties. What I had to say about Mr. Cranston I said yesterday and I still stand by the RECORD.

What is the gentleman's opinion of Mr. Cranston? If I have misquoted him I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. BUSBEY. I stated it yesterday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Evidently what the gentleman stated yesterday does not agree with the report of the admiral of the United States Navy which I quoted this morning.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be happy to read what I said for the gentleman if he will just be patient for a minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Since the gentleman does not remember what he said, is it possible it was someone else's opinion he expressed yesterday?

Mr. BUSBEY. It was my opinion, and I stand by it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further because I have a word or two I want to say. The gentleman may get some time of his own. I just want to say this: There may have been an inaccuracy in that statement with reference to the Negro press. My information was as I gave it to the House and I do not know any more about it than that. That was the information that was given to me by some of those people who received the documents.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman give the source of his information? Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I am a little surprised at the frantic efforts the gentleman from Missouri is making to cover up the things that have been shown here about the O. W. I. I said that the Office of Facts and Figures was a stench. Is there anybody here in this House that would want to say it was not a stench, and that it was eliminated because President Roosevelt found that it was such a stench that he could not stand it any longer? I wonder, is there anybody who says it was not a stench?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think it was not a stench?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The reason which the gentleman gave yesterday for considering it a stench he now says does not apply.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; I am not taking back anything. Everything I said about that was true, and everything I said about the O. W. I. being a stench was true, and the American people know and they pretty well expressed it on Tuesday, that it was a stench.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Who was the head of the Domestic Branch who sent out the photographs?

Mr. TABER. Where? This year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The photographs to these Negro newspapers.

Mr. TABER. The head of the Domestic Branch is a gentleman from Oregon. I believe his name is Hoyt.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Hoyt, former editor of the Portland Oregonian?

Mr. TABER. I am stating that when anybody operates the way that was operated it is a stench. Now that is all I have to say on the subject.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the gentleman does not give any reason why he considers it a stench. The reason he gave yesterday he now says is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I just want the gentleman to understand that it is sending out things now that ought not to be sent out——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What things? What is it sending out?

Mr. TABER. Such things as I described yesterday, such things as that. I have lots of them. The gentleman does not listen, or he does not understand; I do not know which. I showed the statements that they were making and sending out with reference to Negro housing. It has not been disputed and it was a stench.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COX. I happen to know something about the record the O. W. I. has made. I did not hear the gentleman's speech on yesterday, but I read every word he said. I think he understated the case against the O. W. I. It is an aggregation of extreme left-wingers. It is just the sort of thing that the people last Tuesday in a number of States voted against, and it is just the sort of thing that the soldier is going to smash when he gets back home.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield? The gentleman ought to yield for me to answer an unwarranted statement like that.

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield; Mr. Chairman, all I ask for is order.

Mr. Chairman, there has been altogether too much frantic effort to cover up this operation. I wonder if the House of Representatives ever heard of William L. Shirer? And if they have ever read any of his articles, a portion of which I shall read in a little while as to the way they have operated their set-up over across? I wonder if they have heard of these articles that have come out from Algiers through the Associated Press in the last couple of days with reference to the value of these things they are putting out? I wonder if they have paid attention to the director——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman be more specific in his references? Will the gentleman read some of these articles?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

I wonder if they have paid attention——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman ought to put them in the RECORD if he predicates his charges on them.

Mr. TABER. I will. I m going to put them in the RECORD. The gentleman need not worry; it will get there quicker than he would like to see them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us have them. The committee ought to have that information.

Mr. TABER. If I can get time enough I will put them in the RECORD. I have them here.

Here is one of them:

British Division of O. W. I. does much with little.

This is by Shirer. I have not the date of it here. It is a clipping out of the New York Herald Tribune:

Each month, for example, O. W. I. distributes to the regular British press service some seventy advance releases, official documents, and so forth, which are too long for the newspaper correspondents to handle. A surprising number of these are published in full in the local press, and they give the public here a background to American goings on which it would not otherwise have. All sorts of background information are dished out daily. The O. W. I. has not neglected the weekly papers. It is true that since the war the British public has been much better informed about American affairs although the paper shortage is reduced.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Why, that is a strong endorsement of the service.

Mr. TABER. I did not yield to the gentleman. When I get through we will let him have a chance.

It is the O. W. I. British Division in London—

I will leave that one out for the present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is not a criticism.

Mr. TABER. I did not yield to the gentleman. I will get you those.

The O. W. I. misses bus on Mussolini's fall.

This is by Shirer in the New York Tribune on the 11th of August. Shirer is the correspondent who was in Berlin for a long time. The O. W. I. broadcast at Mussolini's fall changes nothing in Italy. The Voice of America was telling Europe's millions, telling the Italians, Germans, and the occupied peoples that there is still no reason to believe that the essential nature of the Fascist regime in Italy has changed. An American commentator for O. W. I. was informing them that for the American people the resignation of Mussolini is welcome news, but it is not considered here to be an event of great importance.

That is what Shirer says, that is, "it is not an event of great importance." As Churchill was to say the next day:

Mussolini's end marks the close of an epoch in the life of Italy. The keystone of the Fascist arch has crumbled and without attempting to prophesy, it does not seem unlikely that any other Fascist edifice will fall to the ground in ruins.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no reflection there.

Mr. TABER. On O. W. I.?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Nothing to warrant rejection of this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. I say it is a direct, deliberate reflection. They said they missed the boat. That is a reflection. They just missed the boat. If that is

not a reflection, what does the gentleman call it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether my understanding of the rules of the House is correct. Any time a Member seeks recognition he shall address the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's interpretation is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is my understanding also correct that when addressing the Chair in asking a Member to yield the Member has the right to yield or to refuse to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I would like to address this further parliamentary inquiry. Does the chairman of the Appropriations Committee have any rights inherent to his office that do not accrue to the rest of the Members of the House? If not, I would like to see order maintained and I would like to have him stop his constant criticizing and heckling all the time during the balance of the debate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stationery: For stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, fiscal years 1943 and 1944, $600.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "second" and insert in lieu thereof the word "first."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a clerical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Office of War Information, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head and under "General provisions" pertaining to the Office for Emergency Management in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, $5,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of the Office of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations: *Provided further*, That the last paragraph under the head "Office of War Information" in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944, shall not be construed to apply to supplementation by reverse lend-lease: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the appropriation for the Office of War Information for the fiscal year 1944 for printing and binding within the continental limits of the United States is hereby increased from $1,400,000 to $1,500,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER of New York: Page 5, line 8, after the figures "1944", strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the Office of War Information foreign service is $29,000,000. The expenditures and obligations for the first 3 months were $6,200,000. Four times $6,200,000 equals $24,800,000. That means that they have been spending at a rate which, if continued throughout the year, would leave a balance of $4,200,000, and that without any additional funds whatever they are in a position to increase their expenditures for that service to a tune of $1,400,000 each quarter, or nearly 25 percent of their expenditures for the first quarter. What does that mean? That means that they do not need at this time any additional funds on any basis that you may take whatever. It means that the O. W. I. has enough money if it is properly used to get along on, and carry on the work that needs to be done. They have 3,765 positions set up for their United States end of their foreign service, a number which is absolutely ridiculous, as compared with the number that are actually in the service, where they would be supposed to do some good in carrying on propaganda against the other countries. That means that we can do away with a great lot of the 3,765, who are in continental United States. Twelve hundred of them are in the school over on Long Island, and you know these people are not the ones that carry the main part of the load in this connection.

This whole set-up is under General McClure, in Italy and north Africa. It has been since December, when he went over there. The whole thing is coordinated, and this propaganda, under Maj. Gen. Fred Osborne, in the War Department. The O. W. I. is not in charge of this foreign propaganda. That appears clearly in the set-up and the hearings on page 1259 and page 1260. They only assign people to General McClure's unit in Italy and other places. It is not a set-up where they are the ones who are doing the job. It is clear who is doing the job.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thought we voted to eliminate the Domestic Branch and that it was completely eliminated.

Mr. TABER. No.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And yet I have had complaint from writers that there is some woman there who sends them books before they are published and she lets only a certain point of view be published, and if you publish something she does not like from her point of view, it is not published in the United States.

Mr. TABER. The O. W. I. domestic branch was given $2,750,000 in the conference report. The Senate restored a very large amount, and that was the final result. It was the best deal that the House could make just before the recess. It was too much money. It was more than they were able to use and use rightly, and they are doing things they ought not to do. But this is not an appropriation for that purpose, and only this $29,000,000 that is available for the foreign service. We do need some foreign service of this kind, although frankly I think it would be much better if it is under the sole direction of the Army. Just to illustrate some of the things that they have had to do, they hired in this service a Mrs. Frederick Witt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mrs. Witt is the wife of Commander Witt, of the Navy. She was hired to educate these boys who are hired by the O. W. I. to go over there. That is they did not know enough about the American Government, but that they had to be brought into Washington to look around and to be in the gallery of Congress, and told how the United States Government functions before they sent them over there. That is the kind of people they hired. When this thing was exposed by Mrs. Lombard, wife of a French general, they fired Mrs. Witt, but they moved the educational system over to the Marshall Field estate on Long Island, where they have increased the number from 600 to 1,200, which they now have. If they would hire people who knew something about the American system of government and not the kind of people who know nothing about it and do not appreciate it, it would not require all that set-up.

There was an Associated Press dispatch in the New York Times yesterday which I do not have in front of me, but which I have seen, from north Africa, indicating that our O. W. I. propaganda was not particularly desirable.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield because I do not have the time.

Just a little while ago, Jack Benny returned from a tour of Italy. And he told us that the O. W. I. was not furnishing a great deal that was helpful; that the British were doing most of it. General McClure tells us that the number that the British were furnishing was much below the number that O. W. I. furnished, indicating the caliber of people they have been putting on.

Some of the generals have endorsed O. W. I. and told how valuable it was. Some of them have said it was really valuable. Others have said that they approved of its continuance. The cut which I propose to make would still leave $5,200,000 available to O. W. I. above the first quarter rate of expenditures. That would mean a $1,733,000 per quarter step-up. Is that not enough? That would leave them an opportunity to increase their operations $5,200,000.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why do we not strike all of it out?

Mr. TABER. Personally I would like to, but I have yielded to the sentiments of some who wanted to make a gesture of a million dollars toward this thing. Personally I think it ought not be given a cent, and if we were fair with the American taxpayers and just wanted to give them the money they needed, it would not be necessary to give them anything. But I am giving them a million dollars in this amendment, because I want to see a cut made, and I am compromising with my conscience, because I am afraid that this outfit that is running this thing will continue with ridiculous expenditures, away out of line, and that it will not be as effective as it would be if they would clean it up and get it straightened out.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Have the generals refused to take the money in the War Department and operate their own information service?

Mr. TABER. I think they have had pressure put on them to go along, operating to a large extent with personnel contributed by the O. W. I. I believe that we ought to get to the point where the generals would absolutely and completely control this picture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says that the generals had pressure put on them. Does the gentleman want to leave that remain in the RECORD, without knowing anything about it? Just let us be practical.

Mr. TABER. I have felt that that was the situation, that they had been told that they should take these people from the O. W. I., because I do not believe that the generals would want the type of people that, I understand, are being drawn in.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to let the statement stand, that our generals have responded to pressure on a war matter?

Mr. TABER. That does not mean that I know that pressure has been put on, but I do feel and my inference is that they have been told that they should take these people rather than that they have affirmatively asked for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see where the gentleman might not agree with some individual or some policy, but to accuse the generals of being subject to pressure is a different proposition entirely.

Mr. TABER. I do not mean that I know they have been subject to pressure, but my inference from the operation and the effect of it is that they have been told that they should take these people and operate with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could reach some agreement as to time on this amendment.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if those who would like to speak upon the question would stand so that we could get an idea of how many would like to speak and then we would be able to get some better judgment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Twenty Members have arisen. Would the gentleman be willing to agree upon 2 hours, the time to be controlled by the Chair?

Mr. TABER. I would think that would be fair.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And the committee to have the last 10 minutes for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to close.

Mr. TABER. That would be fair.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 2 hours, the last 10 minutes to be retained by the committee for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the Chairman if this unanimous-consent request just goes to this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is just for this amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, since I propose to speak to the general bill and desire to have my time extended to 10 minutes, I withdraw from this group and will present my unanimous-consent request later.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the debate that will come in these 2 hours will be confined to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I include that in my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be confined to the amendment, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the names of those the Chair has listed as desiring to be heard on this amendment: Messrs. REED of New York, COFFEE, MCCORMACK, WOODRUM of Virginia, O'NEAL, LUDLOW, SNYDER, CANNON of Missouri, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, FOLGER, DWORSHAK, VURSELL, BUSBEY, JUDD, DIRKSEN, WIGGLESWORTH, FORD, EBERHARTER, DITTER, LEMKE, and WILSON.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, just a word upon the importance of propaganda and its place in military campaigns. Organized propaganda has been one of the determining factors in all wars, ancient and modern.

In confirmation, may I read a brief excerpt from the official organ of the American Legion. This article is the story of the most successful soldier who ever lived, a man who lived more than 700 years ago, a general who never lost a battle and a conqueror who consolidated an empire reaching across Asia and Europe from the Pacific Ocean to the North Sea.

Here is the quotation:

"Were the accounts of all battles, save only those of Genghis Khan, effaced from the pages of history * * * the soldier would still possess a mine of untold wealth from which to extract nuggets of knowledge useful to molding an army." That was said by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The soldier, General MacArthur explains, cannot learn his profession solely by practice. Though weapons change, he must go to the past to acquire the unchanging fundamentals of the art of war. Nowhere can he find them better exemplified than in the career of the Emperor of the Mongols—700 years ago.

Genghis Khan's wars were half-won by propaganda before he put an army in the field. In the use of words as weapons no commander has surpassed this barbarian who couldn't read or write. His fifth column was the caravan merchants. Through them he hired agents in each country that he planned to attack. He studied the foe's geography, people, politics; he sought out disaffected elements and set one against another.

He also used propaganda as a weapon of terror. It was his regular practice to remind the country he planned to invade of the dreadful things that had happened to others who had resisted the Great Khan.

He used propaganda skillfully at home to build up morale. He extolled the soldier's profession, made it seem natural that all others should toil to keep the soldier in the field. He taught his people that the Mongols were a race apart, superior to all others. It was a phony theory, of course. The races, then as now, were of mixed descent.

So General MacArthur suggests a closer study of the great Mongol's conceptions of the "unvarying necessities of war." Separated from "the ghastly practices of his butcheries, his barbarism, and his ruthlessness, they stand revealed as kernels of eternal truth, as applicable today in our effort to produce an efficient army as they were 7 centuries ago."

In German there are five full-length technical studies of the military system of the great Mongol. In English there are only two or three brief works. It is obvious how much the Germans have learned from him.

And in this connection, and in further corroboration, Mr. Chairman, I now wish to quote from another article just off the press, showing how effectively the Germans themselves used this great weapon at the close of the last war. This is an excerpt from this month's Reader's Digest,

It is as follows:

Nothing like the German reparations swindle which followed the First World War has even been perpetrated in history. The story throws a high light upon the extent to which the world had grown used to letting itself be deceived by German propaganda.

Look at the case of the Saar coal mines, which the Allies took from Germany to compensate for the Germans' wanton flooding of the French coal mines—a dirty trick indulged in to paralyze French competition. In 1913 the German Finance Minister had valued these Saar mines at 300,000,000 gold marks, but when it came to reparations the Germans had the audacity to value them at 1,028,000,000 gold marks.

Did they get away with it? They got away with a great deal more, for in 1935 they got back the whole Saar state property, of which the mines were only a part, for 140,000,000 gold marks. Why this charity to tricksters? Because for 15 years the world has heard

about the poor Germans. Such was the power of German propaganda.

Yet such is the force of German propaganda that the world was persuaded that the whole Treaty of Versailles was indefensible, and that reparations had left the ruined Germany no alternative but to throw herself into the arms of Hitler. Few recall that reparations had been canceled a year before Hitler came into power.

All power of forming independent judgment had been beaten down by the sheer din and reiteration of German propaganda.

The incredible story cannot be concluded without mentioning the present war, in which the "swinder state" imposed on the nations that she conquered an annual contribution of 1,000,000,000 pounds in cash. This is four times as much, in one year, as the total amount of reparations that Germany had paid in cash in a dozen years after the last war.

In our midst a number of people are already organizing sympathy for post-war Germany.

Let us not be fooled again.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for propaganda carried in this bill is one of the most vital provisions for the war. Propaganda will turn the tide of war for the Allies as conclusively in this war as it turned the tide in favor of the Great Khan's hordes on the same battlefields 700 years ago. It will save men. It will hasten victory. It is desperately needed just at this time. We are reaching the crisis of the war. The next 2 months will decide the issue. We cannot afford for a mere cheese-paring $5,000,000 to neglect the most potential weapon in our arsenal and delay for a single day the conclusion of a war costing billions of dollars every week. I trust the House will vote down the amendment and thereby hasten the close of the most dangerous and destructive war that has ever cursed mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is no time to get excited about an item in a bill of this nature. To me, this is serious, this is solemn, because this very day more than 200 of our boys will die on the distant battle fronts—that is the average—in order to give you and me the privilege of standing here in a democracy and defending the principles of democracy. So I cannot see how we can get excited. It is a solemn occasion.

Since we marked up this bill in the deficiency committee I had the privilege of talking to two officers who came from the north African and Sicilian battlefields. If I had not given my word to the committee that I would stand by $5,000,000, I would offer an amendment here today to raise it to $8,000,000. The big movements that will be made in the near future, which, of course, will mean the loss of lives, will need more propaganda of the kind that General McClure spoke of before the committee, two or three times as much propaganda of that nature as has been used in the past. They spoke of General McClure. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege and opportunity to know him as a man, my privilege when I was in England to have him escort me over England to the secret war installations. I know the high esteem in which he is held as a Christian gentleman. General Eisenhower called him down to Africa personally and put this under him, and I was rather surprised at my friend from Illinois when he said that the general might have said it but somebody else said so and so. I do not think anybody within the sound of my voice who knows General McClure and General Eisenhower would say that they would say anything they did not believe. Let me read what General McClure said in response to a question:

Mr. SNYDER. Do you think that O. W. I., as it has been operated in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy since its inception, has saved the lives of American boys to any extent? If you did not have O. W. I., would there have been more lives lost, without the steps we have taken thus far?

General MCCLURE. I can only state my opinion, and I would say, definitely, "Yes." Illustrative of that is the fact that a number of Axis soldiers, Italians and Germans, have come in and surrendered and used as their passes through the lines the leaflets we have dropped calling for their surrender. Using that instance only as an answer to your question, I should say the propaganda we have used there has kept a number of soldiers from shooting at us and thereby saved the lives of our own troops.

I happen to know that more than 8,000 Italians came up with those leaves and surrendered. These pamphlets were dropped behind their lines the evening before telling them what we would do, what was going on, and that it was better for them to surrender, that they would be taken care of, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this is too serious to quibble over a little sum like $5,000,000 when we know it saves lives and that there is going to be more needed the next few months than there has been in the past. It is too serious not to give this amount of money. I know that if the many thousands of fathers of the boys at the front, the thousands of wives and the thousands of mothers throughout the Nation whose sons and husbands are at the front were here today, there is not one of them who would vote against this $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself to the subject of the Technical Training Center of the O. W. I. Under date of March 6, as is set forth in the hearings, under a press release the plans for a school to teach foreign outposts personnel the technical aspects of press, radio, and other information activities in the field were announced by the Office of War Information. A portion of the estate of Marshall Field at Huntington, Long Island, has been leased to the Government for the duration of the war at a rental of $1. The instructors will be men on leave from outpost service or loaned by operating divisions of the Office of War Information. Approximately 40 students will be at the school at any one time, most of them studying for a 30-day period. Students will pay the cost of their maintenance.

What is wrong with that? One dollar rental and the students will pay the cost of their maintenance. Why all the holy horror about it?

The cost to the Government, Office of War Information officials stated, will be considerably less than teaching facilities in New York City. So they move to this dollar-a-year home at Long Island. The curriculum of the school, it was explained, will concentrate on technical aspects. I will not read all of this, but I do want you to look at it on page 1339.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. No. I only have a short time.

Mr. DITTER. Just for one question?

Mr. RABAUT. Just for a question.

Mr. DITTER. Was that a release put out by O. W. I.?

Mr. RABAUT. It is for immediate release on Saturday, March 6.

Now, I take you over to page 1350 where I asked:

What is going to be the curriculum?

And there is set forth on page 1350 and page 1351 the names of the teachers and the subjects they will teach. What more do you want? No more honest proposition could have been put before this committee.

This morning there was a remark made about left-wingers, that the whole of the O. W. I. was full of left-wingers. Yesterday there was the innuendo of communism. I want to read to you from one of the most outstanding weekly publications in this country, edited by the Jesuits, the followers of St. Ignatius. The sun never sets on their labors. They are in every corner of the world and if any group opposes communism it is the Jesuit Order. What does the editor say in America?

In its editorial, under date of October 30, here is what they say.

It should not be necessary at this late date to insist that in the conduct of modern warfare words are at least as important as bullets. * * * It should not be overlooked that the country is asking its chief propaganda organ, the Office of War Information, to fight the war of the air waves on little more than a shoestring. The 1943 appropriation for the foreign branch of O. W. I. amounts to not much more than the cost of the 60 bombers lost during the single raid on Schweinfurt!

This kind of economy * * * is apt to be a very expensive mistake, since our failure to use effectively the weapon of psychological warfare can easily prolong the war and involve wholly unnecessary expenditures of men and money. That is a piddling sum for a Nation which is spending billions on armaments.

The matter is especially pertinent right now. O. W. I.'s foreign branch has about reached the end of its limited resources, and last week Elmer Davis * * * had to go hat in hand to the Senate Appropriations Committee to beg for an additional $5,000,000 to carry on critically essential work. Why there should be any haggling over this request is hard to see. If anything, it errs on the side of modesty and reasonableness. The pity is that Mr. Davis should have to plead for funds which in the long run may save billions of dollars and no one knows how many lives.

Do you question the necessity now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] made a point regarding the Jesuit Order and its stand against communism. Every word he said regarding the Jesuit Order and their attitude is absolutely true and I commend them most highly for their stand. However, there was not one single word in his statement to the effect that the Jesuit Order has even approved the O. W. I. in their cooperation with Communist groups in this and foreign countries in order to get their propaganda across.

Yesterday the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] made the following statement. I quote:

> But every person who is hired by the Office of War Information has to run the gantlet of a series of gruelling investigations, first by the Bureau of Investigation, then by the Civil Service and Intelligence Services of the Army and Navy, and finally by O. W. I.'s own Security Division. These investigations go into the most intimate details of personal history, affiliations, and habits of the applicant. A person of any taint or guilty of subversiveness could hardly come through that scorching fire of investigation without being exposed.

I quote from page 1056 of the hearings on appropriations for the national war agencies this past spring, as to the thoroughness of these investigations, the statement made by Mr. Vernon A. McGee, assistant director for management, O. W. I.:

> The last report I had showed that there were 1,235 cases for complete investigation still pending before the Civil Service Commission.

I also wish to call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the statement on page 1349 of the hearings on the bill before us today, in which it is stated by Mr. Philip C. Hamblet, Assistant Director, Overseas Branch of the O. W. I:

> It is estimated that the number of employees in which the Civil Service Commission has not completed investigations is 1,720.

I am sure that the gentleman from Indiana did not want to leave the impression with the House that before any of these men can go to work for O. W. I. they are so thoroughly investigated, as he said.

What happens—and this has been proven; and I made the point yesterday here on the floor—after an employee has been on the pay roll of the O. W. I. for a year, then they cannot be removed without specific charges being made before the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. There is a preliminary examination of every one of these employees before he ever goes into the service. I am so informed by the responsible officials of the O. W. I.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Indiana would certainly agree with me that a preliminary examination is not the "scorching fire of investigation" that the gentleman from Indiana described yesterday.

I have here an article that appeared in the Wednesday, November 3, 1943, edition of the Daily Worker regarding a recent broadcast by John Vafiades, alias John Burns. This man was convicted in 1940 by Federal Judge Henry W. Gaddola in New York to 2 years' imprisonment for the obstruction of justice by influencing witnesses in antitrust proceedings against the Communist-controlled International Fur and Leather Workers Union. This is borne out by the Daily Worker of July 12, 1940, pages 1 and 3; July 13, 1940, pages 1, 3; and the November 5 issue of the Daily Worker on page 3. This man John Vafiades is known as a Communist Party member, and I think his immigration status should be investigated.

The article states, in part:

> The United States Office of War Information made its facilities available to Mr. Vafiades, so that he could greet the Greek people in the name of Greek-American anti-Fascists and encourage the Greek underground movement against the Nazi tyrants.
>
> "We Greek workers in the United States * * * are following your example in unity behind our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt," he told his countrymen.
>
> "We are trying to be your equals in a National Liberation front against Nazi-fascism, in our efforts to obtain closer unity in our ranks for a full and final victory and for a lasting creative, democratic, people's peace."

The average American citizen would not think the wording of this last paragraph had any particular significance, but one who has studied the technique, phraseology, and Communist policy would readily understand what Mr. Vafiades had in mind. When he says "We are trying to be your equals in a National Liberation front against Nazi-fascism" he is really saying that the Communists of this country are doing everything possible to cooperate with the Communists of other countries, because all through Europe the Communists are forming Liberation fronts. And where he refers to a people's peace, in reality he means a peace favorable to the Communist Party in every country. The Communists in all their writings and speeches are getting away from using the word "Communist" more and more, and substituting the words "people's," "workers," and "democracy" instead.

This trend in the Communist Party of the United States is reflected in the action of the recent convention of the Young Communist League in New York City, when they changed their name to the American Youth for Democracy.

I predict that in the very near future, possibly within the next year, the Communist Party of America will change its name to some other title and substitute either "people's," "workers," or "democracy," instead of Communist. Because so many people in speaking of our Government refer to it as a democracy, instead of a republic, the Communists are beginning to take advantage of this inaccuracy to confuse the people.

A great deal has been said during this debate regarding letters and telegrams received from generals of the Army. To me, it is very significant that no information has been given us regarding the exact circumstances under which these letters were written. I am wondering if by chance the writing of these letters might have been suggested by someone in high office. There is nothing in the record to the effect that anyone, at any time, in the War or Navy Departments, requested that the Office of War Information be established to assist them in winning the war. As a matter of fact, everyone knows that the Office of War Information was set up under a Presidential directive, and this agency has repeatedly used the facilities of its office for propaganda that does not in any way help in the winning of the war. This activity on the part of O. W. I. is resented by countless parents who have boys at the front ready to make the supreme sacrifice for their country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, if misleading information were argument and its reiteration proof, the case against the O. W. I. would be definitely closed. The usual red-baiting charges are promiscuously disseminated in the Chamber reflecting on the patriotism and the Americanism of the self-sacrificing members of the talented staff of that great organization. Derision, ridicule, and personal defamation of personnel are inept and inefficacious arguments.

At the head of the Pacific Branch is one of the greatest students of oriental culture living in the world today, Mr. Owen Lattimore, whose integrity and Americanism are beyond question. No man should attempt to impugn the integrity or loyalty of that distinguished traveler and scholar and feel he can do so with impunity.

The Director of the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I. is Dr. Robert Sherwood, three times Pulitzer Prize winner, and one of the most gifted authors and playwrights living in the world today.

The head of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. is Mr. Palmer Hoyt, managing editor of the Portland Oregonian, whom we on the Pacific coast regard as the outstanding Republican publicist in that area. He is one of the leaders of the Republican Party, a man who directs the operations of the O. W. I. domestically in the United States.

As an example of the kind of attacks that have been launched against O. W. I., I have here a column by John O'Donnell published in the Washington Times-Herald on Tuesday, November 2, 1943.

Mr. O'Donnell starts out by saying:

> Mr. Elmer Davis' Office of War Information has taken up the problem of India in a serious fashion—so seriously, in fact, that their broadcasts on F. D. R.'s program of freedom from want to the famine-stricken terrain of Calcutta is causing both irritation on Capitol Hill and a bit of eyebrow raising from Great Britain.

Mr. O'Donnell goes on to say that O. W. I. has overspent its budget on such items as 15,000 short-wave receiving sets for India to enable the Indian people to listen to O. W. I.'s broadcasts about the "four freedoms." Mr. O'Donnell also accuses O. W. I. of "horning into the India political problem without invitation."

Mr. O'Donnell states that O. W. I. has launched its psychological assault on India by displaying posters of a Christian religious nature.

Having read Mr. O'Donnell's blast at O. W. I.—with charges which, if true, would be serious, indeed—I have taken the trouble to look into this matter, and I am in a position to report the following revealing facts:

First. O. W. I. is not doing any broadcasting to India whatsoever either in the English language or in any of the many native Indian dialects. The truth of the matter is that there is no short-wave radio transmitter in this country powerful enough to reach India.

That disposes of the first of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Second. O. W. I. has not purchased 15,000 short-wave receiving sets for India. O. W. I. has not purchased any receiving sets for India, although it has sent there perhaps three or four small sets for the use of its own representatives in listening to Japanese broadcasts so as to be constantly aware of what the enemy is saying to India

This disposes of the second of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Third. O. W. I. did not go into India uninvited. It was specifically invited to start an American information program in India, the invitation coming from the British Government in London and the Government of India in New Delhi. In India today O. W. I. is working in closest cooperation with our own American diplomatic and military representatives there, and they have praised highly the work that O. W. I. is doing.

That disposes of the third of Mr. O'Donnell's charges

Fourth. O. W. I. has never displayed in India any posters of a Christian religious nature. Some such posters as those described by Mr. O'Donnell were shipped by mistake to India—but that was before O. W. I. was formed—before Mr. Elmer Davis had ever entered the service of this Government. By the time those few posters reached the port of Karachi in India, O. W. I. had been established and was on the job there. O. W. I. men in India were responsible for stopping the issuance of those posters.

That disposes of the fourth of Mr. O'Donnell's charges.

Now, I do not know from what source Mr. O'Donnell obtained this information. I assume he believed it to be true and factual, otherwise he would not have published it. But I suggest that he should think twice before he believes any further information from the same source which provided him with these completely false and insupportable accusations against O. W. I.

Incidentally, Mr. O'Donnell may be interested to know that his column is read with utmost interest in Tokyo. On Wednesday, November 3—the day after the column referred to was published—it was quoted on the Japanese radio which stated, and I quote.

The propaganda of the United States Office of War Information was severely criticized by the well-known correspondent, John O'Donnell, particularly in regard to the situation in India.

The Japanese broadcasters showed particular relish in their quotations of Mr. O'Donnell's remarks about how O. W. I. is broadcasting a message of freedom from want to the starving millions of India.

It seems to me that an American columnist should not put himself in the position of writing false propaganda for the Japanese to broadcast. Let them make up their own lies without help from us.

There is plenty of food for thought for all of us in this particular case. On Tuesday a column by John O'Donnell is published in the Washington Times-Herald. That column is read by a Japanese agent in this country who flashes the text of it to Tokyo. We do not know by what secret radio that news was flashed—but it got to Tokyo all right—and within 24 hours the Japanese are broadcasting that same column back to us over their own radio.

In other words, the enemy is here in our midst. The enemy is reading lies about our Government published in America's free press. And the enemy is broadcasting those same lies on his own radio as his own propaganda.

I most earnestly draw this matter to the attention of our Army Intelligence, Navy Intelligence, and the F. B. I.

It seems to me it is time that we should give pause before we spread propaganda based upon false information.

I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be rejected.

Denial of funds requisite to the efficient functioning of the agency promoting psychological warfare is a step which inevitably impedes the war program. While prodigal with funds for dubious extrabellum purposes, we illogically here are confronted with a serious plan to eviscerate the organization marshaling the shock troops of the printed word and the radio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for 5 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to have to disagree with my esteemed colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on whose leadership and judgment in matters of appropriations I depend a great deal. I voted in June to reduce the appropriations for the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., because I felt that propaganda was not in order here at home. I believe the American people are quite able to make their decisions regarding the war or anything else, on the basis of straight information; and I thought a lot of the output of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. was not information, but propaganda.

However, I believe strongly that in the winning of this war at the earliest moment and with a minimum cost in life and money foreign propaganda is an invaluable weapon.

Further I am sure that those who vote this afternoon to cut down this appropriation from $5,000,000 to $1,000,000 will vote that way not because they are opposed to foreign propaganda but only because they believe a lot of the propaganda being sent out at present is of the wrong sort, is not achieving the thing they believe ought to be done, and in fact, may be doing more harm than no propaganda at all.

I want to say further that I have no sympathy with any attempt to sell abroad the so-called American way of life. I have seen the results of many such attempts in the past in China. For example, a great American foundation came to China and observed that the Chinese ought to have better medical care. It assumed that, of course, the way to do it would be to give the Chinese a demonstration of how it is done in America. They built a medical school on the scale of that at Harvard or Johns Hopkins, so far beyond anything the Chinese themselves can support in this century that the net result was to discourage, rather than encourage, them. If western medicine had to be on so grand a scale as that, then the Chinese could only throw up their hands in hopelessness. It was like asking people to go at one jump from the kindergarten to the Ph. D. standard without having gone through the grade school, the high school, the college or university stages. Instead of putting $7,000,000 into one American-type school in one city, and as a result training Chinese boys to practice, not in their own countryside, but only in that one school or in America, it would have been far more useful to put $1,000,000 into each of seven less pretentious schools, scattered over China.

It is the wrong type of propaganda to assume that the American way of life is best for people everywhere, or attainable in any near future. It emphasizes the differences between peoples, and always to the disadvantage of our allies. Our purpose should be to emphasize the things we have in common—our principles and goals in this war, rather than our superior material standards in America. To tantalize tortured people by dangling before their eyes goals they cannot possibly reach in this generation is not good propaganda, or good judgment, or even decent human kindness.

Having said all that, it seems clear one should base his vote on whether he believes the propaganda being sent out by the O. W. I. to our enemies, our allies, and the neutral countries is on the whole of the right sort or not, whether it is efficient and effective. Well, we now have two main fronts—in Asia and in the Mediterranean. I happen to know something about the propaganda program in the first, particularly in China, and aimed at the Philippines, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Japan, and so forth. It has been, I believe, very well handled. During the first 6 months to a year after Pearl Harbor, about all we had to hold the confidence of our allies in the Pacific was propaganda. The Japanese claimed that they had sunk our Pacific navy, and they had. They said that America and England were finished. What was the

use of the Filipinos or the Javanese or the Burmese or the Indochinese or the people of China hanging on? The only peoples on whom they could hope for deliverance were being steadily driven farther away. America could never come back, and so on.

The O. W. I. did a good job in convincing them that America would come back, hammering away on our ability to make planes, to launch ships, to produce steel, to grow food, to build up an unbeatable industrial and military machine. If that is what is meant by selling the American way of life, it was eminently worth doing.

Now we are getting victories to vindicate their faith in us, and our propaganda agencies in China are turning more attention to Japan.

I have no illusions that propaganda by itself can ever weaken Japan's war effort. Only crushing defeats can do that. But propaganda can be of enormous assistance when those defeats begin, if we are in a position immediately to exploit them to the full. I suspect that the Japanese can be made to crack up terribly, even more spectacularly than the Germans did last time or than they will this time, I hope. The Japanese have never been defeated. No one can be sure what they will do. We should be building up, not contracting, our propaganda agencies in the Pacific in order to be able to take quick and full advantage of the first breaks that come. That is merely good judgment.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. In a moment if I have time. With regard to the other front, I have no direct knowledge and must base my vote on the views of those who should know best, the military commanders there. On page 1263 of the hearings Mr. Robert Sherwood, the Director of Overseas Operations Branch of the O. W. I., stated:

> I beg leave to give you a few figures on our required expansion in north Africa alone during recent months:
>
> On April 1 of this year, when I was in north Africa, we had 32 O. W. I. employees there. The total pay roll was $202,500, which included foreign-service allowances.
>
> Today we have 160 American employees in or on the way to north Africa, Sicily, and southern Italy with a total pay roll, including foreign-service allowances, of very close to a million dollars.
>
> The demands from that theater for more personnel continue constantly. We now have an order of 83 additional people, and we know that at least 100 more will be required. It must be remembered that every individual we send is sent at the request of General Eisenhower and General McClure. Every one of them has the approval of the State Department and War Department.
>
> Since April 1, 1943, O. W. I. has shipped to north Africa from New York alone, with the approval of the War Department, 900 tons of paper, 7,703,343 publications; 7,500 reels of motion pictures; 302 tons of radio parts; 180 tons of printing presses, office supplies, recordings, and other equipment.
>
> Orders from General Eisenhower's headquarters for 12 additional radio transmitters for that theater are now being filled.
>
> Every ounce of material that we send, as well as every individual, whether by ship or airplane, must be authorized by General Eisenhower's headquarters.

Mr. Chairman, if General Eisenhower believes that the O. W. I.'s work in that theater of war is sufficiently important to make such requests and to assign it that amount of greatly needed tonnage, then I think it is important that we grant the relatively small amount of funds indicated. I hope the suggested reduction in the appropriation will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, our friend the lovable gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has a very fine mind, a very logical mind, but to save my life I cannot understand the operation of his mind in this instance. He said in the Well of this House today and yesterday and on other occasions that the Office of War Information is a stench in the nostrils of the American people. Now in reducing the appropriation from $5,000,000 to $1,000,000 he places himself in the attitude of saying that a stench is out of the question, but that one-fifth of a stench is all right. The gentleman has said time and again, as have other Members on his side in proposing this appropriation, that there is plenty of money to carry on the activities of the Office of War Information.

If that is so, why give them a million dollars? It seems to me the gentleman would have been in a more consistent position if he had offered an amendment to strike out all the appropriation and not give them a cent. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is a great man and a great public servant, and I think he is usually right in respect to appropriations, but he is not always right and, in my opinion, in this instance he is as wrong as any man could be.

The gentleman from North Dakota asked me yesterday if I thought the bill as presented would take care of all of the essential activities of the Government. I told him that I felt sure it would; that it would not cripple any essential activity; but I want to say if this amendment is adopted, I will withdraw that assertion, because in my opinion it would vitally cripple one of the most vital of our activities, in fact the outstanding vital activity; that is, the war effort. At the expense of being repetitious, I should like to quote again today what I quoted yesterday as to what some of the leading generals who are in charge of the war effort think of the Office of War Information.

I should like for you again to ponder over what General Marshall said. On November 22, 1942, General Marshall writing to Mr. Davis, Director of War Information, said:

> The efficiency with which the personnel of the Office of War Information cooperated with the War Department in connection with the operation in north Africa contributed directly toward its success and is deeply appreciated.

On March 30, 1943, General Marshall, again writing to Mr. Davis, said:

> I desire to express my appreciation to the members of your organization for their excellent work in the field of psychological warfare during the Sicilian campaign.

The RECORD is full of expressions of faith and commendation from the top generals of the Army. I shall not at this time read others. But I should like to say that I think we are taking on a great responsibility and we are encountering very great danger and hampering the war effort and contributing toward the possibility of the loss of lives and the defeat of our armies if we cut down this appropriation as proposed in the gentleman's amendment.

In conclusion I should like to call attention to the fiscal status of O. W. I. in the light of this proposed amendment. The appropriation for O. W. I. for the present fiscal year is $24,000,000. Already one-third of the fiscal year has elapsed and approximately one-third of the appropriation, $8,000,000, has been obligated, leaving $16,000,000 for the remainder of the year. If the $4,000,000 cut provided in the Taber amendment should be required to be absorbed into the $16,000,000, it would cut all other appropriations to $12,000,000 for the remainder of the year. Bearing in mind also that an additional $5,000,000 as shown by the testimony, may have to be provided for contingent military operations, and that this may have to be taken out of the $12,000,000, there would be left only a meager sum of $7,000,000 for all of the rest of the O. W. I. operation overseas.

Such whittling down of funds would not be economy. It would be crippling, demoralizing, and a terrific blow to our war effort, the extent of which, in the loss of lives of our men and possible prolongation of the struggle, cannot be foreseen and should not even be contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I reckon it is not entirely a breach of rules and regulations to address you as "my friends." I do not mean to have you recall through that, the custom or habit of another, but I do it to preface what I am about to say in order that I may have you understand that I would not have what I propose to say leave too great a sting. I am astonished at this attempt to cripple a war activity. I must be truthful this once and say that I am not greatly disappointed, but I am grieved that in the Congress of the United States, when I occupy that position which compels me to forget, particularly in this day of war, death and soul sorrow, whether I am a Democrat or a Republican. It is a significance and a contemptible contemplation that I would resent and immediately deny if it were thrust at me, in forgetfulness of the high position that I occupy as a Member of the House of Representatives.

We are apparently willing and want to be commended, I suppose, for appropriating moneys to buy tanks and guns and airplanes and machinery of war and thereby say to the boys who are on the battlefields today and in the air and on the seas, "Take these and fight to the death, but I am going to cut down from $5,000,000 to the pitiable sum of $1,000,000 an appropriation that, if it has any tendency at all, is designed, calculated,

capable, and competent to save the lives of thousands of our own mothers' sons by telling the truth and letting the world know the truth, through the Office of War Information." Whether the Director of that agency be a Democrat or a Republican does not make a bit of difference to me. It does not make any difference to me whether Mr. Hoyt is a Democrat or a Republican.

I am somewhat grieved that debates go on on this vital, serious subject, as to whether we are entirely satisfied with the aesthetic tastes of the men who are undertaking to save the lives of our boys through the dissemination of war information, meeting the propaganda lies that are set on foot by our enemies.

It is too serious. I hope no political consideration will enter into this matter. I warn you, whether you be a Democrat, a Republican, or a member of some other party, that you are trifling with a serious and dangerous thing and that which interests you and me most is that it is trifling with the lives of our own boys; and it is also trifling with your politics a little, too.

Is there anyone so politically prejudiced that he cannot have confidence in the provision in this bill that this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure unless the Director of War Information, with the approval of the President, shall determine that such funds are necessary for carrying on activities in conjunction with actual or projected military operations? To me this is an assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a little amused after listening to the debate on this bill for an hour or so. I hope anything I may have to say will not be branded as any desire on the part of myself or Members on the side of the House I represent as not being intensely interested in winning this war as speedily as possible.

Like many of the Members, I have only two sons and they are both in the service—one in the Army and one in the Navy. When I stepped into the House this morning I noticed a great array of stalwart debaters and leaders on the Democratic side. I noticed quite a heavy attendance over there and that struck me as being so different from what it has been for the last number of weeks that I rather raised a political eyebrow, thinking there was going to be some fireworks and some real debate here today. It gave me the thought that maybe there might be a little politics in this fight over the O. W. I. in which they were interested.

I came to Washington as a new Member, with the idea of leaving politics at home so long as it might affect in any way my best service to this House, to the district I represent, and to the Nation at large. I wish we could all do that. Maybe I have not, but I have tried, and will continue to try to do so, because the last Congress—the one preceding this—drafted and sent out to fight on the battlefields of the world some 10,000,000 men. They were taken away from their jobs, many of them lucrative, their ambitions in life were dashed to the ground, and certainly when that is done the Members of this House ought to try to exemplify something of the patriotism and the heroism of these young men who have been sent out by this Congress. If there ever was a time when the duty of the Members of this Congress should ring in their ears every day they enter this House—this the greatest legislative body in the world—it should be now, because we have passed on a tremendous responsibility to those young men who have gone out to maintain the freedom of this country. I doubt if many Members of Congress want to bring politics into the deliberations. Our responsibility on the home front is tremendous.

I am reminded that this bill called for something like $1,200,000,000 when it was received by the Committee on Appropriations. The committee, making a fine record, cut it by something like a billion dollars—a world record. I am informed that when it came before the committee the item for O. W. I. called for $5,000,000 for a further extension of the work of this organization, and I am informed the $5,000,000 came out unscathed reported to the House. I am wondering if there is anything in the fact that this $5,000,000 could have some political nerve centers hooked to it and that some of the people downtown may be interested in preserving it because they have propagandized the people of the country locally and the boys in the service all over the battle fronts of the world with propaganda useless, much of it, for winning the war. I am wondering if that has anything to do with the fight that is being made today to keep this $5,000,000 intact.

The question before the Congress today is: Will we vote an additional appropriation of $4,000,000 to the Office of War Information? Will we waste $4,000,000 of the people's money? Let me break this down so you can understand what it means.

I represent a district in southern Illinois consisting of 10 counties. My people are patriotic; they want to win the war; they have put up with regimentation, rationing, and all of the necessary and many unnecessary restrictions. The businessmen have given their time in leading the war-loan drives, in scrap drives, and in everything to support the war. They have given up and sent into the military service some 15,000 of their sons and daughters in my district. They have oversubscribed, in every county, every war loan.

Let me show you how this unneeded waste of $4,000,000 would affect their contribution to the last war loan. This $4,000,000 represents the sum total of all the bonds bought in the Third War Loan by the people of 6 counties out of the 10 I represent if it were to fall on them alone. Of course, it is spread over the Nation affecting other people who are just as interested in economy as are the people in my district. I am supporting the amendment offered by Mr. TABER, the Republican minority leader, to cut this appropriation from $5,000,000 to $1,000,000 because it is not needed, because it is a waste, and because I refuse to see as much money wasted as was taken from the people from 6 counties of the district of 10 counties which I represent.

We have just witnessed an election, the returns of which in New York, New Jersey, Philadelphia, and Kentucky show conclusively that the people are aroused at the waste and extravagance of this present administration. It is a mandate to the Members of this Congress who are their only direct representatives to stop this reckless waste of their money.

We have witnessed an election in which the radicals, the Reds, the Pinks, and the Communists seeking to keep regimentation and the New Deal fastened upon the American people have openly supported the New Deal crowd in every State where the election was held Tuesday of this week. And now we witness the New Deal leadership fighting to increase to the appropriations for Elmer Davis at the head of the Office of War Information, who was a Socialist first, left of the left wingers secondly, who graduated into the New Deal and now heads the Office of Propaganda for America wherein hundreds of people who are on his pay roll are openly accused of either being communistic now or having graduated from a background of communistic connections.

It is amazing to me that many of the fine men on the right side of the aisle seemingly will not learn that the American people are through with such waste on such a gang which is wasting their substance and who are violating the purpose and intent of the Office of War Information to propagandize the people of America and the people in foreign lands with such sentiments and ideas that are contrary to the American way of life and our constitutional concepts of government.

I wish the people of America who listened in so intently to the radio on Tuesday night over all the Nation hoping and praying that those States which were holding an election would turn back toward constitutional government and defeat the waste and extravagance of the New Deal could be sitting in the gallery today and witness almost the solid ranks of the Republicans of this Congress fighting to save them $4,000,000 while on the other side of the aisle, leaders who do not believe in the policy they support are fighting for this extra appropriation of $4,000,000 to the Office of War Information.

There is but one conclusion that can be drawn and that is they want to continue this vast network of channels of the air and of the press for political purposes to try to keep the New Deal in power.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to exchange in personalities nor to debate ancient history with my good friend and colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who as Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has authorized the greatest public expenditures and has thus created the largest public debt this Nation and its overburdened taxpayers

have ever suffered. However, the gentleman has taken pains and has exhibited considerable excitement in an attempt to refute the cold evidence I have exhibited to the House to prove that the O. W. I. has been engaged in activities which cannot be justified by the greatest stretch of imagination.

The gentleman attempts to justify the distribution of thousands, indeed millions, of trinkets by the O. W. I. on the grounds that it worked to some extent in winning the friendship of the American Indian in the early days of this country and therefore should work in winning the friendship of the Indians who live in India and other kinds of people in all other nations of the world. I would respectfully point out that this is 1943, not 1492. I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that the foreigners whose friendship we seek to win may not be so ignorant as the savages who inhabited this continent years ago. Indeed, it can hardly be argued with effectiveness by the gentlemen that the Italians are so ignorant that their friendship can be purchased with these trinkets. Yet, that is what the gentlemen are going before the taxpayers with as a justification for reaching down deeper in their pockets.

I have no objections to our Government making other peoples acquainted with what this country is. In fact, I think it is a good idea. But, as I stated in my speech in debating this appropriation bill yesterday, I want to see this country sold to other peoples in terms of our Constitution and Declaration of Independence and not in the terms of any one man, as the O. W. I. prefers to sell it, much to the disgust of informed people.

The gentlemen contend further that this sort of global boondoggling is justified because they say it saves lives. If this could be true I would be offering an amendment to increase this $5,000,000 appropriation. But, I am disappointed that the gentlemen on the majority side of the isle are so naive as to believe that a campaign button with the President's picture on it can scare the enemy away and thus save the lives of American boys. Of course, the majority is still using the old worn-out stock argument that all the boondoggling they are for is necessary to the war effort and that to oppose it means opposing the war effort and sacrificing American lives. The absurdity of such an argument has been demonstrated better than I could demonstrate it by the contention of the gentleman from Missouri that these campaign buttons, which he and O. W. I. prefer to call lapel clips, have saved American lives. If this was true why does the gentleman not argue that we should at further expense to the taxpayers make more of these buttons and use them instead of drafting fathers?

The gentleman says that the Army wants these trinkets or knickknacks. He says that the generals are begging for them. Unfortunately, that does not appear in the hearings on the bill. When I pointed this out to the gentleman on the floor he said that he did not like to publish information of this kind. Ah, now I suppose he thinks we have revealed some kind of a military secret which the American people should not know about. It is not a military secret but I can well understand why the committee does not want the people to know about it. I can well understand that though the hearings on this deficiency appropriation bill are contained in a volume of 1,634 pages no reference was made to that. If there is any American general who is begging for lapel clips with the President's picture on them I would like to know who he is. These clips or buttons have been distributed to American troops as well as to the ignorant savages the gentlemen refer to in India, Africa, and Italy. It is a good thing these ignorant savages can read or most of the O. W. I. literature would not be effective. They might not even know whose picture was on the buttons.

If in some of the jungle islands of the Pacific or elsewhere it is necessary for us to give a string of beads to gain acceptance of the theory of the "four freedoms," I have no objection to it. But let us put an end to this sham and pretense and secrecy about it. And let us put an end to the promotion of the political fortunes of any one man or political party in doing so. Let us advertise America as the land of the free and the home of the brave, and not as a novelty counter.

Let us preserve O. W. I. and the good work it has done, but not let this need obscure the proven fact that mistakes have been made which if eliminated would save our constituents money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York is, of course, in keeping with the philosophy of unintelligent economy that his party has consistently followed. I wish to paraphrase the old saw: "Penny-wise and pound-foolish" by saying that that amendment culling O. W. I.'s appropriation from five to one million is a classic example of the amended proverb, "Dollar-wise and human-life foolish." When I say "human life" I mean the lives of our gallant fighting forces on the world's battle fronts.

This sentiment has been characterized by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as hysterical. If this is hysteria then I hope Congress as a body goes all out for hysteria.

To me it seems completely inconceivable that this House could, in spite of political partisanship, oppose this psychological effort, which, from evidence given by competent authorities has actually contributed to the war effort, by not only saving the lives of our fighting men, our fighting ships, but in addition thereto has actually enhanced our chances of victory by adding to our forces both military and naval, both ships and men.

I venture this assertion on the statement of five military officers who, I believe, are better able to appraise the work of the O. W. I. as they have observed its results on the battle front than the arm chair admirals and generals here at home. I myself would not in good conscience risk one life on the fighting front to save a few paltry dollars on the home front, particularly after voting millions and billions for guns and ships and planes and tanks.

When we consider, Mr. Chairman, that it was the O. W. I. broadcast that brought in the Italian fleet, and I think this cannot be refuted, this is important. If we had to go out and fight that fleet we would have lost ships and men, we would have destroyed that fleet, and instead of having an asset that we can now use to release some of our ships for service in other war areas, we would have less ships and less men.

Prominent military authorities have said that the all-day-long broadcast of the O. W. I. succeeded in bringing those ships into Malta where they joined the United Nations forces.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated because it represents to me a pinch-penny attempt to cripple one of the effective fighting forces that is now conducting our global war. If this does not smell to high heaven of rotten political chicanery, then I have never seen that type of activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard all of the debate yesterday and most of the debate today. In all the debate to which I have been privileged to listen nobody has denied the tremendous value of psychological warfare. Everybody, in fact, has admitted that the value of psychological warfare is equal to the value of warfare by force of arms, and I think the experiences of this war already have proven that in some instances the value of psychological warfare is greater than the value of warfare by force.

Up to the present time this Congress has not refused the armed forces of this country any request that they have made for funds. The Congress has gone down the line with every request made by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Merchant Marine, War Production Board, Shipping Board and every other agency of the Government that has something to do with trying to bring victory to the United Nations. Any attempt at this time to deny funds to the psychological branch would be, in my opinion, just as foolish as it would be to deny a commander on the battle front the munitions that he needed if such ammunition were available. Were we to deny $4,000,000 which the psychological branch of the O. W. I. wants, we would be subject to just criticism were something to go wrong in the various theaters of operation. It would be just as unwise to deny a ship to the Navy if the Navy Department asked for one.

Those who are attacking the O. W. I. and who want to deny them this money should look at the hearings and their reports. Every general in command

overseas has signified either by cable or in writing the tremendous value that the psychological warfare has had in gaining victory; Pantelleria, in Sicily, in Italy, in North Africa and in every theater in which our forces have been engaged. The attack that is being made by some on the O. W. I. is merely a flank attack. It is a camouflage attack on the ground that perhaps some of the personnel in this psychological warfare branch are not loyal to the United States. The question now before us should be decided solely on the basis of its military value.

We cannot afford to take a chance at a critical time like this when we admit how valuable this type of warfare is. To cripple the O. W. I. would be taking a serious chance. I hope the members of this committee and the Congress will not approach this question from a political viewpoint because it appears to me that some are giving consideration first to the political aspect of getting victory for one side or the other. I trust that the Congress will consider this seriously. Give the commanders in chief what they want and also give the O. W. I. what they say is necessary and what the generals say is necessary.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman remember that this House cut the appropriations on the domestic activities of O. W. I. this past summer?

Mr. EBERHARTER. That may be true. That is a domestic question.

Mr. PLOESER. Let me finish the question. Does the gentleman think this has done any injury to the war effort?

Mr. EBERHARTER. We have not had enough time to find out whether or not it has done any injury. No reports have been received, no investigation has been made, no committee has reported on it, and the country does not know, neither does this Congress. It may develop that very serious harm was done to the war effort by a denial of funds to the domestic branch of O. W. I.

Mr. PLOESER. Very serious harm was done to the political effort on the home front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, during the debate last evening on this particular issue some remarks were made by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee which should be corrected and clarified at this time. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

> In the Overseas Branch everything is under the direct control of the Army officers. The program must be submitted, and it is made up by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is at all times under the control of the military zone.

I called attention to a United Press dispatch which appeared in a local paper on October 24, reporting on the activities of a gentleman who happens to be mayor of Portland. All of the Members probably recall his comments and his caustic criticism of five Members of the other body who had just returned from a global tour, during which they inspected the combat zones.

I should like to quote Mayor Riley in this dispatch as follows:

> I've talked with generals and privates, I've talked with Johnnie, Jane, Mary, and Joe, people at the beaches. Nowhere did I find the slightest justification for charges made by the Senators. I'm not one of those people who sit around a hotel room and come up with all the answers.

This man Riley said that the British people know enough of America to understand that "Those men aren't talking for America. They can't tell the people what they think. They don't run the country. They are just Senators with a strange yen."

When I called the attention of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to this newspaper dispatch, I asked him if he would have us infer that our military leaders in Europe approved of such political activity on the part of representatives of O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON's reply was:

> In response to the gentleman from Idaho, I may say that that man is not a representative of O. W. I. at all, and has no connection whatever with it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Briefly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does the gentleman contend that this man is an employee of O. W. I.?

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the gentleman will just withhold his comment 1 second, I think I will answer the question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He has never been an employee of O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. At this time I should like to read from a letter I have received from Elmer Davis, Director of the O. W. I., dated October 30, 1943, in answer to an inquiry from me:

> I am glad to reply to your letter of October 26, in which you ask whether this Office has been paying the expenses of Mayor Earl Riley, of Portland, Oreg., in England.
>
> Mayor Riley is one of a small group of representative Americans who are in England for us to inform the British people at first hand about the American war effort. As in the cases of the other speakers, we pay Mayor Riley no compensation while he is on this mission, but we do pay his transportation expenses and a per diem of $10 a day while he is in England.
>
> Mayor Riley was invited jointly by the O. W. I. and the British Ministry of Information when Mayor Lausche, of Cleveland, who had been previously invited, was unable to make the trip.

That is a letter from the Director of the O. W. I.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Briefly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman stated yesterday that Mayor Riley is a representative of the O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What would the gentleman call it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He is not a representative of the O. W. I., he is merely one of a group who are guests of the O. W. I. on a trip. Nobody can say a guest is a representative of the organization which is paying his expenses on a good-will trip. He is not an employee, he is not on the pay roll, and he has never received any salary from the O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly, the letter of Mr. Davis indicates that this particular individual represented the O. W. I., that his expenses were paid by O. W. I., and when he made those remarks in London the British people had a right to assume that he was reflecting the views of the American people.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I do not have the time.

I realize that my distinguished chairman wishes to repudiate activities like this.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is no more authorized to make a statement for me than Mayor Riley is authorized to represent O. W. I.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho yield to the gentlemar from Missouri?

Mr. DWORSHAK. No; I do not have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho declines to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course the gentleman wants to repudiate this man, who has done incalculable harm to the cause of winning this war by promoting disunity and dissension. When Mr. Davis points out that men of this kind are sent to England to inform the British people at first hand about the American war effort, certainly that is an insult and an affront to the hundreds of thousands of gallant young men and women wearing the uniform of our country who are serving in England and in other theaters of war. We have been unstinting in pouring out our treasure in behalf of the United Nations' war effort; yet we have the O. W. I. sending men like Mayor Riley to insult not only the men and women in the American uniform but all Americans. This surely cannot be considered smart psychological warfare.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, because the O. W. I. already has ample funds with which to sponsor legitimate activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the gentleman who preceded me feels, judging by the heat of his words, that the way to cure a toothache is to kill the patient.

One of the gentlemen of the opposition said on the floor here that the O. W. I. was not requested by any general but was created as a result of a Presidential directive. May I remind that gentleman and those who may go astray on this particular vote that the President who issued the directive is the Commander in Chief of all the Army.

To me, the intent of the opposition is obvious in this particular amendment.

Earlier in the year I made a protest against the abolition of the domestic activities of the O. W. I. For the past several weeks on the floor of the House I have heard Congressman after Congressman say that the people ought to be better informed on the war effort, that the people ought to know more about the war. It was this very Congress that by abolishing the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. prevented the O. W. I. from telling the people more of the facts.

In my judgment, the attack on the domestic policies of the O. W. I. was nothing more or less than plain, ordinary, unadulterated politics. In my judgment, the attack which was made a few weeks ago on General Marshall's being promoted to the greatest position in the world as commander in chief of all the armies was nothing but politics. In my judgment, this particular amendment is nothing more nor less than politics.

During the last war one of the greatest strokes we made toward victory was President Wilson's Fourteen Points. At the present time one of the greatest strokes we are making is the spreading throughout the world the report of the Moscow Conference. When that particular report has to be spread throughout the world, the most effective agency we have for spreading it is the O. W. I. It seems to me a travesty to hear the able gentlemen of the opposition refer as his sources of authority to two comedians; one, Jack Benny, of the radio, and the other, John O'Donnell of the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I decline to yield; but I wish to refer to the gentleman's question put to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to whether or not cutting down the domestic appropriation of O. W. I. hurt the war effort. I say, unquestionably and unqualifiedly, it did, for this reason: A lot of people of America have the assurance that this war is going to end by Christmas. If the people of America had the facts, we would have greater production, a greater war effort, and less of this smug complacency which is generated by such remarks as those made by the gentleman of the opposition.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MURPHY. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. For the gentleman's information, that he may be accurate, we did not abolish the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. this summer. We did reduce it to an appropriation of approximately $2,700,000.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree with the gentleman. We have Mr. Hoyt, who is doing a splendid job; but we cut down the appropriation so that we practically abolished its effectiveness by not giving it enough money to work with.

In my judgment, the real basis of this amendment is politics for 1944, at the cost of the war effort. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, we should not get very much excited about this amendment, but I do believe that every man on the floor should think very conscientiously as to what he wants to do about it. There are a great many veterans on this floor, there are a great many men here who went through the last war in Europe. They saw there the effect, both by our own troops, and by the enemy, of psychological warfare. There is no question that it is one of the most potent weapons used in any war, and it has been used in this war most effectively by the Germans, the Japanese and by the Italians. It is recognized by military men and cannot be neglected. Yet you gentlemen must realize that the only agency, the only one that the American Army and the American Navy has today, for psychological warfare is the one provided for in this appropriation, and the amount that you are being asked to reduce, is the only money in any appropriation bill for the purpose of psychological warfare. By this amendment you are being asked here to say to the Army—and this is an Army activity—we do not want more than 20 percent of the psychological warfare that we have had heretofore. There is coming shortly after this request for a $5,000,000 appropriation, another five million request, because as we secure additional captured territory, we enlarge our activities, and more money is needed. Where this money is to be used: One area, the European, is to get $3,000,000; another one, $1,000,000; another one, $900,000; and another $262,000, as set out in the hearings. That is all of the money that our people have to do this job in these theaters.

I wonder how many men here have read the testimony with respect to this. I think gentlemen ought to take the trouble to read it, they will find that this is the only money for psychological warfare and that it is badly needed. This is highly important work. It has the approval of General Eisenhower, General Patton, General McClure, and the other men there. It is a serious thing to reduce it. If you are mad at the O. W. I., if it has done something that you do not like, there is another way to get at them, but do not deny to General Marshall all of the money that he wants for the purpose of psychological warfare. If you read the testimony in the hearings you will see the effects of psychological warfare on the Italian and German prisoners. They have said as they came in that the leaflets and the broadcasts that came from the American Army through this agency were having a tremendous effect on the morale of the German soldiers, and that they realized that the end was coming closer. General Cunningham said that the activity of this agency had much to do with the surrender of the Italian ships to the American forces. You may create prejudice, you may make any sort of argument, but the fact remains, which I defy anyone to disprove, that the only money that the American Army has for psychological warfare is the money in this bill, and that a cut from $5,000,000 is denying General Marshall and the Army the amount of money they need to conduct this important piece of work. Do not, because of prejudice, or lack of having read the hearings, or lack of information, or listening to false information, vote to cut this down. This is an important work for the Army, and that cannot be denied.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of some who have entered into this debate, I call attention to a few facts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] awhile ago stated that we abolished the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. In a brief interrogation I called his attention to the fact that it had not been abolished, but had been curtailed. For his information I call to his attention the fact that Mr. Palmer Hoyt, who is the head of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., said shortly after he had taken over that branch, that he had reduced the help by over 800 and thereby greatly improved the efficiency and the operations. All of this weak argument is in my opinion an effort to reestablish a political propaganda fund. Such argument is wholly false, because the Director of the Domestic Branch admits that by the forced reduction he has improved the service. The question now is on this additional $5,000,000, which has been requested. It happens that the O. W. I. for the first 3 months of their fiscal year have expended less than their budget allowance and if they continue at the same rate for the remainder of the fiscal year they will have in their foreign funds a surplus of $5,200,000. They can within any additional authorization increase their foreign staffs. If they wasted the money to the tune of $15,000 per man, and they could increase it by 340 more people on annual basis or 461 more people on a basis of three-quarters of the fiscal year, or 9 months.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] awhile ago gave all the credit for whatever work had been done in China since Pearl Harbor to the C. W. I. It so happens that the O. W. I. was established in June 1942, 7 months after Pearl Harbor. I am inclined to believe he is greatly confused with the Office of Strategic Services, and that is not the subject under debate on this amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The Overseas Branch was in existence long before O. W. I. was established and it was under General Donovan.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, that is the Office of Strategic Services. I said the O. W. I. was not established until June 1942, and that is the fact.

Mr. LUDLOW. The service was being rendered before that time, is the point I am making.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. By Mr. Robert Sherwood, under General Donovan, who is now conducting it under Elmer Davis.

Mr. PLOESER. The fact remains that, twist it as you will, O. W. I. was not rendering such service because there was not such a thing as O. W. I.

Mr. LUDLOW. The fact remains that the service was being rendered.

Mr. PLOESER. No one criticizes the service. No one is criticizing the Office of Strategic Service. No one is criticizing the departments of the Army or the Navy who can render very similar service. Indeed, if I were proposing this amendment I would have cut out the entire $5,000,000, because I think the purpose is to carry on the same service described on this floor yesterday by my very able colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] which is pure political rot and waste, and designed more to influence our boys on foreign battlefields on how they might vote than in fighting a war to preserve their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of heat engendered in the course of this debate. Much of the discussion seems to me entirely removed from the point at issue at this time.

The question before the House has nothing to do, as I see it, with the value of psychological warfare on the fighting fronts of this Nation. If you will read the letters that have been read again, and again, from various generals, you will find almost without exception that every one of those letters is devoted to the fine work which this agency has done on the fighting fronts. Of course, that work is invaluable. Of course, we are all for it. One reason it has been so effective is that at the fighting fronts it has been under the direction of our commanding generals.

I do not know a single member of the committee: I doubt if there is a single Member of this House who would deny to General MacArthur or General Eisenhower or Admiral Halsey or any of our commanding officers overseas $1 of funds essential to prosecute psychological warfare on the fighting fronts. From my point of view all the discussion along this line has been entirely beside the point.

As I see this question, it is a cold-blooded, dispassionate question as to whether or not $29,000,000, which we have already made available for the overseas branch of O. W. I. is adequate to take care of the needs overseas, including those at the fighting front. In my judgment, the $29,000,000 at the present time is more than adequate.

I hold in my hand a letter from Elmer Davis dated October 25, 1943, in which he breaks down the expenditure to date of the Overseas Branch of O. W. I. into three classifications: In enemy countries, in neutral countries, and in Allied countries.

What does the statement show? It shows two things. First, that the overall expenditure for all three classes of countries for the first quarter of this year amounted to $6,200,000 or thereabouts. Second, that the amount expended in neutral and Allied countries, entirely apart from the fighting fronts, amounted in the same period to $3,300,000.

What does that mean? First. It means that on the basis of spending in the first quarter we are going to expend $24,800,000 in all classes of countries, leaving a balance of almost $5,000,000 to take care of the present request.

Second. It means that there is anticipated an expenditure of $13,200,000 in the Allied and neutral countries, wholly apart from the fighting fronts.

In other words, O. W. I. now has a probable surplus of $5,000,000, and in addition, some $13,200,000, any part of which can be allocated to the fighting fronts tomorrow or the next day or whenever it is called for by our commanding generals.

There is a further item that should be mentioned. We are giving authority in this bill to O. W. I. to take advantage of reciprocal lend-lease aid. I am advised that aid of this character, which is already in sight, amounts to something over a million dollars a year. Very likely there will be more aid of this character which will come into play in the near future.

This is the entire picture, as I see it. We have provided enough money under present circumstances on the basis of the agency's own figures for all purposes.

In my judgment, the adoption of the pending amendment will not handicap the forces at the fighting fronts in any way whatsoever. If I thought that it would do so, I should be the last to support it.

I hope the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me as just one Member of Congress who sits here in this room trying constantly to acquire information, and trying to work out in his own mind what the right thing is to do about this appropriation, that we have reached a rather confused point, and I should like to record on the record one or two facts as I get them in my mind from the discussion.

I do not know anybody in this room who wishes completely to remove—and especially to remove suddenly—all of those services which are actual propaganda as a part of warfare. It is a peculiar thing, however, that those of us who have for any reason at all had to talk confidentially, and many times very much off the record, with people who have come back from the countries in which our propaganda agencies have worked, that these men are completely of the same opinion. They are unanimous on the fact that our policies are not successful—that is, completely successful—so far as the foreign division of O. W. I. is concerned, and I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who spoke a few moments ago, to the fact that his statement that the O. W. I. is equally as effective as our armed forces cannot be so. I am sure that impression was not intended. Were we to carry it to a logical conclusion, we would simply double the O. W. I. and reduce the size of the Army. There comes a time when propaganda warfare becomes ineffective and we must do some fighting. So the issue before us is not whether we shall have it or shall not have it in its entirety, but how much is necessary for what we should do. While, therefore, I may run the risk of putting on the record some things that have already been said, it seems to me that we should emphasize over and over again the fact that the appropriation not only gives the O. W. I. all that it needs—that is, with the adoption of the amendment—but actually gives the O. W. I. very much more than their own figures indicate that agency really needs. They have asked, as has been said, for 80 more people. We gave them an appropriation for some $29,000,000, which they are only spending at the rate of $2,000,000 a month, or about $6,000,000 a quarter. They will not consume, at that rate, the whole of the original appropriation. No additional appropriation whatever is necessary, and I, for one, would be willing to vote for an amendment to cut this item out entirely. Congress is not going out of business. Congress is going to be here; Congress can at any time vote to give the O. W. I. a deficiency appropriation if it is necessary. There remains some $24,800,000 in the former appropriation for this agency. They have sufficient on hand now to allow them to employ 461 more people, yet they have asked for only 80. It seems illogical to come here and ask for many times more than an agency needs when we are asking the people of the United States, who must carry this war, who must finance this war, to carry the heaviest debt that has ever been imposed upon the people of any country. It would in no way harm the O. W. I., according to any figures that have been presented to this Congress, to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Certainly the Congress is not going out of business that rapidly, and I, for one, intend to vote for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much today to arouse the emotions and the passions. I want to get down to cold figures for, after all, this is a mathematical matter. No one on the minority side, no one on the majority side, who opposes the present request for $5,000,000 is unmindful of the value of psychological warfare; we are not taking any exception to that; what we are taking exception to is the encouragement which will be given to an agency that has already established a record of profligacy to further moves along the same line. O. W. I. had $29,000,000 for this operation under the regular appropriation. They have been spending for the first quarter at the rate of $6,200,000, which means for the year $24,800,000. This leaves $4,200,000 as a balance at the end of the year. We give them a million dollars additional by this amendment, which means $5,200,000. They say they need an expanded staff. I am going

to estimate that each one of this expanded group will consume $15,000 in salary and expense. This would mean that the $5,200,000 would permit O. W. I. to expand its staff by 346 new employees, or on a 9-month basis it would mean 461 additional employees. No matter what the demands may be for the expansion suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], no one can conceive that 461 will not be sufficient to carry on the work. So it is a matter of permitting O. W. I. to establish its own spending program or keeping it in line with what the Congress wants done. The issue resolves itself into the simple question, Shall the Congress surrender its right to determine the amount necessary for a Government activity?

Of course, you will give O. W. I. the $5,000,000 if you believe that an agency should write its own ticket. If you believe that the taxpayer wants the Federal agencies to write their own tickets as to appropriations and you sit here and blindly acquiesce, then, of course, you will support it. On the other hand, if you feel that your duty is to keep within bounds the expenditure of an agency in line with its needs, then the appropriation that we are suggesting by the amendment will be supported.

Much has been said about the value of this agency and about its foreign work. We have had a parade of generals before us. I hold in my hand an Associated Press special advance. It is dated November 4. It is headlined "America losing prestige among Algiers French."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have 5 minutes which I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say in that connection that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] was recognized when the gentleman failed to respond.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the gentleman from Indiana be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement arrived at, there appears to be some 5 minutes unused. If the gentleman will modify his request, the Chair will put it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that 2½ minutes of that be allotted to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the time will be divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DITTER. The concession that is presently being made, and I want to acknowledge it gratefully, will in no way take any of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will it?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at all. His time is allotted. The agreement is that two and a half minutes shall go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and two and a half minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

This headline is "America losing prestige among Algiers French." There is a subhead headline, "Poor propaganda gets blame for decline."

I will read a line or two:

A year ago the name "American" was a magic one to the French in north Africa. Today, a year after the Allied landings, it is more often a term of reproach than praise. The blunt truth is that the prestige of the United States among a considerable proportion of the French people has taken a nosedive.

I further quote:

The British are a long way ahead of the United States in the presentation of her role in the war in north Africa. This is particularly noticeable in the newspapers. Reuters, the British news agency, supplies the bulk of the foreign news in the north African newspapers and London date lines dominate the front pages, often appearing on items originating in this war theater.

The British Broadcasting Corporation also is a highly effective British agency for developing good will among the north Africans and a substantial share of the programs broadcast by the American Expeditionary Force radio station for Allied troops in this theater is received through B. B. C.

Why do I give you that? It comes from Algiers. The date line is "Algiers, November 3, A. P." I give you this to refute the repeated statement that has been made here of the efficiency and the value of O. W. I. It confirms the position which we have taken on the minority side that O. W. I. needs a house cleaning. The best way to force that house cleaning is to hold on to the purse strings here in the House rather than permit the agency itself to write its own ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that my Republican friends have seen fit to make an issue of this particular appropriation, particularly when we have in mind the letter of Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers of August 21, 1943, in which he said:

The work you are doing is of enormous importance both in connection with America's relationship with our allies and in connection with military operations.

Also having in mind the letter of November 22, 1942, signed by General Marshall, in which he said:

The efficiency with which the personnel of the Office of War Information cooperated with the War Department in connection with the operation in north Africa contributed directly toward its success and is deeply appreciated.

Also in view of the evidence found on page 1265 of the hearings where it was stated:

The demands from the other theater for more personnel continue constantly. We now have an order for 83 additional people and we know that at least 100 more will be required.

Then I call attention to this testimony:

It must be remembered that every individual we send is sent at the request of General Eisenhower and General McClure. Every one of them has the approval of the State Department and the War Department.

In other words, no representative or employee of O. W. I. in any foreign theater of war can go into that theater unless the commander of that theater approves the sending of him in there and recommends it.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and there is no one for whom I have a finer regard personally or legislatively, ignores the importance of propaganda in a modern global war. It is not so many months ago since we were on the receiving end, when our people were getting the jittery effects of the propaganda of Nazi Germany and vicious Japan. As a result of the heroism of our men of the air, sea, and land, and the war propaganda now being engaged in, our enemies now are on the receiving end. If the amendment of my friend from New York prevails, it will seriously interfere with the work that is being done along such lines. Let us not take a chance to adversely affect this activity which is part of modern warfare by failing to make this appropriation for the work. Just because some may not like some individual here and there is no justification for voting against an activity which General Devers has said is "of enormous importance."

Let us remember that this $5,000,000 is simply appropriating the balance of a $10,000,000 appropriation recommended last year for the 1944 fiscal year. When the appropriation was made for the 1944 fiscal year in this activity the recommendation was $10,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations cut it to $5,000,000 because it was impossible to determine then how expanded the war activities would be in the future. It was suggested that they come back if they needed a deficiency appropriation. We must bear in mind that last spring the rapid progress of our armies in the Mediterranean could not be foreseen, nor the preparation for extensive military operations in other theaters. Therefore, this is simply asking for the $5,000,000 the Committee on Appropriations in its wisdom cut out last year of the $10,000,000 that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Insofar as this work in support of military operations is concerned, whether we like some individual or some policy or not, we must realize that in all fields of war the O. W. I. operates under the orders of the theater commanders.

Some criticism has been directed against this agency because of the number of the press releases it has issued.

We must be fair and bear in mind that the O. W. I. issues press releases for 22 other war agencies. The large part of the press releases issued by the O. W. I. are required by law to be issued through that agency. Under a statutory duty, the O. W. I. gives public notice of administrative decisions and orders of such agencies as the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the O. D. T., and others. In a week of releases made recently, 65 percent were reports of administrative actions by various agencies. During September, for example, a total of 1,140 releases were issued, of which only 19 percent, or 222, related to the work of the O. W. I. I have here a break down which I shall put in the RECORD:

Break-down by agencies:	*Number of releases*
Office of Price Administration	322
Office of War Information	222
War Production Board	189
Department of Agriculture	54
War Manpower Commission	30
Office of Defense Transportation	29
Petroleum Administrator for War	20
Solid Fuels Administration for War	16
Maritime Commission	12
Department of the Interior	10
Office of Civilian Defense	8
War Shipping Administration	7
Coal Mines Administration	7
Department of Labor	7
Federal Security Agency	5
Fair Employment Practices Committee	5
Office of Economic Stabilization	3
Lend-Lease Administration	2
Office of Foreign Economic Cooperation	2
Smaller War Plants Corporation	2
War Relocation Authority	1
Federal Works Agency	1
Department of Justice	1
Total	1,140

In modern war, with the effective means of communication that exist, we cannot underestimate the value of work of this kind against the enemy. It is through these means that we help undermine the morale of the enemy and combat the propaganda efforts of the enemy in neutral countries, to do effective work among the people of every conquered country by informing them of what is happening, of the successes of our armed forces, and of our productive capacity, and to encourage them.

Constructive criticism is and should be always in order, and always is welcomed. I never have any opposition to and I never condemn constructive criticism. I respect the views of all with whom I disagree. However, whenever any activity such as this is a part of our strategy in the waging of a global war, I do not think it is a wise or a proper course to follow to prevent the operation of the whole activity because of dislike of some appointee or some policy. The course to take, it seems to me, is to make specific criticism of a constructive nature with a view to correction.

Having in mind the importance of this work as a war activity, and recognizing that some persons may not like some appointee or some policy, but looking at its basic importance with reference to global war, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I deem it scarcely necessary that one should have to appeal to the patriotism of the Members of this House. One hundred and sixty-eight Members of this House wore the uniform in the last war. One hundred and twenty-three Members of this House presently have sons and daughters in the military service. This speaks for itself, and there is no one here who would knowingly do anything to impair the efficacy of psychological warfare conducted through the O. W. I. Speech after speech has been directed to that point and it is not in issue. Everybody is agreed that O. W. I. should carry on. The only question is here, How much money do they need to carry on? That is a grave responsibility for the Congress.

Yesterday morning the Budget Bureau told me that there are $60,000,000,000 of unobligated war balances. Yesterday morning the Budget Bureau told me there were $148,000,000,000 of war expenditures that had not yet been liquidated or expended. There is a rising tide of spending consciousness in the country. There is a responsibility on this Congress to measure every dollar to give the people of the country who are bearing their part of this burden a break. So the only issue here is, Do they have money enough?

Congress gave them over-all $33,000,000 plus early this year, namely $24,000,000 for overseas warfare plus $5,000,000 in the contingent fund. With the approval of the President, Elmer Davis can use that contingent fund for psychological warfare. So he could have $29,000,000 for overseas operations in enemy and enemy-occupied areas.

How much have they expended out of this fund in the first quarter? Six million two hundred thousand dollars. They still have a very substantial amount of money. On the basis of expenditures for the first quarter, they will wind up at the end of the year with more than $4,000,000 in unobligated balances. That is one of the best recommendations I know of for the Taber amendment to reduce the pending request from five million to one million.

When they say that General Marshall, General McClure, and General Devers speak in behalf of this, read the testimony carefully. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, in effect, as indicated in the hearings, "General McClure, have you anything to say about O. W. I.?" He said, "They did a good job at the front." General Marshall said they did a good job at the front in Africa. But, let me remind you, they have $13,200,000 for expenditure, not at the front but in Allied and in neutral countries. This is not my figure, if you please; you will find it all in the record, and it will not be controverted. All of that money is available for psychological warfare in conjunction with an actual or projected military operation.

So the question before us today is, Does O. W. I. have funds sufficient to do a good, efficacious job of psychological warfare? The answer is, very simply and plainly, on the basis of the figures they have submitted to the committee, that they have. There are ample funds. In addition, what they have in the contingent fund of $5,000,000, which presently, I think, is down to about $4,200,000, is still available for this same purpose with the approval of the President. Why not use these funds, instead of appearing before Congress for additional funds?

As I envision the problem before us, it looks as if they are trying to set up sufficient funds to have a very substantial unobligated balance at the end of the year. What with $60,000,000,000 of unobligated money now, it is high time that the Congress give this a most careful scrutiny. This amendment is quite in line. I cannot too strongly emphasize, in view of many of the emotional arguments made on this matter, that the issue is not whether O. W. I. shall continue its program of psychological warfare but whether they have sufficient funds available for that purpose at the present time.

It is rather singular that long ago Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "Of all debts, man is least willing to pay taxes. What a satire on government." And why? Because as a general thing people see waste, they see extravagance, they see indefensible expenditure, and then there comes a kind of quiet but determined rebellion in the hearts and the minds of the taxpayers.

The people can speak only through us as their elected representatives in securing the most careful scrutiny of all expenditures that taxes might be kept within bounds. It is therefore for us to measure the O. W. I. request before us now, not for the purpose of crippling or destroying this agency or its operations in the field of psychological warfare but to provide the funds that are needed, but no more. That leaves the responsibility upon us that there shall be no reproach upon the efficiency of government. So the only issue here is not whether psychological warfare will continue, because it will. It is only a question of whether the O. W. I. has sufficient funds, and the only answer to that is the great, big, resounding, affirmative "Yes." I suggest that on the record presented by the deficiency committee the Taber amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time assigned to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] be transferred to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, just before we vote on this very important amendment, I would like,

if I may, to get the record straight on the historical development of this item we are now considering. In the first place, let us please remember that the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. is not in any way involved in this amendment. It was involved in the regular appropriation bill earlier this session, and the House of Representatives, in its wisdom, reduced the Budget estimate from $8,500,000 to $2,750,000. There are no funds whatsoever in this bill for the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., but it might be recalled that the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. has been streamlined by Congress, and it might be interesting to some gentlemen to know, perhaps, and comforting to some, that it is now under the management and control of a very distinguished journalist, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, former editor of the Portland Oregonian, and, so far as I know, there has been no criticism, certainly from my friends on the left-hand side of the House, of the operation of the O. W. I. Domestic Branch under Mr. Palmer Hoyt.

Mr. Chairman, we get wrong sometimes, we all do, in our zeal. I have said before, and I repeat, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is more nearly always right than wrong, but he has the peculiar faculty, when he gets wrong, of getting wrong all the way. He gets wrong good and strong. He is by himself on this appropriation. He is in the position now of standing alone. Oh, yes, some gentlemen are going to support his amendment, but I have not heard a single gentleman get up on the floor today and say that the O. W. I. overseas service is a stench and that it ought to be wiped out.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I said that it is a stench, but I did not say that it ought to be wiped out.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understood the gentleman to say that he had to compromise with his conscience in order to give them a million dollars. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] asked, if it is that bad, why give them a million dollars, and it was then that my friend said, if I recollect right, that that is too much, and that he had to compromise with his conscience to even give them that. But along comes my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He said, of course, we are for this thing, but they don't need any more money, they can get it somewhere else. Last year the Appropriations Committee said to them when they asked for $10,000,000 for this contingency fund for use in conjunction with actual or projected military operations; for this highly specialized, some of it secret, work, under the Office of War Information, what did we say? Just what the gentleman said in the well of the House today, that we are going to be here, that we are going to be in session, and that we will give them $5,000,000 now, and that they can come back. So we cut it half in two, and the Congress approved that action, and we gave them earlier this year only $5,000,000 instead of the $10,000,000 they said they needed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the gentleman refers to, of course, is that the request was for a contingency.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; the work that this $5,000,000 in the bill is for. We only gave them half of what they asked for in the last bill, and now they come back and say they are going to have to get ten million more, and they ask for $5,000,000 now, and indicate they may need to come back for $5,000,000 more. Mr. Chairman, it is a strange thing to me, engaged as we are in a global war, approaching, as we are, the zero hour, spending, as we are, billions of dollars in this effort to win the war, that we will stop and haggle about such a relatively small sum of money as this. Nobody can say that this Committee on Appropriations did not do a little cutting in this bill.

About eighty-some percent of the Budget estimates were eliminated. One gentleman has asked, "Is there any significance in the fact that you did not cut this item any?" No; there is not, because there are a great many items that we did not touch at all. We did not touch the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for necessary scientific research, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Weather Bureau, the Coast Survey, and other activities related to the war. But, this House of Representatives, this day, and many gentlemen whom I am addressing today, have established a very enviable record of giving support to the armed forces in what they said they need to fight this war. We may change that today. We may set a precedent today, but so far we have not said to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to the accredited military leaders of this country, "You say you need so many airplanes, but we do not think so. You say you need so many tanks, but we do not think so. You say you need this activity, but we think you ought to get along with a certain amount."

Today we may establish the fact that we are going to say to them that "notwithstanding the fact that you say you need the full force and effect of the O. W. I. on the battle front, we are going to cut it out", because if you vote for this amendment you would cut it out.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Where, if anywhere, did any military man say that we needed $5,000,000 appropriated at this time?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They did not say they needed $5,000,000, but they said they needed the help of the Overseas Branch, and if you cut ou this appropriation, they will not have that help.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, in just a minute. Now, I know about the $29,000,000. We gave them this year $24,000,000 for the Overseas Branch and an additional $5,000,000 in this kind of a contingency item for use in connection with actual or projected military operations when the President released that money to them. They could not use it until he released it for the military reason. They have $24,000,000 for their general work. The gentleman said in the first 3 months they had obligated $6,000,000. Now, it has been 4 months and they have obligated $8,380,000 of the $24,000,000. The entire $24,000,000 has been allocated as follows:

Work directed to and against enemy and enemy-occupied countries, $10,800,000;

Work in and to neutral countries, $4,900,000;

Work in and to Allied areas, $8,300,000.

Every penny of the money that we gave them in this $24,000,000 has been allocated and much of it is being used in the foreign broadcasts from New York and San Francisco. If you take $5,000,000 away from the $16,000,000 that is now left, you cripple the activity in the foreign field; it would leave only $11,000,000 for all other O. W. I. overseas operations for the rest of the year.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania read an Associated Press article a few moments ago in which America was criticized for not having enough propaganda; that the British were ahead of us. That may be true. What we have appropriated and made available for this service is infinitesimal as compared with what the enemy countries have used and what Great Britain has used. If we divert these funds we place our propaganda definitely where my friend alleges it is, in north Africa.

Reduce our facilities and service and we leave to our British, Russian, and Chinese allies the task of interpreting America, disseminating news and providing the information to insure the friendly reception of American troops wherever garrisoned. It is doubtful that the British, the Russians, or the Chinese can speak for America as well as Americans can speak for themselves. Our allies should not be solely responsible for providing the information that will interpret America abroad and the actual news of what American forces are contributing to the winning of the war on the land and the sea and in the air all over the world.

Mr. TABER. And the British have less in north Africa and Italy than we, and still they are doing well and we are not.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We will not help them any by taking away what they already have. The $5,000,000 asked for in this bill provides 2,024 personnel altogether, 1,716 of which are to be in the military program work overseas.

Now let us see about this. We do not have to go out and speculate as to what this means. We had a gentleman here in the House today, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who gave us personal testimony as to what it means. I am sorry there was not a full membership of the House to hear that statement, because the several times this distinguished gentleman has addressed this body he has

impressed us because of his knowledge, his sincerity, and his ability. He told you he lived in the Orient. He told you what propaganda means. Every man knows today that propaganda and strategic warfare is as much an integral part of an invading, marching army as shot and shell and airplanes. Yet we haggle today, seeking to cripple this activity when we are told that it is necessary and important.

I want to read something to you for just a minute. My dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] got up today and he made a little light of something that somebody said yesterday that this might save lives. Let us see about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not put words into my mouth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; but I think the gentleman made this statement, that somebody had exaggerated the fact by suggesting that this appropriation might actually save lives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was only a case of interpreting exactly the language of the military men.

Mr. FORD. He said we were hysterical.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am afraid I addressed that to something besides that testimony.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Now, let us see just a minute. Are we going to take the testimony of the gentleman from New York, "Admiral" TABER, and the gentleman from Virginia, "General" WOODRUM, or are we going to take the testimony of somebody who actually knows? It just so happens that Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure was in Washington when this matter came before the committee. He was sent to the United States by General Eisenhower for a conference on censorship matters. Our committee heard he was in Washington and secured permission of the War Department to have him appear before our committee. He is a Regular Army man—a professional soldier. He was formerly military attaché in London. He is on the staff of General Eisenhower, commander of the Allied forces in the Mediterranean theater, in charge of psychological warfare, censorship, and public relations. In this capacity General McClure has under his immediate direction all of the psychological warfare and propaganda forces of the Allied armies. He directs forces which constitute an integrated unit, consisting of the United States organization of the Office of War Information, military personnel, and forces of the Office of Strategic Services, and of British forces, consisting of the British Political Warfare and the Ministry of Information, military and naval personnel.

The entire forces operate as a single unit under General McClure subject to the general direction of General Eisenhower. This procedure is typical of procedures in other theaters of the war in connection with military operations. I want to read what he says about O. W. I. operations overseas, and whether it is a stench, whether this Congress should today deny the armed forces the instrumentalities they say they need. This is what he says.

I read:

The CHAIRMAN. What have you to say about the effectiveness of O. W. I. activities at the front, General McClure?

General MCCLURE. I am convinced that they are particularly effective and have made an important contribution to our military effort.

The CHAIRMAN. What criticism have you to make, or what suggestions have you to make, regarding the operations of O. W. I. at the front at the present time?

General MCCLURE. I have no criticism of them. I am particularly satisfied with their cooperation and the help they are furnishing us.

A little further in the colloquy the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] asked this question:

Mr. SNYDER. Do you think that O. W. I., as it has been operated in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy since its inception, has saved the lives of American boys to any extent? If you did not have O. W. I. would there have been more lives lost, without the steps we have taken thus far?

General MCCLURE. I can only state my opinion, and I would say definitely "Yes." Illustrative of that is the fact that a number of Axis soldiers, Italians and Germans, have come in and surrendered, and used as their passes through the lines the leaflets we have dropped, calling for their surrender. Using that instance only as an answer to your question, I should say the propaganda we have used there has kept a number of soldiers from shooting at us, and thereby saved the lives of our own troops.

The chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], also asked:

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say that you did not have sufficient service of this character in your area and that you could use additional personnel and additional O. W. I. service?

General MCCLURE. That is correct, sir; and we have made requisition on Mr. Davis for that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In just a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from New York, was doing like we lawyers do sometimes when we get in court and pick up an opinion and start to read it to the judge, thinking it is going to support us, and then it turns out it does not help us any. I sympathize with him. He started to read from an article by William L. Shirer, holding him up as a great authority because he had been over there and had seen at first hand what had been done. He was held up as a man who knew what he was talking about. As my good friend read on we saw his embarrassment, for he found he was reading a very strong endorsement from William Shirer of O. W. I. I now read from a recent article by William Shirer. I wish I had time to read all of it, but I shall have time to read only the first paragraph or two:

At long last a little can now be told of how one branch of our propaganda in north Africa and Sicily was successfully carried out. In this war there are two principal weapons of propaganda, radio and leaflets. We have heard a great deal about the radio war. We know very little about "pamphlet warfare." Yet there is good reason to believe (unfortunately the complete story cannot yet be told, because of military security) that Anglo-American pamphlets spread among the German-Italian troops in Tunisia and Sicily by the millions, contributed not a little to the quick Allied victories in those two campaigns.

Such a statement may well strike many Americans as a silly exaggeration. How can a leaflet, a mere piece of paper, help win battles? The facts made a rather impressive answer. We have, for example, the unsolicited word of a captured Italian general who threw up his hands and said: "I could do nothing to maintain the morale of my men when they were plastered with hundreds of your leaflets every day." What made the leaflets so effective, he admitted, was that his men believed them. We shall see in this article what those pamphlets said.

What else? We find in the hearings evidence that General Eisenhower, General Marshall, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, General Patton, and General McClure have praised the O. W. I. service along this line, and yet here we are today, in considering this bill, taking the attitude that we will deny them sufficient funds to carry out this very important activity.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is it not logically true that the more the combat of war spreads, the more countries that become involved, the more of this service we shall need?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what I was trying in a feeble way to get over to the Committee: That we are right at a critical moment in this thing. Other battle fronts are going to be opened up. We have heard much recently of that. We know that when an enemy begins to be softened up, he is particularly susceptible to propaganda. If you pour it in relentlessly it is tremendously effective. If this $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, or even a larger sum contributes to a shortening of the war by a single day it saves the lives of the men who would otherwise be killed that day. The effectiveness of propaganda and psychological warfare needs not be proven here. It has been demonstrated time and time again in this war. We want to win this war in the shortest possible time to save the lives of our boys and relieve the suffering and misery of the many distressed populations under the Axis yoke. Propaganda and psychological warfare will help do it and this $5,000,000 is for that purpose, not in the United States but abroad in connection with actual or projected military operations. Let us do the sane and sensible thing here and not be diverted from the main issue.

I do hope this Committee under the guise of economy will not establish perhaps the first record for some of us in voting against something that directly affects the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 129, noes 132.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 139, noes 146.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Migration of workers: To enable the War Manpower Commission to provide, in accordance with regulations described by the Chairman of said Commission, for the temporary migration of workers from foreign countries (pursuant to agreements between the United States and such foreign countries) and from Territories and possessions of the United States, for employment in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the war effort, including the transportation of such workers from points outside the United States to ports of entry of the United States and return (including transportation from place of employment in the United States to port of entry of the United States in any case of default by an employer to provide such transportation to a worker, in which event the employer shall be liable to the United States for the cost thereof), reasonable subsistence and emergency medical care en route, and guaranties of employment while in the United States to the extent agreed upon with the foreign country from which the worker is imported, $2,125,000, of which not to exceed $125,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses necessary for the foregoing, including not to exceed $12,250 for temporary employment of administrative personnel outside continental United States, not to exceed $1,000 for printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed $26,880 for travel expenses: *Provided*, That no transportation of workers shall be allowed hereunder unless the employer and the worker have entered into a contract for employment approved by said Chairman or his designee, and unless said Chairman certifies that reasonably adequate use is being made of the local labor supply: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall remain available after June 30, 1944, to the extent necessary to provide for the return of the workers to the country from which they migrated under the provisions hereof: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the recruitment or transportation of workers for employment in agriculture.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 6, lines 18 and 19, strike out the word "described" and insert in lieu thereof the word "prescribed."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am going along with the recommendations of the committee because of the tremendous importance of the war manpower problem. I am going along, although I think the committee has been liberal in its recommendations.

I rise for the purpose of making three observations:

First. Right or wrong, the policies of the War Manpower Commission are leading to almost complete job control by the Federal Government. The Congress and the country should realize this fact. Wherever a controlled referral plan has been adopted, anyone out of a job will probably have to obtain a job through the United States Employment Service. Wherever a controlled referral plan has been adopted, anyone having a war job or a nonwar job and desiring to change that job will probably be able to make the change only if approved by the United States Employment Service. Where no controlled referral plan has been adopted, the power to classify a given area in class 1, which means no further war contracts, is obviously a tremendous lever with which to induce adoption of the plan. It is estimated that the controlled referral plan will be in operation in all critical manpower-shortage areas and in 25 percent of all prospective areas of this character by December 1, 1943.

Second. Despite the fact that there are some 3,300,000 workers on the swollen Federal pay roll at this time, the record indicates that the War Manpower Commission has no figures as to those in nonessential positions who can be transferred to more essential war jobs, and that the Commission itself has made no study of Federal employees in this connection.

Third. My attention was called in August to an advertisement in a Buffalo paper reading, in part, as follows:

Strong, husky men, can you qualify? Earn $1.15 per hour for unskilled work and a bonus excess. We teach unskilled laborers and in a short time they have qualified for an increase to $1.50 per hour. Apply to U. S. E. S., 51 Erie Street, immediately.

The War Manpower Commission disclaims responsibility, stating that it acts merely as the mouthpiece for those advertising for workers. To my mind, it is both absurd and unwarranted for one Government agency to lend itself in this manner to the payment of wages at the rate of $1.50 per hour to unskilled labor, while another branch of the Government, chanting "hold the line," insists on limiting wages to those who have become highly skilled by long years of effort to a very much lower level.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I wish, in the next few minutes, to briefly refer to an activity of the War Manpower Commission as it is affecting many of the industrial communities in this country. Three of the cities within my congressional district have been declared to be in what is called a labor scarcity area. Under this ruling of the War Manpower Commission, no procurement officer of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, or Treasury Department can place orders for materials that can be purchased in any nonlabor scarcity area. The unfortunate part of that ruling is that it is working a definite hardship on the small manufacturers. The larger industries in my district, such as Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Engine Corporation, the Colt Manufacturing Co., and units of the ball-bearing industry are not affected at this time by the labor-scarcity ruling. However, there are several small and medium-sized industries that are seriously and adversely affected.

Ten days ago one such factory laid off 80 people. Yesterday, another factory laid off 200 employees. It is pretty hard to convince those that are being laid off that Hartford, Conn., is actually in a critical labor shortage area.

It is my understanding that this ruling is in force in an effort to force employees, laid off from plants that have no business, to go into the ball-bearing industry where employees are needed. Unfortunately, however, it does not work out just that way. Every bit of information that I can secure indicates that those laid off go back to their home communities, rather than go into the ball-bearing industry. Last week I talked to a procurement officer in the War Department and was startled to have him inform me that in all probability we would have a limited unemployment problem in Hartford within 90 days, rather than being worried about labor scarcity. At this time, when we are being told that the Army and Navy needs material as it has never been needed before, I am at a loss to understand why orders should be denied to manufacturers who have the necessary manpower to not only accept the order but to make delivery on the date set by the War or Navy Department.

I have asked the War Manpower Commission to make a resurvey of the whole labor situation in central Connecticut. I hope that some way can be found to lift the ban that prevents orders from being placed in that area. I appeal to my colleagues from other industrial areas that are adversely affected by the rulings of the War Manpower Commission to join with me in this effort.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The amount that may be used for administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the head "War Shipping Administration, revolving fund," is hereby increased from $9,650,000 to $12,000,000.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no legislation authorizing this appropriation, and, further, it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the provision is subject to a point of order, and we yield the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Employees' compensation fund: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for the payment of compensation provided by the act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 785), as amended, including the objects specified under this head in the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, $3,000,000, which, together with the amount heretofore appropriated under this head, shall be available also for reimbursement payments authorized by the act of December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), rehabilitation expenses and fees or payments to other agencies of the United States and other public agencies or private persons, agencies, or institutions, for services or facilities rendered by them pursuant to agreement and approved by the Commission.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph just read be passed over for the present in view of the fact that the amount contained therein is dependent upon a subsequent item appearing on page 28. I merely wish to pass this paragraph over temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War Housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940 (42 U. S. C. ch. 9), as amended, and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), $50,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON: Page 17, line 8, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000."

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, having been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which authorized this appropriation some time ago, and having traveled with this committee in practically every State of the Union and seeing first hand the way the money is being used which we have appropriated, and from a study of the need for new appropriations, I have seen fit to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations is to be congratulated on their successful efforts to eliminate nonessential spending of the taxpayers' money. However, it is only reasonable to assume that they have not been able to hear both sides of all the issues involved for which appropriations are requested. The item of Federal public housing now under discussion should be completely eliminated and by so doing the committee would have further reduced the amount of this bill from $225,000,000 to $150,000,000 and thereby have real cause for rejoicing over the success of their efforts.

My amendment merely calls for reducing the $50,000,000 requested in the bill to $25,000,000. I do not consider the economy of the Government any different from my own personal economy and therefore I guard the funds of my taxpayers as I would guard my own personal funds. When we who believe in the American philosophy of economy need funds for personal use and are hard pressed, we usually conserve. We do not overstaff our businesses or overbuild our farms or overpay for land and property or for personnel to operate our various businesses. Therefore, I cannot subscribe to the argument presented in defense of this appropriation measure in view of the facts I am going to present to this committee.

Originally, our criterion for allocating houses was one house per five applications, assuming that at least 400 of 500 applicants would already be housed and upon shifting would leave their homes available for others, thereby leaving the 100 houses available for the shifting around of personnel plus any new and unhoused applicants. But those in the National Housing Agency desirous of holding their high-salaried jobs have had to find a greater need for housing or give up their jobs, which has resulted in the building of five houses for each application in many cases, or a complete reversal of the original criterion. Also in the beginning the F. P. H. A. was organized only to supplement private building. In other words, take care of any needed housing where private capital was unable to take care of it. We now have a complete reversal of that rule, for it is a well-known fact that private capital today is only being permitted to supplement the Federal public housing. This is very unfair for the taxpaying public businessmen to have to compete with their own money. As evidence that the National Housing Agency has overbuilt, I only need to refer to a few projects in and near Washington and in my home State of Indiana.

First. Let me refer to the Kingsford Heights project in Indiana. Last July, when we gave this Administration $2,000,000 for housing, I cited the Kingsford Heights project, where 286 houses were available for occupancy and only 242 occupied, and where the F. P. H. A. was continuing to build a total of 2,970. I charged that this was a waste of funds, critical materials, and manpower, and that the project should be discontinued for the sake of saving the taxpayers millions of dollars. The project was completed. A ghost city was built and yet, today, only 319 of those 2,970 houses are occupied, and the F. P. H. A. has seen fit to move them away at an expense of approximately $1,500 per unit, plus the installation of utilities at some $600 to $1,000 per unit, making the relocation of the house cost approximately $2,500, when the original cost was only around $2,800, and would be much less today.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am sure we could build these houses in the new location from the ground up for less money than it is going to take to move them and also have better houses. But that is not all, Mr. Chairman; when I was in Indiana this summer I found that they had a staff of 53 people looking after this housing project on a pay roll amounting to $97,480. The manager of that housing project, where 319 houses were occupied, receives a salary of $5,600 a year, with 10 managing assistants drawing up to $3,200 each per year.

There is the Versailles project, which illustrates the waste of money in the purchase of land for these projects. The land on which the Versailles project is located consists of 19.3 acres in the country hills of southern Indiana—suburban to a town of less than 5,000. The assessed valuation was $970, or $50.50 per acre. The Government housing authorities paid not $970 but $17,500 for it, or $907 per acre.

Gentlemen, may I ask you, Would you, if you were hard-pressed for funds, pay that price for that land, or can we assume that anyone spending like that is hard-pressed for funds? I am sure you would not, and I am sure you will not, support an appropriation for an agency that has money to spend in that way; also, gentlemen, in regard to the administration of that project, consisting of 100 nice brick homes, I wish to inform you that it is costing us 165 percent of the operating income to operate that project alone.

Let me refer briefly to the Crane Naval Ammunition Depot project, Crane, Ind. Six hundred homes were under construction for a year or more and have been completed for many months, a project which I also fought bitterly and informed Members of this body to stop appropriating money for such purposes because those houses would never be used. Today, gentlemen, after they have lowered the rent, moved electric refrigerators in, and done everything possible to entice people to move in, they have an occupancy of 150.

The Charlestown, Ind., project—750 houses—has been finished many months and only 204 of the houses are occupied. A storm came along one day last summer and flattened—and I mean flattened—some hundred of those houses and materially damaged 150 more.

The Seymour, Ind., project, located adjacent to the Freeman Army Air Field, has 350 units with only 90 occupied by civilian personnel.

The Washington Post, on November 5, carried an item by the Associated Press stating that 950 dormitories for war workers were constructed in Radford-Pulaski. None is occupied.

The Baltimore paper, on October 26, special, stated that 260 bed dorms built for war workers never have been occupied. Only 90 of 500 new trailers have been occupied, only 62 of 299 houses have been occupied with 450 expected to be ready for occupancy soon; 297 homes in another project are vacant.

I ask you, gentleman, Can you support an appropriation to be used in this matter? But, gentlemen, I have not arrived

at the most dangerous part of the whole program. I want to read to you from a recent publication of the National Real Estate News:

As we told you last week it would, the F. P. H. A. has authorized regional offices to accept applications for post-war public-housing projects. Pressure for that action seems to have come principally from the local housing authorities.

Let me read a paragraph from the National Association of Home Builders of the United States, October 22:

As a preliminary step toward formulating its post-war housing program, the F. P. H. A. has announced that it will start receiving applications for federally aided projects and has sent instructions to this effect to its regional offices.

Gentlemen, if we are going to forestall this national socialistic trend, we had better get busy now. If we are going to permit this Government to own and operate the roofs over our people's heads, we had better call our boys home and give up the fight for there will be nothing left for us to fight for. I ask unanimous support of my amendment to forestall this national socialistic development while it is in the embryo stage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Here is an article from a Baltimore paper of October 26. A large number of 2,100 publicly owned trailers are vacant and only 90 of 500 new trailers have been occupied. A large number of 2,100 already existing trailers are not occupied, yet they have seen fit to move in 500 new trailers, of which only 90 are occupied. Only 62 of 299 new houses in another project are occupied, with 450 additional houses of a 1,000-unit project expected to be ready for occupancy within a week.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In what cities are these projects located?

Mr. WILSON. In Baltimore, Md., and down at Radford-Pulaski, Va. Over in my State about 50 percent of all the projects I know of have many houses standing idle. This includes Crane, Ind., Freeman Airfield, Seymour, Ind., and Charlestown, Ind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Have the houses to which the gentleman has referred been built under the Lanham Act, and have the trailers been acquired under the Lanham Act?

Mr. WILSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that no trailers whatever have been acquired under the Lanham Act.

Mr. WILSON. The Federal Public Housing Authority built the houses. The trailers are part of the National Housing Agency program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just the houses, then?

Mr. WILSON. The houses were built from Lanham Act funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I call attention to the situation that exists with reference to war housing insofar as war housing appertains to legislation which emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We held 5 weeks of hearings before that committee with reference to what amount of authorization might be necessary to construct essential temporary war housing, to be removed when the war is over. After 5 weeks of hearings, we reported legislation authorizing $300,000,000 for that purpose, although $400,000,000 had been requested in the message which came from the President.

That was our deliberate judgment after 5 weeks of public hearings. On the floor of the House of Representatives, and I think I may safely say in the committee itself, the gentleman from Indiana contended that $200,000,000 would be sufficient. Only $100,000,000 has thus far been appropriated, and consequently with the $50,000,000 appropriated in this measure, we would still be $50,000,000 short of what the gentleman from Indiana thought, after all these hearings, was the proper amount to be authorized and appropriated for this purpose.

This appropriation is distinctly and peculiarly for war housing. It is for temporary construction. It is for in-migrant workers at these various plants, and no in-migrant worker today can be taken to one of those plants unless there is a house awaiting him. This goes to our matter of production. These houses are built upon the recommendation of the Army and the Navy to meet their needs. Not one penny of this money is to be used or can be used under this legislation for any post-war housing. It is for the actual construction of temporary units which, under the terms of the legislation itself, are to be removed when this war is over.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. No. Reference has been made to post-war housing. This has nothing whatever to do with that.

Mr. WILSON. It goes to pay the salaries of these men who are out in the field.

Mr. LANHAM. I decline to yield. The gentleman has a habit of being in an objecting mood, and monopolizing the meetings of the committee, and I should like to have such time as I have available for me here.

The gentleman makes reference, for instance, to Radford, Va. It is easy to cite a case of that sort. What is the situation at Radford? It is construction out in the country at a powder plant, very temporary construction, and when a sufficient quantity of powder has been manufactured to meet present needs, of course, those houses are no longer occupied until it shall be necessary for us to produce more powder there. With reference to vacancies, 94 percent of the family units built under this legislation are occupied. With reference to single workers the percentage naturally is not that high, because many of these have been called into the service and, consequently, there are fluctuations in occupancy. A number of these plants were for ordnance, and the housing was constructed upon the recommendation of the Army and the Navy Departments, and then when the ordnance had reached a certain level that the naval and the military authorities thought was sufficient for the present, they discontinued or reduced production at that particular plant, and naturally that has led to some temporary vacancies until it shall be necessary to produce again that kind of ordnance.

The administrative authorities of the National Housing Agency, insofar as this act is concerned, have been very helpful and very cooperative. They themselves suggested, in order to iron out any kinks and to discuss any complaints which might be made, that we have a monthly meeting of our committee with the administrative officers; and we have carried that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are gentlemen present who can testify that we have succeeded in getting many of their problems and many of their difficulties settled through those conferences we have had with the administrative officers at these meetings and at other meetings which have been especially called to look after their problems.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Do I understand that all of this housing will be removed after the war?

Mr. LANHAM. Every bit of it for which this bill provides.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I want to say to the gentleman that as far as the Hartford area is concerned, we would have been in a bad way if we had not been able to get this housing.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, and the testimony that was brought before the Committee on Appropriations shows, in my judgment, as a matter of fact, proper basis for the appropriation of the entire authorization. That committee has cut it to the minimum. I hope that when the matter goes to the other body they will have a little more time to examine this particular phase of this measure, because I can realize, as you do, that a great deal of the consideration of the House committee has been with reference to the O. W. I. and some other phases of the pending measure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman prepared to clarify the charges about these housing conditions in Indiana, charged by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]?

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly am. Some of them arose before the present administrative authorities took office. I have a great deal of data, of course, that I could place in the RECORD, and a great many statements that I could make to clarify this if time permitted.

This appropriation is for plants in many, many sections of the country to carry on the war effort, and the houses are to be removed to get out of the way of private industry when the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has again expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the majority on the committee would not attempt to get an agreement to close debate on this. We ought to be closing it up pretty soon. What does the gentleman say about 10 minutes?

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, I would like about 3 minutes.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I modify the request and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes following the present speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the efforts of our distinguished Appropriations Committee to cut to the bone every civilian expenditure of our Government, and I think my record in support of that sort of a program speaks for itself. I think that with high taxes it is the duty of this Congress to cut out every useless expenditure that we can. But we are in the midst of a war, and I think we would make a great mistake to eliminate an expenditure which is vitally necessary to the prosecution of this war. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I am a member, heard testimony for many days on this issue, and we did all the cutting that we thought we could safely do without jeopardizing our war effort.

I think if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] should unfortunately be agreed to, we might pay for it in the lives of those splendid young men who are fighting the battles over there in Europe. This is a war of production. This is a war of mechanization. Just take the instance the gentleman complained of in his own district. I received a copy of the newspaper describing that terrible condition with all those houses vacant. Immediately I was concerned, as any of you would have been, and I made inquiry. I found that by reason of the fortunes of war, the production of that great plant was suddenly curtailed. They could not have gone ahead with the production if the houses had not been there. That same thing might happen again. I would rather lose a hundred houses in some locality than to lose this war. We had better spend an extra $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 to provide roofs over men's heads rather than to lose this war. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish. There is a place to cut and a place to spend. I am in favor of so many cuts that have been made in this bill that I want to give all honor to the members of this committee for cutting out unnecessary expenses. But, for God's sake, let us not cut where it is going to lose this war for us. Let us not go back home and have our constituents say, "How foolish you were in cutting out roofs over the men who were to furnish munitions of war where they are needed."

This is a war of constant changes. We are in the midst of a maelstrom, a hurricane, a whirlpool. We must be prepared to take whatever course it is necessary to take. In the days of old when men stood in front of each other with rapiers, fencing and fighting, they had to be prepared for whatever thrust the enemy might take. With keen eye and quick step they had to look in all directions and be prepared for whatever happened.

That is our situation in this terrible conflict. If we shut our eyes and lie down and say: "Well, we are not going to provide the housing," we would not be in position when a plant started here or a plant expanded there to put roofs over the heads of the workers so they could move into the neighborhood and do the necessary work and we shall find ourselves open to the keen thrust of the rapier against which we cannot defend ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, I believe the RECORD should show some of the accomplishments of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds upon which I had the pleasure of serving for 2 years under its splendid chairman the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

One thing I noticed about this committee that I thought was very commendable was the spirit of cooperation that prevailed between Democrats and Republicans, and I think therefore credit for its accomplishments must also be given to such men as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP], and others.

This committee is in closer communication with and supervision of the administrative agencies than almost any other committee in the House; it meets monthly with them. Some mistakes have been made in the housing program, particularly in the first year, but, like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who commended the housing program in Connecticut, I know that in Pittsburgh the tremendous steel production would not have been possible without public housing. There was a desire on the part of some at first to make this war housing a continuation of the low-cost housing program. The committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas wisely decided that this was war housing and should be kept distinct from low-cost housing and its essential purpose thus preserved.

This committee has in addition tried to cooperate with local municipalities in order that public housing might pay a just share of the tax burden of the community, and has changed the provisions of the act so that now public housing must pay taxes to the same extent as privately owned real estate. This committee has written into law a provision that public housing, wherever possible, must receive from its tenants an economic rent, so that it should not be in competition with other real estate in the community. I have not studied the need for this particular appropriation but I am convinced that if the gentleman from Texas and his fine associates on this committee have examined it and approved it then it is for the best interest of the Nation that it should be allowed. I feel confident that it will be allowed, that that is the sentiment of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to obtain some additional information. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] if he can give me any direct information along this line: Out in Michigan through the machinery of the office of the Governor there has been created a post-war planning committee. This committee has two divisions; one having to do with post-war housing and another with the liquidation of post-war inventories. This week I am informed by the chairman of the post-war housing phase that in the program in my home city in addition to a 250-unit dwelling project now being completed under the Lanham Act an additional one is being planned, and that over and above those two propositions a group of Austrian, German, and Russian refugees have had their representative in my home city of Saginaw soliciting loans from one of the building and loan associations to build a considerable number of houses for war and post-war occupancy. I understand from the chairman of this committee that these people have brought in an enormous amount of foreign exchange which has been converted into dollars, and that they are now proceeding throughout the United States, going to those cities where

building priorities have not yet been allocated but which are on the barrel head subject to being allocated and picking up that opportunity and proceeding to finance housing against private ownership and public housing operations. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas can give me any information on that?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that nothing of the kind could be done under this act. This is all temporary housing for the duration. The law itself provides for its removal after the war is over and there is no post-war plan connected with this measure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sorry I did not make my question clear. I was not claiming that such operations by the Russian, Austrian, and German refugees could be carried on under the Lanham Act.

I am asking the gentleman as the head of this great operation, for which we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars, if he knows anything about this matter of which I speak, and this comes right straight from headquarters.

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly do not know anything about that operation, but I can assure the gentleman it is not being done under this act or with funds under this act unless the provisions of the act are being violated and no one has brought that to the attention of the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not claiming it is being done under the Lanham Act. I am trying to find out if you, as the head of this great committee, know anything about these operations I am referring to because they are of interest to my community and I know they are of interest to every city in the State of Michigan.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know anything about that because they have not come within the provisions of this act.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. When this bill was brought into existence first it was meant to supplement the private builders.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Exactly.

Mr. WILSON. But it has turned into a project whereby the private builders supplement the Federal public builders, and they are competitors, nothing else. When the public housers get through the private builders are permitted to come in.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to what you just said, refugees from Austria, Germany, and Russia are now coming in there, obtaining special privileges, and they will finance these projects in a manner that they will get their money out of them as soon as the building is completed and the local community will have to take the rap.

Mr. LANHAM. They are not occupying any of these houses.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield for me to read about five lines?

Mr. NORRELL. Not in my time. I am sorry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that 5 minutes is reserved for the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. No such reservation was made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was temporaily absent. I trust that the committee will have 3 minutes anyway.

Mr. NORRELL. This is not coming out of my time, I hope.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, they have the majority of speakers on that side and, unless you give me 5 minutes to answer these false charges which have been made against my speech, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. The request was that debate be limited to 15 minutes. Three gentlemen were standing—the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] for the last 5 minutes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote to sustain the recommendations of the committee, but I do want the record kept straight.

Mr. Chairman, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to be incorporated in the appropriation bill presently being considered is $1,196,428,749.32. After several weeks of hearings, your committee has presented this bill for the total sum of $215,368,444.32, a reduction of $981,060,305, a reduction of approximately 82 percent.

There are further cuts which, in my judgment, can be made without impairing any of the activities provided for in this bill, and at this time I desire to discuss briefly the pending amendment reducing the sum of $50,000,000 as provided by the bill supplementing the annual appropriation for the National Housing Agency.

On May 13, 1943, the President sent a message to Congress recommending $400,000,000 additional authorization for the National Housing Agency, to provide additional housing units for war workers. Soon afterward, Congress passed a bill authorizing $300,000,000 for such purposes. On July 12, 1943, about 4 months ago, we passed an appropriation bill for $100,000,000 for the National Housing Agency, and they are now back before us trying to secure the full balance of the authorization. They have heretofore secured a total appropriation of $1,300,000,000 for construction of publicly financed housing for war workers. If and when this additional $200,000,000 is made available the total appropriation for publicly financed housing for war workers will amount to one and one-half billion dollars. This is a collossal sum of money, so large it is difficult to comprehend or analyze. It means that the United States is spending more money for housing than many of our heroic allies are spending in their total war effort—and I think they are exerting possibly their maximum financial ability to win the war. It is nearly as much as Australia has spent so far this year, according to available information, in her total war effort. It is about one-half of the total sum so far expended by Canada this year; about one-third of the total amount expended by France in the fateful year of 1940. It is approximately 32 times the amount expended by Greece in 1941; about 10 times the money expended by Poland in her great effort in 1939, and about one-eighth of the money expended by Russia in her war effort for the year 1941.

I am saying nothing detrimental of these nations, having already said that they are exerting their maximum financial effort. I am trying to say that, in my judgment, this Nation is spending too much for such housing facilities.

Since we started our public-housing program for war workers, there have been constructed by the Government of the United States, with public funds, 122,137 single-person units, and 45,787 are presently programed and are to be completed; 323,722 family units have been constructed, and 233,457 are presently programed and to be constructed; and there are 27,407 stopgap accommodations now available, and 12,509 are programed and are to be completed. This makes a total of 765,019 housing units for war workers constructed with public money.

In addition to this construction, I am advised that 2,768,702 housing units have been constructed with private funds, making a grand total of 3,533,721 housing units for the exclusive use of our war workers.

You will find, upon inquiry, vacant publicly financed houses in practically every defense area in the United States where there is a public-housing project. At one place there are 2,974 family units and 90 percent of the Houses are vacant; at another place there are 3,574 family houses constructed and 1,090 are vacant; 1,606 family units are presently under construction at this project, notwithstanding these enormous vacancies; also, at this place, they have 1,000 dormitory units, all vacant; at another place they have 700 family units and 600 dormitory units constructed, 682 of the family units are vacant out of the 700, and I am advised that all of the dormitory units are vacant. Still at another place there are 2,350 family units and 1,638 dormitory units, and 408 of the family units are vacant and 1,520 are not completed. The others are occupied. Of the dormitories, 1,373 of the units are vacant.

I wish to make it plain that I believe the units are needed at all of these places and that they have not overconstructed so far as the number of units are concerned. The estimates made by the War Department, Manpower Commission,

and other bureaus are probably about correct, but the mistake which has been made has been in spending so much money in the construction of housing facilities. The Washington social planners and advocates of racial equality are desirous, apparently, of spending about as much money as is possible in the construction of these houses. They have cost from about $3,000 to $4,500 each. In the South, they have insisted on constructing houses for our Negro workers costing as much as the houses for our white workers. The Negroes are unwilling to pay the necessary rent for such quality houses and consequently most of them are vacant. Too much money has been placed in those units. The local people knew this mistake was being made but these social reformers had to have their way and since they had the money they exercised their authority. The houses are vacant today not because they have overconstructed but because, in view of the investment in each unit, the rents have been more than the workers are willing to pay. I am told that there are war workers in Arkansas who travel in excess of 50 miles per day in going to and from their work because they are unwilling to pay the rent required by the Housing Agency. If these rents were reduced these workers would live at the projects. In many instances the rents are increased because they have improperly and unwisely installed the wrong kind of utilities. For instance, at Portland, Oreg., I am told they have one of the largest housing projects in the Nation, constructed under the shadows of Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and Boulder Dams, presently producing more power than any other area in the world and they found that in view of the shortage of power the houses had to be constructed to be heated by coal, and coal is also used for cooking. I think this is a reflection on that area to say that in the greatest power-producing area in the world, Grand Coulee itself being the largest power dam ever to be constructed, there is insufficient power to be used for fuel in these houses.

The time has come when Congress must refuse to appropriate the funds, if economy is maintained. If the money is appropriated, we know it will be spent. Let us practice rigid economy in every possible way without impairing the war effort and the legitimate activities of our Government in nonwar activities, so that additional tax legislation shall not have to be passed by the Congress. The people want this, they are demanding it, and in my judgment there are several very conspicuous signs we may observe in the recent current events which indicate this is the way they are thinking. I expect to stand by the committee, but I think this is my last vote for funds for this agency, unless a real need is shown.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has authorized $1,500,000,000 for public housing during the war emergency.

Out of this amount the sum of $1,300,000,000 has been appropriated.

Prior to the recess, $100,000,000 was appropriated for public housing, and the National Housing Authority has asked the Congress to approve the $200,000,000 balance of the authorization heretofore enacted.

The Committee on Appropriations has studied this matter thoroughly and has recommended that out of the $200,000,000 requested that $50,000,000 be made available by the Congress.

I am of the firm opinion that the National Housing Agency has overbuilt in every section of the country. While I realize that it is difficult to determine the number of workers that will be needed in any particular area during extended periods, the programing on the part of the N. H. A. has squandered millions of the taxpayers' dollars.

In the Kingsford Heights, Ind., project there were constructed in public housing units, 2,970 family dwelling units, of which only 218 were occupied for many months. Even today this project shows a vacancy of 90 percent.

In Point Pleasant, W. Va., there is a vacancy of 632 housing units and only 18 in the project occupied.

In Ravenna, Ohio, there are 422 occupied public-housing units, and 408 vacant, while dormitory facilities, none are occupied and 1,373 are vacant.

In Chateau Pryor, Okla., there are 300 occupied units against 200 vacant ones.

At Radford, Va., there are 361 occupied units and 82 vacant, and none of the 930 dormitory facilities are occupied.

In the Philadelphia area the evidence given to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds showed a vacancy of 60 percent.

This condition exists also in the State of Arkansas, where at Jones Mills 383 family units were constructed and for many weeks only 60 were occupied.

I am told that at Bauxite, Ark., out of 2,762 family units which were constructed, 1,962 were vacant and only 800 occupied.

In the Washington area, I hold in my hand a photograph which shows a portion of the George Pickett Homes, Arlington, Va., which was taken November 1, 1943. While I do not have the exact number of housing units in the project, there exists a vacancy of from 85 to 90 percent, although the project has been completed for 2 months.

The record shows in the testimony before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that in instance after instance private enterprise was ready and willing and able to build in many sections of the country, but was prevented because of the appropriations by this Congress of a stupendous sum of money to the National Housing Agency.

In the testimony of Robert Gerholz, chairman of the emergency committee of the National Association of Home Builders, it was revealed that in Pittsburg, Calif., 526 public war-housing units were constructed since March 1, 1942, which could have been built by private interests;

At Millbrae, Calif., 800 public war-housing units were built since March 1, 1942, which private builders could have built;

At Hunters Point, Calif., 4,000 public housing units have been built since March 1, 1942, which private industry could have built;

In Richmond, Calif., 19,000 public war-housing units have been authorized since March 1942, and it is estimated that private builders could have built from 7,500 to 10,000 of them.

These projects are only in one State. Mr. Gerholz further stated that in Miami, Fla., 200 public war-housing units could have been built by private builders, and in Wichita, Kans., 5,000 public war-housing units had been built which left no materials and labor for private builders whatever.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious threats to our efforts as a free people is for the Government, through its agencies, to compete with the taxpayers who are attempting to make a livlihood from their chosen fields of endeavor. I refer specifically to the fact that no private builder can obtain priorities to construct housing units during wartime without the approval of the National Housing Agency, which is in full and complete control of all the war public-housing program. It is time for this Congress to clamp down the lid on expenditures of public funds for the purpose of competing with private enterprise.

I am proud to have voted against the authorization of $300,000,000 for public housing, which was recently passed by the Congress. I felt then, and I do now, that entirely too much money had been spent by the Government for housing of war workers, a goodly portion of which could have been provided by private capital.

The Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job in reducing the request by $150,000,000. I hope that the conferees on the part of the House will insist that this figure of $50,000,000, which is entirely adequate, and in my judgment excessive, not be increased by the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point two letters on the subject with an accompanying statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman that such permission will have to be received in the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to realize the extent of the huge shifts in population occasioned by the establishment of the war industries. Overnight vast plants were erected, often in remote locations, and accommodations for housing the workmen who were to operate the plants were hardly an afterthought. But, Mr. Chairman, obviously labor could not be brought in to produce munitions without providing shelter for them and their families. Private capital and private industry could not be depended on to provide this emergency housing. Unless the Government itself made provision for them, adequate labor could not be secured. Housing was as necessary as machinery and raw material.

It follows that appropriations for this purpose are as essential to the war program as the appropriations for the factories. The danger here is not that we have provided too much, but that we have provided too little. In the estimation of those most competent to judge, the entire $200,000,000 requested by the budget estimate is insufficient. In confirmation of this view I submit a letter from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: I should like to take this occasion to reiterate the interest of the War Production Board, previously expressed by me to Congressman LANHAM on May 17, 1943, in the program of the National Housing Agency.

I understand that there is now before your committee a request to appropriate $200,000,000 which constitutes the balance of the authorization of $300,000,000 for emergency housing made in the spring. I hope that the Congress will act favorably on it.

Every effort is being made for more efficient production methods and better utilization of manpower to attain our maximum production goals. It would be a real impediment to war production if plants were unable to recruit their full complement of workers for lack of adequate shelter.

The balance of their authorized appropriation is required by the National Housing Agency to supply emergency needs in critical war-production areas.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

I also have a letter from Henry J. Kaiser, the most efficient production manager in the world today. Mr. Kaiser's letter reads:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *November 4, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I hope that Congress acts favorably on your pending request for $200,000,000 for war housing.

As you know, war housing is a matter of deep concern to us because of our production facilities in many States. Failure to get scheduled war housing definitely would prevent us from reaching production peaks. I am sure that others on the war-production front are faced with the same situation.

We must continue to seek the maximum utilization of manpower; we may find places where prospective needs for housing can be reduced. However, it has been my experience that the National Housing Agency has kept closely in touch with changing conditions and programed conservatively, utilizing existing housing and private financing wherever possible.

Regardless of the reduction in housing needs which may be possible here and there, I am confident there will be a net additional need which will require the funds you are asking.

At this critical period we should not find ourselves short of any of the facilities which may be necessary to speed victory.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY J. KAISER.

Mr. Chairman, there are no two men in America today in better position to pass on this question than Donald Nelson and Henry Kaiser. They not only know whereof they speak but neither has any personal interest to serve in the matter. Both are emphatic in recommending an appropriation of $200,000,000. Both would consider $50,000,000 as wholly inadequate much less the mere $25,000,000 proposed by the amendment. The amendment should be voted down. If any change is made it should be an increase.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON), there were—ayes 12, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board (national defense), to perform the duties imposed upon it by the War Labor Disputes Act (Public Law 89, 78th Cong.), including the objects specified under this head in the National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1944, $75,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time simply to call the attention of the House to the testimony of the National Labor Relations Board commencing at page 1029 of the committee hearings, referring to the administration of section 8 of the War Labor Disputes Act commonly referred to as the cooling-off period.

The record indicates that at the time of the hearings 318 strike notices had been received. Of these 197 had been withdrawn and 49 had been voted upon. In the 49 votes taken all but one or two resulted in a majority vote in favor of a strike. Actual strikes resulted, however, only in a half dozen cases.

The Congress will be interested in the following colloquy between the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Mr. Reilly, a member of the National Labor Relations Board. I quote:

The CHAIRMAN. Have you had sufficient experience by this time to indicate the efficacy of this 30-day delay? Has it, in your opinion, merely delayed the strike 30 days, or has it resulted in expediting settlement of disputes without a strike?

Mr. REILLY. I should say the second. The fact that so few of these cases have resulted in actual strikes, I think may fairly be taken as an indication that the 30-day waiting period does offer opportunities for settlement which may have existed before to be sure, but I think by putting the agencies of adjustment on notice, it tends to expedite the holding of conferences and the work of the Conciliation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. In your opinion, then, this cooling-off period really cools off?

Mr. REILLY. I do not see very much evidence to the contrary, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

Compiling census reports: For an additional amount for compiling census reports, and so forth, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944, and including sample surveys throughout the United States for the purpose of estimating the size and characteristics of the Nation's labor force, $470,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 18, after line 22, insert a new paragraph:

"Customs statistics: For an additional amount for customs statistics, fiscal year 1944, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944, $10,680."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is made necessary by an oversight in connection with a decision by the Comptroller General and action taken by the Civil Service Commission on reclassification of salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of safety regulations: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for enforcement of safety regulations, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944, $64,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: On page 20, after line 17, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Development of landing areas: For the completion of landing area construction at public airports, including all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field in connection therewith, fiscal year 1944, $6,756,918: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended at any public airport unless prior to the date of the enactment of this act construction has been undertaken at such airport with financial assistance from the Federal Government."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it is expected that a number of amendments of this character will be offered, I wonder if we can reach an agreement at this time that the gentleman from New Mexico, representing the various Members who have amendments of this character in prospect, shall at this time present the case for them in 5 minutes, the other Members to be authorized to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD. If that is agreeable, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is the agreement that we be allowed to extend our remarks at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That all those who appeared before the committee and those interested in this matter be allowed to extend their remarks at this point.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close

in 10 minutes, the understanding being that all Members desiring to speak on the subect may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that the last 5 minutes are reserved for the committee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which has been before this House before. It passed the Senate of the United States last June and came back to the House in the closing hours of the session and was not favorably considered. Since that time the Members of the various congressional delegations have gone back to their areas and ascertained carefully the exact circumstances with reference to each one of these airports.

I wish to remind you that all of these airports were started as parts of a Federal W. P. A. program for the construction of ports, and with the liquidation of the W. P. A. these communities found the ports not completed and were therefore in need of this money to do the job. Bear in mind that no airport could be started at that time unless its military necessity was certified to by the Federal Government. Bear in mind that there was an engineer from the War Department who had been formerly chief engineer of W. P. A. whose sole job it was to clear these projects and to certify to them.

Let me call your attention to just one of these airports, that at Pueblo, Colo., which is represented by my good friend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]. At that airport $745,000 was spent by the W. P. A.; $125,000 was spent by the sponsor. When W. P. A. folded up, only $70,000 was needed to complete that and make it a fine airport.

The same situation exists at every one of these other airports, for instance, at the airport at Raton, N. Mex., in my home State, where a great deal of work was done and a little bit of work remains. I can testify to you that as a field agent of W. P. A. I went into the Raton community and went into the Pueblo community and as part of a Nation-wide program urged these people to put up their money, and told them the Government would go on and see the project through.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the expenditure of approximately $6,000,000 is necessary in order to conserve an investment already made in excess of $10,000,000?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is entirely correct. The amount that has been spent by W. P. A. is $7,165,092. The amount the communities have spent is $3,051,025. It seems to me too bad to throw away $10,000,000, on airports of all things, without properly taking care of that investment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, who has been a vigorous sponsor through this endeavor, as has the gentlemen from Nebraska, Mr. CURTIS and Mr. STEFAN.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not a fact that the authorities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration feel that the money would be exceedingly well spent at this time?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes, they think that.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to add I am very much for the amendment of the gentleman from New Mexico. One of the 24 airports is in my district at Henderson, Rusk County, Texas. The people there have spent $97,400. The Federal Government has spent $64,000. This is not a case dissimilar to any of the others, but certainly it seems to me, with this Nation going all-out on a civil aviation program, it is the part of wisdom to send $6,000,000 after $10,000,000. That is not sending good money after bad money; it is sending a relatively small amount of good money after a bigger amount of good money, all of which is for a mighty excellent purpose. With reference to the war effort, I do not see how any person here could have listened to what was told the Members of Congress by our military leaders recently with reference to aviation and say this is an item not needed. Twenty-four additional airports doubtless will serve a wonderfully good purpose in the future; if not for winning the war certainly so far as civil aviation is concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Did not the expenditure of this W. P. A. fund for airports in the early days of our commercial aviation lay the foundation for the building of the greatest commercial air system the world has ever known?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman for that very fine contribution, because it is exactly true.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is it not also true that the gentleman's informal committee has very carefully gone over each and every one of these airport projects and is completely satisfied that no excessive funds are being asked for?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I will answer the gentleman by saying that after careful scrutiny we are convinced that no excessive funds are being asked for from any source.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the position of the War Department in regard to these airports at the present time?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The matter was not submitted to them, but the War Department certified to their military necessity before they were started.

Mr. DONDERO. That was under the W. P. A.?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have none of these airports in my district, but I think it is vitally necessary to build them all for post-war purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The Civil Aeronautics Authority declared that these airports should be completed because they are wanted for national defense, and they recognize that in building them it is a matter of trying to save an investment of $10,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is correct, and we have gone very carefully over these projects to make sure that each one is necessary. It should be remembered that the individual communities in every case put up the sponsor's contribution at the instigation of the Government that was then and is now trying to develop a program of airports throughout the country. The program for W. P. A. airports under C. A. A. supervision has been tremendously useful. Hundreds of airports have been finished and are being used today for flying schools. In my home city of Albuquerque there is a bombing school on a W. P. A. airfield, and there is another school where men are being trained for the trans-Atlantic ferrying of ships. Twenty-four of these W. P. A. airports remain, and we are asking for this money which the Civil Aeronautics Authority says is absolutely necessary for their completion. We hope that you will grant it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate these enterprising communities, on these forward-looking efforts to secure adequate airports. After the war is over a city which does not have an adequate and convenient airport will be as much out of the picture as a city without railroads and highways, but the day when we can build them at Federal Government expense has gone by, unless they are needed for military or naval purposes. This is a matter the House has twice acted upon—once, when it eliminated the W. P. A. root and branch, and again, when the matter was up on the second deficiency appropriation bill before the summer recess, when the House defeated an amendment carrying this identical matter on a yea-and-nay vote.

If this were in any way connected with the war effort, and the pending bill is devoted almost exclusively to items related to the war program, they would not have to come here for money. Funds for such purposes are already available. If these projects are related to the war program all that is necessary is for these communities to appear before the Navy Department or the War Department and convince them that these airports are essential to or useful in the war program, and automatically the money is available. It already has been provided, but evidently these projects have no such classification.

I must confess to some surprise to find some of my friends supporting this

amendment. They were most emphatic in their opposition to W. P. A. and actively cooperated here on the floor in its elimination. They made perfect disestablishment and denial of funds for W. P. A. purposes, and here this afternoon they are, in effect, asking us to reestablish the W. P. A. and provide further appropriations.

If the construction of these few airports were all that is involved in this amendment, we might pass it over, but it involves more than the resuscitation of the W. P. A. It requires the scrapping of a policy carefully planned for the discontinuance of this character of public works, and if we continue W. P. A. work on these airports, there is in every congressional district in the United States numbers of similar projects, streets, roads, sewers, water systems, highways, public buildings, housing, hospitals, and schools that will immediately apply for the same consideration. It is utterly inconceivable that we should again at this critical time resume the operation of the W. P. A. in every nook and corner of the United States, because that is what is involved in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the House has repeatedly rejected the principle embodied in this amendment. We would like to see these communities get their airports, but we must all realize that in these war-burdened, tax-ridden times the Government has enough on its hands to win the war, and the local communities are for the time being dependent on their own resources.

Of course, when the war is over, and peacetime conditions warrant it, the Federal Government may be in position to cooperate again in post-war construction.

In the meantime, I trust the Members of the House will support the committee and vote down the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Some of these airports are 90 percent completed, in which the Government has invested $10,000,000. Government airplanes could land at those airports, some of which are in close proximity to Government forts, which would save many crashes. Does not the gentleman feel that for the sake of economy, those airports should be completed?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They should be completed, but for the present not at Federal expense.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that permission has been granted to all Members.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this item for completion of airports has been before this body several times. I have spoken a great deal for aviation and I feel deeply about the entire matter. No one in this House is more interested in eliminating useless expenditures than I am. But here is an item which will in reality save money. Here are airports which are 90 percent completed. Airports which are needed for national defense. Airports which the C. A. A. says should be completed. Airports in which the Federal Government and local taxpayers have $10,000,000 invested. With the requested expenditure in this amendment we have a chance to save the original investment. Some of these airports are eroding. They are needed, in my opinion, for present war efforts and for future aviation. They are so important that recently the Senate passed an amendment to complete them. Nearly 20 members of commerce have gone into the matter fully with their home communities, with the C. A. A. officials, and with the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I feel this expenditure will not only save our original investment but would result in completing in a very short time airports which are needed in our present emergency. To prove that I point to the fact that some of the airports in this original program have already been taken over by either the Army or the Navy. I sincerely hope that the membership will support us in the passage of this amendment.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment to appropriate funds for the completion of various airports throughout the United States. Measured by spending standards the amount of this appropriation item is very small, indeed. I am supporting the proposed amendment by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] because I believe that Congress already has an investment in these uncompleted airports, and it is only a matter of good business to protect that investment.

In July of this year, when the matter of an appropriation for uncompleted airports was before Congress, I supported the preferential motion. I will not here go into detail, but I simply want to say that I not only have not changed my mind but that I am more strongly than ever in favor of having Congress recognize the tremendous possibilities that will come from airport development in this country. The aviation industry is just in its infancy, and while we are spending billions of dollars for destructive war purposes now is the time to begin to plan to spend some money to build up our own country and to develop its possibilities. Nothing is more important than the planning to develop an aviation program. There should be a network of airports from east to west, and north to south. I discussed this at some length when the amendment was before Congress back in July.

All of this fits into the post-war planning program because there will be thousands and thousands of aviators returning from the present World War and jobs ought to be available for them in the aviation program. I hope that the short-sighted suggestion that a similar amendment was defeated in July constitutes an argument for a repetition of that mistake will be discarded by the Members of the House of Representatives. These funds ought to be provided and every argument made in favor of the appropriation in July is in point at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were yeas 59 and nays 62.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico and Mr. STEFAN demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were yeas 77 and nays 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for the Solid Fuels Administration for War, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $950,000; and the limitation upon the number of technical employees who may be employed without regard to civil service and classification laws is hereby increased from 18 to 25.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to call attention to the testimony of the Solid Fuels Administration for War commencing at page 410 of the committee hearings.

The agency paints a very grave national and for that matter world picture in respect to coal both anthracite and bituminous. The record indicates that reserves are down some 20,000,000 tons. It estimates also a deficit for the year as the result of decreased production of 39,000,000 tons. It reflects a loss of skilled manpower during the past year to the extent of 75,000 workers and more recently at the rate of 4,000 skilled workers a month. The War Manpower Commission has apparently been helpless in relieving substantially the manpower problem. The record also reflects an estimated loss of about 1,000,000 tons of coal a month due to "slow down" primarily because of the lack of wage contracts for the workers in the mine to work under. The War Labor Board until recently, at least, seems to have been helpless in finding a solution for this aspect of the situation.

The agency predicts a desperate condition in the absence of additional production before the first of the year. It is to be hoped that recent developments will be conducive to this end.

The record shows a loss in production attributable to the interruption last summer amounting to 28,000,000 tons of coal—3,000,000 tons of anthracite, 25,000,000 tons of bituminous.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan was granted permission to extend his own remarks at this point.)

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, when the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for the year 1944 was being considered by the subcommittee, a great deal of testimony was taken with regard to the advisability of

constructing a barge canal across the State of Florida. According to the proponents of the bill, the canal would cost $44,000,000. The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army testified the cost would be approximately $60,000,000. After considerable controversy, the subcommittee recommended an appropriation for $44,000,000 for that purpose to the full committee. On March 31, 1943, the full Appropriations Committee, on my motion struck the item from the bill. The War civil functions appropriations bill passed the House on April 1, 1943. After prolonged hearings, and due consideration in the Senate committee, the bill was passed by the Senate without the canal item, and on June 2, 1943, it was approved by the President and became a law. No one offered to amend the bill on the floor of the House to restore this item, nor was any effort made, as I recall the facts, to amend the bill by putting the item in the bill in the Senate.

On July 1, within 30 days after the bill was passed, and after the House of Representatives through its committee, they refused to appropriate funds for this canal, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, in which he used in part the following language:

As yet, it has not been feasible to undertake work on sections of the waterway not now in existence, primarily because of shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages are overcome.

I am including a copy of this letter herein. The President said nothing about waiting for an appropriation being made by this Congress. On March 31, 1943, I issued the following statement giving a summary of the testimony before our subcommittee and the facts which induced me to oppose this appropriation:

PERTINENT FACTS ON FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

1. Cost: According to the proponents of the bill, the canal would cost $44,000,000. The Chief Engineer of the United States Army says $60,000,000.

2. Proponents say it would cost $451,250,000 to build the canal, including equipment units, such as barges, tugs, etc., to transport 1,600,000 barrels daily (p. 145 of the hearings). R. K. Davis, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, itemizes the cost at $1,522,625,000. (See p. 175 of hearings.)

3. Canal proponents' figures are based upon 65 percent of the tugs and barges being constructed of wood and 35 percent steel. The Petroleum Administrator's office says only heavy residual oil or about 10 percent of the total can be transported by wooden barges and 90 percent would require steel barges; that no wooden barges could be used because of the various hazards, including fire hazard (pp. 173–176 of the hearings; p. 159 of the hearings). Both parties base their figures upon the assumption that the total requirement of 1,600,000 barrels per day is to be transported by canal, which, of course, would not be true, as 535,000 barrels will be transported next year by pipe line. Assuming that 50 percent is to be transported, you would, of course, cut each figure down to 50 percent, or whatever percentage of the oil that is to be transported by canal.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION

By tanker before the war, 21 to 24 cents per barrel.

Present cost of transporting by tanker as fixed by Maritime Commission, 40 cents per barrel.

Cost of transporting by rail, $1.65 per barrel.

Cost of transporting by canal, $1 per barrel.

Cost of transporting by pipe line, 35 cents per barrel.

No subsidy will be paid on pipe-line transportation, and the 35 cents per barrel would be paid by consumer and would liquidate the entire investment within 5 years (p. 198 of the hearings).

SUBSIDIES

The subsidy is the difference between the tanker cost fixed by the Maritime Commission at 40 cents per barrel and the actual transportation cost. Under canal transportation, subsidy would still be paid of 60 cents per barrel, which is the difference between present tanker transportation cost and canal transportation cost (p. 169 of the hearings).

INVESTMENT

Government capital would have to be used. No private individuals or corporations will invest money in barges and tugs to transport oil at $1 per barrel when tankers can transport the oil at 21 to 24 cents per barrel in peacetime and pipe lines at 35 cents per barrel, including amortization of capital investment of pipe lines in 5 years. Capital invested in barges and tugs would be a loss after the war.

It would cost $3 a barrel to transport oil in drums through the canal (p. 170 of the hearings).

NEW METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION AVAILABLE IN 1943

1. Pipe lines: One 24-inch pipe line to be completed July 4; capacity 300,000 barrels per day. This pipe line can be stepped up to 450,000 per day (pp. 149 and 158 of the hearings).

One 20-inch pipe line as far as Illinois by September and through to the East by December. This pipe line will transport 235,000 barrels daily without subsidy at 35 cents per barrel paid by the consumer and liquidate the total investment in 5 years (p. 198 of the hearings). This is additional capacity over what we had last year.

2. Supplying oil to the East: Mr. Wilson, of the Petroleum Administrator's office, stated that when these two pipe lines are completed "we will be able to meet the full east-coast petroleum requirements on the basis of continuing gasoline rationing substantially as it now is and supply normal requirements of fuel oil and other petroleum requirements for domestic and offshore use" (p. 199 of the hearings).

STEEL

Under date of March 24, 1943, Mr. Ralph K. Davis, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, wrote me as follows:

"At present, a program calling for ultimate construction of some 500 wooden barges and 100 tugs is in process of completion under the direction of the Office of Defense Transportation. This program was authorized in December 1942. At present, contracts for the construction of some 80 tugs and about 280 wooden barges have been let to various yards. The time necessary to construct a single barge ranges from 40 days to 3 months, and for a tug, from 4 to 6 months. It would be impossible to arrive at an accurate time estimate covering the construction of 9,600 barges and 3,995 tugs unless one could base one's estimate on the number of yards available in which the work could be done, and the number of vessels which each yard would undertake to build simultaneously.

"It is the opinion of this office, however, that with existing yard facilities and with the projects already under construction and authorized which now are utilizing the capacity of such shipyards, it is questionable whether or not sufficient equipment could be constructed within a period of 2 years which would be capable of moving an additional 200,000 B/D from Texas gulf ports to Trenton, N. J., let alone moving 1,500,000 B/D.

"It should be pointed out that the use of steel for large diameter pipe-line construction involves minimum interference with either the shipbuilding program of the Maritime Commission, the barge conversion program of the Office of Defense Transportation, or with the production of bombs. The barge and shipbuilding program is predicated upon the use of rolled plate, while the large diameter pipe-line program is predicated principally upon the use of drawn tubing, which is produced in separate mills not capable of producing rolled plate. It is interesting to note that in the construction of the 24-inch war emergency pipe line, the question arose as to the possible interference this construction might have upon the bomb program. Drawing of pipe for the "big inch" line was stopped for a sufficient period of time to permit the drawing of necessary bomb casings to meet the requirements of the armed forces. Drawing of pipe for the "big inch" line was then resumed. Similarly, it is believed that no interference would arise in a future possible expansion of the presently planned large pipe-line program."

Space will not permit me to quote other testimony. However, I had Mr. Buckman, representing the proponents, give me a statement covering the main items of cost. I then had Mr. Davis, Petroleum Administrator, and the Government authorities take that statement and give their side by way of comparison. You will find the comparison on pages 172 to 176 of the hearings. If you will read just these four pages, it will give you a complete story. I have no desire except to give you the facts.

The War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1944 contained an item of $3,000,000 appropriated for the purpose of having the Corps of Engineers make surveys to prepare plans and specifications for projects which might provide post-war work. This $3,000,000 was supposed to cover work in the entire United States.

To my amazement and surprise, I was informed recently that the Chief of Engineers had used a part of these funds to prepare plans and specifications to build the Florida barge canal. I telephoned Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Acting Chief of Engineers, and asked for a complete statement, which I am including herein. He informed me that the Corps of Engineers had allocated $1,000,000, or one-third of this $3,000,000 which was intended to cover the entire United States, to prepare construction plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal. This statement was later verified in writing as per letter hereto attached. The Chief of Engineers testified before our committee, and he knew very well that the Appropriations Committee had refused to make this appropriation for the Florida barge canal. For him to allocate one-third of the entire amount intended to be used for plans and specifications throughout the United States, for a project which had been rejected by the committee, shows a contempt for the committee's position that cannot be justified. The Chief of Engineers must believe that the $60,000,000 that he says it will require to build this canal will be

forthcoming from some place. Certainly, the action of the Appropriations Committee did not encourage him in his belief; or did the President of the United States order the survey to be made?

The President's statement in his letter of July 1 that—

Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages—manpower, materials, and equipment—are overcome—

Leads me to believe that it was the President who ordered this survey made. It is interesting to note that the President did not say that the canal will be built when Congress appropriated the money. Can it be that he is intending to use funds that Congress appropriated for other purposes and entrusted him with to build this canal? I have not forgotten that after Congress refused to appropriate more than $35,000,000 for the Pentagon Building he used funds appropriated for other purposes to build that building.

The following is a copy of the letter written me by the Acting Chief of Engineers:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, November 2, 1943.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: Referring to your recent telephone call, I am pleased to furnish the following information regarding the work presently underway in connection with the Florida barge canal.

The Department recently established a field office at Ocala, Fla., for the purpose of preparing construction plans and specifications for the authorized Florida barge canal. The activities include subsurface explorations, hydraulic investigations, design of structures and other field investigations and studies required for the preparation of detailed plans for this waterway. A considerable amount of advance investigation is necessary in view of the nature of the ground formations in the section of Florida through which the canal will be built. Funds in the amount of $1,000,000 have been allotted with which to carry out the work now in progress. Initiation of actual construction operations is dependent upon the appropriation of necessary funds therefor.

Funds for such investigation and design studies for the Florida barge canal as are being undertaken at this time were made available under the provisions of the War Department Civil Appropriation Act approved June 2, 1943 (Public Law, 64, 78th Cong.), making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, which provided that "$3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works' is hereby made available for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized." As you know, the project for the construction of a high-level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico was adopted by the act of Congress approved July 23, 1942 (Public Law, 675, 77th Cong.).

I trust that the information furnished herein will clarify the status of this project. Should additional information be desired, I shall be pleased to furnish it, if available, upon receipt of your further request.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

In reading this letter by Major General Robins, I noted the following language:

The activities include subsurface explorations, hydraulic investigations, design of structures, and other field investigations and studies required for the preparation of detailed plans for this waterway. A considerable amount of advance investigation is necessary in view of the nature of the ground formations in the section of Florida through which the canal will be built.

I telephoned General Robins and asked him to explain this paragraph. He informed me—

That this survey could be used for a ship canal. The same kind of a survey is used for the barge canal and the ship canal.

I asked him, "All you have to do then to get a ship canal is to throw out the locks and deepen the canal?" and his answer was "Yes."

In view of the fact that this barge canal is built on practically the same site as the old ship canal site, can there be any doubt but what the next step will be "to throw out the locks and deepen the canal" to make it a ship canal?

It seems to me that in view of the testimony of the Chief of Engineers that it would take several years to build this canal and in view of the difficulty of the Ways and Means Committee is having in raising taxes and the requirement for manpower, I cannot bring myself to believe that the Chief of Engineers would order one-third of the entire amount appropriated for plans, surveys, and specifications by the Department for a project of this type unless the orders came from the Commander in Chief of the Army, the President of the United States.

The following is a copy of the letter from the President to Judge Mansfield hereinbefore referred to:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 1, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on
Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I have received your letter of May 25, 1943, regarding the need for improvement of the Atlantic-Gulf intracoastal waterway, and, in particular, the need for construction of the Florida barge canal.

I have always realized the importance of an adequate and continuous inland waterway for barge traffic along our Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast. Upon authorization of such a waterway by Congress, steps were taken promptly to initiate the improvement and work has been carried on as fast as possible without interfering with the war effort. This work has consisted of large-scale dredging operations along the existing sections of the waterway, which, without improvement, could not be used to full capacity. It is my intention to continue these dredging improvements during the next fiscal year.

As yet, it has not been feasible to undertake work on sections of the waterway not now in existence, primarily because of shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages are overcome. While I cannot foretell how soon that will be, it is possible that the situation with respect to these shortages will change sufficiently to permit an early dredging of the sea-level sections of the canal, and I am, accordingly, asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chief of Engineers to keep me advised of any changes of conditions which would justify the inauguration of this work.

I appreciate the further expression in your letter of May 25 of your continued concern with the improvement of our waterway system, to the development of which you have contributed so much.

Sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Patrick Henry National Monument: For completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill, including expenses incidental to such acquisition, in accordance with the provisions of the acts of August 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 652), and January 20, 1940 (54 Stat. 18), fiscal year 1944, $25,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On page 25, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, before the final vote was taken in the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the pending measure I made one reservation and one only. I reserved the right to offer the amendment that I have just submitted to eliminate a $25,000 item for the completion of the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry in Charlotte County, Va., known as Red Hill.

On yesterday I gave notice to Members of the House that I would offer such an amendment. The reasons are obvious and I shall not take the full time allotted me in support of this amendment. Suffice it to say that this is an Interior Department item, considered at length by that subcommittee in connection with the regular annual appropriation bill, and was unanimously rejected.

If Members will turn to page 328 and the several pages following giving a history of this transaction, I am sure that abundant proof will be found that the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, of which I have the honor of being chairman, acted wisely in unanimously rejecting it. Certainly, it has no connection with the war effort, and the purchase of an estate of 960 acres of land, much of which is cut-over acreage, which it was testified would hardly grow bumblebee cotton or black-eyed peas, will neither add to the prestige of the Congress at this critical period in the Nation's history, nor further endear the name of the immortal Patrick Henry to the hearts and minds of patriotic liberty-loving citizens of America.

As stated yesterday, the Director of the National Park Service assured the committee that it did not initiate this project and did not need 960 acres for a memorial to Patrick Henry. The hearings give abundant proof that all members of the Subcommittee on Interior

Department Appropriations were correct in their unanimous opposition to unloading another white elephant on the taxpayers of the country and that they are justified in being wholly dissatisfied with the transaction. I am also advised that the owners of the estate have now become dissatisfied. Considering the evidence presented, I am very definitely and strongly of the opinion that the taxpayers of the country would be dissatisfied should this appropriation stand. Furthermore, I see no Member of Congress here who is sufficiently interested to defend the item under the existing circumstances.

Therefore, without any further comment, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the able and distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. We ought to get along without memorials in wartime. Wait until we get through with the war before we begin to spread out on that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad to be able to agree with the gentleman on this item, even though we did not see eye to eye on another provision of the bill. I agree that it is a bad policy to be erecting memorials in wartime. In this connection let me say that the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over memorials of this kind refused to appropriate a single dollar for the purpose of investigating future memorials. That is the firm policy of our committee. I think I can safely say that Interior Department appropriation bills in the future will contain no funds for investigating or erecting memorials, at least for the duration.

And now that no one appears sufficiently interested to——

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I beg to differ with the gentleman. We are interested. The fact is I also have an amendment on the Clerk's desk similar to the gentleman's amendment. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I was going to say that now no one is sufficiently interested to defend this item, and since it is our firm and determined policy not to erect memorials at this time in our Nation's history that it is unnecessary to prolong the debate.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that I am in full accord with what the gentleman has said and I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman and am confident that it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Damage claims: For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment and settlement of certain claims arising out of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation," approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), as fully set forth in House Document No. 323, Seventy-eighth Congress, $253.58.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the membership of the Committee of the Whole will indulge me for just a moment, I would like to make an observation on a matter that is not especially germane to this paragraph.

I hope there will be no objection on the part of the members of the committee. I do so at this point, however, because for some time I have been interested in the restoration of the power of review to the Federal courts of the country in connection with the Office of Price Administration. Now it has come to my attention only today that a model ordinance has been prepared by or for or at the suggestion of the O. P. A. to be sent to the city councils of all cities and villages of the country. It is an ordinance so drafted that it would make unlawful under local ordinances any violation whatsoever of any price ceiling or of any rent ceiling or the exchange of goods without necessary coupons, and would virtually incorporate in local law every order, regulation, and price schedule that has been issued by the Office of Price Administration.

The interesting thing about it also is that it contains a punitive provision. It makes any violation in such an ordinance an offense which would be punishable by a fine not to exceed $200 or 90 days in prison, or both. If this is true it presents a rather amazing situation. It seems to me that it necessarily ought to have some attention and investigation because the model ordinances have been pretty well scattered over the country. It will be a rather interesting thing when Federal law and local law are so mixed, jurisdiction so mixed, enforcement so mixed that the local magistrate then becomes the enforcement official for all the regulations issued from Washington irrespective of whether he has an up-to-date file of all orders and regulations or not.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman knows that the O. P. A. is constantly amending its regulations. Is the local body to pass the act as it exists now or is the local body merely to pass an ordinance that they will enforce all future regulations of O. P. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The local body would enforce everything by way of regulations whether they had been adopted up to that time or were subsequently adopted, for otherwise such an ordinance could not have full creditable effect. It would be a very interesting development in our law. I am going to extend a copy of this ordinance in the RECORD that all men may see.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman think that according to the election returns last Tuesday a good many of these localities from the gentleman's standpoint will take care of themselves and not be apt to be overcome by the O. P. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my genial and gracious friend that I am not very much interested in this from the standpoint of election returns. I am interested in this from the standpoint of the man who may be put out of business by O. P. A. regulations. He cannot today go into Federal court because this Congress by solemn decree has divested the Federal courts of jurisdiction to hear any cases involving regulations, orders, or price schedules; but on the other hand they propose in a series of ordinances throughout the country to make violation of an O. P. A. regulation a criminal offense under a local ordinance and haul everybody before the local magistrate or perhaps into Federal court; so the law is all one-sided and it is against the citizen, and this may be just another move in a further direction.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I think the gentleman need not fear that communities inhabited by men like him will be overcome by this terrible octopus.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend for that gracious compliment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman any information that any city or village in the United States has adopted such ordinance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but I am informed that these model ordinances are already in the hands of some village officials and are at least receiving attention.

Mr. DONDERO. One other question: Does that mean that a citizen can be brought into court under an ordinance before he finds out what some order is here in Washington?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; although he may never have heard of the order or regulation, if this kind of ordinance were adopted.

Mr. DONDERO. It is an absurdity.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the ordinance provide any way of testing the constitutionality of any rule or regulation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; there is no such provision in the sample ordinance that is before me at the present time and which I intend to insert in the RECORD where all may see.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe that the O. P. A. will furnish the order to the local prosecutor after an ordinance such as this is adopted?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to say that the reason I brought this in under the Department of Justice item in this bill was because it presents some very strange and mixed enforcement problems.

This new move might be interpreted as a confession of failure to regulate the affairs of people from Washington and that it might be better to rely on home rule. But the essential point is that every O. P. A. regulation would by such an ordinance have the effect of law for a violation of which, a person might be punished. But think of the huge volume of regulations to be considered by a local magistrate. It presents a very interesting situation.

There follows a copy of the proposed ordinance:

Ordinance 1078 (a)

An ordinance to prevent and suppress violations of any orders, regulations, or schedules, in effect on the effective date of this ordinance, or which shall hereinafter be in effect, pertaining to rationed commodities, maximum prices, or maximum rents, issued by the United States of America, by the Office of Price Administration, under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or as may hereinafter be amended, or by any other agency thereof, under the acts of the Congress of the United States of America

Whereas it is necessary for the health, safety, and general welfare of the inhabitants of the ---------- of ---------- that during the present emergency commodity prices and the cost-of-living accommodations shall be stabilized and commodities shall be equitably distributed; and

Whereas the United States of America, through the Office of Price Administration and other agencies, has issued orders, regulations, and price schedules which are designed to effect such equitable distribution and stabilization of prices: Now, therefore, pursuant to the provisions of Revised Statutes 40:48-2 of New Jersey

The ------ of the ------ of ------ do ordain:

1. That no person shall sell, offer for sale, or deliver at wholesale or retail any commodity of service for which a maximum price has been or hereafter may be prescribed by any regulation, order, or price schedule or any amendment thereof issued by the Office of Price Administration under the authority of the acts of the Congress of the United States of America known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as now amended, at prices in excess of the applicable maximum price prescribed by the applicable regulation, order, or price schedule of the Office of Price Administration.

2. That no person shall sell, offer for sale, transfer, or deliver a commodity rationed by an order or any amendment thereof, heretofore or hereafter issued by the United States of America by the Office of Price Administration, under the authority of acts of Congress of the United States of America, without taking the coupons, stamps, certificates, ration books, or other ration evidences prescribed by the applicable regulation or order in force and effect at the time of the transaction.

(b) That no person shall possess, acquire, transfer, or otherwise dispose of any ration coupons, stamps, certificates, ration books, or other ration evidences pertaining to any commodity rationed by any such order, or any amendment thereof, except in the manner prescribed by the applicable regulations or order in force and effect at the time of the transaction.

3. That no owner shall rent any housing accommodation for which a maximum rent has been prescribed by any regulation or order issued by the Office of Price Administration under the authority of the acts of the Congress of the United States of America known as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, at a rent in excess of the applicable maximum rent prescribed by the applicable regulation or order of the Office of Price Administration.

(4. All complaints to be made to local O. P. A. price board. If they decide the violation is serious, they may prosecute in local courts as below.)

4. That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be subject to a fine of not exceeding the sum of $200, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 90 days, or both, for each such violation, in the discretion of the magistrate.

5. That if any provision of this ordinance, or the application of any provision of this ordinance to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the ordinance and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

6. That the provisions of this ordinance with regard to violations of price regulations, price schedules, and orders shall remain in force and effect so long as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or as hereafter amended, is in force and effect. The provisions of this ordinance with regard to violators of rationing orders shall remain in force and effect so long as the Second War Powers Act of 1942, or as the same be hereafter amended, shall remain in force and effect.

7. That the term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

Naval stock fund: For the purpose of increasing the capital of the "Naval Stock Fund," the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the sum of $750,000,000 from the appropriation "Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Navy, 1944," to the "Naval Stock Fund": *Provided*, That after June 30, 1944, the value of stock in the "Naval Stock Account" plus the outstanding obligations under the "Naval Stock Fund" shall not exceed $2,250,000,000 at any time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON:

On page 28, after line 15, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

"The appropriation 'Public Works Bureau of Yards and Docks,' shall be available for the payment of compensation of those employees of contractors who are known to have been taken by an enemy as a prisoner, hostage, or otherwise, while employed on Wake Island, at such rates as the Secretary of the Navy may determine to be equitable and just (not to exceed the rates of wages being paid for comparable positions to employees of the Navy Department in areas nearest to the places of employment of such contractors' employees at the time of their having been taken by an enemy), until such time as such employees may be returned to such places as may be provided for in their contracts of employment: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be payable after the death of such an employee has been established or can be legally presumed to have occurred: *Provided further*, That compensation paid in pursuance hereof, to be effected by or through the contractor, shall be in lieu of any payments authorized by Public, No. 784, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 2, 1942."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I presented this matter last night in the RECORD so that the Members who were not here could read it, because it involves not only the technicality but it also deals with legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is this the same language exactly that the gentleman submitted last night?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from New York that it is the same language and the same amendment.

Mr. TABER. It is simply designed to correct an injustice that has resulted in connection with the civilian employees out on Wake Island?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand that this comes with the unanimous consent of the gentleman's committee? That is, everyone you have here is in favor of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is here, and I yield to him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman from Washington will permit me to make this statement, I think it is important to say that some time ago the gentleman from Washington introduced a bill dealing with this subject matter. The Committee on Naval Affairs is engaged in several investigations, and it has been impossible to get the committee together, but the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and myself have consulted the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and other members of the committee who are in town, and, recognizing the urgency of this legislation to do justice to these people, I suggested to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that he offer his amendment to this appropriation bill. We recognize the fact that it is subject to a point of order, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but it would be next March before we could get an appropriation bill before us, even though we passed the authorization act doing what this amendment proposes to do at this time. I am gratified to know, after conference with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, that there is no objection, so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, to accepting this amendment, and I hope the House will agree to it and

permit justice to be done to the families of these people who were taken prisoners while engaged in Navy work at Guam and at Wake.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the gentleman from Washington also took this matter up with the Speaker and myself. I understand also the matter has been cleared with the Republican members of the subcommittee and, I assume, the Republican leadership; is that right?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is an amendment to correct an oversight. While it is a little unusual, the emergency requires it, and I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the committee it is estimated that there are some 1,146 civilian employees of contractors who are prisoners of Japan. The whole purpose of this amendment is to compensate them under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy determines to be just and fair, or to compensate their families while they are prisoners of war. Under the law now, whenever a soldier or sailor is taken prisoner the Government continues to pay that enlisted man or officer his compensation right along as if he were in line of duty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say here the contractors are willing to pay these men. They were working there on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, but their contract of employment provided for employment and that they would be paid from the time they left continental United States until the time they came back. The Navy is willing to pay them; they feel their moral obligation, but they also feel they cannot pay them legally because they are not being employed. They are prisoners of war. Many of them may be dead.

The Congress in March of this year passed a bill providing that prisoners of war, military and civil-service employees, shall be paid the amount of their salary while they are prisoners. These people were left out. We have been trying to pay them under the Workmen's Compensation Act. We have called them longshoremen in order to pay a dribbling amount to their dependents. Some of the situations are getting desperate. I may say that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] called this to our attention some weeks ago. It is a condition that should be rectified immediately.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows I also had a bill with his committee to provide for the same thing. We have 372 of these families from California alone; that is, families of men taken on Wake. I trust the House will approve this amendment, and I am delighted to hear the statement of the chairman of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In discussing this with other members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we feel highly complimented that the Members have agreed to take this thing up and straighten it out immediately. I hope the House will adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman from Washington because the justice of his amendment is not only meritorious but necessary to care for the families of the 1,180 civilians taken at Guam and Wake Island, approximately one-third of whom came from my state of Montana. These men are now prisoners of war in Japanese camps suffering untold hardships. I know that when the Japanese invaded Wake and Guam they dropped their shovels, left their bulldozers and trucks, and armed themselves with rifles to defend American soil. They fought courageously and gloriously in our behalf and this act on the part of this Congress is in recognition of their valiant and courageous worth. We of Montana are proud of them.

While it may appear that I speak selfishly because so many of them came from my State, I do not, because I think this is a just debt we owe to all these people, no matter where they come from.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I was not here when the gentleman's amendment was read, being temporarily out of the room. What does it do for the widow or child of the boy who happened to be killed over there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Secretary pays them a wage comparable to that which would be paid a man working in a navy yard in the same capacity, until the time we get some word that they are dead or are presumed to be legally dead. We have no knowledge where these contract employees, now civilian prisoners, are, where they have been taken. We do not think they are still on Wake, because we have made some forays over Wake Island and we do not think they are there. Some of them may be dead, but the families do not know it. Many of these families are desperate and many of them are destitute. If and when we find out they are dead, then, of course, under the Workmen's Compensation Act, the families will receive a stipulated amount. I do not know exactly what it is, but they are protected under death benefit provisions.

Mr. GILCHRIST. That is exactly the situation I want to know about. A neighbor in my little town lost her husband there. We cannot hear from him, and suppose he is dead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We hope these men are not dead. We hope the Japanese are treating them as prisoners of war. Maybe that is wishful thinking. They were from all walks of life and were doing an installation job on Wake when the Japs came in. I think many of them will come back.

Mr. GILCHRIST. If he has been killed the widow should be entitled to compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Most of these contracts of employment contain some benefit provisions, insurance and otherwise. I do not recall the exact terms.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. A good many of these men are from my district and are in the position the gentleman has mentioned. I have had a great deal of correspondence in connection with them. Their families are unable to get compensation from any source and in a good many cases are unable to determine whether the men are still alive. I think the Government ought to make provision for them under the circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Committee on Appropriations for doing this very humane thing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as is well known, it is the policy of the Committee on Appropriations to refuse all amendments proposing legislation. This amendment proposes legislation, and therefore is subject to a point of order.

But in view of its sponsorship by the committee having jurisdiction of the subject, the great Committee on Naval Affairs, and its approval by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we now return to page 9 and take up the paragraph under Employees' Compensation Commission, which was passed over on the reading of the bill awaiting action upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the Committee, the Clerk will read that paragraph at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Employees' compensation fund: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1944, for the payment of compensation provided by the act of

September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 785), as amended, including the objects specified under this head in the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, $3,000,000, which, together with the amount heretofore appropriated under this head, shall be available also for reimbursement payments authorized by the act of December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C. 1701), rehabilitation expenses and fees or payments to other agencies of the United States and other public agencies or private persons, agencies, or institutions, for services, or facilities rendered by them pursuant to agreement and approved by the Commission.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 9, line 19, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in conformity with the amendment just adopted by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 205. For the payment of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office pursuant to the act entitled "An act for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain, and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899," approved May 2, 1940 (Public Act No. 505, 76th Cong.), and which have been certified to the Seventy-eighth Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), under the War Department in House Document No. 317, $2,880.82.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the guayule rubber project was authorized by the President on March 5, 1942, the Congress has appropriated approximately $45,000,000 for the continuance of this project. I understand from a reading of the hearings that a request was made for an additional $7,500,000 in this bill, and that has been refused by the committee. I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations for the action taken, but if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I do want to ask a few questions in connection with the attitude of the committee on this project.

A reading of the hearings discloses that both the Baruch committee and the Rubber Administrator, Mr. Jeffers, urged that this project be continued as an insurance policy. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would care to tell me just what the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations is toward this entire project at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee provided in former bills $45,000,000, in full of the estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau for this purpose. However, the question involved in this last estimate was whether or not rubber could be produced in merchantable quantities before the close of the war. In the course of the hearings they testified they could not produce rubber in appreciable quantities before 1946, and in view of the fact that the war is not expected to last that long and the cost of rubber produced by the guayule method would be too expensive to compete with imported rubber after the war, the committee doubted the advisability of enlarging the program at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Do I correctly understand, Mr. Chairman, that the committee is not opposed to the continuance of the project as a post-war insurance measure? Guayule is the only source of raw rubber available within the continental limits of the United States. The committee's attitude is not opposed to the continuance of the project at a later date? Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The last proposal differs slightly from the original plan. Under this estimate individual landowners in various sections of the country were to be encouraged to grow the plant as a new industry. The proposition involved such a material change in policy that the committee hesitated to embark upon such an experiment at this time.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. They also proposed a good deal of work in other States where they had not even started any work, and they were planning to stop some work where they are now doing it, moving it to new States with the idea of carrying it on as a new development in those States and as an agricultural job following the close of the war.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I have today introduced a resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to thoroughly investigate this entire guayule program, and report back its recommendations, and such changes in the legislation as may be necessary. I trust I may have the concurrence of the Committee on Appropriations in such an endeavor, because I think that is the only way we can find out where we are going in the production of guayule, and I think it is well worth following it up as a post-war project.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think I may say that the committee will agree, insofar as the proposition relates to the prosecution of the war and the production of war material in time for practical use. Of course, so far as legislation is concerned, the proposition falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us appreciate the splendid work the gentleman has done in the promotion of the cultivation of the guayule plant. In that connection I want to say that in my congressional district there is a lot of guayule that grows wild.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am aware of that.

Mr. THOMASON. In fact some years ago there was a rubber plant at Marathon, Tex.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. And later there was so much raw rubber imported, that they were not able to make a success of the plant.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. All of the guayule that was in the gentleman's district was exploited, and the rubber plant had to be closed down for lack of supplies.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that I express the hope that there is some encouragement for the preservation of the guayule plants in his State, and in west Texas, and perhaps some part of California, also in New Mexico, because those plants ought not to be destroyed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will act on my resolution and make a thorough investigation and report back to the House.

Mr. THOMASON. I join with the gentleman in expressing that hope, and also offer him my hearty cooperation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to support the suggestion of my colleague from California [Mr. ANDERSON] on the subject of guayule. It is my very sincere hope that his resolution, which proposes a committee to investigate this very much misunderstood subject, will be approved by the House and that such an investigation may be made.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I rise to disabuse the gentleman's mind of the thought that this is a special committee. It simply authorizes the Committee on Agriculture to extend the scope of its present investigating committee to this subject.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his correction. I know that the Committee on Agriculture will be interested in guayule. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations spoke of the fact that enough rubber is being manufactured from other sources, and I think the gentleman ought to state that in the manufacture of certain rubber commodities live rubber is necessary, and that unless you have live rubber from trees or from this plant, you do not have the correct kind of rubber.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The real facts of the synthetic rubber program are that we are producing 30,000 tons of synthetic rubber now under the Jeffers program, and in the first quarter of 1944 we will be producing 800,000 tons under the Jeffers program, or about sufficient for our normal use. Our wartime use is about 1,200,000 tons of rubber.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for that information. The point I make is that there are three factors in the proper growing of guayule. The first is rubber, which the gentleman has spoken about, and the second is the development of a new agricultural commodity in certain areas, and, third, the fact that the labor used in the guayule fields can be taken at a time which is the low period in our use of labor. Therefore, that use of labor is a fill-in between the other commodities that we grow, and therefore of great value to the agriculture program.

It was, as one gentleman said, the original intention to grow guayule by contract and not to have it placed in the hands of a Government department. It is my opinion that any criticism of the program has developed, not from anything intended in the original resolution of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] but from features of the handling of the project by individuals or by the agency to which it was given.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman does not mean to criticize the Forestry Service for its handling of the matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman wishes definitely to criticize the Forest Service, and I will give chapter and verse for everything they have done, from expenditures of money to broken promises to the farmers of California. The forestry department knew nothing about guayule and does not seem to me to care as much as it should about knowing about guayule. Many farmers in California would have been able to tell the forestry department how to grow this better than they are growing it now.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman understands, of course, this was a war program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is a war program; therefore, why should it not have been put into the hands of somebody who would have been more interested in making the program successful?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Did any Government agency know anything about it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I suggest there were people who could have done a better job than the people who have handled the program as it has been handled in some parts of California.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. But, is not the Forestry Service a part of the Department of Agriculture and evidently could have had its advice?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If so, I regret it did not take it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I do not come to criticize any individual in connection with the guayule program, but I think it has been unfortunate that there was a misunderstanding somewhere down the line as to the nature of guayule and the need for guayule. I think much of it originated in the office of the Rubber Administration, which probably could not have been expected to be familiar with the methods of production of a crop of this kind.

Guayule is the only form of natural rubber that is produced in any quantity in the United States. It is a natural rubber. That is something that so many of us do not have in our minds. It is not synthetic rubber. It is not a substitute. Guayule is rubber. In fact that is the name—"Hay ule" means "There is rubber." That is where we got the name—from the Spaniards. It is rubber. There is rubber in the plant, just the same rubber that is grown in the trees of the South Pacific and in South America. We need that rubber to blend with synthetic rubber.

In my home town, Waco. there is a large synthetic-rubber plant being constructed to build tires. I mean to fabricate tires. They cannot fabricate those tires for large trucks and busses unless they have natural rubber to mix with the synthetic product. They must have this natural rubber. As a matter of being sure that we have the facilities to make use of the great investment that we have in synthetic-rubber plants, we must proceed to protect the one source of natural rubber that we have in continental United States. This is the guayule development.

I recognize that the committee is on solid ground when they say they were told last spring by the Rubber Administrator that we probably did not want to go so far. The Rubber Administration decided they did not need as many natural-rubber tires as they thought they needed. Now they say they are not going to get to the bottom of the bucket until next year. They had said that we would experience the greatest shortage this fall. All we can do is to change our minds along with them. I do not blame the committee for not giving them money when they said they did not need it. But now it seems we need the money which was not spent on this program last spring. Now we know that we must make extensive plantings of guayule. We have the shrubs on hand—these little slips to set out, like onion sets. Those are available to plant something like 30,000 acres in guayule rubber this fall and winter if we can get the money to put them out. If we do not put them in the field they are useless.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is not the weakness of this thing the fact that you can produce so little rubber with guayule; it takes 3 or 4 years to get started?

Mr. POAGE. No. That is not a weakness, because you can produce a thousand pounds per acre. It is one of the most productive forms of rubber production. In addition it does not take 4 or 5 years. Within 2 years you can produce a very worth-while crop although you can, of course, produce more per acre if you let it grow longer. The gentleman has not kept up with the guayule development. The gentleman is quoting what we thought about the guayule back during the times we were dependent upon gathering it wild from the hills of Mexico, and when we had made no experiments with it. But even the small experiment and study we have conducted shows that guayule is not simply a shrub of old Mexico, but is a valuable commercial plant.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not a fact that the time up to now has been used to produce seed and that the program is just getting started?

Mr. POAGE. And the plants are in the nurseries now. Unless they are put into the field they will not be worth any more than so many weeds, but if they are put out into the fields we will have a year's growth on those plants.

Mr. PHILLIPS. More than that.

Mr. POAGE. And another year's growth and we can start producing some rubber; but if we leave them in the nursery, we will produce nothing. If we set them out they will be producing rubber in 2 years, not 4.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I read the hearings held by the committee and saw where producers of guayule have to harvest the whole plant and replant the shrub.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. That in 2 years they do get some small production of rubber.

Mr. POAGE. They get around 300 pounds an acre.

Mr. MAHON. It would seem hardly worth while.

Mr. POAGE. It is tremendously worth while to make up that 10 percent that is neded to mix with synthetic rubber to make it useful. Without that 10 percent of natural rubber you have nothing but a useless heap that might as well be clay or sawdust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about guayule rubber, and in the course of the debate some criticism was made of the Forestry Service. I rise at this time to say a word in behalf of a fellow Nebraskan who is in California planting guayule. I refer to Mr. Paul Roberts, the administrator of that planting program in California. If Paul Roberts makes as great a success out of the planting of guayule as he did out of the planting of trees in the Plains States, or the shelterbelt program, the guayule-planting program will be successful. I do not know what Paul Roberts has done in the way of contracts with the farmers, but I will assure you that whatever he does will be honestly done, because he is one of the most efficient, one of the most loyal and honest men I have seen. You can contact any farmer, ask any farmer in the State of Nebraska with whom Paul Roberts made a contract for trees in the shelterbelt. They were successful. They will tell you that their relations with him were most satisfactory.

I want to say another word, make another statement in behalf of another Nebraskan, and in passing I want to assure you that you are getting synthetic rubber

because of the ingenuity, the progressiveness, and the efficiency of a Nebraskan. I refer to the Honorable William Jeffers, of Nebraska, who was the Rubber Director. We are making rubber out of four products today: The byproducts of petroleum, petroleum, molasses, and alcohol. The cheapest rubber we are producing today comes from the byproducts of petroleum, the next cheapest from petroleum, the next from molasses, and the last from alcohol. The highest-priced rubber comes from South America, the next highest priced from guayule, according to information I received from the Rubber Director's office.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. In a moment, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

Mr. Chairman, we are producing 30,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year at the present time from our synthetic-rubber plants in which we have approximately $750,000,000 invested. In the first quarter of 1944 we will be producing 800,000 tons of rubber, which is equal to the normal consumption of rubber in peacetimes in the United States. We need during the war approximately 1,200,000 tons of rubber. We are getting a lot of raw rubber. I say a lot because comparatively speaking it is a lot. I cannot tell you where we are getting it from, but we are getting some. During next year each essential passenger car and each essential truck will have one and one-quarter tires provided from your synthetic-rubber plants, but the majority of your synthetic rubber will go to war. The rubber picture has been made bright because of the ingenuity, as I said before, of Hon. William Jeffers. He has performed for the United States in rubber production in 1 year's time what experts tell me usually takes 10 years. There is, however, a movement on foot, Mr. Chairman, to junk the $750,000,000 we have invested in the synthetic-rubber plants we have constructed in our country.

Unless we take heed and warning and be on guard, we are going to surrender again to the British and Dutch rubber monopolies the synthetic-rubber program which we now have in operation and which will make us independent and self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned in peacetimes. I predict that when the war is over you will find the greatest price war in history on rubber, but the United States is now about to be self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. The provision of law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by employees of the Government traveling overseas (46 U. S. C. 1241) shall not apply to such travel during the fiscal year 1944.

THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 10 years legislative power throughout the world has been in retreat. Unless the trend is checked, it will seriously menace the continuance of representative government.

Congress has been under withering fire. Much of it has been constructive and designed to bring about improved legislative technique. Some of it has been destructive. Undue and distorted emphasis on x-cards, pensions, and bundles for Congress seemed designed to bring Congress into public disfavor and disrepute.

But when editorial writers observe that "the spectacle of Congress is anything but encouraging," or when a publicist writes that "the provincialism and ignorance of Congress makes it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government," there is time and occasion for introspection.

Why this unhappy estimate of the lawmaking branch of the Government? It goes back to 1933.

Distress was upon the land and the Nation clamored for remedial action. The pressures of distress can easily induce a departure from constitutional and balanced processes of government, for in the shadow there is always the profound hope that when normal conditions are restored, balanced government can be recaptured.

The pattern whereby legislative powers were usurped by the executive branch with the acquiescence of Congress needs but brief description.

First came broad grants of power. But power is an empty thing unless fortified with funds. Blank checks quickly followed. Such funds were used to create and staff the agencies to spell out those powers. Thus were the beginnings of bureaucracy laid. Grants of power to the Executive carried with them the authority to issue rules and regulations through subordinates. There began the bold expansion of administrative law carrying with it the power to punish. In some cases, courts were completely divested of jurisdiction to pass upon rules, regulations, and orders.

For a decade we functioned under that pattern. The executive branch came to regard Congress as little more than a convenient appendage of government. The virtues of a strong Executive and a weak Congress were strongly advanced. Pressure groups demeaned those Members of Congress who resisted the rising tide of Executive domination. Unbalanced party representation in Congress served to accelerate legislative decline. Frustration and a sense of futility assailed those Members who fought this trend, for they had not the tools with which to work. Radical elements who filtered into places of high executive authority labored diligently to plant the seed of distrust and suspicion. The radical press lost no opportunity to stir antagonism and ridicule.

It was a time of legislative drift and Executive mastery. And how shall the devastation to balanced government be undone?

The granted powers remain unretrieved. Volumes of regulations continue to issue forth and Congress is powerless to review them. Appropriations are expended and there is no effective method for determining how wisely and efficaciously they are expended. There is still no court review of administrative decisions. Post-war problems are at hand and Congress is not now equipped to deal effectively with them.

If the Congress is to resume its proper place in a government of checks and balances, it must be staffed, weaponed, and equipped to better discharge its constitutional functions.

The problem admits of two approaches. The one is piecemeal. The other is comprehensive.

The piecemeal approach is to introduce measures to deal with each of these matters. The other is to create a Committee on Congressional Reorganization to deal with the whole matter of improving the procedures and the structure of Congress and providing it with legislative, investigatory, and supervisory tools for the better performance of its functions.

It is a monumental and imperative task. But it must be done. Such a committee could pursue this problem with diligence, avail itself of the suggestions of students and obesrvers in this field, present a comprehensive report and perform one of the most important legislative services ever rendered since the adoption of the Constitution.

I, therefore, suggest to the membership and particularly the Rules Committee the necessity for immediate action on House Resolution 19 which I introduced in January or on some similar resolution which provides for the creation of a seven-man committee to survey, study, and investigate this whole problem of congressional reorganization, and report an over-all and inclusive program for the consideration of this body. It will be a truly progressive and forward step which will recapture representative government and bring about the efficient administration of the people's affairs.

In conjunction with these observations, I am including a copy of House Resolution 19 which I introduced on January 6, 1943:

Whereas the Congress by an act approved April 3, 1939, authorized and directed the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and the agencies thereof to secure greater efficiency, economy, and improved service in the administration of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the expansion of Federal functions and the magnitude of the operations of the Federal Government which prompted that act make it desirable and necessary that there should also be a survey and study of the structure, function, and procedures of the legislative branch of the Federal Government for the purposes of determining, in the light of present and future problems and responsibilities, how the structure, functions, and procedures of the Congress may be modified, revised, augmented, or strengthened in the public interest and for the purpose of better enabling the Congress to discharge its constitutional responsibilities and carry out its functions; and

Whereas the scope and extent of such a survey and study make it desirable that it be undertaken by a select or special committee: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee shall be appointed by the Speaker, to consist of seven Members of the House of Representatives, and to be designated the Select Committee on Congressional Reorganization. Said committee is hereby authorized and directed—

(a) To investigate and study the structure, functions, and procedures of the legislative branch for the purpose of determining how they may be modified, revised, and augmented so as to promote better balance between the legislative and executive branches, strengthen representative government, enable Congress the better to discharge its constitutional functions, and more effectively to supervise the performance of delegated powers, provide for a more effective use of the investigatory powers of Congress, and better equip the legislative branch with facilities and information requisite for the initiation of legislative policies.

(b) To investigate, study, and make recommendations with respect to—

(1) The creation of a joint committee of the House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, for the more effective cooperation of the legislative branch of the Government in the conduct and prosecution of the war effort;

(2) The creation of a joint committee of House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, to study and make recommendations for more effectively dealing with the problems of post-war planning and reconstruction, demobilization, unemployment, the utilization of our national resources and related problems;

(3) The creation of a joint committee of House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, to study and make recommendations for more effectively dealing with the problems of peace, peace-planning, and related matters;

(4) The creation or strengthening of such legislative services or agencies as may be necessary to implement the Congress and assist it or any committee thereof to discharge more effectively its functions and responsibilities; in particular, the expansion and implementation of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress and the other research and informational facilities of Congress with a view to their maximum usefulness;

(5) The expansion of the functions, authority, and facilities of the General Accounting Office for the purpose of securing a more effective and continuous supervision of the activities and operations of the executive departments and agencies of government in the interest of efficiency, economy, and improved public service;

(6) The creation of a joint committee of House and Senate, or other adequate legislative instrumentality, to devise ways and means of bringing about a more effective liaison between the Congress and the Budget Bureau for purposes of better control and supervision of the Budget.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make final report to the House at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable; it may submit partial or preliminary reports and recommendations upon any separate subject of its investigation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions or recesses of Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, documents, and records as it may deem advisable, to take testimony and to employ such clerical and stenographic help as may be necessary, all expenses, which shall not exceed $_____, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon voucher of the chairman.

SEC. 3. In the event that the Senate of the United States should create a like committee for the same or similar purposes as set forth in this resolution, the committee herein created is authorized and empowered to confer and consult with such committee of the Senate, to participate in joint sessions, to join with or in any reports or recommendations submitted by such committee, and to cooperate with such committee in such manner and to such extent as will effectuate the purposes of this resolution.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The $6,500,000 requested as direct appropriation to supplement the present $20,000,000 for administrative purposes will enable the Farm Security Administration to hold the line for the next 8 months and do the job Congress gave it to do for the War Food Administration. The money will prevent another drastic cut in operations, a cut which would render the organization powerless to function effectively.

This $6,500,000 now asked for will go mostly to run the local field offices out in the rural areas. So long as F. S. A. is charged with responsibility for making rehabilitation loans to needy farmers and collecting their loan payments and assisting them to become efficient operators, the county offices must stay open; men and women must be there to serve the borrowers, advise them, and help them raise the food we need.

This $6,500,000, added to the $20,000,000, still gives a total amount for the Administration far below last year's $41,000,000 and the $60,000,000 available in 1942. The $26,500,000 will pay only for those F. S. A. operations found to be essential by the War Food Administrator. The number of employees has already been reduced from 17,000 in 1942 to 14,000 in 1943, to a little more than 10,000 now. By drastically curtailing the services formerly performed at higher administrative levels, the F. S. A. so far—through October 31—has been able to save most of its county offices. There are now about 2,000 county offices operating.

But beginning November 1—if the $20,000,000 appropriation is not increased by at least $6,500,000—the number of employees will be reduced to about 6,000. Most of this cut will have to be made in the local offices. About 1,000 Farm Security county offices will be closed. No supervisors will be available for great numbers of families who owe the Government and who need further assistance in good farm management before they can reasonably be expected to finish their payments. Those supervisors whose services are retained will have an average case load of 288 families, as compared with 178 now, and these families will be spread over large areas so that it will be difficult even to keep up with collections. Spread too thin, virtually no supervision will be possible. The heart and soul will be gone out of Farm Security.

From a dollars-and-cents viewpoint alone, a failure to maintain the direct appropriation for Farm Security would doubtless cost the Government far more than $6,500,000. More than 600,000 families still have unmatured amounts on past loans. On last June 30, $401,388,811 was outstanding in rehabilitation loans. This, of course, does not mean that families are not paying back satisfactorily; their repayment record is the best in the history of F. S. A. Repayments are running better than 90 percent on all rural rehabilitation loans. But if the F. S. A. offices are closed, if F. S. A. offers little or no supervision or technical help to these families who owe the Government, how much of the $400,000,000 will be or can be paid when the maturity dates arrive? The Government's investment and the taxpayers' investment in rehabilitation funds outstanding must be adequately protected.

To curtail further the administrative budget of the F. S. A. would be folly from an investment standpoint, as well as a threat to the War Food Administration's program to get greater production from the small farmers whom F. S. A. assists.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great care this afternoon and yesterday to the arguments presented in behalf of various appropriations. I listened very carefully to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] and, like him, I had hoped that selfish interests and politics might not be brought into these appropriations, but I am compelled to accept a good many of the arguments presented as not being in good faith.

In too many cases, appropriations have been asked for and assertions made that they would shorten the war and save many lives. Certainly, we are all hoping for this.

One of the reasons that I cannot seriously accept a great many of the arguments presented is because of a letter I received from a certain newspaper publisher who presented the same sort of an argument. It so happened that last spring when newsprint was being rationed to the newspapers I wrote to a group of publishers asking for their reaction and how the cut would affect their business. I stated in that letter that the Government was using a million or more tons of paper annually, apparently, much of it for propaganda purposes.

I had a certain newspaper publisher write me immediately, stating as follows:

I notice that you are again attempting to induce people to put their selfish interests above the best interests of their Nation.

There is no reason why newspapers should not do their part. As far as the dissemination of information by the Office of War Information throughout the world is concerned, it can be as effective as bullets, something that should by all means be done, in my opinion. You may be sure that I am not interested in protecting myself to the disadvantage of the war effort, and that we will abide by any reasonable regulations those in charge of our war effort deem necesasry.

If you and some of the rest of our Congressmen do not stop trying to stir up the people's selfish interests you will have a great deal to answer for in the lives of boys who otherwise might not have had to make the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of argument that I have listened to here on

the floor from numerous Members from the other side of the aisle. Now, I have in my hand a statement from the War Production Board's Printing and Publishing Division giving a list of additional grants of newsprint authorized on appeal from certain newspaper publishers. These grants are over and above the fixed quotas. I find that this particular publisher in the second quarter of this year, asked for and received 20 additional tons. In the third quarter, this same publisher, asked for and received 41 additional tons. Without a doubt, he will request an additional grant for the fourth quarter.

This same newspaper publisher has a son of draft age who was classified I–A by his local draft board, and he is now enjoying his second deferment. I have never known anyone to admit that he has ever done a day's work.

After listening to the arguments and receiving a letter like this, to us who have sons and daughters in the armed forces, pleadings of this kind come with poor grace.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Line 8, page 5, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to explain the amendment?

The SPEAKER. No. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, then I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Thirteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON there were—ayes 34, noes 172.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-four Members are present, a quorum.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may have 5 days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by J. Edgar Hoover, in another an address by Senator FERGUSON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., under date of November 3, 1943, entitled "Investigation of Lend-Lease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Secretary Ickes to Judge Vinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 247), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CLAIR ENGLE of the State of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Lands.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can give us any definite information as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week. From then on, however, there will be a very heavy program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution passed by the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities in Washington recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include in several places therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GWYNNE and Mr. HOPE asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a thought-provoking resolution passed by the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs on the question of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. COLE, of New York), for November 4 and 5, on account of official business.

To Mr. BLAND (at the request of Mr. BURCH of Virginia), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. HOBBS), from November 4 to 15, on account of official business.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI for the week beginning November 8, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2859. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 400. An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 8, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 9, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS—NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING

The executive session scheduled for today by the Committee on Patents was postponed until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. Proposed legislation by the National Patent Planning Commission will be discussed.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 9, 1943, at 11 a. m., to resume hearings on H. J. Res. 148, a joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of Daylight Saving Time Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10:00 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, November 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 875, "To restore standard time during months of January, February, November, and December."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

900. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 5, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Buffalo Harbor, river and ship canal, New York, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 4, 1939, June 6, 1939, and March 26, 1940, and by resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on May 16, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

901. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting statements in connection with the personnel requirements of the Federal Communications Commission for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3442. A bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 State. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); with amendment (Rept. No. 843). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; with amendment (Rept. No. 839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Anna Charack; with amendment (Rept. No. 840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Leo Gullo; with amendment (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3619. A bill to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 5, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3620. A bill to amend an act entitled, "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3621. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3622. A bill to appoint a commission to settle the claims of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3623. A bill to insure adequate care of disabled veterans by establishment of a per-

manent Medical Service in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3624. A bill to validate certain applications for national service life insurance where deductions of premiums from service pay were authorized or otherwise paid but where the applicant died prior to the effective date of such insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution for the relief of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the role of a President-elect during the interim between his election and inauguration in the present emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives' current session on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015), to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 346. Resolution providing for an investigation of the program for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Alvin W. Twigg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3626. A bill to validate the application for national service life insurance of Jerome J. Simandl, late major, Army Air Forces; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Sims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Max Kanarenstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Wilfrid Verl Wilson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Bacic, Charles C. Cox, H. Forest Haugh, and Luther M. Durst; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3440. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of sundry residents of Odessa, Tex., advocating passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3441. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Irvin Smith, president, Christian Missionary Workers of the Central Christian Church, of Fairmont, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3442. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Resolution passed at a meeting of the Christian churches of East Liverpool on the 17th day of August 1943, opposing the manufacture, transportation, and sale of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3443. Also, petition of Mrs. H. R. Davy and Alice V. James, of Dellroy, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3444. Also, petition of Linnie G. Simpson and 59 other residents of New Athens, St. Clairsville, and Cadiz, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3445. Also, petition of Mrs. C. L. Imhoff and 57 other residents of Bellaire, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2062; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3446. Also, petition of the Ladies Bible Class of the Presbyterian Church of Lisbon, Ohio, opposing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3447. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Lowry and 37 other teachers of the public schools of Toronto, Jefferson County, Ohio, opposing increase of taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3448. Also, petition of Florence Harshman and 28 other residents of Mingo Junction, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3449. Also, petition of Chester H. Dean and 28 other residents of Mingo Junction, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3450. Also, petition of Mrs. Carl Berg and 81 other residents of East Liverpool, Ohio, urging immediate action on further restriction and control of the liquor traffic in the vicinity of our armed camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3451. Also, petition of Charles Besozzi and 98 other residents of Lansing, Ohio, and nearby villages, protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3452. Also, petition of Jared E. Davis and 80 other residents of Martins Ferry, Ohio, and nearby villages, protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3453. Also, petition of Forest Walters and 39 other residents of Carrollton, Ohio, and nearby villages, protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3454. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Orville Fricke and 40 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3455. Also, petition of William Frank and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3456. Also, petition of Louis Van Mierlo and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3457. Also, petition of the United Garment Workers Local Union No. 67, and signed by 21 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3458. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. Fink and 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3459. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 35 members and adherents of the Mahoning United Presbyterian Church, New Castle, Pa., urging the passage of all bills now before the House to prohibit the advertisement of alcoholic beverages, to ban beer and liquor sales at military and naval canteens, to make it unlawful to furnish alcoholic beverages to anyone in uniform, and to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3460. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petitions of the Cliffside Brewing Co., and 20 other residents of Cincinnati; H. Dennert Distributing Co., and 133 other residents of Cincinnati; Edwin Wulfhorst and 19 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3461. Also, petitions of Howard Sullivan, Michael Taylor, John J. Beck, C. A. DuBois, Carl Ludwig, Carl Chaney, Harry W. Swift, Clarence Nienaher, Walter A. Willis, Walter Burden, J. H. McCutcheon, R. L. Slomer, Charles Doll, Henry Frederick, Charles H. Hahn, H. W. Coy, Louis C. Rieger, Mary McRoberts, James E. Hickey, Herbert B. Robb, E. C. Fischer, Pat Dowell, Albert Stone, William Downson, Nicholas Diehl, Henry Westermann, Joseph Ullman, and 512 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3462. Also, petitions of Harry Bickers, Harold Hilge, Howard Garrett, Ralph G. Herbold, Mary Waechter, Frank Herrman, Nicholas Draginoff, Edward J. Donnelly, Mrs. Fred H. Dress, Marguerite Doerger, Herbert Wood, Albert H. Meyer, Charles J. Due, W. E. Prost, Richard W. Fischer, Meda M. Ketterer, Edward J. Krieger, George J. Kopp, Alethia V. Schaefer, F. J. Brading, William Book, John J. Behrmann, Charles Wagner, Stanley J. Humbert, Burton C. Drayer, Albert Spaulding, Mrs. Fred Benzinger, R. C. Flanigan, Edward Gehring, Joseph Stoeppelman, Robert E. Smith, and 529 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3463. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of H. A. Wagner and 1,006 other residents of Luzurne County, requesting the defeat of House bill 3420, the Lea bill, affecting air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3464. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Omer Moore and 16 other citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3465. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 43 parishioners of the Central Bridge Methodist Church, Central Bridge, N. Y., petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3466. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 23 qualified voters of the city of Butler, Pa., urging the adoption and final passage of House Resolution 117, to permit shipment of food to those unfortunate children residing in occupied countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3467. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of A. F. Mitchell, Mrs. Glynn Mitchell Johnston, W. H. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. M. J. McClure, Lillian McClure, Robert G. Dillard, Joe E. Butler, John C. Calhoun, and E. C.

Bowen, favoring House bill 106; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3468. By Mr. KING: Resolution of the San Pedro Typographical Union, No. 862, of San Pedro, Calif., relative to a wage adjustment; to the Committee on Printing.

3469. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the mayor and city council of the city of Chelsea, Mass., concerning Senate bill 1163; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we bow in reverence before Thee whose name is hallowed, whose judgments are true and righteous altogether, and whose love is unfailing. For Thy mercies which have followed us all the days of our lives we offer praise and thanksgiving. The evidences of Thy beauty we have seen in lives that have blessed us, and we have recognized Thy fatherly care in delivering us from many evils and misfortunes.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, for America. While her sons are offering up their lives in battle and many homes are becoming the abodes of anxiety and sorrow, we pray that the spirit of the Lord may visit our land in all its comforting power. Rescue our citizens from their follies, redeem them from their iniquities, and cleanse them from all uncleanness that thereby America may be made precious in Thy sight because of her righteousness.

As these Thy servants stand upon the threshold of another week, grant them discernment of such means as will contribute to a world in which Thy precepts shall be honored. Here may they indicate the direction in which America should move that her citizens may become abundant in good works and that her devotion to the teachings of Thy Son may serve as an example to the nations. We offer our prayer in the name of Jesus Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 5, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2188) entitled "An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SEÑOR DON PEDRO CASTELBLANCO AGUERO

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, we have the honor today of having with us Señor Don Pedro Castelblanco Aguero, president of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies. He has presented to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a message from the Chamber of Deputies of Chile. I ask unanimous consent that the message be read to the House at this time by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF CHILE.

To the American Congresses:

By the intermediary of the president of the corporation, Señor Don Pedro Castelblanco Aguero, formulates its most fervent votes of American brotherhood.

It anxiously desires that his journey may strengthen and translate, into positive and concrete accomplishments, the ideals and aspirations of spiritual and economic unity animating all the countries of the continent.

The Chamber of Deputies of Chile, which has had a long and more than century-old tradition of democracy, hopes that by the common action of the American nations there may be obtained full confirmation of the principles of democracy and liberty.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House of Representatives, I desire to thank the president of the legislature of our great sister republic of Chile for bringing us this message, and to welcome him, not only to this House of Representatives but to the city of Washington and to the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll. No. 156]

Anderson, Calif.	Dingell	Jones
Andrews	Ditter	Judd
Baldwin, Md.	Douglas	Kearney
Barden	Drewry	Kee
Barry	Durham	Kennedy
Bates, Mass.	Elmer	Keogh
Beckworth	Engel, Mich.	Kerr
Bell	Fay	Kilburn
Bender	Fenton	Kleberg
Blackney	Fernandez	Klein
Bland	Fitzpatrick	Lambertson
Boren	Fogarty	Lane
Bradley, Mich.	Ford	Lea
Bradley, Pa.	Fulmer	LeFevre
Brehm	Furlong	McGregor
Brooks	Gallagher	McLean
Brown, Ohio	Gamble	McMurray
Buckley	Gavagan	Maas
Burchill, N. Y.	Gavin	Madden
Busbey	Gerlach	Magnuson
Butler	Gifford	Marcantonio
Byrne	Gillie	Martin, Iowa
Camp	Gore	Merritt
Cannon, Fla.	Gorski	Miller, Pa.
Capozzoli	Hale	Morrison, La.
Carter	Hall, Leonard W.	Mott
Chapman	Halleck	Murphy
Chenoweth	Harness, Ind.	Myers
Clason	Hart	Norton
Cole, N. Y.	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Compton	Heffernan	O'Connor
Costello	Hendricks	O'Leary
Courtney	Herter	O'Toole
Crawford	Hess	Pace
Cullen	Holmes, Mass.	Peterson, Ga.
Curley	Izac	Pfeifer
D'Alesandro	Jackson	Philbin
Davis	Jennings	Ploeser
Dawson	Johnson, J. Leroy	Pracht
Dies		Rabaut
Rees, Kans.	Sikes	Randolph
Robsion, Ky.	Slaughter	Vincent, Ky.
Rogers, Calif.	Smith, Maine	Wasielewski
Rowan	Smith, Va.	West
Sabath	Smith, W. Va.	Wheat
Sadowski	Somers, N. Y.	Whelchel, Ga.
Sasscer	Starnes, Ala.	White
Satterfield	Steagall	Willey
Scanlon	Sundstrom	Winstead
Scott	Taber	Winter
Shafer	Taylor	Wolcott
Sheridan	Thomas, N. J.	Zimmerman
Short	Towe	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 270 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker speaking for the whole delegation of my State, and for the whole people of North Carolina, I ask the Members to suspend their labors for a brief while, in order that we may do honor on the anniversary of the birthday of a model man, one of the greatest patriots my State ever contributed to this Republic. In the northwest corner of my State there is a region known for centuries as the Lost Province. It is so beautiful that only a poet could describe it, but until a few decades ago it was shut off and pent up by lack of transportation to other parts of the world. Without railroad facilities, without dirt roads, the people had lived there because they loved its beauty, the grandeur of its mountains, the beauty of its sunsets and sunrises. They had grown a great, brave people, but they had had few of the modern facilities for development. They were blessed however in rearing in those surroundings, two great men, brothers, who were to lead them from their hard environment, and by bringing modern conveniences and opportunities to make it such, there is a land that is fairer than day, and I wish by faith that I could make you see it from afar. They commenced to move along every line that Christians and patriots move, and today they are blessed with the finest rural schools in the land, roads that are as up to date and superb as any in the Republic, and with one of the happiest people ever found in all the world.

In 1908 one of these men, unknown to the State at large, a businessman, a farmer, a trader in livestock, moved about the people, and without being a candidate or desiring it, in spite of himself, the party to which he belonged, nominated him for the State Senate. He accepted the nomination in a Senatorial district overwhelmingly Republican, and commenced a campaign unlike any other I have ever heard of in my life. He moved among the people with great celerity. The roads were impassable a great deal of the time, and still when his mode of conveyance broke down, he walked from county site to county site. He engaged in discussion unlike any ever heard before in that part of the country.

Without oratorical blandishments, without large literary attainments, he moved among the people and in their

language, with their homely illustrations, he talked to them about public matters, and the condition in which they were. He talked, and yet never resorted to demagoguery, nor did he ever soil his Christian house with low buffoonery or coarse joke. When the election was over, he had defeated the able, splendid man on the other ticket by a handsome majority, and went to the halls of the general assembly of our State. There, modestly, he commenced to work for his State and his people, and to advocate programs and policies that looked to the progress of his State.

Two years later, in 1910, when he was 47 years old, they nominated him for Congress—this House of Representatives—then represented by my friend, the brilliant and accomplished Republican, Hon. Charles Cowles, a member of one of the most powerful families in the South, a gentleman of accomplishments. Why did they nominate him? The great lawyers and public debaters and natural leaders had nearly all been defeated by the Republican Party in that district. The convention, I can hardly help but think divinely guided, nominated farmer ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, for that high honor, against his wishes and against his will. He commenced a campaign unique and almost impossible of definition or description to you. It was almost a foot race. Hard to travel still, he moved in almost mysterious swiftness through the district, talking to little groups, talking to individuals, talking everywhere, while Mr. Cowles, with that scholarship for which he was noted, was making addresses. But, Farmer Bob went about among the people, moving always as the model man, the devout Baptist brother that he was. And, without trying to use his religious life to secure votes, but, with true sincerity and simplicity, he moved among the people.

There were 10 counties in the district, and 7 of them were Republican. His county was the smallest in the district. My friend Cowles represented the great county of Wilkes, with 2,000 Republican majority, and yet when the election was over, Farmer Bob had been sent to this House of Representatives.

He has been here longer than any other North Carolinian ever represented our State or any district in this House, or either branch of Congress, in its entire history. For 11 years, longer than anybody else, he has been chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means in this House.

Let us study him a little bit. He is a very modest man, but he must take a little in his presence. A very modest man. He does not possess a command of much richness and powerful literary citation and quotation, though he learned the great truths in the Lord God Almighty's book, the Bible. He is deeply grounded in the principles of our great fabric of liberty, and loves them. He is not given to neat phrase, but with simplicity of speech, he still speaks with power upon any subject he discusses. Not a trained orator, but of that type that from the day of the Father of our Country down to this the American people have most honored, unrivaled in the soundness of his judgment and the God-like capacity to decree and decide; a man of almost unparalleled judgment for our day and time. He may lack the scintillating brilliancy of literary orators of today, but in moral vision and spiritual power, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON is one of the greatest men who have ever occupied a seat upon this floor.

I congratulate him upon this, the eightieth anniversary of his birth. May I, without knowing much of the propriety of speech of this occasion, congratulate him upon the fact that the beautiful and noble woman that God gave him for wife still lives and is by his side to comfort and encourage and strengthen him and make him happy as he continues down through the years of life.

May I also congratulate him that his great brother, the greatest legislator who ever served in the halls of the general assembly of my State, still lives, though 8 years his senior, honored by the whole people of the State, still practicing his profession, that of the law, president of a large chain of banks, which he and his brother, Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON, control. Successful in business as our friend has been, honored by all the State, Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has increased its great manufacturing establishments in the last few decades. We have tremendously increased our wealth and we are proud of our factories. We are proud of our banks.

We are proud, oh, very proud, of our rich and fertile farms. We are proud of all our accumulations in material things, but North Carolina's two most precious jewels are the life and example of ROBERT L. DOUGHTON and his great brother, R. A. Doughton.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I voice the true sentiment and the feeling of each of the majority members as well as the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means in joining in this tribute and an expression of these felicitations to our distinguished colleague and warm personal friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. Those of us who have been privileged to serve side by side with him through the years know that he is a man who possesses the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling quantities of manhood, a man of recognized ability and demonstrated devotion to public service; indeed, a great American patriot, a great American statesman who enjoys the confidence, respect, and genuine affection of all the members of the committee over which he presides with such distinguished honor and great ability.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, for me to attempt to add anything to what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] and by our good friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] would be like gilding the lily; yet I cannot refrain from taking the floor for a few moments and paying tribute to one of the great Americans of this period. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON], in his splendid encomium, pictured our beloved chairman of the Ways and Means Committee as an outstanding North Carolinian. My friends, he is more than a North Carolinian; he is an outstanding American, and 48 States of the Union and all the Territories join in paying tribute to this great man today.

It was not given me to attend college in my youth, having been raised in a frontier country, but after having served on the Ways and Means Committee for 10 years under the able leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] I no longer miss what was denied me back in those days. Serving under him has been like going to college.

There is not an abler or fairer presiding officer in either House of Congress. Woe be unto the man who comes before our committee seeking some special privilege or basing his contention upon a false premise. That hard-headed, discerning chairman of ours picks his arguments to pieces. Hardly a day of hearings pass but what he gives expression to some homely truth. I am reminded of one that he made only a few weeks back, while the tax bill was under consideration. He said: "You can shear and shear a sheep, but you can skin it only once." That saying will go down in history. It will endure, it will be used by people of all lands in explaining something just as long as mortal man has the use of his tongue.

BOB DOUGHTON is 80 years young today. With 80 years behind him he is as alert, mentally and physically, as a man of 50, due to the fact that he has always taken good care of himself. He certainly has set a fine example to the other Members of the House in the way of clean living, and it is most unfortunate that more have not profited by his example. But that is neither here nor there; we rejoice in the fact that it is given to us on the Ways and Means Committee to have such an outstanding chairman, and I can say to the American people that so long as BOB DOUGHTON is chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, we will never substitute the wringer for the eagle on our coat of arms. He is not one who believes that because a thing is large it must of necessity be corrupt. He does not believe that you pull the man up from a lower stratum by reaching up and pulling all men down from the upper strata. In all the time I have known him I have never seen him do an ungenerous thing or utter an unkindly thought.

Marse Bob, we join with the North Carolinians today in paying you this tribute, and wishing for you length in years. At the rate you are going now you will be in this House for another 50 years; and, God bless you, I hope you will.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MAJ. JACK ADAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, out of this tragic war has come a number of well-known heroes whose names have been flashed across the continent because of outstanding achievements accomplished under circumstances and conditions that made such feats appear impossible. One of the flying heroes of the present war whose name is known throughout the width and breadth of the land is that of Maj. Jack Adams of Oklahoma.

I am delighted to say that I have known this gallant young officer since he was a small boy. His devoted mother is a very charming and gracious lady who now resides at Walters, Okla., where, incidentally, I also resided as a boy. I had the pleasure of visiting his mother recently at her home and it is needless to add that she is justly proud of her famous flying son who is one of America's outstanding war heroes.

Under the leave granted me, I am including as a part of my remarks an Associated Press dispatch with reference to a review held at the Fitzsimons General Hospital in Denver last week in honor of Major Adams, at which time Gen. John Curry pinned the Distinguished Service Cross and also the Distinguished Flying Cross on this modest young man. The news dispatch in question follows:

MAJ. JACK ADAMS NOW WEARS BOTH D. F. C. AND D. S. C.

DENVER, October 28.—Credited with destroying an enemy transport in early stages of the Pacific war, and with subsequent bravery in the evacuation of American officers from the Philippines, Maj. Jack Adams, 26, wears the Distinguished Service Cross and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Both medals were pinned on the Temple, Okla., hero yesterday by Maj. Gen. John F. Curry, commanding the Army Air Force Western Technical Command, at a Fitzsimons General Hospital battalion review. (Major Adams is a graduate of Cameron College, Lawton.)

Lt. Gen. George H. Brett awarded Major Adams the D. F. C. in April 1942 and 5 months later Gen. Douglas MacArthur cited him for the D. S. C., the Army's second highest decoration. Formal presentation was delayed until the review before General Curry and Brig. Gen. Omar H. Quade, commanding the hospital where Major Adams has been recuperating from the effects of tropical heat, undernourishment, and overwork.

On December 14, 1941, the D. S. C. citation reads: "Major Adams' plane became separated from a formation off Mindanao, but he continued to the target area and bombed and destroyed a large transport."

He was credited with shooting down three enemy fighters, then skillfully landing his plane in a rice field after enemy machine-gun fire disabled two engines of the craft.

He subsequently destroyed the plane, which was beyond repair, hospitalized a seriously wounded crewman, and led the remaining members of the crew "* * *" to rejoin his units 300 miles away," the citation said.

The citation for the D. F. C. said that Major Adams, then a captain, was one of the pilots who flew from Australia in March 1942 with emergency supplies for American forces in the Philippines. With "great courage and superb flying," they returned to Australia with the last remaining members of General MacArthur's staff, and with valuable records.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the Associated Press dispatch referred to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board at the F. B. I. National Police Academy exercises at Washington, D. C., on October 23, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Perry T. Kistler, of Bangor, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARMED SERVICES' HONOR DAY

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 177.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state the purpose and the necessity and the advisability of bringing the bill up at this time in this way?

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, a reading of the bill will explain better than I can. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be read at this time in its entirety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 7th day of December 1943 be, and it is hereby, designated as Armed Services' Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby requested to issue a proclamation commending the observance of that day in honor of all men and women who have served or are now serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America, and in prayer expressing our gratitude to Almighty God for His blessings thus far and imploring His continued favor, protecting care, and aid in their behalf and of the United Nations, the complete victory of their arms, the restoration to health and strength of the wounded and ill, and a righteous, lasting peace.

That the Governor of every State is hereby requested to invoke the cordial cooperation of the people of the State he serves, and that the counties and municipalities are hereby urged to make plans and hold appropriate ceremonies for proper observance of the occasion in every community.

That the proper authorities are hereby requested to authorize such component parts of the military or naval forces to participate in ceremonies attending the observance of Armed Services' Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent, as, in their discretion, may be consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That fitting messages be transmitted through approved channels to all those in whose honor the day is dedicated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker reserving the right to object, this is one of those bills that one dislikes to question; it is one of those bills that has the patriotic touch and fervor that appeals to all of us; but it is also one of those bills that establishes another patriotic day in the vicinity of Armistice Day. I do not want to object, and I shall not object. I understand that the gentleman from California has consulted with the minority leader and he agreed that the bill might come up at this time.

Mr. TOLAN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Therefore, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the last two paragraphs of the joint resolution are to be stricken out.

Mr. MICHENER. Those are the words where the President is authorized to write a letter to everybody in the military services all over the world to tell them what the purpose of this legislation is?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. That is stricken out of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the resolution is passed, will this be a national holiday?

Mr. TOLAN. It is just for 1 year.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not a national holiday.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has chosen Tuesday, December 7, and in the resolution it is contemplated that we shall pray for our men in the armed services, as well as the women, and give thanks to the victories that have come to us therefrom. Why not take the usual day of prayer, Sunday or Thanksgiving, rather than stopping the work of providing our men who are in the armed services with production from the factories?

Mr. TOLAN. There is something to what the gentleman says, but we discussed that in the Committee on the Judiciary and that committee has reported this bill unanimously. The 7th

of December is a day that is very memorable with us.

Mr. DEWEY. Of course, it is the anniversary of Pearl Harbor; we all realize that.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is not a holiday and there is no time lost, of course. This does not provide for December 7 of this year being set aside as a holiday. It is simply a proclamation.

Mr. DEWEY. Purely a proclamation, and there will be no cessation in the war effort?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from California if December 7 is declared to be a holiday for 1 year, will it mean double-time pay?

Mr. TOLAN. This does not provide for a holiday. It does not make this a holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it should be clearly understood that this resolution does not provide for a holiday, but only for a proclamation to be issued designating December 7 as the Armed Services' Honor Day, and provides for the necessary proclamation in connection therewith.

Mr. CASE. This involves no additional expense to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he does not understand that most of our people are praying at least once a day right now? Why put this on a weekday, when you can just as well have it on Sunday?

Mr. TOLAN. It was the unanimous feeling of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With all due respect to that committee, they will use this as another excuse to quit work. We have just heard testimony before a House committee that one of these big factories is only working a third of the time, while at the same time they are drawing pay for overtime and double time, pay-and-a-half and double time. Now, you come along with this. No one wants to object because it is a sort of a patriotic gesture, yet they will be using it as an excuse to quit work all over the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to call for the regular order very soon.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, what would they lose if they waited until tomorrow, one more day, if this went over one more day?

Mr. TOLAN. This bill has been passed by the Senate and we want to get it back there. We have to pass it, and it takes time to get back to the Senate. It is only about 30 days off.

Mr. CHURCH. You would lose nothing if you let it go over until tomorrow?

Mr. TOLAN. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I do object. Let us wait until tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Rather than place the gentleman in the position of objecting, since I am sure he is not opposed to it—certainly, I think it is a very good thing—may I suggest to the gentleman from California that he withdraw his request, with the understanding that it will be submitted tomorrow?

Mr. TOLAN. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a protest against the threatened extermination of Polish children, adopted by the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, a leading fraternal organization in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, and that on Wednesday next I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement issued by the Central Labor Council of my home city of Tacoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, and that on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by former State Senator Frank J. Sell, of Minnesota, entitled "When This War Is Over, What Then?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may clarify the situation as to requests for special orders for Wednesday next, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. MUNDT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there are some Members of the House on this side of the aisle who have some important matters they want to discuss on Wednesday, I shall have to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman desires to discuss something on Wednesday?

Mr. MUNDT. Not I personally, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only reason I submitted this unanimous consent request was that if permission were granted that the House adjourn from Tuesday to Thursday, Members would have knowledge as to the days as to which they could submit requests for special orders.

Mr. MUNDT. As far as I personally am concerned, I have no speeches to make on Wednesday or Friday, but I happen to know of some important business to be discussed on the floor of the House this week. Consequently, I do not believe we should recess beyond a single holiday during the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. We shall have to meet on Thursday anyway.

Mr. MUNDT. Then let us meet every day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall not put the gentleman in the position of objecting. I submitted my request merely to find out just what the feeling was on the part of the Members. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

JAPANESE ON THE PACIFIC COAST

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese demonstration at Tule Lake reveals once again how deep-seated is the problem facing the United States. Repeatedly Congressmen from the far West have been calling attention to this serious issue. I have stated over and over that the overwhelming sentiment in California is, "Now that the Japanese are evacuated from our State, we want them kept out." This latest outrageous Japanese activity is further evidence the question affects not only the Pacific coast; every man, woman, and child in the Republic is involved. Representative HENRY M. JACKSON, of Everett, Wash., now loyally serving with the armed forces, introduced House Resolution 132, asking for a special committee to study and find out the best solution of the whole affair. The Jackson resolution is pending before the Rules Committee. What are we waiting for? The special committee should be at work now. It is of paramount importance. I urge every Member of the House to give earnest consideration to this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Indianapolis News of November 4, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered; and if the House is not in session on Wednesday, that he be permitted to address the House on Thursday for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the legislative business and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after all other business on the calendar has been disposed of and any other special orders, I be permitted to speak for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a very, very shore editorial on a very touchy subject Milk Subsidies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] tomorrow, after other special orders may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his remarks and include certain recommendations of the New England commissioners of agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after all other special orders are disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DRIVE-FOR-ACTION COMMITTEE GETS ACTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the session on Friday the majority leader, responding to an inquiry from the Republican side about the legislative program, said:

> There is no program for next week. From then on, however, there will be a very heavy program.

Mr. Speaker, as announced last week, a number of us have banded together in the drive-for-action committee in an effort to end the repetition of those melancholy, defeatist words, "There is no legislative program for next week," which we have heard with such monotonous and disturbing regularity since Congress reconvened on September 14. We rejoice, therefore, in the majority leader's prediction that "from now on there will be a very heavy program." Our committee will do its best to help make this prophecy a reality.

However, Mr. Speaker, the country and the Congress can no longer thrive on hope alone. Therefore, this week, starting today, the drive-for-action committee will endeavor to present to this House a program for action. We start with discussions under special orders this afternoon—we shall continue our activities tomorrow, and on Wednesday and Friday, so it is only fair that the membership be notified that there will be activity on the floor during the week.

It is hoped many Members besides those on the drive-for-action committee will participate in the general debate scheduled for this week on the problems now vexing and plaguing America. We also urge that Members sign petitions Nos. 13 and 14 on the Speaker's desk and join us in other steps designed to supplement floor debate by floor action in support of the war effort both at home and abroad.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILITARY MEN IN POLITICS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitancy and embarrassment that I suggest to the country that the growing tendency to involve prominent military men now engaged in fighting the war in the discussion of politics is not a good thing for the country. It does not help to win the war. It is not fair to these able military leaders concentrating their efforts upon the one great objective. I hope that each party, all parties, everybody, will declare a sort of truce in that regard until this war shall have been won. At least I submit these observations for whatever they may be worth. I hope they will be seriously considered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday and Friday of this week, after other special orders have been disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes each day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week, after all previous orders have been disposed of, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes each day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Tuesday, after other special orders have been disposed of I be permitted to speak for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article prepared by my colleague from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert an editorial from the Omaha World Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday next after other special orders have been disposed of, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MRUK was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. First that I may extend my remarks and include therein an address by Col. Miles Reber, division engineer for the Missouri River Division, delivered at the National Reclamation Association convention in Denver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. I also ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include an address by S. O. Harper, Chief of Engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation, delivered on the same occasion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES FOR OIL

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 29 Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson denied the proposed 35-cents-per-barrel increase in the price of crude oil, which increase had previously been recommended in April 1943 by the Petroleum Administrator, Mr. Ickes. This increase during the interim, as the Members of the Congress well know, was also denied by Mr. Prentiss Brown, the recent Director of O. P. A.

Practically all of the independent oil companies of the Nation, and many of the best-informed oilmen connected with some of the major oil companies, have consistently appealed for the past year for a raise in the price of crude oil, and in every instance have shown, by correct analysis and figures, that the decline in the drilling of new wells, with a consequent decline in oil reserves, was and is due primarily to the policy of the Government, expressed through the O. P. A. first and later through Director Vinson, to maintain the price set on crude oil in 1941 at a figure so low that it stands today with relation to the general price index of commodities at 60 percent of parity.

The Administration has taken the position that, even though the price of labor has gone up and the use of new labor and scarcity of equipment causing much delay has contributed to production costs to the point today where the best authorities insist that it costs 50 cents per barrel more to produce a barrel of oil than it did when the price was frozen back in 1941, this great and vital industry must be compelled to continue production at a price estimated at about 60 percent of what it should be.

The Administration, through Director Vinson, has rejected every argument of the oilmen of the Nation, most of whom have spent their lifetime in developing this great industry, practically all of whom are against the use of subsidies paid by the Government as incentive to oil production. I have been informed that the Petroleum Administrator for War, who, for years, has worked with and had charge of the governmental direction of oil, does not believe that the use of subsidies is the right approach. His efforts on two or three occasions to convince the Administration that the proper approach was through a raise in price is sound and I submit is the best evidence of his position.

Can it be that out of all of the wisdom of the past in building this great oil production up that, in view of the great record the oilmen of this Nation have made, from the small independent operator in the field up to those men who have been borrowed from the oil industry, who sit in the highest councils on oil problems in the Nation cooperating with the Petroleum Administrator for War—can it be that the wisdom and judgment of these men, gained in the practical and hard field of trial and error, must now be regarded as of little or no value?

By the hard hand of Government control and regimentation millions of barrels of oil per day are being taken from above ground, because it is being used faster than it can be brought out of the ground at 60 percent of its value; at 60 percent of replacement costs.

The oilman is now in the position of a retail merchant who would like to stay in business, but if the same rules are applied to him as are applied to the great oil industry, after he sold out his stock the shelves would be bare.

This is an unwise and unnecessary move away from the philosophy of free enterprise, and I submit that such a policy is unfair to one of the greatest industries of this Nation; that it is an unwise and dangerous policy which may weaken our war effort It is a policy that has so slowed down production that it has helped to bring gas rationing on us Nation-wide, which will likely stay with us for some time after the war is won, unless the little oilmen and the big oilmen of the Nation are allowed a price that will pay for production and, in addition, a small margin of profit.

Mr. Vinson has instructed the Secretary of the Interior, Petroleum Administrator for War Mr. Ickes, to work out and put into effect a subsidy policy. Such a policy is so unnecessary, so unwise, and so opposed by the great majority of the oilmen of the Nation that it is hardly worth while to reproduce some of the arguments against it. It is an extension of the policy of this administration of centralized control and regimentation. It well could terminate in the socialization of this great American industry. It will add to inflation by piling up the national debt, and it will waste the people's money through more bureaucratic administration.

It appears now that the next move that Congress can make is to secure enough signers to petition 14, which is on the Speaker's desk, to bring onto the floor of the House the bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman DISNEY, H. R. 2887, which is now in the hands of the Banking and Currency Committee.

This bill will settle the argument over price, for it will take price control over oil away from the O. P. A. and make it mandatory that the price of oil be fixed

according to the general index price of commodities. It will further place control of oil matters with the Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary of the Interior Mr. Ickes.

The low price during the past year has caused to be abandoned thousands of small producing stripper wells. The stripper wells of the Nation produce 17 percent of our supply—when a well is abandoned the oil is lost to the Nation.

Let me quote a statement issued by Alex U. McCandless, president of the Illinois-Indiana Petroleum Association. Mr. McCandless is a fine businessman of Robinson, Ill., in my district. For 40 years he has followed the oil business as a producer. Here is a man who knows what he is talking about from practical experience in that local field. I quote:

OIL PRICE CEILING MAY FORCE STRIPPER WELL ABANDONMENT

"The refusal of Fred M. Vinson, director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, to approve the increase in the price of crude oil as recommended by Petroleum Administrator for War Harold L. Ickes, and other Congressional committee chairmen will result in the abandonment of hundreds of stripper wells in the counties of Clark, Crawford, and Lawrence in Illinois, and Sullivan and Gibson in Indiana, according to Alex U. McCandless, president of the Illinois-Indiana Petroleum Association.

"Operators in these counties have been operating wells for the past several years at a financial loss, hoping that a reasonable advance in the price of crude oil would justify their continued operation.

"The refusal to allow a price increase will hasten the abandonment of these wells and sizable reserves of crude oil will be lost to the country at a time when our oil production is insufficient to supply the need of the military forces and the general public.

"In addition to the monetary loss to the community as a whole, the individual farm owners will be deprived of an income which they have been receiving for the past 20 or 30 years.

"Crude oil prices have been frozen at 60 percent parity, while the average price of all other raw materials is well above 100 percent.

"The margin of profit in producing oil is so small that the incentive for wildcatting is materially curtailed and without the opening of new pools the public can only look forward to further curtailment of its gasoline needs as the requirements of the military forces augment," Mr. McCandless said.

Now, I want to quote from H. P. Nichols, executive vice president of East Texas Oil Association, independent producers. I quote:

The war has to be won with oil, not hot air from Washington. A collapse of civilian and industrial economy is in the offing. Come Christmas or Easter, the oil supply may drop so low the holders of A cards may be grounded for the duration—A cards may be suspended entirely.

Now, let me quote from D. Harold Byrd, Dallas oilman and wing commander of the Texas Civil Air Patrol:

We are not asking for any favors—just fair treatment. We only want oil to sell on a parity with all other commodities. We are not asking for the same increase in price that labor has received. All we want is parity. Coca Cola sells for 5 cents a glass—oil for 3 cents a gallon. What is wrong with our Washington minds?

Now, I quote from the Beaumont Enterprise, Beaumont, Tex.:

STILL BEATING ABOUT THE BUSH

In rejecting a proposed increase of 35 cents a barrel for crude oil, * * * the Director of Economic Stabilization, Fred M. Vinson, uses an argument that has grown familiar through frequent repetition. * * *

Also, other practical measures can be used to increase petroleum production.

What are those measures? The stock device of offering a financial incentive to bring about the drilling of more wildcat wells and development of new oil fields. Where does the money to offer this financial incentive come from? From the Federal Treasury, of course. The American taxpayers provide the money the Government takes out of the Federal Treasury to pay subsidies and rollbacks, which are the same thing.

By this method of "now you see it and now you don't" the Government tries to make the American people believe it is preventing price increases to the consumer. But the pennies it ostensibly saves the individual in this way are taken away in nickels and dimes to pay the subsidies. In the end the taxpayer pays the subsidies so he is no better off than he was before.

It has been estimated that the proposed increase in the price of a barrel of crude oil will add about half a cent a gallon to the cost of gasoline to the consumer. He probably will pay considerably more than half a cent in the form of subsidy taxes. Just as in the case of food subsidies, an apparent saving is no saving at all. The Administration merely saves face and keeps up the pretext that it is holding the line against inflation, but the taxpayer, as usual, foots the bill. * * *

If, however, none of the compromise measures favored by the economic stabilizer produces the desired results, what will be the next stop? Socialization of the oil industry?

If the Government would, just one time, make a direct approach to an economic problem, instead of an oblique approach, the American people might have more confidence in the Government's willingness or ability to deal with inflation realistically.

Hundreds of the ablest oilmen in the Nation have supported a price raise as against a subsidy. Are they all wrong? These men have made a life's study of oil production.

Shall we scrap the wisdom of their experience of the past, gained by trial and error, and erect on its ruins a bureaucratic structure for the encouragement for the production of oil by subsidies?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was not his intention to make a request that the so-called Disney petition at the desk be signed, along the line he suggested.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman. It is to be hoped by those of us interested in this matter, that as many of the Members as possible, sign petition No. 14. That would bring out the Disney bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix an editorial entitled "The Administration's Wartime Troubles," appearing in the Columbia Daily Tribune, of Columbia, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include certain excerpts in each instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GRATUITY PAYMENTS TO MOTHERS AND FATHERS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under present law, if a man in the fighting forces of America is killed in fighting for his country, his wife or children automatically receive a 6 months' gratuity payment from the branch of the service in which he was serving; but if he has no wife or children, his mother does not receive such a payment unless she has been specifically designated as beneficiary by the soldier or sailor. At the present time there is a bill on its way through the Congress bearing on this general field of legislation. I am informed that that bill is going to be so amended by the time it gets through conference as to provide retroactively that, where there is no wife or children and where no payment has heretofore been made to them, mothers or fathers of men killed in service shall receive these 6 months' gratuity payments even if they have not been specifically designated as beneficiaries by the soldier, sailor, or marine.

This is the way it should have been from the first, I believe, and I want to pay my tribute here and now to a Member of the House today who has worked tirelessly for this just, necessary, and proper reform, and to whom a great deal of the credit for getting this provision into the law is due. I refer to our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD in two instances: In one to include an editorial from American Aviation and in the other to include a brief resolution passed by the American Trucking Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order granted to me today to speak on Thursday next. I now ask unanimous consent that the time be changed to this afternoon to follow the special orders heretofore entered; that I may address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored by having the gentleman from California in the chair. I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes again on the question of subsidies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the only possible connection between what I am going to say this afternoon on the subject of subsidies and the very eloquent and well-deserved encomiums expressed on this floor in behalf of the distinguished and respected gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] would be for me to express the wish that the gentleman from North Carolina may live long enough to see such a subsidy program successful, because by that I wish him everlasting life.

When I first spoke on this subject I quoted from a number of people who had reviewed the attempts in earlier years tc impose similar subsidy programs on the peoples of the various eras in which they lived. My attention was afterward called to the fact that I had omitted a very well known example. This was the attempt of Caius Gracchus to impose subsidies on the people of Rome by exactly the same method which is now being proposed by the bright young men of O. P. A. as an entirely new idea. The O. P. A. economists call it the buy-and-sell method. Caius Gracchus had no name of that kind; he simply bought the grain and gave it or sold it at less than cost to the people of Rome. I would like to quote on that subject from a book which is familiar to all Members of Congress of my college age or older and probably completely unknown to the present generation. First I quote:

> Corn should be sold at a rate artificially cheap to the poor free citizens.

And then I quote again:

> It was the deadliest blow which had yet been dealt to the constitution.

And then I quote again:

> Caius Gracchus, however, had his way and carried all before him. He was elected tribune a second time. He might have had a third term if he had been content to be a mere demagog.

That is the end of the quotation. It is from Froude's Caesar, on page 25.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a little disappointed that the other gentlemen who are speaking on the floor in favor of subsidies have not given us very much in the way of figures to support what they have to say. The opposition, or at least the gentleman from Texas, who follows me each time—and again today will follow me—seems to feel that if we are not in favor of the present subsidy program, the subsidy program as presently offered, we must of necessity be isolationists, or be in favor of Hirohito, or something like that, the connection being not at all clear to me. The opposition is constantly represented as being "in favor of inflation."

If the gentleman from Texas keeps repeating these things in an attempt to persuade himself of their accuracy, I have nothing to say; that is entirely between the gentleman from Texas and his own soul. If the gentleman from Texas is attempting to persuade the Congress of the accuracy of these statements, I should like to call his attention to the fact that this technique and this philosophy of propaganda is too well known to be used successfully in the Congress; in fact, the master propagandist of this generation announced it in his book—and I quote:

> Any effective propaganda must be confined to a very few words and must use these as slogans until the very last man cannot help knowing what is meant. Propaganda must limit itself to saying very little. This little it must keep forever repeating.

Mr. Speaker, I said last time that I would like today, in the 20 minutes I have asked for, to state what it is those of us who fear inflation would like to substitute for the present application of subsidies.

I emphasize application; I have heard nobody say that we do not like subsidies; what I say, and what I have heard the members of the Republican Food Study Committee, or members of the Committee on Agriculture say is that they do not like the present application of the subsidy program. I think, therefore, I should set down four things which are in the minds of those of us who do not like the present program. These four things which we would like to see emphasized or changed——

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I yield briefly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I have little time and I ask the gentleman to be brief.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; I do not like to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought but I believe the gentleman has declared the contention that there have never been any successful subsidy programs. There have been plenty of successful subsidy programs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As presently applied?

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman believe that the British and Canadian subsidy programs have been reasonably successful?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman because that is exactly my contention. My contention is that the British program has been successful. The difference between that program and our program is the point I now make as point No. 1. In the American program of the last war, and in the British program of this war, the basic emphasis was laid on the matter of production. In other words, this Government's program in the last war—under a Democratic administration, so there is no political point involved—and the English program, and the Canadian program, all went directly to the farmer. Each one said, "Produce, and we will guarantee to you the cost of production." I read you the British figures on October 27 showing how the acreage increased.

Mr. WRIGHT. But the price was kept down to the consumer?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The price was kept down to the consumer for a different reason. The English system has no group of slide-rule boys, as we have in O. P. A., who have come out of the middlemen's offices and are not, therefore, particularly interested or particularly, shall I say, experienced in the matter of the producer's problems. Also under the English system the consumer is protected by knowing exactly where to buy, and can get what he or she is supposed to have. You are told to go to a specific store, and you will know that the thing you expect to buy is there for you, in foodstuffs.

Mr. WRIGHT. At a price less than the cost of production, however.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not always, no sir. I do not think so.

Mr. WRIGHT. In many cases?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, sir; not entirely. In some cases in Canada. In England only in cases where there is special difficulty in obtaining things. England is an importing nation. The United States is a producing Nation. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I have heard it said, I do not know how accurate it is, that also under the British system our lend-lease has been of great benefit to them in regard to the working out of the system.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. I thank the gentleman. I think that is so. I am going to ask that I be not interrupted until I make the four points.

The first is production. I have already developed that. We must emphasize production. We must take the uncertainty and confusion out of the minds of the farmers of the United States.

My second point is that the greatest difficulty in the present program, in the present application of the program, is an intangible difficulty. It is raising in the minds of the farmers of the United States an uncertainty as to just what is ahead of them or what they can do. Having asked the farmer to produce, he should obviously be assured of the cost of production. That has been done, as I

said to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the present English system, and also under the system used by the United States in the last war. This time it is not being done in the United States. The farmer has been annoyed, arraigned, badgered, bothered, directed, disturbed, embarrassed, encumbered, fettered, governed, guided, hampered, harassed, harried, hindered, impeded, molested, ordered, perplexed, pestered, plagued, regulated, restrained, shackled, troubled, vexed, and just plain worried, by means of an alphabetical soup of bureaus, many of them more interested in the possibilities of social reform according to their likes than they are in production.

So we should restore confidence to the people of the United States, and the first way to do this is obviously to remove the duplications, and the overlapping functions in connection with food.

Mr. Speaker, this means the immediate passage by the Congress of H. R. 2837, which is the bill of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. FULMER] providing for central responsibility for the production and the distribution of food. I can assure you that no single act of this Congress would do more to recreate a feeling of confidence in the farm areas of the United States than this simple act.

Now, having established a central authority, the next step would be the recreation of some semblance of efficiency. It would follow automatically. At the peak of the last war the administration of food required the employment of exactly 3,000 people, no more, no less; 1,417 of them were working in Washington, and 1,583 were working throughout the United States. The Administration did its own legal work; it issued its own regulations; it released its own publicity; it investigated, and it prosecuted where that was necessary.

At the same time, in World War No. 1, the Department of Agriculture had 25,239 employees. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention particularly to the fact, and the gentleman seated in the Chair will remember this, that in those days there were 7,984 voluntary workers, unpaid, in the counties of the United States. They were proud of their services. They were the ones who made the program successful. The keynotes were cooperation, confidence, and production.

Today, the Department of Agriculture has 73,104 employees. The O. P. A. has 4,800 employees in Washington and 33,700 employees throughout the other parts of the United States. All of these are paid employees. I asked how many of the 38,500 employees of the O. P. A. worked on food-administration problems, and the reply of the O. P. A. official to whom I spoke was that he did not know but that he would be glad to send a questionnaire to each employee, asking each employee to set down the amount of time used each day on matters having to do with the administration of food, and then to compile for me the result. I do not need to ask you if you consider that typical of the present administration of food.

The Army and the Navy buy food, the lease-lend program buys food, and that agency, by the way, did not exist in the last war, yet we delivered in a comparable period of time an equivalent amount of food to the nations who were then our allies. The lease-lend program has 678 employees, 536 of them in Washington, 17 of them from other departments, 8 in other cities, 103 abroad, and 13 of them $1 a year men, who are usually the most expensive of all.

The Food Administration in World War No. 1 did its own legal work. Today if prosecution is necessary, the Department of Justice is asked to prosecute; yet there are 2,700 attorneys in the employ of the O. P. A. alone.

The Board of Economic Warfare, which now has a new alphabetical designation, had 3,257 employees.

Governor Lehman's world organization, familiarly known as U. N. R. A. R.—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation—up to its transfer tomorrow night, when the agreement will be signed, has 156 employees. The agreement will be signed tomorrow night at the White House. On Thursday, representatives from 44 nations will go to Atlantic City and set up a new organization, and select the people who are to head the new organization, and choose its administrators and its clerical employees.

I call your attention to the fact that up to that time, which will include the complete setting up of the organization, with Governor Lehman unquestionably as its head, not once has the executive branch come to Congress and asked for approval, or told Congress officially about it, or asked for funds. I think it would have a very wholesome effect when the request for money does come to Congress, after the work is presumably all done, for Congress to say that we have known nothing about these agreements, which are in effect treaties, and that we naturally cannot vote any money for them until we know something about the agreements and about the proposed workings of the organization, and have had something to say in the matter.

I feel very strongly on that subject, because I am convinced in my own mind that not only are we setting up this organization, but we may be promising the food of the United States beyond the production possibilities of the United States. We are not merely counting the chickens before they are hatched, we are giving them away.

In the First World War, the Food Administration handled its own publicity. Today, when it is necessary to issue a 50,000-word directive to tell the butchers how to cut meat, the O. W. I. does the job. I have been told that a Chicago packing house gave these regulations to some of its expert cutters, who were unable to cut a steer to fit the O. P. A. rules. I take for granted you have to be a graduate of Harvard, an expert surgeon, and a meatcutter, in order to meet the requirements.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I do not believe being a graduate of Harvard would be of any assistance.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He speaks with authority. The O. W. I. has 4,336 employees. In World War No. 1, George Creel had an organization that did a pretty good job, everybody thought, and it had 565 employees. But in those days it was not necessary, as the gentlemen in Congress have heard, to send 100 men to India to tell the people how well and how differently the United States is governing itself.

It is important for all of us to remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are at war, and that we have adopted a policy toward builders of ships and planes in which penurious economy has never been a part. We have subsidized them. We have told the producers to produce. We have permitted them to do almost anything with the labor market. We have built them houses, and we have given them every priority. Why do we not place agriculture upon a basis of production, and emphasize production as we are doing in the other fields?

The time that the pinch will come, Mr. Speaker, is after the fighting is over. I say this sincerely and respectfully to the gentleman from Texas, because it was he who pointed out to me the other day that the war officially ended in 1921. That is a trouble we could all fall into. We look on a calendar, or into a book on economics. The war ended, in the minds of the people, with the end of the fighting war, which will be celebrated on Thursday of this week—Armistice Day. The rise in prices, as can be discovered if anybody cares to read the records of prices, began then, and a comparable place would be the end of hostilities in this war, when we might expect, under the present situation, which is the greatest invitation to inflation that we have ever had in this country, the beginning of the inflation which the gentleman from Texas fears, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania fears, which I fear, and which everybody in Congress fears.

At that time there will be an accumulation of $40,000,000,000 of money unspendable. Agriculture will not have been able under the present subsidy system to increase its production. Farm implements will be worn out. Farm labor will have had the experience of being paid $209 per month to learn how to do something, and $270 per month 6 months later when the employee has learned how to do it. I quote from an advertisement for women employees from 18 to 35, appearing in a California paper.

The most damning thing that can be said about the present ineffective and ineffectual method of food administration, put into effect by the best classroom brains in America, is that it does not work.

There is nothing in the United States, as a result of recent years of academic marketing and producing theories, that could not have been obtained by a drought, a flood, or an earthquake. The same results would now be apparent, without the years of bureaucratic administration, the years of economic experimentation, and the years of trial and tribulation to the American farmers. We simply have less production than this

country is capable of, and we need maximum production, plus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everyone has the deepest sympathy for the men fighting in the South Pacific, due to the type of fighting and the climate. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the matter of furloughs being granted to members of the Armed Forces serving in the South Pacific, and include a letter from the Secretary of the Navy and from the War Department regarding that policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for 30 minutes.

OUR REPUBLICAN FRIENDS IN THE HOUSE ARE ADVOCATING A PROPOSAL THAT WILL GREATLY INCREASE THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND PROMOTE INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question before the Congress and the country is whether or not we will promote and further increase the high cost of living. It is strictly a high-cost-of-living issue. If there were any other way that we could stop an increase in the cost of living, except by subsidies, I would like very much to know what it is, but since no one has been able to suggest any way or method except subsidies to keep down the high cost of living and prevent inflation, necessarily, being in favor of stopping inflation, I am in favor of subsidies until I am shown a better way and another way, so to speak, is pointed out to me. We are in a confused state in many of our domestic policies if we listen to everything that is said or written. It is not as confusing as many would have us believe it is, but after listening to people on the floor, Members of Congress, and after reading newspapers and listening to commenators over the radio, one would think our country is in a very bad condition. I wish that some of the people who are pointing out the faults and wrongs of the administration of law in wartime, when war is waste, and haste makes waste, would at the same time compare the situation in Japan so that we would know how much improved we are, or how much worse off we would be if Japan were to win this war, and at the same time point out to us the situation that exists in Germany, so that we would know which would be the better of the two Governments.

MANY THINGS WRONG

The fact is, there are many things wrong with our country and our Government, but I am glad to say there are more things right about our country and right about our Government than are wrong. It is my belief that there are enough brains in this country to settle the most complex and difficult problems that will arise in America.

It is just a matter of approaching those problems in an understanding way, in an unselfish way, in a way that will be tolerant toward others, and work to the end of saving our country here at home as well as saving it on the 55 battle fronts of the world where our boys are fighting today. With hotheads and confused minds, we are not going to solve this problem, but with cool heads, clear minds, and courageous hearts, all of these problems can be solved.

HIGH INCOME

The fact is that our income today in America is higher than it has ever been in our history. The national income this year will be approximately $150,000,000,000. That means that we will have about $90,000,000,000 worth of goods and services that will be available for the people to buy, who will collect that $15,000,000,000, and after we spend the $90,000,000,000 for goods and services, and then pay $20,000,000,000 approximately in taxes, there will be about $40,000,000,000 of excess purchasing power which might be called hot money that is just out looking for something to buy.

Take into consideration $40,000,000,000 of excess money in connection with our limited and scarce supplies of goods and materials, and you will find that many people will try to buy the same thing, and they will bid the price up unless there is some way of preventing it. The plan to prevent this excess price is a price administration, and I know that many things have been done by the Price Administration that I do not agree with, and many things have been done that I did not think were necessary, but if we had not had a Price Administration our dollars today would not be worth 10 cents, and the middle class in our country would be entirely wiped out. Many people in approaching this problem seem to think that everyone has been receiving extra high wages during this war. True, many have, and possibly too much in many instances; but there is a large group, about one-third of the population of our country, that has not received any increase whatsoever, and every time you increase the cost of living on them it is just the same as reducing their old-age assistance, or their life-insurance check, or their retirement benefit check, or their wages and salaries that have not been increased since this war commenced.

So this, in addition to being a high cost-of-living proposal that has been proposed here to stop subsidies, could very properly be called a bill to cut down all pension checks and reduce all wages and salaries, because, in effect, that is exactly what will be done.

NO DICTATORSHIP POSSIBLE IN UNITED STATES UNLESS PEOPLE VOTE FOR IT

In this country we have what I believe to be the finest and best government on earth. I do not see how you can devise a government that would be better than our American form of government. The people are the masters at all times. Oftentimes you hear people say, "We are liable to have a dictator in this country." That is just as impossible as it can be. It is not possible to have a dictator in the United States unless the people themselves vote for a dictator and want a dictator. Under our form of government this House of Representatives is always close to the people, because they are elected every 2 years by the people in their respective districts. In the United States Senate they are elected every 6 years, but in this body, 435 Members, one-half of the Congress of the United States, the people, the masters, pass upon their records every 2 years. Therefore, every 2 years the people, the masters of this country, can change their form of government entirely if they want to by electing a House of Representatives that will carry out their particular will or wishes at that particular time.

In order to further properly safeguard our Government against a dictator, those who framed the Constitution very wisely said that all monies must be appropriated by the Congress in order to be spent. Therefore, this body that is elected every 2 years must pass on all money that is spent.

In addition to that, in order to have money Congress must pass tax laws. What did the framers of our Constitution say about taxes? In order to protect the people, our masters, it is written into the Constitution that every tax bill must originate in the House of Representatives. It cannot even commence in the United States Senate. It has to originate here where the people have the power to change this body every 2 years.

Could you have a better system of government than that, one that is as far removed from a dictatorship as that? We will never have a dictatorship in this country unless the people themselves vote for one and desire a dictator of a particular kind. If they do they can get it, but as long as the people do not want it we will never have it under our Constitution.

ELECTIONS HERE MANDATORY

In England it is different. In England they have not had an election in 5 years. They can suspend elections over there, but we cannot do it here. We have to have an election every 2 years, and this body must be passed upon by the people in their districts every 2 years. In England possibly they will not have

an election until the war is over, or perhaps a long time after the war. But, every 2 years this body must be elected, because if the House of Representatives were not elected every 2 years there would be no Congress to function, and there would be no way of making people pay taxes. There would be no way of appropriating funds. There would be no way of spending public funds. Therefore, in order for money to be spent, for anyone successfully to have charge of this country, they must operate through and by this body of 435 Members who are elected every 2 years by our masters, the people.

Now oftentimes, especially in wartime, we must do a lot of things we do not like to do. Of course, it is an easy matter to be against all tax bills. Just to say "That is a tax and I am against that"; but, be for all appropriations. Just say, "I am for that." Be for all appropriation bills and against all tax bills. That is an easy popular way, but in wartime we have got to rise above things like that and we have got to save this country, especially when we have 9,000,000 young men in uniform who are offering to give their lives to save it. We should do our part to save it at home. There are two things we have got to do. One is that we must win the war. We are going to do that. We are all pleased with the progress that is being made by our fine, brave soldiers who are fighting this war for us, and the splendid leadership furnished by our Commander in Chief. There is a battle on the domestic front that we must win. That battle is against inflation. If we have ruinous, run-away inflation we have lost as much in money value as we would lose if we lost the entire war. So there is something that can be done right here in this Congress. If we fail to tax, fail to stop inflation, our country is ruined.

WHY PRICE CONTROL IS EASIER IN ENGLAND

The gentleman who preceded me mentioned the fact that in England price control seemed to be so easy. I will tell you why it is so easy. It is because they have had the courage to pay so much of the cost of this war as they go along. They are paying more than 50 percent of the cost of the war as they go along. We are paying less than one-third. They are siphoning off these hot dollars, this excess purchasing power, in the form of taxes, and there is not so much competition among the people for the scarce and limited supplies of goods over there as we have over here. That is the reason it is so much easier. If you will add up the amount of taxes that the average taxpayer will pay for the 2 years 1942 and 1943 in this country, I mean the income-tax payer, and then get the same information for England and Canada, you will find in either England or Canada the average income-tax payer as compared with this one, will pay 300 percent more for the 2 years. We are leaving them with money in their pockets and then expect to hold prices down and expect to pay for the cost of this war. It is not fair for two or three reasons: One of the best ways to stop inflation is by siphoning off this extra money. Another reason is that it is not fair to the ex-servicemen or the veterans of this war who will come back as ex-servicemen to have them win the war on the battle front and then come back here and have to pay two or three times the cost of the war. We ought to pay more of it as we go along, just like England and Canada. That will make our problem less difficult. Furthermore, for every dollar we borrow now we will have to pay two or three dollars eventually. When we borrow money on long-term bonds we really pay about $2 in interest or $3 in interest for every $1 in principal. Every dollar that is paid now, therefore, is the equivalent of two, three, or four dollars that would have to be paid in the future. For several reasons we should pay every dollar we can now, and that is something that is hard to do. It takes a lot of courage and it takes sometimes a lot of beating to stand up against the opposition that you have when you advocate unpopular things like increased taxes and price control.

A BILL TO REDUCE WAGES AND PENSION PAYMENTS

With reference to this particular proposal that will increase the cost of living, the title should be changed to read: "A congressional act to force a higher cost of living," or: "A bill to lower the pensions and retirement benefits and insurance benefits and low wages, and salaries that are being drawn by the middle class of this country" because that is what it will do; it will actually reduce what each receives by increasing the cost of living. What will a Member's answer be if he votes to increase the cost of living when one of his aged constituents says: "You voted to increase my cost of living, why did you not vote to increase my pension at the same time? When will I get my increase to make up for it?"

This particular proposal is in the Commodity Credit Act. The Commodity Credit Act is the best vehicle for good that the farmers have ever had in this country; it has helped the farmer more than any other vehicle. We want therefore to continue the Commodity Credit Act, but in our committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, when this bill came up for an extension of the act recently our friends on the Republican side voted together, they voted solidly together, and three or four Members on our side, the Democratic side, voted with them and they were able to force an amendment that will compel an increase in the cost of living as I have suggested. That amendment is that after December 31 of this year there will be no more subsidies—food subsidies. The present milk subsidy will stop December 31 under this proposal. They do not like food subsidies; they do not like to pay someone else's grocery bill, they say. Now, that is a phrase that is very appealing. It is expressive. Oftentimes you can use a phrase, a slogan, that will carry so much weight and power that it will take an hour of logic and reason in order to combat it. That is an appealing phrase: "We do not want to pay anybody else's grocery bill." Standing alone it seems unanswerable; but that does not tell the entire story; so this section 3 was put into a bill which says there will be no more subsidies after December 31 except—except there will be support prices and subsidies for domestic fats and oils and oilseeds. Now, if our friends think that subsidies are so bad and that they are wrong in principle, why make that big exception? That is a great big exception, that is a big camel's nose under the tent, a great big one—except all domestic fats and oils and oilseeds. I am in favor of excepting them; I am in favor of excepting all. If they are against subsidies why make a few exceptions, why not let it apply to everything? Some believe subsidies are working; some think subsidies are not working. Congress cannot say which ones will work and which ones will not work. There is only one person who can do that; that is the War Food Administrator. He can make a start. If he fails he can back up, he can change, he can use the trial-and-error method; but the Congress cannot do that. We must delegate that power to one person. He can act and act quickly; he can act hurriedly; he can act overnight, so to speak. Congress is too cumbersome in its movements to act so quickly and so satisfactorily. It must therefore be left up to the War Food Administrator.

Why do we have these subsidies? Why are they necessary? In the first place we want lots of food; we have got to have it. Food is just as important and just as necessary as bullets. In this war we need fuel, we need food, we need ammunition, and we need oil, we need petroleum. These are the principal things, and we have got to produce enough food. Now, how are we going to produce that food? The farmer says: "I want to know how much I am going to get. I want a support price. I want you to tell me how much I will get for this if I plant it." There is only one way to do that and that is through the use of subsidies. There is no other way to do it. If there is I wish someone would tell me. To say: "You will get a certain price" is not sufficient. If you say: "We think there will be a lot of money; we think there will be good times, good prices;" that is not sufficient. The farmer wants to know how much he is going to get for his products if he produces them on his farm. There is no other way to assure him except through subsidies. In many cases farmers will not have an opportunity to produce the things they normally produce. They are accustomed to growing certain crops and they grow them year in and year out. They know how to grow them. Many of the people in the administration and the Congress believe that they should change those crops over to other food crops. How are we going to get them to change? They will not change just by asking them. Of course, they are patriotic and they would like to do that. They will ask, "What will we get, what price will we get, if we change these crops over and grow these new crops we do not know anything about? We are not familiar with them. Will we get a fair price, cost of production plus a little profit?" If you cannot use subsidies you cannot tell them anything. You can only say, "You ought to be patriotic and grow those crops." There is only one way on earth to give them support and encouragement to grow those crops and change to

the necessary crops, and that is through subsidies. There is no other way.

There is only one way you can give this support price adequate and sufficient to the farmers as a guaranty and promise on the part of the Government, and that is through the use of subsidies. Let us assume for the sake of argument, we do not know anything about subsidies, let us just depend upon this patriotic appeal and see if we cannot get people to go out there and produce food, just on the risk and chance of getting a good price. Now, suppose we do not produce enough food? We can lose the war through lack of food just the same as we can through lack of bullets. As I heard Congressman Jones, now Judge Jones, back a little while ago say: "Suppose you are in a battle and you only have 90 percent enough bullets. You will lose that battle just the same as if you did not have any bullets at all."

If you go into this war and you run a chance and run a risk in the production of food and you produce only 90 percent enough food, you will lose the war just the same as if you did not produce any food at all. So, Mr. Speaker, let us not take any chances.

This year we are going to spend probably between seventy and one hundred billion dollars on our war machine, and I am for every penny of it and twice that much if it is needed. We have got to have it. Let us use it. Let us not be too close in the expenditure of money for food for the war. Do you not think it is running too much of a risk when we are spending some seventy to one hundred billion dollars a year on tanks, ships, guns, and ammunition, and are not willing to spend $800,000,000, about 1 percent, to be assured and to be guaranteed that we will have enough food to go along with those bullets? That is exactly the point. It is to make sure, to guarantee ourselves that we will have enough food to go along with those bullets. It is too much of a risk to take to say, "Let us see what will happen." We know what might happen.

We cannot expect these farmers to grow these crops, especially new crops, unless we guarantee them some kind of a price. You cannot guarantee them that price without a subsidy. Therefore, we will be running this risk I have been telling you about. The farmers have a lot in the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not have time to discuss it, my time is passing rapidly, and instead of that I will go on to the question of whether or not subsidies are wrong.

ARE SUBSIDIES WRONG?

Since when have subsidies been wrong? The First Congress was called to meet on March 4, 1789. A quorum did not assemble until some time in April and they did not get down to business much until June. The first general law that passed the First American Congress was a subsidy law, a tariff law, that has cost the people of this country up to $4,000,000,000 a year. It has been on the statute books ever since in one form or another. Another of the first laws that was passed was a subsidy law subsidizing shipping, saying by law: "If you transport your goods into this country on vessels owned by United States citizens you will get a 10-percent reduction in your tariff duty." There were two subsidy laws passed at the first session of the First Congress of the United States and they have remained in effect in one form or another ever since that time.

In addition to that there are the railroad subsidies. Some seventeen to eighteen million acres of land were given to the railroads of this country as a pure subsidy. No one denies that the inland waterways have been subsidized. Certainly they have. When has the word "subsidy" become so obnoxious, when did it become so bad? The merchant marine also has been subsidized, air mail has been subsidized, and there is one other that is of especial importance today.

NEWSPAPER SUBSIDY

Washington started it more than 150 years ago when newspapers and magazines were subsidized. Washington was exactly right. He in effect said, "Do not make them pay the full postage. Let us pay part of their postage. Give them a subsidy so we can disseminate knowledge more easily." I agree with what Washington said. The newspapers and magazines enjoy a subsidy that is equal to almost $100,000,000 a year. Is the word "subsidy" so bad? If so, why do they not refuse to take it? It is true it serves a good purpose, and I am for it. It is passed on in the form of a lower subscription rate, which is a fine thing. Sometimes it is not all passed on but most of the time it is. It is a fine thing, but it is a subsidy in favor of the newspaper and magazine even if passed on to the subscribers.

A subsidy on food would be a subsidy in favor of the consumer of that food and would help the taxpayers, because they would save so much money by reason of it. Under the laws of this country, Mr. Speaker, a newspaper can have a thousand subscribers or a hundred thousand subscribers within a county where the newspaper is circulated, where it is distributed, and that newspaper does not pay one penny of postage, not one penny, on that circulation. The newspaper will just take the papers down to the post office, the civil-service employees will take them and circulate the papers in that county—a thousand, ten thousand, or a hundred thousand papers—and the newspaper not pay out one penny on earth. That is a pure subsidy. Then if some are transported out of the county, the rate is very low.

If we are against all subsidies, why not stop that? No; we should not do it because it is a good subsidy; it is in the interest of the people. I am telling you that this effort to make it appear that all subsidies are wrong is just applied to the farmers and the low-income groups alone. It is only when it comes to helping the farmer and the poor fellow who is getting $30 a month pension that the word "subsidy" becomes such an obnoxious one. If a subsidy is so bad, why not stop it on copper, why not stop it on lead, zinc, and aluminum, and on the transportation of fuel oil, and on sugar, and dozens and hundreds of other things I could name?

The fact is that there is no deliberate intent to stop subsidies generally. The only subsidy they want to stop is one that will help the farmers and help the poor people in the lower-income brackets. Imagine all these people who are getting subsidies trying to tell the farmer that a subsidy is so obnoxious. Imagine the newspapers and the magazines that receive a benefit indirectly of $100,000,000 a year, and the railroads and the inland waterways, and those who are beneficiaries of the tariff and of the subsidy on copper and lead and zinc and aluminum, telling the farmer, "Oh, subsidies are awfully bad; you should not take them; it is wrong; it is wrong to pay someone's grocery bill."

You do not hear anybody trying to change that subsidy on petroleum. You know when the submarines became quite active around in the Gulf of Mexico it was necessary to send petroleum by rail to the Northeast. The excess cost of transportation would have made the cost of it almost prohibitive to the people in New England. What did our Government do? It stepped in and paid the extra cost, as it should. It costs hundreds of millions of dollars a year, but it is a subsidy. Who wants to stop that? Nobody wants to stop it.

As to public housing, you must have good housing accommodations for the people around the defense plants. The Government had to step in and build the houses and charge a rent that will not pay for the housing.

The point is, it is so wrong, it is said, to pay a food subsidy when it will save the consumers of this country, the taxpayers, from $5 to $30 for every dollar that is paid; but it is all right to help pay the fuel bill of the people in New England—I am for that; it is all right to help pay the rents of people around defense plants—that is all right; and it is all right to pay all these other subsidies I am talking about; but for the farmer and the low-income group it is absolutely wrong.

I plead with you to study this question. I know whenever you do you will be for the only method, the only alternative, for keeping down the cost of living, and that is subsidies.

I am inserting herewith in parallel columns some interesting prophecies and what actually happened:

FOOD PROPHECIES AND FOOD FACTS—A COLLECTION OF PREDICTIONS RESPECTING AMERICAN FOOD MADE DURING THE PAST YEAR, WITH STATEMENTS OF WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED

PREDICTION	ACTUALITY
Louis Bromfield wrote in the New York Times for February 11, 1943, that "on the food production front we lost the year 1942, and now we have lost the year 1943."	Nineteen hundred and forty-two was the sixth consecutive year in which new all-time records for food production were established, with production 26 percent higher than the 5-year pre-war average. Farmers this year are making their seventh consecutive new all-time record, with production almost a third higher than the 5-year pre-war average.

PREDICTION	ACTUALITY
Herbert Hoover told the Midwest Governors' Conference at Des Moines, according to the New York Times of March 16, 1943, that a recent survey by county agricultural agents indicated decreases in planting of 11 to 20 percent.	Planted acreage in 1943 increased by 2.6 percent over 1942—an increase of 9,259,000 acres.
Clarence Francis, president of General Foods, Inc., told the War Food Industries Committee, according to the New York Times of March 17, 1943, that action by all divisions of the food industry was imperative if the country was to be spared "the tragedy of near famine in wartime."	Food allocations to civilians are 5 percent greater than the food consumed on the average per capita in the 1935–39 period and, according to competent nutritionists, greater in nutritive value than in the 1935–39 period.
H. W. Vorhees, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau Federation, was quoted by the New York Times of April 20, 1943, as saying that the consuming public would be "on a 70-percent food ration within 9 months."	Civilian food allocations total 75 percent of our food supply, but this supply is now so large that civilian allocations are the equivalent of the average food supply in the 1935–39 period.
Louis Bromfield, in Reader's Digest for August 1943, spoke of a coming wheat crop 20 to 40 percent below normal.	The 1943 wheat crop was 97,404,000 bushels larger than the 1932–41 10-year average.
Donald Montgomery, U. A. W., wrote in the Survey Graphic for February 1943 that our food production had reached its wartime peak and would decline from then on.	New all-time food production records have been established by farmers every year since 1936, and 1944 food production goals will be higher than 1943 goals.
Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, addressing the Council of State Governments on April 9, according to the New York Times, predicted a catastrophe on the food production front and attributed it to the Government's crop-restriction program.	There is no crop-restriction program affecting any food crop. Tobacco acreage alone is controlled. Food production in 1943, nearly a third higher than pre-war, is at a new all-time high for the seventh year in succession.
Louis Bromfield stated in Reader's Digest for August 1943 that the volunteer farm laborers would be a green army who could accomplish little in aiding farmers.	In the last 3 years 3,100,000 farm people have taken other employment. In 1943 an estimated 2,700,000 placements of farm workers were made under the farm-labor program. Harvesting of the greatest food production in United States history is nearing completion.

The following statement was prepared in the office of the War Food Administration:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON AGRICULTURAL SUBSIDIES

1. Question. What is the purpose for which agricultural subsidies are advocated at present?

Answer. Agricultural subsidies are advocated for the purpose of providing returns to farmers sufficient to secure adequate food production without substantial increases in prices which consumers must pay for food.

2. Question. Are increased returns to farmers necessary to secure adequate food production?

Answer. For some commodities present prices seem adequate to bring forth the desired production. For others, however, prices are not sufficient to cover added risks and costs of expanded production. In some cases the needed volume of production can be obtained only by extending production into new areas and by having farmers shift from the production of commodities with which they are familiar. In other cases prices received by farmers have not increased as much as their costs for supplies, equipment, and labor used in production.

3. Question. Are prices above parity necessary in order to obtain kind of agricultural production needed in the war effort?

Answer. Prices for some commodities need to be above parity in order to be in a desirable relation to prices for other commodities and in order to cover production costs adequately.

No price ceilings on farm commodities may be imposed which reflect less than 100 percent of parity. Price support programs must be at 85 to 90 percent of parity. This means, in effect, that few, if any, commodities will sell for less than parity, including the basic commodities.

But we need increased production of a large number of other products, particularly dry beans and peas, the oil crops, potatoes, vegetables, dairy products, and eggs. In order to get farmers to shift from commodities with which they are familiar and for which they can get parity prices to products with which they are less familiar and for which their facilities are less well adapted, it may be necessary to assure them prices, for the kind of products we need, substantially in excess of parity.

4. Question. Will subsidies increase production as much as a corresponding increase in farm prices?

Answer. All the evidence indicates that subsidies will increase production as much as corresponding increases in farm prices. Of the commodities for which increase in production was requested in 1943, soybeans, peanuts, and potatoes were the most heavily subsidized. Price-supports were announced for all three of these commodities, which will involve losses (subsidies) through resales. In addition, a direct incentive payment on potatoes is being made.

Despite the large increase in production requested for these crops, production has approximated the goals. The potato acreage was increased nearly 25 percent over 1942, and production is up more than 25 percent. The soybean acreage was up 7 percent over the record acreage of last year, which, in turn, was more than three times the average acreage grown during the preceding 10 years. The peanut acreage was up 20 percent over last year, when the acreage was more than double the average of the previous 10 years.

Moreover, in the case of soybeans and peanuts, most farmers were not conscious that a subsidy was involved since they received the entire returns for these crops at time of sale. A direct subsidy payment is being made on potatoes, yet the increase in production has been even more than requested.

5. Question. Will an increase in farmers' prices, if passed on to consumers, mean an increase in wage rates?

Answer. The only reason why the Administration has been able to substantially hold the line on wages since last April is that food prices and other costs of living have been largely stabilized. We may want to argue that wages should not increase if food prices increase, but it is the considered opinion of those in constant close touch with the situation that such increases cannot be prevented. The records both support the fact that prices and wages tend to move together and support the contention that wage increases would be demanded if food prices advanced.

6. Question. Are subsidies more or less inflationary than price advances?

Answer. Under conditions as they exist in this country, subsidies are almost certain to be less inflationary than price advances. Subsidies are inflationary to the extent that they represent the disbursement of Government funds obtained through borrowings from banks. To the extent that subsidy payments are matched by increased taxes or increased barrowings from nonbanking sources, the payments are not inflationary.

Similarly, price advances are inflationary when they lead, directly or indirectly, to an increase in Government expendture financed by borrowings from banks. Increased agricultural prices mean increased food prices. Increased food prices mean increased wages. Increased wages mean increased manufacturing costs. Increased manufacturing costs mean increased prices for manufactured products. The Government is now spending at the rate of $100,000,000,000 a year, most of which goes for food, guns, planes, tanks, ships, ammunition, and other war materials.

With Government expenditures for war materials at this high level, even a very small percentage increase in prices for these materials would greatly exceed the amount contemplated in agricultural subsidy payments. If, as seems certain, increases in food prices through a sequence of wage and price increases would bring about a general increase in costs of war materials, that would cost more than the subsidy method.

7. Question. Will subsidies increase the national debt?

Answer. Of course, subsidies will increase the national debt, but the increase will be less than if prices are permitted to spiral upward, because the savings on the huge volume of goods and services bought by the Government will be so much more if prices are stabilized by subsidies than the cost of the subsidy itself.

8. Question. Are subsidies un-American?

Answer. No; unless all the activities of the United States Government, since 1776, have been un-American. In the last 150 years, we have subsidized homesteaders and railroads through land grants and domestic industry by means of high tariffs. We have directly and indirectly subsidized merchant shipping and air transportation. More recently we have subsidized agriculture through the A. A. A. program, parity payments, and the collection of interest on farm-mortgage loans at less than the rates specified in the loan agreements.

9. Question. What different types of subsidies have been used in agriculture in recent years?

Answer. (a) A. A. A. allotment payments; (b) A. A. A. conservation payments; (c) parity payments; (d) grants to farm families; (e) Government services, extension and research, Federal and State; (f) absorption of part of the interest on farm mortgages; (g) price supports and nonrecourse loans on which losses are incurred in disposing of the stocks at prices below the loan rate; (h) payments to processors or other middlemen which permit a decrease in prices to consumers without decreasing prices to producers. Examples include meat and butter payments made by the Defense Supplies Corporation; (i) payments to processors or other middlemen which permit an increase in prices paid to farmers without increasing prices to consumers. Examples include the cheese, fluid milk, and hay and dairy feed payments by the Commodity Credit corporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address by Mr. Cedric Foster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief speech by Col. George Cocheu.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on subsidies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE LATE GEORGE W. LOFT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this House, George W. Loft, died Saturday at Baldwin, Long Island. He passed away at the age of 78. His career is known to all of us in our State and throughout the country. In 1913 he was elected to Congress from the old Bowery district to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Big Tim Sullivan. He was reelected, and at the expiration of his second term in 1917 retired and no longer held public office. He was a distinguished citizen of my State and held the respect of all who had the privilege of knowing him. May he rest in peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DISLOYAL JAPANESE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was startled to read in the newspapers that 500 Japanese invaded the administrative building of the Tule Lake camp and that 20 Japanese armed with clubs and knives had to be taken into custody, and that some of the internees were injured. It is shocking to read about the disturbances created by the Japanese internees at the relocation camp. It is almost as distressing to see in this morning's paper that the Dies committee is going to probe the situation. It seems that no matter what happens anywhere, the Dies committee is always ready and eager to start a new investigation. It does not seem to matter to them that they have wasted about $600,000 of the taxpayers' money on their previous attempts at investigating without bringing in any constructive legislation to remedy some of the situations they were supposed to have investigated.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that the war is going along very well. Our Army, Navy, and marines are doing a great job and we hope that the war will soon be over. I am afraid, however, that we are letting our boys down on the home front. The very things they are fighting against—the myth of racial supremacy, racial intolerance, and bigotry—have raised their ugly heads in our own country. There are certain groups in this country who are using the emotional instability of people facing wartime conditions to further their own ends in sowing distrust among our people and in poisoning their minds against some of their allies and even against some of their own fellow Americans. Why have not such groups been investigated? Why, when our Justice Department finally does try to expose some of the ringleaders, these troublemakers even find defenders on the floor of this House.

Coming back to this Japanese question, there is not any doubt in my mind that some of the Japanese in this country have no business to be here, and there is no doubt in my mind that some are disloyal. They should be dealt with accordingly in a lawful way and I believe it should be left to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to deal with this problem and to determine what should be done. Some time ago our committee tried to get through a resolution to give them authority to investigate certain conditions involving aliens and Americans of foreign extraction. This problem does not come under the jurisdiction of the Dies committee. The members of that committee do not have as much experience in dealing with such a problem as have the members of our committee. Let us have some action that will eradicate these evils. We should have the right to study these questions more closely. Here is what is in my mind. It is my best judgment that all these Japanese aliens ought to be brought together and if they are disloyal or advocating anything contrary to the best interests of this country, they should be deported to Japan in exchange for some of the Americans still in concentration camps in Japan. I would give all of the disloyal Japs back to Japan and take back whatever we can of our own citizens.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to make sure that the gentleman understood that all of the Japanese in the Tule Lake camp are disloyal Japanese who have been taken from the other camps and segregated there, and also, I forget how many, but a small number of disloyal ones from Hawaii, had also been brought there.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I say to you that our committee should be given the authority to study this question so as to enable us to bring in legislation which would remedy the situation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has a resolution before his committee now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We will get to that resolution in a moment.

Mr. RUSSELL. And I may state that there is a bill now before the gentleman's committee which if he will report favorably and it can be passed will deport everyone.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Which bill do you have in mind?

Mr. RUSSELL. I forget the number of it. I am the author of it. I wrote it, but it is in your committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As a matter of fact I have a number of bills that, in my judgment, do not hit the point that we are trying to make, and that is to destroy un-Americanism and remove from our shores disloyal people, whether they are Japanese or any other disloyal people in this country. It is a rather delicate situation, but we should be able to find some workable solution.

In addition to the naturalized aliens of Japanese blood, there is a large group of native-born Americans of Japanese descent. What has the committee before it to justify the taking away or canceling of their citizenship? We cannot very well take away the birthright of a person born here, just because he is of Japanese descent. If necessary, however, it would seem to me that in cases of disloyal native-born Japanese we might take away some of their civil rights, which the Congress would have the right to do. In that way we might take away some liberties that they have been exercising by right of citizenship, when in truth and fact they are nothing but spies for the Japanese Government.

All three of these questions will have to be determined, not by a lot of hysterical publicity but by some legislation that

will settle these problems in a legal manner. It is very difficult for any congressional committee to bring out any constructive measures unless it has been given an opportunity to judge the situation and investigate it so that it can intelligently present the matter to the House. Our committee has asked for this authority time and again, but this House—or, rather, a certain group in the House—was able to block it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a bill, H. R. 2701, before our committee now. I have given this matter some very, very serious consideration. We are all trying to find some way to dispose of all disloyal people in this country. We know of the Japanese menace.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to say to the gentleman that I am in accord with a majority of his statements made on the floor this afternoon. He specifically referred to a bill of which I am the author. I would like to call attention to the fact that the bill expressly and definitely takes in those American citizens who have declared their allegiance to one of our enemy nations, and nothing else.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes. I know that the Department of Justice, through Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has done the greatest job in wartime or in peacetime of any investigating agency. But, at the same time, we are a democracy, and we hope to remain a democracy, and that entails certain responsibilities in our dealings with people. The gentleman's bill, as much as I agree with him as to the necessity of punishing disloyal Japanese, is too broad and may endanger the civil rights of native-born loyal Japanese. The question is, Can we take away the birthright of a man of Japanese birth? My judgment—and I believe Attorney General Biddle agrees with me along that line—is that we cannot do it that way. You can take care of an alien who is not a citizen. You can disfranchise a naturalized citizen because of disloyalty to our country, especially in time of war. But what shall we do with the native-born disloyal Japanese?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would do the same thing that you have done with any other American citizen under wartime conditions, if those in power were inclined to function as they should function. You can take away their citizenship under circumstances as set forth in that bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would like somebody to tell me when this country ever took away the citizenship of a loyal American-born person. It has never been done in the history of this country. It is an entirely new proposal. There are thousands of those persons who are just as loyal to American principles as any other nationality. I think it is wrong to even suggest that we take away the citizenship of decent, loyal, law-abiding citizens who have never committed any wrong but who were born in this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think that is the intent and purpose of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I do not think it is the intention of any Member of Congress to hurt any law-abiding person born here. We are talking about disloyal people. I admit this is a very delicate subject and that is the reason we have to be very careful in working out a solution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want it understood that I hold no brief for any person who has sentiments of loyalty to any other country except the United States, no matter whether they were born in this country or not, but my plea is for those persons who have professed their loyalty.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman is a member of the Dies committee, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have read your minority report on the Dies committee and I think it was very constructive and very enlightening, but in your report, as well as in the majority report, I have never seen any recommendation to the Congress as to just how to deal with disloyal Japanese who, in my judgment, are a menace to our war effort, without hurting the loyal citizens of Japanese ancestry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to my splendid friend and colleague who voiced the very splendid statement a moment ago in which I am in complete accord, that in California in our internment camps, we have over 18,000 American citizens who have, in the screening process conducted by your Government and my Government, definitely stated their allegiance to their own country, Japan, even though they are Americans. That is what my bill, along with others of like character, covers.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I think I stated before that I am not putting up any argument or holding any brief for any person who has not been proven absolutely loyal to this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have never indicated that I favored handling disloyal persons with kid gloves; so that is perfectly understood.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think both you gentlemen are right. I do not think any Member of this House wants to go beyond the realm of the Constitution. The question under the Sheppard bill and other similar bills is: Can we take away the birthright of a Japanese-American born here? Would not the better way in the cases of disloyal Japanese be to take away their civil rights, rather than to try to destroy the fundamental principles of our Constitution? I am just as anxious to find a solution to this problem as is my colleague from California. As he no doubt remembers, I scheduled a hearing on his bill some time ago but it had to be postponed because he was unable to appear before the committee at that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Gladly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the gentleman believe that under our constitutional procedure a person who, during wartime, declares his allegiance to another country, especially one with which we are at war, has automatically sacrificed his so-called privilege of birth?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman knows how I feel about that. I have talked to him. As a matter of fact I am willing to set this bill down for a hearing with what little knowledge we have on this question in the hope that something can be worked out. The committee has not been given an opportunity to study the question thoroughly. We had hoped to have that opportunity. We had hoped through some intense study of the problem to bring back some suggestions which would render harmless every individual who seeks to destroy our form of government and, in fact, all people who are disloyal in time of war. Speaking as a lawyer, and I think you will agree with me, I do not see how we can take away the birthright of any individual by legislation alone, for to do that would be to take away some of the rights guaranteed him under the Constitution. It is easy enough to take care of an alien or a naturalized citizen, but I doubt very much whether it would be constitutional to do what these gentlemen seek to do in the bills they have introduced.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, as chairman of this committee, that I am more than happy to cooperate with the membership of this House. I am willing to stretch the point as far as any gentleman wants to stretch it if the process does not destroy the fundamentals of our Bill of Rights in the Constitution. It seems to me it is high time we stopped long-winded investigations, time that we got some legislation; or if further investigation seems necessary some committee should be empowered to make recommendations which could be carried out and would result in constructive legislation which would destroy our enemies.

As a result of some fine work by the Department of Justice under the able guidance of our Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle, the citizenship papers of thousands of naturalized citizens have been canceled, and rightfully so. Some of these people are to be deported after the war; all would be deported now were there a place where they could be sent. It was done in an orderly fashion, however. The people were brought into court and the Government sustained its case against them. There are many more thousands of disloyal people in this country, not only people of Japanese birth but Americans, white people, native-born, who have not been 100 percent

in support of our country in this critical war period.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article relating to a splendid example recently established by the officers of Boston University providing a free college education for the children of every one of the graduates of Boston University who die or are killed during this war.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders that I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ARMY AIR CORPS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, 2 short years ago a lot of people we know were shaking their heads and repeating the formula of the day—"Too little, and too late." Most of them were well-meaning people who did not realize that it was they who were primarily responsible for the state of affairs they so readily deplored.

The United States was caught napping at Pearl Harbor, caught without enough airplanes in any of the major theaters of war, and the best that most of these well-meaning folk could do was shake their heads sadly and mumble, "Too little, and too late."

Some of these people came to life very suddenly. They said we must build 50,000,000 airplanes in a hurry, and train 100,000,000 skilled crews in a hurry, but the majority of them were simply left mumbling, "Too little, and too late."

Some of those people, I am afraid, were born too little, and too soon.

They were born too soon—soon enough to have their minds cluttered up with a lot of fine antique notions about air power. To them air power meant gallant dogfights over "no man's land," a little reconnaissance and maybe some effective functioning as a kind of long-range artillery. Airplanes, to the best of our friends' recollections, were something you went up in to look over the terrain—or to help out some ground troops who found themselves in a jam. That was their conception of air power.

Now, ordinarily very few of us spend our nights sitting up with copies of field manuals published by the War Department. But some of our more alert newspapermen recently called attention to a paragraph in one of these bookets—Field Manual 100–20, entitled "Command and Employment of Air Power."

The paragraph reads as follows:

Land power and air power are coequal and interdependent forces; neither is an auxiliary of the other.

That is a simple statement, axiomatic and completely self-evident to anyone who has followed the military campaigns of the past 10 years, if only in terms of headlines. But, some of our friends, whose education was completed on the day of the armistice in 1918, went into something of a dither. They began to view with alarm. And when people like that view with alarm, they take the rostrum or rush into print with equal abandon.

Was this a move toward an independent air force, they demanded. Did it mean that we have given up the idea of a large-scale invasion of the European continent? Why should not an air commander be held responsible to officers who ranked him? What had the Army Air Force ever done to merit such consideration? Our friends were highly exercised, and they wanted to know.

If they had taken the trouble to read a little further into Field Manual 100–20, at least some of their doubts might have been allayed.

Allow me to quote two paragraphs:

2. Doctrine of employment: The gaining of air superiority is the first requirement for the success of any major land operation. Air forces may be properly and profitably employed against enemy sea power, land power, and air power. However, land forces operating without air superiority must take such extensive security measures against hostile air attack that their mobility and ability to defeat the enemy land forces are greatly reduced. Therefore, air forces must be employed primarily against the enemy's air forces until air superiority is obtained. In this way only can destructive and demoralizing air attacks against land forces be minimized and the inherent mobility of modern land and air forces be exploited to the fullest.

3. Command of air power: The inherent flexibility of air power is it greatest asset. This flexibility makes it possible to employ the whole weight of the available air power against selected areas in turn; such concentrated use of the air striking force is a battle-winning factor of the first importance. Control of available air power must be centralized and command must be exercised through the air force commander if this inherent flexibility and ability to deliver a decisive blow are to be fully exploited. Therefore, the command of air and ground forces in a theater of operations will be vested in the superior commander charged with the actual conduct of operations in the theater, who will exercise command of air forces through the air force commander and command of ground forces through the ground force commander. The superior commander will not attach Army Air Forces to units of the ground forces under his command except when such ground-force units are operating independently or are isolated by distance or lack of communication.

That makes sense. It is air-power doctrine, streamlined to be sure, but not by an advertising agency artist under instructions to be visionary. It is air-power doctrine forged in the heat of combat and hammered out by men who placed not just their reputation but their lives at stake. It makes sense, and it has produced something that even the most hidebound exponents of the Maginot Line or the Greek phalanx must recognize—results.

On the day of Pearl Harbor—due, at least partly, to the efforts of people who are now loudest in their demands for action—our Air Force was as ill-equipped to meet the needs of the moment as any other arm of the service. Our strength in combat aircraft was approximately 3,000 planes, or about the number used by Hitler in the Polish campaign alone. Fewer than 1,200 of this 3,000 were actually suited to combat service.

Slightly over 500 planes of this first-line strength had been deployed to meet a possible attack on the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. Within a few hours—hours, I repeat—350 of these were smashed in the air or on the ground.

With its remaining strength, the United States Army Air Force was called upon to do the following jobs—I list only a few:

First. To defend the continental United States from aerial attack.

Second. To garrison with airplanes and crews, and to defend from aerial or any other kind of attack, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Panama, Trinidad, Newfoundland, Iceland, Greenland, the Virgin and Windward Islands, and British Guinea.

Third. To collaborate with the Navy in keeping the supply lines open to Australia.

Fourth. To operate China's only connecting line with the Allied world.

Fifth. To meet the urgent, and often desperate, demands of all war theaters for airplanes and crews.

Sixth. To set up training schools, complete with curricula, instructors, and matériel, for an air force of two and a half million specialists.

Seventh. To initiate and supervise the production of hundreds of thousands of combat, transport, and training airplanes of an immense variety of types and models.

Eighth. To organize and maintain a world-wide network of airways for the transporting of vital matériel and personnel.

Ninth. To plan for offense while fighting on the defensive against overwhelming odds.

Tenth. To implement our Commander in Chief's characterization of our country as the arsenal of democracy by feeding some of our finest airplanes and best trained men to the United Nations forces everywhere.

Those were some of the jobs that our Army Air Force was called on to perform—in a hurry.

As General Marshall observed in his biennial report to the Secretary of War, there is only one man who can tell the real story of how the Air Forces met this challenge. And that is General Henry H. Arnold, who, without a moment's recrimination against those who had for decades overruled his far-sighted proposals, pitched into the job at hand with imagination, driving energy, and complete scorn of obstacles. I hope General

Arnold will find time to tell that story in the not too distant future.

In the meantime, it may be well to recall just a few of the extraordinary achievements in this war of our Army Air Force:

First. The existence of the Army Air Force is primarily responsible for the fact that not a single American home or factory has been bombed.

Second. Australia has not only been kept in the fight but today our Fifth Air Force, under General Kenney, is knocking the Japs out of the sky and driving them back along their own triumphant path—fast.

Third. China's life line in the air is intact, and our Fourteenth Air Force, under General Chennault, has already accounted for hundreds of enemy planes and has established a matchless record of approximately nine Jap planes brought down to each one lost by us.

Fourth. Together with the R. A. F., the Army Air Force is systematically, relentlessly crushing Germany's ability to wage war, saving millions of American lives in the land invasion to come.

Fifth. Already at least 2,300,000 specialists—pilots, gunners, bombardiers, navigators, mechanics, weathermen, radio operators, a list of several hundred occupations—have been trained and are functioning at their appointed tasks.

Sixth. Airplanes—the best in the world—have been developed to meet every conceivable need of a well-rounded combat force. Those airplanes are rolling off assembly lines and roaring into action on every front of this immense war. Our Army Air Force has been in continuous contact with all our enemies on every front since the beginning of the conflict. We have established air superiority on every front. When American ground troops look into the skies today, it is American war planes that they see.

Let us be accurate in our characterization of these matchless achievements. The existence and operations of the Army Air Forces represent what General Arnold has justly called our "margin of victory"—the difference between winning and losing this war.

Our "margin of victory"—nothing less.

In building up this margin we have acquired a vast body of invaluable experience. This experience has been boiled down and published by the War Department as Field Manual 100–20. The fact that so much inept debate and speculation has been aroused by this simple, incontrovertible little document is, I am sure, a tribute to something or other. A tribute, let us say, to the patience of the American soldier.

All in all, perhaps it is a very good thing that some of the debates carried on at home never do reach our soldiers on foreign duty, or reach them late enough to provide some innocent merriment. All the same, I think I would like to be present when General Spaatz, for one, runs into some of the confused speculation now going the rounds about Field Manual 100–20.

General Spaatz, you see, has in his quiet way been proceeding for some years now on the natural assumption that land power and air power are indeed coequal and interdependent forces; that neither is an auxiliary of the other. As commander of the joint R. A. F.–A. A. F. forces in northwest Africa, his job, as a coequal, was to help clear the Germans and Italians out of that continent.

Fortunately for us and for the British, the Italians in Africa never had the opportunity to make a very careful study of FM 100–20, which was published only last July. In 1940 the Italian Air Force in Africa was vastly superior in numbers and quality to the R. A. F., which had no more than a handful of obsolete planes. But the Italian Air Force was dispersed in penny packets at the beck and call of local ground commanders, who used it to give protection to their own sectors. In that campaign, the R. A. F., employed as a true air force should be, in concentrated mass, utterly destroyed some eleven hundred Italian aircraft.

In our final push from Egypt across the desert the ground commander and the air commander lived together in intimate daily consultation. They made their plans together, each stating what his force could contribute to the general victory.

They worked together in complete harmony. They both knew that only the long reach of air power could achieve a quick triumph in Tunisia. They knew that it would be easier to destroy the enemy than to push him into the Mediterranean. In accordance with this plan the ground commander pressed his units steadily forward to capture and protect the airfields. Our air forces, for their part, knocked out the enemy air power first, and then threw their full weight into blasting a path for our ground troops.

In the meantime our strategical air force of heavy and medium bombers, under the command of General Doolittle, concentrated on blasting the enemy embarkation points and other military installations on both the European and the African side. The coastal air force protected our own ports.

As evidence of these and similar combined efforts, as evidence, in brief, of the soundness of our air-power doctrine, we hold the continent of Africa, the islands of Pantelleria, Lampedusa, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and a substantial portion of the Italian boot. Until a better argument should happen along I think that should suffice. And better arguments, I assure you, are in the making.

Field Manual 100–20 is not the final word in air-power doctrine. There is no final word in warfare. The only sure thing about innovations is that they are dead certain to be opposed. You are going to hear of some startling innovations of far-reaching consequence taking place in our Army Air Forces. You may be sure that, as new ideas, they will encounter much opposition. But in analyzing this opposition make a point of looking up the records of the men involved. Find out how they stood on the measures which our Army Air Forces adopted in carrying out its magnificent mission. Do that in justice to the men in strange skies and on strange soil, the men who are relying on you to decide on the basis of evidence. Those men have taken some trouble to make their evidence exceedingly plain.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks employees exhibit No. 119, filed by Mr. E. E. Milliman, president of the maintenance-of-way employees of the railroads with the President's Emergency Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD BLACK LABOR MARKET

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, what I have to say today concerns a group of workers absolutely essential to this war whose base rate of pay is not $1 an hour or 80 cents an hour or 75 cents an hour or 60 cents an hour, but as low as 46 cents an hour over a great portion of the country. I am going to talk about railroad workers and the problems they are up against.

There are conditions, and there are going to be conditions both as to farm prices and as to wages which will have to be fairly adjusted as we go along through the war. I believe this is one of them. No strike or stoppage of work can be tolerated as long as this war lasts. But that puts all the greater responsibility upon government to see that conditions which are unfair and unequitable are not tolerated either.

One of the outstanding factors that has contributed to the present railroad labor crisis, and the serious impairment of morale in this important war industry is a Nation-wide "black labor market" being carried on by the railroads and thus far tolerated by those who exercise the power of decision in such matters here in Washington.

The existing basic wage scales in the railroad industry are so low, and inequitable in comparison with other major industries, that railroad workers have left the industry by the tens of thousands and new recruits have not been obtainable at the existing rates. After an exhaustive investigation, the President's Emergency Board found an 8-cent houly increase in railroad wages essential to the effective prosecution of the war, but the Office of Economic Stabilization has thus far not granted that increase.

The labor condition was already serious at the time the President's Emergency Board was investigating the wage case early last spring, and it has become more and more critical from month to month since that time as a decision has been delayed and delayed. Prior to the Board's hearings last spring, the railroads had already launched upon a Nation-wide black-labor market, and these facts were placed before the Emergency Board in the evidence and testimony presented by the representatives of the employees. It was presented in factual detail in the employees' wage exhibit No. 119, which gave names, dates, and places in a clear and indisputable manner.

The railroad black labor market here referred to, rose out of the following combination of circumstances:

First. The basic wage rates for several hundred thousands of railroads' maintenance workers were so low that the employees had already quit their jobs in great numbers for the much higher wages in other war industries.

Second. The railroads refused to meet the requests of the employee organizations filed with them in September 1942, for the improvement in these substandard wage scales that the employees insisted were necessary to retain the experienced railroad workers on their jobs and to maintain the morale highly essential in this indispensable war activity.

Third. The railroads were unable to obtain or retain a sufficient force to maintain their tracks, bridges, tunnels, and other fixed properties and their rolling stock or other equipment in safe and efficient operating condition.

Fourth. While refusing to pay a wage sufficient to retain their regular and experienced maintenance workers, or to attract new recruits to take the place of those who were quitting their jobs at an alarming rate, the railroads adopted the direct practice of paying much higher wages for the performance of this same routine work when performed by employees hired through contractors.

The employees' representatives, in bringing these facts to the attention of the President's Emergency Board, cited illustrative instances of 66 such contracting arrangements, or black-market practices, on 19 different railroads in 24 widely scattered States. On pages 86 and 87 of its printed report to the President, under date of May 29, 1943, the Emergency Board dealt with this uncontradicted evidence of the employees and stated in part:

> In many instances it appears that some railroads are indirectly paying a much higher rate to employees hired by contractors than they are paying to the similar groups of workers employed directly and forming a part of their experienced railroad labor force. * * * No qualifying or explanatory circumstances having been brought to the attention of the Board with respect to this testimony, the Board, on the basis of the facts at its disposal, is compelled to conclude that a grave disparity in wages prevails on a number of railroads by virtue of the practice of some carriers letting out to private contractors ordinary and apparently routine railroad-maintenance projects. Such a situation creates serious wage inequalities and is not conducive to the retention of the high morale of regularly employed railroad workers. Moreover, it seems to indicate a pressing need for additional railroad workers, coupled with a desire to maintain basic rates of pay at relatively low levels.

Time will not permit my making reference to any considerable number of these black-labor-market instances and, therefore, in order that my remarks may be adequately supported with a factual record, I request permission to incorporate with my remarks a table of names, dates, places, and figures incidental to this black-labor-market procedure as placed before the Emergency Board by the employees in the hearings conducted last spring.

This record will show one railroad pays 75 cents an hour for track work handled by the contractor, or black-market basis, while refusing to raise its 56-cent rate being paid directly by the road itself in the same locality for the performance of the same work by its regular and experienced forces.

It will show another road refusing to raise its basic carpenter rates of 74 cents an hour while, at the same time, paying $1.375 an hour for the same work handled on this black-market basis. It will show still another road paying its regularly engaged painters 74.5 cents an hour, while contracting the same work at $1.25 per hour. It will show more than 100 typical cases of this contracting or black-labor-market practice.

However, the tremendous difference in hourly wage rates here referred to is only part of the story. The black-market workers also get time and one-half pay for work performed on Saturday, while the regular forces engaged directly by the railroads in the same work and in the same locality continue at their straight-time rates for the sixth day of each week. For example, the railroad that pays its regular and experienced carpenters 74 cents an hour continues that same 74-cent rate for Saturday, but its black-market carpenter with a rate of $1.375 goes to one and one-half times that figure for Saturday, or to $2.06 an hour. In other words, the railroad pays its black-market carpenter $16.48 for 8 hours' work on Saturday, while its own regularly employed and experienced carpenters are paid only $5.92.

On the basis of a 48-hour week, the railroads' regularly employed carpenters earn $35.52 a week while its carpenters doing identically the same work being hired through the contract or black-market procedure earn $71.48, which is more than double the amount that the railroad pays its own directly employed workers.

The Government authorities will not permit this railroad to raise that 74-cent carpenter rate by 8 cents an hour or to 82 cents per hour, but no governmental agency seems to be concerned with the publicly recorded fact that the railroad, through this black-labor-market scheme, is actually paying $1.375 an hour.

The factual data that I shall place in the record will show that these are not isolated instances. They were already in effect last spring in 24 different States, on 19 big railroads, and on page 86 of its printed report to the President the Emergency Board made reference to more than 100 such conditions. As early as last spring, the practice had already extended from the New England States to California and from the Gulf coast to the Great Lakes. I am informed that it has become more extensive since that time.

The railroads engaging in this practice were not small nor isolated carriers. They included such outstanding trunk-line systems as the Baltimore & Ohio, Boston & Maine, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific, the Illinois Central, the Pennsylvania, the New York, New Haven & Hartford, the Colorado & Southern, the Soo Line, the Seaboard, the Southern Pacific, the Union Pacific, the Texas & New Orleans, and the Northern Pacific. It will be seen that these roads engaged in this black-labor-market practice are among the Nation's outstanding carriers located in the North, East, South, and West.

The railroad black labor market which has now become more general because of the constantly growing railroad labor crisis was being practiced last spring in widely scattered States. Among these were Ohio, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Wisconsin, Mississippi, Kentucky, New York, Minnesota, Michigan, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Florida, California, Oregon, Utah, Texas, Louisiana, Washington, and Wyoming.

The railroad workers are fully aware of this black-market scheme because they are working on the same jobs and in the same territories where it is being engaged in. For example, one railroad hired school boys at 75 cents an hour through the so-called contractor method and put them to work right in the same gang and under the same supervision of the same foremen with their regular experienced trackmen who were being paid 56 cents and 58 cents an hour. Here we had an instance of school boys working in the same gangs with the railways' experienced forces and drawing 18 cents and 19 cents an hour more than the regularly employed trained railway employees.

As one Member of Congress, this combination of circumstances seems to me as being not only indefensible but utterly fantastic. However, when these facts were placed before the Emergency Board last spring by the representatives of the employees, they were not challenged or contradicted by the representatives of the involved carriers. If a governmental agency is actually going to deny an 8-cent hourly increase to the railroad industries' loyal and experienced forces, what is it going to do in connection with this Nation-wide railroad black-labor-market practice?

Under these circumstances, a regularly engaged railroad carpenter could quit his regular employment with the railroad today, which pays him 74 cents an hour, and apply for reemployment tomorrow through the contractor or black-market arrangement at a rate of $1.375 an hour, which would be double his regular railroad rate. He can do this but he cannot stay on his job and be granted a raise of 8 cents which would make his rate 82 cents an hour.

The conservative railroad labor leaders in this industry have tried patiently and diligently to correct this situation for more than 13 months, and it is alarming but hardly surprising to find a real crisis deepening over this whole matter.

It was my impression that the basic purpose of the Stabilization Act was to aid in the successful prosecution of the war. But for that result to be obtained there has got to be consideration given to these inequities as to the wages of regularly employed workers in industries like transportation, which are certainly as important to the war as anything else in the world.

Surely we have the intelligence and the courage to do what is fair and right and equitable without having such action lead to an uncontrolled spiral of inflation.

Maintenance-of-way work performed by contractors

Name of railroad, name of contractor and location	Wage rates paid—														Time and one-half for Saturday	
	Section men		Laborers		Foremen		Carpenters		Helpers		Painters		Miscellaneous			
	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor
Baltimore & Ohio: Vang Construction Co. (Ohio).	$0.56 .58	$0.75														
Boston & Maine:																
T. Stuart & Sons (Boston)			$0.55	$0.75	$0.80 .82	[1] $1.00										
Various small contractors (over entire system).											$0.81	$0.95 1.15				
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy:																
Parsons Construction Co. (Gibson, Nebr.).							$0.785	$1.375	$0.65	$0.70	.78	1.20			No	Yes.
Izard Paint Co. (Omaha, Nebr.).							.785	1.25			.78	1.45			No	Yes.
Assemacher Contracting Co. (Havelock, Nebr.).							.785	1.25							No	Yes.
Assemacher Contracting Co. (Lincoln, Nebr.).							.785	1.25							No	Yes
Smith Roofing Co. (Chicago).							.785	1.25								
Carl Johnson Construction Co. (Iowa).			.53	.70			.77	1.50							No	Yes.
Olson, Ausomaker & Rocar (Alliance, Nebr.).							.785	1.25							No	Yes.
Carnac Constr. Co. (Atchison, Kans.).			.53	.90			.77	1.50							No	Yes.
Hastings Morgan Co. (St. Joseph, Mo.).			.53	.70			.77	1.25							No	Yes.
Wm. Karnopp Construction Co. (Kansas City, Mo.).			.53	[2] .70											No	Yes.
Ougles Contracting Co. (Kansas City, Mo.).			.53	.85											No	Yes.
Cameron Joyce & Co. (Alpha, Ill.).			.50	.85											No	Yes.
Rocko Bros. Construction Co. (Norris, Ill.).			.50	1.00											No	Yes.
Christ Poschen Corp. (Ottumwa, Iowa.			.53	.85									$0.77	[3] $1.50	No	Yes.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific: Fritz Bros., Builders (Madison, Wis.).			.46 .50	.85			.7725	1.25							No	Yes.
Colorado & Southern: Western Elaterite Co.							.77	1.50							No	Yes.
Gulf & Ship Island: Contractor (Brooklyn, Miss.).											.77	1.00 1.35			No	Yes.
Illinois Central:																
Contractor (Dubuque, Iowa)			.53	.75			.79	1.25								
Mills Contracting Co. (Iowa)			.53	.90			.77	1.25								Yes
Contractor (Louisville, Ky.)							.74	1.375								Yes
Contractor (Kentucky division).											.745	1.25				Yes.
Long Island R. R.:																
Salson Construction Corporation (Long Island City, Long Island).			.55	1.03			.86	1.85					.84	[2] 2.00		
Hallen Welding Co. (Long Island City, Long Island).													.97 .91	[4] 2.00 [5] 2.00		Double time.
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie:																
Ganley Construction Co. (Minneapolis, Minn.).							.745	1.375	.61	.925						
Jensen & Campbell Contractors (Superior, Wis.)							.745	1.35	.61	.75 .90						
Michigan Central: Elding & Miller (Detroit, Mich.)							.855	1.40 1.65							No	
New York, New Haven & Hartford: Malley (Boston Area).			.55	.625												
Pennsylvania R. R.:																
Stevens Constr. Co. (Niles, Ohio).	.55	.80													No	Yes.
Furgerson & Edmonson Co. (Crestline, Ohio).	.55	.825													No	Yes.
J. C. O'Connor & Son (Bucyrus, Ohio).	.55	.825													No	Yes.
Trimble Construction Co. (Wilmington, Del.).			.55	.75			.84	1.50					.91	[6] 1.80	No	Yes.
Whiting-Turner Construction Co. (Stoney Creek, Pa.).			.55	.70											No	Yes.
Seaboard Air Line: Sam F. Bissett (Southern Florida division).											.65	1.20			No	Yes.
Southern Pacific (Pacific Lines):																
F. Terheyden & Bros. (Stockton, Calif.).	.53 .55				[7] [8] 210.60	[8] 1.75					.82	1.50			No	Yes.
Morrison-Knutson Co., Inc. (Coast division).	.53	.85													No	Yes.
Morrison-Knutson Co., Inc. (Salt Lake division).	.53	.85													No	Yes.
Morrison-Knutson Co., Inc. (Portland division).	.55	.95													No	Yes.
Morrison-Knutson Co., Inc. (Eugene, Oreg.).	.55	.75 .95													No	Yes.
A. H. Hardy (Oakland, Calif.).							.82	1.50							No	Yes.
Morrison-Knutson Co., Inc. (San Francisco, Calif.).	.53	.85			[8] [9] 172.60	[9] 310.00										
Spokane, Portland & Seattle:																
Geo. Buckler Contracting Co. (Vancouver terminal Co.).	.50 .56	1.10													No	Yes.
Albany Sand & Gravel (Albany, Oreg.).	.50 .56	.95													No	Yes.
Geo. Buckler Contracting Co. (Willamette, Oreg.).		.95													No	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Maintenance-of-way work performed by contractors—Continued

Name of railroad, name of contractor and location	Wage rates paid—														Time and one-half for Saturday	
	Section men		Laborers		Foremen		Carpenters		Helpers		Painters		Miscellaneous			
	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor	Railroad	Contractor
Spokane, Portland, & Seattle—Continued.																
Geo. Buckler (Wishram, Wash.).	$0.50	$1.00													No	Yes.
Texas & New Orleans:																
A. S. Daniel (Victoria division).							$0.72	$1.00			$0.72	$1.00				
S. O. Harris (Austin division).							.72	1.00			.72	1.00				
Contractor (New Orleans terminal).			$0.46	$0.60	[7] $18960	[7] $1.20	.72	1.125								
W. E. Crawford (San Antonio division).							.72	1.00			.72	1.00				
Murty (Houston division)							.72	1.00			.72	1.00				
A. J. Snapp (Victoria division).							.72	1.00			.72	1.00				
Union Pacific:																
Diamond Engineering Co. (Kelso, Calif.)			.60	.75	[7 8] 215.00	[7 10] 75.00					.83	1.00			No	Yes.
McNeil Construction Co. (Kelso, Calif.).			.60	.875	[7 8] 215.00	[7] 1.875	.83	1.35							No	Yes.
G. Gnam (Cheyenne, Wyo.)					[7 8] 215.00	[7 8] 300.00					.79 .83	1.25 1.375			No	Yes.
J. Schrag (Albina, Oreg.)					[11] .88	[11 12] 15.00	.83	1.50							No	Yes.
L. James & Co. (Seattle, Wash.).					[7 8] 215.00	[7] 1.615					.79 .83	1.49			No	Yes.
Izard Construction Co. (Omaha, Nebr.).											.83	1.20			No	Yes.
Diamond Engineering Co. (Denver, Colo.).					[7 8] 215.00	[7 10] 75.00			$0.67	$0.85	.83	1.00			No	Yes.
B. Wannicott (Green River, Wyo.)											.79 .83	1.25 1.35			No	Yes.
Vedder Contracting Co. (La Grande, Oreg.).							.79 .83	1.35							No	Yes.
H. E. Dodson (Arlington, Oreg.).											.79 .83	1.35			No	Yes.
Diamond Engineering Co. (Evanston, Wyo.).				.75	[7 8] 215.00	[7 10] 75.00					.79 .83	1.00			No	Yes.
McCormack Construction Co. (Pendleton, Oreg.).											.79 .83	1.32 1.65			No	Yes.
Diamond Engineering Co. (Ogden, Utah).			.60	.75	[7 8] 215.00	[7 10] 125.00	.79 .83	1.25			.79 .83	1.00			No	Yes.
Diamond Engineering Co. (Huntington, Oreg.).											.79 .83	1.32 1.65			No	Yes.
Carl Christensen (Cheyenne, Wyo.).							.79 .83	1.25							No	Yes.
Worley Paint & Sign Co. (La Grande, Oreg.).											.79 .83	1.32 1.65			No	Yes.
A. H. Barbour & Son (Albina, Oreg.).					[7 8] 215.00	[7] 1.75					.79 .83	1.32 1.65			No	Yes.
L. Yeaman (Seattle, Wash.).			.60	1.08	[7 8] 215.00	[8 12] 12.92									No	Yes.
Jack Evers (Wyoming Division).			.60	.75	[7 8] 215.00	[7 8] 300.00	.79 .83	1.25			.79 .83	1.50			No	Yes.
Superior Lumber Co. (Wyoming Division).			.60	.75	[7 8] 215.00	[7 8] 300.00	.79 .83	1.25							No	Yes.
McNeil Construction Co. (Yermo, Calif.).			.60	.875	[7 8] 215.00	[7] 1.875	.83	1.35							No	Yes.
Israd Paint & Decorating Co. (Council Bluffs, Iowa).											.79 .83	1.20 1.45			No	Yes.
Earl Vandehei (Cheyenne, Wyo.).			.60	.75	[7] 215.00	[7 10] 75.00	.83	1.50							No	Yes.
Diamond Engineering Co. (Gering, Nebr.).											.83	1.00			No	Yes.
Diamond Engineering Co. (Grand Island, Nebr.).											.83	1.00			No	Yes.
Israd Paint & Decorating Co. (Omaha, Nebr.).											.79 .83	1.20 1.45			No	Yes.
Yazoo & Mississippi Valley: A. E. McGraw (Baton Rouge, La.).							.77	1.25	.52	.90					No	Yes.
Northern Pacific: D. M. McRae (Seattle, Wash.).							.795	1.41							No	Yes.

[1] Extra gang foremen.
[2] Minimum.
[3] Masons and bricklayers.
[4] Welders.
[5] Ironworkers.
[6] Work equipment engineers.
[7] Bridge and building foremen.
[8] Monthly rate.
[9] Section foremen.
[10] Weekly rate.
[11] Carpenter leadmen.
[12] Daily rate.

Source: From general chairmen of Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees on Railroads listed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES UNDER THE CANADIAN PRICE CEILING

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, today I am offering a complete and exhaustive history of the payment of subsidies under the Canadian price ceiling for the benefit of the Members of the House.

Next week this body will consider a bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the vote thereon will reflect the issue of subsidies or no subsidies.

I personally am of the opinion that the issue should be "restricted use of moneys for subsidies," or a new method of congressional origin to control inflation as a substitute for that of the administration. However, that is beside the point at this time. A careful examination of the history of the experiences and headaches, so to speak, of the Canadian subsidy plan will reveal a parallel situation to that in the United States.

I am devoting my time today to discussing the Canadian need for subsidies, its administration of subsidies, its principles of subsidies, the commodities subject to subsidies, the details and costs of subsidies, and price control as a factor in stabilizing wages.

1. NEED FOR SUBSIDIES UNDER PRICE CEILING

The payment of subsidies has been an essential part of Canadian price control since the Government first introduced a comprehensive control system. The principles and administrative organization of the Canadian subsidy program are directly related to the price control policy followed by the Government. Canada was the first of the democracies engaged in this war to introduce a general ceiling over the prices of all goods, services, wages, and salaries. This price and

income ceiling was introduced in December 1941 and has been more or less rigidly and successfully maintained during the period of nearly 2 years since its introduction. The cost-of-living index which had risen approximately 15 percent in the 27 months between August 1939 and December 1941 has risen only slightly more than 3 percent in the 22 months since the establishment of the price ceiling.

In spite of this policy designed to freeze production costs, the Government recognized the fact that certain costs could not be controlled or stabilized and that the payment of subsidies was necessary if the general price ceiling was to be maintained. The Wartime Prices and Trade Board had already been granted broad power to institute a subsidy program or at least to recommend the payment of subsidies to the Minister of Finance, the responsible cabinet minister under which the board operates. In practice, the board actually formulates policy and administers the program. When the price ceiling was first introduced the Government specifically stated that if there was an unreasonable squeeze between costs and ceiling prices—

> The Government representing the people as a whole, should * * * take a share of the burden by way of a subsidy * * * or in some other appropriate way.[1]

In discussing the subsidy policy of the Government before the House of Commons on April 23, 1942, the Minister of Finance stated in clear and unequivocal terms the basic reasons for a subsidy program—

> The necessity for subsidies or their equivalent—
>
> Mr. Ilsley explained—
>
> arises from the fact that the costs of providing goods or services to the Canadian consumer cannot be completely controlled or from the fact that in some cases these costs were actually higher at the time the ceiling was imposed than the level of costs that were then being reflected in the prices charged. * * * Insofar as these costs rise beyond the amount which the industry can absorb with fixed prices, we must either do without those goods, or raise the ceiling on their prices, or else pay subsidies, or take some equivalent action to meet these increased costs.[2]

The Government decided that sound economic and social policy dictated that the Government should take the responsibility of ensuring adequate supplies of essential goods at stable prices. If the price ceiling was to be held, provision for subsidies had to be made. The Minister of Finance emphasized that the decision to pay subsidies to producers rather than grant price increases is based on the assumption that it is a less expensive and less inflationary method of control. He argued that the payment of a small subsidy to producers prevents pyramiding of costs and the far greater total proportionate cost to the Government and to the individual that price increases all along the line would entail. Subsidies are no more inflationary than price increases would be. In fact a rise in prices places as much if not more additional spending power in the hands of producers and most important of all, it could not be subjected to as close control as a subsidy.

Subsidies have been paid to serve a variety of purposes:

First. The major problem inherent in the establishment of a general price ceiling effective simultaneously at the manufacturing, wholesale and retail level is that price relationships between the different levels are out of line. Due to the normal time-lag, many base-period costs are not reflected in base-period prices. The resultant "squeeze" primarily at the wholesale and retail level may, if not corrected, result in undesirable, inequitable and in some cases prohibitive burdens on wholesalers and retailers and will dislocate and hamper the production and distribution of civilian goods. Since Government policy required a rigid holding of the retail ceiling, the prices board handled this problem by "rolling back the squeeze" by means of price reductions or increases at the producing or wholesale level in order to distribute the squeeze equitably, requiring reasonable absorption of the squeeze by industry, and simplification and standardization programs but wherever warranted, the payment of subsidies.

Second. Certain costs cannot be stabilized no matter how rigid or comprehensive a ceiling is placed over prices and wages. One obvious category of costs which cannot be controlled by the price control agency is imported goods, the prices of which are to a great extent beyond the control of the domestic price control agency. Since imported goods constitute such a significant factor in the Canadian economy, import prices could not be exempted from the general price ceiling and some method had to be adopted to stabilize their prices. Originally, in fact, the board expected that the chief need for subsidy would be to compensate for increased import prices. Experience under the price ceiling has, however, showed that there are many domestic costs which tend to increase no matter how rigid the ceilings. Unavoidable and uncontrollable increases in real costs in the domestic field arise from the use of less efficient labor, the use of substitute materials, changes in source of supply and form of transportation, and a number of other causes. Unless the Government is willing either to permit a decline or in some cases a complete cessation of production or supply, or permit the breaking of the ceiling, these increases in costs must be subsidized.

Third. Subsidies are also necessary to maintain and increase production and supply, particularly in the case of high-cost production.

Fourth. Subsidies are often necessary in wartime where conditions of supply and distribution are frequently abnormal in order to promote the proper flow and allocation of supplies.

Fifth. Temporary subsidies are often necessary to compensate for inventory losses accompanying a price reduction or as interim measures while a price adjustment is put into effect or while a reduction in costs is secured through rationalization, simplification, and standardization programs.

2. ADMINISTRATION OF SUBSIDY PROGRAM

The duty of recommending the payment of subsidies in order to restrain increases in the cost of living or to offset uncontrollable increases in other costs was originally entirely granted to the Wartime Prices and Trade Board. The power to authorize and administer subsidy programs has in practice been exercised by the W. P. T. B., subject to the direction of the Minister of Finance. A special corporation, the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation was established—P. C. 9870, December 17, 1941—to operate under the direction of the Board and this corporation has administered subsidy and purchase and sales operations instituted by the Board. The Prices Board formulates general subsidy policies as well as the formulas and rates employed, except in the case of imports where the formulas and rates are worked out by the corporation. The corporation administers the programs in line with the principles worked out by the Board, verifies claims, and makes the actual payments.

Agricultural subsidies of various types have also been paid throughout the war period by the Department of Agriculture and boards operating under its direction. These subsidies have been principally designed to increase or direct production rather than to control prices. It is difficult, however, to distinguish between these two types of subsidies since most production subsidies operate and in some cases are designed to operate also as price stabilization measures. There has been considerable friction between the Department of Agriculture and the Prices Board regarding the farm price and subsidy policy followed by the Board. In many cases the Department of Agriculture felt that the Board's subsidy program was either inadequate or ill-timed and also argued that higher prices were essential to bring forth sufficient supplies. In February 1943 a clarification of powers and responsibilities between the Department of Agriculture and the W. P. T. B. was announced—Canada, House of Commons Debates, February 9, 1943, pages 272–274. The price ceiling even in regard to agricultural products was not relaxed. The Prices Board continues to be responsible for estimating domestic requirements for food for consumer rationing, for food imports and their distribution, for consumer subsidies and has final responsibility in all matters of price. The Department of Agriculture is responsible for securing the required production of agricultural foodstuffs under the price ceilings established by the Prices Board, and if production is not forthcoming the Department and the Board must consult regarding the steps to be taken, which may consist of subsidies, price adjustments or other measures. The Department of Agriculture has, however, been granted the power to recommend subsidies to primary producers and must be consulted by the

[1] Wartime Prices and Trade Board, preliminary statement of policy, November 21, 1941, p. 5.

[2] Canada, House of Commons debates, Thursday, April 23, 1942, pp. 2046–2057.

Prices Board in regard to any consumer subsidies introduced by the latter. Exports are subject to control by the Department. The Department is also responsible for the necessary diversion of food to the armed forces and other priority users, while the Prices Board controls distribution to civilian consumers.

Exceptions to this policy of centralized control of price stabilization subsidies are few. The draw-back or subsidy paid on wheat to millers in order to maintain ceiling prices on flour in the face of increases in the price of wheat is paid by the Department of Trade and Commerce through the Canadian Wheat Board. In addition, a few special production subsidies are paid by the Department of Munitions and Supply, the government agency responsible for the procurement of all war material, and also responsible for all controls except price over raw and industrial materials and war production.

3. PRINCIPLES OF SUBSIDY PROGRAM

The effectiveness of a subsidy program and price-control system cannot be attributed solely to the fact that a subsidy program is in existence and a general price ceiling has been established. Its effectiveness arises chiefly from the technique used and the policies followed in administering the price control and subsidy program coupled with the general economic and fiscal policies followed by other Government agencies. The most important principles of the Canadian subsidy policy are summarized below:

First. Power to authorize and administer subsidies has been granted to the agency which has broad power to control the prices and with some exceptions the supply, production, and distribution of all civilian goods and services. All possible production costs have been placed under rigid control. Although wages and salaries are controlled by the National War Labor Board and not by the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, the wage and salary ceiling was imposed at the same time as the general price ceiling and is considered an essential factor in price control policy. Although the Department of Agriculture has always exercised certain controls over agricultural production and distribution, it was not until February 1943 that responsibility for producer subsidies was transferred from the Prices Board to the Department. The Department is responsible for production of food and agricultural products and for certain phases of noncivilian and preretail distribution.

Second. In general, subsidies are authorized only on essential goods when adequate supplies are not forthcoming under the established price ceiling.

Third. Subsidies are not payable on all cost increases, but are in general strictly limited to the amount which cannot be reasonably absorbed by the industry or firm applying for a subsidy. In the case of nonfood subsidies, particularly, eligibility for subsidy is often approved only if the industry or firm agrees to special government control of profits. Profit control is achieved through the limitation of subsidy payments to those manufacturers or importers who are not earning excess profits in the 100-percent bracket—as defined by the Excess Profits Tax Act—exclusive or inclusive of subsidy. Subsidies are therefore not payable to manufacturers or importers to the extent that they are in the 100-percent excess-profits tax bracket, for example, those earning more than 116⅔ percent of standard profits—normally average profits during the 4 years, 1936 through 1939. The use of this formula relieves the Prices Board of the problem of setting up profit standards and determining reasonable profits since it accepts the formula and financial data of the Department of National Revenue. Any subsidies paid to manufacturers in the 100-percent excess-profits bracket would be entirely returned to the Government in the form of taxes at least during the war—a post-war 20-percent refund is provided for. This formula operates to minimize the total cost of the subsidy program, and to insure that unwarranted subsidies are not paid. Irrespective of the profit or loss position of a particular firm in regard to the particular product which may be subsidized, subsidies are often only paid if the overall profit situation of the firm justifies it. The application of profit control tends to minimize the cost of subsidies and to prevent payment of unwarranted subsidies since importers and manufacturers will generally wish to avoid governmental supervision of their books and the additional work of processing and following up applications unless the subsidy is necessary.

Fourth. Even when a subsidy has been authorized in principle, it is not obligatory but may be varied or refused at the discretion of the corporation, for example, if costs are deemed excessive or if the cost or supply situation or profit position of the firm or industry changes. Subsidy programs are kept under continual review. Subsidies may be reduced or abandoned and in a number of instances this has already been done. Where the payment of a uniform rate of subsidy for all manufacturers has been adopted for administrative reasons and this subsidy reduces the net cost of any individual manufacturer or distributor below the cost on which the ceiling price is based, either the ceiling price or the subsidy paid must be correspondingly reduced.

Fifth. Under no condition will a subsidy to constitute a benefit or to be a source of special profit to the subsidized industry or business firm. In order to qualify for a subsidy, an industry is required to show that it has instituted all possible economies and that its margin of profit is no more than reasonable or necessary. The industry receiving the subsidy must bear a part of the increased costs in respect of which the subsidy is paid and the payment of a subsidy is "conditioned upon certain action which increases the costs or reduces the receipts" of the industry. The net effect of subsidies and price control should leave the industry in a worse, not a better, profit position than before the price ceiling was imposed.

Sixth. Subsidies are paid to benefit the consumer and to keep down the cost of living. Various provisions have been established designed to prevent the payment of subsidies on war goods and production goods. For example, production goods and other nonconsumer goods have been declared ineligible for import subsidy. Goods sold to the Department of Munitions and Supply are not eligible for subsidy. A special order has recently been issued providing for the recapture of subsidies which, for reasons of administrative expediency, may have been paid on goods which are not domestically consumed but are exported or sold as ship stores. In this way subsidies are restricted to civilian commodities domestically consumed. Since the Government would ultimately bear the full cost in the case of war goods in the event of either a price increase or a subsidy, it was felt unreasonable and unnecessary to permit subsidies to be paid on such goods or on materials entering into the production of such goods. In practice, however, price increases in the field of war and producer goods have been very limited. For example, the corporation has been paying a variety of retail and producer subsidies on lumber. Since the great bulk of lumber is used in war production or by industrial consumers who could absorb the increase in costs, these subsidies were recently rescinded and price increases permitted all along the line. Consumers are protected by a 10-percent discount which will be paid for by the corporation.

Seventh. Although subsidies are really paid to the consumer, technically because retailers and consumers are so numerous they are paid to producers or primary distributors. As a matter of administrative convenience, the general policy of the Board is to pay subsidies at the level of trade at which there are the fewest firms. This is generally the producing or importing level. In the case of most agricultural food products, subsidies are paid to primary processors or distributors rather than to producers themselves, since the administrative task of making subsidy payments to innumerable individual farmers would be enormous. Processors and distributors act as agents of the corporation in paying subsidies to the primary producers and are reimbursed by the corporation. Payment of subsidies at the lowest levels also prevents the pyramiding of cost increases and minimizes the total amount of the subsidy.

Eighth. The reduction of costs through standardization, simplification, the elimination of unnecessary frills and services, the pooling and restriction of distribution and in general the rationalization of industry has been continually insisted upon. This is an important factor in minimizing and even removing the need for domestic subsidies.

Ninth. A special subsidy formula was established to govern payment of subsidies on imports as distinct from domestic products. Although the Board stated that subsidies would be paid on all essential domestic products, if necessary, no list of commodities which were considered essential was prepared or at least publicly announced in advance. Domestic subsidies on particular goods have

been authorized from time to time as the need arose. A quite different policy was followed in regard to imports. Immediately after the introduction of the ceiling a policy was announced which provided for the payment of subsidies on all essential consumer imports at a maximum rate equivalent to the total cost increase since the base period or over the costs determined to be appropriate to ceiling prices—W. P. T. B., Statement of Import Policy, December 2, 1941; revised January 1, 1942, August 1, 1942, February 11, 1943. Unless specifically excluded, all consumer goods, including equipment for the use of farmers, fishermen, and other individuals in the course of personal trade or occupation, and materials to be used in the production of consumer goods are automatically eligible for subsidy. In order to minimize the cost of import subsidies and prevent the payment of subsidies on unessentials, a long list of consumer goods has been specifically excluded from subsidy. This list, which has been progressively broadened during the last year, covers unessential goods—goods similar to domestic products which are available at reasonable prices, and in some cases goods the production of which is prohibited in Canada. Goods which are exempt from the price ceiling or subject to bulk purchase by the Government are not in any case eligible for subsidy.

Production goods, industrial supplies, and other nonconsumer goods are ineligible unless specifically ruled eligible. Goods purchased by the Department of Munitions and Supplies—sole procurement agency for war material—or its agencies are specifically excluded.

Even in the case of products specifically declared eligible for subsidy, the Corporation at its own discretion may deny the payment of a subsidy entirely, may refuse to pay the maximum subsidy, and may reduce and vary the subsidy at any time on the same grounds described above as governing the payment of domestic subsidies. The statement of import policy specifically denies subsidies to applicants if the total subsidy payable in any 1 month is less than $25 or when the increase in cost is insignificant in relation to the amounts involved. Presumably importers are asked to bear a squeeze roughly proportionate to that borne by producers and sellers. The profit-control formula described above is also applied to imports—at least, in many cases.

In 1942 a category of goods, which is eligible for subsidy but only after prior approval, was established. This technique of determining eligibility for subsidy is being increasingly used. It is a more selective method and serves to minimize subsidy payments while at the same time safeguarding the payment of essential subsidies. This group now includes a wide variety of products. Furthermore, the corporation may at any time refuse to pay the subsidy in any case where it believes the importation was unjustified because adequate supplies of substantially similar goods of domestic origin were available at reasonable prices or when the cost of the particular goods is deemed to be excessive, for example, if foreign supplies attempt to take advantage of the situation or collude with importers to raise or maintain prices at unreasonably high levels.

Several methods of payment and subsidy formula are followed. A subsidy may be paid to an individual importer either for a specific commodity or class of commodities or in the case of a firm with a large volume of varied imports, the subsidy may be determined not on the basis of individual commodities but on the basis of average import costs and the firm's general profit situation. Import subsidies may be authorized on an individual cost basis but for administrative convenience uniform or flat-rate subsidies based on average costs or selling prices are paid wherever possible. If a flat-rate subsidy results in an increase in an individual seller's profit margin, however, an appropriate reduction in the ceiling price or subsidy must be made.

Tenth. Government purchase and sale has been used as a means of indirect subsidy, particularly in the case of imported products. In most cases Government purchase and sale is designed primarily to insure supply. The underlying reason for centralizing all purchases in the hands of a Government agency has been that the world supply available to the United Nations of many essential imports has been placed under Government control. International agreements covering the allocation of such commodities frequently require that purchases be handled in each country by a Government agency. In many cases, however, the corporation sells at a loss at prices consistent with the price ceiling in order to avoid the necessity of breaking the ceiling. Bulk purchasing under Government auspices frequently operates to minimize or eliminate the need for a subsidy which would otherwise have to be paid, since it often results in a reduction of unit costs and permits lower selling prices than would otherwise obtain. The Wartime Prices and Trade Board has been granted broad power to buy and sell both imports and domestically produced commodities and the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation in addition to administering the subsidy program has also administered purchase and sale programs.

Eleventh. In indirect type of import subsidy which has also been used is the reduction and remission of import duties and taxes and the modification of valuation standards for customs purposes. The Prices Board has been granted the power to recommend such action to the Department of National Revenue in cases where shortages and cost increases threaten the price ceiling and its recommendations are rarely if ever disapproved.

In addition to the remission and modification of special import taxes, of the 10-percent-war-exchange tax—covers imports from the nonsterling area; this tax was introduced in order to discourage imports from outside the sterling area and thus conserve foreign exchange—and of ordinary tariff duties, which has been done from time to time in regard to particular commodities, several general actions have been taken decreasing import duties for all commodities. The imposition of special or dumping duties has been suspended and import and excise duties imposed in other countries may be disregarded in estimating the value for duty of such goods when imported into Canada. On individual authorization duties may be levied on invoice value rather than fair home market value as previously required.

The use of this technique of indirect subsidy has been an important factor in the price control and subsidy program. It is administratively easy, although it does not allow for selective control of the firms and industries which benefit or of the conditions determining eligibility.

Twelfth. In general, subsidies have not been authorized on a basis limiting payments to high-cost producers or high-cost portions of an individual producer's output. In the domestic field a uniform subsidy is usually authorized covering an entire industry or all production of a particular commodity and the profit-control formula is expected to operate to limit actual payments to those producers whose costs warrant a subsidy. The rate of the subsidy would thus be established at the level necessary to bring in the required total production irrespective of an individual producer's costs.

Thirteenth. Since wages and salaries are subject to a ceiling similar to that covering commodities, the policy of the prices board has been to refuse subsidies to meet increased wage and cost-of-living bonus costs. In principle wage rates are frozen and the rate of the cost-of-living bonus would only be increased if the price ceiling was broken.

4. COMMODITIES SUBJECT TO SUBSIDY

Commodities subject to subsidy may be divided into two main groups: First, food and agricultural products, and second, non-food products. There are important differences between the underlying problems governing subsidy programs and the basic reasons requiring the payment of subsidies between these two groups. A distinction may also be made between domestic and import subsidies. Indirect subsidies in effect are also of two main types—Government purchase and sale and remission and modification of duties and taxes.

A. FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT SUBSIDIES

The following food and agricultural products are now or have been at one time subject to direct subsidy.

DOMESTIC

Domestic commodities cover: Dairy products, including fluid milk, concentrated milk products, butter, and cheese; a large group of miscellaneous processed groceries; specified canned vegetables and fruits—that is, tomatoes, peas, corn, beans, peaches, pears, plums, and tomato juice—and tomatoes, peas, corn, and beans in raw form when sold for processing; specified types of jelly and jam and specified berries and fruits when sold for processing into jam, frozen eggs, potatoes, white beans, flour, shortening, transportation of beef, butter, potatoes,

and other foodstuffs; feed, fertilizer, wool, alfalfa, eggs for export, oats, barley, and certain seeds, and apples. Some of these subsidies are primarily for the purpose of stabilizing or avoiding increase in prices while others are primarily to promote production. It is difficult to distinguish between these two types of subsidies as most production subsidies are also indirectly instituted in the interest of price stabilization, since otherwise production incentives might take the form of price increases. In the case of flour and apples, subsidies are paid not to increase production or prevent price increases, but to take care of surpluses.

IMPORTS

Although a relatively small proportion of import subsidies have been paid on foods, some foods which are not domestically produced are or have been eligible for import subsidies. Subsidies have been paid on tea, cocoa, cocoa butter, cocoa beans, vanilla beans, spices, dried fruits, peanuts, cleaned and uncleaned rice, tapioca, canned corn beef, rennet, salt, lima beans, white corn, oranges, grapefruit juice, unsweetened fruit pulp, molasses, and skimmed milk powder. Of these 20 commodities 6—canned corned beef, lima beans, cleaned rice, tapioca, fruit pulp, and grapefruit juice—have now been declared ineligible for subsidy. Six others—tea, cocoa beans, vanilla beans, spices, dried fruits, and peanuts—are now ineligible for subsidy because they are subject to bulk purchase by the C. P. S. C., which resells in the domestic market at prices consistent with the price ceiling. Five items—cocoa butter, salt, white corn, uncleaned rice, and molasses—are onl eligible for subsidy after prior approval. Import subsidies have also been paid on a number of agricultural supply and equipment items, such as seeds, fertilizers, and farm machinery and equipment. Due to the fact that most of the imported foods and some agricultural supply items are now subject to Government bulk purchase and sale programs, subsidies of food imports have become relatively small.

PURCHASE AND SALE

In addition to the six imported commodities listed above as subject to Government purchase and sale, imports of coffee, fats and oils, sugar, and such agricultural supplies as fertilizers and pesticides are subject to indirect subsidy through Government purchase and sale programs. All these items are purchased by the C. P. S. C. with the exception of sugar. All imports of sugar have been purchased by the Wartime Prices and Trade Board sugar administrator since the outbreak of war.

Domestic foods and agricultural products subject to purchase and sale programs by the Government are very few. As a result of a serious beef shortage in the spring of 1942 the Government intervened to buy and sell on the domestic market beef destined for export in order to maintain adequate domestic supplies without lifting domestic ceilings. During the summer of 1942 the corporation bought cattle at export prices and resold them on the domestic market at prices appropriate to wholesale ceilings at a trading loss of nearly $1,000,000.

In order to provide adequate markets for dairy butter, the normal outlets for which had been adversely affected by rationing, the C. P. S. C. has been authorized to purchase through retailers and other dealers all dairy butter offered by farmers. The corporation sells this butter to industrial users who are permitted to purchase creamery butter only under very limited conditions. A small trading loss during 1943–44 is expected.

The Government has also intervened through the medium of the C. P. S. C. to assist growers and packers of vegetables and fruits. In this case the board has not definitely contracted to purchase output but has merely guaranteed to purchase at stipulated prices any surplus held by a canner on a given date. This is not necessarily a subsidy but is primarily a plan designed to promote maximum production by guaranteeing a market at a minimum price for all products. In practice no purchases have been made by the corporation.

The Canadian Wool Board, operating under the Prices Board, has contracted to purchase all domestically produced wool for the duration of the war and one clip thereafter. A trading loss is incurred by the board on sales of wool for civilian use in order to maintain ceiling prices on wool textiles and which in 1942–43 amounted to $62,000.

The Department of Agriculture, including the various boards operating under its supervision, and the Department of Trade and Commerce through the Canadian Wheat Board have instituted purchase and sales programs designed almost entirely to insure maximum production for flax and flaxseed of various types, soya beans, sunflower and rape seed, vegetable seeds and dehydrated vegetables. Trading losses are incurred on the sale of flaxseeds for processing in order to keep down prices and although information is not available it is possible that losses may be incurred on some of these other products. The Agricultural Supplies Board has been authorized to subsidize the actual dehydration of certain types of vegetables. This program is primarily to encourage and increase the production of supplies for war uses. The Special Products Board also purchases specified kinds of vegetable seeds, the maximum production and controlled use of which is considered vital to the war-food program. In September 1943 the Government prohibited further open-market operations in wheat and has become the sole purchaser of wheat.

REDUCTION AND REMISSION OF DUTIES AND TAXES

Foods for which import duties and taxes have been reduced or removed include tea, coffee, oranges, sugar, rice, dried fruits, bananas, and a number of fresh fruits and vegetables.

B. NONFOOD SUBSIDIES—DOMESTIC

Domestic subsidies cover leather footwear, garment and glove leather, a number of miscellaneous household items, soap, lumber, cheese boxes, fruit baskets, fuel wood, coal, and some miscellaneous items such as mine-pit props, ties, and pit wood.

IMPORTS

The great bulk of import subsidies are paid out on nonfood items. Seventy percent of the total import subsidies paid out in 1942–43 were on petroleum and in 1943–44 it is estimated that approximately 37 percent will be paid on petroleum. Another important import subsidy is on cotton and cotton fabrics, wool and wool fabrics, and other fibers and textiles. Raw cotton and cotton fabrics alone will account for 37 percent of 1943–44 import subsidies. Other types of imports which have been subsidized include chemicals, drugs, oils and paint, earthenware and glassware, metals and fabricated metal products, cutlery, and tools.

PURCHASE AND SALE

Indirect subsidies in the form of trading losses have also been incurred on a number of nonfood items. Although it is understood that trading losses during the first year of operations were chiefly on foods, this situation is expected to be reversed in 1943–44 with the great bulk of the losses occurring on nonfood items principally wool yarns and fabrics, bindertwine, and materials for its manufacture, industrial alcohol, cheese-box materials, bristles, chemicals, and cotton yarns and fabrics.

Trading losses are also incurred by the Wartime Salvage Corporation, a corporation operating under the Wartime Prices and Trade Board. This corporation was organized in March 1942 for the purpose of acquiring and disposing of waste or used material of all kinds. In addition to regulating prices for salvage and waste materials, it organizes facilities for the orderly marketing of salvage.

REDUCTION AND REMISSION OF DUTIES AND TAXES

Nonfood items for which import duties and taxes have been reduced or removed include coal, vegetable fibers, alfalfa meal, second-hand bugging, tin, rubber, bindertwine, and so forth.

5. DETAILS OF PRINCIPAL SUBSIDIES

A. FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—DAIRY PRODUCTS

One of the most important and certainly the largest domestic subsidy paid has been on dairy products. The problem of establishing proper inter-relationships between the prices of milk according to various end products, either by means of price adjustments or by subsidies, has been a difficult one and has resulted in a series of price adjustments and subsidies. Considerable increases in the production of cheese and concentrated milk products have been necessary to meet war requirements coupled with a great increase in civilian demand for milk. At the same time dairy production costs have risen and since dairy products are one of the principal items in the cost of living, it has been important to prevent price increases in this field.

Temporary subsidies were first paid on fluid milk both for consumption in fluid form and for manufacture into concentrated milk products, effective December 22, 1941. The subsidy amounted to 30 cents per hundredweight on milk sold for

direct consumption in areas where there had been no price increase since August 1, 1941, and 40 cents per hundredweight on milk sold for concentrated milk manufacture above a minimum price of $1.70 per hundredweight or the current price whichever was higher. Payments were made to producers by distributors and manufacturers who were reimbursed monthly by the C. P. S. C. The subsidy was granted as a temporary measure to insure adequate supplies while certain inequalities in the base period price structure were corrected. Prior to the base period, increases in producers' prices in certain areas had been approved while prices in others had not increased. This subsidy was discontinued on April 30, 1942, when the Board issued a revised maximum price schedule which permitted some increases and was designed to provide adequate and equitable price returns without the need for subsidy.

Producers continued to demand higher prices, however, and in order to increase or even maintain production a subsidy seemed required. Effective September 1, 1942, a new subsidy of 25 cents per hundredweight on milk for sale at retail in fluid form in markets specified by the Board was authorized.

Responsibility for producer subsidies was transferred to the Department of Agriculture and on April 3, 1943, the Minister of Agriculture announced the details of the 1943–44 price-subsidy policy covering butter and milk. The 25 cents per hundredweight subsidy on fluid milk was continued. Producers of milk used for concentration purposes were to be subsidized also at a rate of 25 cents per hundredweight during the winter months of October 1943 to April 1944. During March and April 1943, the Agricultural Food Board paid similar subsidies on milk used in concentrated products.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask if the gentleman has included in his remarks figures showing whether or not the payment of these subsidies in Canada has actually resulted in increased production of any dairy product?

Mr. DILWEG. If the gentleman will permit me to conclude my remarks, I will answer his question.

In spite of these subsidies, supplies of milk and more especially milk products have been inadequate to meet requirements. Labor costs have increased and poor feed-grain yields in eastern Canada have resulted in the need to purchase an abnormal amount of additional feed. Farm labor is increasingly difficult to get and at the same time both civilian and military requirements in Canada have increased and export commitments to the United Kingdom have been stepped up. In September 1943 the Government authorized an increase in subsidy rates for the period October 1, 1943, through April 30, 1944, and announced a new subsidy on cheese designed to provide additional production incentives. A maximum subsidy of 55 cents per hundredweight on fluid milk was approved provided that in areas where the 25-cent rate was considered adequate the subsidy should be limited to that amount. The subsidy on milk used for concentration purposes was raised to 30 cents per hundredweight. A new subsidy on milk processed into Cheddar cheese payable at a rate of 30 cents per hundredweight during the period October 1, 1943, to April 30, 1944, was also authorized. This subsidy is in addition to the premium on quality and special factory improvement subsidy already in effect.

In addition to these subsidies on dairy products paid at the production level, a subsidy at the retail level of 2 cents a quart of milk has been in effect since December 1942. This subsidy is paid to retail distributors to compensate for a 2-cent-a-quart roll-back in the retail price of milk introduced at this time. This retail price roll-back was one of several put into effect in December 1942 to secure a reduction in the cost of living index in order to avoid the necessity of authorizing an increase in the cost of living bonus. Payments are made monthly to distributors through the chartered banks. The C. P. S. C. continues to pay this subsidy since the prices board remains responsible for consumer subsidies.

In order to prevent the development of an acute butter shortage indicated by a serious decline in production resulting from low prices of milk for butter manufacture relative to other uses, a subsidy of 6 cents a pound on butterfat—equivalent to 5 cents a pound on butter—was authorized on July 1, 1942, on all creamery butter. This subsidy did not remedy the supply situation sufficiently rapidly. Butter rationing was introduced in December 1942. At the same time, the seasonal price increases for butter, which had been previously authorized, were canceled in order to remove any incentive to withhold supplies and the subsidy was increased to 10 cents a pound of butterfat for the period December 21, 1942, through April 30, 1943. Early in April the Minister of Agriculture announced that a subsidy of 8 cents a pound would be effective May through December 1943, which would be raised to 10 cents for the months January through April 1944.

I think it is quite evident that Canada has experienced the same difficulty we have had in this country in regard to our farm situation. In many instances, it is directly due to a manpower shortage, a machinery shortage, and drought. They have experienced great difficulty in trying to hold the prices down or maintain the price ceiling without paying subsidies.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement descriptive of the Canadian subsidy program. The gentleman has indicated that the Canadian system is designed to do two things: First and foremost, to increase production, and, secondly, to maintain a consumer's price level that is compatible with the fight to prevent inflation. I have listened for three-quarters of an hour to the description of the Canadian system and I have yet to hear the answer, statistically shown or otherwise, as to what the effect of the payment of subsidies has been on production. What has been the influence? Has it been different from what we experienced in Wisconsin when we paid a 3¾ cents a pound subsidy on cheese to insure production and the production of cheese immediately took a nose dive and is still falling? Or have they had a successful experience in increasing production in Canada as a result of the payment of these subsidies? It would be a matter of great interest to the Members of Congress, I think, if the gentleman has those figures available.

Mr. DILWEG. I do not believe I or anyone else can answer that. In order to answer the gentleman's question, one would have to include as a cause for the dropping off of production the need for manpower and machinery, and the inability to produce because of weather conditions. In other words, mere incentive payments are not going to produce if you do not have the wherewithal to do it in the form of manpower, machinery, and favorable growing weather.

Mr. KEEFE. If I understood the gentleman correctly, one of the principal bases of the payment of subsidies was to compensate the producer and pay him a price without raising the price level to the consumer. That would enable him to surmount in some way the high price of feed, the inability to secure labor due to the high cost of labor, and so forth.

Mr. DILWEG. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Regardless of these other elements that may enter into the picture, the gentleman justifies the payment of subsidies under the Canadian system on one ground, that it will tend to increase production. The gentleman must have in mind when offering this program that all of these other impacts are going to be present. The question I should like to have answered, and I ask it because the gentleman evidently has done some research on this subject, is whether or not under the Canadian operation of the subsidy plan as far as it relates to the dairy industry, it has actually resulted in increased production of dairy products.

Mr. DILWEG. Not materially.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the first part of the gentleman's argument is nullified.

Mr. DILWEG. Do not say the first part of my argument. I am not here arguing or justifying anything. I am reporting to the Congress as best I can on a compilation of facts that I think might be informative to the Congress in connection with a bill they are to consider next week.

Mr. KEEFE. I take it that the gentleman favors subsidies, does he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] has done great service in Congress in explaining one of the subsidy operations of our great neighbor on the north. I know he served well and faithfully on

the Banking and Currency Committee and has studied this subject in an effort to prevent inflation. I find nothing in his argument that should be obnoxious I think to anyone, and I think we should appreciate the research he has done.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything that was said by the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now speaking could be interpreted as critical of what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] has said. I think the gentleman has made some research on this subject, and he referred to the fact in his speech that I was here on the floor, one of the few that are here, to listen to his statement, one who is interested in the dairy situation the same as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] himself. I was interested because of the research the gentleman has made, and so stated. I stated that he had obviously made much research, and I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he perhaps would have the answer to the question as to whether or not the payment of subsidies in Canada had in fact resulted in an increase of production, because the two fundamental things I think the gentleman will admit in his research as being the basis for the Canadian system was increase of production, and to maintain consumer prices. Am I correct?

Mr. DILWEG. Yes; they are two of the elements.

Mr. KEEFE. And do I understand the gentleman as favoring subsidies?

Mr. DILWEG. I have already expressed myself, but perhaps the gentleman did not have the answer to that because he was not on the floor at the time. It is not a question of favoring subsidies or of saying subsidy or no subsidy. I believe I have already expressed myself along this line. I believe a restrictive use of moneys for subsidies would be a good thing at this time, or, if Congress will suggest a new method to help control inflation as a substitute for that of the administration, maybe that is the other part of that issue, but I do not believe that the issue can be squarely drawn on subsidy or no subsidy.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that no one can say in the midst of war whether or not a subsidy or sky-high selling prices on dairy production will bring about an increase actually in milk production because you are limited by the factor of feed and by the factor of labor and by many of the unknown future things in weather, and the mere fact that Canada in her experience in the war has found it necessary not only to increase the price in the market place but to go on with subsidy operations on two or three occasions shows that it is a question of using all weapons in trying to maintain as near as possible normal dairy production.

Mr. DILWEG. The gentleman is entirely correct in his statement. The facts that I had at hand in my research do not indicate any increase of production in the dairy field as a result of a subsidy payment in Canada. However, I also wish to state that subsidy payments did increase production on other agricultural commodities produced in Canada, as is the case in this country.

CANNED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Canned fruits and vegetables have been subject to subsidy since shortly after the imposition of the general price ceiling.

In March 1942 it was found necessary to institute a price roll-back for canned fruits and vegetables of the 1941 pack in order to relieve a squeeze on wholesalers and retailers. Wholesalers' and retailers' base-period prices had been established on the basis of advance prices quoted by canners in the spring of 1941. Canners' prices increased before the end of the base period and wholesalers and retailers found it difficult if not impossible to replace stocks under wholesale and retail ceilings. Canners' prices were therefore reduced to the lowest price charged in the spring of 1941 and wholesale prices were reduced correspondingly. Since costs had already been incurred, an inventory subsidy was authorized to compensate for this price reduction. Owners of stocks were subsidized, wholesalers to the full extent of the roll-back and canners by 80 percent of the difference. Retailers were required to absorb the higher costs incurred on any stocks already on hand.

Increasing growers' prices—which were exempt from price ceilings and increases in which were considered necessary by the Government—and other increased production costs required a subsidy on the 1942 pack of canned fruits and vegetables if price ceilings were to be maintained. Subsidies at specified cents per dozen cans were authorized on tomatoes, peas, beans, corn, tomato juice, peaches, pears, and plums. Part of the subsidy on tomatoes, peas, beans, and corn was designed to enable canners to pay specified minimum prices to growers. These minimum prices were stated in terms of dollars per ton increases over 1941 prices. The Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation also guaranteed to purchase at stipulated prices any surplus stocks of canned tomatoes, peas, corn, and green and wax beans on hand after February 1, 1943. Only canners who paid growers' prices which exceeded 1941 prices by specified amounts as indicated above were entitled to sell to the Corporation. The purchase price was slightly higher than the maximum legal prices established but lower than the maximum price plus subsidy.

A similar subsidy program has been authorized to cover the 1943 pack. Subsidies at specified cents per dozen cans will be paid by the C. P. S. C. on canners' sales of tomatoes, tomato juice, peas, corn, green and wax beans, peaches, pears and plums. The subsidies on canned vegetables will be paid at the same rate as the 1942 subsidies less that portion of the subsidy paid in 1942 to cover increased prices to growers over 1941 prices, the subsidy for which is to be paid in 1943 by the Department of Agriculture. An additional incentive subsidy for tomatoes and tomato juice has been authorized by the Prices Board of 3 cents per dozen cans of tomatoes and 2 cents per dozen cans of tomato juice.

The Department of Agriculture has taken over the responsibility of subsidizing producers for vegetables sold to canners. The purpose of this subsidy is to provide growers with suitably higher returns over 1941 prices in the interests of maintaining or even increasing production while at the same time to avoid lifting canners' ceilings. Subsidies are payable at the following rates: tomatoes, $3 a ton; corn, $4 a ton; peas, $10 a ton shelled weight, and $2 a ton straw weight; and green or wax beans, $7.50 a ton.

A Government purchase guaranty similar to that in effect in 1942 has been authorized by the Prices Board for specified kinds of canned fruits as well as vegetables. After December 1, 1943, the C. P. S. C. will purchase from canners any of the specified products at a maximum price slightly below maximum ceiling prices plus subsidy. In the case of canned vegetables and tomato juice, canners are only eligible to sell to the corporation if they paid prices to the grower equal to or exceeding 1941 prices.

MISCELLANEOUS PROCESSED GROCERIES AND HOUSEHOLD GOODS—INCLUDES SOME NONFOOD AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT SUBSIDIES

In order to eliminate a serious squeeze on wholesalers and retailers resulting from the application of the general price ceiling, manufacturers' maximum prices of a broad group of miscellaneous groceries and household goods were reduced in March 1942. Manufacturers' maximum prices were rolled back 3 months from the highest prices prevailing in the base period to the highest prices prevailing in June 1941. A maximum subsidy to all manufacturers equivalent to the total amount of the roll-back was authorized and is still in effect. Manufacturers are not eligible for subsidy, however, to the extent that they are earning profits in the 100-percent excess-profits-tax bracket, as defined under the Excess Profits Tax Act. In other words, no manufacturer in the 100-percent excess-profits-tax bracket is eligible for subsidy nor will he receive any subsidy which will put him in this bracket. This proviso was designed to prevent the payment of subsidies to firms whose profit situations do not warrant a subsidy as well as to minimize the total cost of the subsidy. This was the first instance in which this profit-control formula was used but it has now been extended to many other subsidies.

When this subsidy was first authorized it covered more than 40 different items. The number has now been reduced to about 25. In some instances it was found that a subsidy was not warranted, in others the need for subsidy was removed by instituting price adjustments or standardization programs, while in still others different subsidy arrangements had to be introduced. The commodities now covered include 22 foods and 4 nonfood items. Foods: Baking powder; breakfast cereals; processed coconut, sweetened; baking chocolate; cream of tarter; cocoa and chocolate with added malt in paste or powder,

for beverage purposes; flavoring extracts; jelly and pudding powders; mayonnaise and salad dressing; mustard, prepared and dry; canned meats, other than poultry and corned beef; canned molasses; rolled oats and oatmeal, except in bulk; peanut butter; pickles and relishes; split peas; canned pork and beans; canned soup; canned spaghetti; corn sirup; tapioca; and vinegar. Nonfoods: Floor wax; furniture polish and shoe polish; liquid ammonia, household cleansers, household lye and washing soda; cornstarch and laundry starch. The following commodities were included originally but were removed after the program was initiated either because the squeeze was too slight to warrant a subsidy or because other arrangements were made to handle the squeeze problem. These are: Evaporated apples; soda biscuits and sweet biscuits; processed cheese; mincemeat; household brooms; wax papers; toilet paper; table salt.

It was possible through standardization to eliminate the need for subsidy for macaroni and zinc fruit jar rings, two of the commodities originally eligible for subsidy under this order. In the case of clothespins, a price adjustment involving the establishment of a uniform dollar-and-cents ceiling at all levels removed the need for subsidy. In the case of spices and coffee, a direct subsidy is no longer necessary, since all supplies are now purchased and sold by the C. P. S. C. which sets its selling prices at levels appropriate to processors' ceilings, irrespective of cost. In the case of such important products as pot and pearl barley and puffed wheat, soap and cooking oils, maple sirup and jelly and jam, special subsidy arrangements had to be authorized to compensate for additional increases in costs.

In the case of barley and puffed wheat a special subsidy was provided to compensate not only for the roll-back in the base period to June 1941 but also to meet increased costs of grain since the base period.

SOAP AND COOKING OILS

This was also necessary in the case of soap and cooking oils in order to compensate for the greatly increased cost of oils and fats during 1942. The following new subsidy arrangement was introduced. Domestic subsidies are paid on inventories as of December 31, 1942, and on all purchases since that date. The rate is the difference between laid-down costs and a lower schedule of prices established by the Oils and Fats Administrator. Imported oils and fats are purchased by the C. P. S. C. and sold to manufacturers receiving the subsidy at the price established in this schedule. Assistance under this scheme on the part of soap and shortening manufacturers is voluntary. Nonparticipants do not receive the benefits of any Government subsidy. The C. P. S. C. sells imported oils and fats to nonparticipants at cost. Manufacturers applying for subsidy are subject to profit control.

MAPLE SIRUP

In the case of maple sirup a different subsidy formula was required because of the establishment of uniform dollars-and-cents ceilings on maple products in March 1943. A subsidy was authorized for manufacturers and packers to enable them to pay a specified minimum price to producers for maple sirup. The subsidy is payable on sales of maple sirup, maple sugar, and maple butter at the rate of 4 cents per pound based on maple sirup content. The amount of maple sugar and butter on which subsidy may be claimed is limited to a fixed percentage of maple sirup sales.

JAM AND JELLY

Rising costs of fresh fruits and berries, coupled with an increasingly serious supply situation, resulted in the authorization of a new subsidy in June 1943 to encourage the production of jam and jelly. Uniform dollars-and-cents prices at the manufacturing level were established at levels no higher than those prevailing during the base period. To encourage the manufacture of jam and jelly at these prices, a subsidy was authorized as follows: pure loganberry, black currant, red currant, blackberry, gooseberry, apricot, cherry, peach, grape, and plum jam at three-fourths cent a pound, and No. 2 pectin jam of these same varieties at one-half cent a pound; No. 2 pectin strawberry and raspberry jam at 1¼ cents a pound; No. 3 blended or compound strawberry and raspberry jam at three-fourths cent a pound; all grades of blackberry, bramble, black currant, red currant, grape, crabapple, apple, quince, and mint jelly at three-fourths cent a pound.

To enable the manufacturers of jam and jelly to compete with other purchasers of jam fruits, an additional subsidy was authorized by the Department of Agriculture in May 1943 on strawberries, raspberries, loganberries, gooseberries, and currants used in the manufacture of pectin and compound jams. Manufacturers must pay specified minimum prices to which the subsidy is added and claim reimbursement of subsidy from the Department of Agriculture. This arrangement takes the place of the subsidy paid by the C. P. S. C. in 1942 on strawberries produced in British Columbia.

The following subsidy rates are now in effect:

First. In British Columbia:

(a) Strawberries, 6 cents a pound of No. 1 jam and 4 cents a pound of No. 2 jam based on a minimum purchase cost of 6 cents a pound.

(b) Raspberries, 3 cents a pound based on a minimum purchase cost of 11 cents a pound.

(c) Loganberries, 3 cents a pound based on a minimum purchase cost of 7½ cents a pound.

(d) Gooseberries and currants, 3 cents a pound based on minimum purchase cost of not less than the 1942 price.

Second. In Ontario and the East:

(a) Strawberries, 3 cents a pound based on minimum purchase cost of 9 cents a pound or 11¼ cents a quart—20 ounces.

(b) Raspberries, 3 cents a pound based on minimum purchase cost of 10 cents a pound or 11¼ cents a quart—18 ounces.

(c) Loganberries, 3 cents a pound.

(d) Gooseberries and currants, 3 cents a pound based on minimum purchase cost of not less than 1942 cost.

In addition, the C. P. S. C. is authorized to purchase at ceiling prices any jams and jellies still held by manufacturers on May 1, 1944. The C. P. S. C. is also making direct purchases during the current season of berries and fruits in British Columbia. Strawberries, raspberries, loganberries, black currants or apricots preserved or processed in specified manner are subject to this government purchase program. This program has been instituted not as a means of subsidy but principally in order to insure equitable distribution.

This subsidy, covering all fruits and berries processed into jam and jelly, will supersede the special subsidy paid in 1942 on strawberries for jam making. Under this subsidy processors who paid 8 cents a pound or more for strawberries for jam making and preserving were eligible to apply for a subsidy of 2 cents a pound during 1942. This subsidy was necessitated at that time by a special problem. With the removal of Japanese laborers from the coastal area of British Columbia abandoned strawberry acreage could not be taken over and operated except at greatly increased costs.

The supply situation became so serious in 1943 that the rationing of jam, jelly, and other preserves was introduced in September 1943.

POTATOES

Several types of subsidies have been in effect covering potatoes.

A subsidy on new potatoes was in effect during the months of June, July, and August 1943. Due to an acute shortage of old potatoes and the desire on the part of the board to prevent an increase in the cost of living, the board took action to reduce the price of new potatoes to maximum levels established for old potatoes. Wholesalers and retailers were reimbursed to the extent that their laid-down costs exceeded wholesale and retail ceilings respectively. No subsidies were payable on laid-down costs exceeding specified prices which varied downward at stated intervals during the period of the subsidy. A similar subsidy was authorized to cover imports of new potatoes during June and July but a sudden increase in supplies from the United States resulted in the cancelation of this subsidy on shipments entering after July 3.

In order to help alleviate the potato shortage and facilitate the movement to eastern Canada of surplus stocks of old potatoes in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, a temporary subsidy to cover part of the transportation costs was authorized during June 1943.

WHITE BEANS

With the establishment of maximum dollar-and-cents ceilings at the processor's levels which do not allow processors to pay sufficiently high prices to growers, a subsidy on Ontario white beans to be paid by the C. P. S. C. has been worked out. A maximum subsidy of 50 cents a bushel has been authorized.

FLOUR

In order to maintain price ceilings on bread and other wheat products in the face of rising wheat prices, millers may apply for draw-backs. This draw-back is paid by the Department of Trade and Commerce and amounted to approximately $3,000,000 in 1942–43. Since the price of wheat has risen from 90 cents to $1.25, at which price wheat is now purchased by the Government, the cost of this draw-back or subsidy will be considerably larger this fiscal year although no precise estimate of the cost is available.

WOOL

In order to encourage the production of a greater volume of good quality wool, a bonus of 4 cents a pound has been authorized for wool delivered according to special standards of cleanliness. The cost of this bonus is shared equally by the Dominion and the Provincial Governments.

TRANSPORTATION OF FOODSTUFFS

Temporary subsidies have been paid on such products as beef, butter, and potatoes to encourage the movement of supplies from surplus to shortage areas, particularly under abnormal and emergency conditions.

FEEDS

A Government subsidy on the eastern transportation of feed grains has been paid since 1941. Under the terms of this subsidy the Government pays the full cost of eastern transportation. A poor harvest in the eastern provinces in 1943 resulting in the necessity of importing a much larger proportion of the supply from the West than before and consequently bringing about a further increase in costs, compelled the Government to introduce additional assistance and subsidy programs. The Government undertook to build up at its own expense emergency reserve stocks of feed grain in eastern provinces for use in the winter. The Government also undertook to pay certain charges such as storage and insurance, abnormal transportation charges, and other extra charges. In August the Department of Agriculture announced an additional subsidy program designed to encourage farmers to purchase feeds as far in advance as possible. A sliding scale of subsidies was established.

A draw-back of 8 cents a bushel has been allowed since August 1942 on wheat used for livestock feeding. In view of rising wheat prices, this subsidy was designed to bring the price of feed wheat back into line with price ceiling levels.

In order to insure an adequate supply of alfalfa meal—a good substitute for protein feeds—a subsidy to processors was authorized by the Department of Agriculture in February 1943. The rate of subsidy is $3 a ton.

FERTILIZERS

Fertilizer subventions are paid to compensate for increased transportation costs in order to increase use with a view to increasing production of vital wartime crops such as grain and feeds, as well as to keep down farm production costs.

As a result of a wartime shortage of commercial supplies of protein for feeds, it was desirable to encourage increased production of clover, alfalfa, and other legume crops which constitute principal sources of home-grown proteins. Since legume crops require liming of the soil, special Dominion payments to provincial governments were authorized to cover transportation costs, assist in the establishment or operation of lime plants, and reduce cost of lime to farmers.

It is estimated that the subsidy on imported chemicals for fertilizer purposes will amount to $2,400,000 during 1943–44.

APPLES

The apple industry has been one of the outstanding war casualties. Approximately one-half of the commercial pack was normally exported chiefly to England, but as a result of the war a drastic reduction in the export of fresh apples occurred. Since the outbreak of the war, the apple industry has been indirectly subsidized. The Government has undertaken to dispose of the surplus by agreeing to purchase specified quotas at guaranteed prices. These prices are supposed to provide returns to growers equivalent or nearly equivalent to what they would have realized on sales of fresh apples, in spite of the fact that a great part of the crop must be processed and could not be sold at fresh apple prices.

In connection with some of the purchase and sale operations and other types of agricultural assistance programs conducted by the Department of Agriculture and the Canadian Wheat Board, varying forms of indirect subsidies are in effect. A trading loss on flaxseed is incurred by the Canadian Wheat Board. In connection with the export price equalization program in effect for oats and barley, producers receive what amounts to a subsidy. Government purchase programs have been arranged for red clover, alsike, and alfalfa seed in order to encourage and permit distribution at appropriate ceiling prices. Government-financed programs to secure the production of certain field root and vegetable seed crops are also in effect.

B. NONFOOD SUBSIDIES—TEXTILES

Cotton, rayon, and wool are all subsidized or eligible for subsidy or partial subsidy in one form or another. Clothing and home furnishings made from such textiles are therefore indirectly subsidized. Some imports and the entire domestic wool production are purchased by the Government either through a Government corporation, the Melbourne Merchandising, Ltd., or through the Canadian Wool Board. The Wool Board operates under the supervision of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board and resells wool to the mills for civilian goods at prices consistent with textile and finished goods ceiling and involving some trading loss to the board. The Melbourne Merchandising, Ltd., purchases all wool required for military contracts. The prices of machine-knitting cotton yarns and cotton fabrics were rolled back shortly after the general ceiling was introduced to levels prevailing in February 1941 and subsidies to cotton goods manufacturers to compensate for increased import costs of raw cotton were authorized. Raw cotton, flax, wool, rayon, selected textile manufactures, and certain fiber and fiber products are eligible for subsidy. The range of textiles eligible for subsidy has been progressively narrowed throughout the last year and a half with the object of eliminating all nonessential items. A great number are only eligible for subsidy on prior individual approval.

LEATHER FOOTWEAR, GLOVE AND GARMENT LEATHER, AND HIDES

Subsidies are paid on leather footwear, on glove and garment leather and on hides. Maximum manufacturers' prices for shoes were rolled back to spring 1941 levels and a subsidy amounting to 7 percent of the value of sales was authorized. A simplification program was introduced and the shoe subsidy was reduced to 4 percent in July 1942. In July 1943, as a result of a new distribution of the price squeeze by authorizing a 4-percent discount on manufacturers' purchases from tanners and an increase in manufacturers' prices to retailers, which the retailer is required to absorb, the subsidy in its original form was discontinued although some type of Government assistance is being continued to those tanners who need subsidy.

A subsidy was also granted to glove and garment leather manufacturers. A reduction was made in this subsidy in August 1942 and a further modification has recently been made.

Raw hides and skins and certain types of leather and leather products have been eligible for import subsidy.

LUMBER

Various subsidies have been paid to both producers and retailers on certain types of lumber. These subsidies have now been withdrawn and price increases at all levels authorized. A new subsidy has been authorized to offset the effect of these price increases on certain groups of consumers such as farmers, fishermen, and other individual civilian users, who purchase lumber from time to time for use in their personal trade or occupation or for maintenance and repair purposes. This subsidy is to be paid in the form of a rebate at a temporary rate of 10 percent subject to revision in the future on a regional basis after any necessary revisions in retail prices which may be taken.

FUEL WOOD

In order to reduce an acute wood fuel shortage in British Columbia last winter a subsidy was paid on several types of wood fuel to ensure essential supplies. In order to prevent an anticipated general wood fuel shortage this winter, a subsidy of $1 per cord was authorized in March 1943 to all dealers on commercial fuel wood cut before June 30, 1943. The period was later extended to December 1943. Subsidies have also been authorized to meet special cases of abnormally high transportation costs.

CONTAINERS

One of the major cost problems under the Canadian price ceiling has been that resulting from the increasing costs of containers. Subsidies are now payable on fruit baskets and containers and on cheese boxes.

6. COST OF SUBSIDY PROGRAM

No precise figures are available indicating the cost of all wartime subsidies paid to stabilize prices and/or to encourage production in Canada. Between the establishment of the price ceiling and March 31, 1943, a total of approximately $68,500,000 was paid out in subsidies or incurred on trading losses by the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation and the three other corporations operating under the Prices Board—the Wartime Food Corporation, the Canadian Wool Board, and the Wartime Salvage, Ltd. Of this total, roughly $31,000,000 was paid out on domestic subsidies, $10,000,000 on miscellaneous import subsidies, $24,000,000 on petroleum imports, and close to $3,500,000 incurred on trading losses.

Food and agricultural product subsidies accounted for approximately $27,600,000, of which 85 percent were domestic. Nonfood subsidies, on the other hand, amounted to approximately $34,000,000, of which $24,000,000 was paid out on petroleum imports, about $4,400,000 on other imports, and only $5,800,000 on domestic products.

During the calendar year 1942, the Department of Agriculture paid out a total of $71,200,000 in subsidies, of which $54,900,000 was paid in connection with prewar programs of wheat reduction and prairie farm assistance. Only approximately $16,200,000 was paid on wartime subsidies such as the feed freight assistance program, the feed wheat drawback and the apple assistance program.

Estimates of expenditures on subsidies payable in 1943–44 by the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation amount to $119,000,000 of which $40,000,000 is to be paid out on domestic products, $64,000,000 on imports—including $24,000,000 on petroleum, and $24,000,000 on raw cotton and cotton fabrics—and $15,000,000 on trading losses. No estimates are available covering trading losses expected to be incurred by the other three corporations operating under the prices board, and the estimates of the C. P. S. C. expenditures are stated by the Minister of Finance to be very rough guesses at best. New subsidies have been authorized since the estimates were prepared and rates are subject to change.

Domestic food and agricultural product subsidies—including trading losses—are expected to be only $30,400,000 but the largest subsidies paid on food last year by the corporation and all the domestic food producer subsidies payable this year are now paid by the Department of Agriculture. No estimate is given for import subsidies on food and agricultural products but these will be very small since many of the products on which subsidies were payable last year are now subject to purchase and sale by the corporation. Trading losses on food will amount to $1,700,000. Of the $30,400,000 estimated as payable on food and agricultural products $20,000,000 will be paid out to compensate for the 2 cents a quart reduction in the retail price of milk which went into effect in December 1942. Other important subsidies are $2,000,000 on canned fruits and vegetables and $1,500,000 on potatoes.

Non-food subsidies will account for $74,000,000, of which roughly $50,000,000 will be paid out on imports of petroleum and raw cotton and cotton fabrics. Another $5,000,000 will be paid out on wool imports and $13,000,000 on trading losses covering such products as binder-twine and cotton yarn for manufacturing twine, wool yarns, and fabrics, chemicals for fertilizer, and industrial alcohol. Only $7,800,000 is to be paid on domestic products, of which $2,300,000 is accounted for by the subsidy on leather footwear and glove and garment leather both of which have been greatly reduced if not entirely eliminated. Lumber accounts for $1,100,000, coal $1,300,000, and soap and shortening, which although officially designated as a domestic subsidy is subsidized largely because of the great increase in imported fats and oils, will be responsible for nearly $2,000,000.

No comparable estimates are available covering subsidies to be paid by the Department of Agriculture. An estimate for the calendar year 1943 indicates that approximately $100,000,000 will be paid. About $28,000,000 of this is accounted for by the wheat acreage reduction program and the prairie farm assistance program. The balance of $72,000,000 can be considered as wartime subsidies of which $25,000,000 is to be paid on butterfat, $10,000,000 on milk, $2,600,000 on cheese, $14,500,000 on the feed wheat draw back and freight assistance programs, $1,500,000 on vegetables sold for canning, $2,300,000 on apples, and $14,600,000 on oats, barley, and flaxseed.

The current annual rate of wartime subsidy payments on food, agricultural and nonfood items may be very roughly estimated at $190,000,000 or more. The cost of all subsidies payable on food and agricultural products in 1943–44 may be very roughly estimated at a minimum of $100,000,000. These figures do not include whatever sum may have to be paid out in the form of a drawback or subsidy to millers on wheat. In fiscal year 1942–43, a total of $3,000,000 was paid out by the Department of Trade and Commerce for this purpose. The Government has now become the sole purchaser of wheat at a price which is considerably higher than that prevailing last year. Maintenance of ceilings on flour prices will therefore cost considerably more than last year. No figures are available for trading losses which may be incurred by the Canadian Wool Board, the Wartime Salvage, Ltd., or the Wartime Food Corporation—the latter corporation is now inactive. Finally the figures does not include subsidies, for example, coal, which may be paid by the Department of Munitions and Supply. Certain items are also not included in the estimate of total food and agricultural product subsidies.

The total cost of current subsidies is approximately 2 percent of 1942 gross national income, and about 4 percent of total war expenditures estimated for 1943–44. An equivalent sum in the United States based on the difference in national income would be $3,000,000,000.

7. CONCLUSION

The provisions of the Canadian wage ceiling, authorizing the payment of cost-of-living bonuses to compensate for increases in the cost-of-living index, has presented special problems of price control. A ceiling over wages and salaries was considered essential to the maintenance of a ceiling over the prices of commodities and was introduced at the same time as the general price ceiling. In order, however, to ensure the support of labor the government guaranteed the payment of bonuses if the cost of living was not stabilized. For every one point increase in the cost-of-living index a bonus of 25 cents a week—with some exceptions for certain low-paid workers—was required.

Although the price ceiling was effective in checking most price increases the prices of many staple foods, particularly meats, continued to increase through 1942. The cost-of-living index rose 2.4 points between October 1, 1941, and July 1, 1942, necessitating the payment of an increased cost-of-living bonus of 60 cents a week to approximately 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 workers subject to the wage control and bonus order. Four months later the index had risen another 0.7 point, threatening another increase in the cost-of-living bonus. The board feared the effect on the price ceiling of cost increases arising from further bonus payments. Furthermore, certain important groups are not eligible for cost-of-living bonuses. It therefore seemed more equitable to take special steps to check the rise in the index rather than to compensate for increases through the payment of bonuses.

In December 1942 the board adopted a new subsidy policy. Direct control of variations in the cost-of-living index was to be achieved through a policy of selective reduction of retail prices and the payment of subsidies wherever this was necessary. Milk, oranges, tea, and coffee were the items selected for this purpose in December. The price of fluid milk sold to consumers was reduced by 2 cents a quart at retail. Maximum retail prices for tea and coffee were reduced 10 cents and 4 cents a pound, respectively, and appropriate reductions were made at all levels. Although neither tea nor coffee constitute important items in the index, they are widely consumed, and the fact that the entire supply of both commodities is purchased and sold by the Government contributed to the case of a price reduction, which merely involved lowering the Government selling price. Orange prices were reduced to base-period levels by removing the customs duty and the war-exchange tax and authorizing a subsidy to meet increased import costs. The total weight of these four foods in the food component of the cost-of-living index is 18 percent, approximately 6 percent of the total cost-of-living index. Shortly afterwards banana prices were reduced by means of the removal of the customs duty, war exchange, and special excise tax, and butter prices were reduced, the provision for seasonal increases eliminated, and the subsidy on

butterfat increased. As a result of these reductions, together with some seasonal declines, the food index fell 5.5 points by January 1, 1943, and the total index declined 1.7 points, thus eliminating the immediate necessity of increasing the cost-of-living bonus. By the use of this technique subsidies are not paid to finance wage increases, but are paid to prevent wage increases.

In spite of the considerable drop in the cost-of-living index as a result of the price roll-back for these goods, the index has continued to increase and by September 1, 1943, was 1.5 points above the figure for July 1942, when the last cost-of-living bonus was authorized. It appears clear that another increase in the bonus will have to be authorized on the basis of the October 1 index. The amount of the bonus is calculated on a quarterly basis.

Although the subsidy policy adopted last December in regard to milk, oranges, tea, and coffee was designed to use subsidies to prevent any increase in bonus payments, the Government has not continued this policy and has evidently decided not to attempt to hold the cost-of-living index rigidly stable by means of subsidies.

In connection with this particular subsidy technique it is perhaps of interest to note that subsidies were not necessarily paid on the commodities which had shown the greatest price increases and because of which subsidies were considered necessary. Increases in the price of beef and other meats, for example, had been the major cause of the rise in the cost-of-living index. One logical remedy would appear to be the payment of a direct subsidy on meat, but the board apparently rejected this proposal. In the absence of control over livestock prices—which are exempt from the Canadian price ceiling along with many other farm products when sold by producers to processors or distributors—and because of the particularly complicated price structure of meats, it may have been considered too difficult to exercise the proper control over a meat subsidy. Since, however, the purpose of the subsidy program was to stabilize the total cost-of-living index and since the board pointed out that the payment of subsidies was not intended to benefit any particular industry or firm but was merely a method of stabilizing prices in general and protecting the consumer, it did not appear illogical to select the recipients of subsidies on the basis of administrative and economic effectiveness of control rather than of special need. For this reason the board selected commodities such as tea, coffee, milk, and oranges, which presented relatively simple subsidy problems as well as constituting important items in the cost of living. In two cases—tea and coffee—the supply was purchased and sold entirely under Government auspices. In the other two cases the source of supply and the fact that the price structure was already subject to control at all levels were important factors.

The necessity of subsidies as a technique of effective price control has been consistently emphasized throughout the 2 years of the Canadian price ceiling. In a speech before the Chicago Better Business Bureau in the spring of 1943, Mr. Donald Gordon, deputy governor of the Bank of Canada and chairman of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, said:

> Our experience leads me to say, rather definitely, that a price ceiling policy cannot be successful unless there is an acceptance of this principle and a judicious but unhesitating application of it when the need is apparent.

Furthermore, Mr. Gordon went on to say:

> We have found in practice that it has not been necessary to pay out anything like the sums which some pessimists predicted.

He emphasized that:

> We have found that our declared willingness to provide such subsidies has enabled us to * * * reach agreements between parties providing for a fair sharing of increased costs without actually paying a subsidy at all—

And that he is convinced that in many cases such arrangements could not have been made—

> if a willingness to subsidize in case of a proven need had not been expressed in advance.

In another speech Mr. Gordon argued—

> If instead of subsidies, price increases were allowed to take place, then not only would you have the indiscriminate and haphazard dislocations of inflation but as well the elected representatives of the people would have no means of influencing the situation.

By the use of subsidies the distribution of cost increases may be effectively and equitably controlled by the Government.

> Nor can we make one rule for food prices and another for other kinds of commodities—

Continued Mr. Gordon—

> Food prices represent one-third of the wage earner's cost of living and higher food prices bring higher wage rates.

Although total price stabilization subsidy payments, excluding subsidies paid primarily as production incentives rather than price stabilization measures, may amount to $120,000,000 or more during the current fiscal year it has been estimated by the Prices Board that savings to the Canadian consumer as a result of the first year of the price ceiling amounted to approximately $400,000,000.

The importance of effective price control as a factor in stabilizing labor costs cannot be overemphasized. The Canadian Government realized that the wage ceiling could not be held or even justified unless the cost of living was stabilized. Although compensatory increases in labor income in the form of cost-of-living bonuses were guaranteed in the event living costs did increase, the price control and subsidy program has been administered particularly with a view to preventing increases in the cost-of-living index, since increased bonus payments would in turn exert increased pressure on prices and encourage the spiral of inflation. In one particular instance, described above, a subsidy was authorized specifically to prevent the index from rising and to avoid an increase in the cost-of-living bonus. The fact that Canadian price control has kept the cost-of-living index from rising more than 3 percent in the 22 months since the ceiling was introduced has been the major factor in stabilizing wages. Since the Canadian Government repeatedly states that price control cannot be effective without the payment of subsidies, the direct relation of subsidies to the stabilization of labor costs is obvious. It is true that Canadian labor has criticized the cost-of-living index as a true measure of the cost of living and has increasingly protested the strict administration of the wage ceiling, demanding increases in wage rates. The National War Labor Board has so far refused to authorize wage increases except in a few instances and where wage rates have been abnormally low or inequitable. Unfortunately statistics on the trend in wage rates since the establishment of the ceiling are not available. Monthly indexes of per capita weekly earnings in eight leading industries are available and although there has been an increase in weekly earnings it is due only partly to increases in wage rates. The increase in earnings is due mainly to longer hours, overtime at higher rates of pay, increased production at piece-work rates, upgrading, and other factors.

The trend in per capita weekly earnings and in the cost-of-living index since December 1941 is given below:

[December 1941=100]

	Index of per capita weekly earnings [1]	Cost of living index [2]
1941—December [3]	100.0	100.0
1942—		
January	95.6	99.7
February	101.2	99.9
March	102.2	100.1
April	104.0	100.1
May	104.6	100.3
June	103.2	100.8
July	104.3	101.8
August	104.8	101.6
September	107.2	101.4
October	108.0	101.7
November	109.1	102.4
December	110.0	102.6
1943—		
January	102.2	101.1
February	109.7	100.9
March	112.4	101.2
April	114.0	101.6
May	112.0	102.0
June	113.2	102.3
July	113.4	102.6
August	113.4	102.9

[1] Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, The Employment Situation, August 1943.
[2] Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Prices and Price Indexes, August 1943.
[3] Date of imposition of general price and wage and salary ceiling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFEE). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] has expired.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therewith an index.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a report by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have been informed by the majority leadership that there is no legislative program for this week; this notwithstanding the fact that the people of the United States are demanding such relief from the oil, gas, and fuel shortage as is offered in the Bisney bill, from bureaucratic oppression in the Dirksen bill, and others of a similar nature. Nevertheless, these bills are neglected in the respective committees. While they should be reported out, the House is prevented from acting on them by this neglect. In this respect it is desirable that Members sign discharge petitions Nos. 14 and 13 at the Speaker's desk, and afford the House opportunity for action to give the public the relief they need and want.

However, the Fulmer bill has been reported out by the Committee on Agriculture and reposes in the Committee on Rules. There is no valid reason why it should not be brought on for hearing before the House this week, tomorrow. The principal feature of the Fulmer bill is the provision for a single Food Administrator to eliminate chaos and correlate our national effort in the vital production, processing, and distribution of food for war and civilian needs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of the fact that the gentleman who preceded you spent 1 hour discussing food subsidies supporting the Canadian program and food subsidies as having possible application to this country, and answered an interrogation by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], asking whether there was any evidence in the Canadian experience to indicate that subsidies would increase production, by a negative answer, saying that there was no such evidence, it would seem to me therefore, even taking the argument of the proponents of subsidies that we can find no hope for increased production through such an arrangement, and it is high time the Congress acted on the Fulmer bill which provides, as you have stated, for a single food administration. Unquestionably the appointment of a single Food Administrator would increase production, and end the chaos and confusion and buck-passing now taking place in the food-production program. Consequently it would seem to me that Congress, instead of dilly-dallying, hesitating, hemming, and hawing, postponing, and forever delaying action on subsidies week after week and month after month, when it is brought out by the proponents of the subsidy program that it will not increase production, the Rules Committee and the majority leadership in Congress should act on the Fulmer bill and give us this single food administrator so that we can increase production so desperately needed, not only by this country, but our allies in this war. I wonder if the gentleman agrees?

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman is eminently correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think the Fulmer bill will increase and stimulate production.

Along with others, I have been pleading for the appointment of a single Food Administrator with adequate power and responsibility since the summer of 1942. Early this year the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee was formed, consisting of some 45 Members of Congress. It delved thoroughly into our food situation, and in May introduced H. R. 2739, known as the Jenkins bill, providing among other things for the appointment of a single Food Administrator. Most of its provisions have been incorporated in the Fulmer bill. But we can get no action on this legislation.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WINTER. Does the gentleman have any idea or does he know why it is that we cannot get action on this bill?

Mr. JONKMAN. If the gentleman will bear with me, just a moment, I am coming to that right now.

It is apparent that the President and his administration are opposed to such correction in the chaotic procrastination, indecisions, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities and lack of understanding of the various agencies muddling our food situation. In his November 1 message to Congress, the President repeatedly refers to this demand in some quarters for a single food administrator as loose talk.

But one has only to read that part of the President's message devoted to administration of the food program to realize that the shoe is on the other foot and that the President is indulging in loose talk. The President blandly promises that the allotment of steel for farm machinery for use in 1944 has been increased by doubling the amount available for use this year. But nowhere in any part of his message, does he say what agency will see to it that this allotment is available.

Two weeks ago, and before the date of the President's message, I called attention in this Well to the flimsiness of this promised increase of steel allotment for our farm-machinery program.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question but that the lack of farm machinery is a hindrance to the food-production effort. We will need more farm machinery next year than we did last year. I wonder if the gentleman will explain his interpretation. Will we get the farm machinery next year or is it just a promise?

Mr. JONKMAN. I was just coming to that. I then called attention to the W. P. B. reported shortage of over 6,000,000 tons for the third quarter, and estimated shortage of nearly 5,000,000 tons for the fourth quarter of 1943, making a shortage of 25 percent of steel for present requirements. This makes an additional allotment for farm machinery very doubtful.

Be that as it may, the irony of the situation is that the farmers and farm-equipment dealers do not believe this promise, nor do they put their trust in it.

In other words, it is their claim that this order gives only AA–2 rating and that they should have an AA–1 rating; that the AA–2 rating is nothing more than the right to get machinery if they can get it in the market. In other words, it is like a fishing license. Until you have it, you do not have the right even to fish, but after you have the license you have no assurance you will get the fish.

Farm-equipment dealers and associations are instructing and advising the farmers to hang on to every piece of old machinery they have, to patch it up and repair it, rather than expect new machinery under this promise. One manufacturer claims that even under the sanguine conception that the steel will be available, it will provide only 19 additional tractors for the whole State of Michigan.

It is this spirit of eternal vigilance, energy, and husbandry of free enterprise in agriculture and industry that has won and will have to win the battle of production on the home front in spite of the administration.

If the administration fails to stimulate this heroic effort by cooperating with an adequate supply of farm machinery, it is the duty of Congress to take action for this accomplishment.

It was because of the chaotic conditions in the administration of the whole food problem that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee undertook an examination of the laws and Executive decrees dealing with the subject. It is my privilege to present its report to the House, which is as follows:

CONFUSION AND CHAOS—A STUDY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FOOD PROBLEM

It seems rather anomalous that with the largest agricultural crop in the history of the Nation in 1942 and with reports that the 1943 crop will almost equal it, there should be a danger of a food shortage in the United States during the winter and spring of 1943–44. Such a danger has been brought to the American people by the utopian promises of the Administration to feed large blocks of the world's population, while at the same time it failed to create a positive food policy and then adhere to it.

Ten years ago, when the present administration came into authority, the press and radio carried glowing stories of the great reorganization that was to take place in the conduct of governmental functions, these stories being based to some extent upon the presumed success of the former Governor of New York in reorganizing that State. From that time to the present there have been innumerable reorganizations, creation of new governmental units and agencies, both by legislation recommended to the Congress and by Executive orders, as well as the reorganization of many of these new agencies and the abolishment of others. Simply to list these agencies would require many pages. One was pyramided upon another, with overlapping duties and functions, until almost the entire Federal Government service is in a state of turmoil unsurpassed in our history.

At the outset, through the so-called Economy Act of 1933, the positions of thousands of Government employees were jeopardized, and many of them with excellent knowledge and ability to carry on the functions of the Federal Government were dismissed from the service. Following this temporary reduction of Government employees, thousands upon thousands of new employees were brought into the service in an unparalleled expansion of governmental activity. Men and women were placed in administrative positions who had little conception of the practical problems with which they were to deal. The consequent confusion placed the whole foundation of governmental activity upon shifting sands, that today finds expression in the lack of critical materials, manpower shortages, and probable food shortages, which would induce disaster were is not for the resourcefulness, integrity, and ability of private economic interests of the Nation to cope with the situation—plus a benevolent Nature that gave us large crop surpluses for the past 3 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I have enjoyed what the gentleman had to say. I am sure he is ringing the bell. I also want to say that I have asked for 30 minutes to address the House tomorrow on a matter which I think is very important. I have introduced a bill to create an examining staff for each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of the Judiciary and Legislative subcommittees. I am going to take the 30 minutes and I would like to have as many of my colleagues ask me questions at that time about my bill as possible, and I will try to make some observations and argument to prove that my bill should be adopted. I trust that I can have as many of my colleagues on the floor to take part in the debate as possible tomorrow. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am sure his bill will be constructive and his remarks will add to the general concept of the release that is needed for the American people.

The report continues:

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, as an unofficial committee of Members of Congress, is primarily interested in the problems related to food. An examination of the Federal handling of this problem over the past several years definitely shows that, after 4 years of actual warfare, 3 years after the fall of France, and almost 2 years after the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor, the administration still flounders in trial-and-failure methods, without constructive policies that can be put into practical effect.

One wonders if at this late date the same blind philosophy of scarcity and governmental domination of every private activity does not still control the actions of Federal officials, from the President on down.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has to say regarding production. I am wondering if the gentleman has given any thought to the method of distribution, and I especially have in mind the story which appeared in the New York Times yesterday in which it was stated that the Commodity Credit Corporation was offering for resale back to the packers 2,700,000 cases of grapefruit juice and 17,000 cases of unusable eggs. I also have in mind some of the complaints reaching me from my own district with reference to the surplus of meat that some of my packers are caught with, the stock being there to butcher but the stamps not being there in the hands of the purchasers to take it up. Does not the gentleman believe that very much of this problem is due to the improper method of distribution as well as that of production?

Mr. JONKMAN. In my opinion the gentleman is absolutely correct. I believe it is due to failure to have a single Food Administrator; and, also, as shown later on in this report, the great difficulty of our present situation is due to the fact that we used operational methods instead of a topical approach to the problem.

The report continues:

Certain it is that the reluctance upon the part of the Executive head of our Government to grant specific authority to a single individual to centralize all of the control of food—production, processing, and distribution—is largely responsible for the present chaotic conditions, which create a food problem. After all these years, there is still an inter-agency battle for authority, following at least two different approaches to the whole problem. The result is that the administration is not yet properly organized to direct wartime food policies, when, under competent leadership, it would have been organized to meet these problems long before Pearl Harbor.

This internal strife between two divergent philosophies of procedure—the one operational and the other topical[1] has been encouraged by the failure of the supreme authority of the administration to face the issue squarely and to centralize authority in a single individual.

Executive orders establishing new agencies, or reorganizing old agencies, have been pyramided one upon the other in terms of abstract ideas rather than as specific directives. This has likewise been true in the interpretation of laws passed by the Congress, in order that they might suit the changing day-to-day fancies of administrative officials. Many of these agencies were built around similar operational groupings under a peacetime economy, with a total disregard of functional overlapping. Separate bureaus were established, which duplicated or withdrew from long-established Government departments, each with a Cabinet member at its head, the normal, logical functions of those departments. Instead of carrying out activities in accordance with the direction included in the statutes, general Executive orders created a governmental structure that followed an operational pattern.

Thus such highly interdependent problems as social security, labor relations, and manpower availability were placed in separate agencies in such manner as to encourage duplication of effort, conflict between agencies, dissatisfaction, distrust, and dissension between governmental officials, and the elimination of all hope for unified control of any single problem of Government. A superb example was the Axis-inspiring public charges and countercharges, during this past summer, between the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, and the Honorable Jesse Jones.

Because of the tremendous growth in our industrial economy, largely through mechanization, industry became highly specialized and its individual problems had to be met by the development of a specialized personnel. The incomprehensible nature of the presumed policies of the administration early produced such chaos and confusion among Government personnel that the notion was finally conceived of borrowing from industry's successful experience with its specialized personnel. Sections were established within governmental agencies, staffed by service officers and so-called efficiency experts, in an effort to cope with the serious problems that confronted an overexpanded and continuously expanding Federal administration. The first step in this direction was the establishment of an Administrative Management Division in the Bureau of the Budget.[2] Taking their cue from this important arm of government, almost every department and bureau of the Government created similar units. Management specialists, dealing with legal operations, personnel problems, and fiscal relationships, made extensive studies upon which recommendations could be based supposedly to improve governmental administrative functions. These led to recommendations overemphasizing operational organization in preference to topical organization.

In the fields of food production, processing, and distribution this operational organization is one of the principal causes for the crisis now being faced by the American people. It appears that the solution of food problems can properly be encouraged through topical organization. Only thus will the closely interrelated factors involved in the production, processing, and distribution of food be adequately met, for under it full authority for policy and administrative guidance will rest in the hands of a single individual. All of the problems of a given commodity are a continuous, integrated operation, from its production to its final consumption. The issues inherent in stimulating food production, processing, and distribution, involving as they do related factors of manpower availability, labor management relationships, cost and pricing, are so closely allied to each other that a single unit of government must correlate these problems in order to provide their successful solution. The American manufacturer or businessman, who must collaborate with government through its domination of every phase of our economic life under the present operational method of procedure, is forced to go to one agency to ascertain the wages he may be permitted to pay labor; to another agency to fix prices at which he may sell his product; and sometimes to a third agency to ascertain prices which he may pay for his raw materials. He must contact another division of government to determine the manner in which he may amortize the indebtedness of his business, while still other and different agencies of government must be contacted and then cajoled, influenced, or flattered to secure decisions on the basis of which he may operate his business.

[1] By the use of the term "operational" throughout this study, it is meant that the majority of governmental units are given responsibilities dealing with separate functions of our economy, such as production in one agency, distribution and rationing in another agency, determination of priorities in still another agency, etc. Likewise the term "topical" is intended to mean all of the related problems of a given subject, whether they be production, processing, distribution, priorities, etc., as related to that commodity or group of commodities.

[2] Source: U. S. Government Manual, summer 1943, p. 55. Established under Reorganization Act of 1939.

The consequent delays in such a diverse handling of the related problems of food are in themselves so great as inevitably to destroy any useful purpose for which these agencies may have been created.

In the simple matter of pancake flour, the difficulties of which industry were first brought to the fore by members of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, and which were forcefully brought to the attention of the administration and the Congress in a statement on the floor of the House of Representatives by Congressman CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, on June 30, 1943, it has taken the Office of Price Administration from that time until September 2, 1943, to grant authority for including in the costs of production the actual increases in the cost of raw materials entering into pancake flour.

Because these specialists, who were brought into the Government service to bring order out of the chaos already created, were for the most part youthful theorists, without practical knowledge or experience, the Government was not able to change over from a peactime economy to a wartime economy coincident with the attack on Pearl Harbor. And notwithstanding the public statements already made and the protests which will now follow, the Federal Government is not yet wholly mobilized for the proper solution of the food problem.

In spite of the clear implications of a rapid deterioration of our international relationships with the Axis Nations, when the war broke out there was little or no organization within the Federal Government to deal with the problems of food as such. The Department of Agriculture was originally organized to deal with the problems of food primarily from an agrarian point of view. Within its structure there had been created such agencies as the Agricultural Adjustment Administration,[3] to dominate and control production (largely under a philosophy of scarcity) and to maintain farm income. The Farm Security Administration[4] had been created to aid low-income farm families. The Soil Conservation Service[5] was created for the purpose of conserving soil and developing productive soil in large areas of the country that were well below the average of production. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation[6] was established for the purpose of protecting the agriculturalist against crop hazards. The Farm Credit Administration[7] functioned as an organization primarily to extend seasonal or long-term credit as an incentive, as well as protection for the farmer. The Rural Electrification Administration,[8] as its name implies, was created for the essential purpose of modernizing and mechanizing our rural properties.

There was a Surplus Marketing Administration,[9] whose primary function was to maintain a minimum standard of farm prices and insure distribution by purchasing surplus farm production and distributing it either to low-income groups under the stamp plan, or to encourage export through subsidies, or to encourage diversion of farm production from one commodity to another. The Commodity Exchange Administration[10] and the Agricultural Marketing Service[11] were the only two agencies in the Department of Agriculture which were in a position to accept any responsibilities in our conversion from a peacetime food economy to a wartime food economy. They had been created with a view to encouraging fair practices in the marketing of agricultural products, but there had not been the foresight adequately to prepare them to meet the conditions which would be imposed upon the Nation in providing sufficient food for a United States at war.

Notwithstanding the fact that as long ago as 1933 the Division of Consumers' Counsel[12] had been created in the Department of Agriculture, for the specific purpose of protecting consumer interest in the formulation of any agricultural programs, it now appears that, in the period from September 1, 1939, to December 7, 1941, no steps whatsoever were taken by this counsel in contemplation of the problems war would create.

It was on May 25, 1940, almost 9 months after Hitler's invasion of Poland, that the President took definite action toward creating a wartime organization, when he established the Office for Emergency Management.[13] Its functions were "to (a) assist the President in the clearance of information with respect to measures necessitated by the emergency; (b) maintain liaison between the President and the emergency war agencies for the purpose of securing maximum utilization and coordination of agencies and facilities in meeting the emergency; and (c) perform such additional duties as the President may direct."

Four days later, on May 29, 1940, under the authority of an act of Congress dated August 29, 1916, which created the Council of National Defense (the members of which were the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor), the President approved the regulation of the Council that "the advisory commission provided for in section 2 of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 649), shall be composed of an adviser on industrial production, an idviser on industrial materials, an adviser on employment, and adviser on farm products, an adviser on price stabilization, an adviser on transportation, and an adviser on consumer protection."[14] According to the United States Government Manual, summer 1943 edition, published by the Office of War Information, "This was the beginning of the national defense program."[15]

Two months later the Agricultural Division of this advisory commission submitted its recommendations with reference to the food problem, which in effect specifically called attention to the failure of the Department of Agriculture and the entire administration to exercise foresight by preparing for the coming emergency. These recommendations, submitted more than 10 months after the outbreak of the war in Europe, urged the collection of food-supply data and their centralization in a single unit. At this meeting, the Council adopted a resolution authorizing the preparation of a plan of organization and procedure for a food unit in the Defense Commission's Agricultural Division. Under its direction, in August 1940, in collaboration with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics,[16] the Surplus Marketing Administration and the Agricultural Marketing Service, it undertook a food survey covering raw materials, production, processing, transportation, storage, industrial location, and prices.

It was at about this time, August 1940, that the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense ceased to function as an integrated unit, and its problems and responsibilities were scattered throughout various other Government agencies. Quoting again from the United States Government Manual, we find the following:

"Industrial production, industrial materials, and labor became integral parts of the Office of Production Management, now the War Production Board. Price stabilization and consumer protection were combined into the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, now the Office of Price Administration. The Division of Agriculture was succeeded by the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, now the Office of Agricultural War Relations in the Department of Agriculture. The functions of the Transportation Division were absorbed by the Office of Defense Transportation. The agencies which evolved from the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, with the exception of the Office for Agricultural War Relations and the Office of Price Administration, are now units of the Office for Emergency Management."[17]

On January 7, 1941, the Office of Production Management[18] was created by Executive order. The Office of Lend-Lease Administration[19] was established under authority of an act of Congress dated March 11, 1941, but it actually came into being on October 28, 1941, and replaced the Division of Defense Aid Reports, which was established on May 2, 1941. In the meantime the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply[20] was created on April 11, 1941; and on August 28, 1941, it became the Office of Price Administration.

The administration was establishing parallel organizations to deal with problems of our industrial economy and food on a wartime basis, while in some instances similar organizations already existed on a peacetime basis. Instead of providing coordination, these agencies simply created additional bureaucracy. The establishment of additional Government bureaus meant greater divergence of opinion in solving the problems we faced. Under the aegis of such confusion it was inevitable that agencies would be created within agencies; that conflicts would develop further conflicts; that contradiction in governmental directives would flow in an ever-increasing stream further to complicate the problems of production, processing, and distribution.

In establishing the Office of Production Management as a separate entity, which organization was to deal with the general problems of production, purchasing, and priorities, the President enlarged the operational rather than the topical method of handling the problems, with further duplication of governmental functions. Here again was pyramiding of organization upon organization, for, under its over-all responsibilities covering the production of everything needed for carrying on the war, it took many func-

[3] Ibid., p. 604. Created pursuant to Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933.

[4] Ibid., p. 339. Created pursuant to Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, approved April 8, 1935; amended by Executive order of April 30, 1935, creating Resettlement Administration, which was transferred to Department of Agriculture by Executive order of December 31, 1936; name changed to Farm Security Administration by Secretary's memorandum of September 1, 1937.

[5] Ibid., p. 342. Established pursuant to Soil Conservation Act, approved April 27, 1935.

[6] Ibid., p. 341. Created by title V of Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, approved February 16, 1938.

[7] Ibid., p. 354. Created by Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916, with subsequent amendments.

[8] Ibid., p. 363. Created by Executive order of May 11, 1935, under authority of Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

[9] Ibid., p. 629. Established by President's Reorganization Plan III, effective June 30, 1940.

[10] Ibid., p. 609. Created by memorandum of Secretary of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1936, superseding Grain Futures Administration.

[11] Ibid., p. 604. Established by Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1940.

[12] Ibid., p. 613. Created pursuant to Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

[13] Ibid., p. 62. Established in the Executive Office of the President by administrative order of May 25, 1940.

[14] Ibid., p. 61.

[15] Ibid., p. 61.

[16] Ibid., p. 327. Created by Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1923; subsequently reorganized.

[17] Ibid., p. 61.

[18] Ibid., p. 623. Established within Office for Emergency Management.

[19] Ibid., p. 86.

[20] Ibid., p. 152.

tions relating to food out of the hands of Mr. Chester Davis, who was the responsible head of the Agricultural Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission, and placed them in the hands of persons who dealt with everything—industrial production, war-material production, manpower, and food. Consequently on May 6, 1941, following the first resignation of Mr. Davis, the functions of the Agricultural Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission—limited to their peacetime problems—were transferred to the operating agencies of the Department of Agriculture, while similar functions related to the war program were under the Office of Production Management.

The Economic Defense Board,[21] created on July 30, 1941, and which became the Board of Economic Warfare on December 17, 1941, was responsible for the importation of foodstuffs. A month later, on January 16, 1942, the War Production Board [22] was created within the Office for Emergency Management by an Executive order, giving authority for the establishment of general policies, plans, procedures and methods over procurement, allocation and priorities, including critical materials necessary for food production.

In the meantime much of the Lend-Lease Administration authority in connection with the exportation of food had been redelegated to the Department of Agriculture. All matters affecting farm labor, food-processing labor, and food-distribution labor were placed under the authority of the War Manpower Commission,[23] when it was created within the Office for Emergency Management by an Executive order of April 18, 1942.

The Office of Defense Transportation [24] had the responsibility of handling all problems of transportation, whether of food or anything else.

Apparently the only real attempt that has been made throughout the entire administration to concentrate the problems of food were those undertaken by the Secretary of Agriculture in his reorganization of the Department of Agriculture in December 1941.[25] Under that reorganization the Agricultural Marketing Administration [26] consolidated the activities of the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Commodity Exchange Administration, and the Surplus Marketing Administration. An Agricultural War Board [27] was established, and some of the war food activities of other agencies were delegated to the Department of Agriculture. For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation began to secure food in foreign countries for the Board of Economic Warfare; the Agricultural Marketing Administration began to carry out many of the activities of the Lend-Lease Administration under its direction; but all matters of policy were determined in the respective agencies, and the facilities of the Department of Agriculture were used only to carry them into effect. Each of these separate Government bureaus began to employ "food experts" to handle the food problem from its respective viewpoint, under the terms of the multiple Executive orders authorizing them to function. Again it was inevitable that prolonged discussion after separate consideration would bring needless delays in reaching necessary administrative decisions to solve any of the serious problems which were facing us. Responsibility was divided, and even where no disagreement existed the time element entering into a coordination of action between various agencies was excessive.

[21] Ibid., p. 132.
[22] Ibid., p. 117.
[23] Ibid., p. 100.
[24] Ibid., p. 82. Established within Office for Emergency Management by Executive order of December 18, 1941.
[25] Ibid., p. 324.
[26] Ibid., p. 604. Consolidated by Executive order of February 23, 1942.
[27] Ibid., p. 326.

Public and congressional demands were made to fix responsibility as long ago as the summer of 1942. The immediate outcome was the establishment of a Food Requirements Committee in June 1942, by the War Production Board, and this notwithstanding the fact that the Department of Agriculture is presumed to be more familiar with the food requirements of the Nation than any other agency of the Federal Government. While it is true that the Secretary of Agriculture was appointed chairman of this committee, the inability of the committee to function properly was apparent from the outset. It had no authority for the establishment of policy, but was responsible for action. It was in the same position in which Mr. Chester Davis found himself as Chairman of the Agricultural Division of the Advisory Commission, when he was given responsibility without authority. The strike that developed between governmental officials having responsibility in carrying forward the problems of food became so great that they began publicly to present their grievances, thus focusing attention once again upon the failure of the President to grant authority with responsibility.

It was at this time that one of America's great statesmen, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Food Administrator of World War No. 1, forcefully advocated the centralization of all authority and responsibility for food in a single agency of government. Regardless of party affiliation, the American public and public officials, with the exception of that small coterie of "advisers" who seem to have dominated every major activity of the Federal Government for the past 10 years, recognized the wisdom of Mr. Hoover's suggestion. In fact, the wisdom of it was so well recognized within administration circles that it precipitated a free-for-all battle between at least three of these agencies—the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Production Board—to obtain full authority and responsibility over the control of the national food problem.

On October 3, 1942, the President issued an Executive order creating the Office of Economic Stabilization,[28] also within the Office for Emergency Management, which was to issue directives on policy to practically every Federal department and agency of the Government.

Finally, on December 5, 1942,[29] by an Executive order, the public was led to believe that authority over food was to be centered in the Department of Agriculture. In actual fact, however, it simply placed a part of the food problem in the Department of Agriculture in that the Secretary was given responsibility to ascertain food requirements and to develop food production. While responsibility in connection with the transportation of food and the procurement of agricultural labor was given to him, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the War Manpower Commission still retained their authority over transportation and labor; and the War Production Board still had the final word concerning the allocation of materials for the production of farm machinery.

With regard to this latter, it was not until after the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee and other Members of Congress focused the spotlight of publicity upon the great shortage of agricultural machinery that any action was taken by the War Production Board to alleviate the serious situation that was facing our farmers. At the same time, while the responsibility was placed in the Secretary of Agriculture to increase food production, the whole problem of price fixing and food rationing was retained in the Office of Price Administration.

[28] Ibid., p. 84.
[29] Ibid., p. 325. The second wartime reorganization of the Department.

It is now apparent that the Secretary of Agriculture failed to exercise the responsibilities thus given (without policy-making authority) to meet the food issue squarely. He permitted intra-departmental disagreements to arise between the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture; and after more than 3 months, during which food for civilian domestic consumption became a major public issue, he failed to take any steps that would constructively aid in their solution. Public criticism, both in the press and on the radio, became such a national issue that the President could no longer deny the severity of that criticism for his failure to meet the situation properly.

Various agencies of the Department of Agriculture, including the Food Production Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Food Distribution Administration, and the Agricultural Extension Service were combined to form the War Food Administration.[30] There was such widespread recognition of the ability of Mr. Chester C. Davis that he was appointed Administrator. Mr. Davis, however, upon examining the situation, came to the conclusion that the same old policy of responsibility without authority was still in vogue, as it had been when he resigned as head of the Agricultural Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission. He found that he had all of the responsibility of increasing food production, making food purchases for various governmental agencies, allocating food within certain limitations to the military forces, lend-lease and civilian requirements; but he had no authority whatsoever over rationing civilian supplies or establishing prices to the producer, the processor, the distributor or the consuming public. In a very short time, apparently well-founded rumors were circulating throughout the country that reached a climax toward the middle of June 1943, when Mr. Davis addressed his now famous request for an interview with the President, in which he stated: "I find that I have assumed a public responsibility, while the authority, not only over broad food policy, but day to day actions, is being exercised elsewhere."

During the following week the President interpreted Mr. Davis' request for an interview as a letter of resignation, and appointed Mr. Marvin Jones in his place as War Food Administrator.

Shortly after Mr. Davis' appointment as War Food Administrator, it became so obvious that there was still a reluctance upon the part of the inner circle advising the President to relinquish its strangle hold upon the administration by granting authority commensurate with responsibility, that Mr. Hoover again publicly recommended out of his World War No. 1 experience that full authority and responsibility be placed in the hands of a single individual. It was at this time that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee was appointed. Democratic leaders in the Congress, with a view to avoiding any action that might be interpreted as a criticism of the conduct of the food problem, had completely failed in providing necessary congressional action. The devastating effect upon civilian morale, both on the farm and in the city, was rapidly becoming apparent. A potato shortage developed. Notwithstanding the ration coupons in the possession of the consuming public, they were unable to purchase beef from the butcher shops. Processors did not know what prices they would be permitted to pay to producers for many commodities. The delays inherent in the dual set-up of food control along operational lines was too well making itself manifest.

On the basis of its early investigations, the Republican Congressional Food Study Com-

[30] Ibid., p. 330. Consolidated by Executive order of March 26, 1943.

mittee proposed a bill to centralize all authority on the food problem in a single administrative agency. This bill (H. R. 2739) was introduced in the House of Representatives on May 18, 1943, by the chairman of the Food Study Committee, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS. On June 1, 1943, Hon. HAMPTON P. FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, introduced another bill (H. R. 2837) designed to accomplish a similar purpose. Both of these bills proposed to establish a single food administration within the Department of Agriculture, which would take over the fundamental duties outlined in a long series of Executive orders, and which would also give the Food Administrator policy-making authority along with responsibility.

On June 28, 1943, Senate 1283 was introduced by Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, as a counterpart of Congressman FULMER'S bill as reported to the House of Representatives. Up to the present time no legislative action has been taken on these bills.

Information received by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee indicates that during the 2 months Congress was in recess the strife between governmental agencies for full authority over the control of food for civilian usage has continued with an increasing tempo.

Contrary to the statement of the President in his food production message of November 1, it is apparent that Mr. Jones, as War Food Administrator, finds himself in the same position as did Mr. Davis, and that as a result little or no progress has been made up to this time toward a constructive solution of the food problem. The continued mishandling of the whole food problem through the lack of centralization of authority and responsibility inevitably brings discouragement to the farmers, the processors, and the distributors of this country, who have done a magnificent job under the most severe handicaps.

It is apparent that the continued failure of the Administration to cope with the situation in a manner satisfactory to the American people can now be mitigated only by Congress taking the initiative in enacting such legislation as is necessary effectively and constructively to meet the situation. The first step in this direction should be the enactment of the Fulmer bill (H. R. 2837), which was favorably reported from the Committee on Agriculture on June 24 last. Since that time it has been in the hands of the Rules Committee, and it is urgently recommended that the Rules Committee take immediate action to bring this exceedingly important bill to the floor of the House.

NOVEMBER 8, 1943.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHY NOT MANUFACTURE ETHYL ALCOHOL FROM PULP MILL WASTE SULFITE LIQUOR FOR SYNTHETIC RUBBER IN UNITED STATES—THE CASE OF THE PUGET SOUND PULP & TIMBER CO. OF BELLINGHAM, WASH.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a recent exposition at the National Capitol before select committees of the House and Senate of a truckload of tires made from the so-called Trib-Buna rubber, impels me to call the attention of the House to one of the most outrageous cases of bureaucratic muddling that has ever come to my attention. Briefly, it is this:

TRIB-BUNA TIRES

The raw material—alcohol—for the rubber in these tires was manufactured from waste sulfite liquor in a Canadian pulp and paper plant owned by the Chicago Tribune. Hence, the name "Trib-Buna rubber."

Please do not misunderstand me. I am finding no fault whatever with the Chicago Tribune, nor with the Canadian interests which manufactured this alcohol. But I desire to draw the attention of Congress to the fact that we have spent $650,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in developing plants for the production of rubber derived from petroleum, and not one dollar has been spent in the production of the raw material for this rubber from a source of which we have an abundant supply that is now polluting the seas and streams of the United States.

There is one exception to that in a small pilot plant which has just gone into operation in Marquette, Mich.

These Trib-Buna rubber tires, I am reliably informed, after being tested on the roads of the United States over a distance of more than 30,000 miles, have proven themselves equal, if not superior, to natural rubber.

PUGET SOUND PULP & TIMBER CO. PROPOSAL

Now, the point I wish to make is this: On February 11, 1942, 21 months ago, and a little more than a month after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co., of Bellingham, Wash., which company owns considerable timber in the district I have the honor to represent, made a definite and concrete proposal to the War Production Board to install in the State of Washington a plant almost precisely similar to that which produced the alcohol from which the tires to which I have referred were made. This plant, by the way, is the largest unbleached sulfite pulp mill in the United States.

The Federal Government was, at that time, and probably still is, paying approximately 50 cents (some say an average price of 80 cents) a gallon for ethyl alcohol. This company offered to produce it at a price of from 18 to 20 cents a gallon. The proposal was not turned down. It is still under investigation. This muddling investigation has been going on now for nearly 2 years. In the meantime, Canada has installed its plant, produced the alcohol, converted the alcohol to rubber, manufactured the rubber into tires, and these tires have been running over the highways of the United States for the past 3 months—thereby reminding us day by day of our own bureaucratic stupidity. We could spend between six and seven hundred million dollars in producing rubber from other sources, but we could not afford to risk spending $1,500,000 to produce the alcohol for this rubber in this country, and at less than one-third the price we have been paying for it.

SWEDEN HAS EMPLOYED THIS PROCESS SUCCESSFULLY

The Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. did not go into this blindly, by any manner of means. About 3 years before making this proposal, officials of the company investigated the Swedish process of producing alcohol from waste sulphite liquor, a process from which 12,000,000 gallons of alcohol had been produced annually in Sweden for several years. The company arranged for the use in the United States of this Swedish process, and brought to the United States men who were familiar with its operation. The general superintendent of this company had been familiar with similar operations in Sweden, and the company went to the expense of securing quotations for machinery, equipment, and appurtenant appliances necessary to build the plant. The company had, and still has, on its staff several men who, as practical operators and engineers and chemists, are capable of managing an operation of this sort.

NO INTRICACIES INVOLVED

No peculiar or unusual problem in salvaging this waste and converting it to alcohol was involved. It did not require a large amount of equipment, the principal material being a series of tanks used for distilling, storage, and fermentation, and some small items of pumps, automatic controls, and piping.

The proposal made to the Government was that the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. would produce alcohol at a cost of between 18 and 20 cents a gallon. The Government was to advance $1,500,000 for the construction of this plant, and the plant was to be amortized by crediting to the Government the amount of the difference between the cost of the production and the market price of equivalent alcohol.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I am glad to yield to the brilliant and genial gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true that these conversion and utilization plants not only will make alcohol which produces rubber from a present waste but will also bring about the benefit of cleaning up streams, lakes, and sea water and help preserve fish life and natural resources?

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman is emphatically correct in that assertion. I am coming to that in a few moments.

Mr. MUNDT. I recall that when we had the pollution fight in the House the gentleman from Washington was one of the ardent supporters of the clean stream. I am very glad to see him launching on this new crusade.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman for his splendid compliment and reciprocate by saying that many of us were following his inspiring lead in the program of reducing pollution of streams and waterways of the United States.

PUGET SOUND P. & T. CO. PLAN NOT YET ACCEPTED

The project was not accepted on two grounds:

First. That the project would use too much strategic material. What I would like to know is how this Canadian company was able to secure priorities for this strategic material. I would like to know if these priorities were granted for

American material to go into a Canadian company, and were denied to a company in the United States? It seems strange, to say the least, that an abundance of strategic materials was found to install alcohol-producing plants for the petroleum corporations, and for the distillation of alcohol from grain and sugar, but none could be found to produce alcohol from this waste material that is alleged to be polluting the streams and destroying our fish life.

SULFITE WASTE PULP LIQUOR ALCOHOL MUCH CHEAPER

Second. Objection was made to the fact that the plant would cost $1,500,000 and would produce only 2,500,000 gallons of alcohol per year. It was alleged that a plant costing $1,500,000, and using wheat, corn, or sugar, could produce approximately 15,000,000 gallons a year. But let us analyze that a little. It takes about 16 pounds of sugar, or its equivalent in sirup, to produce 1 gallon of alcohol, and with sugar at 2½ cents a pound wholesale, that makes a raw material cost of about 40 cents a gallon. Wheat and corn, in round numbers, are selling at above $1 a bushel. A bushel of corn or wheat will produce 2½ gallons of alcohol. So there is at least 40 cents raw material cost. This company offered to sell alcohol at 20 cents a gallon to the Government, which is 50 percent of the minimum raw material cost of producing alcohol from farm products or sugar.

Careful estimates show that the amount of sugar contained in this waste sulfite liquor and poured into our streams and lakes amounts to about 450,000 tons of sugar per year. Apparently, our bureaucrats thought it would be sound economy to continue this wasteful process, and, at the same time, put our housewives on a sugar-rationed basis.

Likewise, at a time when the traffic on our railroads and other transportation systems are carrying a heavier burden than at any other time in their history, we have thought it wise to add to that already heavy load by transporting wheat, grain, and molasses to convert those products into alcohol. I do not wish to burden you with a lot of statistics, but let me state briefly that 1,400,000 tons of molasses will produce approximately 100,000,000 gallons of alcohol, about one-fifth of our present requirement. To transport 1,400,000 tons of molasses annually from Cuba would require the use of 14 standard cargo boats of about 10,000 tons each.

ROSTEN UPHOLDS SULFITE LIQUOR ALCOHOL

I quote from the testimony before the Gillette committee of Dr. Rosten, an eminent scientist, who built a number of alcohol-producing plants in Poland and is now doing similar work for Canada:

To build 14 ships we need 50,000 tons of steel and about 1,000 tons of base materials. On the other hand, to build 50 alcohol plants for sulfite liquor about 10,000 tons of steel and 2,000 tons of base materials are necessary. (Using cast iron for distillation columns, we would be able to save about 1,000 tons of base materials.) Besides all this the danger of submarine attack for the alcohol plants is out of the question. If, instead of molasses, grain is used, 1,200,000 tons of transportation will be required. In the production of alcohol from waste sulfite liquor, the problem of transportation need not be considered, as factories should be built where the raw material is to be obtained, namely, in the neighborhood of the pulp mills.

NO GRAIN SURPLUS NOW

Our Government has many other uses for alcohol than making rubber. It is used in explosives, and meets many other governmental requirements. I quote from remarks made by Congressman DAN REED of New York, on the floor of the House, on March 11, 1942, just about 30 days after this application was filed:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clear away all this alarm about this surplus so far as grain is concerned. Here are some figures brought out in the hearing before our committee today which I think will be of interest.

It requires 55 gallons of alcohol to dehydrate the necessary amount of powder to fire a 16-inch shell. To produce 1 gallon of alcohol requires 16½ pounds of raw sugar. To fire a 16-inch gun once is equivalent to the firing of 907½ pounds of raw sugar. Every time you fire a 16-inch gun you fire 22 bushels of corn, the amount necessary to dehydrate the powder contained in a 16-inch shell.

When you consider your surplus and realize the magnitude of this war, you will see what is going to happen to this surplus.

SULFITE LIQUOR ALCOHOL HAS OTHER USES

The Scandinavians drink this alcohol. They call it "half and half"—one-half alcohol and one-half water. It is also used by the Scandinavians to increase the octane rating of their gasoline. Roughly, each 1 percent of alcohol added to gasoline increases the rating by 1 octane.

I do not know how much money the Government has spent for alcohol since Pearl Harbor, but it is a colossal sum, and, according to a statement made by Senator GILLETTE the other day, $650,000,000 have been spent in plant equipment to produce artificial rubber, most of which is made from alcohol.

The production of alcohol from waste sulfite liquor in the United States is a tremendous potential industry. The pulp plants in the States of Oregon and Washington alone could produce more than 40,000,000 gallons of ethyl alcohol per year from this source, at a cost of 20 cents a gallon. There are pulp mills also in many of the Midwestern States, and the northeastern and southern coastal States.

PULP ALCOHOL SHOULD BE CREATED NOW

Think of the effect of the production of this alcohol on rubber. Each gallon of alcohol would produce 2½ pounds of rubber—the type of rubber used for automobile tires. I do not know what the conversion cost would be, but with alcohol at 20 cents a gallon, the raw material cost of rubber would be about 8 cents a pound. Today we are carrying rubber to the United States from West Africa and from South America by airplane and by steamer from Ceylon. I would make a rough guess that it is costing more than 8 cents a pound for transportation. In normal times, natural crude rubber sells at approximately $1 per pound.

AN ANTIPOLLUTION PROGRAM ALSO

There is still another point to be considered. It is pretty generally charged that the distribution of this waste sulfite liquor into the rivers and streams and coastal waters has a destructive effect on the fish life, and the pulp companies are constantly harassed with damage suits for the destruction of the oyster beds and other fisheries. Both judicial and lay opinion is divided as to whether this waste sulfite liquor is destructive of fish life. The establishment of these alcohol plants would remove the controversy, and if it is true that fish are being destroyed, in these days of food rationing, that would simply mean another extra dividend.

CANADA AHEAD OF UNITED STATES AGAIN

The cold fact is that Canada has started on a project that is susceptible of producing from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 worth of alcohol a year, and alcohol is a very essential material, not only to the prosecution of the war, but to the maintenance of thousands of industrial enterprises after the war is over. In the meantime, the United States has simply dawdled along and done nothing because of the blundering incapacity of the bureaucrats we have in office.

Again, I say, please do not misunderstand me. I am not blaming the Canadians. I think the Canadians are smart—in any event, they have outsmarted us in this particular case. But, in the language of my friend, Senator CHAVEZ, "What, may I ask, is wrong with being for America first?"

Nor, do I wish to be too inclusive in my condemnation of the bureaucrats, for, to my personal knowledge, Mr. Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and representatives of the Bonneville Power Administration, have done everything they possibly could to bring about the construction of plants to produce alcohol from waste sulfite liquor in this country.

The burden of my complaint is that by developing the production of alcohol from waste sulfite liquor, this country would have eliminated to a considerable extent the sugar shortage; would have furnished us alcohol at less than one-half than we have been paying for it; would have eliminated the use of about 1,000,000 tons of shipping or railroad transportation; and solved, in part at least, the difficult pollution problem in the pulp industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1225. An act granting a pension to Constance Eager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1373. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot

known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on November 6, 1943, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2859. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 9, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS—NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF MEETING

The executive session scheduled for today by the Committee on Patents was postponed until Tuesday, November 9, 1943, in the committee room, 416 House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m. Proposed legislation by the National Patent Planning Commission will be discussed.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, November 9, 1943, at 11 a. m., to resume hearings on House Joint Resolution 148, a joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of Daylight Saving Time Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10:00 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, November 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 875 to restore standard time during months of January, February, November, and December.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3477. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3597) granting a pension to Ole M. Anderson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 3631. A bill to suspend the immigration of aliens into the United States from the end of hostilities of the present war until the number of unemployed persons, including United States war veterans, within the United States is less than 1,000,000; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 3632. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 107), entitled "An act to reorganize the General Land Office"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3633. A bill to permit the naturalization of Filipinos who served in the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3634. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make further provision for the education of honorably discharged World War No. 2 veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3635. A bill to amend section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925, relating to the compensation, pay, and allowances of the Marine Band; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation of the government of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 348. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Chronology of Major International Events from 1931 Through 1943, with the Ostensible Reasons Advanced for the Occurrence Thereof," as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3636. A bill for the relief of Josephine Guidoni; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3637. A bill granting a pension to Eliza Manser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Osborn Rollins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3470. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 25 citizens of Butler, Pa., urging passage of House Resolution 117, in order to authorize the United States to forward food and necessary supplies to those unfortunate children, who are suffering from hunger in the occupied countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3471. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition presented by E. B. Nall, of Paducah, Ky., representing 54 members of the West End Baptist Church of Paducah and the Margaret Hank Memorial Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Paducah, supporting House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3472. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Henry Levison National Defense Committee, American Legion, Department of Missouri, and signed by 170 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3473. Also, petition of Mr. W. L. Newell and 66 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3474. Also, petition of the Painters District Council, No. 2, and signed by 17 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3475. Also, petition of Anheuser-Busch, Inc., Post No. 299, the American Legion, and signed by 46 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3476. Also, petition of the Ramsey Accessories Manufacturing Corporation, tool and die department, and signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3477. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the members of the Berean Sunday School Class of the First Methodist Church of Portland, Oreg., asking for enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3478. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 22 members of the Richmond Woman's Club, Richmond, Mich., expressing interest in House Resolution 117, which seeks to give aid to the starving children of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3479. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of Mary E. Acton and 61 other residents of Bethesda, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3480. Also, petition of Ida Kail and 29 other residents of Lamartine, Ohio, and nearby vil-

lages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3481. Also, petition of Ralph Crozier and 119 other residents of Shadyside and surrounding communities, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3482. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Theodore L. Sushka and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3483. By Mr. WHITE: Petition of 88 members of the First Baptist Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Church of Christ, and citizens of Kuna, Idaho, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1105, to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3484. Also, petition signed by 25 farmers of Kootenai County, Idaho, urging the support of legislation to continue the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3485. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Mrs. Lawrence G. Clark and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3486. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Lions Club of San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to revenue derived from taxes on rum exported from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

3487. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of resolution with reference to petition No. 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1943

The Reverend Henry H. Crane, D. D., minister of the Central Methodist Church, of Detroit, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we pause this moment to acknowledge our need of Thee.

In these dark days of difficulty, danger, and desperation, we crave the light of Thy leadership. Our own weak wisdom is not enough; our meager human strength is not sufficient. We would lay hold of Thy divine resources to carry us through the bitter ways of this global war to the vastly more important winning of the peace.

Lift us, we pray Thee, above all pettiness and pursuit of personal gain into the greatness of selfless devotion to the common welfare. Lead us past the appeal of partisanship to patriotism, and beyond patriotism to the glory of world brotherhood.

Keep us proudly old-fashioned in our Christian convictions, intelligently up to date in our ideas, and daringly ahead of our times in our ideals. Forgive our faults, our follies, and our furies. Make us honestly repentant for our mistakes and our wrongdoing. Keep us reverently humble in our successes, and unfalteringly courageous and wise in fulfilling our obligations to Thee, to this our beloved country, and to the whole sad, mad world.

Attend us, O God, during the travail and the torture of these tragic times. Grant that the pains of parturition may not be in vain. Forbid that our high hopes should be still-born. Bring into being, O God, the brave, new world we so desperately long for—one world, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. And may this august body play its supremely important part superbly.

In the name of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., November 9, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GILLETTE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TYDINGS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 5, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ELMO PEARCE LEE, SR., TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIFTH CIRCUIT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of November 16, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., of the State of Louisiana, to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, vice Hon. Rufus E. Foster, deceased. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Brooks	Chandler
Austin	Buck	Chavez
Bailey	Burton	Clark, Idaho
Bankhead	Bushfield	Clark, Mo.
Barbour	Butler	Connally
Barkley	Byrd	Danaher
Bilbo	Capper	Davis
Brewster	Caraway	Downey
Eastland	McClellan	Shipstead
Ellender	McFarland	Smith
Ferguson	McKellar	Stewart
George	Maloney	Taft
Gerry	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Gillette	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Guffey	Murdock	Truman
Gurney	Murray	Tunnell
Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Hill	Overton	Wagner
Holman	Pepper	Wallgren
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wheeler
Kilgore	Revercomb	Wherry
Langer	Reynolds	White
Lodge	Robertson	Wiley
Lucas	Russell	Willis
McCarran	Scrugham	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WAR DEPARTMENT—DAMAGE CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 111)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to, or loss or destruction of, property, amounting to $31,960.75 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGE TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. DOC. NO. 112)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay a claim for

damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, amounting to $2,191.70 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY COLLISION OR DAMAGES INCIDENT TO THE OPERATION OF A VESSEL OF THE COAST GUARD (S. DOC. NO. 113)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, amounting to $84.48 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES BY COLLISION OR INCIDENT TO THE OPERATION OF VESSELS OF THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 114)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, amounting to $4,709.44 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 115)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, amounting to $7,699.37 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 116)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to $825,176.59 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. DOC. NO. 117)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, record of a judgment rendered against the Government by a district court, amounting to $1,720.87 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 118)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $337.10 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULE OF CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 119)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, covered by certificates of settlement under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund, amounting to $2,419,868.84 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 120)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $50,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 121)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $153,519 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 122)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $9,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WAGE STABILIZATION PROGRAM: WAGE LEVELS—REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, relating to the wage stabilization program and the level of wages, and submitting a report, lists of dispute cases closed by the National War Labor Board and regional War Labor Boards, September 1943, and also lists of the applications for voluntary wage and salary adjustments approved or denied by regional War Labor Boards September 1943 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A COMMISSION AND AGENCY

Letters from the Chairman of the Federal Communication Commission and the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of Treasury, War (11), Navy (6), Interior (2), Agriculture (5), and Labor; Veterans' Administration, Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management), War Manpower Commission (Selective Service System), and the Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Rev. Alvin T. Perkins, minister of the Whitefield Methodist Church, Lanham, Md., together with a resolution endorsed by the congregation of that church, favoring abolition for the duration of the war of the sale of alcoholic beverages within and around camps, naval bases, air fields, and other temporary homes for the personnel of the armed forces, which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on February 18, 1943, I introduced a bill (S. 735) to amend section 7 (e) of the Natural Gas Act. The purpose of the bill is to enlarge the authority of the Federal Power Commission in determining whether a certificate shall be issued to an applicant for the operation, sale, service, construction, extension, or acquisition of natural-gas pipe lines. The bill provides that, in determining what action it will take, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other things, to the conservation of natural-gas resources, the adequacy of reserves, and the social and economic effects of their depletion, and to the actual and potential value and uses of natural gas in chemical and related industries.

It has been calculated by engineers and other experts that the proven reserves of natural gas throughout the United States will be depleted in about 20 years. The rate of use is constantly increasing. New and very important uses have been found for natural gas, very necessary in our economy. It will probably be a very sound policy on our part to undertake through the Federal Power Commission to direct that our natural gas be utilized more for these new and compelling uses than for our reserves to be exploited in frequently unnecessary ventures, such as the bringing of natural gas into competition with other fuel in distant areas.

On November 1 of this year I introduced a joint resolution directing the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress on various matters with respect to natural gas. A similar resolution has been introduced in the House by the gentleman from Texas, Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD. This resolution directs the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress with respect to (a) the extent, location, and availability of the known natural-gas reserves, and the effects of the present and anticipated depletion thereof; (b) the nature, amount, and location of the present and anticipated utilization of natural gas, the resultant economic waste and undesirable competition with and displacement of other fuels, and the feasibility of converting natural gas and its constituent hydrocarbons for chemical and other superior uses; and (c) such other matters as may be helpful to Congress in determining what additional legislation should be enacted to restrict unnecessary waste or depletion of our natural-gas reserves or the use thereof for inferior or otherwise undesirable pur-

poses, especially in competition with other fuels.

The City Council of Kansas City, Mo., has recognized the necessity of such legislation; and on November 1 of this year it adopted a resolution in support of the bill to which I referred. The Kansas City Times, on November 2, printed an informative article dealing with this subject matter.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at the conclusion of my remarks the resolution adopted by the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., and the article appearing in the Kansas City Times be inserted in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution and newspaper article were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas natural gas pipe-line companies operating in areas contiguous to Atlantic Coast States have made applications to the Federal Power Commission within the past year for permission to construct large pipe lines to withdraw natural gas from fields located in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and to transport such gas as far east as the State of New York; and

Whereas expert geologists have estimated that the reserves in such gas fields in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas will be depleted and exhausted upon the basis of the present rate of withdrawals within 25 or 30 years, but if larger withdrawals are made, such fields will be depleted within a correspondingly shorter period of time; and

Whereas coal deposits in the Appalachian Mountain area are estimated to be of sufficient size to supply the entire needs of industries in that area and on the Atlantic Coast, and of the entire United States for hundreds of years; and

Whereas coal deposits within the area west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rocky Mountains are of comparatively limited size; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that natural gas is a "luxury fuel" and in the postwar period should not be used extensively for industrial purposes but its use confined to domestic and limited commercial purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has at times indicated its desire to restrict the use of natural gas for the foregoing purposes but has been without legal authority under the Natural Gas Act to do so; and

Whereas it is reliably reported that a number of additional pipe lines to withdraw gas from the gas fields of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas are being planned for construction just as soon as the war is ended or the War Production Board will release the necessary critical materials; and

Whereas the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., deems it in the public interest that the gas reserves located in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas be conserved for and restricted to use by consumers west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rocky Mountains, or those consumers immediately adjacent to such areas, and that the more rapid depletion of these reserves be opposed; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate a bill known as S. 735, introduced by Senator OVERTON on February 18, 1943, seeking to amend the Natural Gas Act and to give the Federal Power Commission needed authority for the conservation of natural-gas resources, and it is proposed through a Senate resolution to order the Federal Power Commission to make investigation to determine with accuracy, among other things, the extent, location, and availability of known natural-gas reserves in the United States and the effects of present and anticipated depletion thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Kansas City:

1. That the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., hereby expresses its approval of Senate bill No. 735, introduced by Senator OVERTON on February 18, 1943, seeking to give to the Federal Power Commission additional authority under the Natural Gas Act, so as to make possible the conservation of natural-gas resources.

2. That a resolution be adopted by the United States Senate directing the Federal Power Commission to make full investigation, among other things, of the extent, location, and availability of the known natural-gas reserves in the United States and the effects of the present and anticipated depletion thereof, so as to provide adequate data in support of such Senate bill and its purposes.

3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the mayor to the Missouri Senators and Representatives in the Congress, and that their support of such Senate bill and proposed resolution be hereby urged.

4. That additional copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City and to any and all other persons, groups, and associations interested in the conservation of the natural-gas resources within the middle western area located west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rocky Mountains and the territory immediately adjacent thereto, and their cooperation in this program invited.

The foregoing resolution has been reviewed.

L. P. COOKINGHAM,
City Manager.

The form of the foregoing resolution is hereby approved.

JEROME M. JOFFEE,
Special Assistant City Counselor.

Authenticated as adopted this November 1, 1943.

J. C. RODAHAFFER,
Acting Mayor.
FLOURNOY QUEST,
City Clerk.
By CON R. BAULE,
Deputy City Clerk.

[From the Kansas City Times of November 2, 1943]

URGE LID ON GAS—CITY COUNCIL ASKS CONGRESS TO PASS OVERTON BILL GUARDING AREA RESERVES—DANGER TO SUPPLY SEEN—OIL AUTHORITY IS QUOTED AS COMPUTING RESOURCE MAY VANISH IN 20 YEARS

The city council last night unanimously adopted a resolution urging Congress to enact the Overton bill which would empower the Federal Power Commission to prevent exhaustion of the natural-gas resources of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas by companies seeking to construct large pipe lines to the East.

The action was taken after Councilman George J. Miller quoted excerpts from an address of Eugene A. Stephenson, professor of petroleum engineering of the University of Kansas, before the Interstate Oil Compact Commission at Santa Fe, N. Mex., September 25. Some of the excerpts were:

"By 1950—7 years from now—the 85,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas which were estimated as the proven reserve of the United States by Ralph E. Davis, who has given more serious study to this question than any other engineer and is an eminently qualified authority, will be nearly half gone. If the consumption rate should simply remain stable after that year, only 9 more years would be required to exhaust completely the known proven reserve.

"This calculation does not take into consideration the possibility that new reserves will be discovered, as they doubtless will be, but neither does it take into consideration the obvious trend toward increased use for gas. These two items may well cancel each other.

"We are thus face to face with the cold, disagreeable probability that the known gas reserve will be gone in about 20 years. The rate of consumption has been an accelerating one. Recent pipe-line construction, particularly loops designed to increase the capacity of existing lines has been rapid. Additional expansion of capacity is under way and more new lines are either under consideration or have already been authorized."

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 6, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 400) relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1518. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 1519, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1520. A bill to repeal section 4 of Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to forfeiture of veterans' benefits for certain crimes upon determination of guilt by Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1521. A bill to provide for payments by the United States to the several States with respect to certain Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 97, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

ARKANSAS AND WHITE RIVERS FLOOD-CONTROL AND NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the

basins of such rivers. If the bill is enacted, it is proposed that it be cited as the Arkansas-White River Basin Act.

Mr. President, in view of the purpose of the bill, I respectfully request that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce. At a later hour during the day I hope to obtain recognition and to discuss the provisions of the bill.

The bill (S. 1519) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood-control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood-control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BALANCED BUDGET IN PEACETIME—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment having for its purpose in times of peace an automatically balanced Budget. Undoubtedly the joint resolution should eventually be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, but inasmuch as it deals with fiscal policies, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations before it goes to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be so referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The submission of concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MALONEY. I submit and ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution which would create a committee of the Congress on the organization of Congress. This is a subject which has long been interesting many Americans, and has received considerable attention from the daily press and other publications of the country. I have drafted a concurrent resolution which I should like to emphasize is bipartisan. It would provide for six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party, and makes like provision for appointment in the House of Representatives.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate again, if I may, the fact that we are making some advances, though not rapidly enough, in the matter of organization of the Congress and committees thereof. Recently, and I hope in part as a result of a suggestion I made long ago, the Appropriations Committee provided for the assignment to that committee of experts from the General Accounting Office. Most of us realize that there is much to be done if we are to simplify the work of the Congress and better enable us to carry out our constitutional responsibility.

A short time ago the able and distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] submitted a resolution which is intended to provide for some reorganization of the Congress. I am not very optimistic about the consideration of a resolution unless and until a committee of the entire Congress makes a careful study of the situation, and is prepared to make recommendations to the Congress.

It is with that thought in mind that I submit the concurrent resolution which I have asked be printed in the body of the RECORD and referred to an appropriate committee; and I have the hope that soon thereafter the committee may report back to the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the Senator's thought that the concurrent resolution should go to the Committee on Rules

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to have it go to the Committee on Rules.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be referred as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationships between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of personnel by the Members and the committees of the Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed _____, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, within 6 months after the passage of this resolution and every 6 months thereafter until the completion of its study. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: Mr. President, for some years there has been discussion in Congress and in the press of what is known as the streamlining of congressional procedure so as to enable Congress more effectively to cope with the increasing volume of work which is being thrust upon it. We have had legislation proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, and this morning I heard the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] submit a concurrent resolution. A year or so ago some of us introduced a bill to provide for expert assistance for the Appropriations Committee.

For that reason, I think it would interest the Senate to realize that the able and distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has actually accomplished something concrete along that line, that a number of experts of high caliber have been secured for the Committee on Appropriations in order to enable that committee more effectively to do its work. I regard that as a practical forward step toward enabling the Congress to discharge its functions. I desire to compliment the senior Senator from Tennessee, and I had in mind the thought that this new development would be of encouragement and interest to the Senate.

POST-WAR ECONOMY—CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I submit three concurrent resolutions dealing with post-war economy, and respectfully

ask that they be referred to the appropriate committees dealing with the general subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolutions submitted by Mr. TYDINGS were referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution requesting information concerning the construction of needed public works in the various States during the post-war period; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Governor of each of the 48 States is hereby requested to transmit to the Congress at the earliest convenient date detailed reports showing the roads, streets, curbs, bridges, schools, hospitals, sewers, waterworks, ferries, tunnels, docks, and other needed public works and improvements which should be constructed within his State during the 10-year period immediately following the termination of the war, together with estimates of the manpower and materials necessary for each such project, as well as information concerning amounts appropriated or proposed to be appropriated or made available for such purposes by such State and its political subdivisions."

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution directing the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to furnish the Congress with certain information relating to flood control; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army is directed to transmit to the Congress at the earliest possible date a report showing (1) the nature and location of all flood-control projects which should be undertaken in the United States during the period immediately following the termination of the present war; (2) the estimated costs of such projects; (3) the manpower necessary in connection therewith; (4) information concerning the relative urgency of the various projects recommended; (5) the amount of land which would be permanently flooded in connection with such projects, the value of such land, and the annual value of products therefrom, as compared with the amount and value of the land, and the annual value of products therefrom, which would, in the absence of such project, be subject to recurrent floods; (6) the average annual damage from floods to the area which would be protected by each such project as compared with the annual interest, amortization, and maintenance costs of such project; (7) the extent of damage to wildlife involved in each proposed project; (8) the estimated time that would elapse before reservoirs constructed in connection with such projects would become silted up; and (9) all other pertinent data which should be available to the Congress for its consideration in the formulation of a post-war flood-prevention program."

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution requesting recommendations for the post-war period from the Governors of the various States with respect to the respective authority, jurisdiction, and functions of the Federal and State governments over certain matters; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Governor of each of the 48 States is hereby requested to transmit to the Congress at the earliest convenient date his recommendations for the post-war period with respect to—

"(1) Proper fields of taxation as between the Federal Government and State and local governments;

"(2) Proper division of authority as between the Federal Government and State governments with respect to the regulation of commerce;

"(3) Proper percentages of contributions to be made by the Federal Government and by State and local governments toward the financing of post-war work, welfare, and social programs; and

"(4) The functions of government which should be exercised exclusively by the Federal Government, those which should be exercised exclusively by State and local governments, and those which may be combined or exercised jointly."

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT RELATING TO VISIT OF SENATORS TO WAR FRONTS: AMENDED ORDER

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request I made a day or two ago for the printing as a Senate document of the addresses of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] relating to the senatorial tour of war theaters, be amended so as to include the address delivered on October 12, 1943, by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PLAN TO SAVE FROM EXTINCTION THE SURVIVING EUROPEAN JEWS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, there is now in process of consummation in Europe one of the most diabolical and stupendous crimes in all history, the studied extermination of an entire people. Already millions of those people have been destroyed. Unless some action can be developed to check, if not halt, the further progress of the plan, other millions will be destroyed.

On behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself, I submit a resolution for which I request appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by concurrent resolution adopted on March 10 of this year, expressed its condemnation of Nazi Germany's mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children, a mass crime which has already exterminated close to 2,000,000 human beings, about 30 percent of the total Jewish population of Europe, and which is growing in intensity as Germany approaches defeat; and

Whereas the American tradition of justice and humanity dictates that all possible means be employed to save from this fate the surviving Jews of Europe, some 4,000,000 souls who have been rendered homeless and destitute by the Nazis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States recommends and urges the creation by the President of a commission of diplomatic, economic, and military experts to formulate and effectuate a plan of immediate action designed to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, tomorrow, Wednesday, November 10, will mark the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the founding of the Marine Corps. November 10, 1775, 168 years ago, a Corps of Marines was created by a resolution of the Continental Congress.

Simple ceremonies in commemoration of this anniversary will take place tomorrow, November 10, on the east steps of the Capitol, at 11:30 a. m. At that time the Marine Band will be present, together with a detachment of marines, and a flag will be raised over the United States Capitol with the usual military ceremonies. A marine wounded at Guadalcanal will raise the flag.

This flag, incidentally, is the first American flag flown by any of our armed forces over territory conquered from the enemy during the present war. The flag, which was raised by the marines over Guadalcanal upon the recapture of that island from the Japanese, will fly tomorrow from the Capitol as a tribute to the marines on the occasion of their anniversary.

All Members of the Congress are invited to participate.

I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed by the chairmen of the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps, and General Holcomb's reply. This correspondence relates to the ceremonies which will take place tomorrow.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, November 8, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: On behalf of the officers and men of the United States Marine Corps, I wish to acknowledge with deep appreciation your kind invitation to the Corps to raise over the United States Capitol the first American flag flown on Guadalcanal.

Officers and men, who may be spared from their duties, will participate in the ceremony to be held in the plaza on the east side of the Capitol at 11:30 o'clock on the morning of November 10, 1943.

It will give me great personal pleasure to meet with you and the members of your committee on this occasion.

Sincerely yours,

T. HOLCOMB,
Lieutenant General, United States Marine Corps, the Commandant, United States Marine Corps.

NOVEMBER 5, 1943.

Lt. Gen. THOMAS HOLCOMB, *United States Marine Corps, Commandant, United States Marine Corps, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR GENERAL HOLCOMB: I understand that you have at the Marine Corps Headquarters here in Washington the first American flag hoisted by our armed forces over territory conquered from the enemy. This flag was raised by marines on Guadalcanal,

after this island was recaptured from the Japanese.

It is our belief that this flag has great historical value inasmuch as it signifies the first successful offensive launched by American forces in this great war.

As Wednesday, November 10, is the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the founding of the United States Marine Corps, we believe that it would be most appropriate for you, and as many officers and men of the Marine Corps as you deem advisable, to participate in a ceremony at the Capitol, at which time this flag will be raised with appropriate ceremonies, and will fly for the remainder of the day.

This event would be a fitting tribute to our gallant marines, and should serve to inspire all Americans to continue to carry on in the spirit of sacrifice and service of our marines until we attain final and complete victory.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma subsequently said:

Mr. President, tomorrow, Wednesday, November 10, will be the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Marines. After the Continental Congress provided for the enlisting of marines in 1775, those soldiers of the sea took part in many of the important battles for independence. They fought with John Paul Jones on the *Bonhomme Richard* and with General Washington at Trenton and Princeton.

The marines have served in almost every part of the world and in all our country's wars. In times when the Nation has been nominally at peace marines have stood guard on foreign soil over American rights and lives.

The corps has expanded greatly since the beginning of the war, but it remains a relatively compact force, highly trained to carry out those operations that have always been its special duty—at sea, on land, and now in the air.

The bulk of marine strength today is in the Pacific, where the amphibious nature of island warfare is a sharp challenge to the skill for which our marines have become world-famous. The success with which the indomitable "Leathernecks" have met that challenge is a matter of record. Since they launched the United States' first land offensive of the war at Guadalcanal on August 7, 1942, they have carried out to the letter every task assigned to them. Not once have they faltered; not once have they stopped short of their objective.

And still they go forward. Moving in to seize Japanese-held island bases, they fight the most rugged kind of jungle warfare. While allied land fighters on other fronts can exploit fully the mechanized power of modern warfare, our men of the Pacific must count strongly on individual action to push back the Japs. Each man must be able to fight a battle all his own, without help from planes, artillery, or any weapons other than those he can carry. The marine, partly by intense training and partly by a traditional aptitude for developing his tactics quickly to meet any battle situation, has learned to take to the jungle as if he had lived in it all his life—city-bred though he may be.

In addition to his basic training, the "Leatherneck" very often is an expert in the study of aerial photographs, compass and map reading, infiltration, demolitions, stalking, camouflage, communications, and unarmed combat. He can make his way through wild terrain as surely as he can negotiate Main Street at home, and when he meets the enemy he is more than a match for him.

Besides training its own men during the past year, the Marine Corps has imparted the benefits of its long experience in amphibious operations to other branches of the service by helping to prepare American forces for the seaborne landings which have been made so successfully in all theaters of the war.

On the occasion of this anniversary, let us commend the Marine Corps for its fighting services, proudly confident that our marines will carry forward into the coming year that heritage of victory they have so nobly upheld in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Marine Corps to Mark One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Anniversary on Wednesday; Battlers Will Hear Message," and an Associated Press dispatch bearing on the same subject.

There being no objection, the article and dispatch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINE CORPS TO MARK ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY ON WEDNESDAY; BATTLERS WILL HEAR MESSAGE

The Marine Corps, which in the present war has added new luster to its record, will mark its one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary on Wednesday. Marines everywhere, sky fighters, jungle warriors, gunners aboard capital ships of the Navy, from Iceland to the South Pacific, from the Caribbean to the Aleutians, will pause a few minutes for the reading of the annual birthday message, reminding of their heritage and their obligation to carry on the tradition of the corps.

Only last Tuesday, in their most recent large-scale action, marines swarmed ashore at Bougainville Island, last Japanese stronghold in the Solomons. They steadily have pushed back the enemy and are expected shortly to add another name, Bougainville, to the long list of marine battle honors.

In this war the newest arm, marine aviation, has lived up to the corps' traditions. Marine aviators have received 765 awards, including 6 Congressional Medals of Honor, the Nation's highest award. In this group are Maj. Joe Foss, with 26 Japanese planes to his credit, and Lt. Ken Walsh, with 20.

In the battle area, at Bougainville and other South Pacific islands, the entire celebration will consist only of reading of the birthday message by the commanding officer.

"In every battle and skirmish since the birth of our corps," the message goes, "Marines have acquitted themselves with the greatest distinction, winning new honors on each occasion until the term 'marine' has come to signify all that is highest in military efficiency and soldierly virtue.

"So long as the spirit of the corps flourishes, marines will be found equal to every emergency in the future as they have been in the past, and the men of our Nation will regard us as worthy successors to the long line of illustrious men who have served as 'soldiers of the sea' since the founding of the corps."

WASHINGTON, November 7.—The United States flag that the first marines who landed on Guadalcanal carried ashore will be flown over the Capitol Dome on the Marine Corps' birthday on Wednesday. The Senate and House Naval Committees invited the display because, they said: "It is our belief that this flag has great historical value, inasmuch as it signifies the first successful offensive launched by American forces in this great war."

RECORD OF NORTH DAKOTA IN SALE OF E BONDS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I am justifiably proud of the record my State of North Dakota has made in connection with the sale of E bonds. In the sisterhood of States North Dakota ranked No. 1 in the purchase of these bonds. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject published in the Fargo Forum of October 24.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FINE RECORD

North Dakota has made another enviable record, topping the entire sisterhood of States in the percentage of E bonds bought, compared with the quota of these bonds set for the State.

That, according to Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, was to be the acid test which would show up the interest of the small buyer—the wage earner, the small businessman, the farmer—in short the folks who make the wheels go round.

These are the folks who buy E bonds and others of those small denomination securities which the Treasury likes to sell, for it is proof that the people are back of the war.

North Dakotans did not need that evidence of the way this State is backing the war effort. We who live here know that the citizens of the Flickertail State are supporting the war program to the hilt—but it was a very convincing demonstration to the rest of the Nation.

The results of the sale are the more remarkable when it is considered that it was undertaken here under severe handicaps. The farmers were in the midst of harvesting one of the greatest crops of all time with about the smallest supply of manpower they ever had.

Mr. R. R. Wolfer, executive director of North Dakota's War bond efforts, comments that the people surveyed the job, and they did it despite all the obstacles.

He is hopeful and, in fact, expects that there will be no great let-up in North Dakota bond purchases with the passing of the special Third War Loan drive.

He suggests that as the proceeds of the greatest income crop in all the State's history roll in there is no safer nor better spot to put the money than in War bonds.

NORRIS NOW BACKS PEACE PLAN—ARTICLE BY GEORGE W. NORRIS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued yesterday by a distinguished statesman who served in the Senate for almost 30 years, Hon. George W. Norris. The statement, which is entitled "Norris Now Backs World Peace Plan," was published in the New York Times on November 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORRIS NOW BACKS WORLD PEACE PLAN—1919 FOE OF PARTICIPATION IN LEAGUE HEARTILY APPROVES CONNALLY RESOLUTION—BACKS A POLICE PROGRAM—SAYS NO ONE IN LAST WAR WAS TRYING TO ENSLAVE MANKIND—WOULD DISARM ALL AXIS

(The following was written by the former Senator from Nebraska who, sitting then as a Republican, voted in 1919 against the United States joining the League of Nations.)

(By George W. Norris)

McCOOK, NEBR., November 7.—I heartily approve the passage last Friday by the Senate of the amended Connally resolution.

I believe the resolution will have a tendency to unite our people more firmly than they have ever been united before in the prosecution of the war. In reality, it places before the civilized world the postion of our Government in the establishment of a permanent world peace that will follow our victory in the war.

The victory that will follow this war would be of temporary value only unless a peace is established that shall be permanent and lasting. Whether we like to or not, we must do our part in the maintaining of such a peace.

The peace should disarm completely Germany, Italy, and Japan, and it should provide also for the necessary measures, whatever they may be, to make that peace permanent and enduring.

APPROVES WORLD POLICE

If those messages include the establishment of an international police force with American units, well and good. Whatever they may be called, all measures should be taken to see that the treaty is carried out.

The reason for my change of mind is that changed circumstances demand changed attitudes, as I am trying to explain in something which I am now writing—my memoirs.

No nation or nobody was trying to conquer the whole world and reduce it to slavery in the First World War, as Hitler and the Japanese are now admittedly trying. Compared with Hitler, the Kaiser was a safe man.

During the First World War we were not confronted by an enemy who carried his conquests to the extremes of enslavement to which Hitler and the Japanese have carried theirs.

I won't comment on the vote against the resolution of Senator JOHNSON [Republican, of California]. It's his privilege not to change his mind. (Senator JOHNSON also voted against the League in 1919.) Nor would I venture to predict that if Bill Borah or old Bob La Follette were living today they would recognize the changed international situation and vote differently.

But to me the change is apparent.

I was also very much pleased by the Senate's action in endorsing the conclusions reached at Moscow because it advertises American national unity to the world.

HITS AT SOME REPUBLICANS

And in this connection I want to say that I am very much worried about the effect on our national unity of the attitude of some Republicans—some of them my best friends.

It seems to be that they are moved primarily by an attitude of hate toward the administration. Some of our people seem to be moved by an over-dose of partisanship. There is no disunity among our enemies or among our allies. There was no fault-finding by the Russian people, for instance, when their Government concluded the pact with Hitler, no matter how much the people didn't like it.

I think President Roosevelt has done a very good job of conducting the war, and unless some outstanding man comes along who would be able to do an equally good job, I think we should reelect Roosevelt next year if the war is still going on.

I would be for any man who could do the job of carrying on the war as well as Roosevelt, but I see no such man on the horizon now.

What would be the effect on our allies, our enemies, and the world if we should repudiate Roosevelt and his policies in the midst of war?

I want to go through next year's campaign and stand by the man, whoever he is, who is elected by the American people to make the peace.

ADDRESSES ON OCCASION OF AWARD OF ARMY-NAVY E TO THE CENTRAL CALIFORNIA WAR INDUSTRIES, INC.

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him and other addresses made in connection with the award of the Army-Navy E to the Central California War Industries, Inc., of Fresno, Calif., September 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SECOND IMPERATIVE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Second Imperative," broadcast by him over Wisconsin radio stations on November 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PROGRAM FOR THE FIGHTING FORCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McFARLAND

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "A Post-War Program for the Men and Women of Our Fighting Forces," delivered by Senator McFARLAND on November 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR-ELECT WALTER E. EDGE, OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Governor-elect Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey, in the gubernatorial campaign in New Jersey, November 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP McNICHOLAS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "War and Peace," delivered by Archbishop John T. McNicholas, at Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO BERNARD M. BARUCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post commenting upon the appointment of Mr. Bernard Baruch to organize plans for war demobilization and the mobilization for peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, meeting at Swampscott, Mass., June 28 to July 2, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN COMPETITIVE SYSTEM—LETTER FROM E. F. HUTTON

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mr. E. F. Hutton, of Westbury, Long Island, discussing the American competitive system, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERALIZATION OF OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to the liberalization of the old-age pension system, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAGUE OF NATIONS ACCEPTED IN FORM REJECTED BY WILSON—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR SEARS HENNING

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "League of Nations Accepted in Form Rejected by Wilson," written by Arthur Sears Henning, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of November 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING THE BALLOTS BEFORE THEY ARE VOTED—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Counting the Ballots Before They Are Voted," from the Philadelphia Record of November 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION RESULTS IN NEW YORK—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of November 8, 1943, containing extracts from a radio address by Mayor LaGuardia with respect to the recent election, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter, on the subject of railroad freight rates and the Dallas address of the Vice President, addressed to the Vice President by C. E. Childe, a member of the Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT IN STATU QUO

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I report back favorably with amendments Senate Joint Resolution 95, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I may say just a word so that Senators will understand what the short joint resolution provides. It deals with the tenure of office of the president and vice president of the Philippines. These two gentlemen are now in Washington. The term of the president will expire November 15, but a few days hence. Last Friday I placed in the RECORD a request signed by the President of the Philippines and the Vice President of the Philippines, and the members of the Cabinet of the Philippines, asking Congress to take appropriate action dealing with this matter.

The joint resolution which I ask to have immediately considered was unanimously reported from the Committee on

Territories and Insular Affairs, and only the imminence of the 15th of November, and the importance of having no hiatus or interregnum causes me to make the request I am now submitting.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Did the Senator from Maryland say the joint resolution comes before the Senate with a unanimous report from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs?

Mr. TYDINGS. It does.

Mr. WHITE. And is designed for the purpose of meeting an emergent situation?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I presume that in the ordinary course the joint resolution would go to the calendar, but in view of what the Senator has said, I have no purpose to object.

Mr. MALONEY. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall take only a moment, but I do wish to state what the joint resolution provides, so that the Senator will know what it is. Then I shall be glad to yield.

The joint resolution is very short, and reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of article 7 of the amended Constitution of the Philippines, the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines serving at the time of the introduction of this joint resolution shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands. Thereupon the tenure of office of the present President of the Commonwealth shall cease and the Vice President shall become President to serve until such time as his successor shall have been elected and qualified according to the Constitution and the laws of the Philippines.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the able Senator from Maryland what would happen if we neglected to take action on the joint resolution now?

Mr. TYDINGS. If we neglected to take action on the joint resolution now the immediate happening would be that the President would go out of office and the Vice President would come into office. However, if the Vice President came into office, and we were not able to drive the Japanese out of the Philippines at the time the term of the new President expired, then there would be neither President nor Vice President, nor any way, in my judgment, to carry on the government.

Mr. MALONEY. As I understand the Senator, and I ask him if I correctly understand him, if we take no action on the joint resolution the present Vice President of the Philippines, Mr. Osmena, would automatically become President?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. So that the Philippines would not be without a President if we should not take action?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not quite understand the Senator's fears.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that the action we propose to take now is at the direct request of the present President, the present Vice President who would become the President in the circumstances set forth by the Senator from Connecticut, and all of the Philippine Cabinet, formulated at a meeting attended by such men as Secretary Stimson, other members of our Cabinet, Representative BELL of the House, and myself, as well as Army and Navy officials, all of whom agreed, looking at all angles in the present situation in the Philippines, that this was the appropriate action to take in the interest of the Philippine people as well as our own.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask the Senator one or two more questions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Philippine Cabinet was in accord with the request?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I placed the letter signed by the President, the Vice President, and the members of the Philippine Cabinet in the RECORD last Friday afternoon.

Mr. MALONEY. When was the letter written?

Mr. TYDINGS. The letter was written last Friday morning.

Mr. MALONEY. Where are the members of the Philippine cabinet now?

Mr. TYDINGS. In Washington.

Mr. MALONEY. Did Mr. Osmena approve of the letter?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Osmena approved of the letter. He signed the letter.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will bear with me a few minutes, let me read a short letter from Secretary Stimson which I received this morning, dated November 9, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 9, 1943.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have read the proposed joint resolution to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands and hasten to advise you that in my opinion the passage of this resolution will greatly assist in a continuous and effective prosecution of the war effort to liberate the Philippines from the Japanese. I hope it may be adopted by both Houses promptly.

Very sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

I also have letters to the same effect from the Acting Secretary of the Interior and the Acting Secretary of State. I ask to have their letters printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 9, 1943.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on
Territories and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: A proposed Senate joint resolution, recognizing that enemy action has interrupted the normal governmental processes of the Philippines, would authorize the temporary continuance in office of the President and Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

I am advised that this resolution would reflect the views of both President Quezon and Vice President Osmena, the elected and now the only authoritative spokesmen for the Philippine people. For this reason Secretary Ickes has authorized me to say, in his absence, that he approves the action which is now proposed.

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 8, 1943.

The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on
Territories and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: It is my understanding that you will submit a joint resolution by which the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands. Thereupon the tenure of office of the present President of the Commonwealth shall cease and the Vice President shall become President to serve until such time as his successor shall have been elected and qualified according to the Constitution and the laws of the Philippines.

The Department of State has been asked to comment on this proposal, and I desire to state, in connection with the request, that the Department is in sympathy with the purpose of the legislation.

Sincerely yours,
E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. For my own information I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what this body will accomplish by passing the joint resolution, by way of abrogating or changing or altering the Philippine Constitution. Have we such authority?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator that the joint resolution as amended deals only with the time intervening between now and the reestablishment of civil processes in the Philippines. When that moment comes everything goes on exactly as it is provided for in the constitution. Prior to that time—that is, in the interval between now and then—the Filipinos themselves, as represented by the President, Vice President, and Cabinet on the one hand, and the Americans as represented by members of the Cabinet of our own Government, have all agreed, after a thorough survey of the circumstances, and in conjunction with Army and Navy advice, that this is a sound procedure for us to follow in order to accomplish perhaps the greatest

good that can be accomplished in the emergency.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is only for that reason, with the consent of everyone interested, that I have sponsored the joint resolution, and I went so far, I may say in complete frankness, as to tell the Filipinos that I would refuse to sponsor it unless they themselves requested me to do so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The measure we are considering is a joint resolution?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a joint resolution.

Mr. WHITE. It must be acted upon by the other body and approved by the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs acting, I believe, unanimously, this morning reported an identical joint resolution in the House, and are going to try to obtain quick action on it at the other end of the Capitol. I therefore renew my request for unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of article 7 of the amended Constitution of the Philippines, the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines serving at the time of the introduction of this joint resolution shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands. Thereupon, the tenure of office of the present President of the Commonwealth shall cease and the Vice President shall become President to serve until such time as his successor shall have been elected and qualified according to the constitution and the laws of the Philippines.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to observe that I think the great Philippine Commonwealth, which one day will emerge again as a free and vigorous government in the society of nations, is exceedingly fortunate to have two supreme executives, serving as President and the Vice President, who are as able and patriotic and utterly competent and unusual in their character, courage, and statesmanlike abilities as Manuel L. Quezon, President, and Sergio Osmena, the Vice President. It is a benediction upon the Philippine commonwealth that these two brilliant and splendid statesmen should have been at the head of this great adventure in liberty and independence at this critical time in Filipino destiny.

Personally I have hesitated very much about intrusion on our part into the constitutional processes of the Philippines themselves, but, Mr. President, in view of the fact that we seem to have a color of authority to do it, I know of no place where I would be more willing to turn for my conclusive advice in such a matter than to a joint agreement between Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmena. Therefore, I am very happy indeed to support the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the preamble to the joint resolution will be stricken out.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines."

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Acting President pro tempore. It is one which I think is of vital importance to the Senate. On February 11 I introduced the following resolution, which is in standard form:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized—

Both the committee and the subcommittee—

during the Seventy-eighth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer * * * to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee.

I have not read all the resolution, but have read only the pertinent provisions.

In May, I think it was, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] submitted a resolution on rural electrification. I took up that resolution with the committee, and it authorized me to appoint a subcommittee, which I did.

The subcommittee found that the subject was a far-reaching and important one, and it did not have sufficient funds. Therefore it submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry appointed by the chairman of said committee to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act is authorized for the purpose of such inquiry to employ clerical and other assistants, and to expend during the Seventy-eighth Congress not to exceed $15,000.

I submitted that resolution in proper course, and it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I have been informed by the chairman of the committee that unless the full committee makes such a request, he will not consider it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator that question, if he will permit. Has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry passed upon the question at all?

Mr. SMITH. The committee passed on the question of the Shipstead resolution, and authorized me to appoint a subcommittee to investigate it.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; Mr. President, that was not my question. With respect to the request for an appropriation from the contingent fund of the Senate, has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a whole joined the subcommittee in the request?

Mr. SMITH. No; it has not. My experience for a good long time in this body has been that when a subcommittee is appointed under an original resolution, it can ask for funds. I think that has been done.

However, I desire to have a ruling as to whether I have proceeded in the proper parliamentary way, and, if not, wherein I have digressed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the inquiry?

Mr. SMITH. The inquiry is, is the subcommittee within its rights in asking for money to carry on its investigation?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the very able senior Senator from South Carolina has seen fit to refer to me in connection with the inquiry, I deem it necessary to say just a word as to my position as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

As the Chair well understands, at the beginning of each session of the Congress, the Senate adopts general resolutions which permit each standing committee to hold hearings upon any proposed legislation which is referred to it for consideration.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. That is not the wording of the resolution. It says "The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof."

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair is familiar with the type of general resolution which is adopted, and the resolution speaks for itself if I misquote it.

On the basis of the general resolutions which are adopted, it has been the custom in the Senate ever since I have been a Member of it, and ever since I have been chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, for a committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to hold hearings upon legislation which was referred to it. In this instance the amount of money which

is requested is based on the resolution submitted some time ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. I have sent for a copy of that resolution.

Be that as it may, after that resolution was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota, the resolution was referred, as I understand, to a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. At no time has the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a whole—and I am a member of that committee—ever passed upon the question of whether or not $15,000 was necessary to conduct the investigation. I submit that under the rules and precedents of the Senate no subcommittee has any right to act independently upon a resolution which is submitted for the specific purpose of investigating some matter, without first having the approval of the full committee. That is the position which I take. If a subcommittee can pass upon resolutions of this kind, and say "we need $15,000, $20,000, or $25,000——"

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I decline to yield. I should like to finish my statement.

I submit that there is no precedent for a subcommittee acting independently of the full committee. To do so would place an undue burden upon the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. We are charged with protecting the money which is appropriated by the Senate for conducting investigations.

I have taken the rigid position—and I shall continue to take it—that until the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry passes on the request for $15,000, so far as I am concerned, I will not consider the request, because I think it is the duty of every committee to pass upon matters of this kind.

Moreover, Mr. President, I do not know what hearings were held before the subcommittee. Not a scintilla of evidence taken before the subcommittee was submitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and no report was made to that committee. So far as the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is concerned, there is not a single line of evidence upon which it can intelligently base an opinion as to whether or not the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is entitled to $15,000, $5,000, or $50,000. As I understand, it is the duty and the right of my committee to be informed on the subject.

I urge committees to be more serious in their consideration of resolutions which come before them, and not to place upon the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate the responsibility for determining whether or not any amounts requested are needed. If under the rules of the Senate the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is to be compelled to allow $15,000 or $25,000 merely because a subcommittee says it needs that amount, there is no need for my committee. We might just as well abolish it, and when a committee states that it needs $15,000 or $25,000, let it go directly to the disbursing officer, and let him pay the money.

Mr. President, so long as I am in charge of the purse strings of the Senate as one member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I will not agree to any such procedure. I say that with the utmost sincerity, in the hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on this question to determine how much money is really needed to make the proposed investigation, and then permit such hearings to be printed and made available for study by the committee of which I am chairman. Otherwise, my committee will have to hold hearings to make the determination, as it has done on one or two previous occasions.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me give the history of this question.

When the Shipstead resolution came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Illinois, who is a member of my committee, was not present. He rarely is. However, we went through the ordinary process. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota was read, and the committee stated, "We instruct the chairman to appoint a subcommittee to investigate this question and report back what action the committee should take on the resolution."

The original resolution provided as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, the total expenses pursuant to this resolution (which shall not exceed $5,000) to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

The Shipstead resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee instructed me to appoint a subcommittee, which I did. The subcommittee made a preliminary study with respect to the scope of the investigation, and reported that it thought there should be an appropriation of $15,000. I then had the subcommittee draft a resolution requesting that sum. I thought I was following the general practice of the Senate. I am not a parliamentarian. I should like a ruling as to whether the process which I followed is in accord with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from South Carolina yielded the floor?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to the resolution which was submitted by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] on July 1. It provided as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, is authorized and instructed to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and for the purpose of determining whether political groups or organizations have been created to influence the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and if so, how they have been organized and how they have been financed, and what efforts they have made to influence the administration of the Act, whether the administration of R. E. A. has not suffered since R. E. A. was made subject to the Department of Agriculture, and whether R. E. A. should not be restored to its original status as an independent agency responsible only to the Congress, and whatever other facts are helpful in determining a policy for R. E. A. which would carry out the original purposes of the Rural Electrification Act.

The point I make is that the resolution is totally silent upon the request for a single dollar for the investigation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the able chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the point he makes in this controversy is that after the resolution was referred to the subcommittee, as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has said, and the subcommittee met and decided that it should have $10,000 or $15,000, or whatever sum was deemed necessary, the proper procedure would have been for the subcommittee to make that report to the full committee.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. And the full committee should have acted on the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, what I wish to know is, has that been the rule of this body? I do not want to go contrary to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SMITH. I understood that the Senator had the floor by sufferance.

Mr. LUCAS. I have the floor, and with all due deference to my dear friend, I decline to yield it for a moment.

With respect to the resolution which was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] as I said a moment ago, it fails utterly to request a single dime with which to carry on the investigation. On page 137 of the Senate Manual, 1943 edition, under the heading of "Committee expenses," appears the following paragraph:

Provided, That hereafter Senate resolutions providing for inquiries and investigations shall contain a limit of cost of such investigation, which limit shall not be exceeded except by vote of the Senate authorizing additional amounts.

This resolution asks for no money whatsoever, and yet it is a resolution requiring a special investigation of an important matter. Therefore, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that under the rules of the Senate, somewhere along the line some committee must pass upon the $15,000 request before it finally goes to

my committee for action. I do not think there can be any question about it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to address the Chair on the subject of the inquiry?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, have I lost the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Chair recognized the Senator from Illinois, he asked the Senator from South Carolina if he yielded the floor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, it is true that the original resolution did not ask for any funds. It was a resolution in the usual form. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and it has been acted upon by that committee, as is usual, by referring it to a subcommittee.

The purpose of the resolution originally was to have the committee determine whether or not hearings should be held. The full committee agreed that the matter should be referred to a subcommittee for investigation.

Mr. SMITH. That was the action of the committee.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; I understand that. I have said so. The subcommittee met and decided to investigate in order to determine whether further investigation should be held, and to what extent it was justified in asking for funds. The committee sent for certain papers and documents and spent a great deal of time in probing correspondence and several reports which had been made.

I was instrumental in submitting the original resolution because several years ago I had received many complaints relative to the administration of the Rural Electrification Act. I was tremendously interested in rural electrification because I think it is one of the finest things for agriculture and for the rural population of the United States that has ever been made possible by the Congress. I had so many complaints about its administration and the various practices associated with it that I appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture to make an investigation of the practices. The records will show that Senator Miller, a former Member of this body, also asked for an investigation. The complaints did not cease. I did not know that investigations had been made. The record shows that two investigations were made; and I think the record will show, when fully developed, that the results of the investigations have never been turned over to the Administrator. He did not know anything about them.

It is a disagreeable task to investigate anyone. I do not think any public exposure or statement should be made unless it is made upon the basis of sworn testimony. The members of the subcommittee had several meetings and unanimously, upon representations which were presented to it, decided that it was necessary to make a thorough investigation. In order to do that it is necessary to have funds. It may be necessary to subpena witnesses. It may be necessary to pay per diems. To what extent the probe should go will be determined when the real investigation can be conducted in a proper manner.

The question is raised with respect to the authority of the subcommittee. It was assumed upon the authority of advice to the chairman that the original resolution giving power to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave authority to a subcommittee to conduct an investigation and report as to whether or not a more thorough hearing, at which sworn testimony could be given, should be held, and the subcommittee unanimously came to the conclusion that such procedure should be adopted. Under the general resolution giving authority to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the question arises as to whether the committee has a right to delegate its authority to a subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH. It is delegated under the resolution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes, I have said that. The resolution adopted by the Senate gives the full committee authority to delegate to a subcommittee the authority which is delegated by the Senate to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Perhaps the Senate will have to decide whether or not it can approve the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina, or whether it shall go back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The question is, How much authority has been delegated? The subcommittee is a servant of the full committee. The full committee delegated authority to the subcommittee—and I believe it was full authority—to commence an investigation and hold hearings for the purpose of making a report to the Senate, and on the basis of their findings to request funds, in an effort to render a public service by conducting a thorough investigation to show what remedy is necessary to stop some of the practices which have been followed in the administration of the Rural Electrification Act.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think no one can doubt the authority granted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the disjunctive conjunction "or" puts the subcommittee on the same footing as the full committee. The language is "or any subcommittee thereof is authorized."

Why is authorized? The full committee and the subcommittee are authorized. I read from the resolution:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee.

All I want to know, Mr. President, is whether I was acting for the subcommittee and the full committee, within the custom of the Senate, in presenting the request of the subcommittee for funds, or must I go back and call together the full committee and tell them what a mess has been stirred up here?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair, as he is a member of the full standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as well as the subcommittee referred to, is somewhat embarrassed. The Chair understands, however, this to be the situation: Under the general resolution to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred, giving authority to conduct certain procedures by subcommittee, within a certain scope, and providing $5,000 therefor, it was perfectly proper for the chairman of the committee, through a subcommittee, on direction of the committee, to undertake the investigation which has been undertaken and to expend up to the sum of $5,000 for the specific purposes provided in the general resolution. But the Chair understands that it was the opinion of the subcommittee that it would be necessary to make additional expenditures not provided for in the original resolution, such as for the employment of counsel, which would require a larger sum than that envisioned in the $5,000, which was the specific limitation. Acting on instruction of the subcommittee, the chairman of the committee has submitted a resolution asking that there be made available the sum of $15,000 additional funds for the additional purposes. That resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate under the accustomed procedure of the Senate. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate have refused to act because they have not been informed of any action by the full committee.

The Chair calls attention to section 1 of rule XXV of the Senate, which sets up the standing committees, and reads the fourth paragraph:

> Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to consist of eight Senators, to which shall be referred all resolutions directing the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same: *Provided*, That any such resolution relating to the substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

In the instant case that action was not taken, and, under that rule, the resolution should not have been referred, in the opinion of the present occupant of the chair, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate until the substantive proposal had been acted upon by the full committee.

The Chair does not hold with the Senator from Illinois that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is clothed with jurisdiction to make a decision on substantive matters.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that. All I want to know is how shall I proceed? Shall I call the full committee together and have them take action?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from South Carolina will bear with a suggestion from the Chair, the Chair suggests that the Senator move that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of

the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the committee of which he is chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am just about as clear now as I was when I asked for a ruling.

As I understand, the ruling of the Chair is that I have got to call the full committee together to act on what the subcommittee has, under a misapprehension, asked for, and therefore must ask for again. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not think it is quite fair to the Chair or to the rules or to the Senate to leave the situation in the posture to which the Senator from South Carolina assigns it. It seems to me that the Chair's ruling is eminently correct. A subcommittee does not report to the Senate on anything; it takes the action of a full committee to report to the Senate. The rule requires—and it is conformed to without exception, so far as I know—that when a resolution involving the expenditure of money beyond the routine allowance of $5,000 for all standing committees, which was the amount agreed to early in the session, is submitted, when additional sums are required or requested or when additional committees, special or otherwise, are set up and require funds, the resolution authorizing the funds must first go to the full committee to which it would properly be assigned. If that committee reports favorably upon it to the Senate, the resolution then goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. That rule was adopted by the Senate in order to give the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a check upon the expenditures of committees. There is nothing unusual about the situation, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I was under the impression that subcommittees had made requests for funds without the action of the full committee. I think that has been done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Special committees have done so, I will say to the Senator; but I have no recollection of any subcommittee directly making a report to the Senate asking for additional funds. It usually goes through the full committee. That is my information, and I think that is the proper course.

Mr. SMITH. That may be. I wanted to know what was the proper course. The subcommittee wanted money, but no action was taken on the resolution they submitted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution not having been sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, obviously, there is nothing before them to act upon, and the Chair respectfully suggests, if the chairman of the committee cares to follow that course, that the Chair would be glad to entertain a motion to have the resolution referred to his committee.

Mr. SMITH. That is, to refer the resolution to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Well, Mr. President, I am an ignoramus about what goes on in the Senate. I do not object to the suggestion, and ask respectfully that the resolution be referred to the august Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, and that it be referred to the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think in the interest of the Senator from South Carolina I should ask unanimous consent that the statement that he is an ignoramus be stricken from the RECORD. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if I am one, I have plenty of company. [Laughter.]

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in the hurry of the final hours of the consideration of the peace resolution (S. Res. 192) it was not practicable for us to do some things we would have liked to do, and I desire to take this occasion, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to express my very great personal gratitude, particularly to the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which considered the resolution.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], by his outstanding ability, by his wide grasp of foreign affairs, and by his sound judgment, made a very distinct contribution to the work of the subcommittee.

The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], in his profound scholarship, and with his intimate knowledge of foreign relations, was also of great assistance to the subcommittee.

The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Democratic leader, as a result of his long experience and his qualities of leadership, and with the knowledge on his part that he would have to lead the fight on the floor for the adoption of the resolution, gave of his ability and wise counsel generously.

The able senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] had a resolution of his own, but in a fine spirit and with a desire to serve and to coordinate all efforts, he did not press his resolution. His ability and his interest in foreign relations were of substantial help to us in our labors.

I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who I regret is absent from the Chamber at the moment, for the very valuable contribution he made. Being of the minority party, it was probably more difficult for him than for some of the rest of us to go along with the main purpose we had in view, but at all times he manifested a very earnest desire to cooperate, and he gave to the committee wholeheartedly of his talents and leadership in achieving agreement and unity on the resolution. He deserves high credit for his services.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who, like the Senator from Michigan, had a resolution of his own, but did not press it. His ability and his earnest endeavors gave us much encouragement and hope and he exhibited a fine spirit of cooperation.

There was one other member of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who was ill, and for that reason was absent most of the time during the sessions of the subcommittee, but when he was present he approached the problem with his usual industry, ability, patriotism, and intelligent understanding.

Mr. President, in addition to these members of the subcommittee, I wish to thank all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The practical unanimity of the committee in supporting the resolution gave assurance that it would triumph in the Senate. Without such unanimity it would not have succeeded. So, I wish to express for the RECORD my appreciation of the great service these Senators rendered to their country and to the cause of world peace.

I wish to add one further word. I have already spoken of the majority leader. I wish to express my appreciation of the contribution of the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who in many ways cooperated and assisted in consideration of the resolution. His constant attendance on the floor, his fine ability, and his engaging personality rendered notable service.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have just listened to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], thanking the members of the subcommittee and the full committee for the work they did in connection with the resolution which was so overwhelmingly adopted by the Senate last Friday.

I would join the Senator from Texas in commending the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee, but I am reminded that before last March certain Senators associated themselves together in an effort to obtain a worthwhile expression from the Senate of the United States as to foreign policy. Four Members of the Senate joined in offering a resolution on that subject.

As one of the Democratic members of that group, for myself and for my Democratic colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] I wish to pay my respects today to our two associates on the other side of the Chamber, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], men of political faith opposite from that of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and myself. We worked together through long weeks and months, traveling throughout the whole country. One of the main purposes of our association was to present to the American people a picture demonstrating that partisan politics should not be involved in our foreign relations. I think we accomplished that purpose.

Mr. President, I personally traveled in various sections of the country with Dr. JUDD, a Republican Representative from Minnesota, and another Republican Representative, Mr. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana. I never had finer associations or more pleasant relations than I had with these estimable gentlemen.

We received support and assistance from other Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. Party membership was not considered. I wish to say that throughout this time never did one question of partisan difference arise on the part of any of us. We worked together, united for one purpose. I wish to express my own thanks and personal gratification to these Members of both the House and of our own group in the Senate who, as we think, worked effectively and well throughout those months.

Mr. President, it has been a pleasure for me to have had these contacts and associations. It has also demonstrated conclusively the old truth that the foreign policy of this country should begin at the water's edge, and there partisan politics must end. I hope that, whatever course future events may take, partisan politics will be entirely eliminated from consideration in our determination of the vast and important questions affecting our foreign policy, which will be ours to determine in the months to come. In our relations with other countries may we always be united as firmly as we were last Friday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has spoken in generous and kindly words of the members of the subcommittee who served under him, and of all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who contributed to the outcome of our labors last week in perfecting and adopting the post-war resolution, so called.

Mr. President, modesty has forbidden the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to mention the chairman of the committee. My observation is that a committee never rises above its chairman. The Senator from Texas, from the very beginning of this controversy and of this study, has manifested zeal, patience, and tolerance for the opinions of others. In the parliamentary sense he managed the progress of the resolution with infinite skill, and he spoke in its behalf with that eloquence which always distinguishes him.

As a minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I want to pay tribute to his contribution to what has been accomplished.

PRODUCTION OF LIQUID FUEL FROM COAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Friday, at the last session of the Senate, Calendar No. 451, which is S. 1243, was made the pending business of the Senate; it would automatically come before the Senate at 2 o'clock, but inasmuch as it appears that there is no other matter pressing for the attention of the Senate, I desire to enter a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 451, Senate bill 1243.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that on a previous day the bill was considered and certain amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys has unanimously recommended the enactment of the bill now before the Senate. The House Committee on Mines and Mining has likewise made a unanimous report on a similar bill, which was introduced in the House by the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and which is now upon the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives.

During the summer the two committees, the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and the House Committee on Mines and Mining, held joint hearings in Washington, in Pittsburgh, Pa., in Salt Lake City, Utah, and in Sheridan, Wyo. Opportunity was sought by the committee to have as widespread knowledge of the purposes of the bill as possible, and to give every person who was interested an opportunity to present his point of view.

I think there are three primary reasons why the bill should be enacted, and enacted promptly. The first of these is that our reserves of oil are steadily declining, and we should not permit ourselves in this era of the world's development to become dependent upon foreign sources of oil.

The second reason is that the military needs for gasoline and fuel oil are steadily expanding. When we consider the quantity of gasoline that is used in the round-the-clock bombing now taking place by American bombers, it becomes evident that we are making a tremendous draft upon the fuel resources of the country and of the world.

I am told upon the authority of the War Department that 1,000 four-motor bombers engaged in a 6-hour mission will consume 1,800,000 gallons of gasoline. Four or five years ago the United States was producing less than 3,000 airplanes in a year. In October, according to the report of the War Production Board, the aircraft industry of America manufactured more than 8,200 airplanes. The new B–29, the latest model of the Flying Fortress, has been constructed with a range that outdistances any other plane ever built. The War Department has not seen fit to make any disclosure publicly of the range of this new bomber, but we know that it is a very essential instrument in carrying the war to Tokyo. We will need more and more gasoline for these purposes.

Mr. President, as Members of the Senate will observe, I have placed several charts around the walls of the Senate Chamber, and I have other charts which can be exhibited if any interest should be shown in them.

The two charts at the rear, one of which is a map of the world and the other of which is a chart showing the well densities, are particularly well adapted, I think, to prove the point I make that the bill should be passed.

The third reason I was about to cite is that in addition to increasing use for military purposes, there has been a steadily expanding demand for fuel oil and gasoline for civilian purposes, and it will be utterly impossible for the United States to maintain its position of leadership in the fields of aviation and of industry unless we have a sure and certain supply of gasoline.

The large map of the world is colored in various hues, principally red and green. The area colored in green outlines the prospective oil lands of the world. It will be observed that the area of possible oil land in the United States and in Canada is but a fraction of the possible oil land in Russia. Russia, in Europe and in Siberia, has vast expanses of territory which geologists tell us are well suited to the production of petroleum, and which have not yet been drilled for oil. The cold fact is that the future of the world, so far as oil production is concerned, belongs to Russia. How important that is may be indicated by the second chart to which I call attention—namely, the one which is labeled "Well density." There are 2 circles, one of which—the one on the right—indicates the number of oil wells which have been drilled in the United States. It shows that there are 1,000,000 wells in the 3,026,000 square miles of United States territory, or 1 well for every 3.026 square miles, whereas in all the world there are 100,000 wells in 52,754,000 square miles, or 1 well for every 527.54 square miles. In these circumstances it seems to me there can be no question that if the United States desires to maintain its leadership in industry and in aviation, it must take the steps now in order to make sure that we shall have a satisfactory supply of liquid fuel.

Mr. President, I shall trespass upon the time of the Senate only long enough to show one other chart. It now rests upon the easel in front of the desk. It was drawn for the purpose of showing the decline of our oil reserves from 1937 to 1942. It will be observed that in 1937 the total new reserves added in the United States for that year amounted to almost 4,000,000,000 barrels, whereas in 1940 less than 2,000,000,000 barrels have been added to the reserves.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not understand the meaning of the term "new reserves." Of course, nothing is added to the reserves already stored in the earth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Probably the phrase should have been "known reserves" or "proven reserves." We are talking of the estimates of the American

Petroleum Institute as to the amount of oil in the ground, as proven by drilling.

Mr. HOLMAN. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The lower part of the chart shows how the newly discovered reserves have steadily declined. The fact is, as indicated by the number of wells which have been drilled, that in the United States the possible sources of petroleum have been thoroughly explored.

Mr. HOLMAN. In other words, we are exhausting our reservoir; are we?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. At this moment we are burning up more petroleum than we are adding by discovery.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean there is no possibility of bringing in any other reserves, even if we had done the exploration we should have done during the last 2 years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean the oil is not available?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, it is available if we explore the fields we have; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say some is available. How much, we do not know. I will say to the Senator that in December last the Congress passed a bill which I had the privilege of introducing, and which had been favorably reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. The bill provided that there should be a reduction of royalty for new discoveries of new deposits upon the public domain, for a period of 10 years. The theory of the bill was that the Government of the United States should hold out a reward to the pioneer, to the explorer, to the prospector for oil, and should offer him a lower royalty if he discovered the oil which our country so greatly needs. That bill was passed by both Houses of Congress, was signed by the President, and became the law of the land. In the past year, partially as a result of the enactment of that bill, and partially also as a result of the stimulation of drilling in the State of Wyoming, approximately 100,000,000 barrels of new oil resources have been brought in. I think there can be more discoveries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. In attending the meetings of the Special Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels in Areas West of the Mississippi River, with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], I observed that it was testified at Kansas City—I do not know whether the Senator from Wyoming was present at the last hearing——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. At any rate, the representatives of the industry itself stated in open testimony that if Secretary Ickes' recommendation that the price of crude oil be increased 35 cents a barrel had been followed they felt the result would be that new fields would be explored to such an extent that all the petroleum we would need for all uses for 6 months would be brought in. I do not know whether the Senator recalls reading that statement. Does the Senator feel that such an increase could be brought about by exploring for oil for use as gasoline and crude oil, or does the Senator think that is impossible?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I think an increase could be brought about by increasing the price; but the possibilities are not sufficient to meet the needs we have when we are reducing the oil reserves.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This chart [indicating] compares coal and oil and oil shale. It will be observed that the possible oil is only a fraction of the possible oil to be recovered or extracted from oil shale, whereas both together are only a fraction of our coal reserves which, under the hydrogenation process which is the subject of this bill, could be used for the production of oil.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. In our State we have lignite coal, which, as the Senator understands, is the lowest form of coal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not know there was anything in Oregon which could be called the lowest form of any commodity. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall have to add to the record there. Let me inquire whether lignite coal is a source of liquid fuel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Lignite coal can be used. All types of coal can be used. The truth of the matter is that the process of hydrogenation is actually a scientific duplication of the process of nature by which petroleum is made.

Some years ago the Congress made an appropriation for the Bureau of Mines to provide for the establishment of a laboratory plant at Pittsburgh. This plant was visited by the committee. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is present at this moment, and his colleague [Mr. GUFFEY], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, were both at the Bureau of Mines Laboratory at the time the committee visited it. There coal is subjected to tremendous heat and tremendous pressure. At this high degree of heat and under this tremendous pressure hydrogen gas is forced into the coal, and chemically the coal is actually transformed into petroleum. The result is that the gasoline and oil derived from the hydrogenation process are in every respect identical with the products made from petroleum. The only question is whether or not we intend now to take time by the forelock and provide that the United States shall not in any circumstances run short of a sure supply of fuel. It is an expensive process. There can be no doubt about that. The laboratory at Pittsburgh uses a ton or two tons of coal a day. I believe that is the capacity of the plant. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who was present at the hearing, can correct me if I have misstated it.

Mr. GURNEY. I am quite sure it is not that large.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it even less than that?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. It is approximately 200 pounds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. As I now recall, the Senator is correct. That toy plant at Pittsburgh is not sufficient to make the commercial test which should be made so that we may not face a shortage in oil such as we faced in rubber, for example. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Department of the Interior to establish demonstration plants which will open the door to private industry to manufacture synthetic liquid fuel in large volume when the need arises.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the hydrogenation process is peculiarly adapted to coal, whereas it might or might not be adapted to oil shale. The Senator does not intend to foreclose the use of other experimental processes so far as oil shales are concerned, does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not. Any process which can be developed ought to be developed. There are two processes which have been used—the so-called Bergius process and the Fischer-Tropsch process. Both those processes were discovered by German scientists. Germany used both processes for the purpose of manufacturing the gasoline with which Hitler undertook the conquest of the world. The bill is intended to afford scientific experimentation with respect to all these processes and any new ones which may be developed. It would make the Government a pioneer in conducting studies in the public interest. Such studies cannot be undertaken, and have not been undertaken by private industry because of the expense involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the early 1920's the president of the Colorado School of Mines and one or two associates on the faculty of that institution came to Congress with a complete laboratory oil shale retorting plant. It was set up in one of the committee rooms and demonstrated to Senators and Representatives who were interested that oil could be produced from oil shale. So there is a precedent for a Government interest in both branches of the subject—both coal and oil shale.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I may add that only last Saturday Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, who sponsored the bill in the House of Representatives, flew from Martinsburg, in his State, to Washington in a Fairchild plane which was fueled by aviation gasoline made from coal in the Pittsburgh plant.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should add that subsequent to the demonstration to

which I referred, Senator Phipps, of Colorado, sponsored an appropriation which resulted in the oil shale experimental plant at Rulison, Colo.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct. I think it was in 1928 or 1929 that the Bureau of Mines conducted those experiments. There are huge deposits of oil shale in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, which the scientists estimate are capable of producing 92,000,000,000 barrels of oil. That is more than three times greater than our present known reserves of petroleum.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell us how many of these plants are contemplated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill says one or more. The committee did not undertake to put a limitation upon the department, realizing that in every instance the request for appropriations would have to be made to the Bureau of the Budget and then to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. Would different types of coal require different plants?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not necessarily. I think there ought to be a plant for oil shale, and a separate plant for coal generally. The gradations of coal from lignite through semibituminous, bituminous, and perhaps even anthracite, might make it desirable to have more than one plant for coal, but the committee did not undertake to decide that question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps the Senator has already answered the question which I am about to ask. What is the relative cost of producing gasoline, say from oil shale and from petroleum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The best we can do is to make estimates.

About 2 years ago Mr. William S. Farrish, who was president of the Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, in testifying before the House Committee on Mines and Mining, gave it as his belief that synthetic gasoline would probably cost about 16 cents a gallon. Other estimates are as low as 12 cents a gallon. Of course, that is much higher than the cost of manufacturing gasoline from petroleum.

It is because of the higher cost that private industry has not undertaken the experimental work. For example, much more steel is required to build a hydrogenation plant than is necessary to build an ordinary oil refinery. So there is a higher cost. One of the purposes of the bill, however, is to authorize the Government to undertake the pioneer work to determine to what extent the cost may be reduced.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the committee have any evidence as to the minimum period within which the first experimental plant could be constructed and placed in operation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think Dr. Fieldner, the head of the Bureau of Mines, was of the opinion that it probably would be certainly not less than 18 months before the work could actually be begun.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. From line 4 on page 1 of the bill, I take it that even any such estimate would be subject to possible limitation because of the critical material situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is an expert on these matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator flatters me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to know about the average cost of producing gasoline from petroleum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that the cost is about 6 cents a gallon.

Mr. McKELLAR. About 6 cents.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I apologize to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for not having heard all of his address, and I wish to ask for information. Is it the purpose of the pending bill to put the Federal Government in the petroleum-production business, or merely to conduct experiments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The purpose is merely to conduct experiments, and the committee amendment, which I hope will be adopted, makes it clear that the purpose is not to invade the field of commercial production at all.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If the Senator will permit another question, I understand that in England a considerable portion of their petroleum products is produced in the manner to which reference has here been made. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the Senator is correct. That is the fact.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If Great Britain has proved the success of the process, is it necessary for us to go through the experimental stage or period in this country?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I think so, because in England they have been working with the original processes which were developed in Germany, and we desire to have the experimentation carried on in order to determine whether or not production costs may be very greatly reduced.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now comes the most important question of all. How much money will be required to make these experiments? What appropriation does the Senator ask for?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. According to an amendment which was adopted by the Senate when the calendar was last called, the bill would authorize an expenditure of not more than $30,000,000. But of course, the Senator well knows that all appropriations would have to come through the Bureau of the Budget and through the various committees of Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am pleased to hear the answers of the Senator from Wyoming indicating a purpose which I believe he has held for years, not to allow the Government to go into business in competition with, or to the exclusion of, private industries. On many occasions I have heard him state his belief in our American theory of private enterprise, or free economy. I make that observation because the bill seems in one particular to be in a contrary direction to his answers.

I notice that in the amendment reported by the committee it is intended to obtain engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid-fuel industry available to private industry. However, in another part of the bill—namely, on page 4, in lines 5, 6, and 7—there are words which would work in the opposite direction, because if they became law they would put into the hands of the Secretary of the Interior complete control of private industry whenever it used any of this engineering data which is covered by a patent. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

> And to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this act.

I wonder if the Senator has considered those words in reference to his belief, and whether he recognizes in them exactly the opposite of what he believes. They say in effect that this engineering data, the new discoveries which may be patented, shall be available to the citizens of the United States and to the industries of the United States for the benefit of its people. I ask that as a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to answer the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

My feeling, at least—I cannot speak for the committee because the question was not raised in the committee—is that if the Government of the United States should discover any new processes, it should be in at least as good a position as any private owner of a patent right with respect to patents that may be taken out on any discoveries which are made.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is not that statement of the Senator in opposition to his well-known and traditional attitude with respect to patents and other similar subjects?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rather doubt it, because the Senator will observe that in the sentence preceding the one from which he has quoted the committee has inserted an amendment which makes clear that the purpose is not to invade private rights. The language to which I refer is as follows:

Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser—

And then the amendment reading—

through regular commercial channels.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, I am familiar with that language. It is entirely inconsistent, as I conceive it, with opening the door of this scientific research to private industry, and making available to private industry the products of the research, because private industry must come on bended knee, and must yield to what the Secretary of the Interior considers to be the appropriate terms upon which the licenses shall be granted. To my mind that is the highest form of control outside of complete exclusion from the field.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me for interrupting him, I have repeatedly stated my own personal position that there should be no restriction, either public or private, upon the ability of the citizen to develop new industry and to create new jobs. I feel that it would be altogether improper if the Government should undertake to use any patent rights for the purpose of restricting the citizens. So far as I am concerned, if the Senator cares to offer an amendment which will be in harmony with his views upon that point, I shall certainly be very glad to have the Senate adopt it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I believed he would take that position if there were real cause for it. I have a suggestion to make. I shall be glad to give the Senator plenty of time in which to go over it and adapt it to his views. It will carry out what I have always believed to be his view, namely, that the door must be kept open to private enterprise for all discoveries in science made at the cost of the United States, or by the agencies of the United States, just as freely as physicians, under their Hippocratic oath, give their special knowledge and skill to all humanity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel most deeply that we cannot hope to make the transition from war to peace unless we promote the greatest possible industrial and economic activity on the part of all the people of the United States who desire to engage in enterprise. I feel that the suggestion which the Senator makes is well worthy of consideration.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am very grateful, and I am pleased also to find that I am in accord with the Senator from Wyoming, as I have found myself to be so many times.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I suggest to the Senator that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments and then take up the suggestion which he cares to make?

Mr. AUSTIN. That would be satisfactory to me if the Senator so prefers. I thought I would first inform him of what was in my mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. AUSTIN. If there was to be such an amendment, I was sure the Senator would be glad to consider it, and I wanted to give him all the time which he desired in which to consider it.

Mr. President, I submit the following amendment:

On page 4 of the original print, beginning with the comma in line 1, I propose to strike out all thereafter down to and including line 3, and in lieu thereof insert a period and the following:

No patent or patent rights acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall prevent any citizen of the United States or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process to which such patent or patent rights relate, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to have had the amendment read to me, and I shall be very glad to examine it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask that the Senate proceed with the consideration of committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the next amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys was, in section 1, page 2, line 5, after the word "act", appearing in the amendment heretofore agreed to, to insert:

The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I take it that the first committee amendment is that stated on page 2, from lines 5 to 12, inclusive. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, one of the interesting things concerning this bill is the fact that there is nothing emergent about it. Representations to the contrary were made to the Senate when the calendar was called some time ago and the bill was objected to, some Senators seeming to think that the war effort would cease overnight if we did not act on the bill on the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, while others intimated that the supply of gasoline available for our necessary civilian transport would dry up, so to speak, and no source of petroleum products would be available to us at all unless we passed this bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. It appears as the Senator from Wyoming has correctly pointed out, that in the State of Wyoming alone more than 100,000,000 barrels of oil have been made available to the American people simply by reducing the royalty charge to 12½ percent for discoveries or development of petroleum products on Government property on the public lands. Moreover, it becomes apparent, Mr. President, that the supply of oil and gasoline to be derived therefrom stretches, insofar as known deposits are concerned, a very minimum of some 50 years, and that with reference only to supplies in the United States not to mention supplies in other parts of the world. It further becomes apparent from the answer the Senator from Wyoming readily gave to a question asked by me, at the very least the earliest period of time within which one of these experiment plants could be built would be 18 months, and that period would, in turn, depend upon whether or not the critical materials would be available for its construction.

So, Mr. President, whatever else the bill is, whatever else it may hold within its four corners, do not let us act on it on the theory that there is anything emergent about it.

What will it do? Mr. President, perhaps we had best turn for our answer to a report which was submitted by the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming, a portion of which at least appears on page A4380 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to two recommendations which are deemed, according to the Senator from Wyoming, most important. I read:

1. There should be set up a central technical authority of the Federal Government. This authority should coordinate the increasing activities of the Government in scientific fields. It should not dictate the methods to be carried out by existing Federal scientific bureaus, but should serve as a clearinghouse for these organizations. It should help their understanding and willingness to work together as a team.

The second of the two recommendations deemed most important by the Senator from Wyoming follows:

2. Every business and institution should have full access to all patents and research findings which have been developed at Government expense. The Congress has provided large sums of money, which are being poured into Federal, university, and industrial laboratories. It is the intention of the Congress that this money be spent for the benefit of the general public, not for the exclusive benefit of a few corporations. Likewise, those enemy patents seized by the Alien Property Custodian should become the property of the Federal Government and be made available to all businesses. These patents should not be turned over to a few corporations or returned to their former alien ownership. The compensation should eventually be made to Axis nationals under procedures prescribed for all types of seized enemy property.

Mr. President, when the bill first came before the Senate from the committee it provided for the condemnation of patents and secret formulas. It, moreover, provided that the Secretary of the Interior, operating pursuant to the authority of this legislation, could grant to American users "on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this act."

This bill collides head on, and we ought to know it, with everything the Government has always stood for with reference to the rights of individual citizens. If we have come to the time in American history when the United States Government should be made a partner in big business or a partner in a given industry, and should take over the development of processes and secret formulas and the like, and thereafter on terms to be prescribed by some bureaucrat, should make the information available to business, then, it may be that we have the power, it may be that we have the authority, it may be that there is necessity for the act. But let us understand what confronts us. That is what this bill represents. It is the opening wedge by which the people's money, drawn from all the taxpayers, will be utilized by the United States Government to develop certain formulas and certain processes and through the plants to be constructed will manufacture the finished product, make it available to the Army and Navy for their purposes, and thereafter turn over to the public any surplus, should there be any, "through"—and I read from page 4, line 1—"through regular commercial channels."

Then, Mr. President, business becomes merely a purveyor to the general public, business becomes solely a distributor; the Government becomes the producer.

If we are to do this in the case of oil, where do we stop? Why do we take oil? We take oil because we can reach the Senators from Colorado and the Senators from North Dakota and the Senators from Wyoming and the Senators from Texas and the Senators from a sufficient number of other States to get them back of this program. That is why we do it. If that is what we are going to do, Mr. President, then let us understand why we are doing it, and let us understand what the result is going to be in terms of its effect upon the American economy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, that if I should vote in favor of this bill, my vote will not have been so cast by reason of the process he has mentioned.

Mr. DANAHER. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I absolve him from any of the strategems which would involve reaching out to the Senators from the various States. As a matter of fact, it is my firm belief that the Senator from Colorado has never been consulted in the development of any such plan. I believe that the Senator from Colorado does not hold to the philosophy represented by this bill, exhibit A.

What else would we do? We would step in and overthrow the experience of generations of men in public life. Under the bill we would suspend, so far as the Secretary of the Interior is concerned, the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes. I call attention to page 3, line 18. What does section 3679 of the Revised Statutes provide? It reads:

No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made——

I break off at the semicolon in reading from title 31, section 665, to point out that the moment we make the authorization provided under the bill, and the moment we appropriate "not to exceed $30,000,000," and then suspend section 3679, we obviously authorize commitments over and above and beyond any appropriation of any maximum authorization, because we would wipe section 3679 from the books by the language of the bill. Why is that kind of power desired?

I resume reading of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes—

And all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department—

And that is Mr. Ickes, in this case—

or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month.

So it is imperative that we suspend the operations of Revised Statutes, section 3679, insofar as it might constitute a limitation upon operations under the bill. That is why the language is in the bill. Whoever drafted the bill did not insert that by accident. We know enough about the writing and the history of the writing of legislation to know that when the suspension of a statute of that character is suggested, there is a purpose back of it.

What else would the bill do? It would suspend sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, described in the bill as 47 Statutes 412. Section 321 appears as section 278a of title 40, United States Code, and I read it:

After June 30, 1932, no appropriation bill shall be obligated or expended for the rent of any building or part of a building to be occupied for Government purposes at a rental in excess of the per annum rate of 15 percent of the fair market value of the rented premises at date of the lease under which the premises are to be occupied by the Government, nor for alterations, improvements, and repairs of the rented premises in excess of 25 percent of the amount of the rent for the first year of the rental term, or for the rental term if less than 1 year: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to leases made prior to June 30, 1932, except when renewals thereof are made after such date, nor to leases of premises in foreign countries for the foreign services of the United States: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section as applicable to rentals, shall apply only where the rental to be paid shall exceed $2,000 per annum.

So the bill would suspend the provisions which would constitute a limitation upon the amount of rent to be paid under section 322, referred to in line 14, page 3, of the bill, which we find appearing as section 303 (b) of title 40, which reads:

Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the leasing of buildings and properties of the United States shall be for a money consideration only, and there shall not be included in the lease any provision for the alteration, repair, or improvement of such buildings or properties as a part of the consideration for the rental to be paid for the use and occupation of the same. The moneys derived from such rentals shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. President, having authorized the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, as the bill would do, "to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances"; having authorized the Secretary of the Interior "to conduct laboratory research and development work"; having authorized him "to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years, or donation, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interest, options on real or personal property, plants and their facilities, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation," we would authorize him also "to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property," to contract for the disposition or development of such properties, including anything that is taken under the authorization of the section, to cooperate with any other Federal agency, and thereafter to sell the product at not more

than actual cost, "including amortization of capital expenses," as the Secretary shall decide.

Having done that, having authorized him to grant licenses under the terms of patent rights he may acquire, I submit we will have erected a vast blanket authority, having suspended all the limitations and the prohibitions which the statutes have hitherto granted unto the American people. The Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, will be the spearhead of this development, to which the Senator from Wyoming has quite candidly and forthrightly called our attention in his report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is mistaken in attributing to me the report from which he read.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct. It was the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] who filed the report. The Senator from Vermont refreshes my recollection on that point, and I thank him for doing so. I will say, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit, that in that particular reference I did confuse his name with that of the Senator from West Virginia, but I was not unmindful of the bill which the Senator from Wyoming introduced, and which was referred to the Committee on Patents last year, which would have accomplished substantially the same result. The philosophy of the report of the Senator from West Virginia and the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming before the Committee on Patents are quite similar, I will put it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. DANAHER. I am willing to have the Senator from Wyoming, who is present, dissociate himself from that if he chooses.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Connecticut is drawing a little on his imagination when he says that the bill which I introduced with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and which went to the Committee on Patents, is similar to the measure which was sponsored by the Senator from West Virginia. The purpose of the former measure was to prevent the use of a right, granted by the Congress of the United States, by international cartels and domestic monopolies, to restrain the activities of the people of America.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming and I am glad to have him afforded the opportunity to make that statement.

Mr. President, whatever may be the effect, let me put it, of the bill introduced by the Senator from Wyoming, and the philosophy back of the measures to which I advert, what concerns us is the trend and direction which will be taken should the pending bill become law, the ultimate of which will be to put our Government necessarily and inevitably in the position of conducting explorations, scientific investigations, and development of properties at Government cost, and thereafter their allocation and use under governmental aegis. That, Mr. President, is what I wish to have the Senate recognize as inherent in the objectives of the bill. It is because of these points, and the views which I hold with respect to the general subject, that I feel the Senate should be put on notice, and it is to that purpose, Mr. President, that I rise before the Senate even considers the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first of the committee amendments not heretofore agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1 of the original committee print, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 15 of the original committee print, before the word "donation", it is proposed to insert the word "or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the same line it is proposed to strike out the words "or otherwise."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thought I heard the clerk say page 1, line 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the bill from which the clerk is now reading contains a different text from that on the desks of Senators.

Mr. DANAHER. It certainly does, Mr. President, because we have just agreed to an amendment which apparently is very much at odds with the version on our desks. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated in full, instead of simply saying page so and so and line so and so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 22 of the original committee print, after the word "purchaser", it is proposed to insert "through regular commercial channels."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that does not correspond with the print I have.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk have before him and read from the same bill which has been printed since the bill went partially through the legislative process on the call of the calendar some time ago. We have a new print before us today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senate must work from the original bill. The clerk will state the pending committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 22, of the original bill, after the word "purchaser" it is proposed to insert "through regular commercial channels."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what is the corresponding place in the bill on the desks of Senators?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I will say to him that the language will be found on page 4, line 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 4, line 1, of the reprint will be found the amendment which has just been stated.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of which the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is the chairman, I have taken much interest in the bill. I have taken an interest in it primarily because I know that the whole economy of our Government is built on the basis of whether or not sufficient fuel is in storage or in our view in the immediate future so that the internal-combustion engine may be continued in use by the citizens of the United States. I do not say gasoline, I do not say acetylene or gas made from charcoal or something else, but I do say fuel used in an internal-combustion engine, and at the moment our economy is built on the use of gasoline. Gasoline made from coal is gasoline similar to that we are now using.

Mr. President, our committee held hearings covering a period of several weeks, and I should like to bring out a few points which I do not believe have been brought out so far.

First, I believe that the evidence was conclusive that our supply of known oil resources inside the continental limits of the United States is being rapidly used up. While the proof submitted was not definite, though two or three statements were made as to the detailed oil resources in the United States, it was quite generally conceded that at our present rate of consumption there is between 14 and, say, 20 years' supply of oil in the ground, and that it would take approximately 50 years to pump or have flow from the ground that 14 or 20 years' supply. If we pump it too fast, as we may be compelled to do in wartime, the supply will not last as long as if we pump it in reasonable amounts as we do in connection with our peacetime economy.

The finding of another resource from which to obtain motor fuel will, of course, cost an immense amount of money. There has been some apprehension among Members of the Senate that with the $30,000,000 provided in the bill we will be able to set up a Govern-

ment industry which could compete with private industry in the production of motor fuel. I do not think there is a possible chance of that. The evidence was that one refinery such as is now in operation at Bellingham, England, costs between $28,000,000 and $30,000,000. That refinery is at present producing, and is only capable of producing, 20 carloads of aviation or motor fuel gasoline a day. I think the exact capacity of the plant is 3,500 barrels, which would be about 15,000 gallons of gasoline a day.

So with the amount of money provided in the bill there is no danger of setting up a competitive industry in the United States. In fact, using the cost of the hydrogenation plant in England as a basis and figuring the output of the plant, it has been estimated that the number of plants necessary in the United States to produce our present requirements of gasoline would cost in excess of $50,000,000,000. Other estimates have been made which might reduce the initial cost of constructing the plants necessary to supply our requirements to $25,000,000,000, using the facts, the processes, and the knowledge now available for making motor fuel from coal.

As I see it, Mr. President, it is very necessary for us to try to find new processes—new ways—to obtain motor fuel from coal. I have a suggestion to make with reference to how we should proceed to acquire this sorely needed information, but I wish to say that in our hearings held in various cities in the United States industry—and by that I mean the oil industry—was given the chance, and accepted the chance, to be present and give us its recommendations as to what should be done in seeking further knowledge on the subject of making gasoline from coal.

Without exception, during the hearings, industry did recommend that the Government undertake the laboratory work, the pilot-plant work, the semiwork-plant work, and finally go into the matter of building a demonstration plant sufficiently large so that the commercial possibilities could be fully demonstrated.

Since the hearings have ended, I have taken the opportunity to inquire further into the desires of industry. My conclusions are that even though petroleum companies in the United States are large, nevertheless, none of them are sufficiently large to undertake from the standpoint of expense the laboratory and experimental work necessary to be done in order to obtain motor fuel from coal. The program is a long-time one. I believe the Government should make every finding resulting from its experiments quickly available to private industry in the United States. I think that Government—by that, I mean the Bureau of Mines, as is stated in the bill—should start at the bottom.

So at this time I offer an amendment which would be, according to the original print, the one from which the reading clerk read some few minutes ago, on page 2, in line 12, after the word "work." According to the print which is now before us, the latest print, it would come on page 2, in line 16, after the word "work." I send the proposed amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the original print of the bill, on page 2, line 12, after the word "work", it is proposed to insert "and with pilot plants and semiwork plants make careful process engineering studies along with structural engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest investment and operating costs."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, subsection (a) of section 2 of the bill then would read:

(a) To conduct laboratory research and development work and with pilot plants and semiwork plants make careful process engineering studies along with structural engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest investment and operating costs necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much interested in this matter. I tried to express my interest in it in June, in a speech I made at that time, because of the tremendous importance of oil to our whole civilization and our position in the world.

As I understand the matter, there are two great sources of natural oil in the world, broadly speaking: One, the Caribbean basin, running from Louisiana and Texas down through Venezuela; and the other, the middle-eastern basin, including Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Russia.

Before the war there was a policy, which I shall not discuss, of drawing from the Caribbean basin a great deal more oil than was drawn from the middle-eastern basin, proportionately. The facts which are now available to us lead me to the conclusion that with the oil we have in the United States at the present time, or which we think we have underground, it would be impossible for us to support another major war on the scale of the present one.

So I am naturally sympathetic to anything which looks toward increasing and enlarging our sources of oil.

The question I desire to direct to the Senator is this: In our efforts to build up and to strengthen our oil position, it seems to me some very serious thought will have to be given to the matter of getting oil in the Middle East and bringing it over here, for storage here either in tanks or below ground. While I welcome the Senator's approach to the question, I hope that he and the other sponsors of the bill do not regard the bill as a substitute for or as excluding the proposition of bringing oil from other parts of the world to this country, and storing it here.

Mr. GURNEY. Of course, Mr. President, I cannot answer for the other members of the committee, but I personally do not so regard the bill.

Let me say that the peacetime imports of oil into the United States will depend on whether we can produce oil from the sources we have at a lower cost than the cost of imported oil. Certainly, in my opinion, we should do everything we can do to find supplies within the continental limits of our own land. That is the basis on which I have approached consideration of the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Am I to understand that the proposed work is solely an experiment, to be undertaken at the cost of the Government, to find some way of producing engine fuel from coal?

Mr. GURNEY. I should say it is not an experiment. We already know that gasoline is being produced in Germany and in England from coal. The purpose of the bill is to find out if we can improve upon the present known method, or whether we can find a new method, of extracting gasoline or making gasoline from coal, so that the cost will not be so great as is presently indicated by the known knowledge of the art of making gasoline from coal.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, Mr. President, am I to understand that what the bill proposes is still an experiment to determine some advanced or improved method of obtaining fuel?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, it is not an attempt by the Government to go into the business of producing gasoline, is it?

Mr. GURNEY. Not as I see it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If, as the Senator has said, there is already established, and has been for some time, such an operation in the British Isles, would not the data the British have be available to the private enterprises of America?

Mr. GURNEY. The evidence is quite clear that those data are now available not only to private enterprise in the United States but also to the Government, and that they are in the possession of the Government.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, if we are endeavoring to ascertain some formula or improved method, would not the work proposed to be done under the bill be a duplication of the effort made in the British Isles?

Mr. GURNEY. There would be absolutely no necessity for the bill if we were willing to take the facts, figures, and operating data now possessed by the British. What we must do is improve on those methods. That is what the bill intends. Its purpose is to give the scientists and engineers a chance to discover better methods.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill proposes that an experiment be conducted in an endeavor to improve the method of obtaining fuel from coal. I desire to ask the Senator one further question. Under the very broad power given under subsection (b) of section 2 "to acquire, by purchase, lease, or donation, land" why is not some limitation placed upon the amount of land which may be acquired for this purpose?

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure a limitation is provided by the specification of $30,000,000 at the beginning of the bill. Also, a little later in the bill the Senator will notice that the experiments under the bill may not continue for longer than 5 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Granting that for experimental purposes the bill should be passed, I desire to ask the Senator whether he feels he can justify the proposed expenditure at this time, or upon what basis he justifies the proposed expenditure?

Mr. GURNEY. Personally I justify the passage of the bill, and the appropriation needed, upon the fact that our whole economy is built upon having a sufficient supply of gasoline for automobiles, for internal-combustion engines in industry, for airplanes, and for many other purposes, in addition to the further fact that our known supply of petroleum reserves is rapidly dwindling. We must do everything to learn better how to obtain gasoline from any source available, including not only coal and oil shale, but also oil sands inside the continental United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that we could accomplish that purpose better by the passage of this bill than by exploring our known oil fields, which are not being explored today?

Mr. GURNEY. I want to do this, and to do that in addition. Everything must be done to increase our known reserves of oil.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator. I think his statement is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. We must not miss a bet.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator; but this is the situation in which we find ourselves in the United States: The Secretary of the Interior has recommended an increase of 35 cents a barrel for the production of crude oil. Thousands of stripper wells would go into production if the producers could get an increase of 35 cents a barrel. Thousands of oil operators would explore new fields and known fields to bring in more oil at the present time if they were given a profitable basis upon which to operate. That could be done by an increase of 35 cents a barrel in the price of crude oil.

Mr. GURNEY. I agree entirely with the Senator. I have written to the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the Secretary of the Interior, and many other Government agencies heartily endorsing Secretary Ickes' request for an increase of 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. WHERRY. The Price Administrator has turned down the request. We are to have no new exploration for oil. For that reason we are still groping for more fuel. We are being rationed, and are working on the theory of a scarcity. The supply does not meet the demand. If we are to get oil, and get it immediately, we can justify the expenditure involved in an increase of approximately 35 cents a barrel, which is approximately equivalent to one-half cent a gallon at retail, and get an immediate supply for immediate use, rather than to spend $35,000,000, which is about one-tenth of the entire increase in cost which would be involved if the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior were approved by the Economic Stabilizer.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator from Nebraska knows that more wildcat oil wells have been drilled this year than in any other year in our history.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the Senator's suggestion, let me state that the testimony in five hearings shows that there has been less exploration this year than in any past year, and that oil operators are stating that if they do not get an increase in price, there will be no new exploration for the year 1944.

Mr. GUFFEY. Will the Senator deny that more wildcat wells were drilled this year than in any other year in our history?

Mr. WHERRY. In five hearings, which were held in Kansas City, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Oklahoma City, and Washington, the oil operators stated that unless there is an increase of 35 cents a barrel in crude-oil prices, there will be practically no new exploration at all.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I have answered it.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not think the Senator has answered my question.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I believe that this colloquy is entirely foreign to the purposes of the bill. The bill is an endeavor on the part of the subcommittee to start the process rolling so that in the future we will know more about how to get a larger supply of motor fuel. I hope the senior Senator from Wyoming has considered my amendment and has found it acceptable.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota called this amendment to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee. It has been discussed with other members of the committee, and on behalf of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, I am very happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. AUSTIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe we are about to have a vote on the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr President, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I now offer the amendment which I called to the attention of the Senate awhile ago, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 1, in the original text, and line 5 of the reprint, after the word "act", it is proposed to strike out "and to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this act" and insert "No patent or patent rights acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States, or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process to which such patents or patent rights relate, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if it is his opinion that the amendment which he has now offered would have the effect of authorizing any corporation to use a patent or a device developed by the United States for any monopolistic purpose

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe that his amendment would render legal the utilization by any corporation of such patent in any international cartel?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the purpose of the Senator in offering this amendment is solely and exclusively to make available to the people of the United States and the corporations of the United States the discoveries which may be made by reason of this expenditure of public funds?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will have to answer that question "No" and make an explanation. It is not my purpose to bar the exclusive ownership and control of patent rights by the United States as against foreign countries and their representatives; but it is my purpose to prevent that limitation existing as against any citizen of the United States or any corporation organized and existing under the United States or any State of the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator satisfied that the language which he has proposed is apt to accomplish the purpose which he has described?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have consulted the legislative draftsman, and this represents his judgment. So far as I have been able to give it study, I am satisfied with it, although I must admit that the amendment has been drafted very hurriedly, within the past hour.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the circumstances, on behalf of the committee, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, for the past two and a half years I have served as a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. First I wish to compliment him in the highest terms for the manner in which he has conducted not only the hearings on the pending bill but all hearings which have been conducted by the committee. In my opinion for industry and his statesmanlike approach to the crucial question involved in the pending bill he should be complimented, and be given a vote of thanks, not only by the Congress but by the people of the United States, for the contributions which he has made by the hearings he has conducted and by the legislation which he has introduced in support of the oil and related industries of the Nation.

Just before the close of the last session of Congress a bill was passed of which the Senator from Wyoming was the author, which in my opinion has greatly stimulated wildcat operations on our public lands and resulted in numerous new discoveries of petroleum in the United States. The bill which we now have under consideration, in my opinion, is not untimely; it is not inopportune; but is very timely. Certainly when we look at the exhibits which have been submitted today by the senior Senator from Wyoming, indicating what is happening to the petroleum reserves within this country, it is high time to give consideration to such a bill as we have before us today.

All we have to do is to look at the diagram immediately in front of me, wherein is shown the density of drilling operations in the United States as compared with the rest of the world, to get the answer to the exploitation of our oil reserves compared to that of other countries.

In looking at the other maps we find that the potential petroleum reserves of the world outside the United States are gigantic, and that when our reserves have been exploited to the degree to which they have been exploited, in all probability we can expect, after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, to see other countries advance and move ahead of the United States in the production of petroleum.

The pending bill does not provide for something new in the way of experimentation. The bill merely provides that the United States shall interest itself in finding out and carrying on the best processes in the development and utilization of the two greatest sources of synthetic liquid fuels in the United States today, those sources being the coal reserves of the United States and the great oil-shale reserves of the States of Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah.

Referring to coal for a moment or two, we find that the coal reserves of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah are not measured in millions of tons or billions of tons, but in trillions of tons. So the coal reserves of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado, as well as the lignite deposits of the Dakotas, are the greatest potential source of synthetic liquid fuels in the United States today.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] stated that if we should raise the price of crude oil we could greatly stimulate wildcat drilling of petroleum wells in the United States. I thoroughly agree with that contention. I have requested, as vigorously as it has been in my power to do so, that an increase in the price of crude petroleum be granted. For some reason or other it has not been granted up to this time. But we do not have to do any wildcat drilling; we do not have to do any drilling at all in the Western States which I have mentioned to find millions of acres—or, if we want to put it in terms of tons—billions of tons of oil shale.

Every ton of oil shale in those three Western States is capable of producing approximately 35 gallons of oil. We do not have to worry about drilling wells in order to avail ourselves of that source of oil. We do not have to do a great deal of experimenting now, because between the years 1913 and 1926 the country did experimental work and research work as well as investigation, to the point that if we want to look at the testimony in these hearings of a very distinguished engineer, L. C. Karrick, of Salt Lake City, we will find that he takes the position that today oil and gasoline can be produced as cheaply from the coals of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado, and from the oil shales, as it can be produced from natural oil wells and delivered to the markets of those States.

Mr. President, some may say that that is an exaggeration; but, whether or not it is an exaggeration, it is backed up by years of research and experimentation, not only experimentation with a pilot plant, but experimentation with a commercial sized plant shipped to this country from Scotland, which was in operation in western Colorado for several years demonstrating the commercial feasibility of producing oil from the easily accessible oil shales of Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah.

We have been told that the consumption of oil in the United States today has at last exceeded the new discoveries of petroleum. We have been told that a great amount of the gasoline and fuel oil which Germany is now using in carrying on the war against us comes from the very processes which are intended to be investigated under the pending bill. We are told that in England a great plant is in operation utilizing these processes in the production of gasoline from coal, and that in other parts of the British Empire plants are in operation producing oil from oil shale.

All that the bill proposes is to authorize the appropriation of $30,000,000—to do what? To determine here in the United States what are the cheapest and most economical processes for producing synthetic liquid fuels from the greatest sources of oil and synthetic fuel within the United States. Is that not a rather small amount of money for this country to expend in order to be fully informed as to the utilization of those great natural resources in the production of synthetic liquid fuels, which in case of a long war may become very necessary in achieving victory in a military way, and which will be such a great and important factor in the economy of this country once hostilities cease?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The distinguished Senator spoke a moment ago about what the pending bill provides. I notice in section 2, on page 2, line 13, the following language:

> In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

To do certain things. I call the Senator's attention to subsection (b) of section 2 on that page, in which occurs the following language:

> to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property.

I am asking for information. Does the Senator interpret that section to mean that the Secretary of the Interior may start out on a condemnation spree and take land holdings away from private owners?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the able Senator is capable of interpreting the language to which he has referred with ability equal to that of the Senator from Utah. In my opinion that is a stock provision in the bill so as to remove any handicaps or anything which might impede or in any way inconvenience the Secretary of the Interior in going ahead under this bill. I do not believe the Secretary of the Interior will have to acquire a great deal of land. I do not think he will have to acquire a great deal of personal property or any other kind of property. Millions of acres of public lands containing oil shale in the three States which I have mentioned are awaiting development by the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to invite the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that an amendment has already been adopted striking out the words "or otherwise", which would remove the right of condemnation. As the bill now stands, it would merely authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land by purchase, lease, or donation. The words "or otherwise" were eliminated precisely for the purpose of making it clear that it was not the intention of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to authorize the Department of the Interior to condemn land unnecessarily.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah further yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am seeking information. I inquire if its the interpretation of the Senator from Wyoming that there is no power of condemnation under this provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no such power. The bill has been amended so as to make that clear.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I was not advised of the amendment of which the Senator from Wyoming speaks, but, even if there were the power of condemnation on the part of the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the purposes of this bill, so far as the Senator of Utah is concerned, I could see no particular danger in that. I have full confidence in the ability, integrity, honesty, and judgment of the present Secretary of the Interior. What we want to do by the enactment of this bill is to place the United States of America abreast of England, Japan, and Germany and all other countries in the production of synthetic liquid fuels. I do not think that today conditions affecting the production and discovery of petroleum in the United States have reached such a point that we need to be alarmed; but I do believe they have reached such a state as to make it prudent on our part, as a great Government, a Government that wants to be in the forefront not only on this question but on all others, to be looking into these great sources of oil and of gasoline, so that, if and when, the time ever comes when the future petroleum supply of this country shall have been dangerously depleted we shall be able to pick up from there and proceed with the production of synthetic gasoline and other fuels from our vast resources of oil-shale and coal.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I have been called from the Chamber and may not be able to return before the close of today's session; so I should like to have a moment of the Senator's time to join him in the compliment he has paid to the chairman of the committee and to add my compliment to the members of the committee for this very worth-while undertaking. As a member and chairman of the oil shortage committee of the Senate I have long been concerned with this question, and I think the contribution here made toward our future needs cannot be adequately visualized at the moment.

Fearful that the debate would be concluded before I returned, because I doubt if there is now any opposition to the bill, I wanted to make this brief statement and to tell the Senator that I share the views he has so eloquently expressed as to the importance of the legislation and the undertaking to develop synthetic sources for liquid fuels. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, I do not desire to hold the Senate longer; I think we are ready to vote on the bill, and I doubt if there will be any votes in opposition to it.

When we held our hearings in Pittsburgh, Salt Lake City, and Sheridan, Wyo., we were advised by State officials of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming that they stood ready to cooperate in every way possible to make the projected plants a reality and to start on this great work of investigation and experimentation.

I shall conclude, Mr. President, by saying that I do not believe that any hearings were ever conducted by the Senate of the United States or by a committee of the Senate that went more thoroughly into the questions involved than did the hearings and investigation conducted by the subcommittee in this instance. We went into the principal coal-producing States; we went into the principal oil-shale-producing States; wherever we went we were welcomed, and, as I have just said, were pledged the cooperation of the State governments in effectuating this great project. From the beginning of the hearings to the end, as I recall, no witness appeared before our committee in opposition to the purposes of the bill.

I hope, Mr. President, that the bill will be passed by the Senate this afternoon; that it will receive speedy action in the other House; that in the not too distant future the plants, the research work, and the experimentation provided for in the measure will be a reality; that the United States of America, instead of being behind in this great program, will be out in front; and that the great resources which today lie dormant, especially the oil shales of the Western States for which there is no other use, will be utilized by the development of processes which will cause such resources to become great national assets.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. DAVIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas gave notice early this afternoon that he desired the floor. He has been requesting recognition for some time. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas.

ARKANSAS AND WHITE RIVERS—FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, early in the session today I introduced a bill to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of flood control and navigation improvements, including dams, reservoirs, and allied structures, in the basins of the Arkansas and White Rivers, and for the disposition of surplus electric energy generated by the Federal flood control and navigation improvements in the basins of such rivers. I desire to discuss the provisions of the bill briefly. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to go into all the details and ramifications of what I think it will accomplish.

The Secretary of War, through the United States Corps of Engineers, has heretofore prepared a comprehensive plan for flood control and for the improvement of navigation on the White and Arkansas Rivers. This plan provides for dams, reservoirs, levees, and floodways on these streams and their tributaries. The plan embraces projects in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arkansas. Each of these projects or improvements is an essential element in an effective, scientific system of water control and utilization of water resources in these basins. A very substantial number of these projects have already been authorized by the Congress in the various flood control and river and harbor acts. A few of those within the general plan and previously authorized have already been completed. Some others are in course of construction. On most of those in course of construction, work has been suspended for the duration of the war.

One of the objectives of the bill which I have introduced today is to assure the construction of these various projects—all of them as quickly as possible—having regard, of course, for the needs of the war program. It is of great importance, however, that this general plan in these valleys be effectuated and the construction of all pertinent projects be undertaken and completed with all possible speed and dispatch as soon as this can be done.

The rampaging flood waters which last May turned the fertile fields of these valleys into murky lakes, and carrying in their wake the loss of a large number of human lives and destruction and devastation of property to the extent of many millions of dollars, testified with far more dramatic emphasis and force than any words I can utter to the need for the consummation of this comprehensive flood-control program in these valleys. That it is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government to do this job is no longer challenged or seriously disputed. The water resources of this Nation, when properly harnessed and utilized, will convert any attending present liability into a tremendous national asset of perpetual benefits that will substantially enhance and increase our national wealth.

Further procrastination and delay in dealing effectively with the problem of our national water resources is an unwise policy. It would be unsound economically, and should not be indulged in or tolerated by the Congress.

In the post-war period of readjustment and reconstruction, and particularly during the period of demobilization and rehabilitation into peacetime pursuits of those now serving in our armed forces, jobs will necessarily have to be found or provided for many millions of our citizens. Peacetime employment for our returning soldiers and for those who are now working in war industries, who will have to shift back to peacetime enterprises in the post-war era, poses a tremendous economic problem. It is a problem that cannot be solved by the Federal Government alone. Likewise, it is not likely that private industry by itself will be able to provide adequate opportunities for employment. It is anticipated, therefore, that the Federal Government will, for a time at least, have to supplement any rehabilitation program in the post-war period by providing employment for a large number of people. It is hoped, however, that our Government will not have to resort again to a W. P. A. made-work program of the character of

that inaugurated and pursued during the years of our economic depression.

For that reason, much has been said—more said than done—about post-war planning. However, in the comprehensive flood-control and water-utilization programs affecting a number of important streams throughout the Nation, and particularly in the Arkansas and White River Basins, to which my bill is directed, we have already many projects authorized, and others planned which can be authorized by the Congress. By constructing all of them immediately following the war, the Federal Government will not only make a large contribution toward solving the anticipated unemployment problem but in making such expenditures as will be involved it will also make a sound investment, which will in the future pay large dividends in prosperity and happiness among the people. These improvements will add materially to the capital wealth of the Nation, and will fully justify all costs the Federal Government will incur.

On the premise I have stated, I have introduced this bill, which if enacted will in effect constitute a legislative directive that the comprehensive program in these valleys be carried out and consummated as expeditiously as may be, and with all dispatch possible, as a part of our post-war construction and employment program.

In its salient features the bill provides:

First. For the use of existing permanent executive agencies of the Government for the construction, operation, and maintenance of all navigation, flood-control, and allied projects in the White and Arkansas River Basins.

Second. For the coordinated operation of all such projects and their efficient management.

Third. That all such public improvements already authorized by Congress, and such as may hereafter be authorized, including general comprehensive plans for navigation and flood control, shall be initiated promptly, and in any event not later than immediately following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, and prosecuted to completion with the utmost dispatch.

Fourth. That dams and other works included in the plans shall be constructed, maintained, and operated under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers; first for navigation and flood control, and second for the generation of hydroelectric power, irrigation, and reclamation.

Fifth. It designates the Secretary of Interior as the agent to receive, transmit, and dispose of all electric power generated at such projects.

Sixth. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain all facilities necessary to transmit, sell, and dispose of all such electric energy at wholesale.

First, to the United States for its own use; second, to public bodies or cooperatives operating primarily for service to the public rather than for profit; and, third, to private corporations or persons, in that order of preference.

Seventh. Authorizes necessary appropriations for carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, I have prepared a list of flood-control projects, including costs of levees and floodways, dams, and reservoirs, in both the Arkansas River Basin and the White River Basin, which have heretofore been authorized by the Congress and are not yet under construction.

I call attention to the fact that levee and floodwater projects in the Arkansas River Basin have been authorized to this date, on which construction has not yet begun, which it is estimated will cost $10,114,900. The estimated cost of levees and floodways in the White River Basin is $14,237,900, making the total estimated cost of approved projects of this character in the two basins of $24,352,800.

With respect to the dam and reservoir projects which have heretofore been authorized by the Congress in these basins, the estimated cost of projects in the Arkansas River Basin is $112,049,000, in the White River Basin $115,564,000.

Mr. President, the estimated cost of all projects in these valleys approved to date, and not yet under construction, is $251,965,800.

I ask unanimous consent that this list of projects be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN PROJECTS

(Authorized but not yet under construction)

Levees and floodways

	Estimated cost
Crawford County, Ark., levees	$284,000
Cherokee, Okla., levee and floodway	800,000
Tulsa, Okla., levees and floodway	513,000
Kaw, Okla., levees	32,500
Fort Gibson, Okla., levee	33,000
Hutchinson, Kans., levee and floodway	1,050,000
Wichita and Valley Center, Kans., levee and floodway	2,603,100
Big Slough to Belle Plaine, Kans., levees and floodway	1,650,200
Florence, Kans., levees	17,000
Cottonwood Falls, Kans., levees	7,200
Emporia, Kans., levee	22,700
Neosho Rapids, Kans., levee	38,900
Lyon County, Kans., levee	237,100
Hartford, Kans., levee	43,200
Burlington, Kans., levee	27,000
LeRoy, Kans., levee	9,600
Neosho Falls, Kans., levee	32,400
Humboldt, Kans., levee	19,300
Chetopa, Kans., levee	28,600
Cherokee, Kans., levee	234,000
Verdigris River, Kans. and Okla., levees	231,000
Fredonia, Kans., levee	189,000
Benedict, Kans., levee	195,000
Elk City, Kans., levee	81,000
Caney Creek, Okla., levee	157,600
Blackwell, Okla., levee	50,000
Morrilton, Ark., levee	603,000
Clarksville, Ark., levee	70,000
Little Rock, Ark., levee	110,500
Dardanelle, Ark., levee	103,000
Little Rock to Pine Bluff, Ark., levees	641,000
Total	10,114,900

Dams and reservoirs

	Estimated cost
Hulah, Okla., reservoir	$8,540,000
Markham Ferry, Okla., reservoir, power and flood	15,410,000
Fort Gibson, Okla., reservoir	21,435,000
Mannford, Okla., reservoir	7,900,000
Toronto, Kans., reservoir	8,102,000
Fall River, Kans., reservoir	9,465,000
Oologah, Okla., reservoir	8,345,000
Optima, Okla., reservoir	1,700,000
Tenkiller Ferry, Okla., reservoir	9,790,000
Wister, Okla., reservoir	6,590,000
Neodesha, Kans., reservoir	5,157,000
Elk City (Table Mound), Kans., reservoir	9,315,000
Total	112,049,000
Total for Arkansas River Basin	122,163,900

WHITE RIVER BASIN PROJECTS

(Authorized but not yet under construction)

Levees and floodways

	Estimated cost
Poplar Bluff, Mo., levee	$546,800
Black River, Mo. and Ark., levee	754,900
Big Bottom, Ark., levee	128,700
Augusta to Clarendon, Ark., levee	2,800,000
De Valls Bluff, Ark., levee	47,500
Clarendon to Laconia Circle, Ark., levee	8,960,000
Total	14,237,900

Dams and reservoirs

Water Valley, Ark., reservoir	7,600,000
Bell Foley, Ark., reservoir	5,363,000
Lone Rock, Ark., reservoir, power and flood	11,422,000
Greer's Ferry, Ark., reservoir	7,179,000
Bull Shoals, Ark., reservoir, power and flood	47,000,000
Table Rock, Ark., reservoir, power and flood	37,000,000
Total	115,564,000
Total for White River Basin	129,801,900
Total estimated cost for levees and floodways in Arkansas River Basin and White River Basin projects:	
Arkansas	10,114,900
White	14,237,900
Total	24,352,800
Total estimated cost for dams and reservoirs in Arkansas River Basin and White River Basin projects:	
Arkansas	112,049,000
White	115,564,000
Total	227,613,000
Total estimated cost for levees and floodways and dams and reservoirs in both Arkansas River and White River Basins	251,965,800

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this list does not include any projects heretofore authorized and already completed under the comprehensive flood-control program for these valleys. Nor does it include the Clear Water Dam and Reservoir in Missouri, or the Norfork Reservoir and Dam in Arkansas on the White River, on which construction has already begun.

The Clear Water Dam, with an estimated cost of $8,560,000, was approximately 28 percent completed when the

President's directive requiring these projects to be suspended for the duration was issued.

The Norfork Reservoir, at a cost of approximately $27,500,000, is now substantially completed, and will soon be in full operation.

There are three dams and reservoir projects on the Arkansas River Basin, namely, the John Martin Dam and Reservoir in Colorado, which is substantially completed, at an estimated cost of $14,200,000; the Canton Dam and Reservoir in Oklahoma, at an estimated cost of $13,870,000, which is partially constructed, and the Blue Mountain Dam and Reservoir in Arkansas, at an estimated cost of $3,700,000, which is approximately 65 percent completed.

The bill does not authorize any particular project, nor does it favor one project or class of projects over another project or class. It states an over-all policy and advances an entire program for these basins. It would accomplish its purposes entirely through existing basic departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The activities for which it provides would be carried on by the existing agencies which customarily carry on such activities and are equipped and experienced to do so. There would be no rearrangement or shuffling of functions between the various agencies, no fanning of the fires of jurisdictional jealousy. The bill creates no new "authorities," new or special agencies, but provides that the program shall be carried out under the agencies now existing, which are experienced and familiar with this character of work.

Mr. President, the bill is brief, simple, and direct. It states a definite policy with respect to the construction, operation, and maintenance of all improvements in the Arkansas and White River Basins in connection with navigation and flood control. These activities would be carried on, as at present, by the Secretary of War through the Chief of Engineers. Electric power and energy generated at any of the projects and not needed in the operation of the project would be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for marketing in accordance with commonly accepted principles of fairness and sound administration. The Secretary of the Interior is now authorized by Executive order to market power from the Norfork Dam project in Arkansas. The bill would give him statutory authority to market Norfork power as well as power from the other projects to be constructed in the area, of which four or five have electric-power possibilities.

The bill would establish the policy that wherever possible provision should be made for the realization of benefits other than navigation and flood control. Facilities for the storage and utilization of waters for irrigation are also included in the water-development program for these basins in the areas where such facilities are needed and are feasible. One section of the bill provides for the construction and operation of irrigation facilities by the Secretary of the Interior whenever he and the Secretary of War agree upon the need and the practicability of building such facilities in conjunction with any of the projects covered by the bill. One of the more efficient means of accomplishing this is by impounding floodwater and using the impounded waters to irrigate fertile lands. We have in the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation an experienced team through which to carry out our purposes along these lines. These agencies can and should work closely together.

Mr. President, the mechanics and procedures for the installation of power machinery and equipment in projects suited for the production of electric energy are set out briefly in the bill. Similarly, the bill outlines the method of operation of the power plants and provides for delivery to the Secretary of the Interior of the excess power to be commercially marketed. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to provide transmission lines and other facilities necessary for carrying the power to market; and he is enjoined to give preference in selling the power, first, to the United States for its own use; second, to public bodies and cooperatives, particularly cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration; and, third, to other persons and corporations. Provisions giving the Secretary of the Interior customary and adequate powers to perform his duties are included in the bill.

The bill states that power shall be sold by the Secretary of the Interior in such a way as to obtain the most widespread use of the power at fair rates to consumers. This means, of course, after reasonable provision has been made for the amortization of the investment of the United States in the facilities. When the United States sells the power generated at these facilities there is every reason, in my opinion, for insisting that the power go to consumers, and particularly to the farmers, at as little above cost as possible. Electricity can mean more to the rural economy of the Nation than any other single factor, if it is put within easy access and at a price the farmer can pay.

In summary, I believe the bill I have introduced has the multiple advantages of simplicity, clear purpose, and great benefit. I cannot emphasize too strongly the real, immediate need which it is designed to fill. The bill, Mr. President, not only meets the needs of the people in the Arkansas and White River Basins, but its enactment will serve as a pattern for further legislation applicable to and that would provide for the development and improvement of the water resources of many other important rivers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will give serious consideration to the bill and that we shall be able in a very short time to have the bill favorably reported and, I trust, passed by the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the remarks made earlier in the day by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], a copy of an address on the same subject made by Col. Miles Reber at the recent meeting of the National Reclamation Association, held on October 12, 1943, at Denver, Colo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In coming before the National Reclamation Association today, I am doubly humble. Sensible of the great compliment implied in an opportunity to address such a gathering as this, I also hold in deepest respect the responsibility of occupying the place on your program originally assigned to the Chief of Engineers.

General Reybold had looked forward for some time to the privilege of addressing your association again. An overseas trip necessitated a last-minute change in his plans, and he asked me to express his deep regret that this military duty prevents his being with you today. Although the general had prepared his message to this association, let me say specifically at this point that I am not attempting to deliver that address. For what I shall have to say, I must admit and am glad to take full responsibility.

For many years I have been intensely interested and engaged in work closely allied with your association's principal objective. My appointment as division engineer for the Missouri River division brings me in closer proximity to this great area and increases my responsibility in our common aims. I have attended your constructive meetings in the past and welcome this opportunity to be with you again.

We meet here in the midst of the greatest war mankind has known in its more than 5,000 years of recorded history. The world is passing through a crisis in which we are evaluating, with an intensified judgment, the fruits of our peacetime endeavors—interpreting them in their relationship to our primary objective of winning the war. To the end of total victory we, as a Nation, are wholly committed; to that end, as individual Americans, our fullest efforts and our very lives are consecrated.

Yet, even as we prosecute the war with all our strength and all our soul and all our mind, we must plan for the years to follow the inevitable victory. To wait until war's end is to wait too long. We do not know when the last battle will be fought nor where the peace will be signed. But we must be ready for that great day. You have all heard over and over again the admonition that to win the war we must also be prepared to win the peace. Do not let the triteness of that phrase distract you from its utter truth. And the responsibility for that preparedness rests upon all of us.

Looking to the future, we must search out the opportunities for development and progress that have made our Nation great. We must examine our national resources, both human and material, and plan to organize them for the joint purpose of maximum productivity and a fair distribution of benefits. Foremost among these resources are our streams and rivers, now only partially developed and utilized.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt once said, and I quote, "The rivers of no other civilized country are so poorly developed, so little used, or play so small a part in the industrial life of the nations as those of the United States. In view of the use of rivers elsewhere, the failure to use our own is astonishing, and no thoughtful man can believe it will last."

In the intervening years since that pointed and well-justified comment, the improvements accomplished, while important, perhaps, in the eyes of this generation, have but scratched the surface of the possibilities

awaiting fuller development. Much has been done, true, but much more remains to be done.

Yet, to our credit let it be said that years of surveys and studies by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies, Federal and State, have resulted in the accumulation in factual reports of more detailed information than is available to any nation in the world on its respective water resources.

Since Congress in January 1927, authorized and directed the Secretary of War to make surveys of the navigable rivers of the United States and their tributaries, with a view to their most effective improvement for flood control, navigation, irrigation and the development of power, reports have been prepared by my Department on more than 200 rivers. And continuing reviews, in strict compliance with congressional directives, have kept these reports up to date.

On the program of the Corps of Engineers, as established by Congress, the Western States are well represented in authorization, planning, and in construction of projects for floor control and multiple-purpose utilization of water.

Included in the existing authorizations are:

A comprehensive plan of reservoirs and channel improvements for the development of the Willamette River Basin in Oregon for flood control, navigation, conservation, stream-flow regulation, hydro-electric power, and other beneficial water uses;

A series of levees along the Columbia River and its tributaries in Washington and Oregon for the protection of valuable agricultural areas;

A comprehensive system of retarding basins, and channel improvements for flood protection of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County, Calif.;

A system of flood-control reservoirs in the Santa Ana River and adjacent areas for the protection of Orange County, Calif.;

A system of levees, bypasses and channel improvements in the lower Sacramento River Basin, Calif., for the protection of the highly productive agricultural lands and important transportation facilities in that area; and this system is carefully coordinated with the great Shasta Dam.

Comprehensive plans for reservoirs and protective works for flood control, water conservation, power, and other uses in the Missouri, Arkansas, and Red River systems;

And reservoirs on Cherry Creek, Colo., for the protection of the city of Denver and for water conservation. That's quite a project, too. I saw the sites yesterday, and I sincerely hope to see structures in the area in the not too distant future.

Of this extensive program the Army engineers have already completed 10 dams, levees at more than 50 localities, and about 55 miles of improved channels. And we will continue that program to completion as soon as world conditions permit.

In accordance with authorization by Congress, the Corps of Engineers is also making examinations and surveys of most of the large river basins and many of the smaller basins throughout the Western States.

Advance planning activities include studies of such important basins as those of the Gila River in Arizona and New Mexico; streams draining into the Great Salt Basin in Utah and Nevada; the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Calif., the Santa Rna River, Calif.; the Rio Grande in New Mexico; the Snake River in Oregon and Idaho; and the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington. These surveys are being carefully correlated with the other agencies authorized to deal with the use of water in this great part of our country.

At this point on behalf of the Chief of Engineers and of the Corps of Engineers I should like to express the sincere appreciation for the splendid cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation in our studies of the great western area. I am sure that this cooperation will improve and increase as we go along and both of us learn more about our respective fields of endeavor.

As division engineer of the Missouri River division, I have a particular interest in the comprehensive plan for the development of the vast region of the Missouri Valley as conceived and prepared by my predecessor, Col. Lewis A. Pick.

That plan, designed to conquer drought and flood, the age-old enemies of man, in that area of over half a million square miles, provides direct benefits and additional opportunities for eleven and a half million people, and creates new national wealth for everyone to share. The report was submitted to the Chief of Engineers in Washington early in August of this year. It is now receiving the final review of the other Federal agencies responsible for various phases of water development under existing law, prior to its transmission to Congress.

The Missouri River Valley is one of the very few major basins of this country where comprehensive development and water utilization have progressed little beyond the planning stage. Yet, I know of no comparable area where money wisely spent can bring more commensurate returns in the greatest good for the greatest number.

In the upper reaches of the Missouri and its tributaries, a decade of drought during the thirties destroyed crops and livestock, and decreased populations.

In the lower reaches of the river, especially from Sioux City, Iowa, to the confluence with the Mississippi just above St. Louis, there are many thousands of acres subject to inundation by major floods. Much of this land is the most fertile and productive in the world.

This year, no section of the 2,500-mile Missouri escaped the curse of floods. Beginning in March and extending until late in June, three disastrous waves of water inflicted tragic hardships on the people and worked incalculable damage to commercial and industrial activities directly connected with the war effort.

A million acres were flooded along the main stem of the Missouri, and an additional million were inundated on the tributaries. Tons and tons of potential food for our soldiers, ourselves, and our allies were destroyed. Rail, air, and highway transportation needed to speed vital war matériel were disrupted. Factory production was impeded. Direct and calculable damages caused by these floods in this year alone on the main stem and tributaries are now estimated to total $50,000,000.

Such recurring material losses and human hardships can and must be stopped. It is engineeringly feasible and economically necessary.

Briefly, the report of the Corps of Engineers on the over-all development of the Missouri River proposes the completion—as soon as existing and necessary limitations on public works are lifted—of the presently authorized reservoirs in Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, and the construction of additional reservoirs, including a series of multiple-purpose dams in the upper river and on its major tributaries above Sioux City, Iowa. It proposes also a series of levees and appurtenant works along the main stem from Sioux City to the mouth to protect cities and industrial and agricultural areas against floods in the regions where reservoir control is not practicable.

It has been estimated that in the period from 1890 to 1942 a billion and a quarter acre-feet of water was the potential inflow into a comprehensive system of multiple-purpose reservoirs in the upper Missouri Basin—an average of more than 23,000,000 acre-feet a year.

The broad program outlined in Colonel Pick's report proposes approximately 73,000,000 acre-feet of storage in the major reservoirs in the basin. This storage is well apportioned among the essential items of flood control, reclamation, navigation, and power.

This system will hold and conserve for beneficial use the excess waters from snow and ice run-off in the upper regions, the cause of the early spring floods. It will impound and control the excess waters from the later spring rainfall in the tributary basins of the lower valley which in this and in other years caused many millions of dollars of damage. In other words the proposed program will remove once and for all the fear of floods that for many years has been a handicap, in fact a definite deterrent to the industrial, civic, and agricultural development of the Missouri Valley.

Irrigation has its important role in this program. A very vital role. The plan for each multiple-purpose project will be worked out in close collaboration with the water-using agencies concerned. As it is entirely feasible to provide water in these reservoirs for irrigation the amount of land that may be irrigated by this storage can be definitely determined by the Bureau of Reclamation and put to most advantageous use. Ample food is an essence of peace as well as a mighty weapon of war.

The power potentialities of this great river will likewise be determined in collaboration with the Federal Power Commission. The plan as contained in Colonel Pick's report is, frankly, a framework, the details of which must be filled in by the coordinated efforts of all Federal, State, and local agencies concerned with the use of the water resources of this basin. Our common objective should be, and is, gain to mankind over the entire valley.

While the preparation of this plan was completed in the short space of 3 months—from May 13, 1943, when the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives requested the Corps of Engineers to review previous reports on the Missouri River—this report represents the sum total of engineering study and experience of many years. The accumulated data of previous thorough surveys were immediately available for correlation and evaluation by Colonel Pick when he set out to prepare his report and to develop a comprehensive framework for the Missouri.

As I have said, the over-all development of the water resources of the Missouri Valley is of immediate and particular interest to me personally, not only because of my assignment to that territory, but also because of my belief in the coordinated, intelligent, and cooperative effort of all interested agencies. I also believe that this is an outstanding illustration of the fact that America's greatest peacetime opportunities lie not with the past but in the future. There are still frontiers in this great country of ours. All they need is the practical and courageous approach that will assure the better use of our agricultural lands, the better utilization of our water resources, and the best coordinated efforts of those agencies—Engineers, Reclamation, Agriculture, Power, and others, State and local—which are expert in their respective fields of progressive development.

Here we meet to discuss the good works of peace for the benefit of man in the midst of a war—an interruption caused by three venomous vandals bent on wartime works for the detriment and enslavement of man. Attention to the defeat of one of the two remaining vandals has, at the last minute, even deprived us of the fellowship and counsel of the Chief of Engineers. But he will be back. And soon, too, I am sure.

From the beginning we have been fighting a coalition war against the Axis. With 10 years of direct preparation and a seemingly perfect coordination finely timed to the stab-in-the-back of France by Mussolini, and Tojo's thrust at Pearl Harbor, the Axis was positive that it would overrun the smaller nations and defeat in detail Britain, Russia, China, and the United States.

For the first time in history it looked as if success would attend these despicable ambitions, and that world-shaking conquests would ensue.

China, isolated, unequipped, hung on only by her fingernails. Britain, saved by the R. A. F., "the mighty few," alone for 1 long year stemmed the westward Nazi tide. She now has gathered with us the strength, the training, and the equipment which have cleared Africa, now pound Hitler's roofless "fortress Europa," and push mightily against the "southern door." Russia, whom all the experts (except the Russians) agreed could not hold out, has ranged her millions in a human fortress which held—and, at the cost of carcasses and rivers of blood, now breaks the back of the Dnieper line.

Meanwhile we built and manufactured and shipped matériel to assist our three great allies in their desperate battles. Meanwhile we built the posts and airfields and facilities where we trained and from which we have sent a mighty army straight to the front lines. Millions have gone and many millions more will go, for just one purpose—victory.

Coalition, once only a lose system of communicated reports of individual and unrelated actions, has become a closely knit grand strategy for military victory. The wartime wisdom of this working coalition is now admitted by all. As we look toward the peace, what a parallel and a pattern it is for our interests at home. Think of the power for good if and when we pool our experience and form an intelligent coalition to solve our problems. Such a coalition will provide protection from floods as real and as ruthless as the Nazi armored flood. It will carve and stabilize channels for connecting the links of commerce; it will impound waters, not only to prevent destruction by inundation but to conserve them to moisten arid farmlands to grow food for us all. It will turn the wheels which generate electric power. No single item of such a program is more important than the others. They must be carefully fitted and dovetailed together for the best over-all results, just as you are doing here today with your own special problems. That is the way of a free and democratic people, the American way.

While we plan this great peacetime coalition—our major wartime combination effects the tightening of two steel nooses, squeezing the life from the necks of both the monsters of Mars, whose heads rise from Berlin and from Tokyo.

Hitler has nowhere to turn but inward. From the Gulf of Finland to the Sea of Azov, the Russian rampage hurls him savagely back toward Berlin. From England, in an arc across Italy and around to Iraq and Iran, the planes and ships and tanks and guns of Britain and the United States pound closer and closer. This ring of steel and fire draws tighter day by day.

Likewise, Tojo finds himself within a clockwise circular vise—a steel-toothed vise featuring the teeth of Buckner, Nimitz, MacArthur, Mountbatten, and Chiang Kai-shek.

But this is only the cementing of the coalition—the beginning—the assurance of the end to come. There is only one possible, one thinkable, conclusion in this struggle for a free world—the complete defeat of our enemies. But, though the outcome is certain, the road to victory may yet be long, as it is sure to be hard. Wars are not cheaply won against such wily and ruthless foes. Ahead lie blood and sacrifice, toil and sweat—yes, and permanent scars for all of us who wage this righteous fight. Yet we cannot falter at the cost, nor shirk whatever price we are called upon to pay. We must not relent or relax until the inevitable moment of final victory.

We have come a long way. We have far to go. Napoleon, by no means an ideal human being, still knew the business of war as few others have ever known it. He voiced the idea that must prevail here at this stage of our efforts when he said, "If it comes to battle, let there be victory, come what may; he who thinks of anything but this single aim is lost."

There is, however, a stronger answer to our meeting here today. It is good to plan here now. If victory fails, nothing matters anyhow. But when our certain victory comes, without farseeing, practical plans for peace, it becomes just an empty armistice.

Remember what Lincoln said when he was criticized for continuing the building of the Capitol during the War Between the States. He replied in effect that when the people saw that work continued, they would know that the Union would survive.

In the midst of our titanic struggle, we take comfort in the realization that "this too will pass away." At the end of the war, humanity once again will stand at the crossroads of history. War has hastened the change which always comes—but slowly—even in calmer times. If we are to be ready for the post-war world, we must cultivate a new concept of space, a new understanding of world conditions, a new faith in the ability of men of all races, of all faiths and creeds, of all economic conditions, to work together for peace as we are fighting together for victory. Our enemies, by the brutal force of arms, set out to impose their so-called "new order." We know that there will be a new order, but not one tailored to their sadistic ends. It will be a new order of understanding among men.

If human beings are going to live together and carry on their daily activities in the fertile valleys of our rivers and on the broad slopes and plains of our watersheds, their lives and property must be protected—protected through the conservation of their water resources—protected from destructive drought, from devastating floods, all of which discourage permanent homes, vital transportation facilities, and flourishing industries.

When the first pioneer cleared a few acres and planted his seed, he did not have a chemical analysis of the soil nor any guarantee that there would be adequate rainfall and sunshine to produce a crop. There was no Department of Agriculture to advise him nor any adequate agency to assist him if his crop failed. In the face of these and other unknown elements, the pioneer farmer forged ahead. Land that was worth only a string of beads to the Indian became valuable to the white man.

What then—if the pioneer had no theory of economics to justify his labor, no precedents to guarantee the value of the land, and about a 50–50 chance of surviving—what then spurred him on? Obviously it was faith in a divine Providence, courage, a goodly share of common sense, and a will to succeed.

With such stuff, America was carved from wilderness, plain and mountain. Man proved himself fit to survive. The post-war period will present a similar challenge. This great area needs the type of pioneering that characterized the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Mathematical equations and theoretical economics may not call for certain developments any more than theory justified the pioneer's risk of life. But the story of American history is ample justification. The American people will provide the pioneer spirit, if the Government will provide reasonable protection from devastating floods—reasonable programs to develop and conserve our water resources. The American people have decided that this is a proper function of the Federal Government, and the Congress has enacted their decision into law.

Therefore let the layman, the engineer, and the Congress remember, when faced with the allegation that the present value of lands is less than the cost of a proposed improvement, that large buildings are worth more than the ground rights—that Manhattan Island was once valued at only $24—and, above all, that the pioneer ventured and gained without the safeguards which we enjoy today.

To be specific about the points which I have covered—the comprehensive framework now proposed for the Missouri River Basin or any other major basin is not the final plan for ultimate development. There is not one single man among us, I am sure, who can foresee today the full needs of the next 50 years. Therefore, we cannot and should not attempt to establish now the full pattern of that future. What I think you want, and what I know I want, today, is action! That action is the adoption of a broad plan with every feature considered from a basin-wide standpoint—a definite plan for a practical beginning of constructive work—a flexible plan for the inspiring hopes of the future. The ideal kind of planning that I am talking about, gentlemen, is the Constitution of the United States.

In the long run, it is far more costly to do nothing than it is to do something. Two thousand years ago, this lesson was taught by the story of the slave who hid his master's talent in the ground—he feared that he might lose it. Not only did the slave lose his money but he was cast into outer darkness. The talent of the God-given resources of this western country must be developed. Let us plan intelligently, constructively, practically, and courageously to bring forth the latent possibilities that are here. Let us work together—unselfishly and with vision—to put these plans into effect—to add to our national strength and welfare, for the greater good of us all.

PRODUCTION OF LIQUID FUEL FROM COAL

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to submit two amendments to the bill. Before doing so, I desire to say that I am trustee of some oil-shale lands in Colorado and have a beneficial interest in the trusts. Those trusts might be hurt or helped indirectly by the enactment of the proposed legislation.

My State is enormously interested in both coal and shale, and therefore I believe I should intervene to the extent that I am intervening, and feel also that I should make the statement I have just made. I am sure that the purpose of the bill comprehends oil shale just as it comprehends coal. I think that has been developed fully in the debate here, but perhaps through an inadvertent oversight the words "oil shale" do not appear in the bill at all, and so, to make it absolutely clear, I send to the desk two brief amendments which will accomplish that purpose, and I hope the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

O'MAHONEY] will find the amendments acceptable.

One amendment is to the text of the bill, and the other is an amendment to the title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, of the original print, after the word "coal", it is proposed to insert the words "oil shale."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that amendment is quite acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The Chair will state that after final action on the bill has been taken the amendment of the title will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Last Friday night, when the Senate adjourned, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] made inquiry of me with respect to the meaning of the provisions of section 2, which provides that sections 321 and 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended, shall not apply to any leases under this act, with respect to exemption from section 3679 of the Revised Statutes. At that time I told him that this language was incorporated in the bill from the text of the Helium Act, and that the exemptions were not at all necessary to the effectiveness of the proposed law.

Today the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] referred to the same section, and seemed to interpret it as meaning that there was a hidden purpose, contrary to the announced purpose of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to permit the Department of the Interior in some way or other to operate with a hand much freer than should be the case.

The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys has insisted over and over again that the purpose of the proposed legislation is not at all to interfere with private enterprise. I believe that the interpretation which was placed upon the language by the junior Senator from Connecticut is not altogether justified by the language itself; because the second provision reads:

> And such leases may be made for a term of not to exceed 5 years notwithstanding Revised Statutes, section 3679, as amended, or any other provision of law.

I interpret that to be an exemption only from the provisions with respect to the length of the leases. However, in order that there may be no doubt whatsoever that the purpose of the proponents of the bill is to enable the Interior Department to conduct the operations without invading the field of private enterprise, I intend to move—and I state this after having consulted with the members of the committee—that, in the second print of the bill, on page 3, lines 14 to 18, inclusive, be stricken, so that there shall be no exemption from any of the provisions of law; and that on page 1, in line 5, after the word "authorized", there be inserted the words "for not more than 5 years", so that it will not clear that, when passed, the bill will have the effect of granting this authorization for not more than 5 years, so that Congress may at any time within that period or after that period reexamine the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to insert "for not more than 5 years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, of the original print, as amended, it is proposed to strike out lines 10 to 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the proposal to authorize the Federal Government to construct and operate demonstration-sized plants for the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other materials should be approved by the Congress as quickly as possible so that this all-important research will not lag. I look upon this measure as being essential to the future of this Nation if it is to maintain its place as a world leader. Passage of the bill simply will mean this: If this work is successful, our Nation will be assured of ample supplies of synthetic petroleum products for hundreds of years, regardless of what happens to our limited reserves of natural petroleum. The bill is in every sense a national defense measure.

The bill assures continuation of our "gasoline age," and it will permit us to progress steadily in aviation. It also points the way to new industries which may provide employment for many thousands of men. It will erase the situation I most fear—that some day our United States may be required to depend on other countries for its petroleum.

In part I represent the people of the great State of Pennsylvania, a State noted for its valuable oil and coal. Our Pennsylvania petroleum is a "must" among aviation lubricants and for servicing other equipment requiring the best quality of oil. Our anthracite is the ideal household and industrial solid fuel. In this war many millions of tons of our bituminous coal have gone into blast furnaces, in the form of coke, and much of it is being funneled into dozens of channels to keep the railroads going and to keep the wheels of industry turning at a faster pace. It made the city of Pittsburgh, with its great steel mills and other heavy industries. Yes, my State owes its prominence to its coal and oil and the will of its people to produce those fuels in abundance for the well-being of the entire United States.

Pennsylvania was the first State to have a commercial oil well. Almost a century ago, near Titusville, Edward L. Drake sank a well 69½ feet into the earth and found oil. At first, development of our oil fields was slow because of the relatively small demand for petroleum. But all of us can remember the time—it was only a few years ago—when the hysterical cry of "Oil! Oil! Oil!" was heard. Derricks dotted farms, parks, and schoolyards. Oil poured forth in seemingly unending streams. Those were lush days when millionaires were made overnight, when oil was wasted because we had so much of it.

Today in Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Texas, Oklahoma, and other States many abandoned derricks stand out against the skyline—silent markers of graves, the graves of abandoned, exhausted oil wells.

In 1759, a hundred years before the Nation's first commercial oil well came into production in Pennsylvania, the mining of bituminous coal began in the western part of my State. I think the first mining of bituminous coal was near Hancock, Md. Today, nearly 200 years later, there are abandoned mine workings in Pennsylvania, but they are not headstones—they are milestones of progress. Pennsylvania today has untold millions of tons of bituminous coal underground, far more coal than has been mined in the past. In the United States we have more than 3,000,000,000,000 tons of coal in reserve, enough coal to furnish sufficient oil products to supply our needs, at the present rate of consumption, for thousands of years.

And what of our reserves of natural petroleum? At the rate at which we are using oil, our known reserves are sufficient to last us about 15 years. However, this 15-year supply would have to be spread over a period of about 50 years, since production from wells decreases rather gradually as the crude is withdrawn.

This is why I urgently recommend immediate intensive research in the production of synthetic liquid fuels in the United States. Some day we must turn to coal, lignite, oil shales, and other raw materials for our oil. When that time comes we must be prepared to make the change-over quickly and efficiently; not in a helter-skelter fashion, but in an orderly and planned manner.

The measure now before us is an insurance policy. We did not have such an insurance policy regarding synthetic rubber, and we have paid and will continue to pay a high price for that lesson. We could use synthetic liquid fuels in the United States today, but we can get along without them. Some day we will not be able to say that.

Yes; thanks to American industry, we have averted a panic in synthetic rubber. But the conversion to synthetic liquid fuels cannot be handled as rapidly as that. The problem, economically and technically, is far more complex than that of synthetic rubber. We know that we can produce synthetic liquid fuels in the United States from American products. But we do not have the know-how for doing it on a commercial scale. An American method for American needs and American resources still is lacking. Great Britain's methods for liquefying coal would not give us the necessary know-how; neither would Germany's—even if we had her blueprints and operating methods. Great Britain today produces enough synthetic aviation gasoline to send 200 or 300 bombers over Germany every night, but she started large-scale studies of coal hydrogenation many years ago. Germany today

produces large quantities of synthetic gasoline from coal, but Germany worked on one coal-liquefaction process from 1913 to 1926—13 years—before reaching commercial-scale production. Both England's and Germany's synthetic fuel industries operate on a subsidy basis. Research on a large scale is the answer.

What have we been doing in the field of synthetic fuel research in the United States these many years? We have gone ahead, slowly but surely. I credit the Bureau of Mines for keeping this field of research alive in the United States.

With no fanfare, and with limited financial assistance, the Bureau has studied the liquefaction of American coals in its laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa., since 1935. There a small staff of chemists, engineers, and physicists put together a laboratory-size pilot plant. I have seen that equipment, and it is amazingly small. Yet, with that improvized plant the Bureau has made great scientific strides. It needed new-type equipment, so it built it from odds and ends. From year to year the Bureau did not know whether enough funds would be provided to keep the project going or whether it would have to call a halt on its work. This was in the pre-war days, when service stations competed vigorously for trade and no one thought of the rationing of fuel oil or gasoline.

Yet, the Bureau kept its studies going and kept its research staff intact. Today the Bureau can report that it has tested 14 American coals and lignites in that plant, and all produced good gasoline, fuel oil, lubricants, and similar petroleum products.

One American coal produced as much as 136 gallons of gasoline per ton; another, 134 gallons. The well-known Pittsburgh bed of my State turned out 130 gallons per ton of coal. Further research can improve the yield.

The laboratory plant of the Bureau at Pittsburgh is complicated. It requires experts to operate it—to turn the right knobs at the proper time, and to make spare parts so that it can produce the mere trickle of gasoline it is capable of producing, since the equipment is able to handle only 100 pounds of coal every 24 hours.

I should mention, also, the Bureau's experiments in the production of petroleum products from oil shale. As I recall, the Bureau's work in that field of research began about 1925, but was brought to an abrupt close in 1929 because of lack of funds. In that short time, however, the Bureau ran about 6,000 tons of domestic oil shale through a retort near Rulison, in Colorado, and produced about 3,600 barrels of oil. According to Secretary of the Interior Ickes, we have enough oil shale in the United States to produce some 92,000,000,000 barrels of oil—about a 65-year supply. Yet, as in the case of coal liquefaction, we have no workable, commercial-scale process for utilizing that oil shale. Again, the Bureau of Mines has not been given a chance to carry on its investigative work on a scale which would provide all the answers preliminary to commercial utilization.

Senators, by the time this war is over we may not have a 15-year supply of natural petroleum. We may by new discoveries have a 30-year supply. On the other hand, we may not even have a 10-year supply. I would be the last one to predict when this war will end, because I believe firmly that nothing is as dangerous as over-optimism.

During the recent recess the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is chairman, held a series of hearings of Senate bill 1243. I was glad to have the opportunity afforded me by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming to participate in the hearings which were held in Pittsburgh. At the first hearing in Washington, D. C., there appeared Brig. Gen. W. E. R. Covell, of the Fuel and Lubricants Division, Quartermaster General's Office, United States Army.

I quote General Covell's short, but extremely significant testimony:

> While at the present time there is no indicated shortage of liquid fuels for military and essential civilian uses, the supply of crude oil in the continental United States is diminishing; therefore, it is deemed advisable to explore the possibilities of producng synthetic liquid fuels, and to familiarize industry with the operation of such plants so that they may be used in the event of shortage of petroleum supplies.
>
> In modern warfare as we know it today, liquid fuels are absolutely essential. Over half—in north Africa, 65 percent—of the tonnage of all supplies for our Army overseas is petroleum products.
>
> From the viewpoint of over-all strategic considerations, any successful developments along the lines indicated will provide a factor of safety against any unforeseen turn of events in this war and might be absolutely essential in the event we are unfortunate enough to be engaged in another world war in the future.

Senators, I agree wholeheartedly with this authoritative statement. It is our duty, the duty of our Government, to pave the way for large-scale production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other materials "so that they may be used in the event of a shortage of petroleum supplies," as stated by General Covell.

Our Government is best equipped to continue this vital research, provide the "know how" for industry, and erase forever the growing fear that some day in the not-too-distant future we may become a weakling, a stagnated civilization depending on foreign sources for our lifeblood—liquid fuels. It is our solemn duty to banish forever any indecision involving our future as the leader of democracy.

The bill should be passed, and should be implemented as soon as possible with appropriations so that the work may be advanced without delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 3, line 3 of the copy of the bill which is on our desks, after the word "property" I propose that the following language be added:

> *Provided, however,* That the maximum quantity of land, or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on the experiments for the purposes herein provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from West Virginia has spoken to me about the amendment he has just offered. I have no objection to it. I feel that the purpose of the measure in its authorization to the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land is merely to enable him to secure such land as may be necessary for experimental purposes. I think the Senator has stated the purpose as the committee understood it, and I am glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 3, after the word "property", it is proposed to insert:

> *Provided, however,* That the maximum quantity of land, or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on the experiments for the purposes herein provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1243) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

> A bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as many amendments have been made to the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the bill as passed printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1243), as passed, is as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized for not more than 5 years to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purposes of this act. The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commer-

cially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work and with pilot plants and semiworks plants make careful process engineering studies along with structural engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest investment and operating costs necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

(b) to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property: *Provided, however,* That the maximum quantity of land or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on experiments for the purposes herein provided;

(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants, the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this act. No patent or patent rights acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process to which such patent or patent rights relate, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

SEC. 4. All moneys received under this act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the 1st day of January of each year a report of all operations under this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to read a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys [Mr. HATCH], from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Michael W. Straus, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to Senate bill 1243. I also have before me a letter, relative to the bill, from R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 8, 1943.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HATCH: In response to a request for immediate notification of any report by the Bureau of the Budget as to whether S. 1243 is within the President's program, I attach herewith a letter received today on that subject from the Director of the Budget. You will note that the Director concludes "that there would be no objection to the enactment of legislation authorizing this undertaking as a post-war project" and precedes this conclusion with the statement that "the construction of these plants during the present war should not be considered in accord with the program of the President."

S. 1243, as you recall, stipulates no time schedule in relationship with the war. The testimony of the Department, industry, and other officials was to the effect that any interference with the President's war program would be avoided, following passage of this authorization bill, by submission of priority requirements on material to the War Production Board, labor requirements to the War Manpower Commission, financial items to the Bureau of the Budget, and any other items to appropriate Federal agencies. This procedure would insure compliance with the changing requirements of the war program. Therefore, the concept of the Department, and the bill as written, would seem to be in accord with the stipulation of the Bureau of the Budget. The Department could not feel free to proceed with the essential preliminary work prerequisite to this large undertaking, unless definitive Senate action is taken on S. 1243.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
First Assistant Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1943.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to prior correspondence concerning proposed legislation to authorize the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war and conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation.

Your letter of October 25, 1943, indicates that you would contemplate the construction, under this legislation, of three plants, with a total investment cost of $50,000,000, and with annual operating costs of $7,810,000. In this connection it is to be noted that the House bill, as reported to the House, fixes a total appropriation authorization of $30,000,000.

Expert testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate indicated the contemplated program could not be looked upon as an important aid to the prosecution of the present war, or even to meeting the immediate post-war petroleum requirements. Moreover, the present construction of these plants would make considerable demand upon our supply of manpower and critical materials.

In view of these considerations you are advised that legislation contemplating the construction of these plants during the present war should not be considered in accord with the program of the President, but that there would be no objection to the enactment of legislation authorizing this undertaking as a post-war project.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in response to your telephone request regarding the plans of the Bureau of Mines with respect to carrying out the purposes of bill S. 1243 authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances.

The first step in this program is the requesting of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in accordance with section 2 (a) of the bill for conducting the laboratory research and development work necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation for these plants.

This work will be started as soon as the appropriation is available. A survey of the situation with respect to availability of men and materials indicates that this part of the project will not be impossible to carry out because of lack of materials or men if reasonable priorities in keeping with war needs are granted.

The Bureau of Mines program will include (a) the Bergius process for the direct hydrogenation and liquefaction of coal; (b) the Fischer-Tropsch process for the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal or lignite; (c) the low-temperature carbonization of coal in conjunction with either process (a) or (b); and (d) the distillation of oil shale.

In order to take advantage of the best available advice in carrying out the objectives of S. 1243, it is planned to appoint an advisory technical committee composed of recognized authorities in this field of research and development. These appointees will be selected from the interested industries and from research organizations working in related fields. The Bureau has found such advisory committees helpful in planning new projects, and in the present instance the Bureau would give careful consideration to the advice of this committee in deciding on the nature, capacity, and location of the demonstration plants and in the planning and conducting of the research and development work necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation. It will be necessary to assemble considerable data and carry out some of the work covered by section 2 (a) of the bill before decisions on location of demonstration plants can be made.

Sincerely yours,

R. R. SAYERS,
Director.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my desire to have a call of the calendar beginning at the point where we left off at the last call.

It is also my purpose later to move that the Senate adjourn until Friday. Thursday is Armistice Day, and many Senators will be absent. On Friday it is intended to take up the Bankhead newspaper advertisement bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is

no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 486.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 486.

MORRIS LEFF

The bill (H. R. 244) for the relief of Morris Leff, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FARRELL-ARGAST ELECTRIC CO.

The bill (H. R. 560) for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MITTIE PEARL NANNY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 937) for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "Mittie Pearl Nanny" and insert "the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny."

ESTATE OF HYMAN WIENER

The bill (H. R. 1049) for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN ENGELL THOMPSON

The bill (H. R. 1666) for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LILLIAN C. FERREIRA

The bill (H. R. 1435) for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INA MAE SHIPMAN

The bill (H. R. 1769) for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD A. SILVIA

The bill (H. R. 1918) for the relief of Edward A. Silvia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NELLIE STARR McCORKLE

The bill (H. R. 2675) providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HAROLD E. DALTON

The bill (H. R. 1887) for the relief of Harold E. Dalton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARCUS O. AND FAYE D. ROWLAND, PARENTS OF GEORGE L. ROWLAND, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 1920) for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIGURD J. E. WALLSTEDT

The bill (H. R. 400) for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The bill (H. R. 273) to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN E. HAAS

The bill (H. R. 2132) for the relief of John E. Haas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD P. BEALE AND EVA M. BEALE

The bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased."

MARGUERITE R. McELROY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2190) for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$150", and insert "$98.75."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NEOLA CECILE TUCKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 921) for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker, of Houma, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Dr. William Lee Tucker, a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Army, who was killed by a train at De Quincy, La., while under Army escort to a psychiatric hospital: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a disdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE STAMPS AND HENRIETTA E. STAMPS

The bill (H. R. 2824) for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED A. FLANDERS

The bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Fred A. Flanders was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. C. ROBERTS

The bill (H. R. 2600) for the relief of M. C. Roberts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT FERGUSON AND OZELLE FERGUSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,500", and insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WILLIAM CARROLL KNOX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1290) for the relief of William Carroll Knox, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$186.20", and insert "$186.65", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Carroll Knox, of Winchester, Tenn., the sum of $186.65, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered as United States commissioner at Winchester, Tenn., for the period from October 22, to November 23, 1942, inclusive, such claim having been disallowed by reason of the fact that his term of office as such commissioner expired prior to the time such services were rendered: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 1889) for the relief of Andrew Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. ELLENDER asked that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOSEPHINE M. MELCHIOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 225) for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,860", and insert "$807.92", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Josephine M. Melchior, of Mount Angel, Oreg., the sum of $807.92, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of certain timber owned by her in Tillamook County, Oreg., such timber having been cut without her consent by a survey party of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANNA RUNNEBAUM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 949) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000", and insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,000, to Mrs. Anna Runnebaum, of Axtell, Kans., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Ralph Joseph Runnebaum, who was killed in an automobile accident while in the employ of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any amount not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT COURT AT ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 1622) to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RENEWALS OF OATHS OF OFFICE BY CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 1206) to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 36 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE—PENALTY FOR STEALING, ETC., ARMS FOR MILITARY FORCES

The bill (H. R. 1202) to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TIME EXTENSION FOR APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 722, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to strike out:

(b) Deficiency resulting from relief under section 722: If any part of a deficiency for a taxable year is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency; and for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of the application for relief under section 722, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later.

And insert:

(b) Deficiency resulting from relief under section 722: If any part of a deficiency for a taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year, no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency. If any part of a deficiency for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year (excluding any portion of a deficiency of excess-profits taxes constituting a deficiency by reason of deferment of tax under sec. 710 (a) (5), and excluding, in the case the taxpayer has availed itself of the benefits of sec. 710 (a) (5), such portion of a deficiency under ch. 1 as may be determined by the Commissioner to exceed any refund or credit of excess-profits tax arising from the operation of sec. 722), no interest shall be assessed or paid with respect to such part of the deficiency for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of such application, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 7, to strike out:

(g) Claims based upon relief under section 722: If any part of an overpayment for a taxable year is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment; and for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of the application for relief under section 722, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later."

And insert:

(g) Claims based upon relief under section 722: If any part of an overpayment for a taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1942, is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment. If any part of an overpayment for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1941, is determined by the Commissioner to be attributable to the final determination of an application for relief or benefit under section 722 for any taxable year, no interest shall be allowed or paid with respect to such part of the overpayment for any period prior to 1 year after the filing of such application, or September 16, 1945, whichever is the later.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 162 (d) (1) (B) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(B) such a plan shall be considered as satisfying the requirements of section 165 (a), (3), (4), and (5) and (6) for the period beginning with the beginning of the first taxable year following December 31, 1942, and ending December 31, 1944, if the provisions thereof satisfy such requirements by December 31, 1944, and if by that time such provisions are made effective for all purposes as of a date not later than January 1, 1944."

(b) Section 162 (d) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) In the case of a stock bonus, pension, profit sharing or annuity plan put into effect after September 1, 1942, such a plan shall be considered as satisfying the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) for the period beginning with the date such plan is put into effect and ending December 31, 1944, if the provisions thereof satisfy such requirements by December 31, 1944, and if by that time such provisions are made effective for all purposes as of a date not later than the effective date of such plan or January 1, 1944, whichever is the later."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask that it may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 7, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 124 (f) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"The certificate provided for in paragraph (1) shall have no effect unless an application therefor is filed before the expiration of 6 months after the beginning of such construction, reconstruction, erection, or installation or the date of such acquisition, or before April 22, 1943, whichever is later."

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, this is the language of Senate Joint Resolution 35, which I introduced in the Senate, and which has been before the Committee on Finance since February 25, 1943. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and I hope he will be willing to accept the amendment, but in the light of the objection which has been raised, I feel that some explanation is in order.

When the resolution was submitted to the Treasury for a report, the Treasury responded adversely, in part. They said:

Though the question of the extent to which limitations should be prescribed for the performance of acts required by the revenue laws is primarily a matter of congressional policy, this department is constrained to invite attention to the fact that enactment of legislation such as that proposed would have a strong tendency to undermine the force and effect of all limitations prescribed by existing law. It is the view of the Department upon sound considerations, including ample time for compliance, the failure to file a timely application would be due to the taxpayer's own negligence and not to any fault of the law. It is believed that the establishment of a new limitation for the benefit of a taxpayer who had failed to comply with the reasonable requirements of existing law would encourage other taxpayers to seek similar relief from the results of their own failure to follow the procedure prescribed by Congress.

Mr. President, in the light of what has previously happened in similar instances, it seems to me the Treasury observations would have been true, and no limit or extension of time would have been in order. I am wondering whether the same observation was made by the Treasury Department when each of the first and second amendments was adopted relating to the same item, extending the time of filing. It would seem to me that if this observation were taken literally and seriously, no amendment extending time would have been in order.

I point out that in at least one instance with which I am conversant there was absolutely no degree of negligence on the part of the taxpayer. Numerous inquiries were made regarding filing of the application for a certificate of necessity, and I observe that the War Department had a definite policy toward the granting of these certificates of necessity which would not have permitted a company to make the application, but it continually adopted the policy that war orders were necessary before a certificate could be granted. It should be observed that the company, in the case I have cited, could not have taken war orders until its mill had been completed. The completion of the mill took from 12 to 18 months. From the very nature of things the policy adopted by the War Department would have precluded any mill ever taking advantage of the certificate of necessity.

More than that, it is definitely demonstrated, contrary to the conclusions which the Treasury would seem to draw, that not more than two or three, at the outside, could possibly take advantage of my amendment if it were made a part of the law.

By Executive order, the War Department, under date of the 5th of October, 1943, gave notice that there could be no more applications for these certificates of necessity, thus closing the door completely to a chance of there being any wholesale advantage taken of any amendment such as that I am now offering.

Under the rule under which we are proceeding at the moment, I cannot go into detail, but I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a statement covering the specific instance to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the war in Europe commenced in September 1939 the Gilman Paper Co., with mills at Gilman, Vt., realized that it might be confronted with a lack of kraft pulp, which it imported from the Scandinavian countries and out of which it manufactured kraft papers. Prior to the war the kraft paper industry imported approximately 35 percent of kraft pulp, out of which kraft paper was made in this country. The Gilman Paper Co., realizing the threat to loss of supply of pulp due to the war, sought and acquired in July of 1940 a site at St. Marys, Ga., for the building of a pulp and paper mill. It then made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan to help finance the building of the mill.

In the meantime, and prior to the granting of this loan, during the month of October or November 1940, St. Marys Kraft Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Georgia, commenced construction of this pulp and paper mill. In March of 1941 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made a loan to the St. Marys Kraft Corporation of approximately $1,500,000 on condition that the Gilman Paper Co. first invested $1,500,000, which investment it did make.

The mill was completed during the latter part of 1941. It was definitely known that if this war continued, there would be a terrific shortage of kraft pulp and kraft papers which would necessarily curtail the war effort. The officials of the St. Marys Kraft Corporation attempted to obtain a certificate of necessity for amortization deduction of its facilities over a period of 60 months in accordance with the law, but to the inquiries made of the War Department they were continuously advised that unless they had war orders, they were not entitled to the certificate of necessity, and that any application they would make for such certificate would be futile. The War Department at that time adopted that policy, and the futility of making the application was impressed upon the corporation. Until the mill was in operation and war orders were received, they were advised that it would be futile for them to make the application.

However, after the mill had been completed, application for certificate of necessity was made. Even at the time of making application, due to the fact that the mill had very few war orders at the time, the mill having just been completed, the corporation was advised that the officials of the War Department did not think that the certificate would be granted. Very shortly thereafter, a terrific shortage of pulp and kraft paper developed, and the War Department then recognized that the manufacture of kraft pulp and paper was an essential part of the war effort. It was only then that the War Department looked with favor on the granting of certificates of necessity to new kraft paper mills, and subsequently issued a certificate of necessity to the St. Marys corporation for all of its facilities.

However, at the time this certificate was issued the War Department knew it was ineffective because the formal application for such certificate was made subsequent to 6 months after the commencing of construction and subsequent to December 1, 1941. Therefore, the granting of this certificate did not give the taxpayer, the St. Marys Corporation, the benefit that Congress intended it to have. Section 124 (f) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code now provides that the application must be filed before the expiration of 6 months after the beginning of the construction, or before December 1, 1941, whichever is later. Let it be here noted that this section has been amended twice since its enactment, at the request of the War Department and the Treasury Department. These amendments extended the time to file the application. The time was first dependent upon the date of the issuance of the certificate. It was subsequently amended, and the time was extended to before the expiration of 60 days after the beginning of construction or before February 6, 1941, whichever is later, and thereafter it was amended and the time extended to before the expiration of 6 months after the beginning of construction or before December 1, 1941, whichever is later. This section was subsequently amended effective October 1942, which amendment added the provisions permitting taxpayers who commenced construction prior to June 30, 1940, for corporations and permitted individuals to have the benefit of this accelerated amortization and the time to file in these latter two cases was extended to 6 months after the enactment of the amendment which was to April 22, 1943.

My proposed amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 35, extends the time to file for corporations who commenced construction after June 1940 to the same date that the other two cases have under the present law. This, I believe, would make the administration of the law more orderly and effective. After my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 35, was referred to the Committee on Finance, that committee requested the Treasury Department on February 26 for a report on this resolution. On April 14 the Treasury Department advised the committee that it was not in favor of the resolution for the reasons set forth in that letter:

"Though the question of the extent to which limitations should be prescribed for the performance of acts required by the revenue laws is primarily a matter of congressional policy, this Department is constrained to invite attention to the fact that enactment of legislation such as that proposed would have a strong tendency to undermine the force and effect of all limitations prescribed by existing law. It is the view of the Department upon sound considerations, including ample time for compliance, the failure to file a timely application would be due to the taxpayer's own negligence and not to any fault of the law. It is believed that the establishment of a new limitation for the benefit of a taxpayer who had failed to comply with the reasonable requirements of existing law would encourage other taxpayers to seek similar relief from the results of their own failure to follow the procedure prescribed by Congress."

It seems to me that these observations would be true in every case, and, carried out to its logical conclusion, no amendment or extension of time would be in order. I am

wondering if the same observation was made by the Treasury Department when each of the first and second amendments was offered and passed extending the time to file, and it would seem that if this observation was taken literally and seriously no amendment extending any time would be in order. However, I wish to point out that there was no negligence on the part of the taxpayer in the case of the corporation I have recited. Numerous inquiries were made regarding filing of the application of necessity, and I observe that the War Department had a definite policy on the granting of these certificates of necessity which would not have permitted the company to make the application, that it continually adopted the policy that war orders were necessary before a certificate could be granted. And it should be observed that the company could not have taken war orders until the mill had been completed. The completion of a pulp and paper mill usually takes from 12 to 18 months. So that by the very nature of things, this would have precluded any paper mill under the policy adopted by the War Department to ever have the advantage of the certificate of necessity, even though it subsequently turned out that the entire production of this mill was needed by and went directly into the war effort. It was only after the shortage of kraft paper and pulp began to curtail the war effort that the War Department adopted the policy that you did not have to have war orders before a certificate could be granted. After that policy was adopted, the application was acted upon and the certificate of necessity issued.

The complete production of this paper mill is regulated completely by the War Production Board. The War Production Board tells them what kind of paper they may make and how much of their pulp they can use themselves and how much of their pulp they must sell to firms and companies designated by the War Production Board. This firm's entire operation is regulated by the Government today. It will, therefore, appear that because of the policy of the War Department, the corporation was precluded from the benefits of the law passed by Congress relating to the certificates of necessity and amortization of facilities, and that it was not due to the negligence on their part that the application was not in timely order.

The attention of the Senate is called to the circular issued by the War Department dated October 5, 1943, over the signature of George H. Foster, colonel, Signal Corps, Chief of Tax Amortization Branch, Purchase Division. This circular advises all taxpayers who have filed applications for necessity certificates under section 124 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code that after October 5 there will be no further applications considered under the amendment to the regulations under section 124 Internal Revenue Code as approved by the President. From after October 5, therefore, no applications for certificates of necessity will be received or acted upon. It might be good legislation at this time and fair treatment for all those who have aided and cooperated in the construction and expansion of plants for the war effort, to repeal section 124 (f) (3) because no further applications can be filed under the new amendments and the fear of the Treasury Department that it would open the gates for many new applications is no longer well-founded. There are very few taxpayers in the position of the firm I have referred to, perhaps not more than four or five.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the committee will be inclined to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment, because the Treasury Department has recommended against it. However, it is not a matter which relates directly to any tax liability of any taxpayer, but it relates exclusively to the right to file applications for certificates of necessity under the accelerated amortization provisions of the law, and I have no objection to taking it to conference. I should not care to be bound further than that. If it is agreeable to the conferees, I shall have no particular objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the bill shall be finally passed, I wish to offer a brief statement for the RECORD applying to the pension trust provision as proposed to be amended by the bill.

The bill deals with relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, and extends the time for filing claims for relief under that provision. The Treasury has approved the provision.

The bill likewise deals with interest upon deficiencies and claims for refunds, and the Treasury has approved those amendments to the law.

The Treasury likewise has offered no opposition to the amendments which were offered before the Committee on Finance, and accepted by the committee, amending section 162 of the Revenue Act of 1942, the section relating to stock bonuses, pensions, and so forth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanatory statement may be incorporated in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because no regulations were issued until July 8, 1943, relative to section 162 of the Revenue Act of 1942, and because the regulations do not cover adequately employees' profit-sharing funds or trusts, and also because there are now before the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for approval more stock bonus, pension, profit-sharing, or annuity plans or trusts than can receive consideration before December 31, 1943, it is apparent that section 162 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1942 should be so amended as to extend the time within which such plans need not meet the requirements of section 165 (a), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, and within which such plans may be made to conform with section 165 as revised by section 162 of the Revenue Act of 1942.

It is recognized that there may be some plans or trusts, particularly those created before September 1, 1942, which will require very substantial amendment to make them conform with section 165 as presently constituted. In some such cases a plan comprises only one fund or trust. In other cases a plan includes two or more funds or trusts, some one or more of which if taken alone would conform with section 165 but which, when as required by the law, are taken with all the funds or trusts of the plan, will not conform. Therefore, those plans which do not now meet the requirements of the law must so far as future payments are concerned be brought into line with the provisions of the law if they are to be continued as qualified funds or trusts. Where a group of funds or trusts are consolidated or are reduced or increased in number but in any event so revised that the resulting plan covers substantially the same employees as those covered by the group of funds or trusts before such revision, such a revised group of funds or trusts are to be considered as a revised plan and not as a new plan in whole or in part.

It is also understood that section 162 (d) (1) (B) and section 162 (d) (2) of the Revenue Act of 1942 as amended by H. R. 3363 will have no retroactive effect on allotments among employees of employers' contributions paid or accrued prior to January 1, 1944, the date as of which trusts or plans must be made to conform with section 165 (a), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ISSUANCE OF FLAGS TO NEAREST RELATIVES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

The bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relative of certain persons who die in the service in the land or naval forces of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YELLOW CAB TRANSIT CO. AND EQUITABLE FIRE & MARINE INSURANCE CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1278) for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the numerals "$2,267.98" to strike out "and to Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co., 1405 Ramsey Tower, Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $7,902.19. Such sums represent losses of tractor No. 387, semitrailer No. 338 and cargo carried therein resulting therefrom" and to insert "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Yellow Cab Transit Co. against the United States for property damages sustained by it when its tractor, No. 387, and its semitrailer No. 338, where destroyed by fire as the result of" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Yellow Cab Transit Co., of 1405 Ramsey Tower, Oklahoma City, Okla., the sum of $2,267.98. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Yellow Cab Transit Co. against the United States for property damages sustained by it when its tractor, No. 387, and its semitrailer, No. 338, were destroyed by fire as the result of a collision with a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 66 near Hazelgreen, Mo., on August 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co."

HARRY L. SMITH

The bill (H. R. 3331) for the relief of Harry L. Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. RUCKMAN

The bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (H. R. 2915) for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER R. JONES

The bill (H. R. 2905) for the relief of Walter R. Jones was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. LELAND M. MOWER

The bill (H. R. 1155) for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.

The bill (H. R. 1555) for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK AND NANCY FOGLIA

The bill (H. R. 2244) for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE A. ROGERS

The bill (S. 817) for the relief of George A. Rogers, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George A. Rogers, of Bellingham, Wash., the sum of $278.90, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred as the result of an accident involving a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, at the intersection of Maple and Jersey Streets, Bellingham, Wash., on March 27, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JOINT RATES OF FREIGHT FORWARDERS AND COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE

The bill (S. 1425) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I note that minority views are filed with the bill. I object to the bill being taken up at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I will say that this matter was called to my attention today by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He called attention specifically to the fact that minority views were filed, but he gave me the definite assurance that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who had filed the minority views felt that in so doing he had done his full duty and that he would not object to the consideration of the bill. It is an emergent matter urged by our military authorities, and I very much hope the Senator will permit the bill to be passed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Upon the statement made by the Senator from Maine, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 3366, Calendar No. 529 is an identical bill. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3366) to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1425 will be indefinitely postponed.

REMISSION OF CLAIMS ON ACCOUNT OF OVERPAYMENTS TO PART-TIME CHARWOMEN IN BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1447) to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments in section 2, page 2, line 22, after "SEC. 2" to strike out "The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make refunds of any and all", and to insert "Nothing in this act shall be deemed to authorize the refund of any", and at the end of the bill to strike out "The annual appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, 1944, is hereby made available to the extent of $700 for the purpose of making said refunds as herein provided", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That remission is hereby made of any and all claims of the United States in consequence of payments of wages at the rate of 78 cents an hour, rather than at some lower rate or rates, for work performed during the period from August 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943, both dates inclusive, by part-time charwomen employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department. Remission is hereby made of any and all claims of the United States in consequence of payments of wages for hours of work in any one week in excess of 40 at the overtime rate of one and one-half times the rate at which payments were made for the first 40 hours of work in that week, rather than at some lower rate or rates, for work performed on or after December 22, 1942, by any of said part-time charwomen pursuant to temporary details (pending promotions) to assignments requiring 48 hours work in one week. Said remissions are hereby made, notwithstanding any determination that the rate or rates at which said payments of wages were made is or are in excess of the rate or rates of pay established by law for said employment: *Provided*, That if said payments of wages at said rate of 78 cents an hour and at said overtime rate are otherwise correct, the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit therefor in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, to make no charge against any certifying officer because of certification of said payments of wages, and to remove every charge, if any, heretofore made against any certifying officer because of certification of said payments of wages.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to authorize the refund of any amounts heretofore withheld or deducted from wages paid to any of said part-time charwomen for work performed after June 30, 1943, in satisfaction or partial satisfaction of any and all claims or asserted claims of the United States in consequence of said payments of wages at said rate of 78 cents and at said overtime rate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to calendar No. 445, Senate bill 932, in order that the measure may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 932) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

BILL PASSED OVER—NOTICE OF MOTION TO CONSIDER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is another bill on the calendar which the departments are very anxious to have disposed of. I refer to Calendar No. 480,

House bill 3309, an act to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia to return to Calendar No. 480, House bill 3309?

Mr. FERGUSON. I object.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I give notice that tomorrow I shall move that the bill be taken up for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is contemplated that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn over until Friday.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well, Mr. President, I shall make the motion on Friday, because there is an insistence upon having consideration of the measure. It already has been passed over once or twice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia gives notice that he will move for the consideration of the measure on the next convening of the Senate.

LANDS AND MINERAL DEPOSITS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on a former occasion Senate bill 1372, Calendar No. 469, was reached on the call of the calendar, and objection was made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I have a letter from a constituent of mine in which the statement is made that the Senator from North Dakota has withdrawn his objection. I tried to reach the Senator today but was unable to do so. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Senate bill 1372, to authorize the purchase of certain interest in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand, Mr. President, that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was the only Senator who objected?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. His was the only objection I heard at the time.

Mr. WHITE. Did the Senator also say that he had gotten in touch with the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from North Dakota came to me after he had objected, and said he thought he would withdraw his objection, but I have not gotten in touch with him personally since then. I tried to reach him this afternoon, but failed to do so. If the bill should be passed and the Senator is not satisfied, I shall be glad to have the bill returned to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator says that the bill is an emergency matter I shall not feel constrained to object. But in the absence of the Senator from North Dakota I feel that I ought to object, unless the matter is of great importance.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No, I could not say that. It is a matter which has been pending for 50 years, I will say, and it is not now emergent.

Mr. WHITE. Then, perhaps it will not be seriously affected if it waits a few days longer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If objection is urged, very well.

Mr. WHITE. I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

TRIBUTES TO BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the recent appointment of Bernard M. Baruch to be the head of a special unit within the Office of War Mobilization came by no accident. Those in public life and many outside of public life well recognize the great capacity Mr. Baruch has exhibited in the past for public service of this character. He manifested courage, vision, and character during World War No. 1, and I am satisfied that his appointment to this responsible post is reassuring to American industry, American labor, and to all those who are primarily interested in seeing a reconversion of industry to a peacetime economy as soon as possible after the war shall end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "A Big Man for a Big Job," an editorial from the Baltimore Sun entitled "Mr. Baruch's Appointment Is Refreshing on Two Counts," and an article by E. A. Evans entitled "Baruch's Election for Important Job Acclaimed," from the Washington News of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 8, 1943]

A BIG MAN FOR A BIG JOB

The appointment of Bernard M. Baruch to head a new unit within the Office of War Mobilization for dealing with war and post-war adjustment problems is welcome news—the best that has come out of Washington in a long period. As Mr. James F. Byrnes said, in announcing Mr. Baruch's acceptance of this important assignment, it assures the country that these problems will be handled with both statesmanlike efficiency and broad vision.

There has been a good deal of public speculation recently concerning the possibility of a sudden and early military collapse of Germany. Any pleasurable excitement that derives from contemplating that possibility, however, will be tempered in the minds of informed persons by the fact that were such an eventuality to occur tomorrow it would find us as unprepared in an economic sense as we were unprepared militarily in 1941 for an effort of the dimensions of World War No. 2. Take, for example, the single problem of war contract terminations. When World War No. 1 came to an end there were approximately 32,000 contracts outstanding, totaling $5,000,000,000. Despite the best efforts of the Government 7,000 of these were still unsettled a year later. Today, according to the Committee for Economic Development, prime contracts number 100,000, while there are several times that many subcontracts. These contracts aggregate between $60,000,000,000 and $75,000,000,000. In addition, contractors' inventories that would be largely frozen by a sudden termination of hostilities amount today to between $10,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000.

Fortunately, both business and Congress are now giving increasing attention to the task that will face the Nation when the time comes to demobilize the millions of men and women now in the armed forces and the two-thirds of the Nation's resources in men, money, and materials currently devoted to the war effort. Spearheading post-war planning for business is the C. E. D., which is headed by Paul G. Hoffman, of the Studebaker Corporation, and which includes on its research staff many of the Nation's outstanding business leaders and economists. In the Senate, a special committee on post-war problems has been set up under the capable WALTER F. GEORGE; and this committee has already done some valuable spade work in the way of soliciting the views of spokesmen for various branches of the national economy, as well as those of disinterested technical experts. In addition, the Truman investigating committee has been giving much time and thought to the subject. In its report filed with the Senate last Friday this committee urged early action by the Government in determining methods to be followed in terminating war contracts; methods for assuring the early removal of Government property from private plants; the extent and means by which industry would be provided with working capital, and methods by which the Government would lease or sell plants and facilities constructed for war production.

But such problems as these cannot be approached without reference to other major policies of the Government. The conversion of industry from war to peace production, for example, must be related closely to the task of military demobilization. Again, as the Truman report observes, the domestic economy will be greatly affected by our policies in the international sphere. If this country joins in support of an international police force, the size of our contribution and the matériel requirements thereof will have to be determined. The plans of many industries, such as agriculture, will depend, obviously, on the Government's policies with respect to foreign trade, lend-lease, and world rehabilitation.

These are merely the highlights of the task that will face the Nation at the beginning of demobilization. It is a task which calls for an over-all administrator who measures up to the highest test of economic statesmanship. For its performance there will be needed alike the most expert and farsighted business wisdom and an impartiality which only a devoted patriotism can maintain. The country will breathe freer for knowing that Mr. Baruch has accepted this important responsibility for which he is so eminently fitted.

[From the Baltimore Sun of November 8, 1943]

MR. BARUCH'S APPOINTMENT IS REASSURING ON TWO COUNTS

Last week President Roosevelt revealed that early last month he arranged for James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, to create within the O. W. M. a special unit to handle war and post-war adjustment problems. Mr. Byrnes takes his first formal step in this direction with the announcement that he has named Bernard M. Baruch as head of such a unit.

While preparing this move, Mr. Byrnes has had available for consideration a rather formidable batch of plans for reconversion to a peacetime economy. Some, notably those offered by the National Planning Association and the Committee for Economic Development, call for some form of a separate office of reconversion with its own personnel and operating staff. Others, including one drawn within the administration, advocate an interdepartmental council, headed perhaps by an

independent chairman and deputy, but composed primarily of representatives of the many executive agencies whose activities will be involved in the reconversion process. Mr. Byrnes' announcement suggests that he leans toward the latter method.

Whatever the structural nature of the unit, Mr. Baruch is the man to direct it. As Chairman of the War Industries Board in the last war, as a member of the Supreme Economic Council of the peace conference, and as the outstanding trouble shooter in the present war effort, Mr. Baruch has had incomparable preparation for the task he now undertakes. Moreover, his appointment is particularly reassuring to American industrialists who have been worrying about possible administration policies in the post-war period. From Mr. Baruch they can expect reasonable and sympathetic treatment, for they know him as a farsighted and intelligent advocate of private enterprise.

His greatest asset in his new post may, however, prove to be the fact that he stands high in the confidence of Congress. There have been stirrings within Senator GEORGE'S Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning indicating that it is not wholly satisfied with the administration's preparations for the post-war readjustment. Mr. Baruch's appointment may not completely allay congressional misgivings, but it will go a long way in that direction. And since harmonious relations between Congress and the Executive are much to be desired in this matter, the appointment is doubly welcome on this account.

[From the Washington News of November 8, 1943]

BARUCH SELECTION FOR IMPORTANT JOB ACCLAIMED

(By E. A. Evans)

Bernard M. Baruch's new assignment gives a great lift of hopes for the quick, orderly shift to high peacetime production that is essential if there are to be enough good jobs after the war.

General opinion is that President Roosevelt and War Mobilizer Byrnes have chosen the best available man to tackle the tremendously tough problems of transition and reconversion. Industry, labor, administration, and Congress all recognize the urgency of finding solutions. Mr. Baruch is expected to find them.

HE TALKS LITTLE

Don't expect much talk from him, but look for a strong report before long on revision, cancelation, and prompt settlement of war contracts, aimed at preventing production of needed military goods, clearing road for earliest and largest possible output of needed civilian goods, and releasing working capital contractors and subcontractors.

Because of changing military needs, Army and Navy have already terminated contracts involving about $8,000,000,000—considerably more than the total of all contracts canceled after the last war—and final terminations this time may be nearly $75,000,000,000.

Later reports probably will deal with disposal of surplus military stocks and Government-owned war plants.

CARRIES GREAT WEIGHT

Mr. Baruch's advice has so often proved sound, past failures to follow it have had such unfortunate consequences, that his post-war recommendations will carry great weight with the administration, Congress, and the public.

No advocate of Government planning of the national economy, he can now do much to end the uncertainties which hamper business, industry, and agriculture in planning for the future.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London;

Lincoln MacVeagh, of Rhode Island, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt and also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in Egypt;

Hiram Bingham, Jr., of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul; and

Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, and sundry officers for promotion, all in the Regular Army.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, November 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 9, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Peru, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following to be officers in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Albert H. Stevenson, to be assistant sanitary engineer.

Howard J. Woodbridge, to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO SIGNAL CORPS

Second Lt. Robert Elwood Kimball, Corps of Engineers (temporary major) with rank from February 20, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Rufus Hardy Holloway, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Channing Stowell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Second Lt. George Eugene Bostwick, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Jack Wesley Streeton, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Isaac Owen Winfree, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from October 1, 1943

Lt. Col. John Henry Cochran, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

To be colonel, with rank from November 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Carl Conrad Bank, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Vernon Evans, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Lewis Clarke Davidson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold William James, Infantry (temporary colonel).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

Clarence C. Moore, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.

Robert M. Jenkins, a citizen of Iowa.

William H. Frey, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to the grades indicated for temporary service while serving in specific assignments, to rank from November 1, 1943:

Commodore Joseph F. Farley to rear admiral while serving as assistant chief of operations.

Capt. Philip B. Eaton (E) to rear admiral while serving as assistant engineer in chief.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 9, 1943:

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Lou E. Holder, Calhoun.
Nathaniel M. Elliott, Corbin.

MONTANA

Delta J. O'Neil, Glendive.

NEW YORK

Willis R. Holt, Black River.
Louis R. Mann, Cobleskill.
Hans C. Hansen, Fishers Island.
Albert J. Griffiths, Keuka Park.
Clyde S. Edmister, Lisle.
Rosabelle Harris, Lyons Falls.
Ruth E. Perrin, Potsdam.
Lawrence Mahoney, Winthrop.

WISCONSIN

George S. Allen, Lyndon Station.
Viola Klassy, New Glarus.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1943

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK) laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

I hereby designate Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN, *Speaker.*

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our most gracious Father, again we rejoice at Thy mercy; in humble gratitude toward Thee our hearts burn bright and clear. When the days become hard and difficult, we would learn something of the Master's quiet, of his valorous spirit and the hardihood of His faith. When hearts are wounded and sore, let Thy gentle presence come as a healing balm, when there is feverish indecision and unrest, teach us that wise labor can be achieved only when we accept with sincere speech and actions our trusteeship.

Blessed Lord, as we look upon this world, weaponed with hate and death, with our youth on the crimson altar of war, the conflict seems too much for our feeble faith. Forgive and forbid that we should crowd Thee out of our lives, lest our dreams and hopes become dull and faithless. May we never lessen our enthusiasm and ardor to work, as outraged guardians of virtue, against the hordes who make war. We pray that we may undauntedly believe in Him, the Saviour of the world, who taught man to think nobly of himself and ever inspired him toward the highest ideals of saint and philosopher. We bear to the altar of prayer our envoys of good will and especially our renowned Secretary of State; bless him with good health and strength and give him peace. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO ATTEND MEETING OF UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 349), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund a sum not to exceed $500 to defray the actual expenses of such members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as may be designated by the chairman thereof, to attend the meeting of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at Atlantic City, N. J., beginning Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on vouchers signed by the chairman and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman explain what this resolution is and the necessity for it? Of course, I realize it is privileged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, at the White House at this moment the representatives of 44 nations are signing an agreement setting up what is to be known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Tomorrow those representatives will meet at Atlantic City. The ranking members of the Foreign Affairs Committee requested this small appropriation of $500 to defray the expenses of any members of that committee selected by the chairman to attend the session at Atlantic City.

There is an agreement here that nothing is to be brought up without the approval of the majority and minority leaders. I may say to the House that the majority and minority leaders, as well as the Speaker, have approved the resolution and I was requested to have the Committee on Accounts meet this morning. The committee met and approved it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, a member of the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is considered important that Members of the House be present to listen in at the rehabilitation meetings to see what is going on?

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentlewoman's view. If the newspaper article this morning is correct that our contribution will be a billion and a half dollars a year I will say it is very important that members of the committee that will be forced to bring in the resolution authorizing the expenditure of this amount of money should be at that meeting so that they can fully inform their own committee and the House when they bring in the bill just exactly what it proposes to do. This of course will be important legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So we will know what we are voting on? I made the point in a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee that our responsibility is very great and that we should be kept fully informed on all that transpires and that we should be allowed to attend the sessions whenever possible.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. This subject will be thoroughly debated and many questions will be asked.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, also a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I draw the attention of the House at this moment to a resolution which I presented last week, now before the Rules Committee, requesting the House to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to "investigate," that being the word used, and study all matters pertaining to the relief and rehabilitation agreement, with the idea that the House will hold the Foreign Affairs Committee responsible for the information given it before the House agrees to any such vast sums being expended for such purposes?

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentlewoman, but if I understand the rules of the House correctly and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it has that power right now without any authority from the Rules Committee or the House.

Mrs. BOLTON. Not in quite the same fashion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. In the first place, is this resolution privileged so that an objection would be of no avail anyway?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I recall that when there was this food conference held somewhere in Virginia there was a great deal of criticism in the papers over the purchase of liquor. Is any of this money to be used for the purchase of liquor to entertain any of these foreign guests or any members of the committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope not, but it would not buy much at prevailing prices. I would like to know from the gentleman where they could get it. Where are they going to buy it if it is as scarce around Atlantic City as it is around Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you interested in that as an individual or as a Congressman?

Mr. COCHRAN. In both, but the gentleman asked me a question and I answered it. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD LABOR CRISIS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few moments on the matter to which I think the attention of the House should be drawn, a matter on which the House may have to take some action in the not too distant future.

Perhaps some of you have seen in the press reports of the present transportation situation and the question that has been raised regarding some railway employees. For 20 years our railway unions have been the good boys of the labor movement. They have done many, in fact, most of the things most of us think the labor unions should do, such as keeping racketeers out of their leadership, publishing reports of their funds and expenses, and so forth.

Today—and this is somewhat typical of certain sections of our own administration here in Washington—they are caught between the upper and the nether millstones of two warring executive departments. The Emergency Board allowed an 8-cent-an-hour increase in wages to one section of these employees, not to bring them up to the standard obtained by most labor, particularly in the war plants, but at least to give them some chance to meet the increased cost of living. The Director of Stabilization has refused to let them have this increase. It is to that point that I address myself, because in due time I think we may have to take issue with the Director of Stabilization.

The labor crisis now confronting the railroad industry results primarily from the fact that the wage rates in this big Nation-wide industry are substantially lower than those prevailing in industry generally.

It is well known that there are more jobs today than there are workers to fill them, and it is only natural that wage earners will prefer employment in industries that pay higher wages and grant more favorable working conditions, such as overtime payments.

Under the Wage and Hours Act as enacted several years ago by Congress, the overwhelming majority of wage earners throughout the United States are paid time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours per week. Congress included the railroad industry in the minimum-wage provisions of that act but excluded the railroad industry from the hours provisions, with the result that railroad workers do not receive the time and one-half required by law after 40 hours.

Many industries pay their employees time and one-half after 40 hours as a result of agreements negotiated with their employees. The President has also issued an Executive order which confirms the general policy of time and one-half for the sixth and double time for the seventh day of any workweek.

The most favorable overtime arrangement now existing for railroad workers is time and one half after 48 hours, but some railways require a certain number of their employees to work 60 hours a week, that is to say, six 10-hour days a week, before time and one-half payments are allowed. As a result of this, the weekly earnings of railway workers on the overtime basis alone fall short of those in other industries.

As an illustration, let us take a worker engaged at a rate of 50 cents an hour. If he works 60 hours, as is the case on some of the railroads in this country, he is paid for the entire time at straight-time rates and will earn $30 per week. If he works in other industries where time and one-half is paid after 40 hours, he will earn $35 per week, or $5 more than the railroad worker, notwithstanding the fact that the straight-time rate in both instances is 50 cents an hour.

In the railroad wage dispute affecting the nonoperating employees which is rapidly producing a chaotic condition in the Nation's transportation system there are 73 different classes of workers involved and they comprise a total of more than a million workers at this time. These groups embrace many highly skilled craftsmen, such as boilermakers, machinists, blacksmiths, electricians, sheet-metal workers, signalmen, and others. The group embraces highly skilled clerical and telegraph forces, as well as bridge carpenters, railroad bridge and building foremen, track foremen, and others who assume important supervisory responsibilities incident to their employment. The group likewise embraces semiskilled and unskilled workers.

At the time of the hearing held by the Emergency Board that recommended an 8 cents wage increase, the average hourly earnings for these classes of railway employees were 73.8 cents per hour.

According to the National Industrial Conference Board, the average hourly earnings of employees in the 25 major manufacturing industries was 95.8 cents per hour. This is 22 cents per hour more than these 1,000,000 nonoperating railway employees receive and, therefore, if they were granted the 8-cent hourly increase recommended last May by the President's Emergency Board they would still be approximately 15 cents an hour under the average rate for the manufacturing industries.

It is an amazing fact to observe that the average hourly earnings of unskilled, newly hired, common labor in the Nation's manufacturing industries are higher than the average for the railroad industry's nonoperating employees as a whole, notwithstanding the fact that the majority of these nonoperating workers are highly skilled mechanics and craftsmen. At the time of the hearing, when 1,000,000 nonoperating workers received an average of 73.8 cents per hour, the National Industrial Conference Board reported that totally unskilled common labor in 25 manufacturing industries received an average of 81 cents an hour, or 7 cents more than the average for all nonoperating workers in the railroad industry as a whole. If the 8 cents as recommended by the President's Emergency Board was granted to all these nonoperating workers, they would still receive an average wage that would be roughly equal to the average paid common unskilled labor in manufacturing.

These higher wage rates in other industries have not developed suddenly as a result of our more recent war activity. Railroad wages have lagged behind from year to year and the discrepancy is one that has been developing and growing greater for the past 20 years. As a matter of fact, in 1921, these 73 classes of nonoperating railroad workers received an average of 59 cents an hour when the workers in manufacturing industries received 52.4 cents. It is seen that in 1921 these railway employees earned approximately 7 cents an hour in excess of the average for manufacturing.

However, by 1930, the average railroad wage was 57 cents, but the manufacturing average had climbed to 58.9 or approximately 2 cents above the railroad wage.

In 1939, the railroad average was 63.4 cents, but the average wage in manufacturing had climbed to 72 cents, or approximately 9 cents higher than the railroad wage.

For the year 1941, railroad workers received an average of 67.1 cents when the average wage in the manufacturing industries had climbed to 84.1, which was 17 cents an hour greater than the railroad industry.

As I have already pointed out, the average railroad wage in June of this year was 73.8 cents, while the average in the manufacturing industries was 95.8 or 22 cents more than the railroad wage. Since the hearing, railroad wages have advanced about 1½ cents per hour—due to additional hours of work—while factory wages have advanced 6 cents, increasing the spread to more than 26 cents.

Wage earners in the manufacturing industries are being permitted and in fact urged to work overtime with time and one-half payments for work in excess of 40 hours. This increases their earnings over and above those for railroad men in a greater measure than would be reflected in the comparison of average hourly earnings, since the manufacturing workers get time and one-half time for their work in excess of 40 hours per week, whereas the railroad men work 48 hours and, in some instances, 60 hours per week at straight time rates.

Wages in the building trades, in the printing industry, in shipbuilding, in the aviation industry, and in other major industries are also substantially greater than those prevailing on the railroads.

Every skilled shop mechanic in the railroad industry today with basic wages of 95 and 96 cents per hour could obtain employment in other war industries tomorrow morning at wages ranging from $1.25 per hour upward. He could also add further to his weekly earnings because of the more favorable overtime provisions to which I have referred.

Every sectionman in the railroad industry today with an average wage of 53 cents an hour could obtain employment in other war industries at wage rates ranging from 75 cents an hour upward and with time and one-half time after 40 hours.

In the final analysis, however, the annual earnings of a wage earner are far more important than his average hourly wage. In this connection, the railroad industry produces an amazing picture of

miserably substandard employee earnings.

According to compilations derived from official Interstate Commerce Commission figures and covering the year 1942 when considerable overtime was worked, there were more than 250,000 of the employees involved in this railway wage dispute whose average annual earnings were less than $1,500 a year. Approximately 175,000 railway trackmen had average annual earnings of about $1,350 per year.

In this connection, it is interesting to recall that the United States Department of Labor publishes from time to time a statement showing the intercity differences in cost of living for 33 cities scattered throughout the United States and covering a so-called maintenance level of living standards. These are not healthful or desirable standards of living, but are referred to as maintenance standards below which, if continued for too long a period there may result physical deterioration.

The latest report of this kind as published by the United States Department of Labor was for the period of March 15, 1943, and of the entire 33 cities covered only one, namely Mobile, Ala., called for less than $1,500 per year. The majority called for annual earnings ranging from $1,600 to $1,800. I repeat that these annual earnings figures are not intended to be adequate for a proper or healthful standard of living, but are intended to show the lowest annual income for a four-person manual worker's family that will not produce immediate danger of physical deterioration.

Incidentally, contrary to the opinions of some, the lower living costs are not always to be found in the southern cities where railroad wages in many instances are at the low levels of 40 and 46 cents per hour. For example, the maintenance level for a four-person manual worker's family in Atlanta called for $1,628 in March of this year. The figure was $1,600 for New Orleans, $1,568 for Birmingham and $1,620 for Jacksonville.

In this connection, it might be pointed out that one of the railway management's exhibits introduced in the wage hearings conducted by the Emergency Board last spring showed that there were 121,140 railway employees whose basic wages were 47 cents per hour or less. There are 306 regular work days in the year under the railroad industry's agreements with their employees, and on the basis of 8 hours per day, an employee who works a full year of 306 days without losing a single hour in a single one of the regular work days, will be employed for 2,448 hours during the year. On that basis, these 121,000 employees at 47 cents per hour or less would earn $1,150 per year or less. These full-time annual earnings of the railroad workers in the lower wage brackets are $300 less than the lowest maintenance level requirements reported by the Department of Labor.

From these annual earnings figures, it is also very evident that railroad wage earnings are clearly substandard on an annual basis to the same full extent that they are substandard on the basis of average hourly earnings.

Under these circumstances, there is nothing surprising about the fact that the trained and experienced forces of the railroad industry have and are leaving it at an alarming pace for higher paying jobs in other industries. The surprising fact is that these railroad workers have remained loyal to their industry and stayed on their job as long as they have while this present wage dispute was being debated and delayed and obstructed for more than a year.

Railroad labor has always been recognized as a high type of labor and the veteran Members of this Congress are well aware of the fact that the railway labor unions involved in this dispute have commanded the respect and admiration of Congress for many years. Even those who raise their voices in the Halls of Congress against certain groups of workers have refrained from any criticism of that portion of organized labor represented by the railway employees. They are a high type of wage earner because the industry in which they are employed is of such a character as to necessitate the highest possible qualification. Unfortunately, however, the low wage rates now prevailing on the railroads have greatly impaired the standard of labor recently recruited to fill job vacancies.

This vitally important industry cannot and will not maintain a satisfactory level of safety or efficiency if it is required to recruit its workers from the lowest brackets of the labor market, and that appears to be precisely the situation that the railroad industry is confronted with at this time. The skilled and experienced men are leaving the industry in large numbers. They are hiring women to do men's work. They are employing 16-year-old children to work on trains and to perform other types of services for which they are unfitted. They are recruiting Mexicans, recalling their pensioners, and seeking the privilege to work war prisoners in this vitally important industry where sabotage on the part of 1 out of 100 could result in great loss of life and property and seriously impair the war effort.

It seems to me that the organized groups of railroad workers are now being unjustly penalized for their good behavior. For 20 years the railroad industry has not seen a major strike. Notwithstanding the lag in the railroad wage structure, these workers have continued on the job and have adjusted their differences with management across the conference table. For years they have paid for this good behavior through low wages and now they are being penalized by being denied an 8-cent hourly increase recommended by a President's Emergency Board after exhaustive hearings that extended over a period of more than 2 months.

If all this is representative of the results that we are to expect from the Office of the Economic Director of Stabilization, then as one Member of Congress, it seems to me that Congress could make a tremendous contribution toward the successful prosecution of the war by immediately abolishing that office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by Mr. G. C. McCall of Norton, Va., to Colonel Neal, chairman of the Selective Service Board in Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a newspaper article and in the other a brief address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one a news item and in the other an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate and greatly to be regretted that two great soldiers and generals are currently being placed in an embarrassing position by politically thinking individuals and groups who link their names with coming political campaigns.

With mighty military operations designed to crush Hitlerism and Tojoism impending, it is most unfair to General Marshall and General MacArthur, and to the millions of fighting Americans under their command, to suggest, even, that either of these great soldiers of the Republic, in an hour like this, would for one second give any consideration to relinquishing his post to engage in a political campaign.

I hope Democrats and Republicans, and everybody else, will refrain from mixing politics with war, and let our

generals lead us on to victory, unhindered by partisan squabbles that tend to divide our people.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that beginning on the 23d of this month the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will start hearings with reference to certain features of post-war planning. I think a great deal of economy can be effected in taking care of unemployment after the war if we have information, discusison, and deliberation with reference to various plans that may be suggested. The municipalities in many instances are quite willing to bear their own expense with reference to the necessary reconstruction and rehabilitation. We do not want to have a long period of idleness as we did after the last war, when we were paying out money for projects which were of no permanent value.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein comments by Mr. Eric Underwood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from the Director of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein three short editorials in regard to the Secretary of State's magnificent work at the Moscow Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program and addresses delivered at the Symbolic Adoption by Fordham University of the Catholic University of Lublin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Fordham University, in New York City, a university under the direction of the Society of Jesus, has set another fine example for our American universities, by her adoption of the Catholic University of Lublin. The formal ceremonies were held at Fordham on Sunday, October 31, 1943.

The appropriate furnishings for the Lublin room were provided by the General Pulaski Memorial Committee.

Every thinking person, interested as he must be, in the cause of learning and the preservation of culture, applauds the generous action of Fordham on behalf of Lublin University. At Fordham, we are sure that the sons of Lublin will find peace, encouragement and the complete opportunity to work and plan for her future in the post-war era in the homeland.

I am grateful to the membership for their unanimous permission to include the following program and addresses delivered at Keating Hall on adoption day.

The program and addresses follow:

INVOCATION DELIVERED IN POLISH BY THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR JOSEPH C. DWORZAK

To all who view these presents the trustees of Fordham University and Fordham College give greeting in the Lord.

In the moment of crisis a mother seeks her child's safety before her own. So Poland today, pillaged and oppressed, with outstretched arms implores the world for a shelter and a home for her young University of Lublin.

Hearkening to the mother's cry of misery, Fordham clasps to her breast the destitute university and lovingly opens to her within these halls a refuge from the ruin of war.

Yes; and also a haven of hope, of sure hope, whose fountainhead is the noble patriot, His Excellency, Vladislaus Raczkiewicz. In youth and age, in war and peace, at home and an exile for her cause, he has never failed Poland in her need; and in her latest and her greatest agony it was to him and to him alone that she turned to be her leader and her President. Under his guidance, please God, the glad day will soon dawn when Lublin University according to her sure hope will resume her life and home in a peaceful and prosperous Poland.

Accordingly by these presents we, the trustees of Fordham University and of Fordham College, authorized to that purpose by the supreme power of the State, bear witness that His highly esteemed Excellency, Vladislaus Raczkiewicz, has been advanced by us to the honorary degree of doctor of laws, and endowed with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereunto.

And in proof thereof we have issued these presents under the seal of our corporation and the signature of the president of this college.

Fordham University, New York, the 31st day of October, in the year of Our Lord 1943.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF THE REVEREND ROBERT I. GANNON, S. J., PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Why select a Polish university rather than Danish or Dutch or Norwegian? Because in spite of our difficulties with the miserable business of phonetics which seems to separate us from eastern Europe more than from the west, Poland is closer to our own United States than almost any other occupied country. Its art and literature and music seem like our own. Americans enjoy their Chekhov and Dostoievski—but they have the feeling of being far from home when they read them—Lord Jim, on the contrary, and The Nigger of the Narcissus, With Fire and Sword, and Quo Vadis are practically American books. The same with music. Mussorgsky is a treat and we find even the Soviet symphonies interesting. But Chopin is a part of every cultured American's emotional life. Even our political ideals are very nearly identical.

Old slanders are always being revived to the effect that Poland is a nation of serfs ground down by aristocrats who can do nothing but fight among themselves. That is what Russia and Prussia and Austria always wanted the world to believe. It was true once of Poland as it was of almost every other nation in Europe. But if one is going back to semibarbarous times, why pick on Poland?

She was one of the first to liberate the serfs, the first to elect her kings, the first in Europe to organize education for the masses on a uniform basis, the first in Europe to achieve constitutional government founded on the right of the people to rule. This was in 1791 in the midst of the French Revolution. Kosciusko had just returned from America where he had done so much to liberate the Thirteen Colonies and because he wanted another United States in eastern Europe, the three great powers that surrounded him did the Adolf Hitler, and Poland vanished for 125 years.

Even today, however, people keep saying as though 't were a reproach, "Poland is just as full of peasants as ever." What they mean is that farmers there wear picturesque clothes instead of overalls. They are peasants, yes, but the kind that any country would be proud to have. Spiritual, shrewd, and brave. When the Bolsheviks under Trotsky thought they could make Poland a Red bridge into Europe (Trotsky had boasted that he would water his horses in the Rhine) all their blandishments failed to move the self-respecting Polish peasant. He chose order rather than revolution and elected one of his own, the great Witos, as prime minister of his country. It took more than intelligence. It took courage and courage he still possesses in abundance.

The frightful blitzkreig which swept the land in a few short weeks while England and France were wringing their hands in helpless anguish did not prove that 10 Germans are better than 1 Pole, but merely that 1 armored tank is worth a hundred brave men on horseback.

All this has made it natural that Fordham should want a Polish university on its campus. But why Lublin? Why not glorious Cracow, or beautiful Lwow down on the borderland—or Wilno, or Warsaw? Because Lublin, founded in 1918, was the symbol of the new Poland, the achievement of the incredible group of men who took over a devastated country which had not ruled itself for 125 years, organized its armies, its finances, its judiciary, its education, its foreign service, and solved its land problem to the satisfaction of the agricultural classes.

Now that Paderewski and so many others of these great men are dead who wrought this national miracle, President Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz is the embodiment of his country. In paying homage then to Lublin University and to the head of the Polish Government, Fordham reverently and solemnly salutes the spirit of modern Poland.

This very week momentous decisions are being made by our allied representatives in Moscow. We feel sure that much definite

good will be accomplished, but in some respects we can only hope for the best.

Doubtless, however, our repesentatives are mindful of Napoleon's words on St. Helena, "My failure to establish a strong Poland, the cornerstone of European stability, my failure to destroy Prussia, and my blunder with regard to Russia were the three great errors of my life."

Hitler has established the present-day peril of the third great error. May the United States and her dearest ally not overlook the other two.

ADDRESS OF DR. OSCAR HALECKI, PROFESSOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW AND DIRECTOR OF THE POLISH INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN AMERICA

Prof. Oscar Halecki, of the University of Warsaw, director of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, president of the Polish University in Exile which was created in Paris, in the fall of 1939, with the participation of representatives of the University of Lublin, expressed to the president and trustees of Fordham University the the deep gratitude of the Polish University professors for their generous decision to adopt the University of Lublin.

"In times of peace," said Professor Halecki, "the University of Lublin would celebrate on these very days the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, simultaneously with the same anniversary of Poland's restored independence. Being one of our youngest universities, it has, however, a tradition going back as far as 1594, when a university was created at Zamosc, a few miles only from Lublin by the great statesman and educator, Jan Zamoyski. Reviving that tradition, the founders of the University of Lublin placed it in a city famous in Polish history. It was here that the Polish-Lithuanian Federation originated in 1386 and was definitely established in 1569.

"Like that of Zamosc, the new university was founded with a view to spreading western culture in the east of Europe, and it is worth recalling that Lublin is the only Catholic university east of a line going from Nimwegen in Holland and Louvain in Belgium through Fribourg, Switzerland, to Milan and to Rome. The Polish center of Christian culture, suffering cruel persecution with all the other Polish universities, is now connected with one of the most important Catholic centers of learning in the United States of America, a large university directed by the same Jesuit order which started the Polish universities of Wilno in 1579 and of Lwow in 1661.

"Smaller than these and other State universities of our country and remaining a private foundation, supported by the Polish hierarchy Lublin closely cooperated with all our institutions of higher education and the high standard of its instruction was officially recognized. The distinguished scholars who during more than 20 years were members of the Lublin faculty, created in connection with the university and the well-known library of Lublin a learned society which issued many valuable publications. The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America is happy to be able to offer a few of these publications to the new Lublin Hall on the Fordham campus in honor of our colleagues in Lublin, Poland, to whom the symbolic ceremony of tonight will be a unique comfort and a ray of light amidst the darkness of their present existence.

"May I express the hope that Fordham's inspiring example will be followed and that other Polish universities will be as fortunate as Lublin in finding American institutions interested in their survival."

DEDICATION OF THE LUBLIN ROOM

By this unique ceremony, Fordham University, desirous of keeping alive that great and ancient tradition of Polish culture which the invader has sought systematically to annihilate, will provide on its own campus a hallowed spot where Lublin can find an honorable refuge until the day of victory and peace when all the universities of Poland will light their lamps again.

CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

The conferring of the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws on His Excellency Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, president of the Republic of Poland.

ADDRESS OF JAN CIECHANOWSKI, POLISH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, Your Excellency Most Reverend Bishop, Mr. Vice President, members of the faculty, ladies, and gentlemen, I have the signal honor gratefully to receive on behalf of Mr. Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, president of the Republic of Poland, the degree of doctor of laws honoris causi, which the rector and faculty of Fordham University have bestowed upon him.

On behalf of President Raczkiewicz I have the honor to express his profound gratitude for this high distinction and to assure the Reverend Rector, the members of the faculty, and alumnae of Fordham University, that he will always greatly value and cherish this distinction which he accepts as a high tribute paid to Poland and to the Polish Nation, for centuries the vanguard of Christian ideals, ever ready to fight and to suffer in their defense.

Hitler has been endeavoring to destroy all Poland's intellectual life, to exterminate our spiritual leaders, our scientists, professors, teachers, writers, musicians, and poets. The Germans in Poland are torturing and murdering them in the hope of turning Poland into a spiritual desert, and of reducing our population to slavery.

In adopting the Catholic University of Lublin, and thus symbolically taking the first step toward the rebuilding of ruined European culture, Fordham University is paying a tribute to the faith and culture of Poland, so valiantly fighting for our common ideals and civilization.

This university is paying a tribute to the sufferings of those innumerable martyrs, tortured to death and trampled down by the blind robots of German "Machtkultur."

I can assure you that when the news of the noble gesture of Fordham University reaches Poland, it will strengthen the spirit of those who are fighting and perishing there. It will prove to them that there are spiritual forces in America which are watching to insure that out of this brutal war there will emerge a better world, in which their wrongs will be righted.

In our modern world of mechanical and technical progress, the sky appears to be the only limit of human enterprise. The speed of scientific achievement precedes the actual requirements of our life. We follow breathless in the wake of discovery and invention and endeavor hastily to adapt our lives to the profound changes caused by scientific progress, rather than to control and to direct its course.

Life consists of hasty mental and physical adjustments at a pace which drives us on, ever expectant and eager to fit our lives to the miraculous innovations of our hectic century. In this atmosphere of speed, thinking appears to have become the greatest of all adventures. And yet, never before has calm, concentrated, and constructive thought been so urgently indispensable.

Two world wars of unprecedented magnitude and consequences have been allowed to succeed one another in the course of one quarter of a century. They were separated by the short breathing space of an unstable peace.

In both cases, after brief hesitations, civilized mankind rallied successfully to the defense of the principles of Christianity, justice, and human decency, mortally threatened by the revival of a mechanized expresssion of prehistoric barbarism.

But the tragic truth remains that, had we been as bold and as united in time of peace, as we finally became in time of war—both world conflicts would have been prevented.

The now certain victory of the United Nations will bring the end of actual fighting. Upon the smothering embers of a total war, in the midst of unprecedented chaos, of suffering, famine, destitution, and despair hitherto unrecorded in history—human statesmanship will be called upon to establish a just and durable peace, to restore new and permanent bases of security, to build, this time, upon solid moral, political, social, and economic foundations a new world order of peace for all nations in which international confidence will replace distrust, and the consciousness of real security will abolish fear—that most dangerous element of insecurity, which for some 30 years has dominated international relations.

Never before has human statesmanship been faced by so stupendous a task. Providence has never given so great a responsibility to mankind, or so great and so creative a chance of reasserting and reinstalling the great moral values and principles of our faith, of justice and freedom for all people.

To face these realities we will have to launch wholeheartedly into the great adventure of constructive thinking.

We will have to reject the temptations of cowardly appeasement and wishful thinking, patchwork statesmanship, superannuated concepts of power politics, of division of the world into spheres of interest, of precarious theories of balance of power.

At the price of countless millions of human lives and material wealth sacrificed in these two world wars, we have learned that world war and world peace alike are indivisible, that in our times of abolished distance isolation has become but a futile slogan, and collaboration in peacetime is not a matter of choice, but a matter of even more urgent necessity than in wartime.

We must realize that not only both war and peace have respectively become indivisible—but that also justice and freedom are indivisible, and that real security and social peace require that prosperity should likewise be regarded as indivisible the world over.

While these important considerations will have to guide the thoughts of the statesmen entrusted with the task of planning the future peace, they will have to reach even deeper to the basic human fundamentals for their guidance.

Paradoxical as it may sound, experience teaches us that the purest idealism and the highest principles have to be invoked to stir up nations to fight a war, that most inhuman thing in the world, whereas cynicism, compromising with ideals and principles, and crude materialism appear to govern our minds when establishing the conditions of peace, that most natural and noble state of human and international relations.

If mankind is to be saved from the recurrence of the scourge of aggressive wars, we cannot compromise with the ideals and principles for which we are fighting. We must be determined to apply them in practice in building the future peace.

The noble principles of President Woodrow Wilson and his League of Nations concept did not fail because they were too idealistic. They failed because the United States refused to collaborate in their application and because the statesmen responsible for their maintenance were too timid to support them by the realism indispensable to enforce them in our world of imperfect human beings.

History proves that all past methods of establishing and maintaining peace have been unstable, precarious, and relatively short-lived.

Living for over 30 years in an atmosphere of insecurity has profoundly affected our

very mentality. Events threatening peace have outdistanced statesmanship. Statesmen dominated by the fear of conflicts applied palliative measures calculated to prolong an insecure peace, rather than resort to bold measures for the reestablishment of real security.

But the most perilous consequence of insecurity was undoubtedly the tendency on the part of some powers to glorify the state at the cost of the individual freedom of the citizen. Aggressive totalitarian imperialism and enslavement can flourish only in countries where individual freedom does not exist.

To build on a world scale the foundations of security necessary for the establishment of a just and enduring peace, it will be indispensable to give full consideration to this important fact.

Freedom is not a limited birthright of world powers, or even of smaller States. Freedom starts with that of the individual. The greatness of the Catholic doctrine, the whole strength and enduring rightness of democracy depend on the respect and preservation of the freedom of the individual. That is the most fundamental, the most precious achievement of our Christian civilization. It is its very foundation. It is the essence of our faith in the existence of the human soul. It is the mainstay of family life and of that of the human community which is the only sound basis of national existence and independence and of international equality.

This fundamental principle must be reinstated, fully maintained and safeguarded in establishing the new world order of peaceful human collaboration on the basis of equality, which alone can bring to our torn and suffering world lasting peace and real security.

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REVEREND STEPHEN J. DONAHUE, D. D., AUXILIARY BISHOP OF NEW YORK

I am indeed happy and privileged tonight to preside at this very unusual and unique ceremony. His Excellency our beloved archbishop and distinguished alumnus of Fordham requested me to represent him on this occasion and extend his best wishes to the eminent envoy of the Polish Government. He deeply regrets that previous important and pressing duties prevented him from personally being present.

This function is unique in character because it is believed that Fordham is the first American institution of learning to adopt another university for the duration of the war. Tonight Fordham assumes the kindly role of an educational stepmother as she extends the hand of true friendship and maternal protection to Lublin University, known and lauded throughout Poland and Europe since the days of its foundation. The president of Fordham has already stated his reasons for this act of kindness. He wishes it to be recorded as a "slight return for the cultural help and influence which our universities had received from the Old World and as an expression of the principle to keep the lamp of learning burning everywhere throughout the world in spite of the oppression and temporary devastation of totalitarianism."

Catholic education, like the Catholic faith, will never die or be extinguished in the hearts and minds of men. The mission of the Church is to preach the gospel to every creature everywhere. Vandals may tear down and destroy our institutions; tyrants may torture and put to the sword the bodies of Christ's followers, but the living, burning, ardent faith which is implanted in the souls of men can never perish from the earth. "For behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world," is Christ's promise.

Yes, the valiant courageous unbroken spirit of courageous Poland is still unconquered. Tonight we pay our tribute of admiration and respect to the sturdy faith, the dauntless hope, and the intrepid courage of the Polish people. Their persecutors and oppressors have ground them almost into the dust, but the light of their spirit still flickers and will flame again most brilliantly as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow. Poland has heard and is following the council and admonition of Christ Himself when He said to His disciples: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another."

It seems a far cry from Lublin University to Fordham University in New York, but the charity of Christ and our Catholic faith have spanned that distance in the twinkling of an eye of love. Tonight the president and the faculty of Fordham are to be commended and praised for this generous act of sympathy and encouragement manifested towards a sister university, innocently suffering the ravages of a cruel war.

May God bless doubly the loyal sons of Ignatius who, true to the spirit of their saintly founder, did not pass their neighbor by, but have brought Lublin University into their very household to await the day of liberation and peace.

May God give comfort and strength to the Polish people whose intense sufferings and cruel privations have been chronicled again on the pages of history as symbols of courage and fortitude and fidelity. May the day soon dawn when we shall see Poland rise again glorious and triumphant to take her rightful place among the world where she shall bring the inspiration of her Christian culture and Catholic tradition to those who have refused to accept and acknowledge Christ as their King.

May God bless Fordham University. May God bless Poland. May God bless the United States of America.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the death of the New Deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. W. Arthur Simpson, a farmer and businessman and long-time public official, before the Montpelier Rotary Club, November 8, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech delivered by Mr. Roane Waring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by Wayne W. Parish, editor and publisher of Aviation, to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the regular order of business, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there obection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other legislative matters and special orders are disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for a period of 20 minutes, on November 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES AND THE PRICE OF MEAT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Price Administrator Chester Bowles in his first press release as the new Administrator, attempts to inform the public that unless Congress grants money for the payment of subsidies that the price of food to the housewife and to the consumer will advance tremendously, and I quote, "A 5-pound rib roast would go up in price by 23 cents while 3 pounds of veal cutlets would cost the housewife 18 cents more than the current price. A 15-pound ham would go up 67 cents, butter would increase by 10 cents a pound."

Mr. Speaker, it must take a great amount of mental gymnastics and the juggling of figures to have the price of meat go up 6 cents a pound if the subsidy now being paid the packer of $1.10 a hundred on the carcass is removed.

It must be remembered that when the roll-back was established on meat last June that immediately the price of cattle was rolled back on to the farmers and the producers. Just why an increase of 6 cents a pound for veal would occur with the removal of the subsidy of 1.1 cents per pound can only be understood by a professor of economics. It does not make sense to the rest of the country. I looked over their complicated charts, and being only a physician, they confounded and confused me to the *nth* degree.

It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the President who is responsible for these bureaus, is intent upon blaming Congress for increased living costs if they do not provide subsidies. It is time, Mr.

Speaker, that this Congress demand action and insist that a food administrator who has the authority will deal with all matters pertaining to food, its production, processing, and its distribution.

The day of reckoning is not far off, and may the angels of Heaven have mercy on these poor deluded economists and new dealers who are making such a mess out of price control and the production of food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Eldorado.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORDELL HULL'S WORK AT MOSCOW

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called attention to the fact that a little group of interventionist propagandists throughout this country were abusing and maligning Cordell Hull and trying to prevent his being sent as a representative of the United States to the Moscow Conference. Secretary Hull, is an internationalist and not an interventionist. He has done a great work; no man on earth could have done it better.

Yet, today, we find this same group of interventionists—not satisfied with maintaining peace among the nations of the earth but wanting us to intervene whenever their plans are interfered with—criticising Secretary Hull for what he did at Moscow and criticizing the United States Senate because it has carried out the provisions of the Moscow Conference agreement and followed the mandate of the Constitution of the United States in providing a legal method for approving any international agreements we may enter into.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, Cordell Hull has done a great work, and if he never did anything else but to turn down this little group of interventionists who are trying to dictate the foreign policies of the United States, he would deserve the undying gratitude of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 20 minutes.

STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include three newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISASTER THREATENS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago, the President told us that the war must be viewed as a whole; that the home front could not be separated from the battle front. In a sense, that is true, for the victory cannot be won if the battle of production and transportation be lost here at home.

Just as two armies with a common objective must work together, so must we at home give unqualified support to the men at the front, and just as the objective of a campaign may be lost because one army fails to give proper support, so may the war be lost because of our failure on the home front.

The President also pointed out that, even though the victory be won abroad, inflation and the evils which always follow might bring disaster. Others have time and again called attention to the futility of a military victory if the end of the war finds us without our liberty, our freedom, our constitutional form of government.

Disunity in France, the yielding of the government to the demands of minority labor groups, brought France to her knees and the German divisions to Paris. Here in America, the ruinous results of the President's labor policy are today apparent to even the most unobserving, the most biased and prejudiced so-called friends of labor.

The press, as day follows day, carries notice of new strikes, of the continuation of old ones. In so many localities, in so many industries, has the production of guns, of tanks, of planes, of ships, of ammunition, been slowed down or completely stopped, that even the great daily newspapers, which for months, although fully aware of the situation through their own news items, have lacked the courage to comment editorially and to condemn the evil, have at last begun to speak out.

In editorial after editorial, during the last few weeks, some of the editorial writers of the great dailies have ventured to clearly point out the danger which is so fast overtaking us.

In last night's Washington Star, appeared two editorials. They are marked exhibits A and B and printed herewith.

It is encouraging to at last learn that some of the editorial writers, who, in years gone by, have condemned and branded as antilabor those of us who saw and pointed out the danger long ago, now have the courage to join in the drive to remedy the situation.

In one of these editorials, we find this paragraph:

> Mr. Lewis has demonstrated that in time of war he can bend the Government to his will. He can do this because the Government—the administration and Congress—has made him so strong that his strike could not be broken without paying a ruinous price in terms of lowered military efficiency.

It is true, as stated in that paragraph, that Lewis has demonstrated that, in time of war, he can bend the Government to his will. It is equally true that the administration and governmental agencies, whose policy is dictated by the administration, have made him strong.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Concurring entirely in what the gentleman has said so far, did not the gentleman some few months ago tell this House the passage of the Smith-Connally bill would do away with the strikes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who told the House that?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I understand that you did, amongst many others. You certainly advocated its passage to do away with such strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not tell this House the passage of the Smith-Connally bill would do away with strikes. I thought it was a step in that direction. But I never said at any time, at any place, that any law would be self-enacting; that the passage of any law would by its enactment cure any evil. When you have an administration that will not enforce the law, Congress can enact until it is black in the face and all the paper has been used in printing laws, but you cannot stop wrong conduct merely by passing a law. The gentleman is aware we tried that when we adopted prohibition.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Yes, but the gentleman was well aware of that before he advocated the passage of the Smith-Connally bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly. You would not repeal all the laws against murder and arson and robbery and larceny would you, just because those crimes are still committed? The passage of the Smith-Connally law was a move in the right direction, and if the President of the United States would perform his sworn duty and enforce that law now it would aid in lessening strikes.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Has not the Smith-Connally bill legalized strikes to the extent that it has told the employers—and I happen to be one, or I happen to be an executive of one—to the extent that if they have a secret ballot then the strike is legal if it is certified by the W. L. B.?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the Supreme Court legalized strikes and picketing long, long ago. You are surely aware of that.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I am surely aware that today if my employees strike the only recourse I have under the Smith-Connally bill is to go to the Government and have them take over. Under the Smith-Connally bill they cannot strike against the Government. Then the Government takes my business and tells me what I have to pay and all the rest of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is correct, but that hardship does not grow out of the Smith-Connally law, it was practiced before that law went into effect. And whose fault is it that that injustice prevails? It is the fault of the administration.

To go back to the charge that Congress is partly to blame for the present deplor-

able situation, it is true that Congress as a whole has permitted Lewis, Murray, Green, and other labor leaders—some of them racketeers, some of them convicts—to defy the law of the land, deprive the citizen of his constitutional rights.

It should be remembered, however, that the House on two occasions, by a two-thirds vote, passed the Smith bill and sent it to the other body, where it never was acted upon. It should not be forgotten that the House, by a substantial majority, passed the Hobbs bill and sent it over to the other end of the Capitol, where it was quietly buried.

Because of the inaction of the other body, racketeering and extortion—what one Supreme Court Justice characterized as plain highway robbery—is still lawful, insofar as Federal law is concerned.

Congress did assist, through the La Follette so-called Civil Liberties Committee, the C. I. O. in its organizing drive. It did aid the C. I. O. and the Communists within its ranks when they unlawfully, in violation of constitutional rights and the law of the land, took possession of the property of individuals; converted it to their own purpose; drove honest workingmen and women from the jobs on which they were dependent for a livelihood.

By the enactment of the Wagner law and the subsequent interpretation and administration of it; by a National Labor Relations Board which, by its bias and its prejudice, its utter disregard of the unquestioned rights of employees, finally brought down upon its head not only the condemnation of employers but of William Green and of John L. Lewis, both of whom characterized it as unfair and biased, the foundation was laid for our present strikes.

A little quiet thinking, the use of a little common sense, would have made it apparent to even the most casual observer as early as 1937 that the administration had set its feet on a road which could end only in disaster, even in time of peace, and which, if followed through, in time of war would make it impossible to win the war, would bring defeat.

The determination of certain Communists and of certain labor leaders to subjugate industry and production to their will became apparent in the late days of 1936. There was information during the closing months of that year that the Communists, infiltrating into the labor unions, intended to wreck free enterprise; to, if possible, destroy our constitutional government.

On the last days of December 1936 and during the first days of January 1937, armed goon squads from other States, some traveling hundreds of miles, invaded Michigan; took possession of private property; intimidated and beat peaceful employees and, from January until the 10th day of June 1937, violated the laws of the State, of the Federal Government; defied the courts and, while so doing, received the support of the then Governor of Michigan, Frank Murphy, now on the Supreme Court of the United States, and of the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In a minute.

Today, although the Congress, by a more than two-thirds vote, passed the Connally-Smith Act outlawing strikes in war industries except under certain circumstances, and although that law has been repeatedly violated, the President of the United States has failed to perform his sworn duty, institute prosecutions through his Attorney General and end the intolerable situation which today is lessening, as it has for months past lessened, the flow of needed munitions of war, which otherwise would have gone to the men who are doing the fighting and the dying for the preservation of this Government.

For months, we have known that slowdowns, work stoppages, and strikes have lessened the ability of the men on the front to protect themselves, to defeat the enemy; but, during all that time, this administration and the Congress, let it be said, have failed to take aggressive action to eradicate the evil.

Just last week, testifying before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, the head of a union, one Tom DeLorenzo, admitted that the employees of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation in certain of its plants had not worked more than one-third of the time and he also admitted that, during the same period of time, many of the employees had received pay and a half and double pay.

Pay and a half and double pay is one of the special privileges granted by this administration to workers of the Nation, who, through their organizations, are powerful politically.

This same union president, who controls some 18,000 workers, admitted under oath that he "declared war on" the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation because it did not give his union credit for certain social activities.

He also admitted under oath that, when it was sought to induct certain employees into the armed service, and Major Brady, of Selective Service, asked the management of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation to determine whether the worker was essential, he, DeLorenzo, as head of the union, told management to notify the Navy that it was "none of its damned business" whether a certain individual should or should not be inducted, and to advise Major Brady of Selective Service that he could "go to hell."

This administration and the country as a whole and the men who are fighting our battles thousands of miles from home are now reaping the fruits of the seeds the administration planted when, in the early days of 1937, in utter disregard of every principle of justice and of law, it supported the violence and the unlawfulness of the sit-down strikers.

Bear in mind that it was in the 1936 campaign that labor unions contributed some $770,000 to the New Deal campaign fund and that, of that amount, John L. Lewis and his union advanced some $500,000.

Why did the unions contribute three-quarters of a million dollars toward the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt? What did the unions expect to get?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with a great deal of what the gentleman says.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All of it so far.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. But he is talking here now about what some of us knew before. It is a question of the Executive and the administration; it is not a question of the necessary laws, the passage of laws, or the repeal of laws. The gentleman pointed that out himself, and yet a few months ago he advocated the passage of a law; and what is he advocating now? A lot of us already know what he is saying.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield for a longer speech; the gentleman must get a little time himself. I will admit I knew all this—the danger that is inherent in lawless labor practices which destroy the liberty of the citizen.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. What good is the war going to do then?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows; he is not dumb. The purpose of the war is the defeat of our foreign enemies. We here at home must carry on and win the battle on the home front, that is, production for the armed forces and the preservation of our constitutional liberties.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. What good is the war doing?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows I did not advocate war. I know that Members of the House knew of the danger which would come to our Government through unrestrained strikes, violence, and a disregard of law, and, by the introduction of bills, I attempted to remedy the defect in the legislation then existing.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman just admitted that laws do not do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is not accurate. I admit that laws which are not enforced are of no value. But the primary responsibility for enacting laws is upon Congress, then the burden shifts to the Executive. If he fails, it then becomes the duty of Congress to see that the laws are enforced. I must decline to yield further; I have only a few minutes more. The gentleman asks why I do not do something about it.

The reply is obvious. I am only one of 435 Members of the House and neither the Speaker nor the House will let me vote more than once. You give me 400 votes, or 250 and I will show you something along that line.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. But the gentleman just said that a law was no good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct if it is not enforced. The House passed the Smith bill twice by a two-thirds majority and sent it down the aisle.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. It did not do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; we did not get anywhere with that bill because it did not become a law. We cannot control the Senate. We passed the act and sent it over there. We passed a bill, the Hobbs bill, and sent it over there, a bill which merely prohibits racketeering by union men, extortion by union men, and over there it is pigeonholed because of the influence of the executive department, of an administration which as the circumstances indicate made this trade with labor politicians. The gentleman says that a law does not do any good? He asks why not do something?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman himself said it, Mr. Speaker; he said it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Way back in 1939 I spent some 60 days rewriting the Wagner Act which practically everyone admits is the foundation of much of our present trouble. To that act, and the gentleman ought to agree with that, to that act I offered a substitute which provided that a man should be allowed to join or not to join—oh, yes—or not to join; a union, that employees should be free from coercion from any source—get that—from union bosses, racketeers like De Lorenzo, men like Green and Murray who insist that no man shall work, not even in support of a son or brother who has gone to the front, unless he has paid tribute to the union.

Another change was that the findings of the N. L. R. B.—and that Board was condemned most vigorously by both Murray and Green—should not be final. I put that bill in. What became of it? I have reintroduced it at every session since and it is still before the Congress. Most people will admit that the Wagner law needs revision. It needs amending. Has the gentleman done anything to help me? Oh, no; that would be anti-labor. He did not know it was before us, did he?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman has just announced it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have announced it many times before.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I was not in the House when it was first presented.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has been here for several years, and surely he must know that this situation has been called to the attention of the House almost every week.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Every day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will go further and I will say that I have labored with my colleagues but I did not get anywhere, perhaps because of my method or my personality, or it may possibly be because there was a fear of the labor vote. But since the election earlier this month I notice that there is a drive on, especially on the Republican side, to enact remedial legislation, to cut appropriations, to bring about economy, to insure full, all-out support of the war.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I desire to get back to the main subject of discussion, which, as I understood it, was that away back in 1936, 1937, and 1938, when those sit-down strikes occurred in Michigan, the President and the then Governor of Michigan, Governor Murphy, at that time sowed the wind which we are now reaping in the form of a whirlwind. Is that the thesis of the gentleman's speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot be that poetic or oratorical. I am just saying the new dealers are now getting what was coming to them. Unfortunately, as the rain falls on the just and the unjust, so the consequences of the administration's political maneuvers, of its disregard of constitutional processes, fall now upon the innocent as well as upon the guilty new dealers.

Mr. MASON. It is a whirlwind they sowed at that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Everyone knew it was coming and this House lacked the courage to force through the Senate legislation which would have cured it.

We have had two elections. We had one in 1942, in which this House received a mandate as to what it should do. We had another one earlier this month and it now seems certain that Republicans will force action, and that, with the help of the Democrats—and many of them are not at heart new dealers—we may be able to accomplish something.

All power to those Republicans who, since election, have perfected an organization designed to carry on the work which I have been doing for the last 5 years. Five years is a long, long time to plead for action in behalf of the people, especially when the necessity for it—to me, at least—seemed evident and beyond question.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish the gentleman would not be so hard on the Republicans. There are twice as many Republicans who sit here day after day seeking an opportunity to enact legislation which will rescue the country from the New Deal's fallacies as there are Democrats.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have noticed that. But let me say to the gentleman that there are many Members on the other side who have no use whatever for New Deal policies; and if we on this side will just avoid giving them offense, welcome their aid, and assist them with their problems, we shall find our task much easier.

Let us go back now to this question of the political contributions made by the unions.

Did they contribute it so that they might call strikes without fear of Federal interference? Did they contribute it so that, when controversies arose, the administration would take the part of labor as against management?

Because of that contribution, did the Government afterward, when war came, seize the property of corporations, compel employees, who did not want to join a union, to join a union, pay an initiation fee, monthly dues, and special assessments?

Were the special privileges granted time and again to members of certain unions granted because of the contribution which had been made during the 1936 campaign? Has the granting of these special privileges, the immunity from prosecution which certain labor leaders have enjoyed, been the result of the continued political support given to the President in successive campaigns?

What connection, if any, is there between the political support given this administration by Curran's maritime union and his deferment from active service, "red" as he is?

See Pegler's article of yesterday on Curran, printed herewith as exhibit C.

Why was Walter Reuther, one of the brothers who said, "Work for a Soviet America," deferred when his number came up? Was it because Reuther was expected to swing the votes of the union men, whom he controls, to the support of the President when needed?

Sidney Hillman, born abroad, at one time member of a Federal board which passed upon questions of interest to union men, was, at the same time, paid a salary by his union. Hillman now is one of the fourth-term boosters.

Louis Lepke Buchalter was, in New York, convicted of murder and ordered to be executed. Two of Buchalter's co-defendants are in the death house at Sing Sing, awaiting execution. It is said that one of Buchalter's backers is Sidney Hillman. The Federal authorities are holding Buchalter; will not deliver him to the New York authorities to be executed for the murder of which he was convicted. Is there any connection between the fact that, so far, the President has failed to order the Department of Justice to turn Buchalter over to New York authorities, and the fact that Sidney Hillman is a fourth-term booster?

Is there any connection between the fact that Walter Winchell, week after week, viciously and falsely charges Senators and Congressmen with a lack of patriotism, and the fact that, when his nasty libels could be no longer stomached by the Navy, he was called, figuratively speaking, to spew forth his filth from his place beneath the White House porch, under which, like a whiffet, the President shelters him?

Yes, the President has slapped in the face his War Labor Board, Administrators Byrnes and Vinson, and, while the miners were still on strike, defying him; while their activities were endangering the operation of our factories, upon which the success, the very lives of our armed forces, depended—the President settled the coal strike. He surrendered. He surrendered to John L. Lewis in time of war.

The Treasury Department may print the President's likeness, in its bond-selling campaign, on billboards throughout the country, and in the papers. He may be hailed as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but the head of a union can get by with the statement

that a major in the Selective Service can "go to hell."

There was nothing new in the attitude of DeLorenzo, as given to the Naval Affairs Subcommittee last week. Way back in 1939, Local No. 208, C. I. O., told the Navy to do the same thing, and the Navy—the administration—did nothing about it.

Yes; the President, as President and as Commander in Chief, settled the coal strike and, in settling it while the men were still on strike, he acknowledged that John L. Lewis was his master.

Today, as the result of the settlement of the coal strike, the Nation is now confronted with the demand of certain railroad workers, of the steel workers, and of others, that they, too, be given increases in wages.

The clawing, snarling cat of the sit-down-strike days has become the tiger of today, and the President lacks either the courage or the inclination to stand back of Congress in its efforts to bring about an all-out production on the home front.

On the President's doorstep is the overgrown dictator, which was nursed and nurtured by the President when the sit-down strike was characterized as but an expression of social progress, social gain.

That the foregoing remarks may not be branded as carping criticism without the suggestion of a remedy, permit me to again call attention to the fact that, down through the sessions of this House held in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942 attention was repeatedly called by me to the situation and, as long ago as March 13, 1939, the Wagner Act, the unfair provisions of which are now recognized as the vehicle which brings much of our trouble, was completely rewritten and a substitute offered to the Congress.

In parallel columns, on pages 1280 to 1297 of volume 86, part 14 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, will be found the original act and the act as rewritten by me.

Even though the rewritten bill may have been imperfect, even though it did not completely meet the need, a careful reading will show that its adoption would have prevented, had it been enforced, many of the evils which exist today.

If it is not presumptuous, let me once more call the attention of the majority leadership, of the minority leadership, to this bill, which was reintroduced in 1941 and again this year.

Permit me, too, to suggest to those Members of the House, who spurred on by the results of the last elections and now riding the crest of the wave of popular indignation against the New Deal, that they give this proposed revision of the Wagner Act consideration and adopt it as one of the planks of their program.

They have been irked, as I have been irked, by the inaction of the House; by the failure of the House to assert itself, to insist that it was a coordinate branch of the Government; by its failure to fight the administration's attempt to render it innocuous.

Of course, the situation has been a difficult one. First there was a depression. Then came the war, and every man who ventured to oppose the New Deal was, by its smear artists, its scandal mongers, branded as unpatriotic. But now the tide has turned and those who wanted action have the opportunity to get results.

I will be only too glad to aid in their efforts and I congratulate them upon the stand which they have taken. A united active Republican organization in the House, with the assistance of our friends on the other side, can restore the Government of this country to the people.

Let us be about the business of our constituents.

EXHIBIT A

GOVERNMENT YIELDS

The one valid justification that can be advanced for the "settlement" of the wage dispute with the United Mine Workers is that the Nation's wartime need of coal left the President and his subordinates with no alternative but to come to terms with John L. Lewis. No one can seriously doubt that this was the case. But, when this acknowledgment is made, it follows inevitably that Mr. Lewis and the miners, using their economic power and the other weapons conferred on them by "slanted" laws, have been able to force the Government to yield to their demands.

This is a fact which cannot fail to give rise to grave misgivings. When one man and one union, comprising a negligible minority of all the people can successfully dictate to the country as a whole we cannot hope to escape undesirable consequences. First, there are those of an immediate nature.

In this instance, Secretary Ickes, acting under instructions from the President, negotiated a contract with Mr. Lewis while the miners were on strike in open defiance of a Presidential order that they return to work. That destroys a fundamentally sound policy of the War Labor Board—not to treat with any union while a strike is in progress—and it is an open invitation to other irresponsible labor leaders to enforce their demands by resort to strikes. The rights of the employers—it seems a little ridiculous even to mention employer rights in this setting—have been trampled on in the settlement, which they will have to accept if they are to get their mines back. Finally, the higher earnings that the miners are to receive will necessitate an increase in the price of coal. That strikes at the heart of the stabilization program by nullifying the proposition that increased earnings will not be approved if they result in higher consumer costs. In effect, Mr. Lewis has been pacified at a price which is to be passed on to the consuming public. No amount of equivocation can conceal the truth of this.

These are some, but not all, of the losses which may be expected to flow immediately from this settlement. In the longer view it has even more disturbing implications.

Mr. Lewis has demonstrated that in time of war he can bend the Government to his will. He can do this because the Government—the administration and the Congress—has made him so strong that his strike could not be broken without paying a ruinous price in terms of lowered military efficiency. If Mr. Lewis can do this during the war, what is to be expected when the restraints imposed by military necessity are lifted? Is a government which finds it necessary to yield in wartime going to assert authority in behalf of all the people when hostilities have ended? There is little reason to believe so, and it is certain that this will not be done while we continue to operate on the theory that organized labor is economically weaker than industry, and that therefore it needs the protection of a legislative system heavily weighted in its favor. When this war is over we are going to face the question whether organized labor, protected by weighted laws, is going to dictate to the Government, and through the Government to the country as a whole. If the pattern of the coal settlement is to be followed this will be the case. But the ultimate answer rests with all of the people.

EXHIBIT B

THE THREAT GROWS

The President's new five-man committee to investigate living costs is linked directly to organized labor's developing drive to crack the Little Steel formula and win wage increases not now permitted by the anti-inflationary stabilization program.

All available statistical studies make it abundantly clear that living costs have not advanced nearly so fast or so far as the income of unionized workers, but some weeks ago a labor victory committee complained to Mr. Roosevelt that such studies—specifically the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics—did not reflect true conditions and that actually the workers were finding it more and more difficult to cope with rising prices.

This complaint is one reason why the new committee has been called into existence. Another reason—the more important of the two—is that the C. I. O., aided and abetted by the A. F. of L. and encouraged by the Government's soft and self-contradictory policy in the coal-strike "settlement," has begun to press for wage boosts greater than those allowed by the Little Steel formula, the first demand being for an increase of at least 15 cents an hour for the Nation's steel workers. Presumably the President's cost-of-living inquiry, to be conducted by five members of the War Labor Board, will seek to determine whether such demands are justified in the light of the present structure of consumer prices and whether that structure has been described with reasonable accuracy by agencies like the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The time allotted for this is 60 days, during which the unions, it is assumed, will hold their fire, thus letting the present stabilization program stand at least until January.

The outlook is no more promising than that. Both the C. I. O. and A. F. of L. are reported to be ready to demand wage increases of 10 percent, or if not that, a compromise figure of 6 or 7 percent. And if they should get it, upward adjustments would be required for all the Nation's workers, adding perhaps as much as $5,000,000,000 of "dangerous money" to the annual income of wage earners. The inflationary threat implicit in this is too obvious to need elaboration.

More than a committee to study living costs will be needed to head off this danger; to meet it, Congress and the administration together will have to be much tougher and much more farseeing in respect to it than they have been up to now.

EXHIBIT C

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, November 8.—It was a foregone conclusion that, on appeal to Washington, Joseph Curran, the president of the National Maritime Union, would be permanently excused from the armed forces and relieved of all risks of that second front in France for which he and other soap-box "commandos" of the Communist Party have been clamoring. In recognition of his valuable services in furtherance of the conspiracy to seize the American merchant marine, Mr. Curran has been placed in II–A by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, who acted by order of President Roosevelt. The

case went to the President on appeal by the union, which is to say on appeal by Curran himself, because he runs the union, after appeal board No. 4 had overruled a deferment granted by local board 18. Meanwhile, of course, other clients of local board 18, lacking Curran's political influence at the White House and the correct ideology, are off in the fighting forces, some of them, no doubt, in battle.

Curran's slogan and the basis on which his indispensability was based is that he keeps them sailing by sending other men to sea through the agency of the union. That many of those who do go to sea as civilian merchant sailors have been draft dodgers attracted by the high wages, some of the officers of the Navy's armed guard or gun crews will testify with disgust, if they are assured that they will not be identified until the war is over and they are safe from political persecution by the pro-Communist authority in Washington.

Thus, the Navy Department protects the Navy's enemies and punishes officers who would like to tell about the loafing of union sailors and the heckling and harassment of enlisted men by sea-going civilians. One such officer recently told of taking a stand when his vessel was attacked and threatening to shoot any member of the crew who tried to put a boat over and abandon the ship without orders while his own bluejackets stood by their guns. He recalled also the refusal of a young merchant sailor to help his men load ammunition because that was not his work, and the incident aboard a transport in which the merchant crew knocked off at quitting time and took the winch controls into seclusion with them so that the Army could not scab their job of unloading stores which were needed in a hurry by soldiers fighting the Japs not far away had been related independently by two young officers—one of the Navy, the other of the Army—back from the South Pacific. In fact, the files of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the shipping companies contain a rich and racy record of the conduct and attitude of unionized civilians in the war zones in contrast with the disciplined loyalty of the armed forces.

The secret of the contrast may be found in the oath which is forced upon sailors of the merchant service which runs as follows:

"I solemnly swear to be true and loyal to the union and the labor cause and to put into practice the principles laid down by the preamble and the constitution, and to obey all rules the union may adopt." The enlisted sailors and commissioned officers of the Navy, of course, swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America above all others.

Under this oath, the merchant sailor makes himself liable to fines and to dismissal from the sea if he condemns communism and, in a notable case, a man actually was put on the beach in New York and fired from an Army transport at that, because he had offered a resolution against communism in a convention of Curran's union in Cleveland.

And, although Mr. Curran gets his deferment for keeping 'em sailing and although many new American ships have been turned over to the British, Norwegians, and Dutch because we could not man them, this union, through its own private system of kangaroo courts, regularly grinds out sentences which rule sailors off the sea for periods of from 6 months to 99 years or life for conduct unbecoming a union member which may be only an anti-Communist remark, impoliteness to a Communist union official, or some familiar manifestation of racial disharmony.

At one recent meeting 13 sailors were beached for varying periods, at another 2 were laid up and at another 11 were subtracted from the merchant service, most of them for conduct unbecoming to union men.

Mr. Curran constantly boasts that he has raised the civilian sailors' wages enormously, but the union just as vigorously resents reminders that the men are paid vastly more than the bluejackets who sail on the same ships and share the same perils.

The union is much embarrassed by references to draft dodging and therefore one brother recently was expelled from the union, because, among other offenses, he was alleged to have said he was not interested in the union and would not be at sea now had it not been for the draft board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a summary of the purposes and objectives of the bill, H. R. 3556, creating an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, introduced by myself on October 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FRANCO'S NEUTRALITY—SEVER RELATIONS WITH HIM

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to pay a high and deserved tribute to our eminent Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, because of his distinguished performance at Moscow, resulting in the Moscow Pact, the Four Power Pact. I believe that America owes our Secretary of State a real debt of gratitude. In a parliament a cabinet member returning from such a triumph would be given a stirring welcome. We do not have that practice in this country. I would that we had such a practice. Nevertheless the Secretary of State, having been once a Member of this House, has the privilege of this floor, and I hope that the Speaker of the House and others in authority might extend an invitation to the Secretary of State to enter this Chamber, where I am sure he would be most welcome and where the Members of this House would be most happy to offer him the genuine and sincere praise for a rare statesmanship exemplified particularly at Moscow.

Despite what I say in praise of the Secretary of State, we nevertheless cannot remain uncritical of some of the things that are happening. All wisdom does not reside within the State Department, and I may say that some of the good things that have emanated from the State Department have been the result of its being stung in criticism. The State Department has not taken unkindly to some of the things that may have been said of it and which have been of a constructive character. No matter how highly we regard our Secretary of State, we would be derelict in our duty as we see it, if we would not at times highlight our disagreements with certain policies formulated. Even a loving wife may call to task a loving husband. Even a fly may sting a stately horse. Only on the anvil of discussion may the truth be known. In such light I desire you consider my remarks on Franco and his Falange.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think it would be helpful if we had the same system they have in England; namely, having the members of the Cabinet appear before Parliament or the legislative body and discuss what is being done?

Mr. CELLER. I am in hearty accord with that procedure and particularly when we remember that the State Department is the only department under the Constitution that need not render a report to the Congress. For the latter reason we know less about the State Department than we do of any other department. The President delivers messages often in person to Congress. The State Department is immune.

I would that that provision of the Constitution were wiped away so that we would have the privilege of hearing the Secretary of State perhaps in executive session, in camera, if public necessity demands, explain to us some of the intricacies of his Department and some of his difficulties and some of his policies and the execution or failure of execution thereof. It would go a long way toward establishing better public relations than have heretofore existed between the American public and the State Department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is often difficult to have the Committee on Foreign Affairs meet with the representatives of the State Department.

Mr. CELLER. I think that would be a halfway measure only to have the members of the lady's committee hear the representatives of the State Department, difficult as that presently may be. I do not think it goes far enough. I think more frequently, probably, the Secretary of State might well meet with the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs or even the full membership of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that the new Under Secretary of State will appear before our committee more often.

Mr. CELLER. I hope that we more humble Members of the House also may have the benefit of that enlightenment the Under Secretary gives to the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The distinguished gentlemen of the Committee on the Judiciary should certainly have that privilege.

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman does not know about it, I understand that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has introduced a bill, the details of which I do not know, which would, I believe, accomplish what the gentleman from New York is talking

about; that is, it would bring the various Cabinet members before the House for interrogation. It would not compel them to come before the House, because I do not believe we can do that under our constitutional system, but questions would be submitted to them from the floor and they would answer them, except as to those questions about which on account of the war they decided it was best not to have a public discussion.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The idea conveyed in the Kefauver resolution is praiseworthy.

I wish to offer some friendly observations, with no desire whatever to dictate in the slightest degree our foreign policy anent Franco and the Spanish Falange. Be it remembered that Franco maintains on the Russian front, directly or indirectly, a so-called Blue Division with a number of thousands of Spanish men. He keeps those men on the Russian front fighting our stanch and brave ally, Russia. Russia has been bled white in this war. She has lost several millions of her people. Those saintly sacrifices are in part for our benefit. Every soldier shot by members of the Blue Division maintained in Russia by Franco to that extent weakens our own cause, the cause of the United States. It is to my mind no different from shooting one of our own men.

This man Franco made a commercial agreement recently with the papier mâché leader of the Italian Government, Mussolini. He has offered best wishes to Hitler only recently for Hitler's ultimate triumph over the Allied Nations, over the United States. Madrid is a pipe line of intelligence clear to Berlin. All the convoy movements, all our troop and ship movements past the bottleneck of Gibraltar and into the Mediterranean are known within 24 hours or less to Hitler, as a result of that pipe line of intelligence to Berlin. He had the temerity within the last few days to felicitate José Laurel, head of the Jap puppet government in the Philippines. Of course, this is not surprising, because in word and deed Franco is a Fascist terrorist and has always opposed the democracies, including the democracy of the United States. However, in the light of these felicitations to this Japanese puppet ruling over the Philippines, what can General MacArthur say, what can General Wainwright say, who is now a Japanese prisoner suffering, very likely, the tortures of the damned. What can the loved ones of the thousands of our troops who went through the valley of the shadow of death in the Philippines say when they read of these words of congratulation offered by Franco to José Laurel.

In a way our toleration, our coddling, our truckling to Franco, who thus espouses the causes of our enemies, is too shocking. It must summarily cease.

At the present moment Franco's most effective role is running the Fascist fifth column in Latin America against the United States, against us. His agents are found everywhere in South and Central America, poisoning the minds of the natives against us. He is causing immeasurable trouble to the United States, particularly in Ramirez Argentina. In the meanwhile, on top of all this, which is beyond my simple comprehension, we have our own Ambassador at Madrid offering paeans of praise to Franco. We have appeased Franco time out of hand. We sent him petroleum, we sent him cotton, we even sent him 1 ton of quinine that is so badly needed in the malaria-infested zones in the Far East. Thousands of our soldiers coveted and needed that quinine which was sent to Franco. We paid him blackmail to keep him "neutral," "neutral" according to Franco's peculiar connotation of "neutral." It is a fine sort of neutrality. This sort of back-scratching praise of Carlton Hayes, our Ambassador, must cease. It has to cease. If not, we might well crack his knuckles.

When a man puts a broomstick between my legs to trip me and then thumbs his nose at me, and then throws mud at me, as Franco did the United States, it is time to call a halt. In common parlance, I am for giving a hotfoot to Franco and the Falange. I would even go so far as to sever diplomatic relations with Spain. That is my humble opinion.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that our State Department accorded recognition to Franco within 24 hours after he captured the city of Madrid, and arranged for the advance of a credit of $25,000,000 to Franco's government within 2 weeks thereafter.

Mr. CELLER. I think in the light of subsequent events even the State Department regrets its action in that regard. Certainly I regret that action on the part of the State Department and I am sure the gentleman does.

Call it global war, call it people's war, call it World War No. 2, whatever noncommittal label we affix to it we know the issue to be that of freemen everywhere against tyranny.

That as a nation we were slow to grasp its meaning, of its cooly calculated growth in the proving grounds that were Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Spain, in no way indicated our approval. With disastrous myopia, cured by Pearl Harbor, we failed to understand that in the very nature of nazism it could not keep itself within the confines of the land that gave it birth. It could no more be caged than one can keep a stench in a closet. Its trumpeteers blared forth the prophecy of world conquest, and to make good its boast caused the hand of brother to be raised against brother, divided house against house—and then stepped into the breach. Chamberlain's pathetic "Peace in our time" bore no relevancy to the truth.

We know now that there could be no peace so long as the cancer remained alive anywhere, even in Spain. Wheresoever and in whomsoever it flourishes, there we meet the foe, in Quisling Norway, Vichy France, Ramirez Argentine, or in Franco Spain.

At first we believed there was no price too high to pay for Spain's neutrality. We wooed her with cotton credits, with gasoline, with wheat, meat, rubber. We turned aside when a gang of Fascist students from the University of Madrid stoned the American Embassy. The pro-Nazi antidemocracies' pronouncements in the press and official speeches went on without let or hindrance. Anti-American posters were freely displayed in Madrid. We sent a million and a half dollars' worth of flour, dried and condensed milk, and medicine to Franco Spain, paid for out of a congressional appropriation to the Red Cross for the relief of war-stricken countries. But our gesture of good will was not permitted to be seen by the Spanish people. The trucks transporting the gift bore nothing to indicate they were from the Red Cross or even from the United States. These markings were painted on later, but they were so small that it was barely possible to see the Red Cross and impossible without close examination to see that it was the American rather than the Spanish Red Cross that was responsible. The Spanish Army, which provided trucks to move the food from Cadiz to Seville, loaded the sacks with the side bearing the inscription "Gift of the American people to the people of Spain" turned down. It was part of the agreement that the Franco press should give plenty of space to our gift, but the truth is that the Nazis obtained more publicity for their offer, which, incidentally, they never fulfilled, to aid the victims of a fire at Santander in the summer of 1941, than we have from all our appeasement efforts since the end of the civil war, not even for the whole ton of quinine we so graciously let them have—quinine so urgently needed by our lads in the Far East.

The press continued to pour forth its vituperations against the United Nations and it was not until we became tough and demanded from Spain in return such vital materials as cork and tungsten ore that we at last embarked on a realistic course of behavior. It was our gasoline embargo that finally resulted in proving to Franco Spain that we no longer chose to play the role of beseecher, of the seeker of favors. Since we now buy from Franco more than we sell him, the question of further credits no longer exists.

But Franco must be convinced that in any of our relationships with him we are acting in the interests of an Allied victory, not because we are frightened of him or that we approve. Franco Spain and the United Nations are terms mutually exclusive.

And thus it is that we cannot afford to sit back with smugness, assured that the situation is well in hand. We must get tough with Franco. There still remains the anomalous situation of our little get togethers with Franco Spain on the one hand and the evil-reeking Blue Division of Spain fighting on the eastern front against our ally, Russia, on the other.

With the invasion by Hitler of Russia in June 1941, the Blue Division of volunteers was formed and left for the Russian front. Russia is our ally. She is being bled white in her valiant advance against the Nazi hordes, our common foe. Yet Franco continues to maintain against the Russians his Blue Legion of Spaniards who oppose the Russians every inch of their arduous way. Certainly the killing of Russian soldiers by Franco's men can hardly be regarded as a neutral activity by any stretch of the imagination.

True, the press carried reports on October 14 that it had received reliable diplomatic information that Franco had already withdrawn the Blue Division and that it had arrived in Spain. There is no explanation, of course, of why one recent broadcast reported that Gen. Esteban Infantes, the division's present commander, had been given the Iron Cross, nor why the regular Blue Division news broadcast by Celia Jimenez continues to come out of Berlin, nor why the Radio Madrid continues its regular Falange broadcast giving Blue Division casualties. But there is a growing suspicion abroad that the Blue Division will gradually be changed into a foreign legion fighting under the German flag, thus giving Franco to play his neat little double-dealing game. The dissolution of Franco's Blue Division will be the seemingly humble response to United Nations pressure and the Foreign Legion of Spaniards will be the salute to Hitler.

Franco has uttered no "a plague on both your houses." Of all Europe, it is "neutral" Franco who has contributed the largest single anti-Soviet foreign unit to Hitler's eastern forces. It originally was created with about 18,000 men, including 2,000 military students from Spain. There is no accurate way of estimating how many thousands of Spanish Falangists passed through it, saw enough action to get some basic war training, and then were shipped back to Spain. Latest estimates place the number of men in Russia at 10,000—10,000 "neutrals."

Remember the Scriptures provide us with a stirring phrase, "He who is not with me is against me."

Franco has not feared in spite of his professed neutrality, to advertise his product. The Division wears Spanish uniforms with German insignia sewn on and the Spanish monarchial colors, red and gold, on the right sleeve. The word "Espana" is included. The war has produced many incongruous situations, made strange bedfellows, indeed, but none more at cross purposes than a neutral country asking and receiving from one set of belligerents the materials it vitally needs and then sending its soldiers to fight under the insignia of the opposing set of belligerents. Treachery shows many countenances, the snarling and the urbane, but the most incomprehensible, I believe, is the spectacle of Franco's bleating before the council of the Falange his determination that Spain shall stand aside from the world conflict. I know a number of 14-year-old Americans who would reply, "Whom does he think he's kidding?"

What Franco terms the "Holy Crusade" against the Communist bogey has received its most shattering blow in the joint four-nation declaration, the Moscow Pact. They have united in a common pledge "to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression." The hope of the Axis to disunite the United Nations by screaming of the Bolshevist menace is blasted. With the signing of the pact, the emotionalism that attended the waving of the "red herring" must dissipate, and the most convenient weapon of the Axis in setting brother against brother will have lost its strength. The fear made so much of by the Axis propaganda machine that Russia would control the making of the peace is now without foundation. No excuse whatsoever exists either on moral or ethical grounds for the maintaining of the Blue Division on the eastern front. It has to go. Do you want it to go? I am sure you do.

The massive victories of the Red Army in Russia, the smashing British-American invasion of Italy, the pulverizing air attacks on the Reich, and the constantly mounting strength of the United Nations in every particular have all combined to make the Spanish dictatorship an uneasy one. Fully 40,000 Spanish guerrillas recruited from civil war veterans and youth groups conduct open warfare against Franco with machine guns and mortars. He is losing his grip on his own army officers. Frankly the bell of doom may be tolling for Franco as it did for Mussolini and as it will for Hitler. We must make that warning a siren's shriek. There is little doubt as the tide of victory rises, Franco will make a bid, basing that bid on his neutrality, for Allied favor, will try to jump on the bandwagon. Then it is we must again proceed warily.

It will be remembered that he praised Hitler and Mussolini, that he gloated with their early victories, that he is in command in Spain because Hitler and Mussolini willed it, not the people; that he spied against us, lending aid and comfort to the enemy in blatant, boastful manner. The meaning of the coalition now ranging itself against him in and out of Spain is clear. The starved, the beaten, the interned in Spain knew that the fight for freedom everywhere is a fight for their freedom as well. The rumblings of the freemen of Spain are heard above the dictatorial mouthings and Franco stirs uneasily. I fear me he has bad dreams.

Soberly and in humility of spirit, without the bitterness of vengeance, we watch the death throes of fascism with the realization that to win the peace, fascism, nazi-ism, and falangism must be completely and thoroughly eradicated. Wherever it remains or is allowed to remain, it will be an eddying pool, spreading in all directions; it will be the spot of decay infecting as it touches. The lives of the young, the gallant, the free, and the brave must not have been given in vain.

In view of the dastardly character of recent acts of Franco—the Blue Division in Russia, his spies in Latin America, the commercial agreement with Mussolini, the congratulations of José Laurel—I humbly petition officialdom that our diplomatic relations be forthwith severed.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the expiration of all business on the Speaker's desk and special orders as of record, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD EMPLOYEES AND THEIR WAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] for 15 minutes.

THE STABILIZATION DIRECTOR'S "BIG STEAL" WAGE POLICY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recent developments indicate that under the affectionate care and paternal guidance of statistically minded bureaucrats the War Labor Board's Little Steel wage formula has grown up to be the Stabilization Director's "big steal" wage policy.

Both formulas and policies, however, have definite antisocial aspects that cannot be concealed by all the patriotic browbeating that has surrounded their infamous existence. This is found in the fact that they hold wages to 15 percent while living costs have mounted much higher, thereby lowering the living standards of some American workers, already underpaid, to still lower levels that border on pauperism.

STATISTICS REVEAL PAINFUL INCREASES IN COST OF LIVING

The Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living figures, recently found unreliable by a distinguished committee of economists and educators, show an over-all increase of living costs of 23 percent and an increase of food well in excess of 40 percent. Here we have unreliable Government statistics showing a 40-percent increase in the price of food that the Stabilization Director wants met with a 15-percent increase in wages. But that is not half the story. These figures fail to show the evil effects of the Nation-wide food black markets which have become a national disgrace. They fail to show the reduced quality of the many items entering the cost of living. They fail to show many other factors well known to every housewife in every town and community in America, but smugly disregarded by our percentage jugglers.

SACRIFICES ARE UNEQUAL

The pious prattle of our bickering bureaucrats that all our people are making equal patriotic sacrifices is pure unadulterated nonsense. The more fortunate few in the upper brackets may be forced at times to take fried chicken when they prefer sirloin steak, but they are not actually going hungry. With railroad wage earners, paid as low as 46 cents an hour, the story is altogether different.

UNDERLYING FACTORS ANENT RAILWAY WAGE ADJUSTMENTS

When considering the War Labor Board's Little Steel wage award in its

relation to the present railroad wage dispute it is important that several underlying and closely related factors be kept in mind. Among these are:

First. The Little Steel award fixed a minimum of 78 cents an hour for common unskilled labor in the steel industry.

Second. The report of the President's Emergency Board filed with the President under date of May 24, found that of 1,097,180 railroad workers employed as of October 1942 and involved in the wage dispute—

about one-half of these workers—544,106, or 49.6 percent—received less than 70 cents an hour; 411,684, or 37.5 percent, received less than 60 cents an hour; 255,813, or 23.3 percent, received less than 55 cents an hour; 160,438, or 14.6 percent, received less than 50 cents an hour; 104,269 received the prevailing minimum rate of 46 cents an hour, and 16,871 received less than 46 cents an hour.

Third. In the railroad labor dispute the President's Emergency Board reported that—

The average earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees involved in this dispute, embodying skilled, semiskilled, and nonskilled workers, as of October 1942, were 73.8 cents an hour.

This was 4.2 cents less than the 78 cents fixed by the War Labor Board in its Little Steel formula for common unskilled labor in the steel industry.

Fourth. Following the application of the Little Steel wage award, and as a result of its effect upon wages in the steel industry, the average hourly earnings of all workers in the steel industry in October 1942 was $1.077 per hour according to National Industrial Conference Board figures. This was 23.9 cents above the 73.8-cent average for the million nonoperating railroad workers.

HOURLY PAY DISPARITIES

There is no justification for one Government agency fixing a 78-cent minimum for common labor in the steel industry while another Government agency cancels a wage increase for railroad workers who receive much lower rates of pay. There is no justification for paying highly skilled mechanics in the railroad industry less than the overall average for the steel industry as a whole, including its common labor. How can the Government justify itself when it establishes a 78-cent hourly minimum for common labor in the steel industry and then quibbling about an 8-cent hourly increase for skilled railroad carpenters who only receive 74 cents an hour.

PACIFIC ELECTRIC WAGE CASE

In his October 25 approval of the Pacific Electric wage case the Stabilization Director clearly indicates that his wage conclusions are not to be based upon the factors set forth in the Stabilization Act nor upon all the factors embraced even in the Little Steel formula. He has become "15 percent minded" to such an extent that he is apparently becoming blinded to the evil effects of existing wage inequities and wage inequalities. In his Pacific Electric statement he frankly admits that the cornerstone of his wage policy was the general rule of not granting wage increases.

He frankly admits there is not a proper balance in some wage scales as compared with others but complacently dismisses this unstable economic factor with the fatalistic observation that there never was and probably never will be. He continues with the equally unstable reasoning that his freezing of wage rates will not result in inequalities any greater than those which existed before he climbed upon his dictatorial throne. Thus, the Stabilization Director builds his stabilization program on the preservation and perpetuation of wage instability.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's opinion, with which I agree, with O. P. A. failing to hold the price, and with profits appearing to be unlimited by reason of no obligation, excepting renegotiation, that now it remains singularly true that labor itself has been isolated in its right to petition for relief by the arbitrary awards of the War Labor Board?

Mr. COFFEE. I agree thoroughly, and thank the gentleman for his contribution.

RAILROADS PROSPEROUS NOW

The railroads of the United States are enjoying the most prosperous period in their history. The first 8 months of 1943 showed gross revenue of class I railroads of the United States increased 28 percent over the corresponding period in 1942. During the same 8 months in 1943, the net revenue of these railroads increased 41 percent over the net revenue they secured in 1942 for the corresponding period. In the first two-thirds of 1943 the net earnings, after taxes of the railroads, increased 30 percent over their net earnings in the same period in 1942. In the full year 1942 the gross revenues of class I railroads of the United States passed the $7,000,000,000 mark, or the peak year in all history. This prodigious amount is one and one-fourth billion dollars higher than the peak year 1929 when the railroads enjoyed the greatest gross revenues of any year up to that date or since that date to the year 1942 in American history. These are statistics that are irrefutable and should give us pause.

STARTLING DISPARITIES IN HOURLY PAY

The top scale hourly pay received by the skilled mechanics employed on American railroads is 95 cents. This is the per hour compensation given machinists, blacksmiths, and so forth. On most railroads carpenters receive but 74 cents per hour, yet, beginning welders in shipyards and aircraft factories draw $1.15 per hour. In many war plants an unskilled worker receives as high as $1.40 per hour. Think of the effect upon the spirit of a skilled worker who has spent 10 to 30 years in his profession and has finally attained the top grade of 95 cents per hour, noting that a high-school girl in a war plant is being paid higher hourly remuneration than he obtains. When it comes to the highly skilled mechanics in war plants, the hourly pay is invariably 50 to 100 percent higher than that paid to railroad workers in the same category. Yet, railroad workers are compelled to spend the same amount for grocery bills, insurance, and taxes as those receiving much higher wages.

All of us sincerely hope and pray that it will not be necessary for railroad employees to go out on strike, nor to resort to any drastic steps to secure long overdue adjustments in their pay on a fair and reasonable scale, which is all that they request. I deplore the denial to these men of their just desserts.

WE SHOULD ELIMINATE WAGE INEQUITIES

The railroad workers do not object to good wages being paid the employees in war industries, but they feel that their own should be adjusted upward, to enable them to be placed more on a parity with such workers. Even without considering the high rates paid in war industry and the seasonal industries, such as building construction, railroad employees still receive considerably lower wage rates than comparable groups in outside industries. Wage rates in outside industries, even with the exclusion of the exceptionally high rates, are on the average approximately 10 cents per hour higher than the railroad workers.

In July 1942, more than one-fourth of all common laborers in the United States were paid at starting rates of 75 cents or more, per hour. It can be seen then that 1 out of every 4 adult, male, unskilled workers received a rate of pay higher than the 73 classes of railroad employees, which include skilled, semiskilled workers, as well as common laborers. Only 8 months after Pearl Harbor, in the Little Steel case, the National War Labor Board fixed the minimum rate of pay in the steel industry for common labor at 78 cents per hour, which is considerably in excess of the average hourly earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees, including skilled and semiskilled workers. Why not treat the railroad employees in comparable fashion?

The prayer of these underpaid railway workers should be granted now. Why penalize the most faithful essential skilled war workers in America by denying them minimum justice in the matter of wage adjustments? I plead for action consistent with the dynamics of a changing age.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I would like to make this observation. The gentleman has just said that he is hopeful that the railroad workers will not strike. That strikes me as somewhat similar to the statement that I made in the Well of the House concerning the coal miners last May. I said at that time that it was possible to break the morale and the will of the coal miners by continually keeping them under subnormal wages, and, likewise, it appears to be the same thing applies to railroads at this time. Our best wishes are that they will not contribute to the difficulty of our country while in

war by going on strike, but unless the War Labor Board and this Government listen to their petition that is exactly what will happend, and they will not be at fault. It seems to me that some of the older Members of the House ought to bring forth some legislation whereby all these categories of wage earners who do not fall directly in the war effort should not fall under the direction of the War Labor Board until their wage has at least reached a level comparable with the wage of ordinary workers in war industry.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman, and I understand that such a measure is now under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the five transportation brotherhoods, representing the engine, train, and yard services of the railroads of the United States, embracing 350,000 workers in number, bitterly protest against what they regard as a trifling 4-cent-per-hour increase recommended by the so-called Emergency Board. These unions had asked for a 30-percent raise, in order that the wages of the workers might be placed on a parity with that of other industrial employees, consistent with the substantial increase in the cost of living. The operating railroad workers presented irrefutable documentary data justifying such an increase to the Emergency Board.

Even that Board announced the men were entitled to a much higher increase than 4 cents per hour, but insisted it was stymied from awarding a greater amount by the restricted interpretation placed on the administration's wage-stabilization program by Economic Stabilizer Fred M. Vinson.

HAD REASON TO BELIEVE INCREASE WOULD BE GRANTED

The 4-cent increase was denominated an insult by the 600 general chairmen of the organizations comprising the operating railroad employees at a 2-day conference recently in Chicago. The issue was ordered to the membership via a strike referendum. This was embarked upon only as a last resort. The railroad brotherhoods have been working for months to obtain justice on wages for their members. The representatives of the railway unions had been repeatedly told that they could expect to be granted a reasonable increase, but just when they had grounds for believing the compromise increase would be ratified, all such previous commitments were repudiated.

Although the Emergency Board found on the record that the employees involved in the dispute had made out an impressive case for a wage increase to eliminate gross inequities and, further, in the interest of more efficient prosecution of the war, indicated it was just that they should receive such an increase, they nevertheless recommended that the employees involved receive but 4 cents an hour increase, effective as of April 1.

LITTLE STEEL FORMULA ASPECTS

The Board based its allowance of such an infinitesimal adjustment upon the so-called Little Steel formula. The railroad employees are exacerbated by this decision. The misnamed Little Steel formula denies justice to the workers and should be revised in the interest of equity and fair play. It should be remembered that the cost of living to the railroad worker requires the expenditure of practically all of his income, whereas the cost of living to people of higher income requires the outlay of but a small percentage of their income. The cost of living has gone up a minimum of 42 percent, which is the major item embraced in the presented case of the railroad workers. By denying a reasonable increase to the 350,000 operating employees of the railroads, these highly skilled and very intelligent employees are left no funds with which to invest in household furnishings and other items which go into the general cost of living. These employees have a difficult time in setting aside any money with which to purchase War bonds and stamps, donating to the Red Cross, Community War Chests, and so forth.

These five brotherhoods affected have seduiously endeavored to get a square deal for their men for 10 months and have exercised the utmost patience during all of that time.

A SEATTLE CASE IN POINT

Every day food prices are going higher, yet the men have not been given their wage increases. Here is a typical case of injustice, as practiced on one individual: In Seattle, Wash., a Pullman conductor works on his railroad 240 hours a month. His gross monthly wage is $196, net $150, after deductions. This conductor has a next-door neighbor, not a skilled worker, but who, prior to his employment in a war plant, had no experience in such a job. If this neighbor works in the shipyards, at a job requiring no skill, for the same number of hours as the pullman conductor, he will draw $360 as compensation therefor. To me it is absurd and ridiculous that such disparities are not recognized. A high-school girl, as an apprentice welder in a war plant, draws $1.15 per hour.

EDITORIAL IN LABOR

In the current issue of Labor, a publication of the Railway Brotherhoods and a beautifully edited and well-conducted publication, there appears an interesting editorial, which I quote.

RAIL WAGE CASE UP TO MR. ROOSEVELT—WILL HE TREAT THE WORKERS AS HE WOULD BUSINESSMEN WHO MADE AN EQUALLY IMPRESSIVE SHOWING?

If businessmen, engaged in the production of vital war supplies, were to go to the White House, appealing for higher prices, and were able to show that costs had gone up to such an extent that they could not "break even," what would happen?

Would the President turn them away on the ground that, if their request were granted, the Nation would be involved in devastating inflation? Would the newspapers denounce them as unpatriotic?

Of course, not. Mr. Roosevelt would immediately start the machinery to assure the businessmen fair treatment and every newspaper in the land would applaud him.

In saying this we are not indulging in wild guesses. We all know that before businessmen consented to touch war contracts they were permitted to "write their own ticket," so far as the prices were concerned, and Congress pushed through a tax bill which met with their approval.

In fact, their profits have been so huge that for months the Government has been renegotiating contracts, saving billions for the Treasury, but leaving the businessmen such a wide margin that responsible Government officials insist they will have surpluses totaling $50,000,000,000 after the war is over.

Railroad labor is not asking anything like that. It is requesting an extremely modest wage increase, in order that rail workers, who are doing an extraordinary job in this war emergency, may be able to keep pace with soaring prices, increased taxes, and the urgent demand that they help finance the war.

Why shouldn't railroad workers be treated with something like the consideration that President Roosevelt and his lieutenants would promptly display if businessmen were presenting an equally persuasive case?

As labor sees it, this railroad wage issue is now on the desk of the President of the United States. He can dispose of it in 48 hours. All that is necessary is a little common sense applied in a spirit of fair play.

SENIORITY, LOYALTY, MORALE INVOLVED

It takes years for the average operating employee of a railroad to attain a seniority rating, assuring him of continuation of employment. This seniority is a coveted possession, for which the railroad worker struggles long and assiduously. It is the principal factor which encourages him to remain at work on railroads, despite disparity in wage income with skilled employment in war industries, such as shipyard workers, aircraft factories, munitions, etc. It has been my experience that these railroad workers have never asked for any unfair increase of remuneration or improvement in working conditions. They seek justice only. I beseech the administration to act now and take steps to insure that these men get the compromise wage settlement they have heretofore accepted, but which, at the eleventh hour, was denied them. Do not undermine the morale of railroad workers. The business life of this Government is geared to the efficiency of railroaders. They have been overworked, they have been compelled to operate their freight trains overloaded with freight, and passenger trains overloaded with passengers. Old equipment is being employed, even the most inferior types—roadbeds are being overused. Under the strain and impact of war, the same safety precautions cannot be employed to the fullest extent, as compared with normal times. Hence, the railroad workers today are subjected to greater hazards and are putting in much harder work during the hours they are employed. They are a patriotic group. They have given generously of their sons and their brothers to the armed services. They have bought tremendous amounts of War bonds. It seems to me we are reaching an unfortunate state of affairs when one bureaucrat, heretofore identified with the judiciary, can substitute his own judgment for that of the combined and considered opinion of those most conversant with the problem—when one official can obdurately undo the agreement between management and labor representatives. Such an arbitrary pronouncement of a

mere 4-cent increase is not consonant with the spirit nor traditions of democratic government. Let us accord justice to the 350,000 men who comprise the operating employees of the railroads of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter and also a table of figures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J Res. 95. Joint resolution relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

CONTINUATION OF GOVERNMENT OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 189, to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the joint resolution?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the law in the Philippines provides that the term of President Quezon ends on the 15th of November 1943, and that the Vice President shall succeed him as President. The purpose of this resolution is to continue things in status quo until such time as the President of the United States shall issue a proclamation that constitutional processes have been restored in the Philippine Islands. At the present time the gentleman of course knows that the Philippines have been overrun by the Japanese, and that they are in control. The legislative branch of the Philippine Government and the judicial branch of the Philippine Government are prisoners to Japan. The only government the islands have is the Government which is in existence here in the city of Washington. That is the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand this resolution is recommended by the Army and the State Department. I would like the gentleman to tell us whether or not the administration has recommended the joint resolution. Has the President asked this bill be passed in view of the fact that it changes the Constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth Government. I was wondering whether or not it had the unanimous approval of the President of the United States and the State Department and the Department of Justice.

Mr. BELL. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's inquiry. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and also to myself as chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. This letter is signed by the President of the Philippines, by the Vice President, by the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, by the Secretary of National Defense, by the Secretary of Information on Public Relations, the Secretary of Finance, the Auditor General, and the secretary to the President. Those signing this letter requesting this action, constitute not only the President and Vice President of the Philippines, but also all of their cabinet and all of the responsible officials, you might say, of the executive department of the Philippine Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that all Philippine officials who are here have agreed upon this, but I would like the gentleman to reply to my question, whether or not our administration has sanctioned that action.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will give me time, I will do that. I have a letter from the Department of State, signed by the Acting Secretary of State. He calls attention to this resolution which is before us at this moment. The last paragraph of the letter is very short and I will read it:

The Department of State has been asked to comment on this proposal, and I desire to state in connection with the request that the Department is in sympathy with the purpose of the legislation.

Sincerely yours.

It is signed by Mr. Stettinius. Acting Secretary.

Perhaps you will be interested in what the War Department thinks, so I will also call your attention to the fact that I have a letter from Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, addressed to me as chairman of this committee. The letter is short and I will read it:

I have read the proposed joint resolution, No. 189, to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands, and hasten to advise you that in my opinion the passage of this resolution will greatly assist in the continuance and effective prosecution of the war effort to liberate the Philippines from Japan. I hope it may be adopted by both Houses promptly.

I might say for the gentleman's information that during the morning the other House adopted this resolution, I understand unanimously.

Mr. STEFAN. But I understand, however, that is not in the form as written in the House committee.

Mr. BELL. It is identical in form with this resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. Was the Tydings bill similar to this one?

Mr. BELL. Some days ago, Senator TYDINGS introduced a similar resolution to this, but this morning or yesterday he introduced a facsimile of this resolution. The one that was passed by the Senate this morning is identical with the one that is before the House at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has there been anything direct from the President of the United States on this particular bill? Has he recommended the passage of this bill?

Mr. BELL. I have no direct communication from the President of the United States, but I do have a communication from the Department of State and the War Department.

Mr. STEFAN. You would assume the Department of State was talking for the President, would you not?

Mr. BELL. I do not know what the gentleman would assume. He may assume whatever he wishes.

Mr. STEFAN. This is a very important piece of legislation. It changes the Constitution of the Philippine Government, Mr. Speaker. However, others wish to discuss it. It should be well discussed so we will know what is being done. For that reason I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the House should be advised of the circumstances which justify speedy action on this measure, and I would appreciate the gentleman explaining that.

Mr. BELL. I am glad the gentleman brought up that question. As you know from the statement I made a few moments ago, the term of office of the present President of the Philippines expires on November 15. That is next Monday. Unless we take action upon this matter immediately, in order to give the resolution time to be adopted by both the House and the Senate, and signed by the President of the United States, it might mean that it would not become law until after that term of office had expired. So it is necessary that we have immediate action on it.

I would like to say that the purpose of this is to work out a situation where we will, before the world, have a united front in the Philippines, so that when American troops come back into the Philippines the entire Filipino people will know that all of their officials over here are united behind American effort to bring about the liberation of the Philippines. The passage of this resolution, I think I can say to the gentleman, in all probability will go a long way toward saving the lives of perhaps many thousands of American troops, because it will pave the way to a complete understanding in the Philippines as to the position of their officials who are here.

Mr. COLE of New York. When did the Committee on Insular Affairs meet to consider this bill?

Mr. BELL. Yesterday.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman advised as to the conditions or circumstances which caused this bill, which the gentleman has said to be so important to the welfare and the lives of 50,000 American boys, to be held up for consideration until the eleventh hour,

when those who were responsible for this bill knew of the situation for at least 12 months?

Mr. BELL. I do not, of course, know everything that has taken place in the last 12 months but I do know that on the 5th of November I received this letter from the responsible officials of the Philippine Government urging that we take this action. I know that doubtless before that time there were many conferences; at any rate that letter was presented to me and I was asked to file this resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. I see the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines here. Perhaps he can explain why there has been this inordinate delay in anticipating a situation which was bound to develop.

Mr. ELIZALDE. I should like to answer the gentleman, although I am not quite sure whether I can give any particular reason why the presentation of such a resolution has been delayed. I may say that for more than 6 weeks at least we have been in constant negotiations here. I spoke to Senator TYDINGS on this matter I am sure it was 5 or 6 weeks ago and we prepared several plans and resolutions. In some cases they did not meet the approval of the members of the Government of the Philippines, and also in some cases apparently there were some objections from the executive departments. That is probably the reason why this has been delayed. I could not really give a more definite answer because I am not in position to.

Mr. COLE of New York. The resolution continues in office only the President and Vice President of the Philippines.

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is all.

Mr. COLE of New York. Are there any other Philippine Government officers whose presence in this country and whose authority is necessary along with the President and the Vice President?

Mr. ELIZALDE. The other officers can be appointed by the President; that is the cabinet; and that is all there is present here in the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman means the financial officer of the Philippine Government is not here?

Mr. ELIZALDE. The auditor general is here.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is he an elected or an appointed official?

Mr. ELIZALDE. He is an appointed official.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then, the President and the Vice President are the only constitutionally elected officers of the Philippine Government who are in this country? Is that correct?

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. The purpose of the resolution is to set aside a constitutional provision that will become effective as of the 15th day of this month; is it not?

Mr. ELIZALDE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROWE. There is no other reason for this resolution except that?

Mr. ELIZALDE. The object is to continue in office the present government in Washington until the time when constitutional processes in the Philippines are reestablished.

Mr. ROWE. And that does nullify this constitutional provision.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Only temporarily; only temporarily. This is a war measure; it is an emergency measure. There are a few members of the Philippine Government present in Washington at this time.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman when the term of office of the Commissioner of the Philippine Islands terminates.

Mr. ELIZALDE. There is no definite time of termination.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is an appointive office?

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is an appointive office; the Commissioner continues in office indefinitely.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman convinced that this action by Congress in upsetting or modifying the terms of the basic law of the Philippine Islands will be acceptable to his own people?

Mr. ELIZALDE. I have no doubt whatsoever. I give that answer categorically to my friend from New York. I may say that I would support this measure strictly and only as an emergency measure and until the government is in a position to return to the Philippines. As soon as that happens, and I think it will, I would favor a reestablishment and continuation of the constitutional processes.

Mr. COLE of New York. As the gentleman knows, I was not in the city yesterday; I had no previous warning, nor had any other member of the Committee on Insular Affairs that this measure was to be called up. I do want the RECORD to show, however, that I maintain grave doubts of the advisability of this measure, both from the standpoint of the Filipino people and our international relations with the Philippines. I want it understood and I want to know whether the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines will agree with me, that this action by the Congress in modifying the Constitution of the Philippine Islands is not to be taken as a precedent for the future so that the enemy now in control of the Philippines can say that this is an example of American control over the Philippines for the future.

Mr. ELIZALDE. I believe that is perfectly well understood by the members of the Philippine Government here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join the gentleman from New York in taking the position as a Member of this House on the Democratic side and also as majority leader—I completely agree with the gentleman—that if this bill should be acted upon favorably under no circumstances should it be considered as a precedent to govern future action.

Mr. COLE of New York. The Congress, the world, the Philippines, and the Japanese Government can understand that this measure is sought by the official spokesman of the Filipino people?

Mr. ELIZALDE. I have no objection to being placed on record on that point. I want my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] to understand that this letter suggesting this legislation was also signed by the President and the Vice President themselves; in other words the whole Government here is in full agreement, the interested parties.

Mr. COLE of New York. What I want to emphasize is that the official spokesman for the Filipino people and the Filipino Government, as heretofore elected, seek this legislation and it is approved by the officials in the United States.

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I submit a question? This is purely a war emergency measure and is not set down as a precedent for future legislation; is that true?

Mr. BELL. This is purely a war measure and the resolution itself provides that as soon as the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and the normal functions of government have been restored in the Philippine Islands, then the Vice President goes right in as President. He immediately assumes his office of President just the same as he would if this resolution had not been passed.

Mr. LECOMPTE. By the terms of this resolution the present term of the President of the Philippines is extended, but it does not give him the right to hold another term of office?

Mr. BELL. Oh, no.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It extends temporarily his present term; that is all?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In the interest of saving the lives of American boys?

Mr. BELL. It is for the purpose of saving the lives of American boys and Philippine boys that this is being done, and it is purely a stopgap thing until the constitutional government of the Philippines can be restored.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has the endorsement, recommendation, and approval of practically all of those in authority who are prepared to speak for the Philippine administration?

Mr. BELL. Every responsible Filipino official in America has endorsed it and has requested its passage.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my intention to object, this resolution was considered before the Committee on Insular Affairs yesterday. It was the unanimous opinion of the members present that the adoption of the resolution under present circumstances would tend to strengthen the position of our country in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who was present when the committee advocated the passage of this bill?

Mr. WELCH. Only members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was anybody from the State Department present?

Mr. WELCH. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The State Department must have filed some request for it.

Mr. WELCH. The request for the resolution came from the State Department, the War Department, the Interior Department, and from officials of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BELL. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman that I have since received a letter from the State Department. I want to introduce all of these letters in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would say if the gentleman would put them in the RECORD at this point it would help.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter dated November 5, addressed to Senator MILLARD D. TYDINGS, chairman of the Senate committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman postpone that request until his unanimous consent request for consideration of the resolution has been granted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am in sympathy with the objective sought to be achieved, but I want to ask the gentleman if he feels that the Congress has the authority to change by this act the Constitution of the Philippine Islands? It seems to me we are confronted here with a very delicate and difficult situation.

Mr. BELL. I may say to the gentleman that that question has been considered. This country has sovereignty over the Philippine Islands under existing law, and it is believed there is no question about the authority of Congress to pass this resolution. That question has been briefed and, incidentally, a brief was put in the RECORD on the Senate side about a week ago by Senator TYDINGS. In his opinion, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of everyone who has studied the question, the Congress has unquestioned legal right to pass this resolution and make the changes required by the resolution.

Mr. MAHON. So we are on a firm basis both from the standpoint of legal right and the end to be achieved by this act.

Mr. BELL. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if I may be permitted to propound a question to the chairman of the committee. What would be the effect of the failure of the Congress to pass such a resolution prior to the 15th of the month? Would it install legally the Vice President of the Philippines as President?

Mr. BELL. Yes, I understand it would.

Mr. COFFEE. I am advised by the Commissioner of the Philippines that the Vice President of the Philippine Government has joined with the President and associated officials in requesting the passage of this resolution. That is a fact of which I had not been aware heretofore and I think it should be brought out for the benefit of the membership. The Vice President has joined in this request.

Mr. BELL. As I stated earlier to the gentleman, the Vice President has signed this letter.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was not in the city yesterday because we had been assured by the majority leader there was nothing coming up on that date or this week. The special meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs was called yesterday afternoon and I was not present, of course. As has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] it seems rather strange when this matter has been pending for so long that it could not have been taken up in the regular meetings which are constantly being held by the committee. What is the major objection to following the constitution of the Philippines as it is and allowing the Vice President to become the President as he should when the term of the President expires on November 15?

Mr. BELL. I may say to the gentleman I think the reason that both the Vice President and the President of the Philippines have joined in this request is that it is well recognized that over there, like in this country, there are different political parties, you have different personalities, and it is desired to put a united front before the Philippine people so that the people over there who are now under the domination of Japan and who cannot speak for themselves will know that all of the various parties and groups over here are united in the effort to drive out Japan and to reestablish free government in the Philippines. That is the purpose that they tell me is behind this resolution.

Mr. JUDD. I am still at a loss to understand how the passage of this resolution serves that end. Surely the retiring President will support the Vice President when he becomes President just as much as the Vice President has been supporting the present President. There would still be a united front, would there not? What reason is there to believe there would be dissension in the Philippines if we allow the constitution which we authorized, and which was written by the Filipinos and approved by them in a popular referendum, to function in its proper form? How different are we from Hitler when we say that just because it will perhaps serve our purposes better, we come along and suspend their constitution temporarily "until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands"? That may be 5 or 10 years from now. I am a little apprehensive that people all over Asia are going to say that America does to the Filipinos just like the countries we are fighting do to their subject peoples.

I cannot see what serious disadvantages would result from continuing under the Philippine Constitution that has been set up in good faith and I can see very serious disadvantages in a sudden last-minute setting aside of a nation's basic constitution without hearings or debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the letter sent to Senator TYDINGS and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], signed by the President and Vice President and other officials, is probably the best answer that can be given to the gentleman's pertinent inquiry. The letter states:

> Due to invasion and occupation of the Philippines by the Japanese, constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been interrupted in the Philippine Islands. While this condition prevails, the question of the presidential succession under our Constitution comes up for consideration.
>
> If we were in the Philippines and our constitutional government there were functioning regularly, there would be no problem. But we are not in the Philippines—

That is, they are a refugee government—

> we are in the midst of a global war, and our constitutional system and democratic institutions are seriously jeopardized. The operation of the legislative and judicial branches are suspended by enemy occupation and only the executive branch which remains free from the enemy's action—

And this only because it is over here—

> and is now temporarily established in Washington is able to continue performing its functions.
>
> Obviously constitutional government and democratic processes will not again function in the Philippines until law and order are reestablished.
>
> Therefore, we, the President, the Vice President, and the other members of the war cabinet of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, respectfully submit this matter to the President and the Congress of the United States with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency. Congress may feel free to consider whether it would be to the best interest of both peoples to allow changes in the direction of the Commonwealth government during the emergency, to continue the status quo until such time as the constitutional and democratic processes are fully reestablished in the Pihilippines, or to follow such other course of action as in their opinion is required by the circumstances.

Then, as I understand, they recommend this emergency legislation. I also understand that this resolution amends in a very marked respect a previous one that was introduced in that it limits it. It does not make it definite, but until such time as in the judgment of the President conditions are reestablished in the Philippines where there can be a normal functioning of the democratic processes of government.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman's position as outlined in that letter would

be defensible and perfecty sound, if the Vice President were not here, if to allow the term of President Quezon to expire would really interrupt the constitutional processes. But when the Vice President, who normally would succeed to the Presidency if the government were in the Philippines, is right here in Washington, how can we say it upsets constitutional processes or normal functions of government?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think perhaps the best answer to that question would be this: Those officers, being here, know the Filipino state of mind and the conditions there better than we. It is their considered judgment, I understand, that it would least disturb the processes there. Of course, it is a matter that has to be determined with reference to the effect it will have in that country. Those Filipinos, after carefully considering it, have reached the conclusion that it would have the best effect, and I think we should defer somewhat to their judgment rather than ours in determining that question.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman thinks that to continue the present President in office against their own constitution would have a better effect upon them than continuing their constitutional processes and allowing the Vice President to become President, as he was elected to do?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The way I would interpret it—and I do not know whether or not I am right—is that any change in the head of the Government of the Filipinos now might disturb and disrupt the existing status of government over there. In view of the conditions, they think it is best to make no change, regardless of whether or not, under the Constitution, it should be done, but to keep the same President as head pending this crisis.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. BELL. May I read this paragraph of the letter which was sent us by the Filipino officials here, answering the question the gentleman has raised?

If we were in the Philippines and our constitutional government there were functioning regularly, there would be no problem. But we are not in the Philippines, we are in the midst of a global war, and our constitutional system and democratic institutions are seriously jeopardized. The operation of the legislative and judicial branches are suspended by enemy occupation and only the executive branch which remains free from the enemy's action and is now temporarily established in Washington, is able to continue performing its functions.

Mr. JUDD. But are we not jeopardizing here today their constitutional system and democratic institutions in a more deadly way than the Japanese can? The Japanese are their enemies, and are expected to do that. We are their friends, they do not expect us to set aside their constitution, as by a wave of the hand. That is the thing I am concerned about.

Mr. BELL. The resolution we are seeking to pass will be effective in any event only as long as the sovereignty of the United States continues, which, of course, will not be beyond 1946. According to the terms of the resolution itself, everything is thrown back into the regular constitutional channels when the President of the United States issues a proclamation declaring that constitutional processes have been reestablished in the Philippines, so that by no possible chance could it be construed as any permanent interference with constitutional government in the Philippines by the United States. I think if that were not the situation all of the Philippine officials would not be unanimously joining in a request that we take this action.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Insofar as the constitutional question is concerned, it would appear to me that the Philippine Constitution was enacted pursuant to an act of Congress, consequently there is no subversion of the Constitution as there would be if you would enter into a sovereign state and upset their constitution, or if we would attempt to do the same thing here.

As to the question of what is the best interest of the Philippines it is significant to me that the Vice President, who would assume office by succession under normal constitutional processes, himself feels that it would be to the best interest of the Philippine Islands for the incumbent to remain in office. To my mind that would answer almost any question if we consider, as we have a right to, that he is speaking as a free agent, and is animated only by a concern for the best interests of his country.

Mr. JUDD. I have the utmost respect for Vice President Osmeña. He is greatly beloved and trusted by the Filipinos. But I find nothing in the letter to indicate he believes this action should be taken. It suggests the President and Congress should review the whole situation and do whichever seems best of three possibilities—allow the Vice President to succeed to the Presidency, continue the status quo, or some other course of action.

Mr. POAGE. From a technical standpoint, the Philippine Constitution until 1946 is a charter from the United States Congress, which can be amended or changed until the day of Philippine independence by this Congress. I would heartily agree with the gentleman that with the constitution in effect, and if Philippine independence had been effective before this date, obviously this Congress could not change the Constitution any more than it could change the Constitution of Mexico or Cuba. Nor can we change the Constitution of the Philippine Republic after the date of independence, but it seems to me that obviously we can change the constitution prior to that date, and up until that date, and whatever we have set up as rules of procedure can be changed, until that time, by this Congress. So it seems to me there is no constitutional question involved, no question of the right of this Congress, if it seems that it is in the interest of the Philippines.

The only people in the Philippines who may speak, and whose voice we can hear today, except over the Japanese radio, are the people who are here, the Commissioner of the Philippines, our colleague, who sits here, who tells us that he considers this to be beneficial to the Philippines. Then there is the President of the Philippines, who is here in Washington, and he tells us that he considers it beneficial, as does the Vice President of the Philippines who also says that he considers it to be beneficial to the people of the Philippines. They are the voice of the free people of the Philippine Islands, and they are the only voice that we have today. Being the only voice, it seems to me clear when they all testify to that effect, that we have the power to do this if it is for the good of their country, and if we have the power to do it, as to which at first I had some question, but after talking to the Commissioner I am convinced that we have the power to do it prior to 1946, and if we have, then we ought to proceed.

Mr. JUDD. I think there is no question but that we have the power. My hesitancy is not over that. It is over the wisdom of such an act. If we are doing this primarily because of the psychological effect on the people out there, then which course of action is likely to have the better effect? It is my fear that this course may do greater harm than good. I am of course greatly influenced by the testimony that has been presented here by the officials. I think we ought to have had the opportunity to ask their individual views on many aspects of the matter. On the other hand, there is quite a section of Filipino opinion in this country which is definitely opposed to this action, and has been warning us for weeks that some such bill would probably be pulled out of the hat at the last moment and rushed through Congress, just as is being attempted here today.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman says there is a section of Philippine opinion in this country that is opposed to this. I am not prepared to say that I know the attitude of the Filipinos here in regard to that, and the only criticism that I have heard has not been from the citizens of the Philippines, but from columnists who may have been in the Philippines it is true, but have no Philippine citizenship, and who are actually Americans, and have no better way of knowing than the gentleman and I have what the attitude of the Philippine people is, and I do believe that if the gentleman and I think we represent our people, then the Commissioner probably knows what the wishes of the people of the Philippine Islands are. It seems to me that if we are going to insist that we know the opinions of our people, we must accept him as being the best voice for the people of the Philippines now.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that overriding this constitution would have the effect of keeping in office an official who would go out of office in a few days, and who is ill and will be unable to attend to his duties? This will keep him in office as against a man who received 2 percent more votes than he did in the same election. Is it not possible there is some Washington and Philippine politics in this thing?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman can draw his own conclusions as to that.

Mr. CURTIS. What happens if we do not pass this resolution?

Mr. JUDD. That is the question that I raised.

Mr. CURTIS. Who would take office?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Osmena.

Mr. CURTIS. What encouragement can we send to the enslaved people of the world if the Congress of the United States abrogates constitutions to keep people in power and thus creates perpetuity in office when there is no necessity for it?

Mr. JUDD. That was my original question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that with the issue of the constitutional questions which arise in this particular matter, at least a majority of the House should know that this particular thing is coming up? Does not the gentleman feel that perhaps we should let this matter go over for the day and permit the body of the House to thoroughly consider it?

Mr. JUDD. I most certainly do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, has not yielded the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has yielded the floor. Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the right to object.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] who is in charge of the bill, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] in view of the discussion that has arisen and the demand for more information, if we might not adopt this procedure: the gentleman from Massachusetts, might ask unanimous consent that this bill be taken up tomorrow with 1 hour of general debate, and then consider it under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think that is an excellent idea.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. With that I am in full agreement.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think that is a very fine suggestion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] withdraw his unanimous consent?

Mr. BELL. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider this bill tomorrow under the regular rules of the House, with 1 hour general debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and the ranking minority member.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman make that request with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 95.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow Senate Joint Resolution 95, which I understand is the same as the resolution reported by the House committee may be considered under the general rules of the House, with 1 hour of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and one-half the time by the ranking minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the time allotted for general debate is only 1 hour?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would ask that the gentleman make that 2 hours.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course, the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule, and there will be plenty of time to discuss the matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As long as I am assured of a little time on the particular bill, I express my appreciation to the leaders for accepting my suggestion that this be placed over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMED SERVICES HONOR DAY

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 177) requesting the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day and urging that it be properly observed throughout the Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 7th day of December 1943 be, and it is hereby, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby requested to issue a proclamation commending the observance of that day in honor of all men and women who have served or are now serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America, and in prayer expressing our gratitude to Almighty God for His blessings thus far and imploring His continued favor, protecting care, and aid in their behalf and of the United Nations, the complete victory of their arms, the restoration to health and strength of the wounded and ill, and a righteous, lasting peace.

That the Governor of every State is hereby requested to invoke the cordial cooperation of the people of the State he serves and that the counties and municipalities are hereby urged to make plans and hold appropriate ceremonies for proper observance of the occasion in every community.

That the proper authorities are hereby requested to authorize such component parts of the military or naval forces to participate in ceremonies attending the observance of Armed Services Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent as, in their discretion, may be consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That fitting messages be transmitted through approved channels to all those in whose honor the day is dedicated.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, in line 11, strike out the remainder of the resolution.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 59 may be considered in lieu of House Joint Resolution 177.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Sunday, the 1st day of August 1943, be, and hereby is, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion for the recognition and the honoring of all men and women who have served or now are serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America.

That the civil, religious, educational, and patriotic authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and that they arrange and hold appropriate ceremonies in their respective communities in honor of all members of the United States of America armed forces and particularly the national defenders from the States and localities in which they reside.

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and hereby are, authorized to recommend participation by military and naval forces under their respective jurisdiction in ceremonies marking the occasion of Armed Services Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent that is consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to prepare and transmit a message to all of our armed forces everywhere, and especially to those heroes who have come from the scenes of battle to recover from their wounds or illnesses, expressing the Commander in Chief's and the Nation's gratitude and voicing our prayers for a final and complete victory and their safe return to the pursuits of civil life in a world at peace.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 59, and substitute therefor the language of House Joint Resolution 177, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the resolution (H. J. Res. 177) was passed be vacated and House Joint Resolution 177 be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ARE DETROIT INDUSTRIES PAYING TOO MUCH FOR NATURAL GAS?—THE NATION'S TAXPAYERS FOOT THE BILL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, an important part of our job is to speed the day of complete and lasting peace at a prudent expenditure of lives and money. If a few days' caution can save a thousand casualties along the road to Rome, our people demand no less. In like degree they are insisting that war's terrible waste in property, as well as human values, shall be held to the minimum. For that reason I renew my recent protest against the needless burden, amounting to many thousands of dollars, placed on all taxpayers by the excessive natural-gas rates charged to war plants at Detroit, and I restate my opinion that an inquiry by this House is warranted.

Detroit is the core of the Nation's production, and fuel is the blood sustaining that effort. Natural gas has come into wide use at Detroit, Mr. Speaker, but why must its war plants pay a rate which is among the highest in the United States? This question is prompted by some additional data furnished at my request by the Federal Power Commission.

In an address to the House last September 27, I quoted a Commission report revealing an industrial rate of 61 cents per thousand cubic feet at Detroit, as compared to a 46-cent rate at Cleveland and a rate of only 40 cents at Pittsburgh. I have since been informed that my facts were inadequate because I omitted to point out that the natural gas used in Pittsburgh and Cleveland contains more heat units and that, despite lower gas costs at Cleveland war plants, the gas company at Cleveland has paid a higher rate for its supply than is paid by the gas company at Detroit. Such omissions, however, are partly remedied in the tabulation below, where the rates are expressed according to therms, rather than cubic feet. Average rates for small consumers are also added, and the list of cities has expanded from three to nine.

Rates at Pittsburgh are significant because several gas companies distribute gas there. Cleveland expects to obtain some of its natural gas from the same pipe line supplying Detroit, to which Fort Wayne, Muncie, and Lafayette are also connected. Toledo and Windsor are Detroit's friendly neighborhood rivals. Chicago derives its natural gas from the same general southwestern area supplying Detroit.

I am reliably informed that Detroit is the largest American city using full-strength natural gas, unmixed with the inferior manufactured gas. Aside from the mammoth war industries and increasing population, about 50,000 homes in the Detroit area use natural gas for winter heating. Thus an unparalleled business opportunity exists, so that moderate gas rates to war industries might reasonably be anticipated. The tabulation presented here, however, demonstrates that in every classification without exception Detroit industrial rates are highest. They exceed by 50 percent not only the Pittsburgh prices, but likewise the rates at Muncie, where the gas is drawn from the pipe line to Detroit.

Competition, and not more regulation, is the American solution to exhorbitant prices. Some years ago a number of Detroit's principal industries sought to break the gas price bottleneck by bargaining for an independent natural-gas supply, but were unsuccessful. It is my opinion that any inquiry by the Military Affairs Committee, which has investigated other phases of wartime gas supplies, should determine whether Detroit's war plants are even now barred from competitive purchasing of natural-gas requirements.

I now want to give to the House some comparative rates on the subject of natural gas: In Detroit 50,000 therms cost, per therm, 6.57 cents; in Chicago, 5.35 cents; in Cleveland, 4.39 cents; in Fort Wayne, 6.50 cents; in Lafayette, 5.29 cents; in Muncie, 4.28 cents; in Toledo, 4.77 cents; in Windsor, 4.79 cents; and in Pittsburgh, Pa., 3.78 cents. I could go on and give a number of other figures, but instead, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks reports from the Federal Power Commission as of October 1, and a letter from the same source dated October 28.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, October 28, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Complying with your request of October 22, there is submitted below a schedule of average natural gas rates available to large industrial firm gas consumers in the city of Pittsburgh and vicinity. The rates shown are net rates and are comparable with those furnished you under date of October 1 for Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Windsor, and certain Indiana cities.

There are three companies generally furnishing natural gas for Pittsburgh industries. The rates of each are given since those for one differ somewhat from the other two which are alike.

There are additional published schedules for interruptible service which show, for large monthly consumption, rates somewhat lower than those here listed.

Consumption, therms per month	Average rate in cents per therm—Pittsburgh	
	Equitable Gas Co.	Peoples Natural Gas Co. and Manufacturer's Light & Heat Co.
50,000	3.78	3.48
100,000	3.77	3.48
150,000	3.77	3.48
200,000	3.77	3.48
300,000	3.77	3.48
500,000	3.77	3.48
700,000	3.77	3.48

If the Commission can be of further service kindly advise.

Sincerely,

BASIL MANLY,
Acting Chairman.

Comparison of rates for large industrial firm gas consumers for Detroit and adjacent areas

Consumption, therms per month	Average net rate in cents per therm							
	Detroit	Chicago	Cleveland	Fort Wayne	Lafayette	Muncie	Toledo	Windsor
50,000	6.57	5.35	4.39	6.50	5.29	4.28	4.77	4.79
100,000	6.03	5.18	4.21	5.50	5.12	4.06	4.77	4.78
150,000	5.68	4.95	4.05	5.17	4.84	3.83	4.77	4.78
200,000	5.49	4.84	3.94	5.00	4.86	3.50	4.76	4.78
300,000	5.29	4.73	3.84	4.83	4.52	3.13	4.76	4.78
500,000	5.14	4.64	3.76	4.70	4.39	2.83	4.76	4.78
700,000	5.07	4.60	3.73	4.64	4.34	2.71	4.76	4.78

Information furnished by Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., Oct. 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES—TO BE OR NOT TO BE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of discussing with the Members of the House this important matter of subsidies. There is a great difference of opinion among those familiar with the subject as to what is going to be accomplished by the use of subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1943, the President of the United States laid before the Congress a message dealing with the subject of food production and inflation. In the opening paragraph of that message he said, and I quote:

> Food is as important as any other weapon in the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, for many months Members of this House have called attention to that fact, so it is with some assurance that we now observe that the Chief Executive agrees with that point of view. It is to be hoped that copies of that message have been placed on the desks of the men in all Government agencies who are charged with the responsibility of organizing a productive food program. There is no evidence that such is the case to date.

The President admits that 90 percent of the cost of living has been stabilized

and that the other 10 percent is out of hand, The answer to that problem, according to his message, is further subsidies to the farmer. Accepting his statement for face value one is prompted to inquire about the possibility of uncontrolled inflation with only 10 percent of living costs involved? What the President actually suggests is that the Federal Treasury pay out another $800,000,000 or more to the farmers. This suggestion is made, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the farmer is in a fairly prosperous position. The farmer is not asking for this Federal hand-out; all he asks is a fair price in the market place and upon such assurance he will produce all the food necessary to supply our armed services and the civilian population. As a matter of fact, if the Government had kept its promise to the American farmer and permitted prices to rise to parity we would not be confronted with this problem. All that is needed is a fullfilling of promises, nothing else.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Upon the point of subsidies, does the gentleman know of any farm-group organizations that are asking for subsidies of the Congress at this time?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is only one group I know of, and that is the so-called Farmers' Union group which represents a very small minority, however, so far as farmers are concerned.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman should not include all farmers' unions, because the Farmers' Union of the State of Nebraska does not favor subsidies and never has.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am glad to have that observation because the Farmers' Union group, I understood, are definitely on record in favor of subsidies, and I believe the national leader, Mr. Patton, has been quoted as being in favor of subsidies.

It cannot be successfully denied that subsidies to the farmer will be at the expense of the taxpayer. The New Deal has been busy spinning some fancy theory around the subsidy idea, by arguing that it is a benefit to the consumer and especially to certain so-called white-collar groups. But are not these people taxpayers as well as consumers? Even the farmers who receive the subsidies are consumers and taxpayers. I submit, that in the long run, it will be cheaper to pay an increased price for this group of 10 percent commodities that the President states is now out of hand than to pay out money for subsidies. The danger of uncontrolled inflation from this source is very much greater than from the other. Farm prices can be fixed as well as other commodities but it must be done on a realistic basis and in accordance with the parity formula.

Some one has said that "subsidies and withholding taxes are Gold Dust Twins." Withholding taxes simply take a part of the wage out of the pay envelope. Actually it results in less money to the worker. Now if we follow this money that has been withheld we see it travel on to Washington where a substantial part of it is used to pay the salaries of those who are used to collect the money and administer the law. Part of it is left to pay subsidies that are intended to reduce the cost of living. What is the result—and every workingman in the United States should understand this—to the worker? He has paid in taxes a great deal more than he has gained in reduced living costs. The payment of taxpayers' money to support the governmental program is always the grounds to request more and more taxes. The worker, be he on the farm or in the factory, is the only one who can lose under this system. The payment of subsidies to the farmer does not help the farmer. He can only be helped, as I have already indicated, by a fair price in the market place. That is all he asks.

Mr. Speaker, this fight against the payment of subsidies to the farmers is not a partisan one. Listen to what the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee had to say about this program on last June 25. I quote him:

> Everybody understands that the way to get production is to pay fair prices. Laborers on the farms have been attracted to higher wages elsewhere, paralyzing the production of necessary food and other products. Everybody understands that—

Says the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. Continuing, he said:

> Certainly no man can make any serious pretense of opposing inflation if he proposes to have the Government borrow money and incur an increase in the bonded debt of the Nation in order to pay the grocery bills for people whose salaries and wages are at levels never before known in the history of our Nation.

It is necessary to keep in mind the distinction between subsidies that are intended to promote the production of food so necessary to the war effort and the subsidies that are intended to roll back prices and thereby pay part of the grocery bill. This is an entirely new philosophy of subsidies, and only a New Deal bureaucrat could figure out that one.

As I have already intimated above, the American people are in a better position today to pay its grocery bill than at any time in our history. Excessive purchasing power leads to inflation, and by the very art of rolling back prices the consumer has more money to spend for other commodities. The only way we can raise the money to pay for subsidies is by taxation or bonding.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has put the matter very succinctly when he said:

> Is there an individual in the United States today who wants his boy and his girl, whether in the Army or not, to pay this month's grocery bill for him? When you subsidize the grocery bill of the Nation, you are passing on to posterity the bill that you should pay out of the largest income in the history of our Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made a most significant statement from the standpoint of the fact that it is unjust to pass on to the taxpayers who are now in uniform the cost of today's grocery bills. All Members of the House may not know it, but I know that the gentleman speaks with some knowledge of the mind of the veteran because he has been very active in American Legion circles and his wife at the present time is president of the National Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion; so it is not exactly conjecture on his part.

I hate to interrupt the gentleman's presentation because he is making a very splendid speech as is his custom. Yesterday one of the gentleman's colleagues from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG], in colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], stated that in the dairy business there was no material increase in production—I believe those were the words that were used—up in Canada from the standpoint of the subsidy program. Our main concern now, therefore, is, Will the subsidy program work to hold down inflation? Or will it stimulate inflation? I was interested in the gentleman's discussion to the effect that it would tend to stimulate inflation, because I agree that anything which increases the ratio of money to consumer goods tends to bring about inflation; it is inflationary per se.

I think it should also be pointed out that the argument formerly used by the President that subsidies were necessary in conjunction with the hold-the-line order is now antiquated, because the hold-the-line order has been violated. It was violated when the President and his advisers capitulated to John L. Lewis on the coal strike. They yielded to the price increase which Lewis demanded. The line has been broken and there does not seem to be much rhyme or reason in Congress' attempting to hold a broken line by giving subsidies which in turn would bring about inflation. So I congratulate the gentleman on his splendid talk and I hope the Members of Congress will take time to study it and read it very carefully.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

The President, of course, has approved the payment of subsidies, but you will note in his message to us that he refers to subsidies as "equalization payments" and "food-production aids." The public has not been fooled, for by this time, I believe, it understands the real import of subsidies and it prefers to pay the grocery bill for today's food now.

In connection with that "hold the line" order I wish to read a very important part of the President's message. I believe it bears repeating on this "hold the line" proposition. He stated under the subject of consumer food prices:

> The "hold the line" order was designed to undo the damage that had been done, and to prevent any further damage. The rise in

the cost of living having resulted almost entirely from the increase in certain food prices, the program was quite properly designed to bring those food prices back to their September levels as far as possible.

Then he goes on to explain how the Government has been handling this question of squeezing so-called profits out of prices.

He continues:

The reductions in cabbage and lettuce resulted from squeezing the water out of the price structure by reducing excessive margins of distributors wherever they were found to exist. The retail prices of meat and butter were reduced by 10 percent. In these instances the prices received by farmers and distributors did not permit reductions without bringing returns to unreasonably low levels.

And that, Mr. Speaker, refers to the prices that the farmers get.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman well knows that this so-called subsidy is being laid at the door of the farmers by certain parties who speak in this House who, in my opinion, do not know whereof they speak, these particular parties claiming that the subsidy is to aid the farmer in production, yet I know that on my own dairy farm upon which I keep records I received the very same price per pound for butter last March as I did last September. Consequently what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying today upholds me entirely and I believe it to be the viewpoint of the farmers of the Nation that this certainly should be known as a subsidy to consumers and, if anything, acts as a ceiling on the farmer's commodities.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is absolutely right.

The President continues:

Accordingly equalization payments—

You will notice he no longer calls it subsidy—

equalization payments are paid by the Government to the processor to enable him to reduce the prices of these products without loss to himself and without reducing the price to be paid the farmer. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation undertook to make these payments to processors of meat and butter so that the retail cost of these foods might be held down while the producers received a large enough return to encourage output. The Public Treasury has been using as food-production aids other forms of payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and so-called section 32 operation for support prices. Additional or subsidy payments have been made to industry in order to secure wartime production of many essentials, including copper, zinc, aluminum, and other critical materials.

But I want to call your attention to the fact that the subsidy paid to the man to produce is one thing and a subsidy paid to a group so that the price may be rolled back is an entirely different matter and, as I said in the formal part of my address, this is a new philosophy.

Mr. JONKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does not the gentleman feel that the use of this term "equalization" is to avoid the term of subsidizing the consumer?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that in my mind.

We have paid premiums to speed up construction of ships and other war materials—

And I say to the President properly so. Let us pay the subsidies that we have to in order to stimulate production, but there is nothing in the President's speech that I have been able to observe to justify the payment of the kind of subsidy he is now asking for.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to express my appreciation for the thought the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has put upon this subject. I would like to ask a question. In his contacts with his farmers individually and the farm groups in his district, may I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that they are of the opinion that the thought of subsidy is a further attempt at regimentation of the farmer himself?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can say to the gentleman very frankly that the farmer today resents the fact that Uncle Sam has agents out in the field who from time to time come along and offer him a Government check. This very morning I received a two-page letter from a farm group in my State protesting against this very practice. The American farmer, in my opinion, is what you might really call a rugged individualist, and he wants none of this Government interference. He says, "Give me a price and I will produce."

In consequence of these programs the rise in the cost of living which has proceeded without interruption from the early months of 1942 was brought to an abrupt halt. In June 1943 the cost of living fell to 5.9 percent above the September 1942 level, in July to 5.2 percent, and in August to 4.8 percent. It is true that in September 1943 the cost of living rose by nearly one-half percent. It was not due to food but mainly to the cost of clothing.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. Is it not a fact that some of the new dealers have been using the argument that subsidies have held down the cost of living when, really, what has held down the cost of living has been the ceiling prices on these various goods? That has done the job of holding down the cost of living.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is right.

Mr. LANDIS. Is it not a fact that if subsidies prevail it will lead to three things—namely, more bureaucrats, more taxes, and more power in Washington? May I say, in reference to power in Washington, it is a fact that there is an old axiom that the man who pays the piper calls the tune. Certainly under this program Washington would be able to dictate even what we eat, since Washington is paying for it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is true, of course, as the gentleman well knows, that ceiling prices keep the cost of living down, but where you have support prices for the same commodities which are higher than the ceiling prices, when you want to lower the support price or raise the ceiling price, you almost have to meet it with a subsidy. Can the gentleman conceive of any other manner in which you can maintain a support price and at the same time a ceiling price without a subsidy?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think the answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the fact it is only being done on a very minor number of food products at the present time?' It has never been indulged in in connection with any major food products.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; and how many such items are actually in that category?

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean items in which the support price is higher than the ceiling price?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. You are including in that the cost of transportation and the cost of processing?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have such a list, and I will be glad to give it, but I do not have it at hand at the moment. I will be glad to get it. I am sure I have it. We had some statistics in the committee, and I think that was one of them.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. When I started out I stated that there was an honest difference of opinion. There are two schools of thought on this subject, but I cannot see how we are going to get much help from subsidies in this situation, especially when we have the President admitting that we are only concerned with about 10 percent of the commodities that are involved in any spiral of inflation. I doubt that there is any real danger from uncontrolled inflation, even if we accept the President's own premise.

I want to conclude with this final paragraph, to indicate just where we are going or what is contemplated by the sponsors of the subsidy program. There is now being put into effect a program recently announced to reduce the retail prices to consumers of other items—apples, onions, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, peanut butter, lard, and vegetable shortening. I am prompted to ask this question: Where are we going to stop? We will be subsidizing every commodity in the country.

Next week this House is going to be confronted with and will have to pass on one of the most important bills that has come before us in a long time. I refer to the Steagall bill. I believe it goes without saying that we are going to be confronted with an issue that will have a great effect on how we are going to spend the taxpayers' dollars and just what we are going to do about helping the farmer, who needs help today. The farmers in my district, as I have already stated, do not want the Government to interfere; they want good prices, fair prices in the market place.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I happen to have this list here. I thought perhaps the gentleman would like to use it in his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Fine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks tables prepared by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. It is true that the farm organizations, the dairy associations, the food processors, and the food distributors are against the subsidy program. By their practical experience they ought to know something about subsidies.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. I think there is a misconception about subsidies. We have this question of subsidies to get production. That is one thing. As far as the war effort is concerned, I think we are agreed that if we must have production the Government will pay something, it will pay a premium, for it; but never before have subsidies been used to roll back prices.

Mr. LANDIS. The dairy associations tell us, and have told us for months, that if an increase of 1 cent a quart of milk were granted it would solve the milk problem. Those in the canning industry have said for a year or more, "If they will give us 1 cent a can we will increase the production." What has happened in the canning industry in the last few months? They have decreased production over 30 percent. They have lost production on account of giving subsidies.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are willing to pay their own grocery bill. Our people who are paying the 20-percent withholding tax are beginning to realize that when the bureaucrats spend, we pay. There is some loose talk that subsidies are holding down the cost of living but the fact is that price ceilings prevent the increase in prices. The subsidy program is a complete admission on the part of the O. P. A. that it is unable to control prices and must resort to hidden inflation rather than orderly wartime price adjustments. The roll-back of food prices will not effectively stimulate food production. On the contrary, it will have the opposite effect. These so-called roll-backs will roll back the taxpayer by collecting $2 in the form of the withholding tax and give him back $1 in reduced prices. Farm organizations, dairy associations, food producers, and processors are opposed to subsidies.

Subsidies are unfair because they are paid from borrowings at the expense of our fighting forces and future generations. Subsidies lead to inflation because they increase available purchasing power, increase Federal expenditures, and contribute to a loss of confidence in the financial stability of the Government. Subsidies are economically unsound and vicious. They lead to regimentation and political control.

Briefly, the so-called roll-back program means three things to every citizen:

First. More bureaucrats.

Second. More power in Washington, for it is an axiom that the man who pays the piper calls the tune, and certainly under this program Washington would be able to dictate to us even what we eat, since Washington is paying for it.

Third. More taxes. The administration has been strangely silent on the fact that to pay these subsidies it must sell more War bonds, collect more taxes, or borrow more money from the banks. This means, of course, that the consumer will have to pay more taxes if the roll-back program is carried out.

ALLOWANCE TO WIDOW OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today. Due to the lateness of the hour, I desire to relinquish that time, and ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

EXAMINING STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when I received unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today, I did not realize so many other Members of the House had similar requests to submit. Because of the fact there are a number of Members who wish to speak following me today, I shall not take the full 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to talk about a matter that is most urgent, a matter about which I am very serious, so serious that I feel my colleagues should have the benefit of what I have to say, and also that I might have the benefit of any argument that might be advanced against the position that I take. As many Members know, on October 19 I introduced a resolution which provides for an examining staff for each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of the Judiciary and the Legislative Subcommittees. In the year 1921 the Budget Bureau and General Accounting Office were organized by law. The Budget Director is purely and simply an agent of the President. The Comptroller General, who has the General Accounting Office under him, is the agent of the Congress, but I think it is fair to say the Congress does not have the necessary contact, does not have the supervision over the expenditure of funds that we should have, because of the fact that we have no contact, no examining staff, no auditors, no supervision whatever over the funds which we appropriate once a year. The spending agencies go ahead and spend that money, with no supervision from the Congress, and when they run out of money, they come to the Congress again and ask for a deficiency appropriation and generally get what they want. However, I am happy to say, and I am sure the American taxpayer was pleased and now has more faith and confidence in their Congress since last week, when the Deficiency Subcommittee reduced the requests of the Budget Bureau on a bill by around 82 percent. Thereby the public must have learned something about the Budget Bureau, they must have decided that the Budget Bureau had not been operating effectively, for certainly if the Budget Bureau had been operating effectively they would not have O. K.'d some of the items in that bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and has made a profound examination of the matter of expenditures. I wonder if he can inform the House whether I am correct in my conclusion, that the Budget Bureau, as it presently functions, is more an agency to report back to the Congress just which expenditures meet with the approval of the President, than it is to inform the Congress of those expenditures which the country can afford.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the history of the Budget Bureau speaks for itself. It seems that when the President asks for an appropriation it goes through the Budget Bureau with no questions asked.

Mr. MUNDT. My observation has been that what purports to be a Budget Bureau has become simply a propaganda agency for emphasizing on House committees that the President wants this or

that expenditure, without any regard as to the Nation's capacity to pay.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman, and to offset that we established the General Accounting Office, which was supposed to pass on the legality of each appropriation, to determine whether it is according to law, not whether the price paid for something is too much or too little. Therefore, we have no agency whatever to determine whether we are paying too much or whether we are paying too little. As far as paying too little is concerned, I do not think that very apt to happen under the present system.

Mr. MUNDT. At the moment, about the only recourse we have in Congress is to support the strong right arm and good, clear conscience of Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, and if we can stop these New Deal spending artists from disqualifying him, there is some small chance that a modicum of economy may result.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right, and I am sure that Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, would welcome an agent from each subcommittee to work with him, to go over these appropriations with him, and report back to the different subcommittees. We would then have something of a businesslike program, a businesslike method in the Congress, such as we find in all private business.

Mr. MUNDT. And the gentleman's bill does that very thing; does it not?

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. MUNDT. The country owes the gentleman a debt of gratitude for making possible this reform, without which there looks to be small opportunity to preserve the solvency of this Republic.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Spencer, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. It might be pointed out that the very wording of the departmental reports when they come back to the subcommittees is that the proposed legislation, to use the language that the Budget Bureau uses does or does not fit into the President's program, and the Bureau of the Budget is the voice of the President as to whether or not he wants a certain appropriation. The gentleman is going into something that affects every pay envelope in America, and it is rather interesting to know that the Republican attendance today is about 10-to-1 of the majority party.

Mr. JENSEN. And I am sure that we will save money for every taxpayer if this resolution is adopted.

I am sure it will tend to reduce expenditures of the Government by millions, and possibly billions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, the gentleman's main purpose is to save money to the taxpayers?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Every dollar that is not needed for the waging of war. Of course, first of all we want to win the war, and we do not want to take away a dime needed for winning the war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations covering military matters has recommended to this Congress the expenditure of many billions of dollars in the last year or so.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So that if you wanted experts to examine into the sufficiency of the requests you would need quite a number of experts, would you not, to investigate the operations of the Army, and to really make intelligent recommendations to Congress, and you would add to the present set-up of the Federal Government, a great many experts, perhaps what are sometimes called "long-haired experts and economists," of whom we have heard too much, which would do the American people very little good? The same is true of the Navy Department Appropriation Committee. If you attempted to hire experts to investigate all of those activities, you would certainly add a great many employees to the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think that this Congress should have a closer relationship and have a closer scrutiny over the spending of the billions of dollars that we have appropriated, sometimes almost blindly, than we have at this time? I am asking for a yes or no.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, it could not do any harm to have a closer scrutiny, but there are some reasons that can be advanced in opposition to the gentleman's proposal, and it is not quite as simple as it sounds. If you want to hire additional experts—in my opinion, one of the things the matter with the Federal Government now is that they have too many experts and too many economists.

Mr. JENSEN. Downtown, but not enough up here.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You just want to add more experts and more economists. I think we should consider that angle a little, too.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. Now, I want to say this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations but if he were and had sat in subcommittee hearings for weeks upon weeks upon weeks, where hundreds of gentlemen from departments of Government, agencies, and bureaus came and asked for these huge sums of the taxpayers' money, and he could not ask intelligent questions about just how this money was being spent, what was going on down here, and who was spending what, and how much, I would like to know how the gentleman would feel if he were in the position that I and the other members on the Appropriations Committee are in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield to permit an observation?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, this Government is set up on the basis of the executive, judicial, and the legislative branches. When representatives of the executive departments come before committees of Congress, of course, we are assuming or supposed to assume that we have confidence in them, and that they have the best interests of the Government, and of the people at heart, just the same as the legislative branch has. But, if we have no confidence in them, then, of course, it will be necessary to set up another superagency in whom we can place confidence as Members of Congress. Now, you set up a vast bureau of experts of Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. It would not take a vast bureau.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, the gentleman said it takes weeks and weeks and there are hundreds of items coming before them. You would want the experts of the Congress to be familiar with each and every one of the items that came before you for consideration. So, from a practical standpoint I think we should consider whether or not it is not better to have in the bureaus and departments persons upon whom we can rely and in whom we have confidence.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish we had. I only wish we had.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is only a question of whether we do have those people in the departments upon whom we should rely. But I rather hesitate to add additional experts and bureaus, pile one upon another, and keep on that process endlessly.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think I have to stand here, or you or anybody else, and defend before the eyes of the American people, these many public officials in our Government who have a record of reckless spending. Anything you say or I say will not make those folks any more pure than they are. What I am doing is this: I am not proposing to set up here an auditing staff. I am proposing to set up an examining staff, and there is a world of difference. That staff, which will be, to start with as I would recommend it, only one expert examiner for each subcommittee; and an expert examiner who is skilled in the art has a faculty of smelling bad things and following the scent and report to the subcommittee every 30 days or at such other time as the subcommittee shall direct, and by so doing, is it not natural to believe that any agency or any official of government will be in the same category as a man running a branch bank or a branch office for some big company, where they send out examiners each month to bring back a report to the head office, and by so doing, carry on a sensible businesslike management?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. The reason I am yielding to you so much is because I want to know if there is anything wrong with this program that I have outlined.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will agree that perhaps the Federal Government is so vast that it is extremely difficult for the Congress to have its fingers on the expenses in every little detail or every little bureau or section.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a very big business, I will admit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It might be well to have some additional help from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. You will be endorsing my resolution if you keep on talking.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I might endorse it right now, but I just wanted to say that you have to be careful that you do not add a vast number of experts and economists to the public pay roll. We have heard a great deal of complaint from the American people about the vastness of the civilian employees that we have.

Mr. JENSEN. I am only going to ask the Committee on Accounts for $75,000 for the balance of this Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not know the gentleman was going to discuss this subject. Why does not the gentleman tell the House that the Appropriations Committee received $100,000 for investigations and has about $75,000 left.

Mr. JENSEN. Now the gentleman knows as well as every other Member of Congress that the $100,000 which was appropriated last year for an examining staff or an investigating staff for the Appropriations Committee, was simply permissive in character.

My resolution is mandatory. The gentleman knows that nothing of any consequence has been done and that we are still groping in the dark.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee is doing, but the gentleman is a member of it; he ought to know.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely; and that is just why I am presenting this resolution. I do know, and it is worrying me, and it should be worrying the gentleman in whom I have so much confidence and faith because he was my chairman of the Committee on Accounts for 2 years and I have much confidence in him. I know that he always tries to save money. I cannot understand why he is opposed to this measure.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have not expressed myself on the measure yet. I told the gentleman the other day, and I told a member of the committee today that he spoke to—the gentleman has been polling or contacting members of the committee by letter.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, just a minute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I have not polled the committee. Last night I sent each member of the committee a letter asking them to give me permission to come before the committee. I have not polled the committee. Is not that proper procedure?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will ask the gentleman this: Why should he go to the members of the committee and ask them for permission to come to the committee when I have given him my promise—and I have been around here for nearly 20 years and no man in this House can say I ever made a promise I did not keep—I told the gentleman that he would get a hearing when the members of the committee were here. They are not here now. I expect them to be here when the tax bill comes up next week. I told the gentleman personally that he would have a hearing before the committee next week if the members were here, and I also told him that at the same time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] would have a hearing on a bill that he has been introducing for the last three or four Congresses.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right; and I will say to the gentleman that I wanted to make sure that the committee members did know about this resolution, had full knowledge of it. If there is anything wrong with that, I would like to know what it is. The gentleman is not the whole committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I realize that; but when I give the gentleman a promise why ask them? I have the right to call the committee whenever I want to. I called it this morning, a few hours ago.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot imagine why the gentleman is so wrought up about this thing.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not wrought up. I have told the gentleman that he can get a hearing.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I again assure the gentleman that he is to have his hearing.

Mr. JENSEN. And I let every member of the Accounts Committee know what they were entitled to know, because every one of them are members of the committee with equal authority. I realize, of course, that the chairman has more authority than the rest.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; he does not.

Mr. JENSEN. But he has always been fair to everybody when I was on the committee. Now, if the gentleman wants to get into an argument, I could advance something else.

Mr. COCHRAN. Go ahead and advance it; I can stand it; I can always take care of myself.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not going to fight with the gentleman because I admire him too much.

Mr. COCHRAN. I promised the gentleman a hearing; he is going to get the hearing.

Mr. JENSEN. I could not get angry with the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. One of the members called me up this morning.

Mr. JENSEN. One of the members of the committee called me this morning also and said he had called the gentleman from Missouri. I think he is a very able member.

Mr. COCHRAN. He is an able member.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; now, what is wrong?

Mr. COCHRAN. Nothing.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; that's fine.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman a few moments ago made the statement that there were certain men in the Government whose philosophy was one of spending. I am wondering if the gentleman has read a book called Economy in Our Democracy, written by seven Harvard economists, one of whom is Dr. Gilbert, who is now Chief Economist in the O. P. A.? A footnote appeared on one of the pages of the book stating that a great deal of the material in this book was contributed by men in Government positions but that for obvious reasons their names could not be used. This book was written in 1938. I spent yesterday afternoon reading it, and it was quite a revelation to me. Their theory was that American prosperity was directly in proportion to the size of the national debt, along with lots of other philosophies which I do not care to take the time to go into, but that was one of the things that struck me very forcibly: Their philosophy, their theory of government, was that prosperity in America, in a democracy, was in proportion to the size of the national debt.

Mr. JENSEN. I take it, then, that the gentleman is for my resolution? Did I hear him say "Yes"? He nodded his head "Yes." I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland if these seven Harvard economists are still on the Government pay roll or if there are still seven left at Harvard?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I do not know. There is only one Dr. Gilbert, and he is on the pay roll as Chief Economist of the O. P. A. The thing in which I was particularly interested was the footnote which stated that a great deal of the material in this book was furnished by men in Government positions but that for obvious reasons their names could not be used. This is a philosophy of government that it would be well for the Members of Congress to read.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; somebody said we should forget the dollar sign.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. We had to have a great national debt and the higher the debt the greater our prosperity.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. A moment ago it was pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that they already had experts in the department and it was a question of confidence, that we could rely on their research and advice as to how much money we should appropriate. I think the gentleman is in error. It is not a question of confidence, it is not a question involving their honesty and integrity, it is like running a school and having the students grade their own examination papers. Those gentlemen who testified before your committee and who are acquainted with the minute details of the departments, share in the appropriation, do they not?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. They are interested in the growth of the department.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. And they are interested in the financial rewards of their fellow workers.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Under the gentleman's proposal, the individual who would investigate and report back to you would not share in the appropriation, would

not have any stake in the department, would not draw a salary from there or would not have any personal feeling about the growth or decline of that department?

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct. I may say at this point that I do not want to give the impression that all these gentlemen who come before our Appropriations Committee asking for these appropriations are trying to get too much money and are reckless spenders. A lot of these gentlemen are mighty fine, upstanding men and they run their departments in fine shape. I took a 30-day trip this summer going over considerable of the country looking after a lot of things that pertained to the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations and 95 percent of the people in the field who are working for the Government are doing a good job in that Department at least. The inefficiency is right here in Washington in most instances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What proportion of the yearly appropriations for strictly governmental departments, not for war or war agencies, is not reported out of the Appropriations Committee practically unanimously?

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean what percent of the requests that are made?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. After the bills come on the floor, we who are members of other committees, rely on the fact that the Appropriations Committee meets every day. It is practically a perpetual committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I find on voting on appropriations and in defending myself or any other Member of Congress against the term "reckless spending" that I look at the RECORD and find the bulk of the appropriations for the regular governmental departments receive the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is exactly right because you have nothing at all on which to base any other contention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to say, among other things, that the motive behind the gentleman's resolution is, of course, correct. We may find something that the Appropriations Committee itself could not find and it would lead to streamlining of this very complex thing that grows up, may I say, under any party in wartime.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. A moment ago it was said that the employees of the executive branch of the Government coming before your committee are enthusiastic about their work. However, at the same time they are restricted under the policy from asking for more money than is recommended by the Budget?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; that is true, but the Budget usually is very liberal.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman a moment ago said that he traveled around for 30 days going over these projects in the field that were subject to the Interior Department Appropriation Subcommittee, of which the gentleman is a member.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. And the gentleman came right back and said that they are doing a grand job in the field.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact, and it is a fact from my observation, that the members of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee get as much enthused over the work involved in the appropriations they are handling as those who are spending the money after you give it to them, and especially is that true of the Subcommittee on the Interior Department. Anybody who stays around here knows that. We have had more roll calls on the Interior Department appropriation bill than any other appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the last appropriation bill brought in by our Subcommittee on the Interior—and I have only been a member of the Appropriations Committee during this term—there were no amendments introduced, and it went through as we recommended after we had cut it down considerably in committee. I refer to the last bill brought in by the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. However, we cut that bill arbitrarily on most items, because we did not have the facts which my bill will give if adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Maybe that is the reason.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is a poor way to legislate.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I am trying to get away from.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You cut it without any rhyme or reason.

Mr. JENSEN. That is the way it is done much of the time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think that is quite proper.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. Is it not a fact that the very thing the gentleman is trying to bring about in his own committee has already been adopted by the Ways and Means Committee? We have seen concrete evidence of its workings through the fact that committee has cut down a recent request from $10,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. They have a staff of experts working for their committee, that is true.

Mr. COCHRAN. They have a committee on internal-revenue taxation.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As a colleague of the gentleman from Iowa on the Appropriations Committee, I am back of him 100 percent in this effort. I think it is a wonderful proposition. He and I both know that we sit day after day as a subcommittee. We have appearing before us defense attorneys, so-called, for the appropriations requested, and you and I have to act both as a juror and as the prosecution.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right.

Now, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we had better start saving some money wherever we can, or we will never be able to live up to and fulfill the promises we are making to our soldier boys and girls who return after winning this war. It is going to take a lot of money to fulfill all the promises we have made them. There is nothing too good for them, and we had better start saving some money in order to pay that bill, so we can prove to them that our word is as good as our promises.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a personality portrait of the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ENGEL, by Robert St. John of the National Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

VIEWS OF CONSTITUENTS ON THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering ever since Congress took its recess this summer whether other Members received the same reaction from their constituents that I received during that recess. The real purpose of these remarks is to perhaps arouse a little discussion, either on the floor or in the cloakrooms. I have been wanting for some time to report on the reaction of my constituents.

People quite generally seem to be more than pleased with the military developments of the present war. We have received just about every good break our Army and Navy could hope for, but, as in the case of a good football team, those breaks have usually been made. I found practically no criticism of the administration of the War and Navy Departments, but there seemed to be a great

deal of confusion and considerable dissatisfaction with the management of the war effort on the home front. The President has said there is no dividing line between the home front and the military front, but it seems to me I do discern a dividing line between our activities on the military and naval fronts and our activities on the home front.

Several times people have said to me, in substance, "Why don't you people in Congress do this or that or the other thing?" There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding as to just how bills become law. Few realize how helpless—and I think that is the proper word—an individual Member of the House is, and certainly how helpless the minority party is, when it comes to getting legislation on the floor. They do not seem to realize that while any Member can introduce legislation it must be acted upon by a committee of the House. Quite rightfully, the committees are controlled by the majority party. If a bill introduced by the minority successfully weathers the storm of a hearing and brings about the support of a few of the majority Members and gets out of the committee with a favorable report, it then has to get by the Committee on Rules. So it is very easy to say to a Member of the House, "Why don't you do this and that?" But it is very difficult to start the action and carry it through to its completion.

However, I was more disturbed by the fact that a great many people blamed Congress for things over which Congress has no control. I think that has been built up quite extensively in the past few years by employees of the Federal Government located in our various States and districts who tell the people who inquire or complain about certain activities, "Oh, well; after all, we do not write the laws, we are only carrying out the laws written by Congress." But when you sit down with those same people and try to find out just what it is that is bothering them, my experience has been that it is not the laws to which they object but the regulations that have been issued to carry those laws into effect.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Oftentimes these persons who have been working for the Government out in the country, in the gentleman's district and in mine, are very careful to cover up that what the people are complaining about may be a bureau directive with which Congress had nothing to do.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I was just going to explain that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The question of whether or not and how any particular commodity shall be rationed is something never submitted to the Congress. Is not that so?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think definitely so.

Mr. CURTIS. The question of a price ceiling and its effect on production and distribution is never submitted to the Congress. That action is carried out by the agents of the President, in whom is vested authority to promulgate rules and regulations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is necessarily so. I am not complaining about that. I am simply trying to place the responsibility in the minds of the people who are asking questions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman believe that a lot of this dissatisfaction comes from the usurpation of power by the smaller officeholders, many times even without the approval of their master in Washington? In other words, they take it upon themselves to do certain things. They have a job in which they have to show their authority over something and they issue letters—I shall be glad to show to the gentleman some of them about matters I have tried to get ironed out—in which, contrary to any law or authority from Washington, they harass the people, when there is absolutely no reason to do so. We are appropriating money for a war-food program, and they are going out there and doing more harm than good as far as the war-food program is concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That seems to be human nature.

During the recess I had anywhere from 30 to 60 and 70 people come into my office each day. Several times in a discussion of O. P. A. and its regulations and prices I would ask them this question: "Do you think Congress should repeal the Price Control Act and wipe that law off the books and let the law of supply and demand operate during the war, letting things reach their own level?" Only two people with whom I talked took that position. So I came to the conclusion that the people were not dissatisfied with the price-control law, that people generally recognize that we must have a certain amount of control, considerably more control during this time of war than we normally would have, but that they resent, and I think rightfully so, many of the regulations issued by the O. P. A.

The same thing is true of the forms prepared by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in connection with the revision of the tax laws. The bill that we passed to revise the method of collecting taxes was very simple. I had several people say to me, "I thought you were going to simplify the collection of income, but I have just been over to the Internal Revenue Department, and I cannot find anybody there who knows how properly to fill out these forms, or how much to deduct or not to deduct." There again is something that Congress is blamed for, but we cannot be expected to prepare the forms. I explained that all we had done was to change the method of the collection of taxes, and to provide for a report to be made on September 15, and for a final deduction or correction at the end of the year, but as to the preparation of these forms, that had to be turned over to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but I am hopeful that with the experience we have had in the past, next year that form will be very much revised.

The people generally are demanding action on some of these things, that we have talked about for the last 8 or 10 months, and if they do not get action, they are certainly going to hold this Congress responsible. I have referred to things that the people complain of, and that I contend are not the responsibility of Congress, but I would like now to point out some of the things that I believe Congress is responsible for, particularly the majority party, and with which we should deal in the near future.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. It is also true that the folks back home do not make any distinction between what goes on in Washington, and what Congress does, and what the bureaus do, what they legislate upon by bureaucratic directives, and that is something that I think Congress should be alert to, in correcting some of this bureaucratic legislation by directives.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with that, and that is what I am trying to indicate, that people are blaming the Congress for, when I do not think the Congress is responsible at all.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very glad to hear that the people are demanding action. I am very sure that every Member on the floor here today is in favor of action, which would mean that about 80 percent of those present, being Republicans, are strong for action; but we are not getting action. All that we are getting from the majority is a long succession of apathetic alibis. How are we going to get this action? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] today presented the means of striking at one of the greatest weaknesses in the Government, and that is the spending and the squandering of public money. He has introduced a bill, and I think the RECORD should show and the country should know that if that bill is not enacted, the Democratic majority has squelched it, and the majority party has defeated a matter of economy and has failed to meet its responsibility, because the Republicans are demanding action and the power of the majority keeps us from securing it. There is a system of scientific, logical, legislative approach which should be in operation, instead of the Appropriations Committee continuing to be simply a jury, looking blindly at evidence which they do not understand, and I am delighted to go along with the gentleman in his demand for action on these important points, which today are crippling the war front at home and abroad.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to inquire as to just what this scientific bill is that is going to do so much to bring about economy and help our economy.

Mr. MUNDT. Was the gentleman on the floor when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] explained his bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman means the bill to provide scientific experts for the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite sure that most of the Members on the majority side are in favor of that.

Mr. MUNDT. Then let us have action on it. Let us pass it tomorrow or Friday or next week.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman knows that I am not even on the committee that is going to consider the bill, and the gentleman ought not to charge me with responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. I am delighted to hear the gentleman is in favor of it, and if enough people on the gentleman's side will say what he has, then we will get action.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will further yield, I do think that in hiring these experts some attention should be paid to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said, that we have to approach it rather carefully, and examine personally the number of people to be hired, because we could very easily build up a bureaucracy on the Hill and make ourselves subject to the criticism that has been made against the bureaus downtown.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree for one; and I am happy to know that the gentleman's voice makes it unanimous, as he is the only Democrat present.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think there is one problem that the Congress must deal with, and perhaps the most important problem we face. It certainly has a definite bearing on the war effort. In my humble opinion, there is not a single Member of this House but realizes right now that we are using petroleum at a faster rate than we are taking it out of the ground. There is not a Member of the House but what realizes that the demands for gasoline and lubricating oil for the war effort are becoming greater every month. It is generally understood that the railroads of Italy are practically useless for the transportation of war material that we are going to use in that country. More and more of the equipment handled by our Army will have to be handled by motortruck and other types of motor vehicles. Unless some way is found to get more crude oil out of the ground in this country it is very reasonable to assume that if this war lasts even 12 months longer, we will face a critical shortage of gasoline, not only for our civilian needs, but that it will become so scarce that we will not have enough for our military and naval needs.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Under present conditions, the crude oil we are getting out of the ground will only last from 12 to 15 years, and the administration has done nothing to increase it. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is right. Not only that, but it is actually decreasing it. There are thousands of stripper wells that are going out of business every month.

Mr. LANDIS. And we have bills in Congress that will take care of the situation?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very definitely. Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, has made his recommendations. I cannot, for the life of me, see why anybody in this Government needs to fear increasing the price of crude oil 35 to 40 cents a barrel. We are told on dependable authority that that means an increase of 1 cent in the retail price of gas. We know that in normal times gasoline fluctuated at the pump anywhere from 1 to 5 or 6 cents a gallon. We paid 20 cents a gallon and we felt pretty good about it. When we had to pay 25 or 28 we crabbed a little about it. But, now it is down in twenties and we are satisfied. Still this Government has failed in the past several months to permit a slight increase in the price of crude oil, which means an increase of 1 cent in the price of gas. We are definitely jeopardizing our means of transportation, both for the Army and the Navy, and for our civilian supplies, by not taking that action.

Mr. LANDIS. One of the best ways to get action on the crude oil is to sign petition No. 14, on the Speaker's desk?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I was coming to the subject of the petition, in a second.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It might be interesting to you to know that I just came back from my district in Pennsylvania, in the Pennsylvania grade crude area, and that our production in the last 8 months is off 1,700,000 barrels of oil. This field is right on the western edge of this eastern shortage of fuel oil and gasoline. One million seven hundred thousand barrels of oil would have produced 50,000,000 gallons of gasoline, also fuel oil that could have been supplied to the eastern seaboard, where you are short fuel oil and gasoline, not figuring the lubricating oil that could be used for the war effort, especially needed for our fighter planes. I would say that in my district approximately 7,500 to 8,000 wells are not on the pump. Leases are being abandoned. The wells are being scrapped, casings are being pulled and sold to the junkmen, and one of our basic industries, upon which my State and thousands of our people are directly and indirectly dependent, is being lost because of the short-sighted policy of the impractical visionaries in charge of establishing these prices over in the Office of Price Administration. You can readily see what great relief we could afford to you people in the New England States in the way of fuel oil and gasoline if a price increase were granted, because deliveries could be made by tank trucks. This price increase on oil has been static since October 1941, when it was frozen at artificially low levels. Manpower has become scarcer, labor costs are up, materials costs are up, everything that enters into production of oil has greatly increased, and the price remains the same. Common sense should prevail. There is flexibility in this Price Control Act, and they could advance the price of crude and secure increased production to meet the needs of our people and the demands of the war effort, but the group over in O. P. A. insist on rationing the ever-smaller quantities available instead of increasing the price to increase production to secure fuel oil, gasoline, lubricating oil, and the byproducts necessary for civilian needs and the war effort. And there is not anything you can do about it. They are going to "hold the line." That seems to be the policy, instead of using good, sound judgment and affording relief to the gasoline-hungry people throughout the eastern area.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. We have reported a bill out of the Committee on Mines and Mining that will take oil from coal and shale. If they get oil from the shale, our crude oil will last 65 years. If we get it from coal, shale and oil wells our oil production will last 1,000 years. We have voted out of our committee a bill which will establish three temporary or starting plants to take this oil from coal and shale. We would like to get this legislation passed so that if we do not find the oil under the ground in the pools, we will be able to get it from coal and shale.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We have got to do something and do it soon.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It may interest the gentleman to know that in a recent dispatch our actual losses, in the dollar-value of planes, fortresses, bombers, and fighters destroyed by enemy action in the last 6 months has been approximately $147,000,000. That has been a wartime expenditure productive of devastating results to the enemy. On the other hand, the administration approves a project up in the Canadian wilderness where we are spending $138,000,000 to develop the oil resources of Canada at the expense of the American taxpayers and thus far according to the statement of R. W. Gallagher, of the Standard of New Jersey, they have secured about 3,000 barrels of oil a day, a negligible quantity. While we are producing in the United States 4,250,000 barrels of oil a day and we produced 1,385,000,000 last year, the administration is asking us to up that to 1,550,000,000 next year. With that $138,000,000 expended in the proven fields of Pennsylvania it would have produced several hundred thousand barrels of oil a day. We talk about oil and getting results; there is $138,000,000 that

could have been invested in our own back yard that would have produced oil to meet all the demands of our civilian needs and war effort.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that in New England we face freezing again as we did last winter so far as coal is concerned because the administration has bungled coal just as badly as it bungled oil last year and is still bungling it. It is a most unfortunate situation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think there has been more bungling in the case of oil and coal than any two subjects with which this Government has dealt during the war. Private people were urged, and industry was compelled to convert their oil burners to coal and now they come along and make them convert back to oil at a time when the chance of getting oil amounts to nothing. It is my contention that the oil will not be forthcoming unless we find some way to stimulate production.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a tragedy of errors, both oil and coal.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Every agency of Government and every committee of the House and the other body that has gone into the subject at all has come to the one conclusion that there is a real shortage of oil; and nothing is being done to encourage production for fear it would establish a precedent. I am in favor in this instance of legislative action to raise the price ceiling on oil. I am willing to go along with that in the case of crude oil. I think it is so important to the war effort and to the civilian effort at this time that I would go along with legislation of that kind, dangerous as it might be.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a great study of the subject.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Certainly something should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one other subject and raise one question that I hope those who favor a roll-back of prices and the payment of subsidies will attempt to answer in the not-too-distant future. I have received numerous letters in which it has been contended that if this Congress should forbid the payment of roll-back subsidies, the consumer subsidies on meat, butter, and milk, and so forth, the lid would be off and we would be faced with uncontrolled inflation. Nobody has explained to me how that is going to come about. Certainly those who so contend do not mean that if this administration is refused its desire to pay roll-back subsidies it is going to take off all control and let prices go as high as they may. I do not believe they are going to take any such dog-in-the-manger attitude as that. I cannot for the life of me see how the price can be reduced 3 or 4 cents a pound on meat and butter below the present level any more than it can be held at the present market level, and I hope somebody who contends for subsidies will answer that question for me before the bill is brought up for consideration.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It may be interesting to the gentleman to know that Fred M. Vinson, the Economic Stabilizer, has also offered the oil industry incentives to increase production, but the oil producer does not want any part of incentives, and I have not the slightest idea where he would get the money to pay them if they did accept, as Congress has made no such appropriation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the energy, effort, manpower, and expenditures that are being made in connection with the war-food program prompt me at this time to call the attention of my colleagues and the people of this country to an important fact in connection with this food program. I am more convinced each day that honeyed words never fed and never will feed a people.

The fact that I wish to bring out in these few minutes is substantiated in Circular No. 670 of the United States Department of Agriculture, which discusses feed consumption by livestock. It states that—

> The average person (including children) should have 2,600 calories of energy a day and should have about 67 grams or 0.15 pound of protein a day; therefore that number of feed units used by each class of livestock to produce 2,600 calories and 0.15 pound of protein was calculated.

The amount of feed used to produce the 2,600 calories of human food is as follows—page 44 of Circular 670:

Feed used to produce 2,600 calories of human food

	Hogs	Cows	Beef cattle
All feed, including pasture	7.66	9.31	71.65
All feed except pasture	7.17	5.62	31.04
Grain and concentrates only	7.17	2.26	15.16

In other words, it takes 71.6 pounds of all feed including pasture, when fed to beef cattle to produce 2,600 calories of human food. The dairy cow only requires 9.3 pounds to produce the same amount of food energy while the hog uses only 7.66 pounds. When these animals are fed grain and concentrates the dairy cow requires considerably less of this feed to produce the 2,600 calories, thus demonstrating her value as an efficient food energy producer.

The amount of feed used to produce the fifteen one-hundredths pound of protein needed is shown in the following table:

Feed used to produce 0.15 pound of protein

	Hogs	Cows	Beef cattle
All feed including pasture	11.58	4.76	28.68
All feed except pasture	10.83	2.87	12.43
Grain and concentrates only	10.83	1.1	6.07

This manifests the proficiency of the dairy cow in producing protein.

Page 44 from this same circular reveals:

Human food produced by 10 feed units of all feed, except pasture

Calories plus protein index:

Milk cows	2.56
Hogs	1.16
Turkeys	1.14
Laying flocks	.99
Chickens raised	.92
Beef cattle	.56
Sheep and lambs	1.04

There are practical angles to consider in the production of these livestock products, such as labor, location, and so forth. A producer might be able to produce one of the products but find no way to sell it due to distance and transportation difficulties in reaching the market.

Though the hog is a high-ranking producer of calories, the cow is the outstanding animal when it comes to converting feeds into calories and protein foods for human consumption.

What is the significance of these scientific facts. First, it is no doubt the basis for the more-milk program of the War Food Administration. The handling of the dairy program may have lacked judgment at times, but nevertheless the objective to increase the supply of milk and its products was a scientific, practical, and desirable approach. Though we had half a million more cows on January 1, 1943, than the same time in 1942, we are evidently producing some billion pounds less milk in 1943.

Second, since the W. F. A. more or less have taken over the food supplies, it is their direct responsibility to see that this feed is used for the best advantage, that of producing the most human food. I appreciate the difficulties. I realize the pressures. But the facts remain that as much as possible these protein feeds should be allocated to the animals that make the most efficient use of them. This animal is the dairy cow—"the foster mother of the human race."

Dairy cattle furnish about 40 percent of the beef and veal supply of the Nation, so be assured this is not a dairy versus beef argument.

In conclusion, let us expect the protein feeds to be allocated to the dairy sections wherever possible, where it can be done fairly to other groups. Then let us adopt a constructive program that will increase and maintain the milk production of the Nation and make the millions of additional pounds of milk fat and solids available for human consumption.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to know if the dairymen get any preference on this protein feed?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I can only answer that by saying that my contacts wtih the departments have indicated that they realize the importance of milk production. I hope, however, this protein feed will be distributed where it will produce the most human food. That is the only contention I am trying to make here. I may say Wisconsin is recognized as the No. 2 bad spot in this country as far as protein is concerned. Wisconsin produces from 10 to 15 percent of the milk of this Nation, and is entitled to its fair share. I certainly hope they will not funnel this feed off into places where it will not make the contribution it should make to the war food program.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question about the ceiling prices on hogs and cattle. Is there a ceiling price on both of them and, if not, why is there on one and not on the other?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer that by saying that the former Secretary of Agriculture was a great hog man and he started the increase in the pork-production program. Since that time it seems that they have agreed on a ceiling for hogs without much difficulty. There seems to be a spirit that the beef cow is a little higher class than other animals, and it is immoral and sinful to put a ceiling on beef cattle although it seems to be moral and not sinful to put it on hogs and on other farm products. I think that results from the legislative situation that has prevailed for many years by which these beef men have had a lot more to say than the importance of their business really justifies. In my opinion, it is the opposition of the beef people themselves that has prevented a ceiling being put on beef cattle, although this last O. P. A. order is practically a ceiling the way it has been manipulated.

Mr. LANDIS. Since I consider the gentleman an authority on agricultural problems, I would like for him to answer one more question. I understand that beef and hogs are coming to the market to be butchered, and have been in the last few weeks, yet in our localities back home the rationing points are still pretty high on hogs at the butcher shop. I feel at this time when meat is plentiful our people ought to get more consideration so far as eating more meat is concerned. I might also add that I feel the Government has been buying up so much food and stuff, such as potatoes, canned milk, dried milk and dried beans, and letting millions and millions of bushels spoil, that the people ought to be allowed to eat this meat while it is available, because I am afraid that next February and March beef and pork will not be so plentiful. That is when we will find our greatest shortage. I wonder if the gentleman believes that we ought to have more relaxation on this problem of getting more meat to eat while it is available and plentiful?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. When you discuss food products, you are always in danger. There are two different problems involved here. We have produced pork, and we have considerably more than we now consume in this country, whereas with beef we have been on an importing basis for years. We have been using a very constructive attitude toward maintaining an increased production of pork. This last ceiling that has been put into operation for next year is very discouraging in one particular, and that is that although with twenty to forty billion dollars of surplus purchasing power I do not like to admit that we cannot even pay the farmer a parity price for his pork during that time. Hogs, as I said above, are efficient producers of calories and come next to dairy cows in efficient calorie and protein production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] made a comment upon the number of Democrats present this afternoon, I think it only fair that the RECORD should show there are 9 Republicans present who will have the pleasure of listening to my speech.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman say how many Democrats are listening?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman mentioned before that I was the only one.

Mr. MUNDT. There are now two others, three of you now. You are gaining.

Mr. WRIGHT. Possibly the two heard I was going to speak and came over.

Mr. MUNDT. The election returns in Kentucky are gaining, but not fast enough.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, the RECORD should also show that the gentleman has the last special order today.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe there is one after me.

Mr. CURTIS. And also that countless numbers of Republicans were here and left.

Mr. WRIGHT. As soon as they finished their speeches. I am not going to draw any unfavorable inference and I would like to also state for the RECORD that I do not think the Republicans should be criticized any more than the Democrats for not being present this afternoon.

There are very many duties a Congressman has besides listening to special orders on the floor. We had no legislative business anticipated, although we did have the Philippine matter brought up, I believe in more or less an unexpected manner. Since we are on that subject, I am quite certain that the Members on both sides of the aisle who are not here this afternoon are in their offices or at some of the various bureaus following out their other congressional duties.

I should like to speak for a moment on a subject which seems to exercise most of the people today, probably more than anything else, and that is the pending Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I do not think all the truth is on either side of this controversy. I do not feel that subsidies are as vicious as some of their opponents would seem to charge, nor do I think they are the one and the only answer to the prevention of inflation. I think we have to approach this subject in the spirit of reason and common sense. It is rather foolish to get exercised about it as if it were a question of morals. It is a pure question of economics. How are we best going to preserve our domestic economy during the stress and strain of a war?

A few of us, eight in number, yesterday filed a minority report in which we differed with the action of the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency when they reported the Commodity Credit Corporation bill with section 3, which absolutely forbids the further use of subsidies.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman means it forbids the use of a subsidy in any way that would help to prevent an increase in the cost of living. It still permits numerous subsidies as long as they do not help to prevent inflation.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct. Subsidies are so grounded and so inherent in our economic structure that if we should attempt by legislation to abolish the use of all subsidies we should immediately cause a financial collapse. I was going to attack the problem from a slightly different angle than that.

In addition to the eight who signed the minority report, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] substantially agrees with our conclusions but arrives at them from a different point of view and uses different arguments.

So we now get to the question of whether or not section 3 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is going to have a good effect or a bad effect upon our economy.

I said the other day when I spoke in the House on this subject, that when any person who is opposed to subsidies gets up on the floor and says that subsidies are inflationary, and also says that subsidies are vicious because they conceal from the people the actual operation of our economy, I am inclined to agree with him. If there were not counterbalancing arguments on the other side which I consider more urgent and important, I would myself be against food subsidies.

Subsidies are not desirable, but they are a weapon against inflation. They are vastly preferable to an inflated economy. As to the argument that the abolition of subsidies would tend to reduce inflation by capturing some of the excess

purchasing power which is familiarly known as "hot money," I would say that would be true if we could be certain that wages would not rise as a result of the rise in the cost of living.

Congress directed the President to stabilize prices and wages substantially as of September 15, 1942. The date was arbitrary and the freezing order preserved whatever inequities as to income and prices were in effect at that time. Any date which Congress might have chosen would have been equally arbitrary and equally harmful to some in the less-favored groups. I may say that that is true with reference to wages as well as prices.

There was a very able address delivered on the floor today in which the fact was commented upon that a substantial portion of the nonoperating employees of the railroads get somewhere in the neighborhood of 46 cents an hour, which is, of course, completely out of line with other industrial wages.

The only protection we have against increased wages is the maintenance of the present price structure. If prices are increased demands for increased wages will follow immediately. If these demands are resisted production of essential war equipment will be impaired. The Price Control Act ties wages to prices. One cannot rise without the other. There may be Members who, without reflecting fully upon the subject, might say, "Well, the people who are working in industries have no right to demand a raise in wages. The demands should be resisted, they should be reduced."

We are operating in a tight economy at the present time. Labor is scarce and goods are scarce. It is an inevitable effect that when you do have a scarcity you always have a demand for high prices and wages. It is not a question of human weakness or frailty; it is the operation of an economic law.

Our greatest job now in winning the war is to get the war material to the battlefields. Anybody who has a realistic sense of present-day events must agree that if prices go up to the consumer and if the consumer, who also happens to be a worker, demands as a result thereof that his wages be increased, and if that demand is refused it is going to impair the production of essential war material.

The Little Steel formula that is very often spoken about and that was assailed on the floor this afternoon from the standpoint of being inequitable to labor, attempts to give workmen a raise in wages which is the equivalent of the 15-percent increase in the cost of living which existed as of September 15, 1942. Since that time the cost of living has gone up some 7 percent. At the present time under this very Little Steel formula these wages, which the Government is trying to keep down—trying to resist demands for increases in wages which are being made by practically every group of workmen—are out of line 7 percent now with the Little Steel formula. It is entirely possible that we may be able to resist the demands for increases in wages at the present time, but the other 3-percent increase in the cost of living which will immediately result by passing the Commodity Credit Corporation bill with section 3 in it prohibiting subsidies, will certainly be the straw that breaks the camel's back and will cause a demand for an increase in wages not corresponding to the 3 percent but to the 3 percent plus the 7 percent, which is the extent to which wages now are out of line with the Little Steel formula, or 10 percent.

Our country's wage bill is the approximate sum of $100,000,000,000 at the present time. If you increase that wage bill 10 percent you increase it $10,000,000,000. Our Government is the purchaser of the products of over 50 percent of that wage bill, so you will immediately cause the Government to pay $5,000,000,000 more for the articles which it needs for war, or 50 percent of the sum I have indicated.

I also spoke the other day concerning a very substantial number of our citizens whose purchasing power has not been increased since the outbreak of the war. When we consider the fact that there has been a 22-percent increase in the cost of living at the present time, their real wage, or their purchasing power, is actually less than it was 4 years ago. Various figures have been given as to the number of these people. I have attempted to accumulate the statistics from various Government departments, and although I did not personally collect them, I think I have the right to take them as accurate. Approximately 25,000,000 nonfarm workers have less purchasing power, less real wages, than they had 4 years ago. These are composed of nonmanufacturing workers such as service employees, transportation employees, Government employees, public-utility employees, and various other classes. I want it to be understood also that the wages that I am considering when I say they have less purchasing power than 4 years ago include whatever extra amount they may obtain for overtime, whether it be straight time or time and a half.

We also have another class in a worse condition and these are the so-called people of fixed income. They include those receiving public assistance, allotments, various sorts of pensions, railroad retirement, civil-service pensions, and so forth. They total over 8,000,000 people. In other words, there are over 33,000,000 people who are less able to meet their living expenses than they were in August 1939, and an increase in the living costs of this group would be unfair and in many cases unbearable. The recent increase of allotments to soldiers' dependents and widows would be of little use if the living costs of those dependents are increased.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman not think that this problem could be approached by passing the Herter plan, for example, and provide cheaper food for lower income groups, those that have not received any increase?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that is the wrong approach, although I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin who asks the question and also for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] who introduced the bill. I think the right thing to do is to keep the cost of living down, and if we want to reach the excess purchasing power of the country, that is bearing so hard on the stabilization line at this time, I believe that we ought to increase taxes. I believe that increased taxation is the only possible way that you can destroy the pressure of this so-called excess money on the stabilization line.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I was interested in the gentleman's statement about 33,000,000 people who have smaller take-home wages than they had 4 years ago. In arriving at those figures does the compiler of the figures deduct taxes before the take-home money is evaluated?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think not. I do not think taxes are deducted, but these figures do not take into consideration the family income, where there are more than one person who work in a family. I got those figures from the Department of Labor.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman has the date on them, that might indicate whether the pay-roll tax was in effect at that time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have so many statistics here which I have attempted to learn and study and compare, that I am afraid I might get a little mental indigestion if I attempted to do so now, but I would be glad to show the gentleman the figures and source from which I obtained them after I have finished.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman has the same difficulty that all of us have in arriving at statistics from various departments, which do not seem to jibe with one another. One set of figures will apparently say that the wage earner has received a greater proportion of increase than the farmer, and another set of figures from an equally reputable Government source indicates that the farmer has received more than the wage earner, and it is very hard for the layman confronted with a tableful of statistics, to know which to believe.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say to the gentleman in response, the percentage of increase in the 1935–39 level—and I think I have the figures that will bear this out—the farmer has a greater percentage of increase, if you compare him with all nonagricultural workers; but on the other hand, his income in that 1935–39 period was probably disproportionately low. So that is not a fair comparison. Also, there is one group of nonagricultural workers which has had an extremely high percentage of increase, which includes manufacturing employees, also mining employees and construction employees. Outside of that,

income has not increased to the worker. These few absorb these fabulous figures as to workers' incomes with which we are constantly confronted by exponents of that economic theory, which would increase the cost of living to the nonfarmer workers, at the present time.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Does the gentleman have the figure for the workers in industry who are receiving around $1.25, $1.50, and $1.75 an hour? The last figure I had was around 7,000,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have the figures here, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDIS. I just want to finish, if you will permit. A wrong impression has been given out through the country that most all of these defense workers and other workers have received these big wages. In my own district I have parachute workers, working for less than 40 cents an hour, doing war work. The Little Steel formula, adding 15 percent, does not mean much to those people, because it is only a very few cents per hour. The big bulk of the labor is having a tough time meeting the situation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman said that, because I do think that, although our national income is at an all-time high, it is not spread equally, and what might be a very fair thing to do to the highly paid employee, who is getting more money than he ever did, is not at all fair to the person who receives barely a living income at the present time, and is at the present time confronted with an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making an enlightening address. He is zealously representing his people and I have a high regard for the gentleman. I want to ask him this question: It is estimated that in 1943, the income will be some $140,000,000,000. Of that $140,000,000,000 some $16,000,000,000 will be spent for taxes, leaving $124,000,000,000, of that $124,000,000,000 some $82,000,000,000 will be spent over the counter for consumer goods. That leaves $42,000,000,000 and out of the $42,000,000,000, say, $25,000,000,000 goes into insurance premiums, the purchase of bonds, and savings accounts of all kinds. That leaves $17,000,000,000 now running loose in the economy. Do you not think at this time, during wartime, we are better able to pay our food bills now, rather than borrow this billion or five billion and issue bonds and notes against it, which is highly inflationary? Do you not think we should pay our own grocery bills now, rather than to have these soldier boys come back and be faced with this enormous debt—absolutely needless?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer that.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the gentleman's question is a very important one. It has been mentioned on the floor a number of times, whether we should pass on to the soldier boys when they come back today's grocery bills. I would say to the gentleman I think it is much more important that we pass on to those soldier boys when they come back a dollar that is worth a dollar rather than a dollar that is worth a dime.

Mr. GATHINGS. May I ask the gentleman to yield again at that point?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The second bond drive netted $18,000,000,000. Out of that $18,000,000,000 only $3,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 were subscribed by the individual citizen. The other $14,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 went to the investment bankers. What do they do in turn? They issue currency against it. That is what you want to do here. You want to borrow some more money and then let another bond drive come along and the investment bankers subscribe to it and issue currency. Where are we?

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. First, I want to correct the gentleman about the last bond drive. It was not $18,000,000,000 that the investment bankers got above the $3,000,000,000 individual subscriptions. Fifteen billion dollars of that went to noninflationary sources on which these bonds could not serve as a basis of currency to be issued. They were noninflationary purchases.

Mr. WRIGHT. Corporations and such?

Mr. MONRONEY. Corporations; yes. Money like that is not reissued. In further reference to the gentleman's point that we are adding to the fires of inflation, I would like to say that the subsidy program, if it is applied, will cost us in the neighborhood of $800,000,000. If investing $800,000,000 rather than breaking the Little Steel formula by 10 percent, which you will do if you increase the cost of living this additional 3 percent, you will have to issue $10,000,000,000 worth of bonds to pay for these purchases that the increased wage costs will bring about.

Mr. GATHINGS. Oh, that $800,000,000 is just a start.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not the duty of Congress, then, to have the courage to say how far you can go, and not to take a simplified line of thinking by saying, "All subsidies must be out"?

Is it not our duty to say: "We think you can use subsidies thus far and no further. Come back here in a few months and get permission for further use." I do not believe we can simplify our thinking to say simply that because we want to hold down the price of sugar by providing subsidies that we should take off a subsidy that is working on 20 percent of the sugar but holding the price of all sugar down by a penny a pound but because of its being necessary to subsidize this 20 percent 1 cent a pounds we should let the other 80 percent go up. I think we have got to say which one is the cheaper and it is the duty of Congress to go into this and study it.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think it is the duty of Congress, yes, to act at this time. Now, section 3 of this bill——

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt this very interesting colloquy. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma is doing my job probably better than I could do it myself, but there are several other features in this bill which I think should be pointed out, some features you probably may not have recognized.

Section 3 would increase the cost to the Government of the food which it purchases for the war. In the minority report we stated that this amounts to 30 percent of the food production. Those figures we felt were correct at the time, but the President in his message stated that it was 25 percent that went to the Government; so, if we increase the cost to the Government on 25 percent of the food products, obviously any fair basis of estimate as to what subsidies are going to cost must be adjusted by that figure because in the subsidy program you pay the money but when the Government buys food it saves the amount of the subsidy. Also, the increase of cost to the consumer would be greater than the amount of the subsidy which would be saved by reason of section 3. The increased price to the producer would be magnified by added margins and markups which are generally added to an article, as I understand, on a percentage basis. By the time the product reaches the consumer it would cost more than the amount of the subsidy.

Section 3 does not forbid all food subsidies. It specifically exempts vegetable fats, oils, and oilseed; and this is rather interesting, I believe, to people who come from the dairy States. Vegetable fats, oils, and oilseeds include margarine and vegetable shortening oils on which subsidies may be allowed, but no subsidy can be paid on butter.

It also means that 20 percent of our sugar consumption would be increased in price by 1 cent a pound if subsidies were removed. In a matching of this price the sugar we import, which is 80 percent of our consumption, must consequently be raised in price an equal amount.

Here, to my mind, is a feature of this bill which should be of interest to you gentlemen who are from agricultural regions: Support prices under existing law are fixed for the sole purpose of bringing out the maximum production of needed food items under section 3. In the future the War Food Administrator would also have to take into consideration the impact upon the cost-of-living index in fixing support prices, since the language specifically declares that ceiling prices must be as high as support prices. This unquestionably would lead to the lowering of some support prices now paid to farmers. In other words, section 3 states that the ceiling prices to consumers must be as high as support prices to the producers. This result can be reached in one of two ways, and in the

case of some products I suppose it would be reached in one way and in the case of other products it would be reached in another way: Either by raising the price to the consumer or cutting the support price to the producer. In other words, you can hike the ceiling price to the consumer or lower the support price to the producer. The latter course may, in many cases, interfere with production. But, on the other hand, in the exercise of their judgment, the War Food Administrator and the O. P. A. Administrator, acting together, might think that result would be less harmful than an increase in the cost of living, which would immediately cause demands for higher wages, which, if granted, might start inflation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. One more thought and then I shall be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning of my talk, I do not believe any of us who signed this minority report are disposed to be unreasonable; none of us think that subsidies are the heaven-sent answer to all our ills. We do not want to use any more of them than we have to; we feel that we should retain the right to use subsidies; but we should put a specific dollars and cents limitation upon them; we should put a specific time limitation on them. It is not necessary to extend the use of subsidies for a period of 2 years after the war to which limit the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be extended. Let us try them for a while and see how they work; let us get them under our control. In addition I believe that all the Members of the House know that the roll-back program on butter and meat and vegetables is being administered with funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and that the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for 10 additional minutes to answer questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. The officials of the War Food Administration, when they testified before our committee, assured us that no new roll-back programs are contemplated. I believe we should put in the bill language which states that there shall be no further roll-back programs; that the programs should be to maintain present prices rather than trying to reduce them unless they can be reduced by squeezing the water out of them. Informed people have told me that certain prices are too high because of the too great margin which is obtained by the middleman and that some squeezing can be done along that line.

If you can reduce the price by cutting down the middleman's margin in some cases where it is too high, I say do it, but not by the payment of subsidies. I do not believe we should initiate any new roll-back programs.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very much interested in the gentleman's discussion. He manifested a very fair-minded attitude, but I am sorry I cannot agree with his conclusions.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was hoping that the gentleman would agree with me, but I feared that perhaps he might not.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that one weakness in the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Oklahoma who so ably seconds him from the standpoint of arguing always that failure to pay subsidies is going to result in inflation is a sort of a naive conclusion on your part that a demand for a wage increase is ipso facto a wage increase. You have argued repeatedly that if we have no subsidies and if there is a slight increase in the cost of living immediately there will be demands for wage increases.

Mr. WRIGHT. The demands are present now, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. I was about to emphasize that they are present now. I do not see how we can alter that situation. Does the gentleman believe those demands for wage increases would be automatically dissipated if we have food subsidies?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think they would exert far less pressure if we did have them. Once this 3 percent is passed on I do not think we will be able to stop there. After we leave this Maginot line or Dneiper line we are not going to be able to find another line on which we can stand and, in my opinion, it is very important that we hold this precarious line at the present time, hoping that the war soon will be over before our economy is wrecked.

Mr. MUNDT. We are pretty well beyond the line already from the standpoint of Mr. Lewis.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to discuss that, too.

Mr. MUNDT. May I ask this further question. I agree with the gentleman there are certain large groups of people in this country who have not had much, if any, of a wage increase net to them during the last few years, but is it not true that strangely enough the demand for food subsidies and the demand for high wages is coming from groups that have had these wage increases rather than from those who have not?

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly that is true. I may say that the farm demands are coming from leaders of organized farmers, probably not from individual farmers except insofar as they have been indoctrinated with this idea. It makes not a bit of difference to a cow whether the Government pays a portion of the cost of the milk or the consumer pays it all. There are organized pressure groups in this country. One is the farm group, another is the labor group, and there is also the industrial group, which constantly exercise pressure against officials of the Government and always will perhaps, but it is our job to resist them and try to decide fairly among the contending forces.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that all of the pressure that is coming on Congress has been from those seeking to improve their relative economic situation rather than from the millions who are being hard-damaged and crushed by this continual increase in the cost of living? We hear very little from these poor individuals whose living standards have been reduced by as much as 22 percent on account of this increase in the cost of living. I think the ear of Congress should seek out these plaintive cries and listen to those people rather than listen to the all-powerful blocs of labor, farmers, manufacturers, and businessmen whose voices ring loud throughout the land in their demands for greater profit in time of war.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman because he is the first gentleman on his side, and I include in "on his side" even Mr. Byrnes, and former O. P. A. Administrator Mr. Brown, who has brought out what he so clearly brought out this afternoon, that is that the August 1939 prices must be viewed in the light of the fact that farm commodities at that time were only bringing 50 to 75 percent of parity.

I think what the gentleman has said is going to do considerable toward getting this thing focused in the right way. I may say that I have read articles which Mr. Brown and Mr. Byrnes and all of these men have written, and what they say always irritates me greatly, because it does not seem they want to give a fair picture, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he has not made any other contribution today than that one thing has gone a long way toward getting a real, honest approach to this very ticklish problem. As a member of the gentleman's committee, I would like to ask if he can tell me one member of his committee who can inform me of the list of all the activities—I was going to say antics but I am in a good frame of mind this afternoon—that are being indulged in by this child known as the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean the foods that are being subsidized?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know of any member of his committee who can give me a list of the activities that are being funneled through Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WRIGHT. What does the gentleman mean by "activities"? I know the law provides what they shall be.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Here is an embarrassing situation: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] for several years have had a bill pending to cancel out the old drought loans. They have collected around $5,000,000 the last 2 years under those old drought laws.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is not that an Agricultural Adjustment Administration activity?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. All at once under this Committee on Banking and Currency we have an agency that is coming out—I do not know how they do it without coming under the Disaster Loan Corporation, but we have the Commodity Credit Corporation in the relief business distributing hay, for example, which they are subsidizing $14.50 a ton. I am not opposed to relief in the drought area or anything like that, but the point I want to make is that this child has grown up awfully fast, she has had lots of vitamins or something, because she is getting all inflated until she is taking over all the activities that take place in relation to agriculture, as well as taking over things that have direct control over what is on the tables of the consumers of this country.

I do not approach this from any angle against subsidies. I am willing to let that stand by itself. If I thought that this was a constructive approach, it surely would not embarrass me to vote for it.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite sure about that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What puzzles me is if there is any evidence to present that the way they have been handled is going to be any approach to the problem whatever, and the same thing on this amount of money. If we would subsidize fairly and equally across the board, it would take $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 even to subsidize the present program, if they gave every dairy farmer the same price.

Mr. WRIGHT. Here is another idea I had. I do not have it particularly well developed yet, and there may be loopholes in it, but I think that another way to keep the control of Congress over the food situation is to have a monthly meeting, possibly of a subcommittee of our committee, with the administrative heads. I think it would be a very helpful thing, because obviously we cannot pass a law putting ceiling prices and support prices on every commodity. It is an administrative matter rather than a legislative matter. One of the greatest functions of Congress is that of criticism of the executive departments. It has always had that historic function. We could review complaints about various programs if there were this meeting at stated times. I notice several members of the committee here, and I would really be happy to find out what they think about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has called attention to a suggestion whereby the committee would meet at certain intervals to review the situation and determine whether or not certain changes should be made.

Mr. WRIGHT. Or a subcommittee; it would not be necessary to have the full committee attend.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that I think is of some importance. When the O. P. A. advisers determined about 2 weeks ago to change the plan of subsidy on beef by providing for a subsidy on live cattle indirectly, that group was asked whether or not the livestock group, for example, the farmers and livestock men, were consulted when they gave consideration to this change. As I understand, the reply was "no," they had not consulted the livestock group or livestock organizations or farmers. Does not the gentleman believe that instead of using the term "pressure groups" as far as farmers are concerned and to feel that way toward that particular group——

Mr. WRIGHT. Let me interrupt the gentleman. I do not refer to the farmers themselves as a pressure group, I refer to the organizations which represent the farmers and which send representatives to our committees as just as much pressure groups as the labor organizations or the railroads or the manufacturers or the canal interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2201 to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce on small business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 349. Resolution providing for expenses of members of Foreign Affairs Committee to attend meeting of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at Atlantic City, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 143); without amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3476. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath Drainage District and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3640. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war-damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3641. A bill to provide for the issuing of headstones to the next of kin of persons in the armed services who may be killed or lost in action or otherwise unaccounted for; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3642. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the deferment from service of men who are over 38 years of age and to release enlisted men from active service in the land or naval forces who have attained the thirty-eighth anniversary of their birth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to create a joint committee for the purpose of studying means for improving the organization and effectiveness of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. Res. 350. Resolution providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 351. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. Res. 352. Resolution providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people

of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3643. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of Louis T. Klauder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 3645. A bill for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Droppelman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3488. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rosso Fisher and other citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3489. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mrs. A. M. Nilsestuen, secretary of the Zion Lutheran Ladies Aid, and Mrs. H. O. Moen, both of Blackduck, Minn., and other members of the society and residents of Blackduck and community, advocating passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting manufacture, sale, and/or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3490. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, protesting against the passage of House bill 3477 which seeks to stop food subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3491. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by Harry F. Pallmeier, secretary-treasurer of Joint Council No. 4, United Shoe Workers of America, and 335 other citizens, urging the Congress to provide money for subsidies which they feel will assure the rollback of prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3492. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition signed by 5,500 war workers of northern New Jersey, supporting the President's program of price control, including the use of limited subsidies, and calling for a progressive war-tax program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3493. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition submitted by Mrs. H. G. Pearce, of Gregory, Mich., and signed by 40 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3494. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition signed by sundry women of Mason City, Iowa, favoring House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3495. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. William B. Coling and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3496. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry members of the Christiar Churches of Newark, Ohio, placing themselves on record as favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which bill would prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until demobilization is completed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3497. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Alta McCollister and 20 other residents of Central City, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3498. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Robert Morris, of Batavia, Ill., and 24 citizens, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Michael S. Wasniewski, pastor, Holy Trinity Church, Pine Grove, Denmark, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, Supreme Ruler of heaven and earth, Father of all mankind, look down from Thy heavenly throne upon us today here assembled in Thy presence. With a humble heart we acknowledge Thy supreme wisdom by which are guided the destinies of men individually and nations at large. We profess our weakness in comprehending things in the right sense and true light, unless we are enlightened by the Holy Spirit, who dispels all the darkness of our minds whenever there is a choice between right and wrong, as long as we are willing to adhere to the eternal and unchangeable laws of justice, fairness, mutual love, and universal brotherhood of all men and nations. We know we can accomplish these things if we follow the teaching of our Divine Master, Christ Jesus, who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. * * * If you abide in Me, and My words abide in you, you shall ask whatsoever you will, and it shall be done unto you." (John xv: 7.)

Inspired with this assurance of Thy Divine Son, we implore Thee, our Heavenly Father, to shower upon the representatives of our Nation the seven gifts of Thy Holy Spirit, that is, the gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and fortitude, of knowledge and godliness and fear of the Lord, in order that all their deliberations and epoch-making decisions just now so important to the American Nation and to all liberty- and peace-loving people in all the world; that these men chosen by our American people, for the people, from among our people, may be courageously guided by that Divine Light and secure for all nations a speedy victory and a lasting peace.

I see in spirit this very moment oppressed nations, poor widows, starving orphans, looking forward and praying amid abundant tears to this very place where we are just now assembled—the Capitol of our American Government—a standing symbol of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

We, therefore, beseech Thee, our Creator and Conserver of the universe, who, in Thy divine wisdom, has allowed this terrible scourge of war to touch us, that Thou be unmindful of our past omissions, of our past indifference, of our past ingratitude; but that through the merits of the passion, death, and glorious resurrection of Thy Divine Son, and through the graces that Thou hast showered down upon us, we may again be found worthy in Thy sight of the heritage of our fathers.

We beseech Thee, after this chastisement by which we may be cleansed from the past dross of indifference, the guile of pettiness, and the pride of personal ambitions, we may, through the mutual cooperation with Thy divine grace, be firmly grounded in the principles of love of God and man, seeking first Thy kingdom—with that guarantee—that all other things shall be added unto us.

We ask this in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased

husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith; and

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 932. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1243. An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes;

S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co.;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox; and

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management).
Veterans' Administration.
War Manpower Commission (Selective Service System).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; and

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

Department of the Interior.
Department of Labor.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Department of the Treasury.
Federal Works Agency.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HADWEN C. FULLER, Representative-elect from the Thirty-second Congressional District of New York, is present and desires to take the oath of office. Inasmuch as there is no contest and no claim of irregularities in his election, I ask unanimous consent that the oath of office be now administered to him, notwithstanding the fact that his certificate of election has not yet arrived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HADWEN C. FULLER, Representative-elect from the Thirty-second Congressional District of New York, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the following telegram to Mr. Miller McClintock, president of the Mutual Broadcasting System, New York:

> Fulton Lewis, Jr., last night made a personal attack on me in connection with subsidies. I demand his time at an early date to answer him. Please advise me at once whether or not this will be arranged.

If the time is not arranged, as suggested, I expect to appeal to the Federal Communications Commission for an order requiring it.

SUGAR BEETS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks now the importance of the Department of Agriculture announcing the sugar-beet program for the coming year has been stressed. This is a matter of vital concern, not only to the farmers of California, where the planting season is already under way in many sections, but also to the entire country, because it involves our whole food production program. I understand now that the sugar price will not be announced until after the Commodity Credit Corporation bill has been voted upon in this House. Personally I had hoped that at least a tentative program could have been announced before this—and had been informed that such a step was contemplated. However, every additional day's delay now is an additional handicap to our beet program, and if the Commodity Credit bill must first be passed, let us by all means expedite its discussion. I am certain that such speedy action will meet not only with the approval of the members of the entire California delegation, regardless of party, but also that of the great majority of the membership of the House.

TRIBUTE TO OUR PACIFIC SUBMARINE FLEET

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of Texas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GENERALISSIMO FRANCO

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's paper an article regarding a recent congratulatory message that the Generalissimo of the Spanish Government, Señor Franco, had sent to the puppet president of the Philippine Islands. I do not know how long this is going to go on with the Spanish Government, but, Mr. Speaker, if I were the Chief of Staff, I would not hesitate, if other major military obstacles were not in the way to a second front, I would march right through Spain.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the regular order of business and other special orders today, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to inquire of the gentleman if this request to speak is in furtherance of the declared and avowed purpose of some Members of the House to carry on a filibuster in reverse, or whether it is the purpose of giving information to the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may answer that if he desires.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I am required to answer such a question. However, for the information of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, may I say that I expect to speak on the subject of Norway and the Norwegian merchant marine. If the gentleman is interested in the post-war possibilities of helping small nations, I hope he will be present when I address the House on that subject today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman——

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request. A bill will be under consideration under the 5-minute rule this afternoon.

Mr. DONDERO. We have a number of witnesses from the Lake States, and that is the reason for the request.

The SPEAKER. We have a large program in the House this afternoon also.

FACILITIES FOR VISITORS OF PATIENTS AT WALTER REED HOSPITAL

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the House today on a subject that I know will be close to all of us. On Sunday last, I went to Walter Reed Hospital to call on a young officer who has been absent from this country for 18 months, and who is a patient at that hospital. His wife had come down to see him, and what joy and hope she brought to him. He was very anxious about her having a place to stay during the few brief days she could be with him. I was surprised to learn that there are only 15 rooms at Walter Reed Hospital for the wives and mothers of our boys who are there.

I ask you to lend your aid, with mine, to bring this matter to the attention of the Committee on Military Affairs. I know that the hostess there at Walter Reed Hospital wishes for 100 rooms. I know they can be constructed rapidly and it will give some place for the mothers and wives of these patients to stay when they come to bring them hope and cheer.

I ask you to aid me in this work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Weekly K. A. P. Review Agency of New York, regarding the formal adoption of the Lublin University by the Fordham University, in a unique ceremony.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD 10 resolutions from the Kern County Branch Cattlemen's Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICES ON MEAT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, weekly sales of hogs and cattle are held in my State of California. On yesterday, on account of the bungling of the price ceiling and point regulation by the Office of Price Administration, 700 or more head of hogs had to be returned to the farmers. There was no one to buy those hogs. The farmers had to return them to their farms and place them back on high, expensive feed and take a great loss. While a bunch of men down in the O. P. A. is bungling this meat program hourly and daily, our meat industry in the United States is suffering. I wonder who can answer to these farmers today or tomorrow or in the weeks to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GEORGE W. LOFT

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I have learned of the passing of the Honorable George W. Loft, former Representative from the Thirteenth Congressional District, New York City, the district which it is now my remarks.

Mr. Loft was born on Division Street, New York City, on February 6, 1865, and attended the public schools. His father owned a candy store and he encouraged his son's interest in the business, which interest manifested itself at an early age.

The former Congressman eventually built up his own candy business, and at the height of his career Loft, Inc., was a nationally known firm, with stores in all parts of New York City.

In the autumn of 1913 he was elected, as a Democrat, to the Sixty-third Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Timothy D. Sullivan. He was reelected in 1914 to the Sixty-fourth Congress, served his term, and was not a candidate for renomination in 1916.

In 1918 Mayor Hylan, of New York City, appointed Mr. Loft chairman of the Mayor's Committee of National Defense. Several years later he was a member of the New York State Racing Commission and served in that capacity for a number of years. He retired from the candy business in 1929 and turned to banking. He founded the South Shore Trust Co. and has served as president of same. He was also chairman of the board of the County Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Mr. Loft was active in many civic movements and he was regarded by all who knew him as a typical American gentleman, who brought credit and honor to the city of his birth. His passing has removed from the scene an American whose patriotism, vigor, and civic-mindedness we can ill afford to lose at this time.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUSBEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Windham County (Vt.) Farm Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, following the address by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FORTY-EIGHT-HOUR WEEK

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RUSSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the conclusion of the business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include an address by Mr. William R. Boyd, Jr., to the members of the American Petroleum Institute in Chicago on November 10, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a brief history of the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., at Baltimore, Md.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BETHLEHEM-FAIRFIELD SHIPYARD, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the past year and a half you and I have heard startling accounts and, accounts much to our satisfaction, concerning the miraculous accomplishments in the various shipbuilding yards in this country. Some of these yards have a set program for publicity. Other yards are too busy building ships to pay any attention to publicity, but let their record speak for labor, management, and production.

I particularly refer to the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., of Baltimore, Md. Mr. A. B. Homer, president of this yard, and Mr. Jack Willis, vice president and general manager, have established records that are worthy of the utmost consideration. Jack Willis, whose dynamic personality and comprehensive knowledge of shipbuilding has obtained results far beyond the expectation of the most extravagant imagination.

I attribute the splendid work done at the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyards to the undisputed fact that Jack Willis and his associates not only take a personal interest in every one of the 48,000 employees but give the utmost consideration to the working conditions and the facilities that necessarily go with efficiency and production. There is very little publicity, if any, given to this yard. Willis and his official family are too busy building ships and making contributions to the war effort.

I have today extended my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD giving a comprehensive outline of the accomplishments of this great shipbuilding corporation.

Mr. Homer, Jack Willis, and the employees of the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard, we salute you.

In conclusion, it might be well to state that everything done by you, Jack Willis, and your organization, is done with this one thought in mind: This is our country, and above all it is God's country. You and your organization with your American determination for production are bound to keep it such. The boys in servic appreciate your splendid efforts and the American people owe you a debt of gratitude.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. O'BRIEN of New York and Mr. DUFFETT asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.)

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution, as follows:

Resolution requesting the Speaker to invite Secretary of State Cordell Hull to address the House of Representatives on the subject of the Moscow Conference

Resolved, That the Speaker is hereby requested to invite the Secretary of State of the United States, the Honorable Cordell Hull, to address, at an early date, the Members of the House of Representatives, during a recess taken for that purpose, on the subject of the Moscow Conference.

I have introduced this resolution because this House has had the privilege and the opportunity of hearing distinguished personages from Great Britain, the Netherlands, China; it has heard the Presidents of South American republics. And I am sure, in view of the importance of the event and the interest occasioned by Secretary Hull's visit to Moscow, that it is not out of order to suggest that this House may enjoy the privilege of hearing for a change from a distinguished American.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Thursday, after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the previous orders already entered for today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article showing the contribution of the American Indian on our fighting fronts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BEDS FOR VISITING RELATIVES OF WOUNDED VETERANS AT WALTER REED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] brought to the attention of the House the fact that there are so few beds in the Hostess House at Walter Reed for families of our wounded veterans. The Hostess House told me they could use 250 beds for families. I remind the House of the fact that the sight of a veteran's family often means the off chance of recovery. It means frequently for a man who is mentally distraught a glimmer of hope that brings back a gradual return of his full mental prowess. Also, I am sure the Members know the comfort it is to men who are not going to live, men who are desperately wounded and sick, to see the faces and feel the touch of their loved ones. Those men and women who have served 21 or 22 months overseas should see their families most especially. More rooms should be provided at the hostess houses.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make this request for the purpose of calling to the attention of the membership the rating of the Appropriations Committee on the last deficiency appropriation bill just approved last week. Its allowance for an additional $50,000,000 for war housing was absolutely unnecessary and a waste of money, to say nothing of critical materials and manpower.

Look at last Sunday's Bridgeport, Conn., paper. Nineteen hundred dormitories are ready, only 266 occupied. This is just another illustration of the waste of the taxpayers' money and critical materials. I offer the commitee this proof. It is only one of many that has come to my desk recently.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on November 15, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders already requested, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

THE CHILLICOTHE GAZETTE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in 1800 a newspaper was established in Chillicothe, Ohio, and published under the name of the Chillicothe Gazette.

This publication has continued since that date and is the oldest newspaper in the State of Ohio published continuously under the same name.

On November 11 fitting ceremonies will be held in the Deshler Wallick Hotel at Columbus, Ohio, commemorating this unusual achievement.

I congratulate Chillicothe on this honor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter and short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. WILLEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I asked this morning and received permission to speak for 30 minutes on Monday next. I ask unanimous consent that this time be given me on Tuesday next instead of Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF GOVERNMENT OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 95.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution 95, with Mr. RICHARDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the background of the pending resolution is that under the present Philippine law the term of office of President Quezon, the present President of the Philippine Republic, ends on the 15th of November 1943. Under the present law Mr. Osmeña on next Monday would succeed President Quezon as President of the Philippine Republic.

We are in the midst of a war. I do not need to tell the membership of this House that our enemies, the Japanese, have occupied the Philippines and are in control over there. I do not have to tell this body that the legislative and judicial branches of the Philippine Government are under the domination and control of the Japanese. Here in Washington are residing the President and Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth, together with the members of their Cabinet, also the Resident Commissioner, the Honorable JOAQUIN M. ELIZALDE. All of these gentlemen who are officials of the Philippine Commonwealth have addressed to myself as chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee of the House and to Senator TYDINGS as chairman of a similar committee of the Senate a letter requesting that action be taken in the matter of the succession to the Presidency.

It has been felt by those who have long been considering this problem that in order to best demonstrate to the world that there is complete solidarity and complete unity in the desire of the leadership of the Philippine people to stand solidly back of the United States, that a resolution such as we now have under consideration be passed.

I may say that I not only have a letter from all of the legally constituted representatives of the Philippine Government in America, but I have communications from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Interior endorsing the purpose of this resolution and requesting that it be passed.

I may say for the information of those who were not here yesterday that the general purpose of this resolution is to bring about a situation whereby when our troops get into the Philippine Islands, as they are going to, there will be no question of dissension over there, that all of the Filipino people will understand the fact that their leaders here have full cooperation and support, one with the other, and that they are supporting the Government of the United States, in order that the troops of our country may have the full cooperation of every Filipino in the islands when we enter.

At this time I include in my remarks a communication addressed to Senator TYDINGS and myself, signed by all of the responsible officials of the Philippine Republic in the United States; a letter from the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; a letter from the State Department; and a letter from the Department of the Interior. They read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES,
November 5, 1943.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.
Representative JASPER BELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We respectfully call to your attention and to the attention of the Congress of the United States conditions affecting the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines upon which you may wish to take action.

Under the provisions of our constitution, adopted by our people with the approval of the United States Government, the present incumbent of the office of the President will cease on November 15, 1943, and on the same date the Vice President will assume the Presidency.

Due to invasion and occupation of the Philippines by the Japanese, constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been interrupted in the Philippine Islands. While this condition prevails, the question of the Presidential succession under our constitution comes up for consideration.

If we were in the Philippines and our constitutional government there were functioning regularly, there would be no problem. But we are not in the Philippines, we are in the midst of a global war, and our constitutional system and democratic institutions are seriously jeopardized. The operation of the legislative and judicial branches are suspended by enemy occupation, and only the executive branch, which remains free from the enemy's action and is now temporarily established in Washington, is able to continue performing its functions.

Obviously constitutional government and democratic processes will not again function in the Philippines until law and order are reestablished.

Therefore, we, the President, the Vice President, and the other members of the war cabinet of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, respectfully submit this matter to the President and the Congress of the United States with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency. Congress may feel free to consider whether it would be to the best interest of both peoples to allow changes in the direction of the Commonwealth Government during the emergency, to continue the status quo until such time as the con-

stitutional and democratic processes are fully reestablished in the Philippines, or to follow such other course of action as in their opinion is required by the circumstances.

In the event that emergency legislation is enacted, we are confident that it will be made effective only for the duration of the war and to cover such period of time as is necessary to reestablish our constitutional processes in the Philippines, when we may proceed again under our own constitution.

We would be most thankful to the President and the Congress of the United States for whatever attention they may give to this matter.

We have the honor to remain,

Faithfully yours,

M. L. Quezon, President; S. Osmeña, Vice President; J. M. Elizalde, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States; Basilio J. Valvex, Chief of Staff, Secretary of National Defense; Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Information and Public Relations; Andres Soriano, Secretary of Finance; J. Hernandez, Auditor General; A. B. Rotor, Secretary to the President.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 9, 1943.

Hon. C. JASPER BELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have read the proposed Joint Resolution No. 189, "to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands," and hasten to advise you that in my opinion the passage of this resolution will greatly assist in a continuous and effective prosecution of the war effort to liberate the Philippines from the Japanese. I hope it may be adopted by both Houses promptly.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 8, 1943.

The Honorable C. JASPER BELL,
Chairman, Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BELL: It is my understanding that you will submit a joint resolution by which the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands. Thereupon the tenure of office of the present President of the Commonwealth shall cease and the Vice President shall become President to serve until such time as his successor shall have been elected and qualified according to the Constitution and the laws of the Philippines.

The Department of State has been asked to comment on this proposal and I desire to state, in connection with the request, that the Department is in sympathy with the purpose of the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 9, 1943.

Hon. C. JASPER BELL,
Chairman, Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BELL: House Joint Resolution No. 189, recognizing that enemy action has interrupted the normal governmental processes of the Philippines, authorizes the temporary continuance in office of the President and Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

I am advised that this resolution reflects the views of both President Quezon and Vice President Osmeña, the elected and now the only authoritative spokesmen for the Philippine people. For this reason, Secretary Ickes has authorized me to say, in his absence, that he approves the action which is now proposed.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

Commissioner ELIZALDE, who is the spokesman in this body for the Filipino people, will address you and give his opinion of whether or not this resolution is the best thing for the Filipino people and for the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does the gentleman have available and can he read to the Members of the House section 5 of article VII of the Philippine Constitution? I tried to get that from the Congressional Library yesterday but was unable to do so.

Mr. BELL. I am sure it is available. I am surprised the gentleman is unable to get it. I do not happen to have it in my file here at the moment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does any member of the gentleman's committee have it available to read to the House?

Mr. BELL. I do not know that any of them have it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I, too, want to know what section 5 of article VII of the constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines is, because this resolution really annuls that for the present time. We should like to hear it read.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think the House can be assured that section 5 of article VII of the Philippine Constitution provides for the regular election of the President and Vice President and prescribes their terms of office. It is that which this resolution seeks to amend.

Mr. BELL. Yes. I may say that under an amendment that, I believe, was passed in 1941, the constitution provides that the Vice President upon the termination of the term of the President on November 15, 1943, shall succeed him for a term of 2 years.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I ask the gentleman which resolution is before the House, the Senate resolution or the House resolution?

Mr. BELL. It is Senate Joint Resolution 95, which is identical with the House resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Not entirely, because the Senate resolution contains a provision which covers a situation that gave me some concern over the House resolution; at least the Senate amendment of the Senate resolution.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday he will find that Senate Joint Resolution 95 was amended on the floor of the Senate to conform with and become identical with the House resolution that appears as House Resolution 189, with the exception that this amendment was inserted in what otherwise would be House Resolution 189. It is a clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

To finish answering the question of the gentleman, the Senate amendment inserted language which, if placed in the House Joint Resolution, would appear on page 2, line 2, after the word "Philippines", "serving at the time of the introduction of this joint resolution." It is merely a clarifying amendment. Otherwise Senate Joint Resolution 95 is identical with House Joint Resolution 189.

Mr. COLE of New York. Did the House joint resolution provide for the procedure that would be followed after the President of the United States determined that order had been restored, in that the Vice President would succeed to the office of the Presidency of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and that an election would ensue after the proclamation of the President?

Mr. BELL. It does so provide.

Mr. COLE of New York. The House joint resolution did provide that?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. That escaped my attention.

There is one other question I should like to have the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs answer in order that the House may be assured. In these days of dictators and one-man rule throughout the world, does the gentleman think the adoption of this resolution by the Congress and retaining in office indefinitely the two Filipino officials can be taken as any criterion or precedent which the American people might follow in 1944?

Mr. BELL. In the first place, the resolution does not retain him in office indefinitely. It merely retains him in office until order has been restored in the Philippines. According to the terms of the resolution, the Vice President succeeds the President when constitutional processes have been restored, until such time as his term has expired and their successors have been elected. The resolution so provides.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. But the gentleman does not feel that the adoption of this resolution is any indication that the Congress approves the idea that the American people, even in time of war, shall suspend the operation of their own Constitution and retain indefinitely, until constitutional and world orderliness

has been restored, the present Executives of the Government?

Mr. BELL. This is a war measure to bring about a situation which will help those people win the war and win their freedom, and leave them with their constitution intact. It certainly is not an attempt to change the constitution or to set a precedent for any future action.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not a guide to the American people on the American Continent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs to distinguish between the power of Congress to amend the Constitution of the Philippines and amending our own Constitution? Obviously we cannot by resolution of the Congress amend the Constitution of the United States. Do we have the power to amend the Constitution of the Philippines in this way?

Mr. BELL. Until 1946 the United States retains jurisdiction, that is, sovereignty over the Philippines. Until that time I think there is no question that we have the legal right and the power and the moral right to pass this resolution amending the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How does this action hook up with the Atlantic Charter proposition, that is, with letting the people decide for themselves?

Mr. BELL. This action is taken at the request of all of the representatives of the Filipino people. We are taking it, not at our own volition, but at their request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all happy in voting for this resolution. I think I speak the mind of many Members when I say that I am doing this solely because we are advised that the administration, the State Department, the War Department, and the Navy Department, as well as the President, Vice President, and cabinet of the Philippine Government, request this.

We all believe thoroughly that a people's government can best function through democratic constitutional processes. Accepting this concept, this Congress passed a law laying down a formula which, if followed by the Philippine people, would culminate in absolute independence for the Filipinos in 1946.

Pursuant to this law, the Filipinos formulated a constitution which was submitted to and approved by our Government. In accordance with its provisions Mr. Quezon was elected President, and Mr. Osmeña was elected Vice President. The constitution provides that on November 15, 1943, President Quezon's term expires, and he is automatically retired from office. The same constitution provides that in these circumstances, Mr. Osmeña, the Vice President, automatically becomes the chief executive. In short, the Philippine people elected Mr. Quezon to be President until November 15, 1943, and elected Mr. Osmeña to be President when Mr. Quezon's term expires. This is what would have happened had the war not intervened.

The President, Vice President, and Philippine Cabinet have taken refuge in this country, and the Philippine Islands are under the control and domination of the Japanese Government. This is the present status as I understand it.

The purpose of this resolution is to change the terms of the Philippine Constitution, if possible, in three important ways:

First. The term of the elected President will be indefinitely continued.

Second. The Vice President will be continued as Vice President, and not promoted to the Presidency, the constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

Third. The Philippine Constitution, insofar as it affects tenure of office of the President and the Vice President, shall be suspended in the discretion of the President of the United States; that is, the resolution gives the President the authority by proclamation to determine if and when constitutional processes may again obtain in the Philippines. The Philippine Government, under its constitution, does not exist today. Japanese dictatorship controls the Philippines.

This proposed action is most foreign to our method of legislating. Only the most compelling and urgent necessities should warrant the passage of this resolution. Congress is told that these necessities exist; that the passage of this resolution will aid the war effort; and that its failure to pass will be detrimental to the war effort.

In these circumstances, I am constrained to vote for the resolution, and in doing so I entertain the fervent hope that the time is not far distant when our country may return to the American way of life, especially as practiced in its legislative halls.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I really believe that this resolution should be defeated. The facts are that the committee was called on very short notice, and very few were present. I think the record of the committee meeting will show that about a dozen were present. Half of them came in after the vote was taken. It is true that I did not oppose this resolution in the committee, but the evidence was so meager, the facts are so meager, that I do not think anyone knew just what they were doing. My information is that this President of the Philippines came over here and brought about 20 aides and servants along with him, and left his Cabinet there. Even the Vice President had to get a special order to go with the party. I believe had he brought his Cabinet with him, that Cabinet would be here today in support of the Government in exile instead of being the Cabinet of the puppet government of the Philippines set up by the Japanese. I am wondering whether the passage of this resolution will not greatly hinder our dealings with the Philippines, and with those people in the Orient. I cannot understand why we should take action like this to keep an old man, who is too ill to attend to business, in office, and pass over a man who received 2 percent more votes than President Quezon did in the same election, who is abundantly able to attend to the duties. I am convinced that Washington and Philippine politics are back of this whole thing, that it is not to save life but that it will cost a lot of lives, and anxiety in the days to come. I believe that to maintain our honor and prestige and strengthen our influence throughout the world we should defeat this resolution.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this resolution proposes a very unusual procedure. There can be no doubt that it lies within the power of the Congress of the United States to suspend the provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. That Commonwealth springs from the authority of the Congress of the United States in the first instance, and the authority of the United States Congress may be exercised in suspending it in part or temporarily. Be that as it may, and I am confident that statement of the situation is correct, I hope very much indeed that this resolution will be adopted. My support of it springs from my conviction that it will bring a distinct military advantage to us in the conduct of this war in the Far East, and especially in helping us to recover the Philippine Archipelago, and then carry out our promise of complete independence of the Philippines by 1946, in the event, of course, that hostilities have ceased, and order is restored by that time. The question is asked, Should these two men be kept in office during the duration? The fact is, as I understand it, that President Quezon represents, more than any other public figure in the Philippines, the aspirations of his people for independence. Second, he represents most conspicuously that spirit of resistance among the Filipinos against Japanese aggression. The suggestion was made a moment ago to the effect that a number of Quezon's Cabinet or government might have reached this country. The facts are, as I recollect them, that President Quezon was on the island of Corregidor when that fortress was under siege by the Japanese, cooperating 100 percent with General MacArthur. His cooperation was exceedingly important and so valued by General MacArthur. Obviously it was difficult under the conditions of that siege to arrange for the transportation of any considerable number of Filipino governmental officials.

It was a rather desperate undertaking as it was to get President Quezon out, and those who came with him, as it was a rather desperate undertaking for General MacArthur to obey the orders of the

President of the United States and leave for Australia. So I think no reflections can be cast against Mr. Quezon or Mr. Osmeña with respect to that particular incident. I happen to know that the military people regard this thing as of exceeding importance, largely, as I said a moment ago, due to the fact that President Quezon, in his present position, represents something of enormous importance to the Philippine people and their aspirations. The constitutional processes—the legal processes—in the Philippines have been suspended. There can be no elections so long as the Japanese are in control, except such puppet elections as may be gone through with under their domination. The whole Filipino people understand that.

This resolution does not create the impression amongst thoughful Filipinos, or amongst any considerable group of people, that the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States are aiming to deprive the Filipinos ultimately of their liberty or independence; rather it is intended as a step toward further securing the ultimate recovery of their independence. and, in the meantime, drawing to ourselves their loyal cooperation during the great conflict upon which we are jointly embarked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] in urging the adoption of this resolution. I hope that my friends who have some feelings of fear will pause for a moment and realize just what the situation is that confronts not only the people of the Philippines but we as Members of the House today in passing upon this matter.

We have been asked by two recognized and regularly elected officials, the President and Vice President of the Philippines, to adopt this action. Certainly they are doing it, as they consider, for the best interests of their people. They are interested in the restoration of the independence of the Philippines. So are we. They are actuated by self-interest, as they should be. So are we. I have repeatedly said that nations respond to interests, not to emotions. As I view this, it is a matter of interest which prompts them to do so. Certainly the patriotism of the President and Vice President of the Philippine Republic cannot be questioned. Certainly they feel that the course they have recommended to Congress is distinctly for the best interests of their own people and their own Government. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in his observation that they must feel that this resolution is a strengthening guaranty of the complete independence of the people of the Philippines when we have recaptured the Philippine Islands from the Japanese.

In addition to that we have the letter from Secretary Stimson. Certainly he is a man with a great career. You and I may disagree with him on this or that, but one thing is certain, we profoundly respect him as a great American and as a great public official. He was Secretary of State in a preceding administration and is now Secretary of War during this crisis. I think that all of us can recognize the weight that is attached to a recommendation coming from such a distinguished American and able public official.

We also have the attitude taken by the State Department. We have the request of the duly elected public officials of the Philippine Republic, the President and the Vice President. I do not know what their party is. I did not know there was a difference of party, to be frank, until yesterday. It makes no difference to me. Frankly, I did not know until yesterday which party either one belonged to. That may be a frank confession that might astonish some people, but I did not know until yesterday that there was a difference of political party between them. But, here they are, both joining. We are justified in assuming that they are actuated by the highest ideals of patriotism for their own people and their own country.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think the majority leader's excellent statement should go uncorrected, because it implies that the President and Vice President and all other officers asked that this bill be passed. Their letter says this:

> Therefore, we, the President, the Vice President, and the other members of the war cabinet of the Commonwealth of the Philippines respectfully submit this matter to the President and the Congress of the United States with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency.

Then they outline the three possibilities we might take.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly the only construction that can be placed upon that letter is that they feel that the Congress should take some action under existing circumstances.

Mr. JUDD. To review the whole situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, let us look at it from a practical angle. Suppose this was 1947 and there was complete independence. If these gentlemen were in exile, certainly they would be justified themselves in taking action which would assure the continuity of the government in exile. But by reason of the fact that this is 1943, it is necessary to come before Congress for action to extend their term of office as provided by the resolution.

Does any of us take the position that the President of Czechoslovakia is not justified in constituting himself with the other officials as the government in exile? Does any one of us take the position with reference to Yugoslavia or any of the other governments that have been conquered in this war, that their governments in exile are not serving a very useful purpose? And in the wisdom of the President and the Vice President of the Philippine Republic they have petitioned Congress to take action. The natural inference to draw from that and the interpretation to place upon it is that they approve of action along the lines outlined in this resolution. Certainly it is for the best interest of the people of the Philippines to have the George Washington of the Philippines continuing in cooperation with the Vice President; and, certainly, it is for the best interests of our own people and our own soldiers when the reinvasion of the Philippines takes place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are two things one must question in considering this bill: One is the wisdom of the bill itself, and the other is the wisdom of the method by which it is being rushed through—without hearings, without testimony from all concerned, without full deliberation by the proper committee, and only by objecting yesterday when it was suddenly brought up without notice were we given a chance to debate it even here on the floor of the House.

The Philippine Islands has a constitution that provides for the term of office of their President. Surely we ought to consider long and seriously before we with a sort of wave of the hand suspend that constitution, which was authorized by Congress, was worked out by a constitutional convention elected by the Filipino people, was approved by the President of the United States, and then approved overwhelmingly by the Filipino people in a national referendum.

When 2 years ago they reelected Mr. Quezon as their President it was known that he could serve for only 2 years, because he had already served 6 years, and the constitutional limitation upon the term of office of the President is 8 years. The 8 years will be up next Monday, November 15. They elected Mr. Osmeña as Vice President with full understanding that he would become President after 2 years, that he would be Vice President for 2 years and then President for 2 years.

The elections were held just a month or so before Pearl Harbor. At the time of the election, troops were partially mobilized, civilian defense had been organized, air-raid drills were being held—all knew they were likely to be plunged into war at any time. They elected Osmeña to be their Vice President, knowing there was a reasonable probability he would be a war President.

I asked certain questions yesterday which have not been answered, and I am going to ask them again: What evidence is there that there will be dissension or

any other bad results in the Philippine Islands if the Philippine Constitution is followed and the man allowed to become President who was elected to become President on November 15? If Mr. Quezon has been the symbol of Filipino liberty, he can certainly still be that symbol of liberty. I wonder if his influence among the Filipinos will not be greatly enhanced rather than reduced by his having followed their constitution and become also an elder statesman who always has such influence in the Orient. Can he not still broadcast to the Filipinos just as now? Can he not still urge them to resist quite as effectively as ex-President as he can as President?

If Mr. Quezon's retirement would leave no successor, if it would mean there would be no government, it would be different; but there will be no interruption in the Philippine Government-in-exile; the duly elected Vice President is here to take over; things can go along without hitch. As we prepare to climax the finest chapter in all colonial history by voluntarily setting free a subject people, practically the first time it has ever been done, do we want to get ourselves in the position of beginning to hedge on our professed belief that the Filipinos can be trusted to choose their own President? Other imperialistic nations have done that repeatedly in Asia; always have been able to produce a good reason at the last moment why actual power should not be given to the Asiatic peoples. Japan has always maintained that oriental nations would never get their full freedom from white powers until or unless they helped Japan wrest it from those powers. I wonder if we will not be building up in the minds of Chinese and other Asiatics, as well as Filipinos, suspicion and distrust and fear that will far more than offset any possible advantages of keeping Mr. Quezon in his official position.

I should like to ask again, Why wait until one week before the deadline to bring this matter before us? The Philippine Government has been in this country a year and a half. If the case is so strong for the bill, would it not be stronger to bring out the proposal in time to allow full, unhurried consideration? The Philippine Constitution has also been a symbol of liberty to 1,000,000,000 orientals. Is that a thing for Congress to set aside in such haste?

We have no word from the President of the United States recommending this drastic action as a war measure or for any other visible reason. If he, in an official letter, were to ask it for urgent reasons, I would, I think, not oppose it; but there is no such letter, and it seems to me that such a grave thing should not be done unless we are dead sure that the President of the United States favors it.

In our discussion yesterday, a good deal was said about Mr. Osmeña, the Vice President, being allegedly in favor of this bill; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] said, for example:

> It is significant to me that the Vice President, who would assume office by succession under normal constitutional processes, himself feels that it would be to the best interest of the Philippine Islands for the incumbent to remain in office.

On what evidence is such a statement made? There is no evidence in the letter jointly signed by the President, Vice President, and other Philippine officials in this country that he or they believe that it would be advisable for him not to become President at this time. If he were to refuse to sign this letter, after the Quezon people had been agitating it for weeks, he would certainly be criticized for trying to get himself in office, or putting his own career ahead of his nation's interests. I ask you, What else could he do but sign it? But you notice the letter very carefully does not commit him or any other signer to the thing proposed in this bill. He merely joins the others in respectfully submitting this matter to the President and the Congress of the United States with the request that they review the whole situation, and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency.

Is refusing to accept the man they constitutionally elected to be their President after November 15 the way he can "best serve their constitutional government"? And without a moment's time in a regularly called committee meeting to "review the whole situation"?

Further, in their letter they suggest not one, but three possibilities for us to consider: "Whether it would be to the best interests of both peoples to allow changes in the direction of the Commonwealth Government during the emergency," that is by allowing the Vice President to become President as he is legally supposed to, or second, "to continue the status quo until such time as the constitutional and democratic processes are fully reestablished in the Philippines," or third, "to follow such other course of action as in their opinion is required by the circumstances."

How can it be maintained that Vice President Osmeña or the other officials have urged that the present incumbent be kept in office "in the interest of the Philippine Islands?" All they ask is that in these troubled times, and since the issue has been raised by President Quezon and others, we review the whole situation and do whatever in our wisdom seems right and best; whether one of the two courses they suggest, or third, any other course that seems advisable to us as being for the best interest of the Filipino people and their constitutional government. I believe we should grant their request. Therefore I shall offer at the proper time a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Insular Affairs, that it may "review the whole situation" before this Congress takes so serious and so momentous a step.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a correction. I have every respect for the gentleman who just spoke. He made the statement, as I understand it, that the bill was passed out of the committee without hearings. The gentleman was out of town, but there was a quorum of the committee and it was discussed for 2 or 3 hours; the communications were submitted to the committee and read and considered by the committee. All the members present unanimously voted to recommend this bill favorably.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, like the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], I also have the greatest respect for the sincerity and also the learning of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I do not believe that there is now in the House or the House that will be in session in 1946 anyone who is not or will not be in favor of all of our pledges being kept to the Philippines. It has been suggested that constitutional government is being suspended by the action that we are about to take. Constitutional government is not being suspended. A provision of the constitution is being suspended.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to hear that provision read.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman allow me to continue? I am sorry I have to refuse to yield at this time.

The civil government of the Philippines was destroyed by the Japanese occupation. It is no longer possible for them to have an election as was contemplated when the Constitution of the Philippines was adopted. Under the constitution an election was provided at the end of the presidential term. The amendment provides that the Vice President succeeds him for 2 years, and then an election should be held for both President and Vice President. It is impossible to have an election to determine whether the Philippine people wish to continue Mr. Quezon in office because of the emergency. The Vice President is agreeable that Quezon remain in office. It is a fair inference that the provision for the succession of the Vice President contemplated continuation of civil government and regular free elections.

It has been said that there will be no dissension if we do not pass this bill. We want something more positive than the prevention of dissension. We want somebody at the head of the Philippines who might be able to symbolize for them a leadership to lead them to resistance against the Japanese, who are ravaging their islands at the present time. The State Department under the leadership of the very distinguished Cordell Hull, who has recently done so much for this country, is in favor of the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has given most compelling reasons for voting for this bill. It is along the road of winning the war, and, therefore, I shall support it.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, for those who want to refer to the letter of the Acting Secretary of State, it is on page 9308 of the RECORD of yesterday. The letter of the Acting Secretary of the Interior favoring the resolution and the letter of the Secretary of War are also on page 9308.

As to the authority to pass the resolution, no matter what the provisions of the Philippine Constitution are, you will find a brief on that at page 9204 of the RECORD. If you want the specific case that makes clear the authority, it is One Hundred and First United States Reports, at page 133.

This problem has arisen in Belgium, Iceland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. In Poland the constitution itself provided that the President could appoint his successor in time of war. In Iceland they created a new constitution and in Belgium Parliament is acting in exile, while in Czechoslovakia President Benes was continued until his successor is elected, so that he continued from 1942 on.

There is one provision in the address of Hon. Frank Murphy, former Governor of the Philippines, that I think is applicable here, as follows:

> The personal aspect of government should be minimized. All officials should be humble before the majesty of the law. Above personal success and personal loyalty, the good citizen and true patriot will place the supremacy of the law, duty to the state, and devotion to the public good and welfare.

In my judgment, since the Secretary of State says the present status should be continued he ought to be the guiding sign for this Congress. I urge that the resolution should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill for a number of reasons.

What is the situation in the Philippines at this moment? The fundamental fact is that the Philippines is our Territory and will be American Territory until 1946.

Where is the American flag? Under the heel of the Japanese conqueror. Where are the Philippine people? Under the heel of the conquerors. They have conquered us and driven us out of the islands, and still we are fussing around here about a constitution. Where is the Constitution of the Philippines? It is where our flag and our Territory is—under the heel of the Japanese conquerors.

We have a situation here proposed by the Philippine leaders who have distinguished themselves in wise leadership in days gone by, who have the confidence completely of our Government and of their own people. They are in exile. That is all the local Philippine Government there is. Argument about the constitution is simply shadow boxing, because there is nothing we can do while the islands remain in the possession of the Japs. That is where the Filipinos are now. So there is no constitution to bother with. The Japs have it in the ditch where they have our flag.

Since this proposal is approved by Mr. Stimson, who is probably the best-informed man on the Philippines in the Government at this moment, by the President, by the State Department, by Mr. Quezon and Mr. Osmeña—who have been respected by us as men of quality and character, and who are cooperating with us and are looking forward to the time when the Philippines will be an independent nation under our friendship and, if necessary, protection—it seems to me the best thing for us to do is to pass this resolution.

The facts of the case are predominant. In face of these serious facts, all the finest-spun theories about this or that constitution that is going to be violated, mean nothing. Why, everything in the Philippines is violated. The Japs have their bayonets at the belly of every citizen. They are raping the women, they are murdering the children. They have torn up the constitution, and they have got our flag under their feet. So why should we fuss and worry about what the constitution says? This seems to be business that needs to be done at this time promptly in the interest of furthering the leadership of these two very necessary and competent gentlemen. In the abstract, the constitutional question is sound enough. But in the concrete, the military question is paramount. This is a case where the facts outweigh all theories. And this is why I shall vote for this resolution.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. He states that there is no Philippine Constitution. He would have us believe that the temporary conquest by Japan destroyed the constitution. He apparently forgets that we still have a Constitution in the United States and that nowhere in that Constitution is the Congress given the right to annul the constitution of other nations. Members of Congress took an oath of office to respect that instrument known as the Constitution. Congress should have respect for the constitutions of other people.

I wonder if we really know what we are doing. We are asked by this resolution in effect to reelect the President of the Philippines for the duration. This in violation of the compact we made with the Philippine people by the act of March 24, 1934, a compact that we entered into with them when we granted them the right to frame their own constitution and to elect their own President and Vice President.

The questionable argument may be used that we have a right to change this compact without the consent of the Philippine people. I deny this. Rights once given irrevocably cannot be recalled without the consent of the people whom it affects. The Philippine Constitution was framed legally by those people with our assistance and was approved by the United States. I shall not be one of those to give my consent to such dishonest camouflage.

We are asked to continue the President of the Philippines in office for the duration. That duration to be decided by our President. This in violation of our solemn pledge when we granted the Filipinos partial independence and gave them the right to adopt a constitution and to elect their own President and Vice President. We are asked to do this under the pretense that we have a constitutional right to do so. We have no such constitutional authority except to the extent that we are willing and able to enforce it by force.

Under the Philippine Constitution no person can hold office for more than 8 years. After that he is ineligible. Their constitution further provides that when the President becomes ineligible, that then the Vice President shall become the President. When the people elected the present President and Vice President they knew that the President could not serve for more than two terms. In fact, he agreed to that in the campaign. It was understood that the Vice President should become President on November 15, 1943. The Japanese invasion does not change that constitution.

Both the President and the Vice President are in this country. There is no reason to believe that the Vice President is not just as patriotic as the President. In fact, he is more popular, because he got 1,446,213 votes to the President's 1,340,638 votes, or a majority of 105,575 votes over the President. That is a remarkable instance where a Vice President gets more votes than a President. That speaks volumes. If we pass this resolution, we will create disunity. We will be playing right into the hands of the Japanese. We are showing that we have as little respect for the constitutions of other people as Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito.

We have no reason to doubt that the President is not just as patriotic as the Vice President, and if he is, he should not violate the constitution of his country. He ought to be the first one to insist that the Vice President take the office of President in accordance with the constitution.

The argument that we have a right to do this under the power to govern territories is false. The Philippines are no longer a Territory of the United States in the general acceptation of the word. We gave them their independence in 1934. We approved of their constitution

under which they elected their President and Vice President. We agreed to give them full and complete independence by 1946. The only reason for keeping a string on them until 1946 was to keep order. It was not for the purpose of changing their constitution.

If this resolution is passed, then we are guilty of the same thing that Japan was guilty of when it set up a puppet Chinese king in Manchukuo. The false pretense that we are acting under constitutional government will fool no one. It would be just as intelligent for us to pass a resolution resurrecting President Ebert as President of Germany.

We are told that the President of the Philippines and the Vice President and the Delegate here in this House all joined in signing a letter asking this to be done. The fact is that this is a misstatement of fact. The President and the Vice President of the Philippine Islands did not in that letter ask us to pass this resolution. The President and the Vice President of the Philippines could not do that without being traitors to their country.

The misrepresentations made to this House are unfair to the President and the Vice President of the Philippines. All that they asked in the letter was that this be considered by Congress. And the wise thing for Congress to do is to recognize the constitution and the laws of the Philippine Islands.

But we are told that our action shall not be taken as a precedent. How absurd. We do a thing and make it a precedent and then say it is not a precedent. We know that whenever an occasion arises those who wish to act in violation of constitutional laws will cite our action as a precedent notwithstanding our pious protest to the contrary.

There is danger in this resolution. This, of all times, is a time the United States should keep its skirts clean. It should not set an example of usurping power belonging to other people. If we do, there is danger that other nations may follow our example. Some other nation may decide it is its constitutional duty to set up a figurehead president for Poland, or a figurehead king or queen for Holland or for Belgium, and so forth. All this in the name of constitutional government, freedom, and democracy.

The only constitutional authority to continue the present President of the Philippine Islands in office is the war power. Our President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, can do that by proclamation if in his opinion military necessity requires it. I am satisfied that he will not do it. He knows better than that.

The passing of this resolution will lose American prestige throughout the world. It will lose American lives. It will create distrust in us throughout the world. Our lip service to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much that the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has honored me with closing general debate on this most important resolution. The reason I took the floor on yesterday with reservations of objection was for the purpose to make possible a full discussion of the resolution which changes the constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth Government. I felt that it was too important a piece of legislation to go through by unanimous consent. I have read the letters sent to Congress from the officials of the Philippine Government. I gathered from these letters that they wanted Congress to give a full review of the subject and I am gratified that we are abiding by that request and giving this resolution full discussion. I believe the Filipino people would appreciate the fact that this Congress is giving matters pertaining to their future serious and lengthy discussion. They cannot be heard because they are enslaved at this moment by our common enemy, the Japanese.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I know something about the Philippine Islands and also about the Filipino people. I served in the Philippines many years ago for the United States Government and in 1935 I was privileged to visit the islands again with the congressional group when we went to Manila to assist in the inauguration of the Philippine Commonwealth Government. There are others in the House today who were present on that historical occasion. Among them is the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], who is the able chairman of the House Committee on Insular Affairs.

It should be recalled that on that occasion the late Secretary of War, George Dern, represented our President and spoke to hundreds of thousands of Filipino people from the inauguration stand in Manila. At that time he stated in no uncertain words that the promise of the United States Government for full and complete independence was a real promise and that this promise of our Government would be carried out. We recall that the hundreds of thousands of people were high in their applause and praise for that promise and that they had no reason not to believe that we would carry out the promise. However, many things have occurred since that historical gathering. Rumors have reached Filipino people that perhaps we did not intend to keep our promise and that Philippine independence was a myth. But the American Government and the American people never intended to break the promise. They meant what we said. Our President has recently stated that this promise would not only be kept but I had the impression that the President favors an earlier independence if that can be brought about. The Filipino people believe these statements. They know that the word of the American Government is good. They have great confidence in us. I know that they believe in protecting and preserving the constitution they adopted for their own country as much as we do our own Constitution. For these and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I was impelled to urge for the fullest consideration and debate on this resolution.

This resolution asks us to change the Philippine Constitution so that one of its provisions can be altered temporarily, as I understand it. The 18,000,000 people of the Philippine Islands know pretty well what is in that constitution. It is their constitution. Like our own Constitution, it is the foundation of the Philippine Government. They adopted it and the Government has been working under it. It provides that on November 15, 1943, the present President of the islands' Government, the Honorable Manuel Quezon, will be succeeded by the Vice President, the Honorable Sergio Osmeña. Both of these officials are now in the United States. The resolution asks that the constitution be changed so that the present incumbent remain as President until such time that the islands be recaptured from the Japanese, when the Vice President will assume office, or at such time as the people of the islands by an election select a new President.

Those of us who are constitutionalists and believe in constitutional government feel that the question we must decide is too important to pass over lightly. We must be given some fundamental and convincing reasons why we should take this serious step.

One argument is that to keep the present incumbent in office would aid in the winning of the war. Both officials affected are represented to us as of excellent character and almost equally known as heroes in the eyes of the Filipino people. We are told that the Department of State, the War and Navy Departments, and many others favor the resolution. Both the President and Vice President of the Philippine Government are said to favor the resolution. Some of the Members have told us that if the resolution is not passed it might give the Japanese some ammunition with which to propagandize in the Philippine Islands. Others feel that if we here take it into our own hands to destroy a constitution adopted by the Philippine people, that would give ammunition to the Japanese to carry on their propaganda among the Filipino people. So far as I can understand it, that will make little difference because the Japanese will resort to any kind of propaganda and they will garble for their own sinister uses anything that we do here. My main concern is that the Filipinos know that whatever we do here we are doing from the best of motives and for the best good and for the welfare of the Filipino people, and for the best interests of the Allies now joined together in a war against a common enemy. I am concerned about our promises to the people of the Philippines. They must know that we intend to keep our promises to them and that we mean that they shall be free and independent as soon as this war is over. If we are breaking promises and doing them harm by tearing up any part of their sacred constitution, that should not be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. This resolution is a prelude to the recent move to grant independence to the Philippines. Granting independence at this time to the Philippines is political chicanery. It will, in my opinion, have the same effect as an order by this Congress extending the benefits of the Atlantic Charter to the peoples of Mars, and guaranteeing the "four freedoms" to the man in the moon. If this Congress is sincere the thing for us to do for the Philippines is to send to MacArthur the tools and materials to win them back and then their independence will be guaranteed. How can we, through a gesture that is purely psychological, expect to impress a people with our sincerity when we ignore the Pacific war by relegating it to a second-rate status. It is by our work and deeds that they shall know us and I for one do not believe that we can impress an oppressed people by political resolutions and insincere lip service.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands, Mr. ELIZALDE.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support, in very strong support, of this resolution, and I am doing so in the name of the Government of the Philippines now in Washington. I am only supporting this resolution as a war measure. There is a letter of request signed by the President, the Vice President, and all of the members of the Cabinet, which has been inserted in the RECORD, supporting this measure. The Vice President of the Philippines authorized me this morning to speak in his behalf and say that he is perfectly in accord with this resolution. We have no quarrel at all about this measure. It has been outlined in full consultation. The Vice President in fact drew the letter that is now in the RECORD. I have all respect for the patriotism of the Vice President, and the support he has given to all of our efforts in this war. President Quezon, as you all know, has been for years the dominant figure in the Philippines. He has been the great leader of the Filipino people. He was a strong leader in the independence movement. As regards the war he took the side of the United States without reservation even before Pearl Harbor. After that he went to Corregidor with General MacArthur. I should like to point out here, in view of what has been said about his health, that in fact his sickness was caused by his hardships in the tunnels of Corregidor.

President Quezon was instrumental in the passage of the Jones Act, of the Independence Act, and in fact it was through him that the term of office of the President of the Philippines was limited to 8 years. I am sure some of the Members here will be interested to know how the negotiations took place for bringing President Quezon from the Philippines to Washington.

In fact I personally took an important part in that work. I visited Secretary Stimson, who has been a great friend of the Philippines. It has not been said here yet that he was Governor General of the Philippines for 3 years. I saw Paul McNutt, Justice Murphy, and other friends of the Philippines. After this consultation a telegram was sent to President Quezon by President Roosevelt inviting him to leave the Philippines and come to Washington to be the head of the government in exile, and the symbol of Philippine redemption. When President Quezon got that telegram his reply was that he would not leave the Philippines, and that his wish was to stay with his people.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIZALDE. I cannot, I am sorry. My time is limited. It was only after repeated requests that he came to the United States.

It was obviously understood that he was coming to be the head of the government in exile and the symbol of Philippine redemption. That is how he happened to come here. I cannot see how he could be the symbol of Philippine redemption for 1 or 2 months, or be expected to head the government in exile for a limited period. The understanding always was that this government was going to be in Washington with only one purpose, to set up a united front for the prosecution of the war and to recapture the Philippines. I cannot see how any Member can accuse the Philippine Government of playing politics in a matter of this kind. There is not a member of the Cabinet who does not have his family in the Philippines.

I, for one, have got all of mine there. I certainly would not do anything which would be politically harmful. I do this in the conviction that it will help the final redemption of the Philippines.

There has been truly a vile newspaper campaign here against this move. It has been said that some Filipinos are opposing this. On our part, we have taken no steps whatsoever to bring here thousands of telegrams which we could have very easily procured from Filipinos all over the country, supporting this move. It would have been a very simple thing.

I am very grateful to all who support this measure, strictly on the basis of a war necessity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of article VII of the amended Constitution of the Philippines, the present President and Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines serving at the time of the introduction of this joint resolution shall continue in their respective offices until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands. Thereupon, the tenure of office of the present President of the Commonwealth shall cease and the Vice President shall become President to serve until such time as his successor shall have been elected and qualified according to the Constitution and the laws of the Philippines.

Mr. CELLER. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the very illuminating remarks of the distinguished Delegate from the Philippines, but aside from the cogency of his remarks which must compel us to vote for this resolution, remember military necessity requires it. The leaders of our armed forces so notify us.

We in Congress and the Executive are the reservoir of power. Out of that reservoir of power we gave this constitution to the Philippines. The power to create is the power to retract. As long as the constitution has not been acted upon and will not be acted upon and made effective until some future time, we have a right to change that constitution or suspend it in whole or in part. Ordinarily a constitution cannot be changed without ratification by the people living under it; but that is not the situation with reference to the change involved in this piece of legislation. That Philippine Constitution is not yet effective. It is effective upon independence. But aside from all that, I want to call attention to the fact that the head of the Spanish Government recently sent a cablegram to J. P. Laurel, selected by the Japanese to head the puppet government in Manila. That message congratulated the Philippines upon receiving independence from the Japanese, through its new regime. Now, imagine the temerity, the insulting conduct of this man Franco of Spain, offering that letter of congratulation to this puppet ruler set up by the Japanese over the Philippines.

If we do nothing else, we should show our deep resentment against the action of Franco, by passing this bill. We must remonstrate against his diabolical cunning, we must castigate Franco, this wretched man in his recognizing this Japanese puppet ruler as the head of the Philippines and beyond that, felicitating him. That is tantamount to felicitating the Japs, our mortal enemies.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. Does anybody lack confidence in the Vice President? Why not make him President under the constitution?

Mr. CELLER. The Vice President himself consents to this resolution. He has joined with the President in asking us to pass it. For all practical purposes no harm can possibly be done; indeed, great good will flow therefrom. All the members of the Philippine Cabinet and responsible rulers of the Philippines will be satisfied.

I say again this man Franco should be chastised, and we can do it by passing this resolution. Franco sought to explain his mistake, and he called the message that he sent "An act of courtesy because of the affinity of blood, language,

and religion between the peoples of Spain and the Philippines." I call that explanation just balderdash. The explanation is worse than the original message. It brings to mind an old saying: "The more you poke an old pile the worse it stinks." The action of Franco is damnable. It is insulting to the memory of the boys who died in the Philippines at Bataan and on Corregidor. If you go outside at this very moment you will find an American flag flying. It was brought here from Guadalcanal and it is flying in the memory of those who went through the valley of the shadow at Guadalcanal, to help continue the independence of the Philippines. I for one want to crack the knuckles of this man Franco because of his wretched act in recognizing the independence of the Philippine Government as presided over by this puppet, José Laurel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask the members of the Committee handling this bill whether or not it is true that it was the understanding of the Filipino people, when they held their last election, that they were, in effect, electing two men, one to serve as President and the other one to serve as Vice President, and that the Vice President would become President on November 15, 1943. I would like to direct that question to the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. ELIZALDE. I can answer that question. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. Why was that arrangement made, do you know?

Mr. ELIZALDE. Well that was not merely an arrangement. The fact was that originally the term of office of the President was a 6-year term. When that term expired the people of the Philippines, I would say, requested that the term of office of President Quezon be extended.

Mr. CURTIS. But the Vice President was elected with the understanding——

Mr. ELIZALDE. I am coming to that.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not care to yield for a lengthy explanation, but I wish to know if it is not true that the people understood when they were voting for Vice President that he would become President on November 15, 1943.

Mr. ELIZALDE. I said it was true; but there was no war at that time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CURTIS. Not at this time.

I do not stand before the Committee today as an authority on the Philippine Islands. There are, however, some things about this resolution that I do not like. I do not like the idea of this Congress passing a resolution to keep anybody in office, to extend their term, to create a perpetuity in office because somebody says it is necessary. The State Department and the War Department say that this resolution is necessary. Suppose they say that individuals holding high office in the United States Government ought to have their term of office extended, but they cannot tell why because it is a military secret, should we extend their term? The Filipino people understood that they were electing a Vice President to take office as President on November 15 of this year. We should have a very good reason before we upset what these people have arranged for. It was a free election of a sovereign people. If the Vice President becomes President he will be the representative of the Filipino people. If we upset that and extend the term of the present President the Filipino people are not represented, but the individual who holds office is an agent of the Government of the United States.

Maybe it is true that the Japanese have put the Philippine Constitution under their heel and torn it up, but the principles of free government, the right to get rid of a man who is in office as well as to elect him in both peace and war is a principle that is the very essence of liberty in the hearts of men and never can be destroyed.

I feel that the proponents of this bill have failed to show any real necessity for this legislation. There will be a head of the Filipino Government if this resolution does not pass. It will be in accord with the election held and in accord with the Constitution of the Philippines. I do not think anyone disputes the fact that the present Vice President is an able man. He has served in the Philippine Assembly; I believe he was Speaker of the Philippine Assembly; he was a member of their constitutional convention. According to due process of law and in keeping with the election held by the people, this man will be the head of their government to carry on. There is no war necessity for this legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman does not feel that we are putting a propaganda weapon into the hands of the Japanese and the Nazis by this type of action. Because they will be able to propagandize people to the extent of saying that we are destroying the rights of self-determination under the Constitution instead of protecting them, as we are supposed to be doing in this hour.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is true. I do believe that if one of the United Nations must extend the term of office of the head of its government in order to win the war, that principle would extend to all of the United Nations, including the United States, and certainly I do not subscribe to that. I do not accept the doctrine of the indispensable man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, Manuel Quezon was elected President and Mr. Sergio Osmeña Vice President of the Philippines with the full knowledge of the people that Quezon's term expired in 2 years, on November 15, 1943, and that then President Quezon would be succeeded by Vice President Osmeña, according to the constitution, under the following provisions thereof:

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

After a long struggle to agree upon a constitution for the Philippines, one was finally adopted by a constitutional convention on February 8, 1935. Article VII, section 2, provided that the President "shall hold his office during a term of 6 years and, together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, shall be elected by direct vote of the people."

On September 15, 1939, the constitution was amended in a number of respects by the National Assembly of the Philippines and approved by the President of the United States. Three principal changes were the creation of a senate or upper house; the revision of article VII, section 2, to provide that the President and Vice President shall hold office "during a term of 4 years"; and an amendment to article VII, section 5, to provide that "no person shall serve as President for more than 8 consecutive years," counting "from the date he shall have commenced to act as President."

That is the very body and soul of the constitution—to limit the tenure of office of any one man.

Section 6 specifically provides that—

> If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President shall act as President until a President shall have qualified.

Furthermore, section 8 of the same article provides:

> In the event of the removal of the President from office, or of the termination of his right thereto under the provisions of the Constitution, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said officer, the same shall devolve on the Vice President.

The 8 years in which President Quezon has served in office expire November 15, 1943, as he, himself, agrees. Those who have continued to represent the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines in this country have done so on the theory that it is the same government that was functioning in Manila when the Japanese attacked the islands on December 8, 1941; this is the constitutional government of the Philippine people, established under the act of March 24, 1934, and under the Constitution of the Philippines. When this government left the Philippines for the United States via Australia, upon the request of the President of the United States—and he requested not only Quezon but the other leaders of the Philippine Government to come with him—it did not leave the constitution behind, but carried it along as the basis for

its legal existence, and as the source of its power. This is the de jure Government of the Philippines, and to destroy it by an act suspending the constitution would reduce it to little more than an improvised government, little better in legal theory than the so-called Japanese Philippine Republic, established by the Japanese by use of other accredited Philippine leaders shrewdly used by the Japanese to head the Japanese Philippine Republic, doubtless under threat of execution if cooperation was refused.

The Constitution of the Philippines should not be regarded as a mere geographical expression which ceased to exist when the Japanese occupied the islands. It is rather a statement of living principles and fundamental rules of procedure constituting a social compact which the Philippine people, after much thought and study, adopted as a form of organized society acceptable to them. Furthermore, the constitution is a compact between the United States and the Philippines. It would be a blow to the morale of the Philippine people and to the validity of our accredited Government here to set aside the clear language and normal functioning of the constitution on ny theory whatsoever, so long as no necessity or valid reason therefor exists.

It ought to be added that Mr. Osmeña served as head of the state in Manila during all the period of the Japanese attack from December 8 to the evacuation to Corregidor on December 24, while Quezon lay ill in an air-raid shelter in the suburbs of Manila. Osmeña was present at the palace from 6 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock at night, carrying on public business, inspecting the emergency hospitals created in the schools, and letting himself be seen by the public.

It is now well known that at the last Cabinet meeting held about the middle of December in the air-raid shelter in the suburbs of Manila, all members of the Philippine Cabinet expressed desire to be evacuated to Corregidor so that members of the Government could not be captured and utilized by the Japanese. Mr. Quezon opposed this, saying that the number of people were limited who could go to Corregidor. He took with him his personal household and servants, leaving behind all the officials of the Philippine Government for capture by the Japanese, with the exceptions of Justice Santos, who had already been assigned to certain duties at Corregidor as legal adviser, and Vice President Osmeña, who personally insisted with MacArthur and Sayre that he must be evacuated even at the risk of leaving his family behind, so that the Government of the Philippines would not cease to exist if Quezon, in his precarious state of health, did not live.

The question of whether or not Vice President Sergio Osmeña succeeds to the Presidency of the Philippine Government on November 15 at the expiration of President Manuel L. Quezon's 8 years of service in that capacity can be divorced from any legal question and resolved into a matter of policy as to whether Congress wishes to set aside the mandate of the Philippine people at the last general election before the Japanese invasion on December 8, 1941.

At that election, out of 3,500,000 registered voters 2,000,000 voted—a firm demonstration of the fact that democracy was functioning in the Philippines. It is not widely known that the popular vote for Osmeña, Vice President, was greater than that of Quezon. Osmeña received 82 percent of the votes and Quezon 80 percent—last report of the High Commissioner of the Philippines, Francis Sayre, the sixth annual report, House Document 111. The nominations had been made at a regular convention duly called.

Osmeña, after first serving as Governor of Cebu was for about 16 years the principal political leader of the Philippines serving as Speaker of the Philippine Assembly before the Senate was created by constitutional amendment in 1935. He then had the support of Quezon who was the first majority floor leader of the assembly.

In the decade after 1935 when the Senate was established, the leadership of the Filipino people passed from the lower House to the Senate, when Mr. Quezon became leader and President of the Senate. A coalition was formed of the two wings of the Nationalist Party in 1935 in order to insure unity, Mr. Quezon leading one wing and Mr. Osmeña leading another. A coalition ticket with Quezon as President and Osmeña as Vice President was again confirmed by the people at the general election on November 11, 1941, just before the Japanese invasion.

The President and Vice President took their oaths of office at the entrance of the Malinta Tunnel at Corregidor before Chief Justice Jose Abad Santos in the presence of General MacArthur and United States Commissioner Sayre and other military and civilian officials on December 30, 1941, 3 days before Manila fell to the enemy. The results of the election had, as usual, been forwarded to Manila from the Provinces and had been widely publicized in the press and generally accepted as the action of the people.

FASCISM AND THE PHILIPPINES

The resolution suspending the Philippine Constitution is a dangerous quasi-fascistic piece of legislation that has come before Congress at this time when we are fighting a war to crush fascism. That some Filipino officials are for it is comparable roughly to the cases of nationals of countries who cooperate in the destruction of their own government.

The Philippine Constitution was not written by us but by the Filipino people through a constitutional convention, which required months to draft it. After the convention adopted it the Filipino electorate voted on it and approved it. Then the President of the United States approved it. These steps were all in accordance with the authorization that Congress gave in the act of March 24, 1934, known as the Independence Act.

Under this constitution the Filipino people voted their President and Vice President to office for a specific term. They knew what they were doing. They voted Hon. Sergio Osmeña to succeed Hon. Manuel L. Quezon as President on November 15, 1943. They held the elections when everyone expected a war, well knowing that Osmeña would be their leader if war did come, as it actually came 27 days after that election. They certainly knew what they were doing.

Now this Congress in its might proposes to nullify their will and plan. It is as violent an action as the destruction of a government by force of arms. What is behind this move? Mr. Osmeña is here, eager and ready to succeed Mr. Quezon. He is a very competent, wise, and upright official. Let us not slam the door on his face. Let us not approve this resolution that would annihilate the foundation of the Philippine Government, which President Roosevelt has stated is the only legitimate Philippine Government in existence.

If we pass this resolution we shall be justly criticized the world over for being a wrecker of a country's constitution and sponsor of personal government. We should not be surprised if the Filipino people should doubt our good faith and fairness. This is no time to put them in that state of mind, for the Japanese are doing their best to wean them away from the United States. The suspension of the Philippine Constitution is clearly a distinct disservice to the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, President Quezon and his cabinet of five persons are for the resolution. Why not? It will continue Mr. Quezon in office. Mr. Osmeña joined with his signature in a letter to Congress to suggest some way to perfect their incomplete regime, but he has not given up, and he does not intend to give up, his right to the Presidency of the Philippines. He cannot very well do so because the Philippine people have given him that mandate and he does not propose to disregard it. He must not. I am sure he will not.

Mr. Chairman, our responsibility is to the Filipino people, not to the handful of officials in Washington. Our responsibility is to ourselves also not to be guilty of doing something that we condemn with voice and bullets elsewhere.

Let us not permit the Philippine Government to commit suicide here in Washington under our flag. It would be a national and international scandal of the first magnitude.

We must observe not only the constitutional process but also the democratic process. Let the Philippine Constitution march on without any tampering by us. Let its provisions be followed. Let Mr. Osmeña become President. In retirement Mr. Quezon can still be of service to his country. But the Filipino people's constitution must not be destroyed so he can remain in office. Mr. Osmeña will carry on, and carry on efficiently and splendidly, I am certain.

Mr. Chairman, I make a part of my remarks two illuminating articles which appeared in the Washington Post, one by Mr. Merlo J. Pusey, of the staff of that paper, and the other by Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer, who has studied Philippine-American questions deeply and extensively:

WARTIME WASHINGTON

(By Merlo Pusey)

A MAN OR A CONSTITUTION?

One of the strangest sideshows to be found in Washington these days is the movement by certain Filipino groups to upset their constitution so that Manuel Quezon may continue to be President. As the Constitution of the Commonwealth now stands, Mr. Quezon must yield his office on November 15 to Vice President Sergio Osmeña. But the idea of adhering to this democratic procedure becomes more and more distasteful to some followers of Mr. Quezon, to say nothing of his own attitude, as the date for him to step down approaches.

There is no question as to what the wishes of the Filipino people were when they first adopted and later amended their constitution. They sought to prevent one man from clinging to the Presidency for so long a period as to endanger the operation of democratic government. Back in 1935 President Quezon was wholly in accord with this view. He sponsored the provision fixing the term of the President at 6 years without the privilege of being reelected. When his 6 years as President were drawing to a close, however, he found himself still eager to hold on.

The constitution was amended in 1934 to fix the Presidential term at 4 years, with reelection permissible only once. Again Mr. Quezon supported the limitation. It is all too apparent now, however, that he is seeking ways and means of clinging to his post through the present emergency.

If the Filipinos had not chosen to write this safeguard against dictatorship into their basic law, there would be unquestioned advantages in retaining President Quezon as head of the Philippine Government in exile. He is undoubtedly the best-known Filipino of his time. He is an effective symbol of Filipino resistance to the Japanese invaders. Still the fact remains that an obstacle to Mr. Quezon's continuation in office is there, and it cannot be removed without smashing the Commonwealth constitution.

Col. Carlos Romulo, information secretary of the Commonwealth, has sent up a trial balloon to see what sentiment can be aroused for discarding the constitution in order to keep Mr. Quezon in office. He raises a question as to whether the basic law upon which the Filipino experiment in self-government rests is still operative. He even goes so far as to intimate that President Roosevelt could set aside the Philippine Constitution because of the war in the Far East. His comment very strongly suggests that the President is being importuned to use this high-handed means of extending Mr. Quezon's term.

An issue of the greatest importance to the Filipino people is thus clearly drawn. It is whether the leadership and political interests of one man shall prevail over their constitutional system. The present system has the strength of the Filipino people behind it. A regime continued in power in defiance of the constitution would have only the strength of Mr. Quezon behind it. Such flagrant disregard of the will of the Filipino people, when they last had an opportunity to express their will, would leave the islands without a legitimate government.

It is difficult to imagine a more devastating blow to the Filipinos' hopes of establishing a constitutional democracy. A few days ago they witnessed the inauguration at Manila of a puppet regime which proclaimed the "independence" of the Philippines under Japanese tutelage. Probably a great majority of the people understand the 'phony" character of this "independence" and are waiting for a chance to fight for freedom and democracy. But what are they going to think if the creation of a Quisling government in Manila is followed by destruction of their constitutional system in Washington?

The only way of avoiding this calamity for the Filipino people is to face candidly and openly the nature of the proposal that seems to be in the offing.

The idea that war justifies abandonment of a constitutional system is the antithesis of democracy. Of course, war may result in smashing the constitutional system of a defeated country, if it has one. But that smashing is part of the defeat inflicted on the enemy. One reason we are fighting this war is to preserve our constitutional system. To use the same war as an excuse for destroying the Philippine constitutional system would be equivalent to inflicting the consequences of defeat upon our war and ally.

It is particularly absurd to suppose that President Roosevelt has any authority to set aside the Philippine Constitution. The Commonwealth now headed by Mr. Quezon was created by the Filipino people in accord with an act of Congress. Perhaps that system could be destroyed by the President as well as by the Japs, if he were willing to resort to fascistic methods. But he would be powerless to put a legitimate government in its place. And the example thus set would weigh heavily against constitutional government in the Philippines for many decades.

Adoption of such high-handed procedure by the United States Government does not appear to be likely. The immediate question is whether Filipino groups will seriously request a coup against their constitution, for any such act by itself would raise the issue of their capacity to maintain democratic government once their complete freedom has been attained.

PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT

(By Vicente Villamin)

CONSTITUTION-BUSTER

It is reported in the press that the President of the United States has been asked by the President of the Philippines to engage in the perilous business of constitution-busting by submitting to him for decision the question of whether the Philippine Constitution is still in operation here, although his Government has functioned under it since its arrival in Washington over a year ago.

On November 15 next, President Quezon will have reached the constitutional time limit of 3 consecutive years as President and will then have to give way to Vice President Sergio Osmeña. This is quite in accordance with the Philippine Constitution. If, however, the charter is declared inoperative, then President Quezon is expected to continue in office until the cessation of the war. That is the long and short of the situation.

The constitution, which may be set aside, came into existence by authority of the act of Congress of March 24, 1934, which provides for Philippine independence in 1946. It was drafted by a constitutional convention at Manila in 1935, adopted by the Filipino electorate, and approved by the President of the United States. If that act is a compact between the United States and the Philippines, the constitution is the essence of that compact, and it can only be dissolved by dissolving the act itself—a course that would reverse America's liberal policy toward the Philippines.

Domestic legislation

Since the constitution is a part, by derivative process, of an American domestic legislation, there can be no doubt that it is in operation in the United States mainland, and its enforcement does not constitute extraterritoriality.

The temporary military occupation of the Philippines by the enemy does not diminish by an iota the American sovereignty in those islands, nor does it disturb the legal continuity of its juridical instrumentality there, which is the Philippine Government, wherever it may find itself through the exigencies of the war. It follows, therefore, that the constitution is in full force and effect, and its provisions should be observed as far as practicable pendente bello.

The sovereignty of the United States in any portion of its national domain, which includes the Philippines, is indestructible and coexists with the Nation's life; and any act of intrusion by any foreign power, however successful, affects only the physical possession of the domain thus occupied but not its sovereign ownership. The expulsion of the intruder is only a matter of time.

As the Japanese invaders have not, in law, destroyed the Philippine Government and its constitution in the incubus of American sovereignty, it is hard to understand the attempt now being made by some of its officials through the use of strained interpretations and in defiance of the principle of estoppel, to try to do what the invaders have not succeeded in doing.

The absurdity of the attempt is stressed by the suggestion that President Roosevelt intervene to preserve the Philippine Constitution and the Government under it, for once it is admitted that that constitution is operative here, the conclusion is irresistible that the President of the United States is being importuned to intervene to defend the constitution from the assault of no other than President Quezon himself.

Philippine assembly

The act of the Philippine Assembly of December 14, 1941, is believed by some to allow President Quezon, if he so desires, to disregard the constitutional time limitation. That act did nothing but empower him to take all legal measures and coordinate all activities and resources for the more effective waging of the war. It could not have authorized him to perpetuate himself in office for the assembly did not have that power. Such action would have amounted to amending the Constitution by unconstitutional methods. President Quezon's powers, under the above-mentioned act, were substantially similar to those of President Roosevelt's under the war-emergency laws, and no one would ever suggest that the American President would or could suspend or amend the Constitution of the United States so he can go on in office indefinitely.

The incumbent President and Vice President were elected on November 11 and took the oath of office under the constitution on December 30, 1941, 22 days after the Japanese began their invasion of the islands. Thus they recognized the authority of that fundamental document. Later they came here and functioned under it. There is now no consistency or justification in trying to eliminate it as the source of their authority and power.

If the Philippine Government succeeds in having its constitution suspended and busted—and that is the meaning of the invitation to President Roosevelt to pass on its validity when it is challenged by no one—by what authority would that Government then exist and function?

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the fourth-termers are a foxy outfit, and the internationalists a shifty group.

The people of the Philippine Islands have a constitution. Acting under that constitution, they elected a President and a Vice President, who received a larger vote than did the President. President Quezon's constitutional term of office expires next week, and, under the terms of the constitution which the people of the islands adopted, their Vice President will next week, upon the retirement of their President, become President.

There is no evidence before us that President Quezon, whose term will expire next week, is indispensable, nor is there any evidence that the Vice President, who next week, under their constitution, will become President, is in any way disqualified or will in any way fail to serve the interest of the people of the islands as well as would the retiring President.

This resolution, if adopted, will substitute for the President elected by the people of the Philippine Islands, that is, the Vice President, who next week, under the islands constitution, will become President, the man whose term of office expires within a few days.

The Congress of the United States approved of this constitution, the people of the islands adopted it, and it has been the law of the land for several years.

Now, in time of war, the new dealers in our administration, the fourth-termers, are asking this Congress to abrogate the terms of the existing constitution; to declare that the man selected by the people of the islands to act as their President shall not hold that office, but that, in his place and stead, there shall be as President a man whose term of office, under the terms of their constitution, will have expired.

The resolution further provides that after we have deposed the constitutionally elected President of the islands we shall place in office this other man, and that he is to continue to hold that office "until the President of the United States proclaims that their successors have been duly elected and qualified in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Philippines."

Yet right now there is a man who has been elected in accordance with the constitution and the laws of the Philippines and who will be deprived of the office to which he was elected, and for which he is admittedly qualified, by our action today if this resolution is adopted.

The foxiness of the new dealers, of the fourth-term politicians, is apparent when we remember that, while this resolution is urged upon us as a war measure or, as some of its advocates admit, because they think it expedient, it will be used to lend force to the false argument that President Roosevelt's continuance in office is likewise a "war measure" and "expedient."

If we continue Quezon as President because we are at war and as a gesture of expediency, what argument are we on the Republican side to make when Franklin D. Roosevelt asks to be continued as President of the United States? When that day comes, we shall be told that, being a war President, he should be continued in office until the war is over.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]—and he may take out of the RECORD what he said if he wishes, but I am putting it in now and it will not be taken out of my remarks—said, in substance, among other things, that the government of the islands was under the heel of the Japs, that the people of the islands were under the heel of the Japs, that the flag was under the heel of the Japs. Then, referring to previous arguments, he said: "Still we are piddling around about a constitution." Later, he said: "There is no constitution to bother with."

My own opinion has always been that the constitution of a country was the supreme law of that land and that, until it was repudiated, all owed allegiance to it and that the people of other lands and other nations were bound, by international law, as well as by common sense, fair play and justice, to respect the terms of that constitution.

Perhaps it should not be difficult to understand why anyone who believes in the establishment of an international government, which would supersede our Constitution, would not worry about the terms or the observance of the terms of the Constitution of the islands or of the United States of America.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] says why fuss or worry about the Constitution of the Philippine Islands. If we are not going to fuss or worry about the Constitution of the Philippines, why worry about any constitution? Why worry about the Atlantic Charter? The doctrine behind the Atlantic Charter, the foundation on which it rests, is that the people of every nation shall have the right of self-determination.

Why not let the people of the islands choose their own leaders? Let me ask again: What is Quezon as President of the Philippine Islands going to do as long as the Japs have the islands? The only thing he can do is sit over here and attend some social functions or gatherings. What influence is he to have on the Philippine Islands, the conduct of the war, or the winning of the war? There is little he can do until, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN JOHNSON] said, we have retaken the Philippine Islands, at which time let us hope constitutional government will be restored to the people.

It has been said that if this resolution is not passed the failure to do so will be used by the Japs for propaganda purposes.

If we refuse to recognize the duly elected President of the Philippine Islands, as we will by the passage of this resolution, and substitute for the ruler of the Philippines a man selected by the Congress of the United States, the Japs will use our action today as proof that we have repudiated our oft-repeated declaration that the people of the respective nations should be free to choose their own rulers.

If the Atlantic Charter means anything at all, it means that the people of the several countries and nations of the world shall have the right to select their own rulers.

Just as consistent would it be to try to justify Hitler in picking the ruler of Poland or any other country under his domination, as for the Congress of the United States here to say it believes in self-determination and then prevent the man who has been legally, constitutionally chosen by the people of the Philippine Islands as their leader from holding that office.

Not only the Japs but the Nazis will pick up our action here today and point to it as proof of a lack of sincerity in the promise made in the Atlantic Charter that the people of conquered lands should have the right to select their own rulers, their own form of government.

At least, let us be consistent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, if I believed there were any reasons of military necessity or military significance for this resolution I might feel differently about it, but I do not believe such a case has been made out. There is only one question that confronts the House. By the passage of this resolution, the Congress will by positive action decide to set aside the Constitution of the Philippine Islands and determine who shall be president of the Philippines for a period in the future. On the other hand, if the Congress should defeat this resolution, it would leave the Constitution of the Philippines in act and there would thereby in normal course succeed to the presidency the present Vice President who, as has already been pointed out, was elected by the people of the Philippines with the understanding that that very thing was going to happen.

It appears to me that the wiser course of action for the American Congress to take, particularly in this tragic hour of the world's history, when a tremendous war for the preservation of constitutional democracy is being fought, is to defeat the resolution and to make it therefore possible for the Philippine Government-in-exile to continue to be in truth and in fact and in every other respect a constitutional government. I think that is important. The American Congress should not interfere with the normal functioning of the machinery which the Philippine people put into effect unless

there is the most pressing reason for such action.

Mention has been made of the action of the Vice President in going along with the letter that has been written. The claim has been made that thereby he has taken himself out of consideration in this matter. I do not believe the letter so reads at all. In signing the letter he has performed a fundamentally patriotic act. I do not care about the personalities involved. I believe the Vice President showed himself to be a big man in so doing. Most of the things I have said here have, it is true, been said already. I was deeply impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Dr. JUDD] and in spite of the strong support behind this resolution, in my own mind and heart I honestly believe it is an unwise thing for us to do and that it would be better for us to let the Constitution of the Philippines stand as it is.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In addition to setting aside the constitution, it sets aside an election duly held in peacetimes in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. In addition to setting aside the constitution, that constitution, contrary to the statement made in the Well of the House by the Member from New York, was approved by the President of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand so.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we cannot reach an agreement as to time for debate on this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I should like to be assured of having 5 minutes to speak myself, and I am quite sure other Members wish to speak on the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request at this time. This is an important matter, and we have plenty of time, so there is no reason why we should not discuss it.

Mr. BELL. I withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter I should like to read and then ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs to help me answer it. I also address this request to the distinguished Commissioner from the Philippines. The letter was written to a mother whose son was killed when the Japs took Manila. The letter is signed by Mr. L. A. Moyer, executive director and chief examiner of the United States Civil Service Commission, Retirement Division. It reads:

Mrs. THOMAS L. GRIMES,
Paoli, Ind.

DEAR MADAM: Referring to your application for payment of the amount due under the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of William Lonzo Grimes, deceased, you are advised that before payment can be made it will be necessary for you to furnish this office with a certified copy of the public record of death, which may be obtained upon the payment of the usual fee, by communicating with the Registrar General, Manila, P. I.

To assist in the identification of your claim it is requested that this letter be returned with the death certificate.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

L. A. MOYER.

That is a letter addressed to the mother of a boy in the service who was killed at Manila in the Philippine Islands, advising her to pay the usual fee to the registrar-general, Manila, P. I., to get a death certificate in order to collect insurance or certain other moneys due her.

Can the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs advise me how this mother can get that death certificate, and who is operating that office in Manila?

Mr. BELL. I would refer the gentleman to the Veterans' Administration. I am sure they can solve the problem for him.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, for practical purposes the Constitution of the Philippine Islands is not operative at the present time. It is in existence as an instrument which will govern these islands when the Japs are driven out. To me, this then resolves itself almost completely into a question where military considerations must be taken into consideration as well as abstract legalistic considerations. I am not stating that legalistic or constitutional considerations are not important, but I do say I do not believe there is anybody in the House who has the idea that because we take this action today we are not going to restore the Constitution of the Philippines and defend it. I believe that is the unanimous sentiment of the House.

Now let us get to the military consideration. General MacArthur has said over and over again that he intends to invade the Philippine Islands. He also is behind this movement to retain Manuel Quezon as the President of the Philippines, I am informed. Why does he want to do that? Because he thinks there is nobody who can so mobilize the Philippine spirit behind a fight for independence and a fight against the aggression of the Japs as their patriot, the man who has led them to independence, Manuel Quezon.

I think this consideration should have the greatest weight in our minds today, because I think we cannot for one moment neglect the very important, I might say the primary consideration of winning the war. After the war is won and the Japs are driven from the Philippines, I am quite sure the Congress of the United States in conformance with its pledge and in line with the same honor that has animated this country traditionally in its relations with other nations will reinstate the Constitution of the Philippines and will see that it is carried into effect and that our pledges to the Philippines are kept.

Inasmuch as the Secretary of War, our Secretary of State, and our high military men are behind this resolution, I think it is important that we pass the resolution today.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that in view of the turn this debate has taken it may have been unfortunate that this resolution was brought to the floor of the House, but since it has been brought here I think it would be far more unfortunate if word went back to the Japs that we had failed to pass it.

I had the privilege and the honor of representing the Committee on Military Affairs at the inauguration of the Philippine Government in the fall of 1935. In that party was the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Garner, and the then Speaker of the House, Mr. Byrns, together with some 35 Senators and Representatives. I know first-hand the affection in which President Quezon is held by the Filipino people. I know the same about Vice President Osmeña, because our party was there at the inauguration. These men are both loved and revered by the Filipino people. They have been the leaders for independence for many years.

Mr. Quezon was once a Commissioner from the Philippine Islands to this House. He was the first great leader in the fight for Philippine independence. He has been their idol for all these years. They have trusted him to bring them full independence in 1946. The Japs moved in after Pearl Harbor. War came, and evidently at the insistence of General MacArthur and certainly at the insistence of the President of the United States, President Quezon and Vice President Osmeña sought refuge in Washington.

There is no constitution today in the Philippine Islands, because it has been trampled underfoot by the Japs. President Quezon and Vice President Osmeña are the symbol today of the Filipino people and of their constitution and law, whatever it may be. Any government or any constitution they have left is here in Washington and vested in their President and Vice President. They are the only ones dealing with the Allies and helping carry on the war.

I repeat that, in my judgment, it would be most unfortunate, now that the President, the Vice President, and the members of the Cabinet of the Government of the Philippines have sent a written communication here in which they unanimously request that these heads of

their government continue as they are at the present during this frightful emergency, if this resolution were not passed. This request has been supported by the Secretary of War, who was once the Governor General of the Philippines, the Secretary of State of our own country, and the Senate of the United States by a unanimous vote.

Remember that our enemies are in control of the situation in the Philippines and have under subjugation not only all of the Filipino people but several thousand American soldiers, including quite a good many from my own city, to say nothing of the entire National Guard of my sister State of New Mexico. To me it would be almost tragic to send word back to our enemies today that we will not pass this resolution, although the President and the Vice President of the Philippines have sent a communication here begging and pleading that in this their hour of peril and distress we not forsake or abandon them.

Oh, my friends, that is what we must think about. I do not want to argue the constitutionality of the question. There may be some question about it, but this is war. This is a terrible and total war. This is no time to get technical. You know that our boys are dying and starving in the prison camps in the Philippine Islands. They are being mistreated and abused by the most cruel enemy in all history. I repeat what was said a few moments ago, that the Vice President of the Philippines has shown magnificent courage and patriotism. In my judgment he is a great statesman. I heard him in his first inaugural address in Manila. President Quezon is also a great leader, and when those two men come here to the people who have been their friends, and are now their allies, when they come to the people who have made possible their independence and say, "Please let us stay as we are during the duration of the war," I think we should listen to them. It will bring comfort to the Japs if we refuse to pass this resolution.

Mr. GEAHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Is there any provision in the Philippine Constitution which authorizes this suspension upon the request of its President?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know of any, but I think everything is suspended in time of war. There is no constitution and no government now in the Philippines. There is nothing there but tragedy, sorrow, and death. When our Secretary of War and Secretary of State say this will further the war effort, that is all I need to know, for they are in a better position to judge and advise than I. When both the President and Vice President of the Philippines join in the request, the least we can do is to grant it. This House ought to do like the Senate and pass this resolution unanimously.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who has just spoken, is always logical and always thoughtful. On the points he raised much agreement could be expressed but let us carry his thought a little further. When he mentioned the message that may go back to Japan and to the Orient as the result of our deliberations this afternoon, he brought to mind the propaganda war that Japan has been carrying on. As I have understood it, the propaganda of the Japanese has been that after all is said and done, the white race, the white man, as personified in the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, likes to sit in the position where he can rule and overrule the people of the Orient.

The question of constitutionality, and of our power to act as this resolution proposes, was the first question that came to my mind when this bill came up. I asked that question of the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs this afternoon. He asserted that we have that right as a matter of sovereignty. Assuming that we do have, what shall we do with the question of overriding the expressed will of the Philippine people?

What shall we do with the fact that before the war started, before the Japs attacked the Philippines, the Philippine people in a free election, elected Mr. Quezon to continue for a period of time and then provided that the Vice President should succeed him?

I fear that the message that will go back to the Orient through Japan, if we pass this resolution, is that we set aside a free election by the Filipino people, taken when they were not at war. The thing that I fear, since this issue has been raised, is that the passage of this resolution setting aside that election will carry a far worse message to the Orient, than that Quezon is no longer President.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. In a moment. If the basic consideration is the effect on the prosecution of the war and what Japan will say and how she will use our action, then we should consider what she will say if we set aside a free Philippine election. If the Vice President is the high caliber of man described by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], if he is the man who gave that splendid speech, if he is the splendid character exhibited by self-sacrifice in signing this letter, and the Philippine people voted for him as a successor to Mr. Quezon at this time, then there should be no great fear as to his capacity to carry on. I yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I was going to ask the gentleman this question. The effect this resolution would have upon the Filipinos it seems to me would be best determined by those who are here representing the Filipinos, rather than by us. It would be unfair for us to substitute our judgment and say we think it might be otherwise, when they say it would have the opposite effect.

Mr. CASE. As to that, in the first place, we have the voice of the Philippine people as expressed in a free election before the war. We are not substituting our judgment for theirs if we do nothing. We are accepting their judgment if we do not pass the resolution. To pass the resolution is to substitute our judgment for theirs as expressed at the polls when the Philippine people were free to express it.

Moreover, as I understand it, this letter to which attention has been called did not ask for the resolution that we have before us today, but asked for consideration of the situation by Congress, and asked that we determine what should be done. The situation is getting exactly what was requested—deliberate consideration. The debate this afternoon has been most helpful in bringing out certain important facts. Having reviewed the situation as requested, if we determine that it would be most dangerous to the principle of self-government and most dangerous to the principle of constitutional government to pass this resolution, then it should be defeated. We should not give Japan any fuel for her propaganda war in the Orient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances existing today, I think this is a good resolution and a good piece of legislation. Due to circumstances beyond the control of our Government, mighty as it is, and due to circumstances beyond the control of the Filipino people, their democratic form of government is in danger of expiring, if you please. As I understand it, the term of the President and Vice President—now in this country—is about to expire. This is a plan to keep that government alive; keep it in existence; to preserve the seeds of democratic government in the Philippines.

The development of the Philippines in the brief era between the close of the Spanish-American War and the present day, a little over 45 years, is a great exemplification of the fruits of democratic processes. Many of us can remember when our ships going to the Philippines were carrying school teachers and teaching personnel to go into that backward country and to train those oppressed people in the ways of democracy. In the brief time since 1898 we have prepared these people for self-rule and now we are proposing to set up a new government amongst the nations of the world. They are an enlightened people—people who have made great progress. I do not think the American people, with all of our power and might, are going to stand aside and see the fruits of those years of constructive effort struck down and the Philippine Nation go into oblivion. I think the Philippine Nation as a democracy is going forward. I think this bill is a step in that direction. I am in favor of it. I think that in holding up the torch of

enlightenment of the world today we are going to demonstrate the liberal policy of America. We are to prove to the world that we did not go into their country for the purpose of exploitation, as some of our associate nations are doing. We are going to carry the torch of enlightenment and of liberty to the Philippine people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, for the enlightenment of those present who have not had time to read the RECORD I would like to read the letter of the Secretary of War in regard to this proposition:

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have read the proposed joint resolution to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands and hasten to advise you that in my opinion the passage of this resolution will greatly assist in a continuous and effective prosecution of the war effort to liberate the Philippines from the Japanese. I hope it may be adopted by both Houses promptly.

From the Secretary of State, through Mr. Stettinius:

The Department of State has been asked to comment on this proposal, and I desire to state, in connection with their request, that the Department is in sympathy with the purpose of the legislation.

Senator VANDENBERG:

Personally I have hesitated very much about intrusion on our part into the constitutional processes of the Philippines themselves, but, Mr. President, in view of the fact that we seem to have a color of authority to do it, I know of no place where I would be more willing to turn for my conclusive advice in such a matter than to a joint agreement between Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmeña. Therefore, I am very happy indeed to support the joint resolution.

And, finally, Senator TYDINGS:

I should like to say to the Senator that the joint resolution as amended deals only with the time intervening between now and the reestablishment of civil processes in the Philippines. When that moment comes everything goes on exactly as it is provided for in the constitution. Prior to that time—that is, in the interval between now and then—the Filipinos themselves, as represented by the President, Vice President, and Cabinet on the one hand, and the Americans as represented by members of the Cabinet of our own Government, have all agreed, after a thorough survey of the circumstances, and in conjunction with Army and Navy advice, that this is a sound procedure for us to follow in order to accomplish perhaps the greatest good that can be accomplished in the emergency.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that we would be making a great mistake if we did not pass this resolution. I think that anyone who plans to vote against it should be very thoughtful before casting that vote. Because of one thing we may be sure and that is that those men who are in charge of our military operations and of our diplomatic negotiations have given this matter very full and thoughtful consideration. It is their opinion that it would be made easier for the progress of our armed forces, it would be easier for us to win the war if this resolution were acted upon favorably and with as much unanimity as possible.

We know that General MacArthur and Secretary Stimson want to retake the Philippines as quickly as possible. They are counting greatly upon the cooperation of the Filipino people. They have weighed this matter as to which way the cooperation can be most easily obtained, and their decision is that keeping in office the man who stands for Philippine independence, who is their great leader, will be of the greatest help to us and to them in our military operations. The reoccupation of the Philippines is going to cost the lives of many, many thousands of American boys. It may cost many more if we make a mistake here today.

It has been pointed out that the Filipino people voted for this term for Mr. Quezon back in 1941, but we did not appreciate the fact that the Philippine Islands were going to be invaded then, and how can we charge them with the knowledge that they were going to be invaded? They did not vote a longer term for Mr. Quezon because they had to vote as the ballots provided. They did not have a chance to say what they would want done in this contingency. How do we know what they would do today? The only way in the world we can reach any logical conclusion as to what they would do today is to take the word of the representatives who are here. Do any of you think that Mr. ELIZALDE, with members of his family living in the Philippine Islands, would stand for something he thought would hurt or delay our reconquest of the Philippines? We have been told that all these men have their families there. They are more vitally interested than any of us in the deliverance of the Philippines as soon as possible and certainly they would take no step, they would not recommend this legislation, unless they thought it was going to make it easier for the American soldiers and for the Filipino soldiers to retake these islands from Japan. So, Mr. Chairman, when the Members vote upon this matter, if they have any thought of voting against the resolution, I ask them to consider our own armed forces, that this is going to make it easier for them, that the passage of this resolution will make the retaking of these islands cost fewer American lives. Otherwise our officials would not have recommended it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for time at this moment because I am going to leave here in a few minutes to go to the airport to welcome home one of the great Americans of all time, Cordell Hull. I believe, if that great American statesman had the privilege of the floor today to speak, he would say to you what I seek to impress upon you: That it would be a tremendous mistake to defeat this resolution—to recommit it to a committee—because we in America must not, when we can help it, be misunderstood. This talk about abrogating a constitution should be weighed, in the light of the fact there is no government in the Philippine Islands today. The Japanese have charge of the Philippines, and what government the Filipinos have functions in the city of Washington.

Manuel Quezon has represented the people of the Philippine Islands for a quarter of a century here and in the islands themselves. Vice President Osmeña has been an outstanding statesman in the Philippine Islands for many, many years. Mr. Quezon and Mr. Osmeña believe they know not only the voice but the interests of the people of the Philippine Islands when their people are under the heel of a relentless enemy. Few men I have known in all my political life, or in the political history of this or any other country, have done a greater act of patriotism or self-effacement than Vice President Osmeña in this thing because, laying aside his personal desire to be the President of his native country, he has signed with the President of the Philippine Commonwealth the request that the Congress take this action. From the State Department, through the Under Secretary of State, speaking, of course, what he knows are the sentiments of the great Secretary of State, you are asked to pass this resolution. The Secretary of War, once a great Secretary of State and Governor General of the Philippine Islands, asks you upon grounds of self-defense for ourselves and the Filipino people, knowing them and their problems and knowing our problems in this war, to pass this resolution. I have never thought myself capable of performing in the place of an admiral or a general. I would be a bold man if I put my judgment on military matters against the judgment of a general or the Secretary of War; and for the moment, since this resolution is up, I want to repeat what was said by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]—that it would be tremendously hurtful, most unfortunate, if this House today should refuse to adopt the resolution under consideration.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have carefully read the joint letter from the President and Vice President of the Philippines seeking to determine what request they had made. Nowhere do I find any request to adopt this particular resolution. They ask that we review the whole situation and then take such action as in our wisdom will best serve the interests of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States in this emergency. Having once taken the oath of office to maintain the Philippine Constitution they could not very well ask this House to

take any action to set aside any part of the Constitution for any time. Hence they have not asked for this resolution. They state further that Congress may feel free to consider whether it would be best to allow changes in the direction of the Commonwealth government during the emergency, second, to continue the status quo or, third, to follow such other course of action as in their opinion is required by the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a good time to declare to the people of the United States and to the people in the Philippines and the world at large that wars do not suspend constitutions, either of the United States or the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, time and time again upon this floor I have taken a solemn oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. When I came here I took no oath to be a party to any scheme to violate the constitution of any other friendly nation. If we pass this resolution today, we, constitutionalists, as we insist we are—we, who protest our belief in our hearts in the prinples of constitutional government—will have given our consent to the tearing into shreds of the constitution of another—a brave, friendly, but distressed people.

The Constitution of the Philippines was adopted after painstaking deliberation by the people of the Philippines, and after further deliberations that constitution was amended to make it more perfect in its application to their particular conditions. That constitution, then adopted, today meets every problem of the emergency which is now upon them. It provides that the President shall not serve more than 8 years, and it also provides that when a President shall have completed 8 years' service the Vice President shall assume and perform the duties incident to the Presidential office until the President's successor is duly and lawfully and constitutionally selected, not by the decree of an American President but by the vote of the Philippine people.

The Vice President is here. He stands ready to hold his hand aloft and take the oath to protect and defend that constitution. There are no legal inhibitions to prevent him from faithfully performing, fully and completely, his constitutional responsibilities. So why should we Americans, 5,000 to 8,000 miles away from from their soil, do for them that which I know they do not want, impose on them officials they did not elect, tear their constitution into shreds, prevent it operating as they themselves decreed it should operate when troubles such as these befall them?

How can we pretend to believe in constitutional government when we at the first opportunity flout and destroy and declare invalid the fundamental law of the Philippine Commonwealth? I feel that I would not only be violating the Constitution of the Philippines but that I would be violating my own oath to support the Constitution which governs this country. How can we ever oppose proposals to suspend our Constitution just because "there is a war on" when we tear up another constitution of another free people just because "there is a war on?"

I beg of you not to create a condition that is going to be embarrassing to each and every one of you when you are under the examination of your people and they inquire of you, "Do you believe in the sanctity of the Constitution that governs us?"

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was it not President Quezon who engaged General MacArthur to lead his army and train his army? There is a very close bond, there is a very close connection between them. General MacArthur needs all the help he can get in the Pacific.

Mr. GEARHART. Of course, the Filipinos are our friends, and because they are our friends we should do everything in our power to protect their constitutional form of government during the days of their distress. Would they love us the more if we by force of American law set up a dictator to rule over them until the American President shall by proclamation release them from bondage? They elected Osmeña to act as their President after November 15, not Quezon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My point is that General MacArthur was hired by President Quezon. The Filipino soldiers were very loyal to General MacArthur and President Quezon and to the United States. We have a deep affection for them and gratitude. This measure is what General MacArthur wants and helpful to the Filipinos during this war.

Mr. GEARHART. Will they continue to hold their respect if we flout their fundamental law? Would you say we should have continued Woodrow Wilson in office for life just because he, during his lawful tenure, appointed Gen. John J. Pershing commander in chief of our armed forces during the course of the First World War? However appealing to some, this idea of perpetuation in office, the Constitution notwithstanding, it is destructive of free government, inimical to free institutions, the very antithesis of the constitutional scheme of things.

If this joint resolution passes, the administration will have, with the backing of a majority of the Members of the Congress, and by force alone of American law, set up a usurper in the Philippines, one who shall rule without the consent of the governed, contrary to their expressly declared desire, until—until the President, by proclamation, shall terminate his tenure, not until the Filipino people shall themselves determine.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the very thing that we are fighting to destroy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support this resolution but I want it understood now that when this war is over I am for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands.

One of the first bills introduced when I first came to Congress was for complete Philippine independence, but during 12 years of Republican administration I was unable to get a vote on it.

When this administration came into power a bill was passed providing for complete independence in 1946. I wanted to make it take effect at once.

But today we are at war. The bitterest, the most loathsome and savage and brutal enemy the American people have ever had is Japan. She has her foot on the necks of the Philippine people. We are going to need the Philippine Islands in order to destroy the Japanese Empire and I am not willing to take any step that is not approved by Mr. Quezon and Mr. Osmeña, the Philippine Government in exile.

Let me say, also, that it is amusing to me to hear some of you gentlemen talk about the Philippine Constitution when you so ingloriously raped the Constitution of the United States in connection with the poll-tax bill a few months ago.

I am not an interventionist. Secretary Hull is coming home today. The puny criticism of him that is coming from a little selfish group that wants to be mentioned personally reminds me of the old fable in which we are told that while Hercules cut off the heads of the monster the little crabs nibbled at his toes.

Cordell Hull has done a great work. The American people welcome him back with open arms. He believes in maintaining peace among the nations of the earth and not intervening in the internal affairs of other nations when the war is over. I remember when I was fighting for Philippine independence back in the twenties I could not get any help. I could not get my measure to the floor of the House. I asked the representative of the Philippines what was the matter. He said, "Sugar, sugar." The Sugar Trust of America did not want the Philippine Islands independent.

I was never at any time in favor of any nation intervening in China and imposing upon China the opium traffic. One of the great men with whom I have served was Stephen G. Potter, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who spent his life struggling to stamp out the opium traffic and to prevent its imposition on the people of a friendly nation.

I was here when you sent the armed forces down into Nicaragua. We got the report that it was for the purpose of seeing that they held an honest election. A Senator of your own party said, "Why in the hell didn't they send them to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh?" Come to find out, there were a couple of New York banks that had floated bonds in Nicaragua, and it was a question of intervention to prevent a certain man from becoming President, Vice President Moncado, I believe his name was, until he agreed to underwrite those bonds.

I was not in favor of backing up the Standard Oil Co. in stirring up a war between Bolivia and Paraguay. Let

us carry out our policies of nonintervention when this war is over, but help to maintain peace among the nations of the earth, and give the Philippine Islands complete independence without domination by any influence, or any combination of interests in the United States.

There you have a Christian nation. They were not heathen people when the New World was discovered. They killed Magellan with steel weapons in open combat in 1519. They had a high state of civilization long before Japan emerged as a world nuisance. They are today one of the few Christian nations in the Orient, yet they are under the domination of Japan, the most ruthless, the most brutal and savage bunch of apes that ever challenged the forces of civilization.

I shall vote for this resolution but I favor the complete independence of the Philippines when this war is over and Japan is destroyed.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the people of America would think if our position and the position of the people in the Philippine Islands were just reversed. Suppose instead of the Philippine Islands we had been subjected and crushed under the cruel heel of Japan, so that every voice in our country had been silenced. Not one human voice can be heard from that great archipelago. The only voice that can speak today for that great and kindly people has spoken to this Congress in the most solemn manner. They have come to us, joining in a common cause, signing a common letter, saying to the great Congress of the United States and pleading with us, "Give us our war government as the people of the Philippines said we could have it; continue it until we can go back into the Philippines and reestablish the government that you the people of the United States gave us." That is all this resolution asks for.

I remember on one bright and beautiful day in the fall of 1935 when I as a member of an American party landed in Manila I saw the vast crowds of Filipino people there to welcome us. I never saw such a demonstration at any place or at any time as that in which they thanked the American people for the things we had done over a period of 25 years.

I was there for 2 weeks. As I looked about me there I realized one thing perhaps better than anything else, that Manuel Quezon and Mr. Osmeña, the Vice President, were the heroes of that great people. Today those two great Filipinos are speaking in unmistakable terms as to what they as the representatives of that people want the American people to do to help them regain their constitution, about which we have been talking. The Japs have torn that constitution into shreds. There is not one breath of freedom in those islands. These leaders, the leaders of the Filipino Nation, the only leaders who can speak for them, are pleading with you today not to gag at a gnat, not to talk about technicalities, but to give them relief.

I remember in those days the President of the Philippine Islands asked General MacArthur to come down there and organize their defenses for them. General MacArthur spent the years following that down there working with the Filipino people. Let us do something for General MacArthur today. Let us give him this help, so that he can carry out his pledge to the world that he is coming back to the Philippines. He is coming back to Manila, and he is going to drive these despicable sons of Nippon away who have come into the Philippines, and restore to this great people down there in those islands constitutional government.

It has been said that no summer can be judged by a swallow and no winter can be judged by a single snowstorm. Neither can you judge a man or a people by a single act. For 25 years the great Nation of which we are a part bent every effort to train those people for self-government, ultimately to give it to them. We are just as earnest now in our desire to see that they have free government as we have been every moment of those long 25 years which elapsed before Japan took free government from them.

For a long time Manuel Quezon and Sergio Osmeña have been the heroes of that nation. They have been the men who have led the fight for freedom. Can you conceive of such a thing as those two great and patriotic gentlemen being able to reverse the careers of a lifetime, after having sought freedom for those islands for 25 years, in fact, ever since they were old enough to fight or to vote or to think or to speak? Can you imagine such a thing as their coming here and joining in a request that the Congress take this sort of an action if they did not think it was for the best interests and for the future freedom of the people of the Philippines?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The distinguished gentleman who just left the Well, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, has paid a distinct compliment to the President and Vice President of the Philippine Republic. If I am to judge the character of his remarks, they would indicate that in his opinion the President and the Vice President are heroic symbols of the people of the Philippines, and he lifted them to the same plane. In view of that statement, it seems to me that some inquiry is clearly in order. As I understand the situation, an election was held pursuant to constitutional authority in 1941. The present President and Vice President of the Philippines were duly elected and were inaugurated into their respective offices shortly before Pearl Harbor. It is an actual fact that we should bear in mind that the people of the Philippine Islands knew when they voted for a Vice President, that under the terms of their constitution, while the regular term of office of the President is for 4 years, the present President could not serve for a period longer than two terms. They knew then that under constitutional inhibitions his term of office would expire on the 15th of this month, 2 years before the expiration of the full constitutional term. They knew when they voted for the present Vice President that under the terms of their constitution he would become the President of the Philippine Islands by operation of constitutional law on November 15, 1943.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is fair to assume that when they voted for this man as Vice President, they did so with full knowledge that on November 15, 1943, he would become the President of the Philippine Commonwealth. These facts have not been disputed. They are admitted by all people. The only answer that is given to the question as to why we should now set aside the Constitution of the Philippines and defy the will of their people is because of some nebulous theory that if we keep Emanuel Quezon in the office of President it is going to help win the war over there in the Philippines. This is speculative in the extreme and no tangible evidence is submitted. Mr. Quezon is here in the United States. The Vice President is here in the United States. If the Vice President so symbolizes the spirit of freedom and independence of the people of the Philippines as has been described by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], who just left the Well of the House, then it seems to me that we need not expect anything but the fullest cooperation of the Philippine people in support of the man who should become President on November 15, and whom they, by their votes and under their constitution, declare should be their President on November 15. I have been unable to find any argument that would dispose of the contention that, under the constitution which we gave to the Philippines and which they adopted and which is the supreme law of their land today, the Vice President, whom all say is qualified and who as truly as President Quezon represents the hopes and aspirations of the people of the Philippines, should not become President. When reference is made to the letter that he signed, it is clear that there is not a word therein that indicates that he demands or even approves this resolution. Under these circumstances and in the absence of any word from the Commander in Chief, I cannot support this resolution, which in effect announces the theory that there is an indispensable man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], immediately before closing his remarks, declared that this Constitution of the Philippines is now the supreme law of the Philippine Islands. I dispute that. The fact is that we can have a de facto constitution as well as a de jure constitution, and the de facto constitution of the Philippine Islands is the law of the Tokyo dynasty, directed by the devil in hell, and not this constitution to which the gentleman refers. We are dealing with the de facto constitution in the Philippines, and not this paper that may be and is the just constitution of that land. And how are we dealing with it? We are not committing any great outrage upon it—simply allowing this Vice President, who speaks, instead of my

friend from Wisconsin, for the people, who would like to see him the President, and for the present President, who has agreed that this is the wise thing to do, to continue them in office. And why is it proposed that we do it? Not to outrage the constitution of this wronged and enslaved people, but to overcome the de facto constitution, the situation there, which is nothing but the will of the bloodiest group of cutthroats and murderers that ever disgraced any land in this age of time. We are to commit this little bit of outrage on the written constitution in this condition in order to make it alive and animated, to make it the supreme law of the Philippine Islands, and we are asked to do it by the men who are fighting the de facto government there in order that the right constitution may prevail. I ask you to vote for the President and the Vice President and the Government of the Philippines, for General MacArthur, for the Secretary of War of our people, and all the forces that are seeking to make the constitution, we profess such love for, again the supreme law of the Filipino people.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last several words.

I dislike to disagree with some of my colleagues on this question, but I think if you will read the letter of the present Government-in-exile of the Philippines you will conclude that in the event they did not desire us to consider this question favorably, there was no occasion for them to have written the letter in the first place. They evidently desire it and we should act. Had it been their desire for Mr. Osmeña to succeed to the Presidency no letter need have been written. As the Philippines are legally a possession of the United States until 1946 we have color of authority to act on behalf of the now enslaved Filipino people.

In the second place I think we will all recognize that the question of the Constitution of the Philippines is a moot question today. That constitution is in a state of suspended animation. It has no force and effect in the Philippine Islands whatsoever, as those islands and peoples are now under complete control of the Japanese war lords. The Government-in-exile of the Philippines is dealing with the governments of the Allied Nations here in Washington. Evidently our own Government officials desire to continue relations with the Philippine Government-in-exile as it is now constituted, and that is not in any sense derogatory to Vice President Osmeña.

It seems to me that in view of the fact that the Constitution of the Philippines is not in effect in the Philippines whatsoever, and has been in a state of suspended animation since the islands were conquered by the Japanese, we might well agree with the heads of our Government at this time to hold in like suspension the question of who shall be considered to be the next President of the Philippines. Unless and until the Philippines are liberated, the Presidency under their constitution will mean very little. He is a President without a country. I shall vote for the resolution which was unanimously approved by the Senate and approved by the Secretaries of State, War, and Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the resolution and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the difficulty we are facing is because no plan was made in the Philippine Constitution for carrying on the true government in case of invasion. Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs last year we had Mr. Hambro, who is the Speaker of the Norwegian House, the President of their Storting, who described to us the way Norway had concocted a constitution which would create a legal official government in exile in case Norway was invaded, and would make it impossible constitutionally to create a government in Norway when it was under occupation by an enemy. The result is that Hitler himself has been embarrassed by the fact that the Norwegian Government in exile is the legal government and that his Quisling government does not have any foundation in law. The Belgians have similar provisions in their constitution. Those nations of Europe knew that there was a possibility of their being invaded and occupied. We never made such a plan, nor did the Filipinos, in devising their constitution, for the situation which has arisen where an occupying enemy might take advantage of technicalities in the constitution to erect a government which was in fact a puppet government. Since we did not make provision in the constitution in advance, it seems to me we are doing the best we can do under the circumstances. We are prolonging the life of what is obviously the real democratically chosen government of the republic, until such time as a free choice can be made.

This has not been the first time, nor will it be the last time that we will be faced with similar perplexing questions, but it seems to me that where military necessity and military demands coincide with what is obviously the unexpressed policy and will of the Philippines, we are making no mistake in taking this step which is proposed here today.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions, and I will ask them together so that he can get the import of them. First, if this resolution is not adopted and if the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency of the Philippines, to which he has been duly elected, is there any way in which the Japanese or the Filipinos, or anyone else can question the legitimacy of that government? Second, if we pass the resolution, setting aside the Philippine Constitution and their election, is it not true that the legitimacy of the Presidency and the Government of the Philippines could be questioned, and properly so?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. You have a baffling question on legitimacy, which the Japanese have tried to provoke by attempting to create a new, legitimate government out there.

The United States still has sovereign power over the Philippine Government, and it seems to me that the constitutional questions are sufficiently answered by the memorandum and brief that have been filed. We have a hazy constitutional question, because, as I say, the Philippine Constitution does not provide for enemy occupation any more than our United States Constitution does. We never dreamed that that was going to be necessary. In the present situation, however, the practical military and political and diplomatic necessities are met by this action, which I feel confident we have the power to take, which will be thoroughly understood in the Philippines, insofar as they get word of it, and which will be more conducive to the final continuation of constitutional democratic government in the Philippines than to beg the question and to permit a succession to take place which would be used by the Japanese in their propaganda as meaning repudiation of the present President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here today with a very serious question. Were it only the matter of helping the Filipinos and rescuing from those islands our beloved brothers who are there under the power of the cruel Japanese there could be no question what our decision would be; but I am of the opinion—and I could not sit here in my seat and have it go unchallenged—that simply because there has been a subjugation by the power of an enemy of a part, even though it be a part, even though it be a Territory, of the United States, that thereupon the Constitution of that territory—or, if you will, of a State—is gone and destroyed simply because of that use of force and violence.

The constitution lives in any country only so long as it lives in the hearts of its people. The Constitution of the Philippines will live as long as the Filipino people want it to endure and will fight to retain it. The Constitution of the United States will live in the hearts of the American people so long as the people here desire that it shall live and be sustained.

There is one feature of this resolution that has not been called to the attention of this body, and it is because of this that I take these few minutes. The resolution contains language to the effect that this suspension of the Constitution of the Philippine Islands shall continue until the President of the United States proclaims that their successors have been duly elected and qualified in accordance with the Constitution. In other words, the Constitution itself is set aside, suspended, and then there will never be an election in a part of the Territory of the United States, a Territory where flies the American flag, until the President says they can have an election. That is not law at all; that is only one man's word. Let me affirm here that this is a Goverment of law and not of men.

If we do not take this action, it will be brought back for further consideration. There will be no military loss, there will not be a single boy over there rescued any faster because of this resolution. This is no disrespect to General MacArthur or any of our forces. Not only that, but if we do pass this resolution we will have killed what is a part of the spirit and the theory of the equality of the United Nations. Most of the United Nations today except Russia, China, Britain, and ourselves are governments in exile; yet a government in exile is affected here today when it comes to the Philippine Islands. Let us be consistent, let us be honest, let us be courageous, let us be loyal, and hold as we did in the first days after the Spanish-American War that the "Constitution follows the flag." Our great Supreme Court upheld that doctrine. It was my own father who as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States wrote the opinion that made the dissenting opinion in the Dred Scott case the law of the land. In this celebrated case he wrote the opinion proclaiming that the Constitution followed the flag and the opinion of himself and Justice Curtis became the law of the Philippines and constitutional liberty was established there.

So I say let us not be rushed in this matter. No loss will be sustained. Let it go out to the world, let it go to all the people in exile, let it go to all the countries and peoples who are looking to the great United States leadership that here in this body today we proclaim and raise this issue: The Constitution, the Constitution and the flag, one nation forever, with liberty for all its States and Territories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, most of the education I have was obtained in the university of experience and the school of hard knocks. I cannot, therefore, get very much excited over some of the fine-spun theories I have heard expounded here today. We have before us a resolution that actually will affect only two people. Any other effect of this resolution will be psychological or propaganda effect. The only actual effect this resolution has on any human being so far as I can tell is on the President and the Vice President who are now in office as officials of the Philippine Government. I should like to emphasize what the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] said: That if those two men, who are the only ones affected, did not believe the passage of this resolution would be helpful to their people, why did they write a letter to this Congress? Why did they write any message at all if they did not believe it? Why should the Vice President, who will be most affected by the passage of this resolution, join in a letter asking Congress to do something about it if he wanted the present constitutional provisions to be applied? There is no great constitutional question involved, because, as was so well said by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the Constitution of the Philippines is functioning only in the exile government here in Washington through the two men who wrote this letter. They are the Philippine Government and are the only people who are operating under it.

As far as I am concerned, I am interested in whether or not this resolution will help us win the war. The two men it affects say it will; the Secretary of War says it will; the State Department says it will; and as long as we are fighting and our boys are dying in the South Pacific—and more of them are going to die taking back the Philippines—for myself, I am going to follow the advice of the men who are leading us in the war and the two men who would be affected by this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, surely we are agreed that the primary purpose of all of us here is to do that which will contribute most to the winning of the war and of the peace. Nobody differs on that. The point on which we differ is the wisdom of this measure, whether it really is the most effective thing that we can do to help win the war in the Philippine Islands and in the Pacific. I must say that the case is not proved just by the repeated blanket statements that these two elected officials have approved this measure as the wisest procedure, when in their letter they carefully and specifically state that what they want us to do is to review the whole situation and then decide what is best. There has been a good deal of agitation by persons who had certain reasons for keeping the present President of the Philippines in office. What else could they do except ask the Congress to review the situation?

We were begged this afternoon not to send out word to the Philippines that we had denied the request of their elected officials. It is because I do not want to deny their request that I ask you to recommit the bill to the committee so that we can review the situation as they asked. I do not want word to go out to them that we have ignored their request for us to consider all of the possibilities, because I believe such word would have very bad effects all over the Orient.

Today we have heard what has been said to be the voice of the great mass of Filipino people; but there are 125,000 Filipinos in this country and we have not had a chance to hear a single one of them testify regarding what they believe to be best for their mother country and their loved ones out there. They know all the ins and outs. They think on these matters and their nation's welfare day and night. Surely their views are worth hearing.

We have heard directly only from the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands. He is our highly esteemed colleague, respected by all. However, he is not a representative of the Filipino people. He is as he told us yesterday an appointed official, appointed by the man whom it is proposed that we keep in office after his term expires and after it is unconstitutional for him to remain in office. The Resident Commissioner is not chosen by the Filipinos in any referendum or election. He represents not the people, but the President who appointed him.

Therefore, I do not believe it is quite accurate to say he speaks for the Filipinos as would be the case if he had been chosen by them at an election.

I have not yet heard anyone make clear just what value or advantages are to be derived from keeping President Quezon in office that are adequate to offset or compensate for the great dangers and real disadvantages which most certainly will result from our choosing for the Filipinos their president, our nullifying their own election of the man they want to be their president, overriding their democratically expressed will. Can we lightly today begin to destroy the very democratic processes we have been nurturing so long and carefully in the Philippines, and of which we ourselves have been the leading exponents in the world during the last 175 years of history?

It seems to me we must recognize frankly that if we pass this bill today we will not be choosing a President for the Philippine Islands. Only its people can do that. We will rather be setting aside the man they chose to be their President beginning November 15, in order for us to establish in his place a personal agent of the United States Government. Let us be clear about this. He will not be their President, he will be our gauleiter, much as I dislike the word.

The man chosen by the Filipinos to succeed President Quezon is here, ready to take office. We, without a single charge against him or by any due process of law or impeachment, deprive him of his duly elected office, disregard the freely expressed will of his people, and put in his place a personal agent of this Government. Is that likely to help our cause in the Philippines? Or in Asia? Or even in Europe?

It has been truly said that President Quezon is held in great affection by his people. What affection or respect or influence will he lose by conforming with the constitution and the elections of his people?

The President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and certainly he is as greatly concerned about winning this war with a minimum loss of American lives as any one of us can be. He has not been hesitant about advising us of his views in the past. Two or three weeks ago he sent us a message asking repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts because he thought it would be helpful to our war effort in Asia. Yet, he has not spoken on this issue. If this thing is so enormously important so far as winning the war is concerned, I cannot understand why the one chiefly responsible for the conduct of the war does not make clear to us as Commander in Chief what his wishes are. If for whatever reasons they cannot be made public, the function of executive sessions of various committees is to hear just such testimony. If we are

to be expected to take the responsibility of going against the freely expressed will of the Filipino people, then surely we are sufficiently responsible to be intrusted with some of the evidence on which that decision is to be based.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I happen to be one of those who has not yet decided on this question. While admitting much that the gentleman says, what would happen if the Vice President becomes President and he dies before this war is over or should be killed or his term should expire before the war is over? Until 1946 the American flag flies there, and we have a direct responsibility until 1946. The gentleman talks about a gauleiter, but may I ask him who would take the place of the Vice President should the Vice President die after becoming President?

Mr. JUDD. That is a hypothetical situation that might develop. I said earlier that this proposal would be defensible if the Vice President were not here to take office, if to allow the term of President Quezon t- expire would really interrupt constitutional processes. But this is not a hypothetical situation. The Vice President is here. The proper succession is at hand, the one duly chosen by the Filipino people themselves.

Mr. MASON. When that happens, then the Congress could act.

Mr. JUDD. Then the Congress ought to act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAMSPECK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RICHARDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JUDD moves to recommit Joint Resolution 95 to the Committee on Insular Affairs with instructions to review the whole situation with further hearings, as requested by the officials of the Philippine Government now residing in Washington.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 93, noes 132.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 119, nays 169, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—119

Allen, Ill.	Griffiths	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl.	Gross	Murdock
	Gwynne	Murray, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
		O'Konski
Angell	Heidinger	Phillips
Arnold	Herter	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Hess	Poulson
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hill	Ramey
Barrett	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich	Holifield	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mo.	Horan	Rizley
Bishop	Hull	Rockwell
Bolton	Jeffrey	Rodgers, Pa.
Brehm	Jensen	Rogers, Calif.
Buffett	Johnson, Anton, J.	Rohrbough
Busbey		Rowe
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Schiffler
Carson, Ohio		Schwabe
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Case	Johnson, Ward	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Kinzer	Springer
Cunningham	Knutson	Stefan
Curtis	Kunkel	Stevenson
Day	LaFollette	Talle
Dondero	Lambertson	Tibbott
Dworshak	Landis	Troutman
Ellis	LeFevre	Voorhis, Calif.
Elmer	Lemke	Welchel, Ohio
Engel, Mich.	Lewis, Ohio	Wheat
Fellows	McCowen	Willey
Gale	McLean	Wilson
Gavin	Maas	Winter
Gearhart	Magnuson	Wolcott
Gilchrist	Mason	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillette	Merrow	
Graham	Miller, Nebr.	

NAYS—169

Abernethy	Bulwinkle	Cooley
Allen, La.	Burch, Va.	Cooper
Anderson, Calif.	Burdick	Courtney
Anderson, N. Mex.	Burgin	Cox
	Byrne	Cravens
Baldwin, Md.	Camp	Crosser
Bates, Ky.	Cannon, Mo.	Curley
Bell	Capozzoli	Davis
Bloom	Celler	Delaney
Bonner	Church	Dewey
Boykin	Clark	Dickstein
Brown, Ga.	Cochran	Dilweg
Bryson	Colmer	Dingell
Disney	Larcade	Priest
Domengeaux	Lea	Ramspeck
Doughton	LeCompte	Rankin
Drewry	Lesinski	Richards
Eaton	Ludlow	Rivers
Eberharter	Lynch	Robertson
Elliott	McCord	Robinson, Utah
Fisher	McCormack	Rogers, Mass.
Flannagan	McGehee	Rolph
Folger	McGranery	Rowan
Forand	McGregor	Russell
Ford	McMillan	Sadowski
Fulbright	McWilliams	Sasscer
Gathings	Mahon	Sauthoff
Gibson	Maloney	Schuetz
Gordon	Manasco	Sheppard
Gore	Mansfield, Mont	Smith, Va.
Gossett		Snyder
Granger	Mansfield, Tex.	Spence
Grant, Ala.	May	Stearns, N. H.
Gregory	Michener	Sullivan
Hale	Miller, Conn.	Talbot
Hancock	Miller, Mo.	Tarver
Harless, Ariz.	Mills	Taylor
Harris, Va.	Monkiewicz	Thomas, Tex.
Hinshaw	Monroney	Thomason
Hobbs	Morrison, N. C.	Tolan
Hoch	Mruk	Vinson, Ga.
Hope	Murphy	Vorys, Ohio
Jarman	Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Jenkins	Myers	Walter
Johnson, Luther A.	Newsome	Ward
	Norman	Weaver
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Norrell	Weiss
	Norton	Welch
Johnson, Okla.	O'Brien, Mich.	West
Kearney	O'Brien, N. Y.	White
Kefauver	O'Neal	Whitten
Kelley	Outland	Whittington
Kennedy	Patton	Wickersham
King	Peterson, Fla.	Wolverton, N. J.
Kirwan	Pittenger	Woodrum, Va.
Kleberg	Plumley	Wright
Klein	Poage	Zimmerman
Lanham	Price	

NOT VOTING—143

Andrews	Gavagan	O'Brien, Ill.
Arends	Gerlach	O'Connor
Barden	Gifford	O'Leary
Barry	Gillie	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Goodwin	Pace
Beckworth	Gorski	Patman
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.
Blackney	Green	Pfeifer
Bland	Hagen	Philbin
Boren	Hall, Leonard W.	Powers
Bradley, Mich.		Pracht
Bradley, Pa.	Halleck	Rabaut
Brooks	Hare	Randolph
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Harris, Ark.	Robsion, Ky.
Burchill, N. Y.	Hart	Sabath
Butler	Hartley	Satterfield
Canfield	Hays	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Shafer
Chapman	Heffernan	Sheridan
Chenoweth	Hendricks	Short
Clason	Holmes, Mass.	Sikes
Compton	Holmes, Wash.	Slaughter
Costello	Howell	Smith, Maine
Crawford	Izac	Smith, W. Va.
Cullen	Jackson	Somers, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Jennings	Sparkman
Dawson	Johnson, J. Leroy	Stanley
Dies		Starnes, Ala.
Dirksen	Jones	Steagall
Ditter	Kee	Stewart
Douglas	Keogh	Stockman
Durham	Kerr	Sumner, Ill.
Ellison, Md.	Kilburn	Sumners, Tex.
Ellsworth	Kilday	Sundstrom
Elston, Ohio	Lane	Taber
Engle, Calif.	Lewis, Colo.	Thomas, N. J.
Fay	Luce	Towe
Feighan	McKenzie	Treadway
Fenton	McMurray	Vincent, Ky.
Fernandez	Madden	Vursell
Fish	Marcantonio	Wasielewski
Fitzpatrick	Martin, Iowa	Wene
Fogarty	Martin, Mass.	Whelchel, Ga.
Fuller	Merritt	Wigglesworth
Fulmer	Miller, Pa.	Winstead
Furlong	Morrison, La.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	Mott	Worley
Gamble		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Peterson of Georgia against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Winstead against.
Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. McMurray against.
Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Sabath against.
Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Durham against.
Mr. Jones for, with Mr. Bland against.
Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Scanlon against.

General pairs:

Mr. Costello with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Elston of Ohio.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Chapman with Miss Stanley.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. GATHINGS changed their votes from "yea" to nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 107, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—181

Abernethy	Carlson, Kans.	Drewry
Allen, La.	Celler	Eaton
Anderson, Calif.	Church	Eberharter
Anderson, N. Mex.	Clark	Elliott
Angell	Cochran	Fisher
Baldwin, Md.	Colmer	Flannagan
Bates, Ky.	Cooley	Folger
Beall	Cooper	Forand
Bell	Courtney	Ford
Bloom	Cox	Fulbright
Bonner	Cravens	Gathings
Boykin	Crosser	Gavin
Brown, Ga.	Curley	Gibson
Bryson	Davis	Gilchrist
Bulwinkle	Delaney	Gillette
Burch, Va.	Dewey	Gordon
Burdick	Dickstein	Gore
Burgin	Dilweg	Gossett
Byrne	Dingell	Graham
Camp	Disney	Granger
Cannon, Mo.	Domengeaux	Gregory
Capozzoli	Doughton	Hale
Hancock	Maloney	Rogers, Mass.
Harless, Ariz.	Manasco	Rolph
Harris, Va.	Mansfield, Mont.	Rowan
Hinshaw	Mansfield, Tex.	Russell
Hobbs	May	Sadowski
Hoch	Michener	Sasscer
Holifield	Miller, Conn.	Sauthoff
Hull	Miller, Mo.	Schuetz
Jarman	Mills	Sheppard
Johnson, Luther A.	Monkiewicz	Smith, Va.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Monroney	Snyder
Johnson, Okla.	Morrison, N. C.	Spence
Kearney	Mruk	Stearns, N. H.
Kefauver	Murdock	Sullivan
Kelley	Murphy	Talbot
Kennedy	Murray, Tenn.	Tarver
King	Myers	Thomas, Tex.
Kleberg	Newsome	Thomason
Klein	Norrell	Tibbott
Lanham	Norton	Tolan
Larcade	O'Brien, Mich.	Troutman
Lea	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vinson, Ga.
LeCompte	O'Neal	Vorys, Ohio
LeFevre	Outland	Wadsworth
Lesinski	Patton	Walter
Ludlow	Peterson, Fla.	Ward
Lynch	Ploeser	Weaver
McCord	Plumley	Weiss
McCormack	Poage	Welch
McGehee	Price	West
McGranery	Priest	White
McGregor	Ramspeck	Whitten
McKenzie	Rankin	Whittington
McMillan	Reece, Tenn.	Wickersham
McWilliams	Richards	Wolverton, N. J.
Magnuson	Rivers	Woodrum, Va.
Mahon	Robertson	Wright
	Robinson, Utah	Zimmerman

NAYS—107

Allen, Ill.	Heidinger	Phillips
Andersen, H. Carl	Herter	Pittenger
Andresen, August H.	Hess	Poulson
Arnold	Hill	Ramey
Auchincloss	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Barrett	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Jeffrey	Rizley
Bennett, Mo.	Jenkins	Rockwell
Bishop	Jenson	Rodgers, Pa.
Bolton	Johnson, Anton J.	Rogers, Calif.
Brehm	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rohrbough
Buffett	Johnson, Ind.	Rowe
Busbey	Johnson, Ward	Schiffler
Carson, Ohio	Jonkman	Schwabe
Carter	Judd	Scott
Case	Kean	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Kinzer	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Kunkel	Springer
Curtis	LaFollette	Stefan
Day	Landis	Stevenson
Dondero	Lemke	Taylor
Dworshak	Lewis, Ohio	Voorhis, Calif.
Ellis	McCowen	Welchel, Ohio
Elmer	McLean	Wheat
Engel, Mich.	Maas	Willey
Fellows	Mason	Wilson
Gale	Merrow	Winter
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Griffiths	Mundt	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Murray, Wis.	
Gwynne	Norman	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara	
	O'Konski	

NOT VOTING—143

Andrews	Compton	Fuller
Arends	Costello	Fulmer
Barden	Crawford	Furlong
Barry	Cullen	Gallagher
Bates, Mass.	D'Alesandro	Gamble
Beckworth	Dawson	Gavagan
Bender	Dies	Gerlach
Blackney	Dirksen	Gifford
Bland	Ditter	Gillie
Boren	Douglas	Goodwin
Bradley, Mich.	Durham	Gorski
Bradley, Pa.	Ellison, Md.	Grant, Ind.
Brooks	Ellsworth	Green
Brown, Ohio	Elston, Ohio	Hagen
Buckley	Engle, Calif.	Hall, Leonard W.
Burchill, N. Y.	Fay	Halleck
Butler	Feighan	Hare
Canfield	Fenton	Harness, Ind.
Cannon, Fla.	Fernandez	Harris, Ark.
Chapman	Fish	Hart
Chenoweth	Fitzpatrick	Hartley
Clason	Fogarty	Hays
Hébert	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Merritt	Smith, W. Va.
Hendricks	Miller, Pa.	Somers, N. Y.
Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, La.	Sparkman
Holmes, Wash.	Mott	Stanley
Hope	O'Brien, Ill.	Starnes, Ala.
Howell	O'Connor	Steagall
Izac	O'Leary	Stewart
Jackson	O'Toole	Stockman
Jennings	Pace	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Patman	Sumners, Tex.
Jones	Peterson, Ga.	Sundstrom
Kee	Pfeifer	Taber
Keogh	Philbin	Thomas, N. J.
Kerr	Powers	Towe
Kilburn	Pracht	Treadway
Kilday	Rabaut	Vincent, Ky.
Lambertson	Randolph	Vursell
Lane	Robsion, Ky.	Wasielewski
Lewis, Colo.	Sabath	Wene
Luce	Satterfield	Whelchel, Ga.
McMurray	Scanlon	Wigglesworth
Madden	Shafer	Winstead
Marcantonio	Sheridan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Martin, Iowa	Short	Worley
	Sikes	
	Slaughter	

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Short.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Burchill with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Elston of Ohio.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Chapman with Miss Stanley.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. WHEAT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks I made today and include certain letters mentioned heretofore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], after the legislative business and other special orders, may address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next at the conclusion of business and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, November 5, during the debate on the appropriation for the Office of War Information, an article by William L. Shirer, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune under a recent date line, was read in support of an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to reduce the appropriation from $5,000,000 to $1,000,000.

The article which appears on page 9227 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when read, failed to support the contention of those advocating a reduction in the appropriation. On the contrary, it paid a tribute to the high efficiency of the Office of War Information. Supplementing this testimony in behalf of O. W. I., I wish to read a subsequent article by the same writer appearing in the Washington Post of November 7, 1943.

Here is the article:

MOSCOW PACTS GIVE ALLIES AMMUNITION FOR A PROPAGANDA DRIVE

(By William L. Shirer)

The Moscow pacts announced last Monday at last have given Allied propagandists the ammunition for a great propaganda offensive. Their pledge of united action not only to win the war but to win the peace, their promise of liberation of the Axis-enslaved peoples and punishment of the Germans responsible for the Nazi massacres, their declarations regarding Italy and Austria and their agreement to form an international organization of all peace-loving states to maintain the peace is an answer to the prayers of most of the war-battered people on this earth.

Its propaganda effect on the peoples of the United Nations, of the occupied lands, and, not least of all, on the Germans themselves will be tremendous.

For the chief lesson we learned from the last war about propaganda was that it must express a definite policy and that that policy must seem to the mass of the peoples practicable enough to be attainable. The Moscow pacts meet this test admirably.

SLOW TO REALIZE PROPAGANDA VALUE

Actually, in the propaganda field, the history of this war is remarkably similar to that of the last war. It was only in the fourth year of the first World War—in January 1918—that the Allies realized the value of a propaganda offensive.

And it was only then they realized that for their propaganda to be successful they must formulate definite policies which would have meaning and hold out hope for a war-torn world.

Until then their only policy had been to win the war, and they did not understand that astute propaganda could help them win it.

On January 5, 1918, Lloyd George made public for the first time a statement of British war aims. Three days later President Wilson uttered his famous "fourteen points." Wilson's address, made to a joint session of Congress, became the theme of Allied propaganda and contributed a great deal to the collapse of Austria and Germany.

But it was not until March 21, 1918, when the German offensive in France threatened to lose us the war, that the British Government finally agreed to join its allies in definitely promising freedom to the subject races of Austria-Hungary and to the Poles of Russia and Prussia.

The disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and of its monarchy was very rapid thereafter.

We are at the January–June 1918 stage now in the propaganda field and perhaps even beyond that in the military.

CONGRESS USING LITTLE SENSE ON O. W. I.

Notwithstanding that, according to the late Generals Ludendorff and Hindenburg, one of the main reasons for the collapse of their armies in 1918 was the poisonous effect on their men's morale of Allied propaganda, and notwithstanding that our propaganda played an important part in the operations in Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy, it is also a fact—and a melancholy one—that the O. W. I. has been having hard sledding in Congress getting an additional $5,000,000 to be used exclusively for propaganda work in coming American military operations.

Some of our elected Representatives in the House, it is reported, want to cut the figure to $1,000,000. One was said to be in favor of cutting it out altogether.

This is a preposterous situation. It is exactly as preposterous as if a group of irate Congressmen were to deny the Army the funds necessary to enable General Clark to land at Salerno.

For psychological warfare has now become an integral part of our military operations. General Marshall says so. General Eisenhower says so. But some of our worthy Representatives speak as if they knew better.

I do not mean to suggest that the Congress should relax its constitutional control of the Nation's purse strings. In this war it has been very generous and farsighted in giving the Army what it asked for to fight and win the war. It has even been tolerant of the waste and the occasional graft. I do suggest that in the field of propaganda warfare it has been neither generous nor farsighted.

Though the O. W. I. is run on a shoestring compared to similar organizations in Germany, Russia, and Britain, the Congress has insisted on pinching its pennies and even making a political football of a state business which more and more has become integrated with actual military operations on fighting fronts.

And it might be noted in passing that most of the opposition to O. W. I.'s foreign propaganda activities has come from the men who consistently opposed the various steps by which this country tried to prepare itself for war. Perhaps this is just a coincidence. Or—on second thought—is it? Being an apprentice in domestic politics because of a long foreign assignment, I wouldn't know. But many readers more fortunate, might.

This is written before O. W. I.'s request for an additional $5,000,000 is debated on the floor of the House. Perhaps before this is printed, that body's decision will have been taken. But as our military operations widen in scope, more money will be requested for psychological warfare.

It will be chicken feed compared to the amounts spent on other branches of the military machine.

But it may be important to the average citizen to ponder whether this particular part of the fighting job should be made a political football or whether a Congressman is any more justified in denying it funds to operate at the front than he would be in, say, denying the Army funds to be used in equipping parachute units.

STRONG G. O. P. BACKING FOR REDUCTION

Right now the attitude of some in Congress seems to be that indicated by the following Washington dispatch which appeared in the press the other day:

"Washington, D. C.—Representative JOHN TABER (Republican) of New York, said the very most he would agree to give O. W. I. was $1,000,000. Furthermore, TABER indicated that by the time the thing hits the House his offer will have dwindled to '000.' There was every indication that TABER's efforts to curtail the foreign propaganda of O. W. I. will have strong G. O. P. backing."

If Mr. TABER's views are correctly reported here, one might ask what particular military information he possesses that would lead him to grant one million but not five millions, for a task connected exclusively with future offensive military operations.

One is tempted to ask, too, why the G. O. P. should make a party issue of a purely military matter.

Surely the Republicans, as well as everybody else in Congress, know that great military operations against the Germans are impending. They know that not Elmer Davis but General Marshall and his staff, who will be in charge of the campaign, will attack the Germans not only with bullets and bombs but with every known form of propaganda.

They know, too, that the Germans, after nearly 5 years of war and 1 solid year of defeats, will be as susceptible to our propaganda as they were in 1918 when Generals Ludendorff and Hindenburg said it broke the spirit of the German troops. They know that this propaganda warfare for this military campaign will cost a few extra dollars—not many but a few.

Finally, they know that is the only reason why the Overseas Branch of O. W. I. is asking for $4,000,000 at this time.

And they have had an assurance that every penny of it is to be spent in conjunction with coming offensive military operations, and not for other activities of O. W. I. which admittedly are proper subjects for debate.

WHAT GENERAL MARSHALL THINKS OF PROPAGANDA

Lest the opinion get abroad that the part which our propagandists are playing on the fighting front is merely a reporter's hallucination, the views of our military men should be heard. On November 22, 1942, General Marshall wrote to Elmer Davis, O. W. I. director:

"The efficiency with which the personnel of O. W. I. cooperated with the War Department in connection with the operations in

north Africa contributed directly toward its success, and is greatly appreciated."

Last August 30, General Marshall again wrote to Mr. Davis: "I desire to express my appreciation to the members of your organization for their excellent work in the field of psychological warfare during the Sicilian campaign."

Only the other day, after the fall of Naples, General Eisenhower sent a cable to the combined Chiefs of Staff paying high tribute to the psychological warfare branch of his headquarters during the campaigns for the conquest of Tunisia, Pantelleria, and Sicily and the invasion of Italy. For security reasons, his cable cannot be quoted, but it may be said that he praised the propaganda warfare unit for making a "definite contribution" as an integral part of the armed forces in the actual fighting and that he said he counted on further valuable work by this branch in the battles to come.

Further testifying to the importance of propaganda in modern warfare and the remarkable results secured by the Office of War Information in the Italian campaign, I wish to read also a brief excerpt from an article entitled "How Revolution Will Come to Germany," appearing in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The article is written by William F. Zollmann, former member of the Reichstag, Secretary of the Interior under the German Republic, editor of the Rheinische Zeitung, from 1911 to 1933, who led the revolt that ended the Hohenzollern dynasty and the First World War and who was commissioned by Field Marshal von Hindenburg to organize the Workers and Soldiers Council following the emperor's abdication.

Here is Mr. Zollmann's carefully considered comment on the current European situation:

We are rapidly approaching another revolution in Germany, perhaps this winter, certainly not later than some day in 1944. How will it come to pass? Exactly as in 1918, there will not be a revolution until decisive military defeats have disintegrated the German Army and destroyed the authority of Hitler's police force inside Germany. This is primarily a problem of allied superiority in men and material on the battlefield, but not this alone. The disintegration can be accelerated by good allied propaganda, as it was successfully used against Mussolini, at least toward the end of his dictatorship.

This statement is notable from three points of view. In the first place, it is by a man who is more thoroughly cognizant with conditions calculated to end the war through the internal collapse of Germany than any other man in the world today.

Second, here is evidence of the importance of propaganda as a factor in bringing about the surrender of Germany in the First World War, and

Third, here is unimpeachable evidence of the efficient and effective use of propaganda by the Office of War Information in the Italian campaign.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriation of the full Budget estimate of $5,000,000 for the Office of War Information will contribute more directly to the early and successful conclusion of the war than any similar amount provided for any phase of the war program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the National Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to include two newspaper articles, rather lengthy, from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be printed in the Appendix, together with a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] for 15 minutes.

STATESMANSHIP NEEDED WITH POLITICS ABANDONED

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, we are receiving glorious news each day from the battle fronts. With accelerated efforts we are certain that victory is now ours. How long hence is problematical; most any day, or possibly several months before we shall conquer the Axis in Europe. In the Pacific area, while the major part of this struggle seems yet ahead, remembering that we are now fighting two major wars, with the European war disposed of, we can much more quickly defeat our foe in the Pacific, and it is reasonably safe to assume, excluding unforeseen complications, that within a year following our victory in Europe we shall also be blessed with an overwhelming victory in the Pacific area.

Labor, agriculture, and business, having full knowledge of the responsibility and problems before them and what was expected of them, have each performed with the usual American courage and capacity, and our production of all those things essential to the winning of this war has been an outstanding monument to the laborer, farmer, and businessman. It has again been exemplified that no matter how great the emergency, the American people, inspired by love for their Government, are always ready and willing to pay whatever may be the cost and to make whatever sacrifice may be necessary, to sustain and to preserve our beloved Constitution and the economic system which has been responsible for our remarkable progress in a brief period of approximately 150 years.

Our boys and girls on the numerous fighting fronts, by their enthusiasm, courage, and sacrifice, have each certainly won the highest honors that any government can bestow upon its citizens. The hardships endured and the sacrifices made by each boy and girl in the fighting force entitles him and her to the Congressional Medal of Honor. Attu, Bataan, Corregidor, Salerno, Sicily, and the constant and successful battle by our aviators over Hitlerized Europe, each singularly manifest a determination, courage, and willingness of sacrifice unexcelled in any conflict in the history of the world, and to those heroes we owe a debt of gratitude that shall never be fully satisfied. Mere words cannot adequately describe, nor can we with justice eulogize, those brave men and women who so nobly contributed to our achievements. I would be remiss in duty if I were not to mention the valiant disciples of John Paul Jones and the men of our merchant marine whose services and sacrifices, beginning at Pearl Harbor, have also so largely contributed to our successes. Unhesitantly, unflinchingly, and with unmatched courage our beloved boys and girls have gone forth into this inferno—and for what? To sustain and to preserve, in this shrinking world, our beloved Republic, with its democratic processes and its fundamental guaranties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And while our farmers and laborers, business and industry have, with unmatched patriotism, each made unstinting contribution to the support of those fighting on the far-flung battle fronts, what has been the attitude of government? Has it been true to its trust? I am loathe to criticize and do not do so, except that I believe it highly important that we on the home front set the ship aright now in that the sacrifices of those on the battle front shall not be in vain. Our diplomatic successes abroad are worthy of commendation. They have secured military, economic, and political advantages. However, this job is not completed. Much yet remains to be done. This includes the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

Experimentation in government during this crucial period is inexcusable. The substitution of bureaucracy for democracy is unpardonable. Inefficiency, bungling, and waste are high crimes against the Constitution and against the sacred honor and sacrifices of our fighting forces. There are numerous problems that have not yet been solved upon our domestic front and which, if permitted to remain unsolved, will make our victory of doubtful value. The American people are courageous, patriotic, and of deep religious convictions. To see the law of God recklessly flaunted and the fundamental law of the land, and the processes provided by it, utterly disregarded, strikes at the very depth of every emotion possessed by God-fearing, liberty-loving, brave, and sacrificing people.

While more than 10,000,000 Americans, possessed of the noblest aspirations and the highest courage are absent, shall the fundamental processes of our government, by subtle means, be abrogated, and in their place a new order, highly foreign to American ideals substituted—an order in which the totalitarian processes of autocracy and of state socialism are to be promulgated and established? Emphatically, no. Every American worthy of the name must at this time, by unequivocal expression, direct the ship of state of our Nation be righted and our Government be administered according to our Constitution, and the laws be made pursuant to such Constitution. It is imperative that experimentations with processes of government and of economies entirely foreign to the American system be immediately dispensed with and those engaged in such experimentation be replaced in the high places of government by men and women of sound judgment, common sense, and practical experience.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I have been very much impressed by the gentleman's views, and it happens that the Kiwanis International, which is a great service organization, comprised of service clubs in Canada and the United States, has recently adopted as its slogan, and one of its major objectives for the current year, the phrase "Keep America America." I wonder if that does not pretty well summarize the gentleman's viewpoint, as he challenges the country to respond to its important responsibility?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I think it does, and I thank the gentleman.

The bungling and inefficiency displayed in the handling of most of our major problems has resulted in a feeling of dissatisfaction and discontent and is universally manifested by the citizens of our great country. I need not point to evidences of this. I believe that all are sufficiently familiar with recent events to justify a belief in this statement. Waste, in time of crucial emergency, is not only inexcusable but unpardonable. I need not point out to you the innumerable instances of vast quantities of foodstuffs that have been permitted to decay while many of our citizens have been in dire need for such. The build-up of men and women upon the Federal pay rolls in this critical time is again a monumental disgrace and an affront to an already overburdened citizenry, who by stint and sacrifice, are ready to pay whatever price may be necessary to sustain, with rigid economy, the normal functions of goverment, but are utterly unable to continue to bear the imposition of this gigantic and unnecessary array of officeholders. I believe that one-third of the 3,000,000 persons now on the Federal civil pay rolls could be released for employment in the much needed agricultural and industrial sections of our country to assist in the production of food and of other essentials of war, and undoubtedly many thousands of them added to our armed forces.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Yes.

Mr. LANDIS. If we had had some of that help in the State of Maine and out in Idaho this year we probably would not have lost 30,000 carloads of potatoes.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

We are in serious danger of an immediate break-down of the hold-the-line directive. Time will not permit me to recite the contributing factors. Inflation seems imminent. This undoubtedly is being brought about by vacillation and bungling. There is a remedy yet available. The situation is by no means hopeless. The installation into places of authority of men and women with courage and capacity, selected without political consideration, but solely for ability to serve, and given authority without interference and unnecessary red tape, and these problems are yet capable of solution and we can thereby avoid highly disastrous inflation.

It is imperative that action be prompt and without regard for political expediency. We shall soon be confronted with the rewards of victory. What plans have been made to definitely assure all those returning from the conflict immediate employment and business opportunities?—None that I know of. What plans have been projected to care for those now engaged in war production who with a sudden impact will be thrown out of employment and remain so during that necessary period of reconversion?—None that I have knowledge of. It is high time that serious thought and action be given to these problems. Their neglect by the executive and legislative departments of government will wreak its vengeance with astounding rapidity and telling effect. We have not been so remiss with regards to other parts of the world. Our hands have gone out to aid in the solution of all the major problems of the other nations of the world. We have had proposed a plan to stabilize the currencies of the world and which involve the use of a large quantity of our gold. Also, there has been proposed for the aid of other nations of the world an international bank in which we shall also, as a member, participate and subscribe another huge quantity of gold. Today at Atlantic City, the Claridge Hotel is completely filled with delegates from the 44 united and associated nations to complete plans for the carrying out of the agreement executed by our Government for rehabilitation and relief and which again will involve a substantial contribution from our assets. We have looked abroad projecting our aid and assistance in all directions, but we have again forgotten the problems that are important and vital to every citizen of our beloved country. I sincerely hope that the executive and legislative departments of our Government can, with equal fervor, immediately set to work to solve our problems and will continue with like diligence and enthusiasm until there has been assured to each of those on the battle fronts employment and business opportunities, and to each of those who will be affected at home, a like chance to escape that serious impact which will undoubtedly immediately follow our victory.

To achieve these things it is essential that serious and constructive thought be given and immediate action be had. When our armed forces return we are going to meet a new type of citizen. These boys and girls have experienced much in this world. They are coming back educated, alert, well-informed, and they will have a definite knowledge of what they are entitled to have and expect to receive. We shall have to account to them. Our delay will be unpardonable. With all sincerity I urge that politics be abandoned for the duration, and that the executive and legislative departments of government set seriously to work to solve these problems which are of so paramount importance to the future welfare of our beloved country. Do not delay—act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] for 10 minutes.

HAY SUBSIDIES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from the C. C. C., together with a list of the carloads of hay subsidized by C. C. C. in Virginia and Maryland. Mr. Trapp informs me that Virginia and Maryland are the only States obtaining this hay subsidy. This seems unbelievable.

There are three questions that I think should be answered by the Banking and Currency Committee, or by any member of this committee that can and will do it. They are:

First. Where did the C. C. C. get the authority to become a drought relief agency?

Second. Why is one branch of the Agricultural Department out collecting the old drought-relief loans, while another branch of the same Agricultural Department is given blank checks to give feed away to people living in two States?

Third. Is there any member of the committee, or any Member of Congress that can justify this use of public funds in this manner? If so, please do.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., November 9, 1943.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: We informed you in a letter dated October 23, in reply to your letter of October 12, that we had requested Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Richmond, Va., which is handling the operational part of the emergency hay program in the East, to furnish us a list of the larger users of Government hay in the States of Maryland and Virginia.

We are enclosing the names and addresses of the larger users of hay in the States of Maryland and Virginia and the number of carloads ordered by each. The list includes only those purchasers who have placed orders for three carloads or more. A carload of hay averages about 15 tons.

The War Food Administration announced on April 14 that shippers of corn from the major corn area of the Corn Belt to Eastern

and Southeastern States would, because of the difference in the ceilnig price in the Corn Belt and the ceiling price in the Eastern States, be eligible for a price adjustment to be paid by Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with all corn shipped from the Corn Belt to Eastern States. The ceiling difference is 5 cents per bushel; however, the adjustment is the difference between the market price of corn in the Corn Belt and the ceiling basis of $1.02 per bushel at Chicago for Eastern States. We have made payments on about 18,000,000 bushels, mostly at the full 5 cents per bushel. Very little corn is moving east at present.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. TRIPP,
Associate Director, Grain Division.

There are 15 tons of hay to the car and the subsidy is about $14 per ton, or about $210 per car.

List of the names and addresses of persons who have placed the largest orders for hay pursuant to the Eastern States emergency hay program

	Number of cars of hay purchased
B. F. Johnston, Glyndon, Md	5
Essex Farms, Lutherville, Md	8
Beachmont Farms, Glen Arm, Md	3
G. M. James, Herndon, Va	7
Thorburn Bro., Chancellor, Va	8
Sherwood Dickinson, Fredericksburg, Va	7
Mrs. M. H. Dickinson, Post Oak, Va	3
E. T. Hilldrup, Chancellor, Va	4
R. O. Gordon, Spotsylvania, Va	3
J. M. Stick estate, Fredericksburg, Va	3
Spring Knoll Farm, Falmouth, Va	3
V. B. Gate Sons, Rice, Va	6
Walton Clark, Rice, Va	3
Jenkins Bros., Green Bay, Va	3
Dr. T. K. Terrell, Graves Mill Road, Lynchburg, Va	6
Montview Farm, route No. 2, Lynchburg, Va	3
Brookville F. F. A., Brookville High School, Lynchburg, Va	7
Mrs. E. H. Brockenbrough, 3004 Rivermont Ave., Lynchburg, Va	4
W. H. Moore, Blackstone, Va	4
L. W. Huff, Nokesville, Va	3
Fred F. Tavenner, Sterling, Va	3
C. T. Farr, Herndon, Va	3
Tweedside Dairy, Blackstone, Va	3
H. S. Ryder, Wellville, Va	3
S. R. Williamson, Wellville, Va	8
William Dalton, Wellville, Va	3
Tucker's Dairy, McKenney, Va	6
C. F. Clarke, Culpeper, Va	4
Bernard Inskup, Rapidan, Va	3
Mt. Vernon Stock Farm, Sperryville, Va	5
J. E. Douglas, Culpeper, Va	3
W. E. Haily, Keysville, Va	3
G. O. Pittus, Keysville, Va	5
Col. H. A. Newcomb, Greenwood, Va	3
Mrs. M. H. Dickinson, McHenry, Va	6–8
Tom J. Ogburn, Lawrenceville, Va	4
R. H. Todd, Darlington, Md	3
S. L. Remsberg, Knoxville, Md	3
Hoffman Bros., Woodsboro, Md	3
Horace Moffett, Marshall, Va	4
John H. Lamb, route 2, Charlottesville, Va	6
John R. Morris, Charlottesville, Va	8
G. H. Vandevender, Charlottesville, Va	3
Dr. J. L. Manahan, Scottsville, Va	3
W. A. Houck, Ashland, Va	3
W. J. Foster, Chester, Va	4
C. C. Satterfield, Irwin, Va	3
W. N. Stoneman, route 5, Richmond, Va	3
R. S. Graves Bros., Syria, Va	5
Z. R. Lewis, Rock Hill Farm, Shelby, Va	4
E. E. Aylor, Criglersville, Va	3
M. B. Heizer, Rawlings, Va	3
Shirley Furton, Purcellville, Va	6
Talbot Farm, Waterford, Va	4
H. H. Kelley, Bluemont, Va	4
Charles M. James, Purcellville, Va	2
W. W. Susley, Purcellville, Va	6
V. C. Wilson, Purcellville, Va	3
Hugh N. Rahes, Leesburg, Va	20
Clay Plummer, Gaithersburg, Md	3
Roland MacKenzie, Rockville, Md	3
P. L. Snyder, Gaithersburg, Md	4
A. W. Ratliff, Gaithersburg, Md	6
J. M. Redpath, Rockville, Md	4
Thomas M. Garrett, Rockville, Md	6
P. R. Marsh, Catlett, Va	5
D. M. Gray, Catlett, Va	3
L. J. Wilson, Catlett, Va	5
W. H. Thomas, Remington, Va	7
Mrs. J. W. McConchie, Remington, Va	7
O. A. Groves, Bealeton, Va	2
G. A. Walker, Clayville, Va	3
Mrs. Eva Pemberton, Doswell, Va	6
R. M. Toney, in care of State Cleaning Co., Richmond, Va	3

Supplemental list of the names and addresses of persons who have placed the largest orders for hay pursuant to the Eastern States emergency hay program

	Number of cars of hay purchased
Eugene Doody, route 1, Frederick, Md	14
Ray H. Smith, route 1, Frederick Md	6
Walter Hahn, route 1, Frederick, Md	5
R. R. Lewis, Jr., Frederick, Md	5
Gladhill Brothers; Damascus, Md	5
Andrew Cornelius, Arcola, Va	6
W. W. Mays, Silver Spring, Md., No. 2	14
John Lee, Greensboro, Md	3
John M. Hart, Haymarket, Va	4
E. H. Marstellar, Manassas, Va	4
C. C. Lynn, Manassas, Va	4
W. L. Coverstone, Manassas, Va	3
Ben Lomand Farm, Manassas, Va	3
G. C. Russell, Woodbridge, Va	4
Fairhaven, Sykesville, Md	6
W. T. Green, Midland, Va	5
Mrs. A. M. Shumate, Bealeton, Va	6
W. R. Burton, Calverton, Va	4
W. W. Sanford, Orange, Va	4
W. A. Williams, Orange, Va	4
F. S. Walker, Orange, Va	4
E. H. Conway, Orange, Va., No. 3	3

WHY NOT MAKE FULL USE OF DESIRABLE FOOD?

Mr. Speaker, every day I wonder how much longer the O. P. A. and its sister agencies are going to carry on the dairy program that is now in operation.

It is startling to realize that we had one-half million more cows the first of this year than the year previous, but that we are producing apparently a billion pounds less milk.

First allow me to present the following food facts, that are found in the U. S. D. A. Circular No. 549, page 547:

	Water, per cent	Protein, percent	Fat, per cent	Ash, per cent	Fuel value, per pound
Dried whole milk	3.5	25.8	26.7	6.0	2,250
Dried skim milk	3.5	35.6	1.0	7.9	1,630

In U. S. D. A. Miscellaneous Publication No. 505 I find:

Vitamins per pound

	Vitamin A, I. U.	Vitamin B, Mcg.	Vitamin C, Mg	Vitamin D, I. U.	Riboflavin Mcg.
Dried whole milk	7,300	1,400	40	------	11,600
Dried skim milk	640	1,700	30	------	9,000

The O. P. A. ceiling on dried skim milk by the spray process is 14.5 cents per pound and by the roller process is only 12.5 cents per pound. Can a 12.5 cents per pound ceiling on a food product that has 35 percent protein content be justified?

I do not feel it necessary to compare dried skim milk with other food products, but I wish to point out that dried skim milk, with its 35-percent protein, has a 12.5 to 14.5 cents per pound ceiling price which is ridiculous when compared with other foods having only a 15- to 20-percent protein content yet still having 40 to 50 cents per pound ceiling prices. Still other food products with comparatively high ceiling prices show only a fraction of the food value of dried skim milk.

Of the 522 allocable supplies for 1943–44 about 12 percent was and is being consumed by the armed forces, about 53 percent goes to lease-lend, and about one-third is used by United States civilians.

The production by month is as follows:

Production: Dried skim milk (for human consumption)

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
	1,000 pounds	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*1,000 pounds*
1935	11,854	11,795	15,232	17,272	22,723	24,100	17,570	16,899	15,364	13,015	9,902	11,805	187,531
1936	13,319	13,410	16,601	19,542	25,165	27,266	19,124	17,019	18,448	19,822	16,129	17,982	223,827
1937	18,495	15,790	19,671	22,211	28,848	29,611	24,442	19,635	17,646	16,049	13,731	18,382	244,511
1938	20,327	18,724	23,455	27,580	34,555	32,482	27,621	23,212	22,762	22,548	17,154	18,701	289,121
1939	20,108	18,401	22,502	24,048	30,666	31,489	24,360	20,260	18,848	18,013	18,041	21,124	267,860
1940	24,495	23,370	27,442	29,036	35,358	38,578	31,094	26,631	22,157	22,564	19,030	22,088	321,843
1941	25,714	25,715	31,142	34,449	43,781	41,780	31,953	29,293	27,016	25,253	22,816	27,543	366,455
1942	33,826	36,114	47,314	54,699	71,427	68,673	58,554	52,896	43,957	36,853	28,809	32,134	565,256
1943	29,000	29,200	40,150	45,350	56,950	59,925	53,650	42,350	33,250	------	------	------	------

You will note that our September production in 1943 is practically 25 percent less than in 1942.

Is there any reason for the difference in price of the roller and the spray powdered skim milk? Is there a justifiable reason for placing a 12.5- to 14.5-cent-per-pound ceiling on a food product most sorely needed as a war food?

As long as the man with the price can buy all the milk and cream he desires from which, without using ration points, he can make his own butter, as long as the average housewife has to pay 16 points for butter produced from the identical milk and cream, and as long as the housewife has to pay 5 points to obtain even a pound of cottage cheese made from skim milk, I am sure we do not have a very well planned dairy food program. As long as the man with the price can buy cream of 15- to 20-percent butterfat content without using ration points, but still the housewife has to pay points to get a can of 7.2 butterfat evaporated milk, a question whether we have a worth-while dairy program.

While the governmental agencies allocate 3,600 to 4,000 tons of tinplate for the filled milk production and yet make it most difficult to get tin for a cheese vat for the corner cheese factory, for a can washer, or for a pasteurizer for any cheese factory, there is not much evidence that the present governmental agencies are equal to their responsibilities.

I have repeatedly pointed out that statistically we can still meet the dairy problem, but I fail to see any constructive effort being made to accomplish it.

The ideal weather in the dairy sections the past two seasons may have misled some to think they planned it that way; but the fact remains that while milk production should be increasing, actually it is on the downgrade.

The two most important consumer groups are the armed forces and the babies. The armed forces make use of evaporated milk, dried whole and dried skim milk, as well as butter and cheese. It is hoped they will be amply supplied. Millions of babies are raised on evaporated milk and these should be guaranteed adequate milk for their needs.

For the purpose of a more efficient dairy production program, and for a more effective use of potential supplies, I trust O. P. A. and its allied agencies will soon correct the existing situation. Dried skim milk, an important and necessary food, is not making the contribution it should to the dairy food program. The low-income groups are being denied one of our greatest of foods. Immediate steps should be taken to correct this situation.

In view of the foregoing facts, how can one become too enthused by the rollback program that cuts back by 10 percent the price of a product with a 15- to 20-percent protein which has a 30-, 40-, 50-cent-per-pound ceiling price while at the same time a product with 35-percent protein has a 12.5-cent-per-pound ceiling price?

We should be rolling up the production of this great food, dried skim milk, before we spend too much time, effort, and expense on rolling back the price of any food products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM OF FEDERAL REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States is the biggest real estate owner in the country. But the Government cannot tell you how much it currently owns. It just does not know. Nobody knows.

In these days of ever-increasing taxes it behooves the Congress to cast about for ways to save the people money. It does no good, for instance, to criticize Uncle Sam for going on a land-buying spree and paying $2,610,000 for 3.08 acres of land, most of it at the bottom of the Hudson River. It is not the first time Uncle Sam has been sold things costly as the Brooklyn Bridge. It may be a mistake for him to spend his money this way, but there is a reason for it which must be corrected.

It is an astounding fact, but none the less true, that at the present time there is no satisfactory uniform control, administrative or otherwise, over performance of the operational steps in acquisition and disposition of real property for the uses and purposes of the United States and its various agencies, nor has any satisfactory procedure been established for the compilation of records whereby adequate administrative control could be effected.

The importance of this fact can be found in the confusion which exists between the scores of Government agencies buying land and in the purchases which have been made.

OVERLAPPING BUREAUCRACY

At present there are over 60 departments, agencies, and independent establishments from which the Congress and the Chief Executive must obtain information upon which to base decisions and execute plans and policies regarding the real property requirements of the Government. Of the more than 60 departments and agencies, all are on a parity as to administrative control and responsibility, and while each functions in its own separate sphere, none is equipped to assemble and correlate the vast information required by the Congress and the President for policy and administrative purposes. This is especially true with respect to new requirements, surplus property disposition, future utilization, and the custody of the greatly expanded Federal holdings. Millions of dollars could be saved if this responsibility was coordinated in one agency. The Comptroller General has recommended that it be centered in the General Land Office.

Article 4, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States provides: "The Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the United States." I have therefore introduced a bill, H. R. 3632, to amend the act of July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 107) entitled "An act to Reorganize the General Land Office," and hope that the Congress will approve this measure to vest in the Commissioner of the General Land Office the responsibility to maintain centralized title records of all Government land, the power of acquiring it, and such other provisions as contained in the bill. A similar bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, on October 5, 1943.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to compliment the gentleman for his industry and his intelligence on this very important subject. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us how many million acres of land the Government has condemned or bought, say for the Army and Navy alone, in this war effort.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I think I can answer the gentleman's question. I have before me some information on that point.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS AND MILLIONS OF ACRES

Without including land purchases of the Defense Plant Corporation for some 1,500 war plants and acquisitions by other agencies not referred to the Department of Justice for title opinions, the total acquired and pending acquisitions for defense and war purposes from July 1, 1938, to March 31, 1943, has been estimated at more than 20,000,000 acres and 20,000 parcels not computed on an acreage basis. The helter-skelter methods by which this land has been acquired have given rise to scandal and extravagant waste of public funds. The purchase of that much land is big business. Since July 1, 1940, there has been made available to the War Department alone over $400,000,000 for acquisition of lands and improvements. A list of Navy acquisitions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1943, page 1221, shows that one department has already spent over $86,500,000 for such purposes. The fair market value of Federal lands and improvements has been estimated to be $4,696,061,638.

No one knows how much land Uncle Sam now owns but as of June 30, 1937, the Federal Government held title to approximately 394,658,000 acres of land, according to information in the hearings on the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1942. That land is all in the United States. It constitutes more than 20 percent of all land in the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. In addition to that land, which has been condemned or bought by the Government there are a great many thousand and million acres of land that have been leased, in which

the fee title still remains in the owners of the land, and the Government simply leases it. Does the gentleman know how many acres are involved in that?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. It illustrates the importance of the passage of such a bill as I have introduced, because that question arose in my own mind and I tried to find out. There was no agency of the Government which could give me the answer to that question. It is necessary for anyone making an investigation of this proposition to contact every agency of the Government, and that is almost a superhuman task at the present time.

Total acreage of the continental United States is 1,903,221,280 acres. This means that our Federal Government owns an area equal to all the lands east of the Mississippi River except Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi. These Government lands are located in 2,628 counties, of a total of 3,071 counties, and in 2,965 cities. Fifty percent of the land area of the 11 Western States is federally owned. Federal acquisition, exclusive of military needs, is building up at the rate of approximately 1,000,000 acres per year. The size of these holdings constitute tremendous opportunity for good or evil. If properly utilized they will be of great value to war veterans and in other Government programs. If left in the present mess, scandals will continue to occur and the poor taxpayer be fleeced.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is there anything in the gentleman's bill that limits further dealing in land on the part of the Federal Government? Has the gentleman gone into that at all?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. My measure does not attempt to limit the acquisition of land by the Federal Government, although I certainly think that is a matter that the Congress might well consider in another measure. I think that acquisition of all the land in the country is the first step in any plan toward socialism, and at the rate we are going it will not be long before the Government owns it all.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman should be complimented for opening up this subject. It is something that the Congress should probe and probe thoroughly before many more months.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from New York.

LAND SWINDLES

The Comptroller General has suspended settlements on many land purchases of the Government. This has been done for a variety of reasons. An example may suffice to show the need for corrective legislation. There is no authority in law, in fact there is express prohibition against hiring by the Government of real-estate brokers to buy land for it. Yet, this is what has happened. Certain Government officials who should have done this work themselves hired scores of real-estate men and paid them commissions of thousands of dollars to buy land for the Government. These real-estate men bought land for more than it was worth, so they could make bigger commissions. In fact, in some recorded cases they threw in allowances for dog licenses, preachers' salaries, and charged commissions on their own commissions. They got away with the money, the Comptroller General suspended the settlements, and this means that the responsible Government officers must justify what they did. I know of no prosecutions for these flagrant violations of law. In fact, as is so often true in the War Department, some of the guilty parties were promoted to other jobs. I am going into that question and will have more to say on it later.

CONGRESS IN THE DARK

Congress, in my humble opinion, has been negligent in face of this situation. Congress required—volume fifty-four Statutes at Large, page 968—that the Secretary of War should make monthly reports to the Military and Appropriations Committees of all land purchases—the area, intended use, purchase price, amount appropriated therefor, and assessed value. Shortly thereafter it amended this law—Fifty-sixth Statutes, page 244—to provide that this information only had to be submitted once per year and on contracts in excess of $150,000. It is obvious that in purchasing a large tract of land for a cantonment, for instance, scores of small individual purchases would be made for less than $150,000. That is what has happened and no reports have been submitted to Congress on the subject, even though these tracts in the aggregate run into millions of dollars and the individual transactions have been clothed in great abuse.

The General Land Office is well equipped by experience, equipment, and personnel to handle the responsibility I would give it, and which is now shared by numerous overlapping agencies. The General Land Office, for 130 years, has had experience in handling of public lands, and it is only common sense that a responsibility it has handled with such distinction should be vested in it alone.

This is one constructive step which can be taken to save the people money, eliminate wartime boondoggling, and enable Congress to act with greater intelligence in its official responsibility to the citizens of this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTION

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Director of Economic Stabilization released a decision on the subject of crude-oil prices which must go into the records as one of the most amazing documents yet from the dozens of emergency, special, and extraordinary agencies which keep the American public befuddled with their contradictory statements.

I do not propose to review at length the 19 pages of single-spaced discussion signed by the Director of Economic Stabilization. He started out by saying that the increase of 35 cents a barrel in crude oil which the Petroleum Administrator repeatedly recommended was a question "within the purview of this office." Then he wound up this long and wearisome treatise by saying, in effect, that under his mandate from the President he was confined to the single duty of saying no to anything that comes his way concerning price.

Then, to make it all the more confusing—to reduce the whole labored essay on petroleum to an absurdity apparent at once to laymen as well as to lawyers, he concluded by saying that if the Petroleum Administrator would devise one of those stealthy approaches to the question of getting some oil for the people—an incentive plan of some kind—he, this powerless Director of Economic Stabilization would find that he had authority to put such plan into operation.

I deny that he has any such authority. There is no plan and there is no money set aside by the Congress for any such purpose. The offer to put such a plan into effect is merely another in the long series of buck-passing antics on this vital question of oil. To make the matter more absurd, the Director of Economic Stabilization has called upon the Petroleum Administrator to get up a plan of incentives to promote exploration and to do something for the stripper wells. The Petroleum Administrator passed judgment on such a scheme last June. He then said that no method could be devised which would meet the situation and do the job in the way that a direct price increase would do it.

It has been characteristic of all the decisions made on this price question that the real issue was ignored. That real issue was that we were running out of the daily producible supply of oil needed to supply the military program and the essential civilian uses. The O. P. A. dragged the question around from the middle of 1941, delaying and stalling. The oil producers were eager to get into action. They knew what happens to the supply when you stop drilling and stop the repair and maintenance work on wells and they knew that this war was going to take all the oil that could be brought to the surface.

The only recipe the O. P. A. could offer for the emergency was rationing. Lately, they have been holding out the glittering promise of imports. Prentiss Brown early in August turned to this as another Heaven-sent excuse for more delay on the price question. He made it sound as though imported oil would soon be available on every street corner. Three months have passed and the only change has been for the worse. Gasoline rations have been cut and it is hinted that they will be cut again.

The Director of Economic Stabilization picked up this thought and went to town on it. He had to juggle the facts around a bit and misquote the au-

thorities, but he arrived at a position of security before he finished his labored reasoning for maintaining the traditional negative position on price. For instance, he quoted the Director of Production of the Petroleum Administration's testimony before the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee to the effect that the deficiency in domestic production in the last quarter of 1944 would be 337,000 barrels daily and then made it sound as though this same individual had also said that the deficiency would be made up, to the exact barrel, by imports. He did say, "if shipping facilities are provided," but that was obscured by the tone of confidence used earlier.

Just to keep everything straight, I will quote what this Director of Production really said:

> It is estimated that by the final quarter of 1944 the deficiency between domestic production of crude oil and crude-oil requirements will total 337,000 barrels daily. Present programs call for this crude-oil deficiency to be supplied from foreign sources, but, with the unpredictable hazards of submarine warfare and with no assurance that the necessary tankers will be available on a continuing basis, this is not a positive solution to the problem.

Earlier, however, before he got his imports program going, the Director of Economic Stabilization had said that—

> There is no reasonable prospect, whether the price of crude oil is advanced or not, that there will be any Nation-wide increase in gasoline for nonessential driving.

"Nonessential" is a vague term; it means anything the bureaucrats want it to mean. It is nonessential to drive to the bedside of a dying father or mother, or to go more than an arbitrarily prescribed number of miles in a month, regardless of usefulness of the travel or the urgency of it. Anyway, in one and the same statement the Director of Economic Stabilization has told us to abandon all hope, and then has repaired the deficiency in supply.

We must now recognize the fact that from the very beginning the bureaucrats had no intention of doing anything to maintain our oil supply. Their philosophy is now coming into the open. It has been from the beginning of this war to the present a consistent program of building up foreign oil development and reducing our own productive capacity to make room for foreign oil here at home. All we need do is to look at what has happened. We have consistently taken oil out of storage here to meet the demand while new development has been discouraged and prevented. At the same time these promoters of the world economy have been running to foreign countries with encouragement and assistance, all the way from the ill-starred Canol pipe-line project, into which has been dumped an amount said by a Canadian writer to total $138,000,000, to schemes for financial assistance in Mexico, Bolivia, Argentina, and many other places.

But nothing must be done that would enable the American consumer to get a little more gasoline and a little more heating oil. Nothing must be done that would let the American oil producer live.

It goes beyond any "hold the line" order. They began to hold the line on oil long before any line was established. The intent of Congress was expressed in the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, which declared that it was a purpose of the act "to assist in securing adequate production of commodities and facilities."

Is there any contention by anyone that oil production is adequate? Is there any contention that anything has been done to make it adequate? It was so claimed for a while by Leon Henderson, but the O. P. A. months ago got off that theory and began hoping that some foreign country would come to our rescue. The remedy was in sight all the time, and it has been pointed out by numerous committees of this Congress. Oil producers simply could not drill and they could not maintain their properties in efficient shape with the income they were getting. They cannot now, on a 1941 price, meet the 1943 costs.

I read a story the other day about a tough sergeant who came upon a shivering soldier on the drill field. His teeth were chattering and his hands were blue. He was out about 10 miles from camp. The sergeant was accustomed to giving orders. He looked at the man and shouted, "Are you cold?" The soldier nodded. "Well," barked the sergeant, "get warm."

I thought of this when I read the pontifical pronouncement of the Director of Economic Stabilization that one of the cures for our oil deficiency was "increased drilling of developmental wells."

What wisdom! What astuteness! This is the brand of reasoning that has been used throughout to run down our petroleum reserves, above and below ground; it has been used to delay and stall and "pass the buck." Any person in the country knows that answer and every Member of this Congress knows by now that more wells would have been drilled if the means had been provided with which to pay for them.

A short time ago there was a press release from the O. W. I. which worried about the $51,000,000,000 gap between income and consumer goods and services available. That is $51,000,000,000 more than can be spent. This is the so-called inflationary gap. This is the dangerous money they speak of. Think of that amount for a minute. The very most that the recommended increase of 35 cents a barrel would cost the public and the Government would be a half billion dollars, this an estimate of Stabilizer Vinson, and to the average consumer it would mean, at most, a cent on gasoline or 2 or 3 cents a week—less than $2 a year. There are willing customers with money in hand to buy essential products. The bill would be paid by the consumers only and nothing would be added to the national debt for nonconsumers to pay, as would be done under the Economic Stabilization Director's incentive proposal.

The people have a remedy. The Congress has the responsibility of applying it. We have wasted too much time already waiting for a bunch of world-wide planners to give a little practical attention to affairs here at home. Their only cure for the oil shortage is to do without until we can get something from Fort Norman or Afghanistan. Congress through committees of both Houses has taken all the evidence it needs and every verdict has been for a raise in price.

The people of all the congressional districts have been asking why nothing is done.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

BUREAU ORDERS AND DIRECTIVES

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to discuss rather generally some of the things I think are of importance to our people and to the Congress.

In the criticisms of Washington I note little distinction between that which Congress does or does not do and that which is done or not done by the various bureaus here in Washington. I feel there has been considerable reaction to the lethargy of Congress since the summer recess. The people of this country look to Congress for action. The constant flow of bureau orders and directives, "bureaucratic legislation," seriously affecting the rights and liberties of the citizens of this country has been in part, at least, a constant source of irritation. In making that statement I do not want to take the position that many of the directives and orders are not reasonable or are not necessary; quite the contrary, I think many of them are reasonable, and many of them are necessary; but here and there is an order which seriously affects the very substantial rights of our citizens—action by some bureau by directive, by order, which very seriously affects the rights of our people and from which that citizen has no right of appeal through judicial channels.

I invite the attention of the Members of the House to H. R. 2705 introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and also to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has filed petition No. 13 to provide that we may legislate upon this all-important question. This bill, by the way, affects only orders and regulations by O. P. A. While it is of particular importance I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that many other bureaus promulgate regulations which seriously affect the people of our country, yet from which there is no judicial process of appeal. Recently my attention was called by a newspaper article to the fact that the people back home do not make any distinction between legislation by the Congress and regulations issued by the bureaus. The fact is when the folks back home think of government, when they think of Congress, they often think of departments and agencies such as the U. S. D. A., the W. P. A., the A. A. A., the C. C. C., the F. D. A., the O. D. T., and the O. P. A. as a part of the Congress. Recently one of the newspapers in my district published a strong column upon the action of the War Manpower Commissioner providing Federal regulations

that all hiring and solicitation of workers in or for work in that vicinity should be conducted within the purview of the employment stabilization program. This is one of the War Manpower directives which provides, among other things, in event of violation, for a fine of not to exceed $1,000, or a year in jail, or both. In commenting upon this and in setting out rather specifically the directives which were provided the columnist who wrote this particular column asked:

> Is the above plan in the Constitution? Is it a law passed by Congress? Did the people have anything to say about whether such a control should be fastened upon them? Have the people, in effect, a chance to vote on whether they wish to submit to or be governed by this rule?

And they then asked a very significant question, thinking in terms of the folks back home:

> Have our Representatives in the United States Senate and in Congress the intelligence and guts to abolish the dictatorial serf-making directive before starry-eyed professors start regulating our sleeping habits?

Let me point out to the membership, Mr. Speaker, that these directives do have a very serious effect upon all of our people, no matter what type of district we may represent. The regulations of O. P. A. not only regulate the merchant who is operating a business but also regulate even the shoes that the baby in the home wears.

When you take the question of the hiring of help, the labor question, they are affected by directives of the Selective Service, by the War Manpower Commission, by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the interpretations of these several bureaus. Those are merely a few of the departmental agencies which are in effect passing legislation each day.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the gentleman is making a very significant statement, I congratulate him for calling this important matter to the attention of Congress. Some action should be taken whereby some appeal may be had from the rules, regulations, and directives that are being promulgated from time to time by the various bureaus that have been set up to administer the acts that we have passed. That becomes more significant each day. For instance, today before the Committee on Agriculture of which I am a member, we find that recently the War Food Administration in cooperation with the citrus fruit industry had worked out a full, complete, and accurate new program for the citrus industry. Now we find the O. P. A., notwithstanding the program had the approval of the War Food Administration and the industry, refused to respect or adopt that plan and are getting ready probably by tomorrow or next day to put their own plan into effect which the industry says is not workable and which does not have the approval of the War Food Administration. The matter has been submitted to Mr. Vinson.

As the gentleman knows, he acts in the position of arbitrator where the War Food Administrator and the O. P. A. cannot agree. I understand in this instance the Food Administrator took it up with the industry, they worked out a plan and urged the O. P. A. to put it into effect, but it was rejected. It seems to me when the O. P. A. has taken over the authority of the War Food Administrator and issuing orders and directives, completely ignoring the War Food Administrator, certainly the processor, members of the industry, and those affected ought to have some place to which they could appeal in order to get some modification of those orders.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman for his observation. The War Food Administration is another very important bureau. The food problem has been a most serious problem and while the gentleman speaks of the citrus industry let me say that I was speaking to one of my colleagues from Texas last winter who spoke of the fact that because of the hiatus, the confusion and the chaos then existing, a great many of the citrus canneries in his district that would ordinarily be preparing and canning citrus foods, had simply refused to open the door of their factories because of the confusion which was existing. Congress has had a very serious problem in passing such acts as the Price Control Act in that Congress has delegated tremendous authority in a very vague and in a very general way.

I am sure that the membership of the House who are lawyers have seriously questioned some of these general acts and whether or not such acts were constitutional. There have been decisions to the effect that where there is a delegation of legislative authority by a legislative body it is necessary that that legislative body rather specifically set out and lay out the manner in which that delegation of authority is to be exercised. I think most of my colleagues will agree that in many cases at least of the Price Control Act that was not done.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'HARA. Now a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I was formerly a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman was a member of the House Judiciary Committee. I wonder whether in his opinion things would have been improved if the Walter-Logan bill which passed the Congress had not been vetoed by the President and if the Congress had been successful in its attempt to override the Presidential veto of the Walter-Logan bill? It seems to me that that would have given the private citizen at least one source to go to for a correction of some of the maladministration of various bureaus that exist at this time.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say to the gentleman that unquestionably the passage of the Walter-Logan bill would have provided some relief. In most instances the right of redress of the average citizen who is affected by these orders and regulations is practically nil.

Mr. MUNDT. The Walter-Logan bill would have tended to help keep the Government in the hands of the people which, after all, is the American way.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement of the gentleman. Let me say along that line that we have the following situation: Let us take one of the bureaus that makes an order. They prosecute it, then they become the judge and jury and high executioner of it. They are responsible to no one from an elective standpoint. Often in the administration of the act they are fair, at least some of them are very fair, but, on the other hand some of them are overzealous, overreaching and unfair in the enforcement of the penalty provisions of many of these directives. I happen to know that our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is chairman of a committee investigating and making a study of the effect of the penalty provisions which have been put out by these various bureaus or many of them. I am hopeful that we will have from him soon a report upon that subject.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. I want to say that some of the directives that have been issued do affect the people I represent in this body. There has been a method of appeal. That appeal is back to the authority from which the directive usually emanates. It is much like the man and wife who agreed that each should have their way 50 percent of the time and the husband allowed the wife to have her way as long as they agreed. It is like that down here with some of these bureaus. As long as you agree with them, all right. But if you happen to be in contravention with their conclusions you are out of luck. Just to illustrate the point, the district I represent is now a No. 1 critical area in which 8,400 new homes have been built since 1941. They are dependent upon coal. We have a critical coal situation. By appealing to Mr. Fortas we got some coal there directly from the Army.

After getting the coal into the district we learned from an investigation that the delivery unit had shrunk some 35 percent by reason of these directives affecting the business. They then issued what is known as order No. 7. Order No. 7 would not permit the retail dealers to deliver coal in amounts larger than 1-ton lots. The contravening effect of that was that they increased the consumption of gasoline, and they further consumed the tires. About 85 percent of the coal haulers in the district were working on a contract basis and the contracts were based on 2-ton delivery lots, so 85 percent of the people who were delivering coal just quit delivering as a result of this order that was issued by one of the bureaus. I called that bureau and told them what the condition was they had created, and arbitrarily in the instance of Akron as distinct from the rest of the country, they rescinded the order for that area.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, recently there was called to my attention from my own district this sort of a situation. There was a dispute between one of the farm cooperatives of my district and the Wages and Hours Division as to whether this cooperative came within the purview of the Wages and Hours Act. The question was serious because the cooperative was in this situation. They were liable to be prosecuted criminally. They were in a position where an injunctive action could be taken against them or where they would be subject to the penalty provision of an employees' suit. So they brought an action under the so-called Federal Declaratory Judgment Act against the regional director of that region. Unfortunately, there were several decisions which held that action could not be commenced against a regional director. The decisions are, in effect, that in that sort of a situation it is necessary for them to sue the Administrator here in the District of Columbia. His office has been moved to New York. Frankly, I do not know where he would have to be sued, whether in the District of Columbia or in the State of New York. But you can imagine the condition in which these people are placed who are seriously affected by these regulations or their administration, where they want to check on whether the views of the Administrator of that particular law are correct. You can imagine how difficult it is throughout the country for the hundreds of small firms or individuals who employ help, to test serious questions of law or fact, taking, for example, questions arising under the Wages and Hours Act.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill which is in effect an amendment to the Declaratory Judgment Act and which will permit anyone affected to bring suit against the Administrator by serving through the mail upon the Administrator here in Washington a copy of the summons and complaint in Federal court.

As these bureau orders increase, these problems about which I speak to you increase proportionately the problems of our people. What I wish to emphasize in a simple way is that I certainly believe in some form of judicial appeal from unreasonable orders or unreasonable regulations or directives. I do not care whether you call it a Walter-Logan bill or what, but I believe our courts are the proper places for those serious questions to be decided. There will not be many appeals, but where there is serious question that an injustice is being done there should be a law which permits these appeals. It is our solemn duty to maintain and sustain the Bill of Rights and the constitutional form of government.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for 30 minutes.

NORWAY AND THE NORWEGIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the agreements signed at the recent Moscow Conference implemented by overwhelming approval by the Senate of the United States clearly demonstrate that the free people of the world are determined to collaborate with each other in a postwar program designed to preserve peace and to insure justice and equality of opportunity to the sovereign nations of the world. It is proper, therefore, in the midst of these discussions that we should take time to appraise the status of one of our active allies.

I refer to Norway and its heroic people. No amount of international discussion can dim the luster of the brilliant record of the Norwegian people in the present war.

With about 74 percent of its 125,000-square-mile area made up of rugged mountains and moors, glaciers and lakes, and lying geographically the farthest north of all civilized nations, it should immediately be apparent that down through the centuries its people had to develop characteristics of sturdiness, ingenuity, and thrift in order to maintain a livelihood. With a coast line of more than 2,100 miles and approximately 12,000 miles if measured in terms of the inlets and large islands, it is perfectly apparent that for centuries the Norwegian people have been compelled through sheer necessity to look to the sea as a source of living and transportation.

This close contact with the violent forces of nature has developed a rugged, reliable, and adventurous type of people. The pages of history are replete with heroic records of bold Norwegian adventurers. The spirit of the early Vikings, who knew how to combat and overcome the terrors of the Arctic, finds expression today in the solid character of the men and women of Norway, who, prior to the invasion of their peaceful country on April 9, 1940, by the lustful hordes of Hitler, had developed a national economy that has been acclaimed by liberty-loving and peace-loving people throughout the world.

The sons and daughters of Norway who came to this country in the years prior to restricted immigration, over a million strong, have integrated themselves as thorough Americans and by precept and example have played an important role in the development of our ever-expanding economy.

In the years preceding the German invasion the people of Norway had overcome almost insurmountable difficulties in developing a solid, firm domestic economy with a high standard of living and an economic system based upon the most advanced ideas of social reform.

With a population of about 3,000,000, with only a small portion of her total land area subject to cultivation, and with mining and manufacturing industries engaged in only on a small scale, the Norwegian people in the decades immediately prior to the outbreak of the present war maintained steady progress. Thousands of small farms were carved out of the hillsides without destroying the forest lands which have played such an important part in the internal economy of Norway. Her rivers and waterfalls have been harnessed to provide electricity, and the nation was well on the way, through the means of hydroelectric power, to independence from imported coal as a means of heat and light. New and valuable mineral deposits were discovered and developed. The fishing industry was expanded. Modern cooperative methods of marketing and distribution were introduced, and many new markets were developed at home and abroad. The paper and pulp industry was expanded and modernized. New industries such as whaling and fur farming were carefully developed under governmental supervision and encouragement as a means of contribution to the expanding economy of the Norwegian people.

Transportation in the form of railroads and highways and airfields was rapidly being developed to serve the national interests. Along with this great industrial and agricultural development, there came important social reforms with provisions for old-age pensions, sick insurance, unemployment compensation, aids to the underprivileged and the helpless and disabled, advanced educational opportunities and a well-developed system of municipally owned utilities. The nation developed a strong and courageous free press that kept the public informed. Public cultural and recreational facilities, along with technical and scientific research were well under way when the blighting hand of the Nazis struck down this small but efficient and courageous nation.

I have called attention to some of the progress made by this nation of God-fearing people because it serves to highlight the background of the great industry of Norway, which down through the centuries has been closely identified with the sea. Because of her inability to produce the things necessary for an expanding domestic economy, imports have vastly exceeded exports. As a result, the Norwegian people have been compelled to develop a great merchant fleet, the income from which has enabled Norway to balance its accounts with other nations of the world. This great fleet has been developed by private capital without government subsidies.

How well they have succeeded through the years in their development of a great maritime industry is reflected by a few simple facts: The total merchant tonnage under the Norwegian flag at the outbreak of the present war was seven and one-half million dead-weight tons. Including all types of ships, Norway's merchant marine in 1939 ranked third among the nations of the world. Only Great Britain and the United States had a greater tonnage. Truly on the outbreak of the war, Norwegian shipping was in truth and in fact carrying a large part of the maritime tonnage to the four corners of the world. This great fleet of fast, modern motor vessels, 40 percent of which were the finest and most modern tankers in the world, was widely scattered at the outbreak of hostilities.

Immediately, the Royal Norwegian Government requisitioned all of Norway's merchant fleet for war use. By means of the London radio, the masters of more than a thousand ships then on

the high seas were ordered to report immediately to Britain or allied ports. Despite all of the efforts of Hitler's agents to confuse the orders, the Norwegian masters, without exception, brought their ships into the service of the Allies. These fast modern merchant ships, together with the 25,000 Norwegian seamen that manned them, played a most conspicuous part in the long months of the Battle of Britain, which followed the collapse of France. Norwegian seamen, braving the dangers of submarine- and mine-infested waters, carried to England more than 50 percent of that nation's supply of oil and gasoline.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the gentleman is paying this much deserved tribute to the people of Norway and to other free Scandinavian peoples. It happens that a part of the background from which the plot of Rolvag's Giants of the Earth was written is in the district I represent in South Dakota. I have, therefore, learned to know and to admire the stalwart qualities of the Norwegian people, and the record which the Norwegian seamen are making in carrying troops and munitions of war for the United Nations. This indicates that the people of Norway are not only giants of the earth but giants of the sea as well.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

High-ranking British officers have given testimony to the fact that this contribution of the Norwegian merchant fleet was of decisive importance in the Battle of Britain. A real estimate of this contribution is to be found in the London newspapers, which declared that the Norwegian fleet was worth more in the Battle of Britain than an army of a million men. Thus we find this great fleet, privately owned, suddenly requisitioned in toto by the Royal Norwegian Government in the service of the allied cause.

There was then established the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission, which operates as an agency of the Royal Norwegian Government. The entire revenue from the fleet goes to the Norwegian Government. It is practically the only revenue at present available to the Norwegian Government out of which its costs of administration can be paid. Out of the earnings of the Norwegian merchant fleet are paid the expenses for maintaining the Norwegian Army, Navy, and Air Forces, which are constantly being expanded in the Allied cause. Out of these earnings must also come the funds with which to pay the interest and amortization on the Norwegian Government loans.

No compensation has been paid to the Norwegian shipowners. Thus we find the little country of Norway making an outstanding contribution to the war effort through the medium of the greatest material resource at her command. True, I could discuss the spiritual and material opposition which the loyal Norwegian people are constantly offering to the attempts of Hitler and his cohorts to subdue them. That tragic story must await another time.

With the necessity for constantly expanding national income due to the continued development of the Norwegian Army, Navy, and Air Forces, the question involved in the development of the Norwegian merchant fleet assumes major importance. Of the seven and one-half million deadweight tons of shipping owned by Norwegian operators in September 1939, 4,000,000 tons have been captured or sunk since the invasion of Norway. This leaves approximately three and one-half million tons of prewar tonnage still afloat.

What has been done by the United States and Great Britain to replace this invaluable tonnage lost by Norway? The records indicate that replacements so far obtained by the Norwegian merchant fleet consists of 19 vessels obtained from Great Britain of 191,000 tons, dead weight; and 8 vessels totaling 78,000 tons dead weight acquired for operational purposes only from the United States. This replacement of tonnage only amounts to about 6.7 percent of the losses sustained by the Norwegian merchant ships up to date. As a result of the tremendous loss of merchant ships and tankers, thousands of expert Norwegian seamen, navigators, officers, engineers, and other licensed personnel are on the beach unable to find employment. This reserve of trained personnel is immediately available for the manning of replacement ships provided the proper authorities of Great Britain and the United States can release sufficient tonnage. This question presents a problem of simple justice. Norway, as no other nation on the face of the globe, is dependent upon her merchant marine. She must have help. That help should be forthcoming now. If we are to crystalize our promises of cooperative effort among sovereign people of the world, and if we are to recognize the contributions made by small nations in the active fight against Nazi tyranny, then it seems to me that simple justice demands that those in authority in Britain and the United States shall lend a sympathetic ear to the pleas of a great people, and extend to Norway the immediate right to participate in the giant pool of reserve merchant shipping which is so rapidly being built up under our war shipping program. As a nation we cannot afford to allow the economy of a great democracy like Norway to collapse, and it would be manifestly tragic and unfair to expect this heroic people to expend years of effort in an attempt to replace the shipping which they have lost as a result of their magnificent contribution to the war effort.

The people of Norway are our friends. They are our active allies. They expect no charity, but while facing continued hazards on the high seas, and with their families being ruthlessly oppressed at home, they have a right in my judgment to expect and receive simple justice.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CARELESS USE OF WORDS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the greatest utterance ever made by the President of the United States was, "Freedom of speech means nothing if you have nothing to say." On this sacred day, it is fitting to remember that the greatest patriotism is silence and action. During the past few days utterances have been made which, although patriotic in sound, were in fact counterfeit utterances which were seeking to exploit the taxpaying public as well as our brave sons. It was a Democratic Attorney General who once made a statement in the nature of a public proclamation, "Patriotism is often the refuge of a scoundrel," quoting Dr. Samuel Johnson. Every man and woman here in this body is alert to duty and is here to give his all in service, completely forgetting himself, his future, or any personal benefit. Most Members here have sons in the Army and some of these sons have made the supreme sacrifice. Yet, at the same time, some of these sons wonder why a blanket brand of lack of duty and sometimes even patriotism, is hurled at their parents just because they refuse to vote to throw away money or insist on requiring a professional audit by their own Congress on every appropriation they make. The Constitution provides that all bills for the raising of revenue must originate in this body and with that responsibility goes the duty of seeing that nothing is wasted and the substance of America exploited and thus a bad reception as to substance when the armed sons return. Truly, the power to tax is the power to destroy and these sons do not wish to return to a country thus destroyed. These armed sons of the Republic want to see a country which does not waste its assets in the name of patriotism while they are crushing the bandits abroad. It is our duty to crush banditry here.

H. G. Wells said "When a man is too lazy to think, he uses slogans or calls names." Unthinking people who style themselves too cultured to use profanity use slogans instead. Slogans lately used are "Internationalists," "Isolationists," "Visionary daydreamers," "Pink professors." People who call others these names reason with their diaphragms and think with their lungs. One biologist said, "They have torpid livers where their cerebrums should be."

There are no what we might call isolationists of consequence. A so-called isolationist would worship the devil because of his antiquity. Almost every Member of this House is a real internationalist, so-called, and by this I mean a constructive citizen of the world who is keeping his foot on the ground. The so-called internationalist who wants to forget completely the United States of America—and these are very few—is opposed to eternity because it is too slow. We should be neither fantastic shadow dancers nor stand-patters. We should be sure steppers, one step at a time.

Our great university presidents and instructors, as well as our teachers everywhere, should not be branded as daydreamers or as "pink." They represent, indeed, a most unselfish profession. Never clock-watchers, they unselfishly toil upward into the night in behalf of others and with consecration in behalf of justice for all and for a world where the symbol of hate will never again be able to start a forward march. To them more than most any other group are we indebted for the fact that it will not happen again. At times, of course, they have blundered but they have blundered forward. True, some peace forums have been mutual admiration societies, but that applies to only about one out of a thousand. It is unfortunate that that one has sometimes been emphasized. To these good and great peace forums, this body is indebted truly for having first given us a charter of thought and action.

The greatest slander is that cheap slogan "Midwest isolationist."

Citizens of the eastern and western seaboards should realize what the unselfish, practical, world-thinking Middle West is doing for them. Most of them on these seaboards are grateful in spite of the fact that a few of those on the receiving end from the seaboards still receive and call these hard, patriotic toilers names. These praying parents of the Middle West will still give and give and give and do without and do without. Read the history of the patriotic motherhood of Ohio; read the record of Ohio's gallant soldier-Governor who has the public service of a surplus in that State for the Buckeye soldiers when they return. Not lip service but constructive deeds.

There now is no east nor west, no north or south, nor no midwest. All are now citizens of the world with the heritage of principle for guidance. That is why we left the Old World in order to allow freedom of worship, speech, and press as well as to escape from the tyranny of oppression of taxation without representation. That we now, as their residuary legatees, give to the world and in this, world justice will demand as a parchment for perpetual action in the new world charter of action. Let us have patriotism without ostentation; courage without boldness; pursuit of the line of duty without glamor and exhibitionism; and meekness without stupidity.

This broad land of ours was not made good that it should wither and die or be blasted out of existence or into smoking ruins and blackened chimneys. We shall not perish. But a heavy obligation is laid upon us to see to it that this earth of majesty and land of plenty and happiness is preserved for humanity, and to achieve that end nothing is too great to ask of any of us. If our country can ask that our boys lay down their lives in your defense and mine, it is very little to ask of our Congressmen that he forget petty matters and forget himself in the physical safety that is his, and vote solidly for what is needed to win, regardless of consequences to himself or anyone else.

THE RUBBER PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, since making my last remarks on the rubber program I am very happy to report to you that the industry has moved much further forward than I at first anticipated. Briefly I give here some brief facts:

All told in our synthetic-rubber program about 59 plants are involved.

These plants are located in the following States: Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Texas, California, Arkansas, Ohio, Michigan, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Canada.

Plants making alcohol from grain and molasses are located in some other States, including Midwest States such as Nebraska.

The Federal investment in these plants is around $750,000,000.

We are producing today at the rate of 437,000 tons of synthetic rubber per year.

At the end of 1943 we will be producing at the rate of 646,000 tons per year. Peacetime consumption under normal conditions is about 700,000 tons.

In the second quarter of 1944 we will be producing at the rate of 850,000 tons of synthetic rubber per year. All plants will be operating at full capacity by that time.

Our factories are making rubber from two optional raw material bases—oil and alcohol.

Petroleum byproducts available from cracking oil to make 100-octane gas and fuel is one base. Or oil itself may be refined to give off the byproduct gases needed for synthetic rubber.

Alcohol from grains, corn, potatoes, and so forth, or from cane or beets.

Styrene—about one-fifth ingredient of Government rubber styrene type is made from coal combined with ethylene produced from either oil or alcohol.

Butadiene—combined with styrene—about 5 to 1—makes Government rubber styrene.

One car of styrene and four cars of butadiene make about four cars of Government rubber styrene and, for information of Members, I placed in the lobby a chart explaining this subject.

It is expected that Government styrene type rubber will be produced at 7 cents a pound post-war.

THE PRESENT COST

We are making synthetic rubber from byproducts of petroleum for about 20 cents a pound. Some of the same kind of rubber being made by plants which are not yet in full operation cost as much as 65 cents a pound.

The present average cost of the rubber produced in our synthetic-rubber plants is 41 cents a pound.

Each month as the plants come into full operation costs become more standardized and lower. Competitive costs with raw rubber are expected after the war.

There is continued experimentation and laboratory work going which is helping to improve the product.

Mr. Speaker, before the war the United States was not self-sufficient in a very critical material—rubber. We did not have sufficient rubber to take care of our own needs. Up to that time we were entirely dependent on our rubber supplies from the Dutch and British monopolies who controlled most of the raw-rubber resources of the world. When the Japanese captured the rubber plantations of the Far East, the supply of raw rubber we had on hand in the United States was not sufficient for civilian needs and far from enough to take care of the great demands of our armed services. We immediately launched upon a gigantic program to make synthetic rubber. The story of that program has been told to you many times. So I will confine myself to bringing it a little more up to date.

Up to this time we have invested approximately $750,000,000 of Federal funds in the construction and operation of plants in various States. These plants are operated by private industry, some of which had made valuable experimentations in the synthetic-rubber field long before the war. The construction and operation program had moved along much faster than I had anticipated and much faster than I indicated in my previous remarks on this subject. The fact is that by the end of this year these plants are expected to be completed and will be turning out enough synthetic rubber to make us self-sufficient under normal times and will make us practically independent of the supplies we normally received from the plantations in the Far East.

Although this report is very optimistic so far as the supplies of synthetic rubber are concerned, this does not mean that everybody who wants an automobile tire can get one. The reason is that there is a bottleneck in the matter of the manufacturing of the tire itself. Rayon, cotton fabric, and the shortage of labor are problems which must be and are being solved in these factories. But so far as synthetic rubber is concerned and the supply we are in the clear. The $750,000,000 of Federal funds which we have invested is in actuality producing rubber in huge quantities.

The question now is, Are we going to abandon these valuable synthetic-rubber plants when the war is over? Or are we again going to surrender our dependence on this critical material to foreign monopoly and endanger ourselves again should a crisis face us? I take the negative side of that question and make the declaration that we must not only preserve these rubber plants for the American people and put to use all of our natural resources but we must encourage the improvement of these plants and make them flow into private channels of American industry in order that they will be part of the gigantic program to solve the economic war which will face us in the post-war period. We must never again face the pathetic situation

as regards rubber as we were faced with before Pearl Harbor.

The demand for r any years after the war for all kinds of rubber will be very great. Products in the hands of people of the world are being used up and are not being replaced. That demand is going to be big enough to absorb the supply of crude and synthetic rubber for several years to come. By that time the United States will have gained a great amount of experience in the use of synthetic rubber. The quality of synthetic rubber will be improved. The special purposes of synthetic rubber now being developed will be perfected. For many purposes synthetic rubber may prove superior to crude rubber, and vice versa. Is it not logical and wise to let synthetic rubber and crude rubber compete, both as to price and usefulness? Usefulness for the hundreds of purposes for which rubber is produced today and for the hundreds of new uses which will be found in the future?

The people of the United States have an investment of over $750,000,000 in synthetic-rubber plants which are now in operation and which will be completed this year. These plants are operated by private industry, some of which have experimented for many years in synthetic rubber. Let me give you the names of some of the industries operating these plants: The Bigler Chemical, Carbide-E-Carbon, Cities Service-Refinery, Humble Oil Co., Koppers United Co., Neches Butane, Phillips Petroleum, Polymer Corporation, Ltd., Shell Chemical Co., Southern California Gas, Sinclair Rubber Inc., Standard Oil, Eastern States Petroleum, Lion Oil Eastern Refinery, Sun Oil Co., Taylor Refining Co., Dow Chemical Co., Monsantc Chemical, Firestone Tire, Copolymer Corporation, B. F. Goodrich Co., Goodyear Tire, General Tire, United States Rubber Co., E. I. du Pont.

I am sure you will agree with me that this great group of industry at war is well equipped to participate in the great economic war with which we will be faced in the very near future.

The great investment we have made in this synthetic program can well be combined with American science and industry to play its part to solve a possible future crisis. Certainly this program should not be destroyed and wasted for the benefit of foreign monopolies as has been suggested only recently. This private industry operating these Government plants knows a lot about synthetic rubber, and they are learning more about it every day. It is my sincere belief that private capital is going to want to purchase these plants and operate them without a subsidy. You need only to read of the patent agreements and cross-licensing plans of these organizations as contained in the progress report No. 4 which I will include in my remarks. What a great augmentation these plants will be to the original experimentations conducted by some of these private organizations.

Further argument that these plants must not be abandoned after the war is based on the fact that the Government is going to sell the rubber from these plants. Every pound is badly needed. If this rubber is fairly priced, this Government investment will be paid for in the not too distant future.

The American spirit of competitive business can take these plants and operate them in competition with natural rubber. Some amortization should be allowed for emergency construction costs so that these plants can be purchased by private industry without any loss to the Government.

One of the remarkable things that can be said about our rubber program is that William Jeffers, who took the Baruch committee report as his background, accomplished in 1 year what would have ordinarily taken 10 to 12 years. This is truly remarkable when critical materials and labor shortage are taken into consideration in wartime. To do this Mr. Jeffers called on Bradley Dewey, the present Rubber Director, to head his technical scientific staffs.

Among many who have done outstanding jobs is Frank Creedon, in charge of construction. His division supervised the erection of these plants; secured for them outstanding priorities which made their completion possible in such a short time.

In other part of the program Mr. L. D. Tompkins was borrowed from United States Rubber Co. to be in charge of operations. His work has involved scheduling of crude rubber for various products. By keeping the use of crude rubber to a minimum he has been able to preserve the United States stock pile. Certain crude rubber has had to be used in heavy-duty truck and bus tires for the military and civilian transportation. Not to mention for the huge airplane tires which are so vital to our bomber fleet all over the world.

Another outstanding man in the organization was Mr. E. E. Babcock who was loaned to the organization by the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. He has been responsible for the substitution of synthetic rubber as it became available for crude rubber.

There are about 275 people employed in this great organization at this time and among them are scores of valuable Americans whose work has helped make the program so successful.

So, as I have said, I believe there is room for both synthetic-rubber plants and crude-rubber production. Let the better product win, both as to price and usefulness.

There has been much discussion about what the price of rubber will be when the war is over and after all of the "bugs" are eliminated from the present program. The fact that it is officially stated that rubber can be made in the post-war period for as low as 7 cents a pound in these synthetic plants would indicate that American synthetic rubber will successfully compete with crude rubber or natural rubber. Some time in the near future, when I have accumulated additional figures, I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some figures which will indicate that even synthetic rubber made from grain alcohol will successfully compete with raw rubber. The high price of alcohol of 85 cents per gallon as compared to the normal price of 45 cents a gallon indicates that rubber made from grain alcohol may be somewhat prohibitive. However, new processes have been developed, and I am told this new process will bring the price of grain alcohol down to a low level with the result that synthetic rubber made from grain alcohol will be in the competitive field with rubber made from molasses products or petroleum products.

Mr. Speaker, William Jeffers, the former Rubber Director, issued his first progress report on November 30, 1942. On February 18, 1943, he issued progress report No. 2. On May 17, 1943, he issued progress report No. 3. Each of these reports gives a romantic and a very exhaustive picture of the remarkable work accomplished by this Nebraskan. On November 10, 1943, Col. Bradley Dewey, the new Rubber Director, who was one of the keymen in Mr. Jeffers' organization, issued the fourth progress report. This report brings the story up to date and gives so much valuable information that I include it with my remarks:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
OFFICE OF RUBBER DIRECTOR.

PROGRESS REPORT NO. 4

THE BASIC SITUATION

The supply of tires and other essential rubber goods continues short and will be so for a long time, but, given adequate feed stocks, fuel, and other essential materials and labor, no one need worry about this country's ability to produce synthetic rubber. The task of constructing the vast new synthetic-rubber industry is nearing completion; the more important processes have been proven, the characteristics of the synthetics are constantly being evaluated for a vast number of products, and daily the rubber manufacturing industry is improving its techniques for using the new forms of rubber. Synthetic rubbers in large quantity are being produced and used, and by the early part of 1944 all of the plants in the production program will have been completed and will be in production. The critical question of 1942, "Can enough rubber be produced before exhaustion of the crude-rubber stock pile?" has been answered in the affirmative.

Availability of synthetic rubber, however, does not immediately assure an adequate number of tires or other rubber products. As is well known, the synthetic-rubber construction program is being completed far later than we wished, and as a result many of the corollary programs necessarily had to wait until experience with the use of synthetic rubber could be gained. But now the job of translating raw materials into a sufficiency of suitable military and consumer rubber products is under way. The solution is dependent upon management, labor, scientists, and engineers in and out of the rubber industry. It demands the utmost of self-sacrificing cooperation by all.

The rubber program in the past year presented four major programs: (1) the increase of reclaim rubber production and of retreading materials and facilities; (2) the construction and development of plants to produce synthetic rubbers and their principal raw materials, butadiene and styrene; (3) the expansion of the rubber manufacturing industry to process synthetic rubber into usable products; and (4) the expansion and conversion of allied industries to produce the necessary components of rubber goods, such as high-tenacity rayon tire cords, carbon blacks,

and so forth—materials essential to the making of rubber goods. The first two programs are effectively behind us, while the other two are underway. Upon the speed of completion of the latter two, together with effective management and a sound manpower and labor situation, depends the time when this country will be able to get enough rubber products to maintain the irreducible needs of modern warfare and essential civilian transportation. In the meantime the allocation of available tire production as between essential military needs on the one hand and essential trucks and busses on the other will be one of our most difficult problems.

Since the last report of progress from this office, we have been confronted with the much larger requirements of the armed forces for heavy duty, combat, and airplane tires as a result of changing war conditions, and the ineffective general manpower situation which has made it difficult to man even existing equipment.

The next 6 to 9 months will be the most difficult. The effect of a global war, the past 2 years of wear and tear upon existing tires, and the necessity, in order to save crude rubber, of building only military and a few most essential tires has emphasized the scarcity of tires. The inventories of tires built up in times of peace have now been drawn down to an irreducible minimum; the requirements of the military forces are tremendous and have increased materially, and while new production will increase, it will have to wait for the gradual installation and manning of the expansions of other programs. A shortage of rayon tire cord has required, and continues to require an excessive use of crude rubber. In the meantime, the greatest conservation must be maintained. For a long time to come, recapped tires must continue to carry much of the transportation burden.

REVIEW OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT PROGRAM

As described in previous reports of this office, the synthetic-rubber program of the United States and Canada has a rated capacity of 850,000 long tons per year. Of this total, plants to produce Buna S have a capacity of 735,000 long tons, butyl plants 75,000 long tons, and neoprene 40,000 long tons. Another 9,000 long tons of neoprene are being produced in a pre-war private plant. The geographical distribution of these capacities is shown in exhibit A. Exhibit D at the end of the report shows the priorities applicable to the various units and the relationship of the present rated capacities to the original recommendations of the Baruch committee.

As of October 31, 1943, the program has progressed to the point where completed plants have a rated annual capacity of 646,000 long tons of rubber. This progress is best shown in the tabulation below, which includes the status of construction of plants producing butadiene and styrene:

Product	Rated capacity	Rated capacity of construction completed—Oct. 31, 1943	Percent completed
	Long tons	*Long tons*	
Buna S	735,000	585,000	80
Butyl	75,000	21,000	28
Neoprene	40,000	40,000	100
	850,000	646,000	76
	Short tons	*Short tons*	
Butadiene:			
From alcohol	230,000	200,000	87
From petroleum	460,400	179,900	39
	690,400	379,900	55
Styrene	202,700	163,700	81

Eighty-seven percent of the butadiene-from-alcohol plants have been completed and 39 percent of those producing butadiene from petroleum. This is due to three principal factors:

1. Ninety-six percent of the butadiene-from-alcohol plants received the highest priorities (first directive) while only 40 percent of the petroleum plants had that priority advantage.

2. The 3 butadiene-from-alcohol plants at Institute, Louisville, and Pittsburgh (Kobuta) are made up of 11 identical 20,000-ton units which involved only 1 design problem and simplified building of duplicate units.

3. A major raw material for butadiene from petroleum sources is butylene made in the cracking of oil, largely by the use of the modern catalytic cracking processes now being built for the high-octane gasoline program. The oil industry has undergone a huge expansion program to supply this material as well as other materials for the production of butadiene and high-octane gasoline. Manpower, as well as shortages of critical component parts, has delayed the construction of both butadiene plants and the raw material feed stock plants.

Since the last report of this office, the only changes in the program have been the cancelation of an 8,000-ton oil refinery conversion butadiene plant and the upward revision by about 10,000 tons per year of the butadiene-from-alcohol plants.

The butadiene-from-alcohol plants have given an excellent account of themselves and for some time have produced at substantially higher than rated capacity. These plants have been the principal source of butadiene for the last few months. This will continue to be the case until early next year.

Disappointments have been encountered in the production of butyl rubber. Intensive research is being carried on in the hope of finding a satisfactory solution to this problem. Pending results of this research, production is negligible and the burden must be carried by other rubbers.

All neoprene plants have been completed and are producing at rated capacity. These have been among the most successful parts of the entire rubber program, and great credit is due to the designers and operators of these plants.

As was to be expected, plants have encountered varying degrees of difficulty in starting up. They are part of a new industry which, because of the urgencies of war, had to start from scratch. As a rule there was no time to test processes in pilot plants prior to construction. There has been no time for the normal steps. The fact that so many problems have been solved in so short a time reflects great tribute to this country's chemical and engineering industry. The resourcefulness of its personnel has produced almost a miracle.

Plants are running, producing raw materials. Synthetic rubbers in increasing quantities are being delivered to rubber manufacturers in this country and abroad for conversion into rubber products. The principal processes have been proven in commercial production so that today it is possible to say with assurance that the production of synthetic rubbers, with the exception of butyl, has passed the doubtful stage. Early next year practically all of the construction will have been completed. In the meantime, barring unforeseen developments, existing plants will produce enough synthetic rubbers to keep the rubber manufacturing industry operating at its present limited capacity.

MANUFACTURING FACILITIES PROGRAM

When this country was cut off from its rubber supplies and severe restrictions were placed upon the rubber manufacturers, the industry turned to the production of many products which it had never before produced. These included not only goods made with rubber, but also nonrubber ordnance items and other war products, such as ammunition and guns. Its excellent facilities and buildings were converted to such new manufacture. Equipment which was not in early 1942 being used in the manufacture of tires was moved out of existing buildings and stored. Rubber warehouses were converted into manufacturing units.

With synthetic rubber now available and with military and essential civilian demands increasing, the rubber industry is again called upon to fabricate an enormous number of rubber products, particularly tires large sizes for combat vehicles, airplanes, trucks, busses, and farm implements.

Pre-war facilities and equipment left in place are now entirely insufficient to meet the new demands. In addition, synthetic rubber has, to date, required additional machinery and longer processing time than did natural crudes. As a result, the industry has embarked upon an expansion in plant capacity and facilities in which it will invest over $70,000,000 of its own capital.

Only two new rubber-fabricating plants are now scheduled to be built. The balance of the program calls for expansions of existing plants at established locations and the acquisition and installation of new milling and processing equipment. New war activities, which rubber companies carried on while they were producing lesser quantities of tires, are being moved to other locations more suitable under present conditions. The Army has turned back to the industry two large tire plants which were being used for the production of ordnance items.

This expansion program involves an increase of capacity at Akron, Los Angeles, and other places at which plants now exist. It is wiser to secure these new facilities quickly by expansion of present plants rather than to wait from 12 to 18 months for the construction of new plants in other locations, which, in addition, would require new organizations and the training of new employees.

However, expansion of plant facilities alone will not produce the volume of tires and other products needed to support the war. Greater output per man-hour on the part of labor, reduction in absenteeism, more efficient flow of materials, better management planning, and improved distribution of manpower are all essential to this program. Labor and management are working together and it is to be hoped that improved results will come from their cooperative action.

With the engineering of the projects largely finished and the approvals of various parts by the War Production Board secured, the program should move full speed ahead. Even with their high priorities, their completion will require from 4 to 12 months. Not for a year will the fully expanded output of the industry be realized.

TIRE CORD PROGRAM

In April of this year, this office submitted its 1944 requirements for rayon and cotton tire cords. These needs were based on the then-stated requirments for tires on the part of the armed forces and for necessary essential civilian transportation. They called for a broad conversion in both the rayon and cotton textile industries. Now, the needs are even greater.

After some unfortunate delays, the program for these facilities has been set by the War Production Board and we are assured that it will move forward at the fastest rate possible.

Airplane and certain types of heavy-duty military and truck and bus tires cannot be made satisfactorily of synthetic rubber except in conjunction with rayon tire cord. The shortage of rayon tire cord prevents a more complete conversion to synthetics for these tires.

Although the cotton-cord situation is very tight, we are assured by the Textiles Division of the War Production Board that it will provide adequate supplies.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF RUBBER

The most important concern of this office has been and is the conservation of the crude-rubber stock pile so that, even when synthetics are plentiful, there will still be left a working stock for use where some crude rubber is necessary in combination with synthetics, for example, in large size over-the-road truck and bus tires. To that end, conversion of products to synthetics has been put into effect as quickly as research has solved the problems involved and synthetics have become available.

The present crude-rubber stock pile, together with new imports from those tropical countries remaining in United Nations' hands, must carry us through. It is a difficult problem. At the start, the synthetic-rubber program was materially delayed by many differences of opinion and shortages of materials which combined to postpone the availability of synthetics and the opportunity of substituting them for crude. Shortages of rayon tire cord and manufacturing facilities will further reduce the crude position.

In order to tide this country through the period when rayon is unavailable in sufficient quantity to produce the large requirements of the armed forces and domestic transportation companies for heavy duty tires, the greatest care must be taken to prevent any avoidable use of any crude rubber.

Imports of natural crude rubber for 1943 are now expected to total 60,000 long tons. It is expected that imports in 1944 will be augmented by increased shipments from British territory and be about a third greater than in 1943. As a result of the creation by the President of the Office of Foreign Economic Administration, all American development and procurement programs in foreign countries have become its responsibility.

Scrap rubber

The country has a satisfactory supply of scrap rubber on hand. As of September 30, 1943, this amounted to approximately 754,000 tons, including 463,000 tons of pneumatic tires and tire parts. The monthly usage is about 35,000 tons.

The tire-collection plan of last year brought in approximately 12,000,000 tires. These tires were stored in guarded reservations and most of them have been sorted (some several times) to secure every usable tire which could be repaired or recapped and reissued for use by essential drivers. Usable tires are also being recovered at reclaiming plants. The tires which have been found unusable are being held for the manufacture of reclaimed rubber.

Besides tires, a large amount of assorted scrap was collected by the Government in the scrap drive of a year ago. Much of this has been and is being used in the manufacture of reclaimed rubber. A part of this miscellaneous scrap, however, is of such low quality that it cannot be used and will have to be destroyed by burning or otherwise.

REQUIREMENTS

The Office of Rubber Director receives from various Government agencies their stated requirements for rubber products. The armed forces, of course, are the largest users of such products. These requirements are translated by this office into requirements of rubber and the many components—tire cords, carbon blacks, chemicals, etc.—that go into their production. Requirements for components are then transmitted to the branches of Government having jurisdiction. The natural rubbers and synthetic rubbers are our responsibility.

Military requirements

The vast airplane and other equipment programs of our armed forces are naturally dictated by the exigencies of war. Now, increasing quantities of rubber products are required and the rubber industry is called upon to make them, while at the same time providing essential products for the home front.

Within the last few months the principal increase in requirements of the armed forces has been for large-sized tires for combat vehicles and airplanes. It is needless to point out that the manufacture of these not only requires substantially greater quantities of rubber, tire cords, and other components, but has imposed upon the industry the necessity of obtaining new equipment with which to produce these tires. It has also accentuated an already very difficult manpower problem.

While the number of tires required in 1944 is probably less than the total units produced by the rubber industry in any year prior to the war, a large proportion of present requirements is in the very large size tires. The result increases the strain upon the industry. The production of one large bomber tire cancels out the possibility of making several truck tires or up to 30 passenger-car tires.

Truck and bus tires

Truck and bus tires are one of the serious problems facing this country today. Overloading and, in many cases, higher-than-recommended speeds already have taken a serious toll of these tires. New tires cannot be produced in sufficient quantity in the immediate future to prevent an extension of the present shortage. The requirements of the armed forces absorb the first and largest percentage of new production. It is not the supply of synthetic rubber that will limit the making of the large sizes of tires, but the shortage of manpower, the shortage of high-tenacity rayon cord, and the current lack of adequate facilities in the industry, i. e., mills, calenders, tire-building equipment, vulcanizers, and special large-sized molds. Today, the industry is making many of these large tires from the same materials it always has used and will so do until more rayon is available.

To bridge the crisis in domestic transportation which this situation implies and keep their industry in operation, the truck and bus industry must cooperate as never before. Overloading and speeding, especially on hot pavements, must be eliminated, and every tire carcass which can be saved by recapping must be so preserved. The length of time during which truck and bus operators can successfully do their job will depend upon the care given their tires.

Passenger-car size tires

By the end of 1943 there will have been distributed during the year approximately 5,000,000 new synthetic tires, 4,500,000 pre-Pearl Harbor tires, 1,700,000 war tires made from reclaimed rubber, 3,800,000 used tires recovered from the collection of tires made last year, and 2,200,000 emergency tires which may be serviceable for short distances. This is a total of 17,200,000 tires of passenger-car sizes for 1943—equivalent in service to perhaps 12,000,000 new tires, as compared with approximately 50,000,000 tires a year prior to the war.

Nation-wide surveys show that the tires on passenger cars, light delivery trucks, taxis, and farm vehicles are showing serious wear. The accumulated deficit, together with a less-than-normal obsolescence of cars, indicates a need for new tires of this type in 1944 of at least 30,000,000.

While 30,000,000 tires sounds like a large number, it should be pointed out that by the end of 1944 the country will have been on a starvation diet for 3 years, inasmuch as only 4,700,000 tires were released in 1942. Every owner of a car must come to the realization that he is now in a position of trusteeship for the benefit of the Nation insofar as his present tires are concerned. To prevent further and more drastic restrictions in the use of motor vehicles, he must redouble his efforts at conservation.

RECLAIMING AND RECAPPING

The reclaiming and recapping parts of the rubber industry have done an outstanding job of expansion and production to meet the emergency. Camelback (the formed, compounded-rubber-tread stock) used to retread tires, is still bridging the gap in tire production. Recapping material is now available in greater quantity than ever before. Buna S is being added to camelback, thereby making recaps last longer. There is no excuse for a good tire carcass being ruined by driving it to the point where fabric shows and recapping is no longer fully effective. As stated before, recapping must continue to carry a large proportion of the country's transportation system through the serious period ahead.

At the close of 1943 there will have been distributed approximately 167,000,000 pounds of camelback for the recapping of passenger-car tires and 59,000,000 pounds of camelback for truck, bus, and Army tires. This compares with a total of approximately 105,000,000 pounds of all types of camelback distributed in 1942.

Conservation measures have been relaxed in too many localities. Speeds must be held to 35 miles per hour to avoid the increased ratio of tread wear resulting from higher speeds. Bruising and rough driving at high speed must be eliminated as every irreparable carcass injury reduces the available tire supply.

Maintenance of domestic transportation is essential. Pool use of cars to and from factories must continue and increase. The nonessential driver will not get a new tire in the visible future and can stay on the road only if he reduces his driving to bare necessity and recaps his tires on time.

RATIONING

It has been the continued policy of this Office to have restrictions and regulations only where and so long as necessitated by circumstances. In view of the increased shortage of new and used tires and in order that essential transportation be maintained, several changes have been made in the tire-rationing regulations. Without such action serious disruption of war-essential activities would result. Primarily the changes have been put into effect to accomplish three purposes:

1. To restrict eligibility for tires, thereby decreasing effective demand and consumption.

2. To increase the available supply of tires by putting into service all tires which are capable of giving further service, regardless of how limited this service may be.

3. To stretch available tire inventories by extensive tire recapping.

The holder of an A gasoline ration book in the critical gasoline shortage area is not entitled to any sort of tire.

The holder of an A gasoline ration book outside of the gasoline-shortage area is entitled to a used tire only if he can show that part of his driving is occupational. The B book holder throughout the country can get a certificate for a used or emergency tire, but no longer can he get a new tire. Only those whose gasoline ration permits them to drive 601 miles or more per month can get new tires. There are no restrictions on passenger-tire recapping.

Truck-tire rationing is based on the use of the vehicle rather than on mileage. Tires are issued only to those vehicles used for purposes essential to the war effort or essential to the health and safety of the public. Vehicles

not essential to the war effort, public health, or safety are classed as list B and may secure certificates for recapping only. Formerly, list B vehicles had to be deemed essential to the community before they were permitted recapping, but in the interest of keeping tires on such vehicles from being worn beyond repair all commercial vehicles are now permitted a certificate for recapping. It is anticipated that the supply of truck-type camelback will shortly be adequate to permit the elimination of these certificates.

A farmer may establish eligibility for a farm tractor or farm implement tire, and also, in view of the shortage of such tires, when farm tractor or implement tires themselves are not available, he may secure a grade HI passenger tire for the front wheels or a used truck tire for the rear wheels. There are no restrictions on the recapping of farm tractor tires.

In order to simplify the tire-rationing program, a new tire-rationing certificate was put into use in July. This certificate represents a very substantial simplification both with respect to the issuance by the local boards and its use by the general public. Present restrictions may be expected to remain in effect until such time as the production of synthetic tires is of sufficient volume to warrant a relaxation of the eligibility requirements.

STATISTICS

The following tabulation shows, in long tons, actual use of crude and synthetic rubbers during the first three-quarters of 1943 and estimates of requirements for the last quarter of 1943 and for the year 1944:

	1943				1944		
	Actual first half	Actual third quarter	Estimated fourth quarter	Estimated total	Estimated first half	Estimated second half	Estimated total
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
Military	132,100	68,300	68,000	268,400	167,000	223,000	390,000
Trucks and busses	36,900	23,500	21,000	81,400	64,000	81,000	145,000
Passenger size tires	5,300	13,200	24,000	42,500	78,000	106,000	184,000
Other indirect military and civilian	14,200	8,900	9,000	32,100	19,000	19,000	38,000
Total United States of America	188,500	113,900	122,000	424,400	328,000	429,000	757,000
Exports	24,400	16,100	33,000	73,500	70,000	76,000	146,000
Canada	17,600	7,500	8,000	33,100	25,000	25,000	50,000
Grand total	230,500	137,500	163,000	531,000	423,000	530,000	953,000

The following tabulation shows in long tons the crude rubber, natural latex, and synthetic rubber position for the United States and Canada at the end of 1943 and 1944:

	1943	1944
Inventory, Jan. 1	443,000	205,000
New supplies:		
Crude	60,000	81,000
Synthetic	233,000	818,000
Total	736,000	1,104,000
Requirements	531,000	953,000
Balance, Dec. 31	205,000	151,000

To summarize, it is expected that the stock pile of crude and synthetic rubbers at the end of 1943 will amount to 205,000 long tons and by the end of 1944 to 151,000 long tons. It should be noted, however, that by the end of 1944 a large proportion of the stock pile will be in synthetic rubbers and we will have less crude than the Baruch committee considered an irreducible minimum. During 1944 restrictions on the use of crude rubber will be increased until the ultimate objective of practically complete conversion (all but a few large-tire sizes, etc.) has been obtained and we are able to live within our income of new crude receipts.

CONVERSION TO SYNTHETICS

Certain restrictions which prevented the use of synthetics in the manufacture of many products recently have been lifted. This action was taken to produce longer-lasting products and because more synthetic rubber was being produced. The critical manpower situation throughout the country has made it imperative that every man-hour be used to manufacture products which will give the longest wearing quality.

Recent orders permit the use of synthetic rubber in the manufacture of a wide range of industrial and consumer goods, and in certain instances where nonrubber substitutes have proven inadequate, synthetic rubber has been made available.

One of the principal functions of this office has been to cooperate with industry's technical staffs to stimulate conversion from the use of natural crude rubber to synthetic rubber in thousands of products. These conversions are made only when products processed from synthetic rubber have demonstrated adequate performance.

The entire production of neoprene is now being used in products where conversions have already been made. Additional products using neoprene have been developed, so that as certain military products are discontinued the production of this rubber can be fully utilized.

Despite the fact that butyl rubber has been available only for experimental and developmental work, many products have been developed to replace natural crude or other synthetics with butyl as soon as it becomes available in quantity.

Obviously, the largest use of rubber is for tires, tubes, and other automotive products. Buna S is carrying this load. At the moment the rubber industry has converted many such products in whole or in part to Buna-s, so that:

A. The use of Buna S is now standard for the production of tires for passenger car sizes, motorcycles, industrial tractors, farm tractors and implements, wheelbarrows, bicycles, and truck and bus tires of the smaller sizes.

B. Except for certain over-the-road bus and truck tires, varying combinations of synthetic and crude rubber (10 percent to 30 percent) are being used on 10-ply 7.00 tires and on all mud and snow and standard highway 7.50 to 10.00 tires.

C. Up to the present time no synthetics are being used (primarily due to a shortage of rayon tire cord) in most sizes of highway truck and bus tires which are used in high speed, heavily loaded service, in truck and bus tires over 10.50 in size, in earth mover, rock service, logger tires, mud and snow tires 18.00 and larger, and in airplane tires of the larger sizes.

Some of the products mentioned above will have the synthetic-rubber content increased by January 1. Many other conversions already approved by the armed services and by industry will be made effective as soon as more rayon tire cord is available.

Whereas steady progress is being made in the conversion program, there are some properties of Buna S which result in the generation of excessive heat and make it doubtful if complete conversion to the synthetics can be effected until new polymers have been further developed and fully proven.

The problem of converting tubes to synthetic rubber has been made especially difficult because of the shortage of butyl rubber. Buna S is being used in tubes for passenger car, motorcycle, farm, truck and bus, and military tires. Crude must be used in certain tubes until butyl or some other such rubber is in greater supply.

Synthetic rubber has now replaced crude for camelback used in retreading truck tires and approximately 40 percent of synthetic rubber has been added to reclaim to improve quality of recapping in all other types of tires.

Larger quantities of special purpose rubbers, such as Buna N, are being used. They are becoming of increasing importance because of their excellent special properties.

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF PRODUCTS MANUFACTURED FROM SYNTHETICS

Extensive testing facilities have been made available for the development of products made of synthetic rubbers, particularly for tires, tubes, and automotive accessories, which represent a large part of all requirements in the field. Products made of synthetic rubber are produced commercially only after performance tests have indicated that they will give adequate service. This does not necessarily mean that performance will equal that of the best crude-rubber products made in the past, although in some cases improved performance has resulted.

Tires now being manufactured for military uses have been put into production with synthetic rubber only after exhaustive tests have been made by the Army and their approval obtained. This approval is given only after the tire has shown that it will perform satisfactorily under conditions to which it will be subject.

The quality of synthetic-rubber tires

It cannot be overemphasized that heat, whether from hot pavements or as the result of overloading or high-speed driving, is and always has been detrimental to any tire. Furthermore, it cannot be overemphasized that speed, quick starting, and quick stopping increase the wear of tires. The life of a tire at 35 miles per hour is 50-percent longer than 45 miles per hour, and three times longer than at 60 miles per hour.[1] Since speed produces heat, it not only increases tread wear but also shortens the life of the tire carcass. The shortening of the life of the carcass is extremely serious, for whereas a carcass in good condition can be retreaded, a bad carcass blow-out destroys all chance of retreading. The blow-out, therefore, destroys manpower, rubber, tire cords, wire and pigments, and wastes part of the productive output of existing tire-building machinery. This is true with any tire.

Two properties of Buna S compounds are, under certain high-temperature conditions, inferior to those of crude rubber. When any rubber is submitted to repeated alternate compression or elongation, heat is generated. In the case of Buna S, more heat is generated than with crude rubber. In the case of crude-rubber compounds at high-running temperatures, there is a material loss of not only tensile strength but, more important, of tear resistance. In the case of synthetic-rubber compounds this loss is much greater. Consequently, under identical running conditions, the compounded synthetic stock will not, at

[1] Tire Wear and Tire Failures on Various Road Surfaces. R. A. Moyer, Iowa Engineering Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa. See p. 10.

high temperatures, stand as much abuse as will the natural-rubber stock.

Despite these properties, great progress has been made in building tires with synthetics, until today the following situations are found in properly made synthetic tires:

Passenger car size tires

Greater care must be given to synthetic tires than to crude rubber tires. If properly inflated, properly loaded, and not abused, these tires can be driven at reasonably high speed over smooth roads to give 90 percent or more of the tread wear of first-line pre-Pearl Harbor tires, but if hot, as a result of either hot pavements or high-speed driving, these tires are more easily damaged than tires made with crude rubber, especially when driven under abusive conditions, such as hitting holes or rocks in the road, underinflation, or overload.

Military tires and city-service truck and bus tires, etc.

With these tires the situation closely parallels that of passenger-car tires. They give excellent service. Fortunately, overloading and driving at high speeds on hot pavements is not prevalent with these types of tires. The same is true with farm implement, tractor, and industrial pneumatic tires. In the military tires the tread design is helpful, for it minimizes tread cracking.

High-speed over-the-road truck and bus tires

The most serious quality problem with synthetic tires is in those sizes of tires used in over-the-road service. Many constructions have been tested, and great progress is being made. Self-sacrificing cooperation between units of the industry has made this possible. With these tires three new elements come into the picture:

1. There is a close relationship between a tire size and the load it is expected to carry.

2. Because of its greater size and the greater thickness of carcass and tread, more heat is generated and these sizes run hotter.

3. Experience has shown that up to now it is not possible to build serviceable tires without rayon cord and some crude rubber.

When some crude rubber and rayon tire cord are used, together with the most promising of today's techniques, except in two respects, the situation with these tires is not too radically different from that of the passenger-car and military tires. A crude-rubber tire of these sizes, although permanently injured by overloading, will operate under an overload for a much longer time than a comparable synthetic tire. The same overload which would be carried for thousands of miles by a crude-rubber tire may, on a hot road with medium speed, cause the blow-out of a synthetic tire in less than half the mileage. An overload which might reduce the life of a crude-rubber tire only 25 percent, or even be carried through until the tread was worn smooth, may reduce the life of a synthetic-rubber tire 50 percent or more and result in a blow-out while there is still wear in the tread. In short, these tires must not be overloaded. Their tire bodies contain priceless crude rubber, synthetic rubber, and rayon cord. Equally priceless manpower and manufacturing facilities have been used to build them.

Even when reasonably loaded it is essential that these tires be properly inflated and not subjected to abuse resulting from hitting holes or rocks in the road. As in the case of passenger-car tires, the avoidance of high temperatures is not the only reason for avoiding high speeds—speed accentuates the damage done by the occasional hole in the road and greatly increases tread wear.

If these tires are properly loaded and inflated, are not abused, and are driven at reasonable speeds they can be retreaded and used again. Many can be retreaded more than once. The resulting extra mileage will cause them to give service closely comparable to that obtained with crude-rubber tires under pre-war average care and conditions. But, if these tires are overloaded, or driven at excessive speeds, or abused, they will fail at low mileages. If so treated there will not be enough materials, facilities, or manpower to make replacements and transportation will fail. The drivers of these tires are destined to play an important part in the future of the rubber program.

All of the foregoing sums up to the conclusion that if synthetic tires are properly used, the treads will give good wear and the tire bodies will stand up so that they can be retreaded. Until more tires are available, however, the careless driver will have to change his habits or stop driving.

Quality of other products

Buna S rubber is still inferior to natural rubber in tubes, particularly those used in tires where the rim equipment is of the drop-center type. The best Buna S tube compounds still tear too easily when hot and are less resistant to abrasion than are natural rubber tubes. but by careful mounting and inflation, they will run to high mileage and few failures need result.

Buna S truck and bus tubes used on flat-base rims are giving many thousands of miles of service without difficulty, although they are less resistant to heat and more subject to tearing and snagging than crude tubes.

From present data, it appears that butyl rubber will be the synthetic desired for most tubes. Such tubes will be better than those of natural rubber from the standpoint of holding air and will resist heat and tearing exceptionally well.

Buna S camelback produces excellent retreads. Here again, the wear resistance of a Buna S truck and bus tire retread will be 10 to 15 percent less than that of a top-grade rubber retread, but it will give equal or better performance than many of the natural-rubber compounds in production before the war. To a large extent the success of the retread is dependent upon the good workmanship of the retreader.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

A large part of the synthetic-rubber program, of necessity, was established on processes that had not been proven either by a pilot plant or by large-scale operation An active program of research and development was therefore initiated in November 1942 to test the processes so that necessary corrections and modifications could be made to improve the performance and quality of products. To carry out this experimental work, programs were initiated with industrial laboratories, particularly those of companies involved in the construction and operation of the various plants associated with the synthetic-rubber program, as well as with many educational institutions. In most cases, the latter organizations experimented on the long-range characteristics intended to improve processes.

One of the major fields of research and development related to raw materials. Pilot plant work was initiated on a number of the principal processes and such studies have been of material aid to the operation of producing units. One of the main programs undertaken was the elimination of undesirable impurities present in butadiene from most petroleum processes. Several methods have been developed and are in use. These methods not only have made the purity of this butadiene satisfactory but have also made the concentration processes operable.

For many of the processes, catalysts have been developed which appear to give improved performance and offer promise of bettering yields in present plants.

Great progress has also been made in the improvement of specifications for various materials, and a number of undesirable impurities have been classified and methods for their determination and control have been developed.

All of the styrene processes have operated upon a sufficient scale to assure workability. In the butadiene program, two main processes, the carbide and carbon process employing alcohol and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey process employing butenes, have operated most satisfactorily on a large scale. Other units are in the initial stages of operation and within a few months their workability will have been ascertained.

An intensive Government-coordinated research and development program has also been carried out in the laboratories of rubber companies and educational institutions on synthetic rubber reactions. Initially a large portion of this work was directed toward insuring satisfactory operation of the copolymer plants. Today the operation of these plants has progressed to a point where their ability to produce rubber is no longer the main problem, and for this reason more and more of the research and development effort is being directed toward improving quality. This effort has developed a number of modifications that are believed to be improvements over present processes.

Copolymerization facilities, intermediate in size between the laboratory and the full-size plant, are few, hence evaluation of improved modifications has been slow. To expedite improvements in quality of the synthetic rubbers, it has been decided to provide new intermediate-size polymerization facilities by the construction of a Government-owned pilot plant at Akron. This unit will be completed within the next few months. The possibility of employing some of the small private plants now used for specialty rubbers is also under consideration. All this work should develop the possibilities of new synthetic rubbers. If any of them prove to be more favorable than the present Buna S, immediate steps will be taken to establish their production on a larger scale.

A Government-owned evaluation laboratory is being built adjacent to the pilot plant in Akron. It will be used for the evaluation of rubberlike materials produced as a result of various Government and private investigations. These facilities should be of material aid in expediting many development phases.

Further to broaden the research program, this Office is sponsoring the construction of several small pilot units to be equipped with 5-gallon polymerization reactors. A certain number of these reactors will be installed in the Akron pilot plant and will be used to evaluate large numbers of suggested methods of improving quality which are not sufficiently developed to justify large-scale production and tests. Others will be placed with various rubber, chemical, and petroleum companies and educational institutions which agree through their own research to further the program.

MANPOWER

Manpower is a serious problem throughout industry today. The production of rubber products and raw materials is being delayed through manpower dislocation.

An important part of the rubber processing industry is located in two serious manpower-shortage areas, Akron and Los Angeles. A large proportion of trained labor is required by the rubber industry and in many instances men of substantial physical strength are needed to handle the heavy weights of truck and airplane tires; smaller men or women cannot do this type of work. Therefore the rubber industry is not only in competition with other industries, but many of the men it most needs are those needed by the Army.

This office is working closely with the War Manpower authorities in Washington and in various regions and is keeping them informed of the manpower problems throughout the industry. The rubber manufacturing industry has organized a group that is giving all its time to this problem. While this office can be of assistance in the over-all manpower problem, it must remain up to the manufacturing industry itself to work out its immediate manpower problems with the various Government agencies involved.

In the field of labor relations, management and leaders of labor have indicated a willingness to cooperate to increase output per man-hour, to reduce absenteeism, and to improve operating conditions and increase efficiency. A very definite proportion of the expected shortage in tires in 1944 can be averted if this cooperation is translated into increased production. In this effort labor and management, working together, will contribute very materially to the general war program.

FEED STOCKS

The principal feed stocks used by the rubber program are benzol, alcohol, and butylenes from petroleum. The first is used for making styrene and is available in the necessary quantities. The Chemicals Division of the War Production Board has the responsibility for supplying us with alcohol and assures us of a sufficient supply. The butylenes used for the program are produced by the catalytic cracking of petroleum and are equally useful in making high-octane gasoline or synthetic rubber. Under normal conditions they would be readily available. Where plants of two tremendous programs are being built simultaneously and are so closely meshed as are the high-octane gasoline and butadiene-from-petroleum programs, it is inevitable that from time to time either supply of or demand for butylenes will run ahead of the other. This has been the case and will continue to be the case for a few months. Under today's conditions where high-octane gasoline is very short, these butylenes could be used to make aviation gasoline ingredients. However, we are assured by the Petroleum Administration for War that we will receive our basic requirements. We have no fear as to their availability.

COSTS AND PRICES OF SYNTHETICS

It is too soon accurately to predict ultimate costs of the various synthetics and the raw materials that go into them. As of today many of the feed stocks are so new that it is almost impossible to predict their ultimate prices in a competitive peacetime economy. But it is safe to say that many of them will be available after the war at much lower prices than were ever contemplated before the war. Every day sees improvements in processing, operating, and management efficiencies, but it will be a great many months before optimum efficiency is reached. The alcohol plants are now using alcohol costing several times prewar costs. Under today's conditions there is no time to determine the byproduct values that unquestionably lie hidden in the wastes from many of the plants, particularly the butadiene-from-alcohol plants.

All of these factors will affect future direct manufacturing costs. Post-war amortization and financial charges will be affected by the extent to which abnormal, as well as normal, costs of building the program are written off as "cost of war." The raw materials from some sources are cheaper than the same raw materials from other sources, but the conditions may be reversed after the war. Some of the processes may not be economically competitive under post-war conditions. Others have every right to hope for a part in a permanent post-war picture. Certain combinations of low-cost raw materials probably will give direct cost for Buna S that will be less than 15 cents per pound.

The same general situations influence the average cost of the crude rubbers so that with both crude and synthetic the 1944 new supply will be made up of some very cheap and some abnormally high-priced tonnages. Faced with this situation the most practical approach has been to average all of the costs of all of the synthetics under present conditions and all of the crudes now being obtained and then price the various rubbers in such a way that those who are required to use any particular synthetic are not at a serious disadvantage when in competition with those using another.

Based on the above reasoning, crude and synthetics used in making Government products are priced per pound as follows:

	Cents
Crude rubber	40
Neoprene (GR–M)	45
Buna S (GR–S)	36
Butyl (GR–I)	33

This office initially recommended a uniform price policy. Being forced, however, to accept certain limitations as to ceiling prices of civilian consumer goods placed upon the Office of Price Administration by statute and Executive order, we and the Rubber Reserve Company agreed with the Office of Price Administration in March to the establishment of a civilian price schedule lower than the above. The advisability of continuing this policy is now being reviewed. This office has again recommended a uniform price schedule based upon that currently pertaining to Government use.

PATENT AGREEMENTS

Shortly after Pearl Harbor the Rubber Reserve Company entered into agreements with a large number of private companies covering the exchange of patent rights and technical information in the fields of buna rubber, butadiene, and styrene. Rubber Reserve Company also made patent arrangements with Standard Oil Development Co. and E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. with respect to the manufacture of butyl rubber and neoprene, respectively. These agreements have served as a basis for the pooling and exchange of technical information necessary to the program and as a basis for the cooperation by the participating companies in the development of improved processes and products, as well as for the settlement of the Government's possible liability for infringement of patents. With respect to butadiene and styrene, a small part (one-eighth cent per pound) of the fees paid to operators was earmarked to cover royalties and provision was made for settlement within this ceiling royalty of claims between the companies involved for the use of technical information and patents. Butyl rubber operations were made royalty-free during the war, and royalties may be payable thereafter, depending upon the extent to which butyl rubber manufacture is carried on by the Government post-war. In the case of neoprene, arrangements were concluded with the University of Notre Dame, effecting very substantial reductions in the royalties otherwise payable. No other neoprene royalties are to be paid during the war.

The original arrangements for the exchange of patent rights and technical information in the field of Buna rubbers were effected under an agreement with the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., U. S. Rubber Co., and Standard Oil Development Co., such companies having contributed most to developments in this field and then being regarded by Rubber Reserve Company as in the best position to develop the production of Buna rubbers on the tremendous scale necessary. Under this agreement, Rubber Reserve Company received royalty-free rights from the four rubber companies, and Rubber Reserve Company and the four rubber companies received rights from Standard Oil Development Co. which are royalty-free until 6 months after the war but subject to small royalties thereafter until September 1951. Rubber Reserve Company has the right under the agreement to permit outside parties to operate under its license and arrangements have been made for such operation by three groups of smaller companies. These groups are known as the Copolymer Corporation, made up of the Armstrong Rubber Co., Dayton Rubber Manufacturing Co., Gates Rubber Co., Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co., Lake Shore Tire & Rubber Co., Pennsylvania Tire & Rubber Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co.; National Synthetic Rubber Corporation, made up of Hewitt Rubber Corporation, Lee Rubber & Tire Co., Hamilton Rubber Manufacturing Co., Goodall Rubber Co., Inc., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; and the General Tire & Rubber Co., in association with the General Latex & Chemical Co.

Most of these patent agreements have provided for the licensing of purchasers or lessees of Government-built plants after the war. Rubber Reserve Company is preparing a digest of its patent agreements and printed copies will shortly be available upon request to the Office of Rubber Director.

Arrangements have also been made by Rubber Reserve Company covering the grant of transferable royalty-free rights in the synthetic rubber field under patents on inventions made in the course of research financed by the Government.

As the program developed, it was felt that the arrangements made in the field of general purpose Buna rubbers were not adequate, and that provisions should be made to expand the benefits of the patent agreement in this field so that they might be made available after the war on a wider basis and in such manner as to encourage general cooperation throughout the industry in the development of better general purpose Buna rubbers, that is Buna rubbers useful for the manufacture of tires and other principal rubber products.

Due to the background and diversity of competing interests in this field, it proved difficult to secure a suitable amendment of the existing agreement. Early in 1942, however, Standard Oil Development Co., which controls the more important patents, offered to grant for the life of their patents to Rubber Reserve Company a royalty-free license covering Standard's patents and improvements in the field of general purpose Buna rubbers, insofar as such patents and improvements related to matters developed prior to the end of the war. The offer included the right in Rubber Reserve Company to grant royalty-free sublicenses to other companies undertaking to assist in the program and agreeing to grant corresponding rights to Rubber Reserve Company. Acceptance of this offer, which was consummated on August 4, 1943, removed all obligation on the part of the Government to pay royalties to Standard in the field of general purpose Buna rubbers, with respect to patents on all inventions and improvements made prior to the end of the war, and made it possible for others who contribute to the rubber program to obtain similar free licenses in this field for operations both during and after the war.

Because of the possible interest of the Alien Property Custodian in certain of the patents of Standard, arrangements have also been made under which the Alien Property Custodian has made available licenses and licensing rights to Rubber Reserve Company over a field including the field of general purpose buna rubbers. Companies executing the standard form of cross-license agreement with Rubber Reserve Company, therefore, receive licenses in the field of general purpose Buna rubbers under patents affected

by vesting orders of the Alien Property Custodian, under patents growing out of the research program financed by Rubber Reserve Company in this field, and under the patents of all other companies executing similar cross-license agreements, including Standard.

Of the four principal rubber companies entering into the original buna rubber agreement, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., and United States Rubber Co. have already entered into the new standard form of cross-license agreement with Rubber Reserve Company. Execution of the standard form of agreement is also under consideration by a considerable number of other companies. These companies and any others which have not been contacted but which feel they can make a helpful contribution to the program, are free to signify their desire to enter into the agreement. Under the protection of this standard form of agreement, arrangements will be made for further development and for a wider interchange of technical information than was originally possible.

As of today, therefore, and as the result of the arrangements made pursuant to Standard's offer, the Rubber Director is in a position to say to any company willing to assist in the development of better general purpose rubbers of the Buna type that in return for the contribution of its "know how" and patent developments, it can enjoy free rights under the patents of Standard and most of the other companies who have been, and will be, working in this field. It is hoped and believed that this background will lead to the development of improved buna rubbers and to the solution of the technical problems not yet wholly solved.

BRADLEY DEWEY,
Rubber Director.

NOVEMBER 10, 1943.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STEFAN was granted leave to include within his remarks the text of the report of the progress of the rubber program by Col. Bradley Dewey.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) until Monday, November 15, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROGERS of California for 10 days on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 932. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1278. An act for the relief of Yellow Cab Runnebaum; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

902. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

903. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of August 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

904. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for various constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

905. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a list of the institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted from taxation by special acts of Congress, in force at time of passage of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, and use made of such specifically exempted property in the calendar year 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

906. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3416) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Almira W. Gunther, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3646. A bill to amend section 42 of title 7 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio:

H. R. 3647. A bill relating to the recapture and payment to the Treasury of the United States, the excessive profits of more than $28,000,000 paid for the Red Sea Charters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3648. A bill to provide that abstracts and other evidences of title held by any department or agency relating to real property of the United States shall be given to grantees of such property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 353. Resolution requesting the Speaker to invite Secretary of State Cordell Hull to address the House of Representatives on the subject of the Moscow Conference; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 354. Resolution granting the subpena power to the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3649. A bill for the relief of Mae Ekvall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3650. A bill for the relief of Adney W. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3499. By Mr BUCKLEY: Petition of Mrs. MacGold and 59 other citizens, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3500. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of 702 residents of the Nineteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing enactment of House bill 2082, the purpose of which is to impose complete prohibition for duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3501 By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Visco Rudolph and other citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3502. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of the members of the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Albert City, Iowa, urging support of the Townsend plan and opposing the Federal sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3503. By Mr. ANTON J JOHNSON: Petition of John W. Tull and 93 members and friends of the Christian Church of Bowen, Ill., protesting the use of alcohol and its evil on our armed forces and urging passage of House bill 2082 now pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3504. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of a number of people employed in industry in El Paso County, Tex., urging that payments into the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of the Federal Security Agency not be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3505 By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council relative to legislation recently introduced in Congress calling for increases in the amounts of annuities and benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and asking that such an increase be immediately enacted, giving to the recipients a sufficient amount in the light of present economic conditions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3506. Also, resolution of the State bar of California, San Francisco, Calif., opposing Senate bill 975 and House bills 2617 and 2466; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK) laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, who hast spoken to earthly mortals and called man Thy friend, we wait upon Thee in gratitude and ask for a place in Thy heart and a share in that love which passes all human friendships. In this moment of holy contemplation we pause at Thy altar and trust that Thy Spirit may work in our souls a deeper establishment of the knowledge of the eternal God.

We pray that the spirit of our fathers may give power to our deliberations, a deep moral passion to our decisions, and a heroic faith in our unseen Lord. To know Him, to serve Him, and to enjoy Him is the greatest end of man. When our hopes in Thee fail and we become materialistic, living by the ethics of pleasure and not of duty, then it is that goodness fades and our high powers are wasted. Grant that all industry shall be as a fruitful vine whose leaves shall be for the healing of the gaping wounds of the nations, and the paths which lead to church, school, and home shall be as a shining light. Do Thou hallow this day and whisper to us the lessons of its priceless sacrifices. Grant that we shall not permit the fighting glory of our heroes to die out of our grateful memory. In the name of Him who gave Himself as a ransom for the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 4, 1943:

H. R. 2886. An act to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp, at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3338. An act relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property.

On November 8, 1943:

H. R. 2859. An act to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARMISTICE DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the twenty-fifth anniversary of Armistice Day. America is proud of her soldiers, sailors, and marines, but not because they constitute a part of a military machine. The pride of Rome in her legions, the pride of France in the disciplined troops that followed Napoleon, the pride of Germany in her vast military machine has never been hers. The pride of America in her soldiers has ever been that they were citizen soldiers, called from their peaceful pursuits to service and sacrifice for the preservation of their liberty, the safety of their country, and the security of their homes. They served not for military distinction, not for fame or glory, not for place or power, but in fulfillment of their obligations as citizens, because they believed that any sacrifice was better than the surrender of all they held dear.

It is this that has ever lent distinction to their service. It is this that has ever made their supreme sacrifice so solemn and so sacred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a resolution by the California Guayule Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MILK SUPPLY IN DENVER, COLO.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to tell the Members of the House what has happened in Denver, Colo.

This morning I received word that Federal Judge Symes has held that a city ordinance to pay 2 cents per quart to the milk producers of that Colorado milkshed is within the law and the money will be raised by a city tax and then paid to producers of fluid milk.

It is a sorry spectacle when a city the size of Denver, over 300,000 people, has to pass an ordinance levying a tax on the entire city in order to get a supply of milk. It is just another example of the bungling of O. P. A. and their plans for consumer food subsidies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NEWSOME and Mr. LAMBERTSON were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and append thereto an editorial appearing in the United States News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Luigi Antonini, at the American Federation of Labor Convention, October 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Raymond Clapper, published in the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to insert therein excerpts from a couple of bills now pending before the Committee on Election of President and Vice President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief paper by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARMISTICE DAY, 1918

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Connecticut addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered over the Blue Network last night.

I also ask unanimous consent to make a few minor changes in the speech I delivered on November 1 for the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the disposition of the other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT FOOD WASTE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a part of a letter I received this morning:

> I suggest sending out a committee of two new dealers and two no-yes men. Let them visit the camp warehouses or storehouses—in fact any place that food is stored.

I will put the rest of the letter in the Appendix of today's RECORD. Then he goes on and says:

> Everyone knows that sauerkraut will work and spoil, so in the spring we will hear of carloads dumped on the dump pile, like the carloads of potatoes this spring while we were paying 60 cents a peck.

Then the writer called attention to the fact that 6,120,000 eggs have gone bad while being held by the Government.

There is something to this suggestion that perhaps Congress should prevent the departments from buying and storing this food and holding it until it spoils and then turning it out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SIOUX INDIANS' SUN DANCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, last summer a special committee of the House of Representatives from the Public Lands Committee visited South Dakota, and while there they attended a sun dance on the Pine Ridge Reservation that was presented by members of the Sioux Indian Tribe as a special religious ceremony with a prayer for victory.

The committee was represented at the sun dance by the Honorable J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, chairman of the committee, and the Honorable HUGH PETERSON, a member of the committee, and it was also my privilege to be present at that time. We observed a very beautiful ceremony in the form of a resurrection of the sun dance, which was abandoned in about 1881, and only recently resurrected.

The Indians use the native sage in making wreaths for their ceremonials. It is supposed to keep away the evil influences. On their totem poles they hang in effigy the evil spirits. On this particular occasion the effigies of Hitler and Hirohito were hung on the totem pole. During the long hours of the dance Indian leaders who have been especially selected pray for victory and for the safe return of the boys who are away in battle. The dancers hold wreaths of the sage toward the sun while they follow its journey across the sky.

The part of the American Indians in this war is going to be one of the most illustrious records that has been written in the history of this country. Since December 7, 1941, more than 18,000 warrior descendants of Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull, Geronimo, and Tecumseh have joined the Army, the marines, the navy, and the Air Forces of the United States. In the Sioux Tribe something over 10 percent of the total population has gone into the armed forces, which means over 50 percent of the men of military age. These men and boys are on the fighting lines today, fighting for Uncle Sam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO TODAY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this morning I was in the woods with a group of men sawing timbers to build a barn. The whistles were blowing and bells ringing in the county seat 8 miles away. We could not stand the pressure, and although winter was coming and we needed that barn very badly, we went to the county seat to help celebrate the occasion.

It was a great day. There was a spontaneous expression on the part of a grateful people because their boys were coming home and because they believed we had won a victory that would end all wars.

When this war shall end, and victory is ours, the peace terms, I believe, will have to be written in the interest of the people who are going to live for those are the people who are going to fight the next war. At the peace table a great many things will have to be forgotten, old grudges, commercialism, the damage done in this war and all kinds of other special interests. They will all have to be forgotten and those who are going to live must have an opportunity in this world, then, perhaps, we will have a lasting peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE SIOUX INDIANS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what it is that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] had on the table there before him when he addressed the House. May I ask him to tell us about that?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] because I did not have time to conclude my remarks in the minute accorded me. I had mentioned the ceremonials of the Sioux and their prayers for the victory and safe return of the Indian boys who are all over the world fighting for the United States.

The wreaths I have here are wreaths that were made by the Indian women of the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation following a suggestion at the ceremony referred to. They arrived yesterday to be placed at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier today, the twenty-fifth anniversary of Armistice Day. One of the wreaths was prepared by Mrs. Agnes Iron Cloud in honor of her nephew who lost his life in early action in the Philippines. The other wreath was prepared by the Catholic Sewing Circle of Sacred Heart Church and is in honor of all the Sioux Indian boys who serve or have served in the forces of the United States. Arrangements have been made to place the wreaths at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier this afternoon.

It will be noticed that the cedar twigs and long pine needles have been intertwined with the sage and that the whole is tied with ribbons in the colors of the United States, while above them are tiny silk flags of the country. The Sioux Indians, Mr. Speaker, are a brave, loyal people. They fought the United States in defense of their homes; today they fight for the United States in defense of their homes and all that we love. They are contributing an outstanding number of heroes, fighting heroes. Some day I shall ask the House for permission to recount some of their deeds. Today, I merely call your attention to the beautiful way in which the Indian women, mothers, sisters, and sweethearts at home, have remembered to send these wreaths for placing at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. For all that anyone knows, he may have been an Indian, an original American.

TWELFTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 353)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

Since the enactment of the Lend-Lease Act in March of 1941, I have transmitted

to the Congress 11 reports describing the lend-lease aid which has been furnished by the United States. These reports have also included information with respect to the types and quantities of reverse lend-lease aid provided to the United States by the various lend-lease countries. While a complete account of the reverse lend-lease aid which we have received is not yet available, the statements recently received from the Governments of the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand and from our Army make it possible for me to report to you at this time regarding a part of the expenditures made by the British Commonwealth of Nations for reverse lend-lease aid to the United States.

The overwhelming benefit which the United States has received from its lend-lease program has, of course, been the pooling of resources and the combined effort of the United Nations against the Axis countries. Each of the United Nations has contributed. There is, of course, no physical or financial standard of value by which we can measure the military contribution to the war on land or sea or in the air which has been made by our allies or ourselves. One thing is clear: By the help which our friends and allies have given us, and by the help which we have given them in the common cause, we have not only made progress in the war, but we have saved the lives of many of our own boys as well as those of our allies.

The master agreements entered into with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and other United Nations receiving lend-lease aid establish the principles which govern the lend-lease relationship. The other United Nations, under the master lend-lease agreements, have agreed to contribute to the defense of the United States by providing as reverse lend-lease aid all articles, services, facilities, or information which they can furnish. Under these agreements, all lend-lease supplies, such as, for example, merchant ships or cargo planes, which are not used up in the war, can be required by the President to be returned at the end of the present emergency. Article VII of the master agreements entered into with the United Nations receiving lend-lease aid provides that they will join with the United States in working toward some of the economic conditions which are a prerequisite to a secure peace.

The master lend-lease agreements do not determine the final settlement, but leave that for determination at some future date.

As conditions have permitted, our allies have expanded the scope and nature of their reverse lend-lease aid.

During the past summer, the United Kingdom agreed to extend reverse lend-lease aid to include not only goods, services, and information for our armed forces, but also raw materials, commodities, and foodstuffs hitherto purchased, for export, in the United Kingdom and the British Colonies by or on behalf of United States Government agencies. Discussions on the administration and procedure for the handling of the contracts, transfers, and other details are now going forward.

This plan will make available to the United States, under reverse lend-lease and without payment, such materials and foodstuffs as rubber from Ceylon, Trinidad, British Guiana, and British Honduras; sisal and pyrethrum from British East Africa; asbestos and chrome from southern Rhodesia; cocoa from British West Africa; tea and coconut oil from Ceylon; and benzol and tar acids from the United Kingdom.

British shipping for these raw materials and foodstuffs from all parts of the British Commonwealth will also be made available under reverse lend-lease.

Discussions are also under way with the other governments of the British Commonwealth looking toward a like arrangement for the provision of materials and foodstuffs as reverse lend-lease aid.

As of June 30, 1943, the British Commonwealth of Nations reported that expenditures of about $1,171,000,000 had been made for reverse lend-lease aid. The United Kingdom has expended about $871,000,000 of this amount; and Australia, New Zealand, and India have expended approximately $300,000,000. Based upon estimates for the first 6 months of this year, expenditures by the British Commonwealth for reverse lend-lease aid to the United States is now at an annual rate of about $1,250,000,000. This does not take into account the anticipated exports of raw materials, commodities, and foodstuffs for the account of the United States.

The data necessary for even an incomplete accounting of the monetary expenditures by the British Commonwealth for reverse lend-lease assistance to the United States have been gathered in the face of difficulties. British aid is rendered to the armed forces of the United States all over the world. Usually it is under conditions very different from those surrounding lend-lease from the United States, which flows from a central source. Many supplies and services have been made available by the British to United States armed forces in north Africa, Sicily, and elsewhere for which no report has yet been received.

The figures set forth in this report include expenditures made by the British Commonwealth for newly constructed barracks, military airports, hospitals, and other military facilities for our armed forces. They do not include such facilities made available to our armed forces where no out-of-pocket expenditures have been made for their construction since our entry into the war. These British expenditures were from appropriated funds which required financing either through taxation or borrowing. They are comparable to the expenditures made by the United States from appropriations for lend-lease purposes, which include funds for capital installations in this country, such as munitions plants, shipyards, and other facilities. It has not yet been determined how such lend-lease or reverse lend-lease expenditures will be entered or treated in the final settlement under the lend-lease agreements. They will, of course, be considered when the final settlement is made. The master agreement provides that in the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States, "full cognizance shall be taken of all property, services, information, facilities, or other benefits or considerations provided by the Government of the United Kingdom subsequent to March 11, 1941, and accepted or acknowledged by the President on behalf of the United States of America."

The governments of the British Commonwealth have submitted their statement of expenditures for the reverse lend-lease aid covered in this report in pounds. To make these figures more intelligible to the American people, these expenditures have been translated into dollars at the official exchange rates. This may be misleading because the rate of exchange used cannot, especially under war conditions, always reflect comparable values in terms of purchasing power, man-hours of work, or materials. But in spite of the misconception which may result from translating the pound expenditure figures into dollars at the official rates of exchange, I think it is desirable to provide the Congress and the people of this country with the best available indication as to the expenditures made by the British Commonwealth for reverse lend-lease aid.

Exclusive of the expenditures for supplies transferred in colonial theaters of war, American forces have received aid through reverse lend-lease channels for which the United Kingdom made expenditures of $871,000,000 as of June 30, 1943, as follows:

Goods and services	$331,000,000
Shipping	169,000,000
Airports, barracks, hospitals, and other construction	371,000,000
Total	871,000,000

We are all familiar with the role which the Eighth Air Force has played, in collaboration with the Royal Air Force, in preparing the way for the invasion of Europe. It is not as widely known that the operation of reverse lend-lease has made contributions to the outstanding performance of our Air Forces based in the United Kingdom.

Under reverse lend-lease, the British have provided our bomber and fighter commands with many necessary items. Specially heated winter flying clothing to protect bomber crews from the intense cold suffered at high altitudes was supplied by the British to our Air Forces. When certain United States fighter gun sights proved less effective than the sights employed by British fighters, the Royal Air Force provided a substantial number of British-type sights for immediate installation. American bombers have been equipped by the British with photographic equipment effective in obtaining photographs of the target during the bomb run. The British have also provided facilities for the development and production of a new type of protective body armor designed by our medical authorities.

A variety of other aid has also been provided for our air forces by the United

Kingdom. Mobile repair shops located throughout the United Kingdom recondition American bombers forced to make crash landings. A one-man dinghy, developed by the British for parachute landings at sea, provides pilots of American planes with a one-man floating raft. Specialized British radio equipment has been installed in American planes which has given greater safety to our bomber crews, and has improved the effectiveness of our bombing missions. For purposes of recognition training, the Royal Air Force has delivered to the United States Air Forces more than 60,000 items of aircraft, warship, and armed-vehicle recognition devices. These are but a few instances of the aid which has been provided to our air forces under reverse lend-lease and without payment by us.

Although Great Britain depends upon imports for a large portion of her curtailed food supply, she is providing American forces with substantial amounts of foodstuffs as reverse lend-lease aid. These range from fresh vegetables, flour, and potatoes, to corn on the cob and soft drinks.

Australia, New Zealand, and India have also provided United States forces in those areas with substantial reverse lend-lease aid, including most of their food.

The Australian Government has officially estimated the expenditures for reverse lend-lease aid to the United States at £A 60,792,000 as of June 30, 1943. As the official rate of exchange of a £A equals $3.23, this indicates a dollar value of about $196,000,000. This sum is divided into the following major categories:

Stores and provisions	$39,000,000
Technical equipment	7,000,000
Motor transport	14,000,000
Aircraft stores and equipment	16,000,000
General stores	24,000,000
Transportation and communication	21,000,000
Shipping	7,000,000
Works, buildings, and hirings	66,000,000
Miscellaneous	2,000,000
Total	196,000,000

Australia and New Zealand have supplied American forces in the South and Southwest Pacific with the bulk of their foodstuff requirements on a ration scale comparable to the basic allowance of the American Army. This program includes fresh, dried, and canned products, and in some cases in the latter category requires amounts ranging up to 100 percent of total Australian production. The following are the quantities of the principal types of foodstuffs the United States has received from Australia as reverse lend-lease through June 30, 1943:

	Pounds
Meat	61,480,000
Bread, biscuits, and cereals	48,110,000
Potatoes	29,762,000
Vegetables and fruit	49,931,000
Canned foods	28,340,000
Emergency rations	2,231,000
Sugar	11,782,000
Butter	6,628,000
Condensed milk	8,711,000
	Pints
Fresh milk	11,500,000
	Dozen
Fresh eggs	22,000,000

Although clothing rationing has been introduced in Australia, the Government has undertaken an extensive clothing manufacturing program for the United States forces. This program includes millions of pairs of socks and hundreds of thousands of shirts, jackets, trousers, pull-overs, underclothing, boots and shoes, and blankets.

Recreational needs of American soldiers have been met by an Australian program which calls for every type of game and accessory from boxing gloves to medicine balls—in all, more than 420,000 items of such equipment.

Numerous hospitals, including the newest and most modern in the country, have been made available to the United States Army for its exclusive use.

Official air, rail, and water passenger costs and freight, and cable and telegraph expenses of our troops are paid by the Commonwealth Government as reverse lend-lease aid.

A large number of small ships of various types have been turned over to American authorities, and Australian shipyards are now turning out landing barges and small vessels for the combat use of our forces.

On September 29, 1943, the Australian Minister of Finance introduced the Commonwealth budget for the current fiscal year in the Australian Parliament. He estimated that Australia will spend approximately $323,000,000 for reverse lend-lease during the year July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944.

New Zealand, no less than Australia and the United Kingdom, has supplied its share of reverse lend-lease aid. For the period ending June 30, 1943, the New Zealand Government has officially reported having expended $51,000,000 for reverse lend-lease aid to the United States, made up as follows:

Supplies, services, and foodstuffs	$24,000,000
Camps	6,000,000
Hospitals	3,000,000
Warehouses	5,000,000
Miscellaneous building projects	7,000,000
Ship construction	6,000,000
Total	51,000,000

New Zealand, with Australia, is the food basket of American forces stationed throughout the South Pacific area. In order better to provide for the needs of our troops in remote Pacific islands, New Zealand has greatly increased her capacity for the packing, canning, and dehydration of meats, vegetables, and dairy products. Although its population is less than 1,700,000, this Dominion has supplied the United States under reverse lend-lease and without charge with more than 170,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs during the year ending June 30, 1943, as follows:

	Pounds
Fresh meat	49,650,000
Canned and smoked meat	21,600,000
Potatoes	9,150,000
Other vegetables	24,125,000
Fruit	10,825,000
Butter and cheese	12,550,000
Other dairy products	10,000,000
Sugar	7,100,000
Flour and other cereals	13,725,000
Miscellaneous supplies	11,475,000

New Zealand also supplies numerous articles of clothing, including shoes and textiles, to United States forces as reverse lend-lease aid. When American requirements were added to those of local forces, New Zealand found it necessary to ration the civilian supply of clothing to less than one full outfit per year.

American requirements under reverse lend-lease have also occasioned shortages in many other phases of New Zealand's civilian life. Nevertheless, the Dominion continues greatly to expand the scope and volume of her reverse lend-lease to the United States, and during the present fiscal year about $65,000,000 has been budgeted for this purpose.

While no official report has yet been received from the Government of India, our Army reports total expenditures by India for reverse lend-lease aid of approximately $56,900,000, divided as follows:

Military stores and equipment	$5,421,000
Transportation and communication	3,161,000
Petroleum products	13,127,000
Construction	31,413,000
Subsistence	3,778,000
Total	56,900,000

We have received aviation gasoline, motor gasoline, and lubricating oil, and lesser amounts of other petroleum products from the Indian Government for use by American forces. A part of the motor fuel has been used in a number of trucks and passenger cars given our troops without payment as reverse lend-lease aid. In addition, United States Army groups have been afforded postal, telegraph, and telephone facilities, water and electric power, furnishings for buildings, and items of clothing, including mosquito- and gas-proof outfits.

Canada has received no lend-lease aid from the United States. She has paid cash for the supplies obtained in this country. It may be noted, however, that Canada has already made a billion dollars worth of aid available without payment to the United Kingdom and is now engaged in making available another billion dollars worth of aid to the United Kingdom, Russia, China, and the other United Nations on a mutual-aid program similar to our lend-lease program.

This statement of the expenditures made by the British Commonwealth of Nations for reverse lend-lease aid furnished to the United States and of the expansion of this program so as to include exports of materials and foodstuffs for the account of United States agencies from the United Kingdom and the British colonies emphasizes the contribution which the British Commonwealth has made "to the defense of the United States" while taking its place on the battle fronts. It is an indication of the extent to which the British have been able to pool their resources with ours so that the needed weapon may be in the hands of that soldier—whatever may be his nationality—who can at the proper moment use it most effectively to defeat our common enemies.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 11, 1943.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, today, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the signing of the armistice of World War No. 1, the boys from the so-called poll-tax States are shedding their lifeblood on the seven seas and on the far-flung battle fronts side by side with the boys of the non-poll-tax States. The thing that the boys over there from all of the States desire of you and me above everything else is unity and a unified effort on the home front to stop this slaughter and win the victory at the earliest possible moment. Yet, in spite of this, we are now advised that the Senate, under a Democratic leadership, proposes to take up the highly controversial and explosive communistically inspired issue of the Federal repeal of the poll tax in the Southern States.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know, and every Member of this House realizes, that if the South were not regarded as being "in the bag" for the Democratic ticket next year this latest onslaught on the Constitution and the South would not be attempted. The Democratic leadership should take this note of warning: Stop, look, and listen! Remember Kentucky!

Surely those responsible for our legislative program will not permit the smoldering embers of discord to be fanned into angry flames by the inevitable and extended filibuster that will ensue in the Senate of the United States at a time when unity of our people should be the prime objective of our leadership. Surely this proposed action on the part of the Democratic leadership is not appreciated by a segment of our people who have nurtured and sustained the Democratic Party throughout the years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR FIGHTING MEN RETURN

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, while millions of American men and women in the armed forces fight the battles of the world we on the home front, with a very simple and plain duty to perform, neglect to keep a light in the window for their return.

By mere expression in law the Congress signified its intention that the men returning from the war should have their jobs back in private industry. It has been the announced intention of the administration that every man should have a job. Many promises have been made, but neither the administration nor the Congress has to date prepared any definite program for the return of our soldiers.

WHEN DOES THE POST-WAR BEGIN

Procrastination has been justified by the thought that we have not yet reached the post-war period. When does the post-war begin? For some it began the day after the disastrous attack on Pearl Harbor. Daily, thousands begin what is to them the post-war period. The post-war comes to different men at different times. Most people would say that the post-war period begins when the fighting ends—when the armistice is signed—or at the beginning of the peace. This may be true for the Nation generally. But for many people in many situations it is not true. For the man or woman in the armed services the post-war period begins whenever he or she is discharged to return to civilian life. This may be before the end of the war or it may be long afterward.

TWO YEARS OF WAR

December 8 will be the second anniversary of the American declaration of war. For 2 long years this war has been waged, and for 2 long years the administration of our Government has procrastinated and purposely delayed the enactment of any legislation which would provide for the readjustment problem which will confront us when the men and women begin to return by many thousands to their homes. Has the administration procrastinated for political reasons? Is it the intent to delay any such enactment, to be timely for any strategically political use in the 1944 election? The majority in this House would cry out, "No." No politics with the men who fight our wars. Yet, every day that they delay in the enactment of legislation, which will enable a decent and respectable return to civilian life for our fighting men, they play the disrespectful game of politics with human lives and misery.

PROPAGANDA

This past summer, on July 29, President Roosevelt in a fireside chat which was broadcast to the men in the services and designed for their political appetites, attempted to hold forth what now appears to be a complete false promise. It was not a coincidence that this speech, designed to approach the vote of the soldier and sailor, was made at a time when the administration was attempting to put under way a plan to organize the absentee soldier and sailor vote. The President's implication was that the Congress had neglected its duty and he forcefully put forth this implication by saying:

> May the Congress do its duty in this regard.

Yet, he did not explain why he, as the leader of the majority party, which has absolute control of both Houses of Congress, had not led vigorously to get congressional action. Excusing himself, he said:

> I have assured our men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down when the war is won.

He had assured the men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down. The men in our armed forces have never doubted the American people, but they have every reason to doubt the President. His record in behalf of the serviceman in the past is probably the most obstructive in American history.

FALSE ECONOMY

Franklin Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency in 1932 on a platform of economy. His economy pledge was to the effect that he would reduce the expenses of the Federal Government at least 25 percent. He was inaugurated President on March 4, 1933. Within 16 days his economy bill had passed the Congress and was signed by him on March 20, 1933. Then, he proceeded to do what he called "economize." The Economy Act had provided for a total reduction of $500,000,000 in annual Federal expenditures. This reduction in Federal expenditures was taken out of the pockets of the veterans of former wars. Approximately four-fifths of the total reduction was accomplished by reduction in the Spanish-American War veterans, by reductions in the Civil War veterans, by the removal of thousands from the veterans' rolls and by the prevention of the addition of thousands more. His restrictions were such as to outlaw veterans who had become invalids in the last war even though they were delayed war casualties. He reduced the total expenditures of veterans approximately $450,000 per year from the previous total of about $1,000,000,000. How much did he reduce the political patronage on the Federal pay roll? A mere $150,000,000—why so little? Because here were useful political jobs. He did not need the veterans for election because he had other plans of putting the needy and distressed on the political dole where they could be manipulated at will. As a result of his false economy, the Nation witnessed a surge of public opinion which was distinctly in behalf of the veterans.

One year after he had been inaugurated President, the Congress in the independent offices appropriation bill of March 1934, which included the Veterans' Administration, attempted to make redress for the wrongs that had been done by their President. The benefits for the veterans in that bill were vigorously opposed by the President, despite his waste of public funds in other directions. This bill was passed by the Congress on March 26, 1934, but prior to the passage of the bill the President had already prepared his veto message and the day following the passage of the bill, the bill was returned to the House of Representatives with the veto message. In that veto message President Roosevelt clearly, without any chance of misunderstanding, set forth his attitude to the veterans of American wars. His attitude was made clear by reference to a speech made by him in October 1933, 5 months before the veto message which I have mentioned. This speech was made to the American Legion in convention. In that speech the President said:

> No person, because he wore a uniform, must thereafter be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens.

Now we know from the experience of the past 10 years that the President does believe in special-class privileges because he has played his peculiar, but successful, game of politics by pitting one class against another. We know that he does believe in making huge sections of the public beneficiaries of doles from the United States Treasury because of his ever-recurring programs of waste. He said in October 1933:

The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his Government a benefit which no other citizen receives.

The man who goes into the valley of death to fight the horrible battles of war so that his nation may be free deserves every possible consideration his government can give him. And I say to you, any man so calloused, so completely unconscious of the sacrificial service of the American soldier and sailor, deserves only public repudiation. The President informed the Congress:

I am wholly and unequivocally opposed to the principle of the general service pension.

It happens that reduction in veterans' benefits made by this administration in 1933 were contrary to the intent of the Congress. The congressional debates on the Economy Act made it very plain that no one in the Congress planned—or no one in the Congress desired—that the disabled veterans in the World War should be penalized. National Commander E. A. Hayes, of the American Legion, stated:

Substantial amounts have been taken away from the war disabled.

It was within a few hours after the President's veto that the House of Representatives repassed the independent offices appropriation bill over the President's veto by a vote of 310 to 72. The Senate also overrode the veto by a vote of 63 to 27. The President was even repudiated by an overwhelming group of his own party.

AGAIN AND AGAIN AND AGAIN

Again, in the Seventy-fourth Congress, the contest between the President and the Congress over veterans' legislation recurred. The President used his veto power four times to defeat the will of the Congress against the benefits of war veterans.

On one occasion, after the Congress had passed the adjustment compensation bill which was also known as the veterans' bonus bill—and this occasion was May 22, 1935—President Roosevelt, setting one of his many historical precedents, appeared in person before a joint session of the two Houses of Congress and read his veto message of the Patman bill. Until this bit of showmanship, no President before him had ever vetoed a bill in this fashion. Within an hour, the House of Representatives overrode his veto by a vote of 322 to 98. In the Senate, the veto was sustained. But this did not end the differences between the President and the Congress on the subject of the veterans' compensation bill because in the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress the bill was reintroduced and was passed by the House. The Senate then passed it in 1936 by a vote of 74 to 16 with amendments which the House, 2 days later, accepted by a vote of 346 to 59.

"MY CONVICTIONS, I CANNOT CHANGE THEM"

What did President Roosevelt do on January 24, 1936? He vetoed the bill again, and in vetoing it he said:

On May 22, 1935, in disapproving a bill to pay the bonus in full immediately instead of in 1945, I gave in person to a joint session of the Congress complete and explicit reasons for my action. I respectfully refer the Members of the Senate and of the House to every word of what I said then. My convictions are as impelling today as they were then. Therefore, I cannot change them.

His convictions impelled him to act against veterans. In his own words, he cannot change them—meaning his convictions.

It is historical to note that within 45 minutes after the veto message of January 24, 1936, the House of Representatives had repassed the bill by a vote of 324 to 61. On January 27, the Senate overrode the veto and the bonus bill became law.

ROOSEVELT NEVER AIDED VETERANS

Were the veterans ever aided by President Roosevelt? Never. He has been their greatest opponent even to the point of reducing disability compensations.

President Roosevelt, in the Seventy-fifth Congress, by the use of pocket vetoes, defeated six separate veterans' bills which were passed by the Congress. His attempt to destroy the soldiers' insurance legislation by a veto during the period of the "Roosevelt Depression" in 1937 caused the Congress to repass this bill over the veto by a vote of 368 to 13 in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate by a vote of 69 to 12. Are we to believe that there is a change of heart simply because the President came forth on July 29 of this year with the hope that the Congress may do its duty to the veterans of this war? The Congress has not failed at any time during history to help the veterans. The President likes to shift the responsibility to Congress. He has assured the men in the armed forces that the people will not let them down. Repeatedly, he has put himself in a position to thwart the people's opinion concerning the veterans of our wars. Did he explain this to our fighting men on July 29? Oh, no. It was hoped that they would forget the record. Now, how serious are his intentions?

DO-NOTHING POLICY

I have said that the post-war began for many veterans of this war the day after Pearl Harbor. The post-war begins every day for many thousands of our fighting men, and all that has been accomplished to date is the extension of the veterans' benefits made available to the veterans of the last war to the veterans of this war.

For months the Military Affairs Committee has held in pigeonhole legislation that would provide for the early transition of our fighting men back into civilian life. I introduced a measure on October 12, 1942, and others have introduced measures, but to date the leadership of the Military Affairs Committee of this House has been too busy to make provisions for the veterans of this war. On October 18, 1943, when the dependency allowance bill was before this House, I attempted to amend to that bill an extended pay provision somewhat similar to the bill I have before the Military Affairs Committee. A point of order was made against that amendment by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky. There was not a single defense of my position by any Member of the Democratic majority of this House. The amendment was ruled out of order by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who was at the time presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. Immediately after the House action on that date I went to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and appealed to him for consideration of my bill, H. R. 1247. He told me then that the committee was too busy to give any consideration to such legislation now and he did not know when it could get to it.

THE CASE OF TROY LUCAS

Two weeks ago a woman here in Washington called me on the telephone and asked if she could bring to my office a young man who had just been given a disability discharge from the Army. I welcomed this visit. This young man was from the Army Signal Corps. He had participated in the African invasion and had fought in several major engagements. In the Battle of Tunisia he lost his right leg and was returned to the States for hospitalization in the Army's Walter Reed Hospital. He had been discharged from the hospital and he was trying to make his way home.

Under the regulations he may wear his uniform for 90 days, after which time he must return to civilian dress. This man needs a suit of clothes. He needs railroad fare to get back home and then more than anything else he needs a job. This motherly woman had given him a temporary place to stay in her home and enough spending money. She also helped him get to the Veterans' Bureau and he was told that his case would be adjudicated as rapidly as possible, which means that he will receive his disability pension in the future—maybe 60 days from now, maybe 120 days. But he needs help now. Why, in this country, even a man discharged from a penitentiary is given a suit of clothes—but not so much as a pair of socks for our fighting men.

TRANSITION

Before this young man went to war he had worked on a farm. But, he can no longer walk behind a plow because he now has only one leg. At various times, before his enlistment in the Army, he had worked for a building contractor. But now he can no longer climb around on buildings because he has only one leg. The post-war period for this man has started. It is here now. Not tomorrow, not next year, not after the war, but now. What have we done to ease his transition from military service to civilian life? We have done nothing but to tell him to get out of uniform in 90 days and that

within the next 2 to 4 months he will start getting his disability compensation. Has the administration done anything for this young man, or the thousands like him or the millions more to come? It has not. Has the Democratic majority of this House done anything for this young man? It has not. It is our duty to do something, a duty so simple and so plain, but has the leadership in this House acted? It has not. Several bills are pending before the Military Affairs Committee, but no action. It is too busy.

Who is this young man about whom I speak? Did he come from Missouri or my congressional district? No. It is an important coincidence that this young man came from Kentucky, from the town of Southdown, which is located in the congressional district of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. To Troy Lucas—and the millions of his buddies—I say, the Military Affairs Committee of this House, under the Democratic leadership, is too busy to give consideration to the human affairs of the men who are fighting to keep America free.

SHAME

The political record of the President of the United States in regard to the veterans is a shame in the eyes of the Nation. The political record of the majority Members of this House to give aid to provide sustenance for the men and women who are returning from this bloody war is a shame. The procrastination of the Democratic leaders of the Military Affairs Committee of this House is a shame. And, now comes this man with one leg—all he has left from the battle of Tunisia—to place the blame on the very doorstep of not only the administration, not only the Democratic leadership, but on the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. What if our men in Italy were too busy to kill the enemy, and what if our fighting men in New Guinea were too busy to fight the battle of preservation for democracy in America? The Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives should commemorate this Armistice Day—in shame.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Before yielding to the distinguished Democratic leader, Mr. Speaker, may I say in regard to the gentleman from Massachusetts personally that while I condemn the leadership for not having taken action long ago, the gentleman was the man who did get this individual situation to which I have referred corrected quickly. I want to say to the gentleman that I cannot hope to nave him, as the Democratic leader of this House, spend his time doing an individual case job for the millions more to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember the case, because the same lady brought the young man in to see me.

Mr. PLOESER. This case is an example. This is just one boy. Every time a man or a woman is discharged from the armed services, either now or after the war, they have to rehabilitate themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was too young to serve in the last war, was he not?

Mr. PLOESER. I was too young to serve in the last war.

Mr. McCORMACK. It happened that I did serve in the last war. I did not get any civilian suit when I got through with the last war, and did not expect one. I served my country to the best of my ability.

Mr. PLOESER. That is no excuse for those who need it.

Mr. McCORMACK. This young man that came in to see me did not. He was concerned with trying to have his case expedited, a proper matter for any one of us to interest ourselves in in connection with expediting action on these matters.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Massachusetts did a grand job. I am wondering if the gentleman is going to give his individual, personal attention to the millions of cases that come after.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will give my personal attention to any case concerning any veteran.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman is to be commended, I know that, but the gentleman will not live long enough to handle them all individually.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be true, all individually.

Mr. PLOESER. Yes; obviously it is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will give my attention to any veteran of any war, whether this war, the last war, the Spanish-American War, or any other war in which this country has been engaged, that I can help.

Mr. PLOESER. I have not criticized the gentleman's individual voting record. I criticize leadership in this House, which fails to get action now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to the point of order that was raised against an amendment that he offered. The gentleman, of course, knows that the chairman of any committee must protect a bill that is reported out of his committee.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman does not criticize the fact that the point of order itself was made, although the chairman of the committee might have allowed it to stand. Then, was an opportunity to get immediate action. Had the chairman agreed to the amendment and made no point of order, I doubt that any other Member of the House would have made it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will concede that it is the duty of the chairman of any committee to protect a bill reported out of that committee. Is not that right?

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman will concede at the same time that it is the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to get action on these problems. Here was an opportunity for action quickly, without months of delay. Advantage was not taken of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman take the position that if in the fortunes of war—and we are all practical—sometime in the future the gentleman's party should come into control of the House, the chairman of a committee on that side should not protect a bill coming out of his committee?

Mr. PLOESER. Is the gentleman prophesying?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said the fortunes of war.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman would not consider a Republican victory in this House the fortunes of war, would he?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman understands that the cycle changes, but assuming the gentleman's party got into control of the House in the future, would the gentleman take the position that the chairman of a committee should not protect a bill reported out by his committee?

Mr. PLOESER. Had our party been in power we would have had legislation out on this more than a year ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. My question is, Does the gentleman take the position that the chairman of a committee, assuming sometime in the future the gentleman's party gets into control of the House, should not protect a bill coming out of his committee?

Mr. PLOESER. He would not destroy the bill. That is not a matter of mere protection of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is evading the question.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman is evading the issue.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is evading the question.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman is evading the issue. The gentleman has evaded the issue for 2 years. I have evaded the gentleman's question for only 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] for 15 minutes.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AMERICAN COMMERCIAL AVIATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the latest developments in American commercial aviation.

Specifically the developments I have in mind are those that pertain to the kind of aviation we will have when the war is over. I do this at this time because I believe that, next to the winning of the war itself, there is no more important subject in the world today than our future policy regarding international air transport.

As a nation we are now in the process of evolving this policy. To as great a degree, if not greater, than any other industry, aviation is the public's business. The public, therefore, is entitled to know all the facts about it. And if all the facts are known—and the discussion is out in the open—we may assume with a considerable degree of certainty that the public will form a sound judgment. Only in this way will we obtain a policy that will be fair, that will be honest, and that will give aviation, America's gift to civilization, its earned chance in the skyways of the world.

The airplane is an American heritage and its world-wide future now is in the making. Two American brothers—the Wrights—started the age of flight. The age of flight is so young that it will not attain its fortieth anniversary until December 17 next. One of its creators, Mr. Orville Wright, still is with us, and even now he is not an aged man. Every Member of this House encompasses within his or her lifetime virtually every phase of the birth and growth of aviation.

For this reason, if for no other, I suppose we should have the utmost familiarity with aviation. Unfortunately, such is not the case. We see planes high in the skies above us; many of us are airline patrons; all of us are conscious of the airplane's role in this war, but few of us, relatively speaking, have had either the time or the facilities to make a study of aviation. That means, as we approach our legislative duty in helping to evolve a sound national policy, that we labor under a handicap.

I, for one, would like to see the aviation industry—the manufacturer as well as the transport operator, the private flyer as well as the carrier—pay more attention to Congress. I want all the facts I can get. I want to know every element that exists which may help me to form an opinion that will coincide with that which is best for our country. In this respect I feel that I voice the desire of the House in its hunger for information, for whatever policy is ultimately evolved must find its expression in the law, and the responsibility for a good law is upon us.

Since the tide of war has changed from defensive to offensive, and we have achieved air superiority over our enemies, there has been a marked increase in the volume of discussion on a post-war air policy Not alone our American policy-to-be, but the British policy-to-be, the Canadian policy-to-be, and the Russian policy-to-be.

Many speeches have been made—some on the floor of this House, others in the House of Commons, still others in the Canadian Parliament. And there have been still others, made by high officials of this and other governments as well as by men who are leaders in commercial aviation here and abroad.

In retrospect, there emerges from all these oratorial efforts a phrase or two, a coined word or two, but I personally sense only one thing, and that is a lack of clarity. This has been distressing to me. I am not interested in shadow-boxing. I want to get down to cases. I want to resolve my thinking about post-war aviation into not more than a half-dozen simple, understandable premises. If I can do this I can do my duty on this subject as a legislator, and my only reason for requesting the attention of the House today is because I feel I am on the way to do this.

To begin with, it now is possible to state, and state factually, the 2 opinions advanced by our own United States air lines. These, as you know, are 19 in number. Seventeen of the lines operate primarily in peacetime within the United States proper. Two others are certificated for transocean flight, and are so operating now.

Sixteen of the seventeen domestic lines met in Washington last July at the request of officials of our Government. The Government sought to get, from all United States air lines, the views of the industry on post-war air policy in the international field. The 16 domestic air lines adopted a declaration of policy containing five objectives. Here they are:

First. Free and open competition—world-wide—subject to reasonable regulation by the appropriate governmental agencies.

Second. Private ownership and management.

Third. Fostering and encouragement by the Government of the United States of a sound world-wide air transportation system.

Fourth. Freedom of transit in peaceful flight—world-wide.

Fifth. Acquisition of civil and commercial outiets required in the public interest.

The foregoing objectives reflect the essentials of the present law governing civil aviation, but most important they state the issue of competition versus monopoly.

One of the two certificated transocean carriers, while not subscribing to the 16 domestic lines' declaration, has since stated publicly its agreement. That means that 17 of our 19 United States lines are a unit in their belief that the principle of reasonably regulated competition should be preserved in our international aerial activities when the war is over.

Now, this does not mean that all 16 of the domestic air lines expect to be granted the privilege of flying abroad as soon as the war is over. They do not have this expectation any more than they expect permission to tap, say three of our greatest centers for the origination of traffic—New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. As a matter of fact, some of our domestic lines are totally uninterested in transoceanic flight, but all 16 are deeply interested in the perpetuation of a doctrine which built this Nation. That doctrine is competition as opposed to monopoly. They believe, and I share their belief, that aviation is too great a gift, too young a business, and has too brilliant a future to be monopolistically handcuffed just when it is about to stretch its world-wide wings. They are opposed, and I share their opposition, to any artificially created cartel of the skies. Free air indeed would be a mockery if we permitted this to happen.

Yet, that is precisely what the two remaining United States lines—the United Air Lines and Pan American—apparently would like to see brought into being. They propose that strange creation already christened the chosen instrument. They would have one big company, the bait being an offer of a merger for transocean purposes to a number of the domestic lines. Let me, right here, give you a few facts:

The United States, which is served by 17 domestic air lines, has by a coincidence roughly one-seventeenth of the land surface of the world. Land area of United States, 3,000,000 square miles; land area of world, 51,239,213 square miles.

The population of the United States is about 136,000,000; the population of the world is 2,169,873,000. Thus, we have about one-sixteenth of the world's population.

Now, then, if it takes 17 domestic air lines to service one-seventeenth of the world's land surface, and one-sixteenth of the world's population, is it the part of wisdom for the United States to have a chosen instrument, or 1 air line, to attempt to service sixteen-seventeenths of the world's land area, and a world population of more than 2,000,000,000 persons?

The war alone should answer that question. It brought us the grim fruits of a quasi monopoly, for when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred we had but one big air company in the overseas field. And we also had only six commercial airplanes designed for transocean flying. That is why the domestic lines were called into the picture. The situation was desperate. Planes which in commercial operation would not have been permitted to cross Lake Michigan without flotation gear were impressed into oceanic service for the military. Pilots who might have flown you from New York to Chicago took those ships over the Greenland ice cap, over the North and South Atlantic, into the Pacific, the Caribbean, anywhere, in fact, the military had a hurry-up job.

Today, as a result of the war effort, many of the domestic lines are flying routes to all five continents, over every ocean, and to the most remote points on the globe. As a consequence, we have more and better airmen qualified for international flight than any other nation on earth. The 16 air lines of the United States ask only the right to utilize the "know how" of those airmen to greater advantage in international flight of the Postal Service, the commerce of the United States, and the national defense. Incidentally, I am told the mystery is all gone from ocean flying. The pilots say it is an easier job than taking a plane over the Rocky Mountains.

But let me return momentarily to the monopoly or chosen instrument idea. May I suggest we are currently shedding a good deal of blood and spending untold treasure in getting rid of a couple of chosen instruments. One is named Hitler, the other is Hirohito.

The third, who was never more than a bumptious clown, is a fugitive from justice, "wanted for murder" by his own people whom he betrayed.

The limitless ocean of the air is just too great for us to entrust our American international air destinies to one man.

Furthermore, this attempt on the part of Juan Trippe, the president of Pan American Airways, to foster an air transport cartel is doomed to defeat, in my opinion, and should be.

The aviation industry has a responsibility to nearly 3,000,000 returning soldiers, sailors, and marines, now engaged

in military aerial warfare, for many of them will wish civilian roles in aviation.

Are they going to get their chance through a monopoly? They are not.

Mr. Trippe's monopolistic approach means less jobs, fewer opportunities, and a continuation of the same sort of "under-cover diplomacy" which has characterized his company's activities in the past.

The American people have never willingly or wittingly sanctioned any monopoly. I cannot conceive of their representatives in Congress betraying a tradition of freedom that has existed since the foundation of this Nation. The air is our last frontier, and the word "monopoly" never had a place in our frontiers of the past, and must not now.

LET'S CLEAR THE AIR—A STATEMENT ON THE SUBJECT OF POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL AIR SERVICE

(By W. H. Coverdale, president, American Export Airlines, Inc.)

When tomorrow comes and the war is ended, this Nation will need—and quickly—air transport services between our country and practically all of the other nations of the civilized world.

Because we are Americans we naturally think first of American air transport services, flying American-built planes manned by American crews—services directed and developed by American enterprise—services operated as the finest and swiftest and safest and best of all the air transport services provided by any nation of the world.

But as cooperative citizens of a new world, we do not want more than our share of this global air transport business—but we do feel entitled to our full share.

The planning and preparing for this post-war activity is one of the foremost problems facing this country and the world in general. Like all problems involving international relations, it has been and will continue to be an argumentative subject. At present it is one of the most momentous projects under discussion by governments, by transportation groups, and by business in general, both at home and abroad. As a result various American air transportation groups from time to time have gone on record as to how this Government should handle this problem. But there is still confusion.

We of American Export Airlines believe that the following open statement will add to the public understanding and at the same time clarify our position—in other words, help "clear the air":

WHAT HAS AMERICA TO OFFER?

So far as aviation is concerned, the answer is, America has everything and in abundance.

Operating knowledge and experience in management of commercial air transport, greater and broader than that possessed by any other nation.

Giant aircraft factories, capable of designing and building the finest, fastest, and best all-around transport airplanes the world has ever known.

An able and energetic nation of 130,000,000 people, world conscious as a result of the war, willing and capable of producing the products the world will need so badly, eager to exchange its wares in the marts of the world, and ready to travel.

These are the prime requisites necessary to establish American leadership in international air transportation.

Let us take a good look at these assets, with special reference to the know-how of our American flag air transport companies, both domestic and foreign.

There are 19 United States air lines. Two of these operate in the foreign service and hold C. A. B. certificates of convenience and necessity for overseas transportation. American Export Airlines is one of these 2 companies. The 17 other companies operate in the domestic field and hold C. A. B. certificates for such operation. There are also other business groups with new capital interested in entering this new and rapidly growing industry.

All 19 air lines are now engaged in aiding the war effort by transporting passengers, cargo, and mail within the country or to all sections of the globe. All of these air lines have been loyally devoting their individual efforts and ambitions to military purposes and the all-important task of winning the war.

Many of the domestic air lines, when the war is over, will want to expand into the international field, as evidenced by the fact that a good many of them already have filed applications for overseas routes.

MONOPOLY OR COMPETITION

While there may be a general desire on the part of the domestic air lines to enter the overseas field, there are two schools of thought as to how that problem may be met.

One school advocates formation of a single, Government-sponsored, monopolistic international air line, in which all American-flag air lines could, if they wished, hold an interest, based on some as yet unannounced formula. American Export Airlines does not support this plan.

The other school of thought opposes the placing of all of the development of our international air transportation in the hands of a single American company—a chosen instrument—or a monopoly. This school believes in regulated competition consistent with the policies and standards established by the Civil Aeronautics Act.

American Export Airlines supports this plan. Furthermore, we do not believe that the alternative to monopoly would be unbridled competition. Far from it.

A definite Government policy, firmly and impartially administered, can give the country the proper type of well-regulated competition—in the foreign, as well as in the domestic, field.

AMERICAN EXPORT AIRLINES' POSITION

We are, and always have been, unalterably opposed to the thesis of monopoly. We believe that the fostering of monopoly would almost certainly result in Government ownership. We do not believe that the Old World practice of fostering a government air line would result in adequate advancement of American aviation. Our country is just too big for such a system.

Our company and 16 domestic air lines on May 18 of this year signed a declaration of policy against monopoly, and presented it to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

We strongly support the thesis of competition. By competition we mean that any American-flag air line interested in providing air service beyond our borders and into foreign countries, should have the right to make application to a properly constituted Government body, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board. We believe that open hearings should be held by such a body, in accordance with the principles of free enterprise. The number of companies that would emerge with certificates from such hearings would depend upon the ability of the applicants to qualify, and in addition, upon the judgment of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the President of the United States, as to the number of routes and services required in the public interest.

Such orderly procedure follows the "American way" of developing a new and vital industry. It encourages competition to an extent necessary to assure sound development—and yet regulates it to the degree that cutthroat competition is eliminated.

It is my earnest belief that the United States will get out of post-war aviation just what its Government and the public are willing to put into it. Regulated competition, as opposed to monopoly—combined with private ownership—and with adequate Government and public support will enable United States aviation to secure for America its rightful share of the air commerce of the world in the post-war period.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHEPPARD was granted leave to include in his remarks a statement on post-war international service by W. H. Coverdale, president, American Export Air Lines, Inc.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] for 30 minutes.

RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE A PRELUDE TO PEACE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I devote myself to my prepared address I wish to go on record as saying that I was impressed by the modesty of an outstanding Member of this body, the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE, who sought to efface himself and his connection with a tribute to the Unknown Soldier paid by those who transmitted the wreaths to be placed upon the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier this Armistice Day.

The letters addressed to him which he did not read were as follows:

To the Honorable FRANCIS CASE:

Kindly place this wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier as a tribute from mothers of the boys in service from Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.

CATHOLIC SEWING CIRCLE
OF SACRED HEART,
Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

And the other:

To the Honorable Congressman FRANCIS CASE:

Kindly place this wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, in memory of my nephew, Clayton Gibbons, who lost his life in action in the Philippines.

MRS. AGNES IRON CLOUD,
Pine Ridge Indian Reservation,
Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

Modesty in these halls is a jewel of great price and when coupled with genuine and recognized ability, inherent, as in the gentleman to whom I have referred, these days is most refreshing.

The native Americans are not unmindful of what they owe to the country, unkind as it may be charged to have been to them. Their day of enfranchisement is at hand.

Their loyalty is appreciated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Vermont is overly generous in his remarks, but in behalf of the Sioux Indians I do appreciate the tribute that he has paid to them.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this Armistice Day observance to put into one document a rambling statement disclosing, in part, what I am thinking about and how, with regard to our attitude to Japan and Germany when we have won the war.

I shall not take time to revise the speech, though I am sure it will need it.

It will, at most, be only a partial answer to those looking for a solution or an aid to their own thinking—those who have flattered me by asking my advice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. To say that any advice the gentleman gives, every Member of the House will profoundly respect—and I say this even before my friend has given his advice, because, as one Member of the House, he impresses everyone here with his intellectually honest mind, and all attest to the courage of the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Now, after all that I have said about modesty, should that go in the RECORD?

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman will admit that a just compliment is always in order.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have to admit it inasmuch as it comes from my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I have no relief. My experience has been, as the majority leader knows, somewhat extended, although I have not profited by that as much as I should. I have even undertaken to teach international law, and have been a member of international commissions as secretary thereof. This is not the first time that the majority leader has graciously extended himself by paying me a compliment, which is not deserved but appreciated.

As Secretary Knox said at Burlington, Vt.:

> Flattery is a perfume to be smelled of, not to be swallowed.

Ever since the question arose with respect to what action we should take in regard to the embargo, there have been those who have sought to know what I thought about almost every situation involving our international relations.

I have sedulously avoided discussion of foreign relations, and any other commitments than such as have been evidenced by my votes. I am now again up against it, for I must answer those who write me asking, "What about Germany?" and "What about Japan—post-war?"

Now, at the outset, let me say I profess to know no more than anybody else with respect or with regard to what should and will happen or be done after we have won the war, as we shall sit down at the peace table to write the terms of peace which shall be enduring.

I have only my own idea, and I may be woefully wrong. However, I have no disposition to dodge the issue, and will answer a lot of letters by means of this prepared and somewhat comprehensive statement, as of this date, reserving the right to change my mind.

RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

At a meeting of the Republican women of New York, which I addressed recently, a prayer was offered by a colonel of the Salvation Army, who said in substance: "O, Lord, we do not ask for vengeance, we pray for retributive justice."

I asked her what she meant. I thought I knew, and said to her that if I did, she and I were in agreement. She referred me to the dictionary, where I found that "retributive" is the dispensing or the receiving of a reward or a punishment according to the desserts of the individual. In other words, "condign" punishment. Well, that suited me, and then what was "justice," I thought, and it is defined as "merited reward" or "punishment."

Taking it all in all, her prayer and the definition, I thought I ought to be satisfied, providing the prayer were granted, as it will be.

AS TO GERMANY

What shall be done about Germany? is the question first asked. Of course, we should everlastingly lick her, first, but doing that and killing off the criminals is only the first step. It will be a long, long time before we will or can trust Germany again, or can afford to cease to take the necessary steps to protect ourselves against some new attempt at world conquest and domination.

Lord Vansittari, a British hard-headed and minutely informed professional diplomatist, has been telling the British Government for 40 years that Germany is mortally dangerous and that Germany will continue to be terribly dangerous when this war is over—to all of us; and that no German group can be trusted in the coming peace; 25 percent of the Germans are good Germans, he says, but the number is so small as to be ineffective. He urges that we are not justified in drawing a distinction between Nazis and Germans. It is obvious that 75 percent of the Germans have for 75 years—the figures are easy to remember—been eager for any assault on their neighbors. Respecting the myth of the two Germanys, he says:

> The origins of the world's miseries are manifold, but there is one preponderant cause. It is the myth of the two Germanys. According to our confident amateurs the Germany of their dreams is always just around the corner, and about to take charge. This childishness has conducted generations of us to our doom. Yet it is on this discredited myth that our propagandists base their output. The other Germany is not waiting around the corner. It has got to be created. If we cling to the old delusion, we shall lose the peace.

NAZI-ISM IS GERMANISM

He insists that nazi-ism is a product of the German character and that to forgive Germany in advance of the most positive proof of a German change of spirit, is deadly hypocrisy and most dubious Christianity—an easy flattering of our own sense of self-righteousness at the expense of those who have suffered the primary impact of German crimes and at the expense of the generations which will follow us. His recent book, Lessons of My Life, makes very interesting and instructive reading. Then David Neuberger of the New York bar gets somewhat excited and says a lot of things which most of us have thought, but refrained from saying. He contends that the sob sisters and sentimentalists, as well as the peace-at-any-price marauders are already indicating their disposition toward post-war settlements in that they wish to extend their kindness and peaceful attitude to the gangsters and murderous renegades of the Axis countries who have flourished in rape, robbery, theft, gangsterism, and all the crimes known both to ancient and modern criminal history, against innocent peoples of the countries they have driven to slavery, debauched, ravished, and stolen with the consent and approbation of the peoples of those countries in whose name they were committing these crimes. This is especially true of that part of the Third Reich called Prussia. They desire that the people of Germany, always controlled by Prussia, be held blameless and forgiven for all horrors, murders, theft, looting, robbery, rape, and sins committed not alone against races, religions, and society, but against the whole civilized world. Kindness and forgiveness to these hellions when the defeat of Hitler and his Nazis is accomplished? Forgive them? How can such crimes against God and man be forgiven? Treat them kindly? These to me baseless expressions cause horror in the minds of the majority of the people of the civilized world. No sentimentalists, sob sisters, or peace-at-any-price marauders can impose on the righteous mind the inhuman and revolting attitude which suggests or espouses forgiveness and charity to these unspeakable criminals, the worst and most atrocious since the world began.

From the beginning to the advent of the Nazi period of murder and horrors against those countries and peoples they have overrun their peaceful inhabitants and foisted their bestial criminality on innocents, church leaders and religious leaders and representatives, while the people of Prussia and the Third Reich and their military, naval and army commanders down to their instructors, lecturers, and school teachers without exception, have in turn followed the old order of conquest and war implanted in them, even to carrying out the maniacal declaration of their present paperhanger Fuehrer that he will conquer the European continent or else destroy civilization. Deutschland uber Alles has forever been their cry. The Prussian people themselves are responsible as much as their so-called leaders, ministers, ambassadors, and representatives everywhere, for in their schools, colleges, and universities the children and youth have been educated for over a century in intolerance and for war and conquest, and the latter brought up and trained to destroy life and subjugate people and nations they are called upon to annihilate.

DESTRUCTION OF CIVILIZATION

The civilized world has had overwhelming and undisputable evidence of the design and attempts of the Prussians, the Nazis, and Hitler to destroy our civilization, and there is no escape from the realization that in this century of progressive Christian civilization we must guard against the recurrence of what is indelibly impressed on the righteous mind that the coming generations should and must be guaranteed and safeguarded against the horrors of war and the destruction of human lives and

property. Our world knows that this holocaust brought on by the bestial and maniacal design and purpose of these criminals which caused the present catastrophe at the cost of millions of lives, not mentioning the untold value of vested interests and property, and its otherwise immeasurable and superhuman losses amounting to such stupendous sums that cannot even be estimated, must be wiped out for all time to come and which if a recurrence is not provided against the lives of the future generations will be made unsafe and the world of the future not fit for a safe existence.

Unless measures are taken to insure our future, it is beyond doubt that within the next 20 years the world will again be subjected to another catastrophe by war.

AGGRESSION DOES NOT PAY

As for me, I agree with the American Council on Public Affairs that the whole Nazi organization should be destroyed, the power of the German Army reduced to zero, justice meted out to al' the war criminals, stolen property should be restored, and the German people made to know this time that aggression does not pay. Just what will or would follow unconditional surrender when the Germans realize that further fighting is futile is problematical. There is no doubt that chaos will prevail, unless we are prepared to take over by force, temporarily. The issue is not to be dodged. While we shall emerge from the war as the strongest world power, just how far we shall go and whether we shall assume the obligations of that power raise interesting questions for consideration. Anyway, it is safe to say that, first of all, Germany must be disarmed and demilitarized, and kept so. To do this we shall have to set up some form of organization to take over and to control the situation until the necessity for such action no longer exists. How long that will be, I have not the slightest idea. I do know that when we have won the war and guaranteed the peace we are in for an awful economic headache for years to come. We shall have to win the confidence of continental Europe, while the economic hegemony of the Reich over the occupied nations will have to be destroyed. We will find out that the defeat of the enemy does not spell peace.

Sidney Fay said in Current History for April that—

The problem is to treat Germany after the war in such a way that it will be the least menace to its neighbors and to the world in the future. There should be a reconstruction period, a cooling off period of 2 or 3 years after the cessation of hostilities, during which there should be miliary occupation of Germany by troops, concentrated at certain strategic points, and by air forces not necessarily based in Germany.

A BARBARIC FOREIGN BODY

Peter Nathan, in Germany and the Future, says:

Germany, not having been conquered by Rome, has remained a barbaric foreign body in Europe, unassimilated and dangerous. Germany is proud of being barbaric, sees everything emotionally, understands the forceful but not the reasonable argument, and is anti-intellectual.

Germany likes fascism, for she has always assumed that the rights of the state outweighed the rights of the individual. Germans have no tradition or conception of self-rule. The Germans and their culture must be dealt with as they are. It is fantastic and conceited to envision educating Germans to be what they are not. They must not be treated as projections of unconscious parts of ourselves, particularly the feared and loathed parts.

NO ARMISTICE THIS TIME

After the war there will be a widespread demand for revenge against Germany, especially on the part of the subjugated peoples. This demand might be met by continuing the war long after Germany requested an armistice until such time as the opportunity for revenge has been fully exploited. Not before this time should peace be made.

STRICT CONTROL

In the American Mercury of April 1943 I found Kingsbury Smith's article entitled "Our Government's Plan for Post-War Germany," from which I quote:

Strict control for an indefinite period of years under a policy of stern but just treatment is the objective envisaged for Germany by those officials in the State Department who are formulating plans for a defeated Axis. The plans involve total disarmament; swift punishment of its war criminals; drastic decentralization of the country as a single industrial and political unit; and temporary restriction of its economic life to the minimum required for self-subsistence. The idea is not to crush the German people permanently but to give them a chance to redeem themselves after a probationary period.

The first step envisaged after occupation under terms of unconditional surrender is the establishment of a supreme Allied military and civil government in accordance with a joint policy adopted in advance by the United States, Britain, and Soviet Russia. This Government would control the administration of Germany, supervise its disarmament, and direct the decentralization of the industries and general readjustment of the economic life.

TRIAL AND PUNISHMENT

Next in order would come the trial and punishment of war criminals. Unless this is done through an orderly process of justice, there is danger of widespread civil war in Europe. Plans are now under way for a United States commission to investigate war crimes. Its members may also serve on the United Nations Court which will be set up later to try the higher German officials.

Plans for gradual demobilization of the Army, and measures for food and medical relief and economic assistance are framed largely with a view to preventing revolution and chaos. Assistance beyond this point will be kept to a minimum, any surplus being directed to Germany's victims.

Aside from disarmament, and reparations in the form of goods and services, the most drastic action envisaged involves fundamental changes in Germany's national, political, and economic systems as a cure for militarism. Politically, this means possible dismemberment into separate states or regions; in the economic field, breaking up of cartels, decentralization and reduction of industries, those left intact being placed under strict Allied control, and, at first, benefits limited to subsistence levels.

To convert the Germans to a policy of peaceful cooperation, a great educational campaign is foreseen for which it is hoped to enlist the aid of the German churches, as well as an internationally supervised press and radio.

SUPPORT OF PUBLIC OPINION

The United States Government will need the support of public opinion in this country to make this plan work. If Germany should become a prey to the vengeance of the European peoples, the seeds of the Third World War will be sown.

So, my friends, although I have only touched the outer rim of a problem which runs around the globe, I have indicated my line of thought with respect to an answer to your question, "What about Germany?" Certainly I have afforded you an opportunity and furnished necessary material for your consideration and discussion of a few of the problems which confront the people as they look ahead toward the winning of the war, an event which is inevitable.

I doubt the effectuality of any program imposed by those who are depending entirely upon the hopes of an educational program.

The foregoing are a few of the things I think we should consider with respect to "What shall we do about Germany?"

JAPAN NEXT

Now comes "What shall we do about Japan?" I think so, too.

From a practical and a realistic standpoint, as a matter of self-preservation, profiting by our experience with Germany in the last war, and with the Japs in this, we should devastate and destroy the cities, drive the Japs into the jungles, then strafe and burn the jungles and drive those left out into the sea to drown, so long as there were any signs of life extant. Figuratively this is what we will have to do on a humanitarian basis, if you know what I mean.

The problem is not the same as that of Germany, for the Germans, as such, can understand what we mean and say and are talking about. Not so the Japs, who are neither civilized, nor human, nor do they understand what civilization means, nor wish to do so. That is no idle statement. It is a fact that their so-called educated class fail absolutely to comprehend the ideas, ideologies, and ideals of the Occident. They never will.

Their intent and purpose heretofore held, which will not be realized, is the domination of Asia. That we can neither tolerate nor permit, nor can or will Russia or China.

Of course, I realize that in the final arbitrament and at the peace table one Mr. Stalin will make it his business to see to it that Japan is put in its place, and kept there. And I also know China will stand out boldly claiming our assistance to help to make it the dominant power among the Mongolians. We owe much to the inventors of gunpowder and to the culture of the early dynasties. We have an obligation to see to it that we keep China our friend and befriend her in our attempt to keep the peace of the Orient.

WE WILL HELP

Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek will have our help and that of the British. It must be so, as a matter of self-preservation.

Realistically speaking, the Japs deserve just such treatment as a nation as we would accord individual murderers, rapists, and criminals guilty of felony. They must be dealt with along that line.

No fake or fantastic ideas with respect to Christianizing the sons of the Rising

Sun should influence our action. It is a waste of time and effort of men and of material for us to longer try to make a white man out of a yellow rat. It cannot be done.

To the extent that Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek will take over the job of straightening out the situation as against the Japanese we can well afford to lend any necessary assistance to the cause.

Then I neglected to suggest that I do not care how far Stalin goes or what he undertakes to do as to Europe, with Britain's cooperation, so long as what he does, and they do, as to the European post-war status, so long as we are not involved, and they cooperate—for they will relieve us to that extent.

WE HAVE OUR OWN TROUBLES

We just cannot run the world alone. We will have enough to do right here at home to clean up the economic mess in which we are wading, due to the excesses of the New Deal administration. That does not mean we intend to shirk our responsibility overseas.

We need not talk too much about what Russia, China, or Britain may be planning in Europe and Asia, nor do we have to worry. The more they do the less responsibility we will have to assume.

We do propose to join with them to see that eventually the terms of the peace and for the peace of the world shall be such that, when signed, sealed, and delivered, the pact for the peace shall outline a definite program which will be workable for the ages, and which shall guarantee a peace that shall be enduring.

COLOR NOT THE ONLY BAR

Then again, it is no use to talk about educating the Japanese. That is not possible from our standpoint. They do not wish to, and will not, much more cannot, learn from the Occident. They will not be Christianized. They are vipers and rattlesnakes in human form, which infest the globe.

Not only by color, but by everything else which marks the difference between the civilized and barbaric, they stand marked for extirpation, nationally, as a world power. They are committing national suicide I hope. Their place at the peace table should be in a closely guarded cell. They should have a fair trial but they should be treated as is their due under the definition of criminals to whom retributive justice is to be dispensed and administered. We should not be mollycoddles. It is they or we, and do not miss it.

So long as any opportunity is afforded Japan to reestablish itself militarily will the peril of another world war be always present. She must be ruled by an iron rod in an iron hand. She cannot claim mercy. Justice is all she can demand. That she shall have. Experience and self-preservation should motivate the United Nations to take such steps with respect to Japan as will guarantee our safety for all time, at whatever the cost.

CHINA POTENTIALLY GREAT

Now, China is not unaware of its potential power, and victory will enhance and increase its nationalistic attitude. China might well insist upon Japan's complete disarmament, require reparations, tremendous in dollars-and-cents value and the imposition of penalties stringent and severe. We should cooperate; for the enforcement of China's demands, of course, would and will depend upon the cooperation of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia.

China assumedly will go along with the Allied Nations, which will go along with her. We will meet her claims and assure her the place so rightfully hers. We will assist her to modernize as we afford her carefully controlled financial and technical assistance so to do.

Victory over Germany is inevitable, and figuratively speaking, must come soon.

Germany can and will know this time what it is to be licked.

The war with Japan cannot end soon, nor under the same conditions as will predominate when comes the collapse of Germany.

NO INTERNAL COLLAPSE IN JAPAN

The Japanese are so constituted that Japan will not collapse internally. They will only yield after they are cruelly crushed. Military defeat will not end the fanaticism of Japan. They must be completely crushed, and the possibility of resurgence at a period foreseeable by any now living must be destroyed and obliterated. It must be made actual and not a theory. It will have to be, for such military success is a prerequisite to the prevention of the recurrence of a racial conflict. This will involve, as say those who have lived with and among and know the Japanese, the practical demolition and destruction of the Japanese homeland. The only good Jap is a dead one.

A complete independence for China will have to be assured. Japan will have to be reduced to a dependency on China and all the territory which she has taken from China she will have to return. Korea will have to be made an independent state; the mandated Pacific Islands taken over by Australia or the United States.

All Japanese property on Chinese soil, the Japanese Navy and the Japanese merchant marine, will have to be turned over to China or somebody else as an indemnity. China's independence must be recognized and secured.

This is not all the story by a long shot, but it is some of the things which have impressed me as necessary, as I have been undertaking to try to answer the question, "What shall be done with Japan?"

A PERMANENT PACIFIC ORDER

You know as well as I do that no lasting peace is possible without the establishment of a permanent order in the Pacific.

The myth and the legend of the invincibility of Japan must be shattered beyond all reestablishment. This can only happen by reason of a tremendous military defeat, a thorough disarmament, and the relinquishment by Japan of all that which she has acquired since the year of her conquest began. She must be made to pay the price for her treachery, be treated as an outlaw, and never again permitted to be able to achieve such domination as that to which she has aspired.

The military power of Japan must be wiped out and its empire shrunk to pre-expansion confines.

On the other hand, China's territorial integrity and full sovereignty must be vindicated.

By removing the stigma of exclusion the United States has laid the basis for post-war cooperation with China. A united democratic China, working in partnership with the United States, is a basic factor for the preservation of peace in Asia in the days to come. Such a state of affairs is not only predictable but possible and will result.

To summarize: Japan should be beaten to its knees; it should lose its empire; it should pay reparations; it should have its industry regulated to the end that there should never be any recurrence of such a state of affairs as prompted it to challenge the domination of the world, and if necessary there should be military occupation of Japan so long as may be necessary to protect the world. Its punishment should be condign and commensurate with the magnitude of the crime committed.

THE JAPANESE PEOPLE ARE GUILTY

The Japanese people certainly are responsible for the war, though they may live in an outmoded social system. Any suggestion to the contrary so far as I see it is propaganda, anti-American, and against a peace such as we propose to make.

I reserve the right to change my mind and to admit that I am wrong, when I am shown so to be, but answering the questions I have been asked, as of today, I have said what I think.

Retributive justice, that suits me.

One step toward the day when the blind goddess will hold the scales in her hands is the adoption of the Connally resolution as amended. Cut to the bone, stripped of all persiflage, it means that America stands ready to give what it may take to win the war and pay a price to insure a peace which shall endure.

HOW SHALL THE PEACE BE MADE?

What is involved in the peace which is to come? How shall we make such a peace?

The method of making such a peace must give all of us great concern.

In speaking at Minneapolis on September 3, Mr. Hoover gave the first new idea for making world peace in 150 years. In presenting it, he said:

> Nations have often enough been successful in making war. But nations have never yet been successful in making peace. More and more over the centuries the world has developed the art and method of making war. But the world has never developed an art and method of making peace. More and more the methods of peave have resulted in a wider spread of catastrophe.
>
> Surely it is time we have a new approach to peace making. * * *
>
> I suggest a new approach * * * principles and program are at least realistic and positive. They suggest a common ground over

which those of divergent views on particular questions can travel with unity toward our common purpose of lasting peace.

I was impressed by the speech in its entirety. It certainly was and is a new approach. You who heard him or have read the speech will recall that he said:

Out of 5,000 years of war, an illusion has been built up in the human mind that war can be ended and peace made by signing a piece of paper. Especially if it is signed with pomp and circumstance. The world has deluded itself before now that such a signed paper is the dawn of a new day. Hasty documents written at the end of wars have an infernal way of becoming the prospectus of renewed war.

We must learn that it is the conduct of nations over years which counts, not the papers they sign. A little good will goes further than documents.

There are those who believe we have only to quickly set up some league or some council or some world institution or some union or world parliament and then unload all of our problems upon it. It is not that easy.

When issues are vast and intricate it is easy to dodge them that way and then announce that the world will go to the dogs if evil men fail to agree.

Neither anything like the League of Nations nor any kind of world institution to keep the peace could succeed amid the passions, the political and economic chaos, that press on the heels of war.

There are a hundred gigantic problems that must be settled between nations before such an agency would have a chance. To force its adoption prematurely is to condemn it to inevitable failure.

The purpose of any world institution must be to preserve peace, not to make it.

They are two entirely different jobs. They must not be confused. Having lived through Versailles, and having had to deal with its consequences, I can give you an idea of what I mean. The Treaty of Versailles consisted of 613 paragraphs, of which only 26 dealt with the League Covenant. It was the 587 outside the League that did most to kill the League, and certainly it was the sins of omission and commission in these 587 paragraphs which laid some of the kindling for this war.

To solve these problems, to allay the forces of destruction, and to build a new spirit in the world requires time, and a decisive hand which no world-wide institution can exert.

The temple of peace cannot be erected until its foundations are well laid. If we make a good peace, it will largely preserve itself. If we make a bad one like Versailles, we shall simply be laying the kindling for World War No. 3. And no machinery for preserving peace will stop it taking fire.

* * * * *

If we are to have peace, any agreement or any treaty in democracies must be ratified by the people at home. The people must have time to debate, understand, and decide.

And we should be careful that our words do not carry more to other nations than we will perform and confirm. Neither by executive action nor Congressional resolution nor public assurance should we give the impression that the United States can be committed to anything without full free action by the Senate of the United States.

The Daily Mirror hit the nail squarely on the head when commenting on the speech it said:

Mr. Hoover is one of our greatest statesmen. He knows there is no quick cure for war or the causes of war. And that any attempted quick cure is dangerous. His warning is simply the wisdom of the old adage: "Make haste slowly."

We are winning the war as the result of long, painstaking, toilsome and bloody effort, with our plans constantly subject to change.

Who can be so foolish as to believe that the peace will be won more easily? Or that preconceived blueprints can possibly fit conditions the unfolding of which are beyond human power to foretell?

ARBITRATION FOR ARBITRAMENT BY WAR

When I graduated from Norwich University in 1896 I was slated to be one of the commencement-day speakers, and the subject assigned me was arbitration as a substitute for war.

I became thoroughly convinced that arbitration could be utilized so effectively as to avoid the ills and the evils of a shooting war. I was wrong. I remember how I was so enthusiastic that for my peroration and as the hopeful answer to end any and all arguments which might be made against my thesis, and as a conclusion I quoted Longfellow's poem which runs:

Down the dark future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease;
And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, "Peace!"
Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the skies!
But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise.

The only commentary I have to make is to the effect that almost before the echoes of my voice had ceased to rebound and reverberate in the halls of that old church wherein I spoke, the battleship *Maine* was blown up in the harbor of Habana, and we were indulging in the arbitrament of a war with Spain.

Human nature has not changed.

The road to universal peace is a tortuous path leading down the dark future through long generations involving the Christionization of the world—an end devoutly to be sought, eventually to be obtained—but obviously ages hence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting on this Armistice Day, which has particular significance for all of us, that we might well, in a spirit of humility, examine the reasons for our failure during the decade that followed the beginning of the long armistice, and during the two and one-half decades of failure which followed. I had originally intended to make some comments on the State Department's apologia for its own actions, War and Peace, 1931–41, but to do so would have involved indulging perhaps in some recriminations and some spirit of criticism for which perhaps this day is not the day and this time is not the time.

I can only say with regard to that, that having in mind the warning of Ambassador Grew on the 27th of January 1941, in his famous cablegram from Tokyo, that the Japanese intended to attack the United States of America by surprise at Pearl Harbor—note that I said "this warning was given," and here it is in the official Government document—on the 27th of January 1941, and the people of the United States of America and the Congress of the United States of America were not informed by the President of that warning by our own duly constituted American Ambassador, nor were we informed of his further warnings in September 1941 and in November and in December 1941, until the day "that will live in infamy."

Why do I bring up on this occasion, Armistice Day, reference to what happened those 10 months preceding Pearl Harbor? I do it because it is my conviction that an administration and a government which would deliberately keep in the dark the people of the United States of America as to the true facts of he appalling menace which overhung them might—and I say "Yes," it would—conceal from the people of the United States matters of eminent importance and of grave purport pertaining to the continuing development of our foreign policy, because we may only judge the actions of an administration, yes, and of the President, in the future by his actions in the past.

I am glad to say, incidentally, that in discussing matters of this importance, we are honored by having on the right side of the aisle one Member of the Democratic Party. I would feel perhaps that I could not go on with a condemnation of the action of the administration—I am glad to see the majority leader has entered, and that gives me the courage to go on.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to recognize the fact that two—no, three—members of the majority party are now present on this Armistice Day at a time when we are discussing foreign policies of the United States of America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I prefer to continue, but I cannot refuse to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says he is going to condemn the administration?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, perhaps the gentleman misunderstands me. I am going to criticize those actions of our Government and of its administration with which I do not agree and with which I think the people of the United States would not agree if they were fully informed of them. I am complaining of the unwillingness to inform the people. So if I may direct my attention particularly to that for a moment, I have heard and you have heard many people say that they do not like the policy of this administration, but they will add at times and out of a state of great mental confusion admixed, perhaps, with a feeling of loyalty which they may feel, permits of no other statement, they will add, "But I do approve of our foreign

policy.". Now I have been wondering what that means. It seems to me that it means simply this, that we like to be winning; that we confuse great military progress, military skill, military advantage, and success with which we have been blessed a great deal during the past year, we confuse these reports of highly satisfactory conduct of our military and naval forces with foreign policy. At the same time I think an examination of our foreign policy will clearly reveal that a consistent foreign policy does not exist and has not existed in this country during the past decade.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SCOTT. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I just wanted to ask my colleague from Pennsylvania whether he thought we had any consistent, realistic foreign policy from the time when the Republicans in the Senate scrapped Wilson's peace treaty down to the time of the Roosevelt administration?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad the gentleman asked me that, because only this morning I read, and the gentleman doubtless read it too, the League of Nations was defeated after the last war by the votes of 42 Democratic and 13 Republican Senators.

The gentleman may get such consolation as he likes from statistics.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is the gentleman aware of the votes on the various reservations that were inserted in the League of Nations which emasculated the League of Nations before it was formally given the death blow?

Mr. SCOTT. It is my hope that we can look forward and profit by the mistakes which were made regardless of by whom they might have been made. They were made, as I recall, during a Democratic administration, although I had hoped not to have to refer to that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] has referred to the rather jig-saw-puzzle type of foreign policy which the administration has pursued during the past 10 years. In order to complete the record I feel it should also be pointed out that the London Economic Conference, which bid fair to bring the world together on some basis of working agreement such as we hope may emanate from the Moscow Conference—that London Economic Conference was torpedoed by Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think that is correct and——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. If I may just finish this thought first: I think it is well also that we seek to erect a better international organization as a result of the experiences of this war than might have come from the immaturity of American world experience after the last war when we were faced with the possibility of an international organization which would give the British Commonwealth of Nations 6 votes to 1 for America. I think that, if the passage of time has done nothing else for us, it has, at least, taught us the unwisdom of overbalancing the power of any one nation against other nations either in international organizations or in the menace of such imbalance when it precipitates the "dread arbitrament of war."

I now yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to make just this observation for the RECORD: How inappropriate it is for some of my Republican friends to use Armistice Day for personal attacks—not so much the gentleman himself as others—on the President of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts does not refer to me and I am glad he does not. I had, of course, made no reference to any personal attacks as such. A man in public office must expect to be criticized for his deeds, and I, as the gentleman knows, have consistently opposed any personal attack on any man in public office as usually being unwise, unfair, and inconsiderate.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for just one more observation?

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield this once, but I must get on with my speech, for I have not yet developed my major premise.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield this once?

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I serve notice that for some minutes I shall refuse to yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman in that I favor for the future a consistent and realistic foreign policy independent of party, that it shall be a national rather than a party matter—and I am sure the gentleman feels the same way, and I am sure the Congress can do much along that line. But I am against bringing up recriminations for the past which might defeat the two parties on the question of foreign policy when they are just about to arrive at an accord and an agreement upon it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will say to the gentleman that he knows I feel exactly as he does, for example, about the Fulbright resolution. I feel sure he realizes that a foreign policy should not be a matter of partisan advantage, nor should foreign policy in any sense be hinged upon forthcoming elections or primary contests; nor should military or naval plans or procedures have any relationship whatever to politics. It is my sincere hope that they will not have any such relationship.

I do hope that the Congress of the United States can present a solid front on foreign policy, but we cannot hope for such a front unless we are informed as to what is going on behind the screen of secret covenants secretly arrived at. The basis of free debate, of free discussion, of free interchange of ideas is information, and the sources of information are within the control of the administration. If one feels that the sources of information are not being made available, what better place to make such a statement than here in the Halls of Congress? And I do so feel.

Now, if I may proceed, I will take up the matter of defining the term "foreign policy." It can be defined variously, in many ways. It is our relationship with other nations for the protection of the United States, and for the preservation of an harmonious relationship with other nations. Where does that foreign policy come from? Does it come from the Executive, who high up above all the common run of mankind seated in a pink aura of remoteness hands down by executive decree or dictate our foreign policy? Or does it come from the people? I quote now from an article in Fortune magazine for August 1943, this statement:

> Responsibility in the conduct of foreign affairs is not merely an issue between Congress and the Executive. It is equally an issue between the people and the Executive. Many people are growing increasingly uneasy about the future—uneasy and suspicious as it begins to appear that although this may be a people's war in the sense that the people are working, sacrificing, and fighting, it is not going to be a people's peace.
>
> Public uneasiness is rapidly turning into suspicion on the subject of post-war policy. There is scarcely a thoughtful publicist in the country, other than well-known apologists for the status quo, who has not in recent months commented upon the unhealthy condition of public morale and who has not called for a clear statement of war aims to fortify men's souls.
>
> The intellectual leaders of the Nation—educators, churchmen, leaders of unions, clubs, professional and trade associations—are apparently as confused as the rest of the public. Large numbers of these men, many with organizations established for action, have besieged Government offices in Washington asking what they should do, where they should start, what line they should take in the job of public education. They have thus far received the cold shoulder. They foresee a disastrous repetition of 1919 approaching, without being able to do much about it.

So I call attention on Armistice Day, commemorating the day on which the long armistice began, to my hope that by directing attention to the complete absence of a willingness to give the people of this country the information that they should have on which to base a people's foreign policy, a veritable American foreign policy, that we may not be untrue to those dead who have handed on to us their torch from failing hands. It is my contention that a foreign policy can only come up from the people, not down from the Executive. The Government cannot be the judge and the critic of its own policies. The people will judge and the people cannot deliberate without access to the facts. Criticism by the press of the administration is evidence of an unwillingness to recognize this concrete fact. The administration conceals its lack of a definite foreign policy behind broad generalities and, I may add, upon partial admissions, such as highly incomplete stories from the Moscow Conference and the release of only those

driblets of information which they think we the people of America are entitled to have. It boils down to the recurring fact that the administration still does not trust the American people.

I hope the passage of an election day has had no connection with the fact that we heard about Italy at a time when the Italian vote in the big cities was somewhat in issue and you hear about what happened in Moscow in relation to Poland after election day because the news as regards Italy was good and the news as regards Poland may not be so good. The same thing may be said as to the Baltic States. I hope that when the news comes out, in leaks and bits as usual, it will not appear that election day had anything to do with the timing of the release of the various matters which took place at the Moscow Conference.

As you know, on yesterday, I introduced a resolution requesting the Speaker to invite the distinguished and beloved Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, to address the Members of the House of Representatives on the Moscow Conference. Why? I did that in view of the revelations that have come out as to what has gone before on the part of this administration, for example, the stabilization program, the world bank, and various matters relating to foreign affairs, which we usually learn from the London newspapers before the American Congress is told of it. It seems to me fitting that this Congress, which has heard very distinguished, able, and honorable heads of foreign governments, might be permitted the refreshing privilege of listening to an American fresh from the scene of diplomatic action, whose mind is now filled with his contacts with the Russians, with the Chinese Ambassador, and with the British representatives. The people would like to know what goes on. They do not like it piecemeal. I verily believe they do not want it doled out by the administration, a little here and a little there as the administration believes we may be able to digest it, but fully, freely, and frankly, because it means so much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we do not know what our foreign policy is—in Europe or elsewhere. Does it rest as it began upon the support of Fascist elements in north Africa and in Italy? Does it rest upon the support of a post-war Germany, strong and fully constituted except for an independent Austria? We have heard from the Moscow Conference that Austria is to be liberated. We have not heard whether she is again to be a head without a body or whether she is to include part of south Germany or not, but the inference, I submit, is that what has happened in Moscow has been that British and Russian viewpoints as to the advantages to each of them—but not to us—of a strong post-war Germany may have prevailed. I think the American people are entitled to know, for example, whether our American Government conceded the British point of view that a strong post-war Germany may be necessary as a buffer against Russia or the counterpoint, the Russian point of view, that a strong post-war Germany should be preserved as a buffer against England, or were our interests fully considered, our interests which might well contemplate a Germany dismembered, reconstituted in less dangerous forms from one end of her borders to the other, with a separated, sterilized Prussia no longer able to dominate a war-minded nation, with other sections of Germany divided, so that we shall not face every generation a central European nation breaking its bounds and precipitating a war which involves substantially all of the nations of the world. Some may say the Moscow Conference could not bind us; only a treaty can do that; but there is ample evidence that the President may not wish to take his chances on a treaty, preferring executive agreements roughly restoring the status quo ante bellum. If such agreements can be kept secret long enough, armies of occupation may give way gradually to governments established within the old pre-war boundaries, and the American people would then be confronted with a fait accompli. Such a condition might be too late for treaties, but only a little too early for the next European conflict.

We do not know whether we are committed to all of the post-war little states of Europe; we do not know how our Government feels about European federations of small states. We have as yet only a guide to that in the Atlantic Charter. The Atlantic Charter states, in point II:

> The United States and Britain desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Point III of the Atlantic Charter states:

> The two nations respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

What does this mean? Does it mean what it says, that we favor the re-creation of Europe with about 25 separate petty states, many of them uneconomic, and each with the right to any kind of government—royal, totalitarian, or oligarchic—which it itself might choose, all under the shadow of a territorially unchanged Germany, perhaps only outwardly repentant? Does it mean we oppose federation of various states in Europe? Does it mean we are more interested in what the Atlantic Charter calls "due respect for the existing obligations" of governments than we are in right and justice and the preservation of a democratic world and the cooperation of democratically inclined nations for the perpetuation of an enduring peace?

We do not know, because all our foreign policy today appears to consist of is the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and the partially revealed program of the Moscow Conference. I submit we are entitled to more than that; and I make this point on this day of armistice, the beginning of the long armistice, because the armistice is not over, and our debt to our honored dead is still undischarged. The armistice will not be over and there will not be peace in the land until an informed, intelligent, free people, dealing with other informed, intelligent, free peoples, arrive at a just, workable, and enduring compact among the nations.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], chairman, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], secretary of the Nonpartisan Farm Machinery Committee, have asked me to announce that they are going to have the department heads over in the caucus room at 3 o'clock this afternoon, at which time they will try to find out the exact situation as far as farm machinery is concerned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a brief address by Robert Simpson, Jr., president of the National Society of the Children of the American Revolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing to be in this House today when general comment is being made on our foreign policy, especially as it may apply to the nations today. I am sorry more Members are not present to hear what has been said and probably will yet be said in the House.

My remarks are apart from foreign policy and have to do with domestic affairs. I shall not indulge in names or criticisms either of the administration or any of the so-called bureaucratic heads unless such names appear in some article I may choose to quote.

Back in 1939 it was my privilege to fight against the setting up of a little government within a government then known as the Metropolitan Federal Housing Authority. I was fearful of its precept in bureaucratic control. There were no experiences upon which I could predicate claim of knowledge and I was constrained to rely upon native instinct, which provoked thoughts entirely too vigorous for silence. As a result of that fight I was defeated for public office in the following election. Many of the people who aided in my defeat were those

who expected liberal subsidies in low-cost shelter rent. Today these same people have learned something about bureaucratic control.

I am in receipt of many letters appealing for my aid against the combined effort of two local branches of central bureaus which are in direct violation of the intent of this body's enactment of law and have conspired to circumvent that law and abrogate their own directives and orders that have until this late date effectively applied to the owners of private property all over the land.

The original claim of the Metropolitan Federal Housing Authority in my district was that the presence of slums in which the ill-fed, the ill-housed, and the ill-clothed were compelled to live was conducive to bad health conditions and a high rate of juvenile delinquency, and that these slums were breeding places for the cultivation of major crime. They said, "If we can provide low-cost housing or shelter rent for these people we can correct most of these ills."

The program at that time was to go into the low-cost housing projects. They were provided by various amounts of contribution from the local subdivision. It was intended that the local project should be tax free. The Federal Government was making a cash contribution, and bonds were sold by the Metropolitan Federal Housing Authority to mature and be amortized over a period of 60 years.

The rate of rent was predicated upon the amount necessary to be collected from year to year to meet that amortization, and as a result the rent was subsidized and the rate was low. The purpose of the low rent, of course, was to meet the demand for proper housing for the underprivileged, and that rule together with other rules promulgated by the Authority, among which was a rule that if a man's income exceeded by five times the amount of the shelter rent he would be caused to move out, to make place for another person who may be underprivileged. This also occurred in the district and in the city from which I come. There was a segregation of races in these different projects, one being provided for white, and another for colored people. After the project to which the colored people were being assigned had been opened to the public, that they might occupy it, it was later learned there was an insufficient number of colored families to fill the 300 units. They then thereafter invited white people to occupy apartments with the colored people, and more than half the apartments were filled by the whites, with less than half by colored people. Then came the war and high wages. When the war and high wages came into effect it was not long before most of the tenants in all the projects were earning an amount in excess of five times the shelter rent.

The first move was made upon the part of the Federal Housing Authority by slight increases, and there came into being a second governmental agency known as the O. P. A., one whose operation was to control rents. They stepped in and took possession of private property, so to speak, through the rent, in that they fixed a time certain for the amount of rent to be paid, as of the first of April 1941, and in addition fixed rigid rules whereby private property could not or could be sold, demanding in the rule, if I remember correctly, that 33⅓ percent of the amount for which property was bargained to be sold must be paid in cash, and that the money was not to be borrowed to make the initial payment. So, substantially, this second agency took possession of all of the rental property in private ownership. The Constitution was substantially set aside in that act, of course. Then, after that was done, there was much turmoil in the city from which I come. There were clauses included whereby if the private owners increased the rent there would be certain penalties. Before stating those penalties I first had better say what the propaganda put out by this rent control agency was. This paper or pamphlet was distributed generally to the renters, and the landlord. Under the title "Rent Control" it says:

HOLD DOWN LIVING COSTS—AIDS IN ALL-OUT WAR EFFORT

When your rent dollar shrinks in value, your pay shrinks with it. Then your pay envelope is like a short blanket on a cold night. It no longer covers you. But rent control can keep your rent dollar from shrinking.

Next to food, rent makes the biggest hole in your pay. Unlike your grocery bill, rent is not made up of many adjustable items. When steak goes up in price, you can buy some other food instead. When rent goes up, you either pay it and cut down on clothes or other essentials, or you move. It costs money to move, perhaps more than you could save by moving, and there may not be a cheaper place available.

If anyone attempted to charge more rent, the following penalty was then provided:

If a landlord charges more than the legal rent, the tenant may sue him and he may have to pay three times the overcharge or $50, whichever is the greater, plus attorney fees and court costs as damages to the tenant.

What is the record of this rent agency of which I speak, the Metropolitan Federal Housing Agency? See if the rent control gave renters any protection from being evicted. I read now from a news item in the Akron Beacon Journal of February 5, 1943:

UNITED STATES HOUSING OUSTS SOLDIER'S WIFE, BABIES

Mrs. Frances Blondheim is a soldier's wife and the mother of two babies.

She's out today trying to find a place for those babies to stay. Somewhere, too, she must find money for rent.

Mrs. Blondheim—small, dark, and 25—has been ordered out of the Government housing project known as the Edgewood homes.

That wouldn't be so heartbreaking—the order to get out—if the Government, which has taken her husband, had provided her with funds to look after her family.

Mrs. Blondheim says her husband was inducted 3 months ago. Under the dependents' law she should get $72 a month. She says she has yet to see her first check.

Technically, Mrs. Blondheim is in the wrong, and that's how the Akron Housing Authority, which represents the Government, is looking at her case—from the technical standpoint.

Her case is this:

Mrs. Blondheim and her babies—one 14 months old and the other 3 months old—have been living in a three-room apartment at the Edgewood homes with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Richards.

TOLD TO MOVE

The mother was told to move by Mrs. M. P. Lauer, the supervisor of the project. Mrs. Lauer is the wife of M. P. Lauer, the $7,500-a-year director of the Akron Housing Authority.

Mrs. Blondheim was told that, under Government housing rules, she could not share an apartment that had been rented to another family unit—in this case, two persons, Mr. and Mrs. Richards.

Mr. and Mrs. Richards were occupying the apartment when Mrs. Blondheim moved in. Legally, she was never a tenant.

The Richards say they asked for a larger apartment and were refused, again on technical grounds. Mrs. Blondheim says she applied for an apartment for herself and was told she could not qualify.

She was informed, Mrs. Blondheim says, that she could not get an apartment unless she was a war worker.

BABIES NEED CARE

"I want to go to work," Mrs. Blondheim says. "But first I've got to find a place to keep my babies."

That, in brief, is the case history, as supplied by Mrs. Blondheim.

When Mrs. Lauer was contacted and asked to supply her side of the story, she said: "I don't want to make any statements. You don't have all the facts. But you'll have to call my husband."

Mrs. Lauer reluctantly revealed that her husband was in Cleveland at the offices of the Federal Housing Authority. "But," she said, "I don't know why you have to bother him for a little thing like this." She said he was seeing about an "important" project.

"NOTHING TO SAY"

Lauer, reached in Cleveland, at first said, "I have nothing to say." Clarence May, the authority's attorney, had this to say:

"An applicant for an apartment in the Edgewood Homes must, on his or her application, state the number of persons who will occupy the apartment. Then they are accorded sufficient space for that number of persons.

"Under the terms of the lease, they are not permitted to bring in other persons to share the apartment."

May said Richards was notified last December to remove Mrs. Blondheim and her babies from the apartment but that he became obstinate.

He pointed out that if extra persons were allowed to crowd into one apartment in one project, "the whole system would break down."

"We must treat them all on the same basis," he said.

Lauer later made a statement pointing out that as the situation existed in the Richards apartment, three adults and two children were living in a one-bedroom apartment.

The Housing Authority has a letter in its files from the Richards, Lauer said, which states that they intended to move last November and that "they had a place and the money."

Later, Lauer said, the Richards ignored this letter. "They took the position," Lauer charged, "that it was a Government project and they could stay as long as they liked."

The Blondheims were married in 1941, a year after the draft law became effective. He was working in an Arlington Street sandwich shop when he was inducted.

The husband, William Leonard, is 22. At present he is stationed in New Orleans, La.

Mrs. Mary McIntosh, coordinator of the civilian defense council's child-care corps, is going to find a place where Mrs. Blondheim can board her children and perhaps find a room for herself.

COMES UP FEBRUARY 10

Meantime the Richards are in danger of losing their apartment in the Edgewood homes.

The Akron housing authority has served summons upon Richards to appear in municipal court on February 10 at 9 a. m.

Richards says he has paid his rent promptly, and apparently his crime was in offering a place of refuge to a soldier's wife and her children. Technically the wrong thing to do.

Lauer said the Cleveland office of the Federal Housing Authority has instructed him to "proceed with the case and win it."

It is a little thing that a soldier and his wife shall be denied a place to live, in the opinion of a $7,500 director and his wife, who is on the pay roll as supervisor of this project.

Now, what has occurred with reference to this rent control? I have in my hand a receipt sent me by an inhabitant of one of these projects. It lists thereon the rent for November 1943. The total of that rent is $18, including utility charges. I think the shelter rent is $13.50.

I also have a letter sent that tenant by the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority, and it reads as follows—I think your attention should be especially directed to this:

MY DEAR MR. ———: The Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority has recently adopted a revised graded rent schedule applicable to all tenants of Elizabeth Park Homes. The schedule provides a series of rent grades ranging from $16.50 to $37.50 per month. Rents are set on the basis of the total income received by all members of the household, and the revision of incomes is in accordance with the agreement the local housing authority has with the Government.

I would call your attention to the fact that originally the rule was, if you earned 5 times the amount of the shelter rent you were invited to get out of the house. Now, the condition, according to this communication, is that the snoopers of the Federal Housing Authority in Akron investigate the place where you work and the pay roll, and determine how much you earn, then come back and render you a bill in the form of a lease for the continued rent at 20 percent or one-fifth of that total income; a complete contravention of what was originally promulgated as the reason for cheap, low-cost shelter rent. To continue with the letter, it says:

The top rent of $37.50 has been set by the Rent Control Division of the Office of Price Administration and represents only a just amount which can be charged by the Housing Authority.

In keeping with the above explanation, the lease for your present dwelling will be canceled November 30, 1943. Effective December 1, 1943 your rent will be $32.50, constituting substantially a 75-percent increase.

A new lease will be prepared for your signature.

Now, let us see what the renter's right is. This is the last instruction in the communication:

Come in at your earliest convenience and sign same.

I pause for a moment on that. All rights of the individual here originally intended to have low-cost shelter rent are being violated by two agencies under bureaucratic control of the Government that were originally instituted to afford that very person some protection, while the private property owner is being denied a privilege Government agencies are exacting for themselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee has examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 600. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith; and

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. Res. 95. An act relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 12, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

907. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

908. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 678. A bill designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect, nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified; without amendment (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 853. Report recommending the disposition of records in various departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 854. Report recommending the disposition of records in various departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 855. Report recommending the disposition of records in various departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 856. Report recommending the disposition of records for various departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3651. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 3652. A bill to provide that credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be allowed for certain service in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution requesting the Speaker to invite Secretary of State Cordell Hull to address the Congress in joint session on the subject of the Moscow Conference; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3653. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise A. Ellison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3654. A bill for the relief of Byron Ennis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3507. By Mr. BARRETT: Petition of Rev. Warren M. Davis and 20 other citizens of Greybull, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3508. Also, petition of Mrs. D. Whitton and 18 other citizens of Greybull, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3509. Also, petition of Mabelle M. Schwoob and eight other citizens of Cody, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3510. Also, petition of the Mothers' Club, Ada Jones, secretary, of Cheyenne, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3511. Also, petition of the Mothers of the Cheyenne Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ada Purcell, secretary, urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3512. Also, petition of Ralph Lorenz and 25 other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., and immediate vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3513. Also, petition of Margaret M. Somers and 11 other citizens of Moorcroft, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082 which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3514. Also, petition of Mrs. L. G. Landers and 14 other citizens of Sundance, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3515. Also, petition of Ora O. Smith and 23 other citizens of Sheridan, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3516. Also, petition of J. E. Frick and 23 other citizens of Sheridan, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3517. Also, petition of Mrs. B. S. Dittmar and four other citizens of Cheyenne, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3518. Also, petition of Marion L. Ainsworth and 23 other citizens of Ten Sleep, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3519. Also, petition of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church of Laramie, Wyo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3520. Also, petition of the Gillette Chapter of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mrs. C. H. Shanklin, president, urging passage of House bill 2082, which would enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3521. By Mr. DIMOND: Petition of sundry citizens of Anchorage, Alaska, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3522. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of Ira A. Fo lesong and 29 other residents of Barnesville, Ohio, and nearby villages, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3523. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Matt Knezovich and other citizens of Windsor Heights, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3524. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Emma MacLean; of Alhambra, and six others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2032); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3525. Also, petition of Ednah D. Georgi, of Alhambra, and 14 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3526. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Rev. R. M. Broadbooks and 13 other citizens of Newport, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3527. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Vesta M. Bentley and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3528. Also, petition of Mrs. C. M. Barnes and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3529. Also, petition of Mrs. E. D. Heimbigner and 15 other residents of Odessa, Wash., protesting against the enactment of a sales tax by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3530. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association of Western State Engineers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a recommendation that increased rather than decreased support be given to the snow-survey and water-supply forecast program of the Division of Irrigation of the United States Department of Agriculture, in order to permit the matching of Federal funds with State and other public funds, as well as private funds devoted to this purpose; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

3531. Also, petition to repeal sections 811 (d) (5), 811 (e) (2), 811 (g) (4), and 1000 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3532. Also, petition of the Spiritualist Lodge, No. 1, of Santurce, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution opposing the Cole amendment to Senate bill 981; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the heat and burden of days that drain our strength and demand our best we would find at noontide the springs by the wayside that flow from the eternal silence of the Most High; for, as the hart panteth after the water brooks, so thirsteth our souls after Thee, O God. May we not miss the wells of living water whose elixir alone can refresh and restore our bodies and spirits, saving us from physical exhaustion, from spiritual impoverishment, from the numbness of routine, and from all bitterness of heart.

Set our feet on lofty places. If we have been engrossed in narrow duties and petty concerns when the vast needs of humanity are calling aloud for prophetic vision and Christlike sympathy, we pray Thee to open our eyes; that great things may be regarded as great and small things as small. May the sparkling dew of morning freshness glisten upon the common tasks and the trivial rounds of daily duties. Override the errors of our faulty judgments. Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days be higher than our own. So may Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in all the earth. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, No-

vember 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 4, 1943:

S. 970. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; and

S. 1151. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons.

On November 11, 1943:

S. 400. An act relating to the organization and functions of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith;

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 124)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $2,500,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 127)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation to pay a claim for damages to privately owned property, amounting to $125.62 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 125)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $225,000, for printing and binding (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 123)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed authorization for the expenditure of $4,500 of the funds appropriated by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 126)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $15,000, for an additional amount for land for school sites, for the purchase of a site for a 24-room elementary school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, in the vicinity of South Capitol and Darrington Streets (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AUGUST 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Corporation for the month of August 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of the Departments of War, Navy, Agriculture (2), and Commerce which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Koolaupoko Lions Club, Honolulu, T. H., favoring amendment of the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to remove the limitation pertaining to ancestry; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Oakland, Nebr., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Yarmouth and members and friends of the Pentecostal Church of Thomaston, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

The petition of Ewald Holtgreiwe, president of Local 118A, United Shoe Workers of America (C. I. O.), and 1,250 employees of the International Shoe Co., Washington, Mo., praying for the adoption of a subsidy program

to roll-back prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

Resolutions adopted by the Associated Cooperatives of Coldwater, Mich., opposing the payment of subsidies to control prices, the so-called Fulmer bill amending the law relating to the sale of oleomargarine, and also the collection of money in the form of dues by organized groups; and favoring the enactment of House bill 3458, the so-called Steagall bill, the abandonment of all controls over farmers, and the decentralization of power rather than centralization of power in governmental bureaus in Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Eaton Rapids and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 1152) to provide for the conservation of wildlife on public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Resolutions adopted by the councils of the cities of Highland and Hamtramck, Mich., favoring adoption of measures to alleviate hardships to expanding communities where there is a practical ceiling on local tax rates and cities cannot legally raise revenue to meet the growing demands of such communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of St. Joseph and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of effective price-control measures and the roll-back of living costs to September 1942 levels, and also the imposition of equitable taxation based on the ability to pay; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition of sundry citizens in attendance at a metting under the auspices of the Detroit (Mich.) Committee for the Study of the Organization of Peace, praying for the prompt repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts and the inclusion of Chinese among the immigrants eligible for quota citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of any prohibition legislation which might return the alcoholic beverage traffic back to underworld participation in such traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation providing appropriations for highway construction following the termination of war so that States and municipalities may plan post-war construction programs; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

NATURAL GAS PIPE LINES—RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL OF KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the city council of Kansas City, Mo., on the subject of natural gas transmission lines. In view of the importance of the resolution and the fact that it is of general interest and was adopted by the governing body of a large municipality, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas natural gas pipe-line companies operating in areas contiguous to Atlantic-coast States have made applications to the Federal Power Commission within the past year for permission to construct large pipe lines to withdraw natural gas from fields located in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and to transport such gas as far east as the State of New York; and

Whereas expert geologists have estimated that the reserves in such gas fields in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas will be depleted and exhausted upon the basis of the present rate of withdrawals within 25 or 30 years, but if larger withdrawals are made, such fields will be depleted within a correspondingly shorter period of time; and

Whereas coal deposits in the Appalachian Mountain area are estimated to be of sufficient size to supply the entire needs of industries in that area and on the Atlantic coast, and of the entire United States for hundreds of years; and

Whereas coal deposits within the area west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rocky Mountains are of comparatively limited size; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that natural gas is a luxury fuel, and in the post-war period should not be used extensively for industrial purposes but its use confined to domestic and limited commercial purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has at times indicated its desire to restrict the use of natural gas for the foregoing purposes, but has been without legal authority under the Natural Gas Act to do so; and

Whereas it is reliably reported that a number of additional pipe lines to withdraw gas from the gas fields of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas are being planned for construction just as soon as the war is ended or the War Production Board will release the necessary critical materials; and

Whereas the city council of Kansas City, Mo., deems it in the public interest that the gas reserves located in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas be conserved for and restricted to use by consumers west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rocky Mountains, or those consumers immediately adjacent to such areas, and that the more rapid depletion of these reserves be opposed; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the United States Senate a bill known as S. 735, introduced by Senator OVERTON on February 18, 1943, seeking to amend the Natural Gas Act and to give the Federal Power Commission needed authority for the conservation of natural gas resources, and it is proposed through a Senate resolution to order the Federal Power Commission to make investigation to determine with accuracy, among other things, the extent, location, and availability of known natural gas reserves in the United States and the effects of present and anticipated depletion thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Kansas City:

1. That the city council of Kansas City, Mo., hereby expresses its approval of Senate bill No. 735, introduced by Senator OVERTON on February 18, 1943, seeking to give to the Federal Power Commission additional authority under the Natural Gas Act so as to make possible the conservation of natural gas resources.

2. That a resolution be adopted by the United States Senate directing the Federal Power Commission to make full investigation, among other things, of the extent, location, and availability of the known natural gas reserves in the United States and the effects of the present and anticipated depletion thereof, so as to provide adequate data in support of such Senate bill and its purposes.

3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the mayor to the Missouri Senators and Representatives in the Congress, and that their support of such Senate bill and proposed resolution be hereby urged.

4. That additional copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City and to any and all other persons, groups, and associations interested in the conservation of the natural gas resources within the middle western area located west of the Mississippi River and east of the Rocky Mountains and the territory immediately adjacent thereto, and their cooperation in this program invited.

The foregoing resolution has been reviewed.

L. P. COOKINGHAM,
City Manager.

The form of the foregoing resolution is hereby approved.

JEROME M. JOFFEE,
Special Assistant City Counselor.

Authenticated as adopted November 1, 1943.

J. C. RODAHAFFER,
Acting Mayor.
FLOURNOY QUEST,
City Clerk.
By CON R. BAULE,
Deputy City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF HEINOLA FARMERS UNION LOCAL, NEW YORK MILLS, MINN.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution in the form of a petition, adopted by the local farmers' union of New York Mills, Minn. The resolution deals with various farm problems which the local farmers desire to call to the attention of Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK MILLS, MINN.

Hon. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Be it resolved by the members of Heinola Farmers Union local in meeting October 13, 1943, assembled to discuss present and post-war problems, That—

1. Boys returning from the armed forces shall be given an opportunity to own good farming land if they so desire and therefore the Government shall provide the land from absentee landlords' and corporations' farms, reducing them to family-size farms, thereby securing their livelihood and independence; be it further

Resolved, That those veterans who want land shall become owners according to the 5-year plan to operate the farms at 10 percent plus cost in order to give them an equal chance with the war production corporations.

2. The ceiling price set by the O. P. A. on live hogs per hundred pounds of pork at the shipping terminals is not sufficient to pay the cost of raising it, thereby creating planned scarcity of pork in the fall of 1944, thereby causing unnecessary suffering among our people at home, the armed forces, and our allies; so hereby we are asking the administration to start paying a subsidy to the farmers who will be raising brood sows in the spring of the year of 1944.

3. We go on record advocating reinstating of Federal crop insurance on all crops and parity on wheat.

4. The point value of oleomargarine be raised on par with butter; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal tax on oleomargarine be raised 50 percent of the present tax.

SANDU MATTSON,
Chairman,
JOHN C. PAJARI,
Secretary,
JALMAR JACOBSON,
GLADYS PAJARI,
EMIL V. VIRNALS,
Resolution Committee.

RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH DAKOTA DAIRY ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on October 20 and 21 at a meeting of the South Dakota Dairy Association in my State, after very extensive discussion, resolutions were adopted in reference to dairy products. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, as free Americans, we are first and primarily interested in the all-out prosecution of the war and for doing everything needed to assure victory; and

Whereas we are deeply interested in maintaining the American way of life and its sound and successful democratic principles of honest and fair business; be it

Resolved, That the point ratio on butter be adjusted and lowered to allow a fair and just distribution of butter; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal taxes on oleomargarine be retained to protect the buying public from fraudulent sale of spreads in disguise of butter during the emergency when so much of the Nation's butter production is contributing to the Nation's war effort; be it further

Resolved, That we recommend that the present bill H. R. 2400 now before Congress be defeated and that the present law governing the manufacturing and sale of oleo on its own merits remain intact; and

Whereas Governor Sharpe has appointed a chief dairy inspector who is trained and qualified to handle the work efficiently and to the satisfaction of the entire industry, we wish to commend and endorse his nonpartisan attitude and his good judgment. The dairy industry should therefore give the inspection department its undivided support; and

Whereas the dairy industry has suffered severely the loss of manpower due to the induction in the various military services of dairy employees we recommend that local draft boards give every consideration to the induction of essential dairy employees and wherever possible defer such nonreplaceable employees for dairy work on the farms and in dairy plants. We further recommend that induction be placed on a Nation-wide basis rather than on a State basis because of the wide difference in essential food industries in South Dakota as compared to States having a larger number of less essential industries; and

Whereas the need for more food, particularly dairy products is essential to the prosecution of the war, we recommend that prices to the farmers be adjusted so that production of milk will be increased. We recommend that butterfat prices to farmers be based on the price of feed, and endorse the ratio of 1 to 32. That is, that the price of butterfat be 32 times the price of 1 pound of feed. We further wish to express our disapproval of the subsidy plans for increasing the production of milk as being economically unsound in principle and impractical in the method of distribution, particularly the recent plan suggested for subsidy distribution: and

Whereas with the gas, tire, and truck shortages about to cause a break-down in the transportation of farm to market dairy products, we appreciate the efforts of the O. D. T. Farm Vehicle Branch in attempting to put in effect an orderly marketing program. We further recommend that milk and cream routes be consolidated and shortened wherever possible; and

Whereas wartime conditions have forced the curtailment in consumption of dairy products particularly by the civilian population and the Government itself has encouraged the use of substitutes especially of butter; and

Whereas we recognize this to be a definite threat to the future of the dairy industry by diverting a large part of our consumers elsewhere; and

Whereas the American Dairy Association since its inception has attempted to expand the use of all dairy products to the ultimate advantage of the dairy farmer and even now is carrying on a successful public-relations program to acquaint the public with the problems of the dairy farmer as well as to continue to emphasize the superiority of milk, butter, cheese, evaporated milk, and ice cream, and to protect the investment of the dairy industry;

Therefore, the South Dakota Dairy Association representing the dairy interests of the State urges unqualified financial and moral support of the A. D. A. program particularly during the next collection period in June 1944. We further recommend that a law be enacted at the next legislature similar to the Iowa statute, which will establish an equitable collection of the deduction by the processing plant from every milk producer.

Whereas we have had a highly successful convention, we wish to express our appreciation to the speakers and others who have participated in the program. We especially wish to commend the local committee for their splendid effort in planning and making all local arrangements.

Respectfully submitted.

JNO. L. KEATING, *Chairman.*
C. W. BROWN,
A. H. PETERSEN,
Resolutions Committee.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY, FOOD PROGRAM, AND WATER RESOURCES—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present a report on Government economy, submitted to the National Affairs Committee of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce; a resolution adopted by representatives of the Nebraska Livestock Feeders Association, Iowa Beef Producers Association, Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and Kansas Livestock Association, in meeting assembled at Omaha, Nebr., on November 9, 1943; and a resolution adopted by the sixteenth annual convention of the Association of Western State Engineers, held at Denver, Colo., October 25 and 26, 1943. I ask that the report and resolutions may be printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report and resolutions will be received and appropriately referred as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

To the Committee on Appropriations:

To the National Affairs Committee, Omaha Chamber of Commerce:

Your subcommittee herewith submits its first seasonal report on Government economy.

National wealth being the foundation upon which all governmental economies are based, some space should be given to it.

National wealth is composed of three basic factors—raw materials; capital, which furnishes the tools to fabricate raw materials into utensils for public use; and labor sufficiently skilled in handling the tools which capital provides.

We in this country are blessed with a preponderance of raw material, capital, and efficient labor, and because of these have developed the wealthiest nation on the face of the earth, with the highest standard of living known throughout the world, and up until the last decade we, as a people, were masters of our own financial destiny. Whether this will prove true through the next decade is a questionable problem, because during the last decade we seem to have either lost or forgotten the basic human trait responsible for making this country great, and that is the right of the individual to determine his own way of life. We seem to have become almost apathetic in our weakness toward defending ourselves against tyrannical practices which are gradually becoming a part of our daily life.

We have permitted a hydra-headed bureaucracy to develop changes in our National Government which are not only a menace to our liberties but are also eating up our national wealth. These bureaucracies, through the Chief Executive, make demands upon Congress for almost unlimited funds.

Reports of the Government's financial condition show that to date Congress has appropriated approximately $330,000,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the present war, and when this war ends it is possible that our national debt will have reached the astronomical sum of $300,000,000,000.

Unfortunately the rank and file of our people have no conception of the enormity of this debt, nor do they seem to give any thought to how it will be paid. Should they measure it with the assessed value of all the property of every kind and character in the United States, which is approximately $150,000,000,000, they should be astounded at the size of it. This amount shows on the records of the Census Bureau and covers property of every kind and character whatsoever owned and possessed by the American people—real, personal, mixed property, also tangible and intangible, and of course includes real estate, buildings of all kinds, railroads, factories, shops, mines, dwelling houses, farms, livestock, poultry, money, stocks, bonds, securities, notes, in fact, everything that the citizens own, whether they be individuals, partnerships, or corporations.

In other words, our approximate national debt of $300,000,000,000 is double the amount of the assessed valuation of everything in the country, and according to the Treasury Department the deficit for 1 year between September 20, 1942, and September 20, 1943, is approximately $70,000,000,000. When we compare this with the total cost of the war from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, the date of the armistice, which was $21,000,000,000, we can readily see to what extremes we have gone in venturing into an Alice-in-Wonderland of debt.

The present Congress from January 6, 1943, to July 8, 1943, appropriated more than $130,000,000,000, and we are still adding to that sum. At the close of the first World War our national debt was approximately $26,000,000,000 and we must, in comparing it with the approximate $300,000,000,000 of debt at the end of this war, do so with fear and a troubled conscience.

A further survey of our national economy will show that the civilian pay roll of the Federal Government amounts to nearly $650,000,000 per month, or nearly $8,000,000,000 per year. This pay roll covers 3,029,483 civilian employees, of which 280,288 are employed in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and 2,749,195 in all other areas. A perusal of the chart furnished by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its booklet How Many Too Many? shows that there are 18 States in which the Federal Government employees exceed those of the States. Seven of these States are strictly

southern States, eight northern, the remaining three being Arizona, New Mexico, and Nevada. Alabama has 64,800 Government employees and 45,700 State employees. Nebraska makes a very good showing in this respect, having 20,400 Federal Government employees and 34,100 State employees. South Carolina has 53,900 Federal employees and 35,200 State employees. Reference to the State employees includes employees in all political subdivisions.

In breaking down this figure of 3,029,483 civilian employees we have 60,000 running the War Manpower Commission, and there are 55,000 people running the O. P. A. That estimate was made as of May 31, 1943, and there are without question more employed now. There are 4,000 running the Office of War Information; 12,000 in the Bureau of Censorship; 33,000 in the Federal Security Agency; 2,200 in the Federal Communications Commission. The numbers shown in these few bureaus are not out of line with most all other bureaus in Washington.

The cost of war is enormous. We expect mistakes, errors, and omissions, but not at the present cost of war. The war expenditures every day amount to $286,000,000, or more than $12,000,000 each hour. A discussion of Government economy can lead in many directions, because, as investigation will show, it is related in some manner to all functions of Government.

At the present time we are giving much thought to inflation and its causes. One of the most dangerous imps of inflation is the expansion of money, as we know from experience of other countries what this can do to a national economy.

After the First World War Germany's money expansion had reached the point where it took four or five million marks to buy a loaf of bread. Can we get in a like position? We hope not, but the facts are these.

In 1920 our money in circulation amounted to $5,698,000,000. On July 31, 1943, it amounted to $17,954,587,757, a growth of over 300 percent. The natural processes of business progress have certainly not been 300 percent. Therefore, the need for this excessive money expansion must necessarily be derived from a will-o'-the-wisp Government money inflation. Excessive money expansion in turn is responsible for Government spending. In other words, Government economies do not exist at the present time but Government spending and edicts by fiats rather than by law have made it possible through increased wages and incentives to increase the cost of war three to five times what it should actually cost.

Recent declarations of policy adopted in April 1943 at the annual meeting and war council of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and representing 1,831 chambers of commerce and trade associations, were as follows:

1. The reductions in nonwar expenditures already accomplished by Congress should be extended at every possible point.

2. Liquidation of activities that cannot be justified in the midst of the country's greatest war effort should be speeded.

3. All possible improvements in controls of authorizations, appropriations, and expenditures should be instituted by Congress.

4. Waste and extravagance in all agencies, including war agencies, should be eliminated.

5. Reduction in numbers of civilian employees not clearly needed and efficiently occupied should be accelerated.

6. Retrenchment and economy were never more essential. Upon them depend the possibility of orderly and proper methods of war finance, future economic stability, and the public welfare.

Respectfully submitted by your committee:

JOHN W. BARTH,
Chairman.

A. J. HALLAS,
Subcommittee on Government Economy.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas the O. P. A. consumer meat-subsidy program has discouraged livestock-feeding operations to the extent that the war effort is being seriously impaired and unnecessary hardships are being imposed upon the civilian population; and

Whereas these regulations are encouraging black-market operations, resulting in higher costs in the aggregate to the consumers with profits to the racketeers and losses to the livestock producers; and

Whereas these subsidies are being paid by the Government to reduce grocery bills that must be repaid in the future by taxes imposed upon the men and women now in the armed services; and

Whereas the Director of Economic Stabilization has ordered the War Food Administration to institute a system of allocation of live cattle to slaughterers and feeders which is thoroughly impractical and would destroy the economy of the livestock industry; and

Whereas subsidies from the Federal Treasury to reduce food prices are inflationary: Therefore be it

Resolved, That representatives of the Nebraska Live Stock Feeders Association, Iowa Beef Producers Association, Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and Kansas Live Stock Association, in meeting assembled at Omaha, Nebr., November 9, 1943, hereby declare their unalterable opposition to the continuation of the price roll-back subsidy and livestock ceiling-price program; be it further

Resolved, That the consumers of the Nation be advised that only by supporting food producers in their efforts to eliminate this unsound economic policy, which is throttling production, can they hope to insure adequate future food supplies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, congressional delegations from the States mentioned, the Office of Price Administration, the Director of Economic Stabilization, the War Food Administrator, and to Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, who represented the consumers at a recent Kansas City livestock meeting.

Resolutions Committee: Parr Young, Nehawka, Nebr.; Louis Smithberger, Stanton, Nebr.; Wayland Hopley, Atlantic, Iowa; Frank Retz, Lewiston, Iowa; Paul Krueger, Fort Calhoun, Nebr.; C. J. Abbott, Hyannis, Nebr.; Plummer Martin, Omaha, Nebr.; George B. Stein, Smith Center, Kans.

To the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Whereas adequate information concerning the water resources of the Western States which is being obtained and published through cooperation between the Federal Government and these States, is essential not only to the economy of the great arid and semiarid regions of the Nation, but especially so to our country in obtaining maximum production of foods during and following the present war emergency and in the formulation of post-war objectives; and

Whereas the Congress has not made available to the Interior Department, adequate appropriations for the present fiscal year for stream-gaging purposes necessary to continue the established policy of matching all State contributions on a 50-50 basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of Western State Engineers reaffirms its many past endorsements of a continuing program of cooperative determination and publication of factual data concerning the water resources of these Western States; and be it further

Resolved, That this association, through its officers, members, and associate members, strongly urge upon our representatives in the Congress, the necessity of providing an adequate supplemental appropriation to the gaging-stream item of the Interior Department budget to match all State offerings for the present fiscal year.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Joseph Moret; with an amendment (Rept. No. 522);

H. R. 302. A bill for the relief of Robert Griffin; without amendment (Rept. No. 523);

H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; without amendment (Rept. No. 524); and

H. R. 3299. A bill for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; without admendment (Rept. No. 525).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1391. A bill for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan; with an amendment (Rept No. 526);

H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price; without amendment (Rept. No. 527); and

H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Ronald A. Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 528).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecilia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 529).

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. VAN NUYS), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 7. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 530).

REPORTS ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation four lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF DR. SUN YAT-SEN

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of the birth of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. I have prepared a statement on Dr. Sun Yat-sen, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Today, the anniversary of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's birthday, marks the close of a year during which more concrete steps have been taken toward the achievement of Dr. Sun's goals than in any other year since his death.

During this eventful year, two of Dr. Sun's major aims have been realized—aims of such magnitude that he incorporated them into his last words to the young Chinese Republic. On his deathbed Dr. Sun urged his followers "to join hands with the people of all races in those countries which are prepared to treat us as equals in our fight for the common cause of humanity." At the same time, Sun Yat-sen stressed the primary importance of "the abolition of unequal treaties." This, as Sun Wen has often explained, was an

essential preliminary step to China's becoming an equal power among the nations of the world.

Early this year the United States and Great Britain relinquished their extraterritorial rights in China. The era of treaty-port trade is now ended. The Chungking Government has expressed its eagerness to accept aid from foreign nations in reconstructing and industrializing post-war China. But after this war the Chinese Government will have full sovereign power to determine the form and extent of this cooperation with foreign business groups.

The abolition of these unequal treaties paved the way for carrying out Sun Yat-sen's concept of using strong international alliances to advance "the common cause of humanity." This aim of Dr. Sun's was fulfilled in Moscow last week.

China has signed a pact with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States which pledged their joint cooperation, not only during the war years but also in the post-war reconstruction period.

In the first clause of the four-power declaration these nations agreed "that their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security."

The fourth point of this joint declaration outlined the form which such post-war cooperation will take. This clause explained that the four powers "recognize the necessity of establishing a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states."

These words of the Moscow Declaration could be a paraphrase of statements made by Sun Yat-sen in explaining his concepts of international cooperation. In addition, the Moscow Pact laid the same emphasis on "sovereign equality" throughout its terms that Dr. Sun made throughout his writings.

But Sun Wen constantly underlined the fact that a mere statement of China's equality or her democracy would not make these conditions an actuality.

As Dr. Sun pointed out, the United States proclaimed the liberty and equality of all American citizens some 150 years ago. Later, following a bitter Civil War, the great American leader, Abraham Lincoln, again declared that the principles of democracy existed throughout that Nation. Yet in Dr. Sun's life, and still today, the American people are constantly endeavoring to achieve complete democracy—to achieve actual equality of economic opportunity for every citizen of the United States.

Thus Dr. Sun foresaw that even though the foreign powers gave back their extraterritorial rights in China and regarded the Chinese Republic as an equal sovereign power, that would not be enough.

China would have to build up its internal structure to acquire true equality among the nations of the world.

The solution of this problem became Dr. Sun's life work. By the time of his death, Sun Yat-sen has compiled a detailed outline of the governmental structure which he believed best suited to bring China her rightful equal status. Even in his historic will, Dr. Sun reiterated his proposal that a national people's assembly be convened within the shortest possible period of time to draw up a constitution for carrying out the principles he had laid down.

A few weeks ago, President Chiang Kai-shek set the date for this assembly. Chiang said that the meeting will be held within 1 year after the war has ended.

Still another of Dr. Sun's concepts is on the verge of realization. In the first of his three people's principles, Sun Yat-sen said that the smaller nations of Asia must regain their independence as a prerequisite to world stability. Dr. Sun warned, "If China follows at the heels of the imperialistic and militaristic nations, China's ascendency to power would not only be useless, but even harmful to humanity."

Today, President Roosevelt has already asked that the American people grant the Philippine Islands their immediate independence. The United States Congress is even now considering this request in accordance with the established procedure of American democracy.

In addition, President Chiang Kai-shek has pledged his country to help all other Asiatic nations gain their independence. Looking forward to the post-war period, Chiang said last July 7: "The independent nations that have been occupied by the enemy must certainly regain their independence. As to the peoples under the rule of the enemy or otherwise still having not attained complete freedom, we must likewise help them become emancipated. The relative speed of emancipation may have to vary in accordance with different cultural levels of different peoples, but it is imperatively desirable that the same principles apply in the emancipation of all peoples."

The Allies have not yet determined their joint policy for reestablishing the independence of smaller nations of Asia. But while this problem is being worked out, it is interesting to study the procedure already announced for reestablishing the independence of European nations.

The Moscow declarations outlined this procedure in the statements regarding Italy and Austria. In these formal pronouncements, the Allies warned that occupied countries are responsible for their participation in the war at the side of the enemy. The statement on Austria concluded with the following words: "In the final settlement, account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation."

It seems safe to assume that this inevitable consideration will also form the cornerstone of eventual decisions regarding the smaller Asiatic countries.

Thus we see that during the past year, four of Sun Yat-sen's major concepts have either been realized or have moved rapidly toward achievement.

It is significant of the greatness of Dr. Sun's vision and understanding that these developments have followed so closely the patterns which he advocated. It is no less significant that this progress came during a war which Sun Wen foresaw 20 years ago.

In 1921, Sun Yat-sen said that China had become a greater bone of contention among militaristic and capitalistic powers than the Balkan Peninsula where the First World War was ignited. At that time, Dr. Sun warned: "Unless the Chinese question can be settled peacefully, another world war greater and more terrible than the one just past will be inevitable."

And today, it is common knowledge that the present war began in China when Japan invaded Manchuria.

It is such foresight into world trends which has made Sun Yat-sen more than the greatest leader of the Chinese Republic. As President Roosevelt said earlier this year: "Sun Yat-sen, like George Washington, no longer belongs only to his own country but rather to all the forces of freedom and progressiveness in the world."

COMMENTS IN PARLIAMENT ON MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY BODIES

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my impression of the events in the House of Commons and of the House of Lords of Great Britain, to which I shall refer, is that notwithstanding the importance of the meeting of representatives of the various parliamentary bodies of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Bermuda, Canada, and of the Congress of the United States, at Ottawa, the record created by these addresses of Viscount Stansgate and Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, which I shall offer for the RECORD, is an important beacon in the airway of world progress. It is the consummating record of the fact that, for the first time in all history, accredited representatives of these great parliamentary bodies met together for informal discussion to ascertain the character of the relations really existing between these great democracies, and to light the way for mutual friendship and better understanding on the parliamentary level of government.

The addresses here offered for the RECORD further attest the fact that the conference held in Ottawa and the subsequent meetings in Washington did achieve their purpose. That had been previously evidenced by the official records of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, and by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Senate of the United States of America.

I am well pleased to call attention to the remarks of the great Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, the comments of the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, Viscount Cranborne—Lord Cecil—and those of Lord Marchwood, which are included in the documents I now offer.

The meeting at Ottawa, that is referred to, justifies the claim which I have made several times before, and which I now repeat with more confidence than ever, that the progress of the world toward law and order established upon the spiritual foundation of that power that resides in the people themselves, could be attained more expeditiously, and be placed upon a more secure basis, if the peace-loving nations would establish a habit of meeting through committees of their parliamentary bodies. These meetings ought to be held frequently enough to afford the people at home in each of the represented countries a continuing understanding of the problems of each country, and of the relations these various problems bear to each other.

I am firmly persuaded that the representatives of the people on the parliamentary level are better equipped to inform the people than is any other branch of government.

The value of this new practice increases as we approach the termination of hostilities. At that time, harmony among the people responsible for the establishment of law and order in the world will be absolutely essential.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD the following extracts from the parliamentary debates of the British House of Commons and of the British House of Lords: first, extracts from the parliamentary debates of the British House of Commons, official report, at the point marked 45 and continuing as far as I have enclosed the material in the blue pencil brackets; second, extracts from the parliamentary debates in the House of Lords, official report, page 448, dated October 28, 1943, all that is enclosed in the blue pencil brackets.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION (PROCEEDINGS AT OTTAWA AND WASHINGTON)

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne asked the Prime Minister whether he has considered the letter from the honorable member for Kidderminster, dated October 21, regarding the resolutions of the United States Senate and House of Representatives in June and July last in connection with the visit of Congress representatives to Ottawa; and whether he has any statement to make.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Churchill). I am very glad to have this opportunity of saying a few words about the conference which on the invitation of the Canadian branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association recently took place at Ottawa between delegations from the branches of the association in Canada, the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda. A notable feature of the meeting to which my honorable friend has drawn attention, was the presence of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

The informal discussions in Canada, some of which were attended by the United States delegation, afforded a valuable opportunity for exchange of private and quite unofficial views on matters of great interest, covering both defense and international problems of the British Commonwealth and Empire and also questions of relations between members of the Commonwealth and the United States in war and in peace. The United Kingdom delegation also had an opportunity while in Canada of discussions with the Canadian and Provincial Prime Ministers and of seeing evidences of Canada's war effort in both defense and aggressive operations and in the industrial sphere, for which we express our gratitude. These meetings were followed by a visit of certain members of the delegation to Washington, where they attended the Senate and House of Representatives and also met a number of Members of Congress personally, and in addition they paid a visit to Bermuda. Everywhere they received the most cordial welcome and generous hospitality.

Apart from its value as a means of personal contact and interchange of opinion between representatives of the different members of the British Commonwealth, which is of such importance to our mutual relations, this conference was of historic significance as being the first occasion on which representatives of the United States of America had taken part in such a gathering. I am sure that I am voicing the feelings of the House in expressing our obligations to all those, whether in Canada or in the other countries concerned, who by their organization of the conference and their interest in its proceedings helped to contribute to its success, as well as of course to all those who took part in its deliberations. I should also like to express our thanks to all those in both Canada and the United States who accorded such open handed hospitality to these visitors from overseas. In all these events we can see a happy augury of fellowship and mutual understanding in the days when after victory we face together the problems of peace.

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Viscount Stansgate had the following notice on the paper: To ask His Majesty's Government whether their attention has been called to the resolution of the United States Senate of the 18th June, and of the House of Representatives of the 22d June, and to the further resolution of the Senate of the 3d July, which deal with the visit of Representatives of Congress to Ottawa; and whether they have any statement to make?

The noble viscount said: My lords, first of all I should like to beseech very earnestly the consideration and forbearance of your lordships in what you must realize is the very formidable task of addressing your lordships' house for the first time. Fortunately my subject is brief and quite uncontroversial. I have to ask two things. First, I wish to ask His Majesty's Government whether they are in a position to make a statement in reference to the recent Empire Parliamentary Conference in Canada and my second purpose is to express on behalf of the British delegation our sincere thanks for the boundless hospitality shown us at Ottawa, at Washington, and in Bermuda on the occasion of our visit. I should add also our thanks to officers of the Empire Parliamentary Association and acknowledge the careful planning carried out by Sir Howard D'Egville. The conference was the first of its kind ever attended by accredited Representatives of the American Congress. The importance of this was pointed out by Mr. Mackenzie King in the Ottawa Parliament. His remarks were duly reported to Congress and, on the motion of Senator AUSTIN, were inscribed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is fitting, therefore, that His Majesty's ministers in parliament should add the authority of their comment to these significant events.

To the conference itself came representatives of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Bermuda and the United Kingdom, and later we were joined by a distinguished delegation from the United States Congress to which I shall refer later. But beside the conference, we had the pleasure of undertaking a very carefully planned and organized journey throughout the whole of Eastern Canada. Some of us went to Washington by invitation, and the Senate paid us the signal honor of adjourning to receive us. Some of us were able to go to Bermuda, and I myself, through the kindness of the American Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force, was able greatly to prolong the trip, flying through Chicago and Arizona to Los Angeles, thence up the west coast to Vancouver and across the Rockies to Edmonton. Thereafter I went north to Fairbanks in Alaska, and then across Canada to Montreal, and home by Labrador and Iceland. We had far to go, and much to see and learn, and although this is no occasion for a debate I should be grateful if your lordships would allow me to record briefly two impressions which I received in the course of this journey.

The first was the impression of the magnitude of Canada's war effort, and of the special place which Canada will hold in the post-war world. The second was the impression of the great value of these private and unofficial meetings for promoting good will among the English-speaking democracies. We saw many forms of Canada's war effort in all fields, men, munitions, shipbuilding, food, and the like. Perhaps I may be excused if I make special reference to the joint air training plan. This is a plan conceived and carried out in the broadest and most generous spirit of Commonwealth unity. Its three well-known advantages are: First, it permits training to be carried out night and day without that risk of enemy air attack which is real in this country; second, it allows this country to be used for its proper purpose—namely, as an advanced air base in the war against Germany; third, by bringing together young men from Australia, New Zealand, and other parts of the British Commonwealth, it enables them to gain some knowledge of the spirit and meaning of the Commonwealth and a just pride in our common traditions. This plan we saw being carried out under the admirable management of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and we learned something also of Canada's air power. Canada is the fourth great air power among the United Nations. This experience made it inevitable that we should review our conception of the post-war organization of the world. When, for example, we read in the newspaper of a Russian diplomat touching down at Edmonton in Alberta on his air journey from Moscow to Washington, or when we flew, as we did, over the thousand lakes and rivers and the boundless forests of Alaska to their air base of Fairbanks, or when we came home flying by Goose in Labrador, now open all the year round as an airport, but previously ice-bound for 9 months of the year, it was impossible not to realize that isolation of the Western Hemisphere in this air age is a thing of the past.

Washington, in his Farewell Address, based his famous advice on detachment and distance. But in this air age distance is nothing. As for detachment, Washington was thinking in terms of the vast oceans of the Atlantic and the Pacific, but we were made to see that, in fact, Canada and the United States and the Soviet Union are now close neighbors round the shores of the comparatively tiny Arctic Ocean. Moreover, Canada is the air highway over which much of the American traffic both from Europe and Asia must pass. To put it simply we were made to realize that the earth is round like an orange, and that the peacemakers will need to lay aside that strange diagram called Mercator's projection which has misled us for so many years, and become, like Miss Pinkerton's pupils, proficient in the use of globes. That was the first impression.

The second point which impressed us was, as I have said, the value of these private and unofficial meetings. There we were, men and women of all parties—Republicans, Democrats, Conservatives of the first water, and Socialists of the deepest dye, having no governmental responsibility, talking freely in private, and representing, within the measure of our limited numbers, that broad foundation of public opinion upon which our leaders must rely when they make their abiding contracts. Moreover, the representatives of Congress came with the special warrant of a resolution, a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses, and they were led by Mr. SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee—which, I was interested to notice, once employed Tom Paine as a clerk; but we have moved from those days—and Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which, of course, has special constitutional rights in international affairs. We, of course, had with us Lord Marchwood, whose charm and talent were invaluable assets to us. He will, I am sure, bear out my observations.

We had to consider for what part we, as a British delegation, were cast. We could, of course, by our work and conversation, strive to give a favorable impression of our country. We realized that the war alliance has produced a warm atmosphere; that we are comrades in arms. That comradeship sometimes takes strange forms. For example, in the flying patrol on the coast of Canada you will find ex-rum runners and ex-preventive men joined in the same air crews, and, no doubt, exchanging interesting reminiscences of the past. But the most striking example, to my mind, was that of Bermuda, where war has flung the seventeenth and twentieth centuries right up against one another, and the most magnificent constructional triumphs, those two giant American airports, lie almost within sight of the legislature where King George and his Queen—Queen Charlotte, I think—still smile down on the oldest colonial Parliament.

But these are war emotions, and, as Sir Wilmot Lewis, who is a great guide in American affairs, often reminds us in the Times, war friendships may be transient. There are more obdurate imponderables—if those terms

are permitted in your Lordships' House. For example, our manner of speech is an offense to the Americans. They think it muffled and tepid, and that it shows a pretentious reserve. That is what they mean when they call us "stuffed shirts." I hope that Mr. Wendell Willkie, in the air-raid shelter in Bethnal Green, may have learnt something of the general language of this country. Americans are much more Shakespearean than we, and, after all, it is Shakespeare that is the real common language. Perhaps we might do well to adopt ourselves a little more of the buoyancy of Falstaff and the direct speech of Juliet's nurse.

The second charge which was made against us was that we were feudal—that this country was feudal. I regret to say that the very existence of this House was mentioned as one of the obstacles to Anglo-American understanding. That is not unnatural among people who derive directly from those Colonists who passed the famous resolution that "The House of Peers in Parliament is useless and dangerous, and ought to be abolished."

The LORD CHANCELOR. It was the House of Chatham—Lord Chatham.

Viscount STANSGATE. I was going to say, though I hardly dare do so in a maiden speech, that that is a resolution which has often attracted my favorable notice! What could we do? We could explain that behind a facade which was largely unchanged we had in fact erected in this country a social democracy which was not unworthy of America's own ideals. We asked them who it was who had had labor governments, and what country it was which had had old-age pensions for a generation, which had wage regulation and the Beveridge Report. I thought the Republican members of the Conference looked a little wistful when we told them that the House of Commons in 24 hours could remove the Prime Minister from office! Then again, there is the persistent belief in America that our diplomacy is clever. I hope that we ourselves contributed nothing to that error, but I am convinced that a closer study of the foreign policy of this country, say for the last 10 years, would completely correct it!

We were deeply grateful to our hosts, who bore us off to the Capitol to meet that interesting group of men known as the B 2 H 2 group. We found them to be missionaries who were carrying out throughout the States a noble campaign for a better understanding, always in the American interest and always from their point of view. They have to meet the ingrained belief that the policy of this country has been, and still is, informed by the spirit of Lord North. I wish that the school books in America contained some reference to the opinions of Mr. Fox and of Lord Chatham, and to the unanimous resolution of the House of Commons denouncing the war. But there it is. Many Americans believe that our Indian policy and our Irish policy represent that same sort of opposition from which the Thirteen Colonies escaped.

So many people came to America to be free. They are called isolationists. There was a description of their attitude by Mr. Robert Waithman, who I think is the News Chronicle correspondent, which struck me, and which I will venture to read to your lordships. He said:

"The preservation of the America they knew never ceased to be a personal anxiety. They have an underlying awareness of America, a deeply buried and often incoherent gratitude for their country."

What could we do to allay their misgivings and to make our case? We could, and we did, cite the North America Act, the South African settlement, the Irish settlement, and the Cripps mission. We claim that the British Commonwealth is a temple of liberty, and that there are its title deeds. But we could do more. We had amongst us representatives of the sovereign dominions, men of pioneering courage and downright speech, cast in the American mold, each mindful of his national interest but all united under the common Crown and by a common belief in freedom. I believe that unity greatly impressed our American friends. In a moving speech at the end of the conference Mr. BLOOM, who is an experienced leader, objective and realist, but capable of touching deep heart springs, asked that the hall in which we met should be forever commemorated as "a shrine of family reunion." I am deeply grateful, my lords, for your patient hearing, and I hope that you will allow that some good has been done.

Lord MARCHWOOD. My lords, we have listened with great pleasure to the words of the noble viscount, and I should like to remind your lordships that this is his maiden effort in this chamber. As a whip in the other house I listened to him on very many occasions. He always had the happy faculty of being able to tell a most interesting tale in the most witty fashion. Sometimes, at night, he was rather long-winded, and we used to say, "For heaven's sake, Wedgy, stop," but that would not deter him. He is a man full of determination. When I heard him arguing on historical matters with the Lord Chancelor, I thought that he is a braver man than I because I should never dare to cross swords on matters of history with the noble and learned viscount. We do congratulate Lord Stansgate most sincerely on all that he has said, and I hope that we shall hear him on many occasions in the future, for it will be to our advantage to do so.

As the other member of the delegation from your Lordships' House, I wish to express my deep appreciation of having been invited, and to say how profoundly I was impressed by the great war effort of the Canadian people. Before I go further I should like to thank the noble and learned Lord Chancelor, who, before I left, gave me much useful, very friendly, and very helpful advice, which stood me in good stead when I was there. I wish to convey to him messages from the many friends he made when he was there himself, and to say that some of the witticisms he gave me helped me to gain a laugh to my credit, and I pass that credit on to him today.

The praise voiced by the noble viscount, Lord Stansgate, for the infinite trouble taken by the officials of the Empire Parliamentary Association, which contributed so much to our comfort and pleasure, I endorse to the full. As he remarked, the delegation was chosen from the three principal parties and represented all shades of political opinion, but the members had a common ideal and a common purpose. They were determined to do everything possible to strengthen the war effort and to foster a spirit of good will amongst all parts of the British Commonwealth, whilst at the same time upholding the prestige of the British Houses of Parliament. Each delegate in his own way made his contribution to those aims, and I think it can be truly claimed that the collective effort was not without success.

We learnt a great deal of the splendid spirit which inspires the great Dominion in the mighty tasks she has undertaken and is carrying out with such impressive effect, and we were also able to give our Canadian friends a picture of wartime Britain in which they took an obvious pride. Before starting out, we were presented at our preliminary meeting with an agenda which was formidable, and almost frightening, but the carrying out of it was a joy and satisfaction, for we were on a mission of good will to our blood relations across the Atlantic.

At the informal parliamentary conferences held at the House of Commons in Ottawa, frank and outspoken views were exchanged which in my opinion were instrumental in bringing about a better understanding and mutual appreciation of each other's problems and helped to clear away many misconceptions previously held. Whilst these conferences were taking place a distinguished delegation of three Senators and four Congressmen appointed by a resolution of both Houses of the United States Congress arrived. It included the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the deputy leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. We met them and talked together frankly and without restraint as members of the same family, and spent a week end with them as the guests of the Dominion Government at the Seignory Country Club just outside Ottawa, which provided a golden opportunity for a free and friendly exchange of views, and everyone soon realized all had the same objectives in view.

Mr. Mackenzie King, Canada's great leader, played a very prominent part in creating an atmosphere of confidence and good will between the American representatives and ourselves. I feel indeed that we owe a great debt to him and to Canada that Anglo-American cooperation is so close and effective. At a dinner he gave to celebrate the visit of the members of the United States delegation to the conference, he made a most eloquent speech in which he stressed the importance of both nations working unitedly, each with absolute trust in the good faith of the other, if the best results were to be achieved. This friendly advice met with almost an immediate response from the American representatives, who made definite declarations that their country intended to march with the British Commonwealth of Nations in a united and unsparing effort to secure victory in the war and to continue with us in the post-war years, working to secure conditions under which the peoples of the world would be able to live a fuller and happier life free from tyranny and fear. Upon that occasion, to my mind and to the minds of many others, a new era of understanding and cooperation was born between the two countries, and we must see to it that the British Empire shall always stand throughout the world for good faith and honesty of purpose.

I wish to take this opportunity of placing on record my appreciation of the wonderful kindness and hospitality extended to us everywhere we went through the great Dominion of Canada. It was really tremendous, and we cannot thank them sufficiently. The people there were most anxious to hear of everything we were doing on this side to defeat and destroy Hitler and his band of murderous gangsters. I found the Canadians, who fortunately have been preserved from the horrors of bombing, particularly keen on hearing of how the morale of the people of Britain had stood up to aerial bombardment; and their expressions of admiration for and sympathy with the men, women, and children of London, Coventry, and other cities which have been devastated, were heartfelt and sincere. The motto of the Canadian people seems to be "All out for victory" and we had the most convincing evidence that they are intent upon bringing this about as speedily as possible, leaving nothing whatever to chance.

We visited engineering and power plants; locomotive and ammunition plants; factories, workshops; foundries; shipbuilding and repair yards and some of their experimental farms. Every place we visited was a hive of industry. Everyone was striving his utmost to increase and improve output inspired by an affection and loyalty for this country which were most touching. Whatever the output, they felt it must be increased and that they could never do enough to help the mother country. Feeling that it was

their war as much as ours, thay almost resented being thanked. They have expanded their army, air force, and navy in a truly miraculous manner. The gigantic air-training scheme has been invaluable in providing pilots and crews for the ever-increasing number of airplanes operating in all theaters of war. The training centers, where they have over 100 schools in operation, have enabled the youth from all parts of the Empire to gain experience and efficiency in record time. Their output of ships, tanks, mechanized transport, cannon, small arms, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns, fighter planes, general equipment, and food production is truly stupendous. They keep in mind that whilst their output may be ever-increasing, there must be no relaxation of effort in the slightest degree until absolute victory is assured.

I said good-bye to Canada with real regret, having formed friendships there which I shall cherish for all time. I have the greatest faith in their affection for us. As loyal partners they will never fail us, for they have dedicated themselves in all earnestness to the task of defending the world against brutal aggression and freeing those unfortunate people who are now enslaved and in bondage.

The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR DOMINION AFFAIRS (Viscount Cranborne) (Lord Cecil). My lords, I should like first of all to say one word of very warm welcome to the noble viscount, Lord Stansgate, on the occasion of his brilliant and charming maiden speech. The noble viscount had a very long and very distinguished career in another place, and I well remember as a young member listening with great admiration to his speeches from the Front Bench—and, indeed, I think we all learned a great deal from him. In particular, I remember some specially forceful retorts which he used to make in debate, and I have long been wondering when he was going to break his long silence here. We shall all agree that he could not have taken a better occasion to do it than the one he has chosen today, and I only hope that now he has spoken here, he will often give us the benefit of his counsel in your lordships' debates. I am quite sure that his experience and his robust common sense will be of the greatest value to us all.

We must all be most grateful to the noble viscount, Lord Stansgate, and to the noble lord, Lord Marchwood, for the vivid and stimulating accounts they have given in the House this afternoon of the visit, which they and certain members of the House of Commons recently paid to Canada, as members of a delegation of the United Kingdom branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, to confer with similar delegations from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Bermuda. As the noble viscount told us this afternoon, an unprecedented feature of the gathering and one of great interest was the presence at the conference of members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. That was a novelty, and, I think, a most desirable novelty. The actual proceedings consisted, as we have already been told, of informal discussions between the delegations, in some of which I understand the United States delegation took part, on questions of imperial policy and relations between the British Commonwealth and the United States. These must surely have been of the utmost value to all who attended them. For, after all, free and frank personal discussion remains, even in these days of telegraphs and wireless, the only entirely effective way of removing misunderstandings between men.

In addition, I understand that the delegates had private discussions with Dominion and Provincial Ministers in Canada, and were afforded the opportunity of seeing some of the manifestations of Canada's outstanding war effort, both in defense and in the industrial sphere. The meetings in Canada, as your lordships know, were followed by a visit of some members of the delegation to Washington, when they not only attended the Senate and House of Representatives but also had private meetings with a number of prominent Members of Congress, as well as a visit to Bermuda to which the noble viscount referred in such a very vivid and illuminating phrase. That such meetings can be of great service in promoting cordial understanding and mutual good will amongst those who have the good fortune to take part in them, the accounts the two noble lords have given us today will provide ample evidence. We shall all wish to place on record our thanks to the members of the delegation and our sense of the value of this example of the spirit of cooperation both in the inter-imperial and the international sphere, as well as our gratitude to all those who, by organization of the conference, by their interest in its proceedings, by the part which they took in its deliberations, and by their generous hospitality to guests from other countries, contributed so notably to its success. My lords, we are very greatly in their debt.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO PVT. JOE P. MARTINEZ

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday appeared an article with reference to the awarding of the Congressional Medal of Honor to a young man, many members of whose family live in my State. He died at Attu. What he did inspires all those who are making a real war effort. Knowing his kith and kin, I am not surprised at his willingness to make the supreme sacrifice for God and country. The article is short, and I ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL AWARDED SOLDIER WHO DIED IN ATTU FIGHTING

An Army private, formerly a Colorado farm laborer, who led an American battalion to victory in the high, snow-bound mountains of Attu Island and almost single-handedly broke final Japanese resistance there, was awarded the Nation's highest decoration posthumously today.

The award of the Congressional Medal of Honor was announced at Secretary Stimson's press conference as the War Department told for the first time of the heroic and gallant action of Joe P. Martinez, 23, of Ault, Colo., who fell under a hail of Japanese bullets with his rifle still at his shoulder.

The action occurred last May as American forces were battling in one of the bitterest engagements of the Pacific war to smash the enemy's hold on strategic Attu at the tip of the Aleutian chain.

For several days, Private Martinez's citation disclosed, persistent effort had failed to drive the Japanese from a key defensive position in the precipitous mountains between the east arm of Holtz Bay, where American troops had established forward positions, and Chichagof Harbor, where the enemy was based.

ATTACK BOGS DOWN

On May 26 a reenforced battalion was thrown into the drive and gradually moved forward in the face of intense machine gun, rifle, and mortar fire. Then that advance, too, bogged down before the enemy's lead.

"Private Martinez arose to his feet and alone resumed his advance," the citation said. "Occasionally he stopped to urge his comrades on and his example inspired the others to follow."

Private Martinez inched steadily up the slope with the battalion behind him and the hell of Japanese fire ahead and all around. Finally he reached a benchlike plateau. Several Japanese positions had been established there in fox holes, but they could not stop the Colorado farm boy. He cleared them out with his automatic rifle and hand grenades.

But the battalion's advance again bogged down under a withering fire from the flank, from trenches ahead, and from high ground above.

CLEANS OUT TRENCH

"Then one lone figure rose and started up the snow slope that led from the bench to the pass," the battalion commander reported. "Again it was Martinez. Again the other men followed.

"Again he was forced to move across open ground under heavy fire until he came upon the first of two trenches. Jumping in, he quickly cleared it out with a few bursts from his automatic rifle and some more well-thrown grenades. Five Japs were found there.

"Without hesitation, he moved forward up the slope to the second trench. He accounted for two Japs in this position. He reached the pass, still under fire from surrounding ridges. Standing up on the ridge overlooking the pass leading into Chichagof Harbor, he emptied his rifle into the Japanese positions just below and beyond the pass."

ABSORBED ALL JAP FIRE

"He was mortally wounded with his rifle still at his shoulder, absorbing all enemy fire and permitting all units to move up behind him and successfully take and hold the pass."

Capture of the pass was described as "an important preliminary to the end of organized hostile resistance on the island."

The Medal of Honor will be presented to the young soldier's father, Manuel V. Martinez, by Maj. Gen. Frederick E. Uhl, commanding general of the Seventh Service Command, at the Martinez home, near Ault, on November 16.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for calling to the attention of the Senate and the country the account carried by the Associated Press telling the tragic story of the heroism of one of Colorado's noble sons, Pvt. Joseph P. Martinez, of Ault, Colo. Private Martinez made the supreme sacrifice on May 26 last under circumstances that will make his heroic exploit live forever on the pages of American history.

Joe Martinez led his fellow Americans up a snow-covered mountain in the face of withering Japanese gunfire, and fell only after driving out one Jap nest after another. This boy was determined, at any cost, to drive the despised Japanese off American soil. All of Colorado sorrows with Joe's family, but is intensely proud that one of her sons proved so courageous.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the remarks of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] concerning Pvt. Joe Martinez.

Our State is in sorrow at the loss of this noble son. Our grief is mingled in the pride we take in the fact that his valor has been honored so deservedly by the Government of the country he loved so well, and for which he gave his life.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial in the Washington Post of today, November 12, under the headline "Poll tax." It reads:

A strike is even more reprehensible on the part of Members of Congress than on the part of the workers. Yet the Senators are laying plans to stage a strike. We refer to the scheme to kill the anti-poll-tax measure which the Judiciary Committee hopes to report out today. Senator BILBO, who has already shown extraordinary powers of endurance as a filibusterer, is preparing to enter the fray again. His like-minded colleagues can be counted upon to do their share in prolonging the debate.

The damage done to the prestige of Congress by a senatorial filibuster in the midst of a war that imposes tremendous responsibilities upon the legislative branch of the Government will not shake the determination of certain southern Senators to talk the anti-poll-tax bill to death. For this is a contest in which more than States' rights and political principles are at stake.

At this point I direct the attention of Senators, and of the country, as well, to the false impression that has been created by the sponsors of this unconstitutional proposal.

Senatorial jobs are also an issue.

If the opponents of the poll-tax measure are fighting the antipoll-tax bill because they think their senatorial jobs are at stake, we might counter by saying that there may be some who would vote for it on the ground that their jobs would be at stake if they did not. The editorial continues:

In the poll-tax States the percentage of otherwise qualified voters who cast ballots in Federal elections is extremely small. Hence, the Congressmen and Senators from those States are elected by a small and select group of voters whom it is comparatively easy to attract and hold.

Mr. President, with all due deference to the splendid editorial staff of the Washington Post, there has never been a greater misstatement of fact in the American press than the statement I have just read. As a rule, I enjoy reading the editorials in the Post, because I know the Post has a very able editorial staff. When I read this editorial I was almost tempted to think that possibly the office boy wrote it instead of some member of the staff.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope the Senator will read the whole editorial, and emphasize what it said in the concluding sentence.

Mr. BILBO. I will. The editorial continues:

Given such conditions, elective officials dread the thought of any change in the qualifications for voting that would increase the number and change the composition of the voting population.

Mr. President, I want to serve notice on Senators who are inclined to vote for the anti-poll tax bill that the passage of the bill will not qualify a single solitary Negro in Mississippi to vote. We do not eliminate the Negroes from the ballot box through the poll-tax qualifications. It is done by another provision of the constitution of the State. So Senators are not going to accomplish the result if they think that by the passage of the bill they will qualify the Negroes to vote in the Mississippi elections.

It would be grossly unfair, of course, to suggest that every opponent of anti-poll-tax legislation from the poll-tax States is motivated solely by selfish considerations.

At this point I think I myself can take a little credit because, personally, I am opposed to the poll tax. But I am opposed to the proposed legislation because it represents a direct violation of the Constitution, as we propose to show later, and I know that if the precedent is ever established to permit the Congress to interfere with the States and strike down the qualifications which the States have provided, and which have obtained for 150 years, it will form the ground and the basis upon which Congress will attempt in the future to interpose in State questions and strike down other qualifications, and perhaps add qualifications. Mr. President, I am simply trying to retain the American scheme of government as between the Federal Government and the States.

However, the instinct of self-preservation is undoubtedly a powerful factor in buttressing resistance to the proposed legislation and increasing the chances for successful filibustering.

Listen to this statement, Mr. President:

Under existing circumstances, therefore, legislators who press for a show-down on poll-tax legislation in the midst of war are doing their country a very poor service.

Mr. President, I serve notice on the country that if the sponsors of this ill-advised proposed legislation press for action at this time when we are confronted with a serious war situation and serious war legislation, and it brings about an impasse in the legislative processes, the responsibility must rest on the shoulders of the sponsors of the proposed legislation, because they know full well that this question will be discussed at length, without limit.

In days to come it will be another case of Bryan's free and unlimited coinage—of words this time instead of silver—and it might be interesting to some Senators to know that there are a sufficient number of Senators who believe in free and unlimited debate on the floor of this body to insure that the Senate will not impose a cloture rule and stop debate on this "inconsequential" question, because momentous questions will confront the Congress in the days to come, especially in the anticipated change of administration, when the cloture rule might serve as the salvation of some of the most precious and priceless legislation which the present administration, over the period of 12 years, has given to the American people.

I read further:

Under existing circumstances, therefore, legislators who press for a show-down on poll-tax legislation in the midst of war are doing their country a very poor service.

To that I say "Amen." The responsibility rests on the shoulders of those who press for the show-down.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are in the morning hour, and I shall object to further discussion of bills or matters which are not before the Senate during the morning hour. After the morning hour Senators can speak as long as they wish to on pending business, but during the morning hour they should limit their remarks to matters which are properly before the Senate.

AMERICA'S AND BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC AIMS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think what I shall say comes within the category of a speech. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will not object.

Mr. President, I spoke last night on the radio program America's Town Meeting of the Air. I wish to place in the RECORD the statement I then made, together with two accompanying documents, with which I would not trouble the Senate except that they may have certain significance since the sponsors represent that there is great public interest in the program. Whether or not the sponsors succeeded in making a monkey out of a Senator will have to be decided by the radio audience, but I think the record ought to be clear that I provided an advance copy of my statement as requested by the sponsor, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., and my opposite member on the program, Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College of Brooklyn, N. Y., was advised of my views in order that he might make an immediate and appropriate reply and in addition be prepared to discuss with a more complete background the issues that would be presented. This is not in accordance with the practice of Town Meeting and similar consideration was not accorded the other speaker on the program.

The integrity of a public forum of some prominence and influence seems to be involved and to warrant this clarification of the record in the interest of a proper understanding by all concerned. The American public is entitled to know whether the voice is that of Esau or Jacob.

Therefore, for the record, I ask that a copy of my statement be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter written by me to Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., director and moderator of the Town Meeting of the Air, as well as Dr. Gideonse's distinguished record as an author and educator.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we enter the arena for this discussion of the economic aims and interests of Great Britain and the United States, it should be clear that the third man in the ring as interrogator is Director of Information of the British Supply Council in the United States. I think we may be confident that his questions will not embarrass my opponent who upholds the negative.

This is another demonstration of my thesis that wherever you go around the world one finds the British most adequately represented. I am sure that here tonight the British Empire is not going to be liquidated.

The question also is somewhat thorny in the difficulty of definition of economic aims so far as the United States is concerned.

If freedom from want is our objective our aims are obviously not incompatible since the process of peaceful amalgamation proposed by Colonel McCormick, of Chicago, can quickly solve the problem. It becomes simply a question of names and terminology.

"Incompatible" also is a somewhat provocative word. If it means irreconcilable the discussion obviously must end before it begins.

Mr. Churchill was profoundly right in declaring this week that the happiness of future generations depends upon the fraternal association of Great Britain and the United States.

Our intelligence and our integrity as well as our self-interest must be the guaranty that our conflicting interests will be reconciled without the inconceivable arbitrament of war.

Advocates of union, however, render very poor service to their cause in seeking to bury our heads in the sands of ignorance or indifference to the very real economic problems with which we are immediately faced if capitalism and nationalism are to survive in any form.

Responsibility for the prudence and propriety of this discussion at this time must be borne by those who sponsor the Town Meeting of the Air. In New England a town meeting orator, like a Member of the Senate, may literally roam the world without inhibition or restraint.

I conceive this discussion, however, to be designed to bring in the open for friendly consideration a few of the major economic issues that must necessarily be determined between Great Britain and the United States in the not distant future. Again in the language of Mr. Churchill, facts may be stated "without hatred or bitterness."

Here tonight we may certainly seek to avoid words that are "provocative" or "clumsy" or "indiscreet" in order to preserve and cultivate that good will that is essential to our countries and—as we perhaps somewhat vainly conceive—to the peace of mankind.

The primary economic aim of Britain seems to be to preserve the Empire and of the United States to preserve the peace. The latter includes the former. The reverse may not be true.

Failure to preserve the peace is costing the United States many precious lives and up to the present time $300,000,000,000.

Failure to preserve the peace is costing us the exhaustion of our petroleum resources and the possible transformation of the economy under which America has grown great.

The United States is determined this catastrophe shall not again recur. Twice in our generation without provocation upon our part we have been plunged into the holocaust of modern war.

Troubles elsewhere, it is now evident, are apt to trouble us. Our national interest accordingly demands that we take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the world. This means some proper part in the communication and transportation systems of the world.

American black-outs abroad lead to misunderstandings exactly as ignorance of the world outside leads to misunderstandings here at home. This was the chief lesson learned in the recent round-the-world trip of the "five innocents abroad."

What we most need are better educators to supply the deficiencies of our statesmen.

"Let there be light" is still the crying need of a world groping in the darkness of ignorance of itself.

When the war ends the United States seems likely to possess 40,000,000 tons of shipping—enough to serve the carrying trade of the world. Is Britain prepared to surrender her historic position in the maritime world? Is the United States expected to turn over half our ships to Britain or other nations? Or is the overburdened economy of the world to be compelled to build ships elsewhere to force American shipping once again into idleness and rust in the rivers and harbors all along the coast?

Other things besides trade seem to follow the flag of the merchant marine. Knowledge and understanding of other peoples seem to be the special property of those who go down to the sea in ships.

In the brave new world of tomorrow the United States must seek its proper share in the shipping of the world if our understanding is to grow and our peace be made secure. Failure here may sow the seed of another and a greater war.

International air transport will also be a key to the keeping of the peace. Hundreds of millions of American dollars have been invested in airfields all around the world.

Yet at the present time American planes have no rights of access to any of those airfields after the war ends.

Those airfields may well be the foundation of a system of international air transport that will be the key to future peace or war.

The United States will possess the facilities and the trained personnel and the resources to produce all the transport planes required to serve the aerial argosies of peace.

Are these facilities to be duplicated elsewhere by the struggling economies of other nations while our aviation industry stagnates?

Here again let us remember the capacity to produce and service planes may be the key to future peace and yet the United States may be condemned to partial paralysis unless rights abroad can be secured from nations who feel less and less occasion for gratitude to the United States.

Britain has just concluded an Empire conference on international air transport after studies extending over the past year. Here is another example of British preparedness for peace as well as war.

Meanwhile an interdepartmental committee in the United States has made a study of international air transport which has never seen the light of day and is gathering dust in an executive department while the congressional committees are still getting ready to hold hearings to consider American policy in this field.

Britain is not to blame for our lethargy but should not blame us for feeling the matter should be discussed—and that without delay.

In communications also the United States finds itself greatly handicapped by a practical British monopoly of cable and wireless facilities. To tell the story of American economic interests and aims to the world there must be either a sharing of these facilities or their duplication in strategic spots in order that the United States may not be misunderstood in its endeavor to preserve the peace.

In all these fields of transportation and communication there is vital need of American participation if America is not again to be insulated from the world until war again breaks out.

Let there be no mistake about it. The United States cannot dwell in economic isolation with safety to itself or to the world.

Yet, world trade requires a voice in communications and in the carrying trade of the world if it is to prosper.

No good businessman will allow his competitor to take care of his sales or his deliveries.

In certain raw materials also both Britain and the United States experience a certain degree of incompatibility.

Petroleum is in this century the sine qua non of war and a most important element in peace.

The end of the war will find United States reserves very greatly depleted and British reserves scarcely touched.

At the present time with approximately equal petroleum reserves Britain is furnishing about 8 percent and the United States about 80 percent of the use by the United Nations.

At the present rate of consumption American reserves will last about 15 years and British reserves about 100 years.

This situation is not conducive to an era of good will.

This particular senatorial monkey will continue to see and hear and speak the truth where the interest of the United States is so vitally involved.

A more equitable sharing of the British petroleum reserves in the Persian Gulf is imperatively required in the interest of Anglo-American friendship.

The United States needs also to be assured that nothing approximating the Stevenson rubber cartel of unpleasant memory shall be revived to send crude rubber to $1.21 a pound as compared with British production costs of less than one-fifth of that amount. There must not again be such exaction as made so difficult the task of Jesse Jones in accumulating adequate reserves of rubber even after the United States was extending economic aid to the United Nations.

Nickel and tin and manganese also have a somewhat curious international history and invite such arrangements as will assure a new deal to the consumers of the United States.

These suggest some of the possible items of conflict between Great Britain and the United States. These discussions do not at all require that we repair at once to Reno but they do suggest the very great advantage of frank and friendly interchange of views such as seems possible in this forum of the Town Meeting of the Air.

NOVEMBER 12, 1943.

Mr. GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr.,
Director and Moderator,
Town Meeting of the Air,
New York 18, N. Y.

DEAR MR. DENNY: We have had several inquiries this morning from those who listened to the discussion last night on the Town Meeting of the Air as to whether Dr. Gideonse was informed in advance of the contents of my opening remarks and I was obliged to advise them that this was the case although a similar courtesy was not extended to me in connection with his remarks.

The very detailed manner in which he made reply seriatim to the points which I raised evidently led to these inquiries.

In justice to the very great importance of the issues which were discussed both to the United States and to the cause of world peace, I feel your printed record of the session should indicate the fact that Dr. Gideonse might well have been far more properly prepared to meet the issues that were raised and shape the course of the discussion than myself as

a result of this advance information which, as I understood from you, violates the practice of the Town Meeting of the Air.

My concern is that a proper appraisal of the merits of this question shall not be dwarfed by any deficiences in the discussion.

I am sure that the talents and abilities of Dr. Gideonse did not require any such tipping of the scales in favor either of him or his side of the discussion.

I should appreciate the printing of this letter in your tabulation of the proceedings for purposes of the permanent record.

Cordially yours,

RALPH O. BREWSTER,
United States Senator.

[From Who's Who in America]

Harry David Gideonse. Economics. Born Rotterdam, The Netherlands, May 17, 1901, son of Martin Cornelius and Johanna Jacoba Helena Magdalena (de Lange) Gideonse. Brought to United States, 1904.

B. S., Columbia, 1923, M. A., 1924; Diplomé des Hautes Études Internationales, University of Geneva, 1928; married Edmee Koch, of Geneva, Switzerland, June 17, 1926.

Chairman research, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y., 1919–21; lecturer in economics, Barnard College and Columbia College (Columbia University) 1924–26; director international students' work, Geneva, Switzerland, 1926–28; assistant professor economics, Rutgers University, 1928–30; associate professor economics, University of Chicago, since 1930. Member American Economic Association.

Club: Quadrangle. Author: Transfert des Reparations et Plan Dawes, 1928; The International Bank, 1930; (brochure) America in a World Economy, 1934. American editor Revue Economique Internationale (Brussels) since 1928; editor public policy pamphlets (University of Chicago) since 1932; The Commodity Dollar, 1936; The Higher Learning in a Democracy, 1937; Organized Scarcity and Public Policy, 1939.

President of Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF STATE HULL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial in the Washington Post of this date, eulogizing Secretary of State Cordell Hull for the great work he accomplished for the world at the recent Moscow Conference.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I want to pay my own tribute to one of the great Americans of his age and generation. History may record him as one of the great Americans of all time, when the results of his lifework are spread in the record of the future. Mr. Hull and I do not belong to the same political party; I have not been in agreement with Mr. Hull on a number of issues in public affairs; but I have, and always have had the greatest regard for his rectitude, his courage, and his ambition to serve his people. There has been as little seifishness in his record in public life as in that of anyone I have known, and in my time I have known a great many.

What will eventuate from the Moscow Conference, the latest of Mr. Hull's many contributions to the national welfare, of course, none of us can say. We do know that this conference has exercised a great, perhaps the decisive influence in insuring Allied solidarity and an earlier ending of World War No. 2. That cooperation, as is well stated in the Washington Post editorial, "could be obtained only by acquiescing in the leadership asserted by the Russians in eastern Europe," and it is my understanding that acquiescence was realized as necessary by Mr. Hull in condueting the delicate negotiations which have added so much to the esteem in which all of us hold him.

I ask that the editorial be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. HULL

It is given to few men in our public life to achieve their greatest success on the further side of 70. Secretary Stimson is in that select company. Now Secretary Hull, for the part he played in the Moscow agreements, has joined it. Many circumstances and many persons conspired to bring about a meeting of minds on the part of the four powers meeting in Moscow. There was, for instance, the recognition of the dynamic and decisive reality of Russia. No plan for the security of post-war Europe could hope to succeed without the wholehearted cooperation of the Soviet Union. And that cooperation could be obtained only by acquiescing in the leadership asserted by the Russians in eastern Europe. It is in this context that the new solidarity must be judged.

Mr. Hull's great contribution to the result, however, was much more than that of a missioner. In him the Russians recognized a man who was prepared to back agreement with his reputation for sincerity and high-mindedness. That accounts for the cordiality attending the birth of the four-power modus and for the pledge of its development. Certainly the rapport would have lacked something in both warmth and mutual trust without Mr. Hull's participation. The Russians know, as we know, that the agreements are assured of the support of the American people in great part because Mr. Hull put his name to them.

It must be a matter of singular satisfaction to the Secretary of State that he should thus find out in Moscow how much strength has been imparted to his diplomacy by the confidence which is reposed in him by his own people. In truth, he has become a symbol as a man of conviction. That that symbol has become the instrument for steering our country along a path that can lead only to peace and concord is cause for general gratification. We welcome Mr. Hull back from his triumph. He is already among our historical figures. In the annals of our continental story he is assured of a niche among our outstanding statesmen. By riveting our association with the three powers into a grand coalition, he has done a general's job in bringing about the downfall of Hitler, and before he is mustered out he will have been regarded as an artificer of an ampler life for all mankind.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, it was my desire to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very complimentary and proper editorial in the Washington Post with regard to Secretary Hull. However, I understand that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] has already placed the editorial in the RECORD.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT—ANNUAL REPORT BY FRED BRENCKMAN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the annual report made by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, to the National Grange Convention in session this week at Grand Rapids, Mich. It makes important recommendations with respect to constitutional government which will interest Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Seventy-eighth Congress, which began to function on January 6, has been making a commendable effort to recapture the rights and prerogatives with which the legislative branch of the Government is vested under the Constitution. At the beginning of the session Congress served notice that henceforth it intended to write its own laws and that it would no longer be content to play the role of a rubber stamp.

It is worth remembering that the first line in the Constitution following the preamble reads: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." As is well known, when Congress passes an act it usually delegates to the proper agency the power to make rules and regulations for its enforcement. Within reasonable limits, this is necessary. But when this power is abused or stretched to unwarranted lengths, then the liberties of the people are placed in jeopardy by bureaucratic usurpation of their constitutional rights.

Every sensible and well-disposed person is willing to submit cheerfully to such restrictions and regulations as are necessary in times of national emergency, such as the present.

However, it is simply stating a well-known fact to say that for a long period of years the people have been subjected to a bewildering barrage of directives, regulations, and executive orders, emanating from Washington, and all having the force and effect of law. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, declares:

"In the last 10 years, the executive branch of our Government has issued nearly 4,000 executive orders. The number of orders is almost equal to all the laws passed in that period by Congress. The regulations which, by uncounted thousands, have sprung from these orders already fill 20 fat volumes. Unlike our laws, these orders were not publicly debated or voted on by the people's representatives. These were prepared in secret by persons unknown and announced by the 110 order-issuing agencies of the Executive. They are executive laws which our national law-making body never saw until they were published. By them, America is being made over and we don't like it."

Senator O'MAHONEY also calls attention to the increasing extent to which Executive agreements with foreign powers are taking the place of treaties. He says: "When, as now in the United States, Executive agreements are used to put into effect measures of high international policy and great economic significance, then they become instruments for excluding the people from international decisions which critically affect their own welfare."

Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS, the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, who is a believer in the principles of Jeffersonian democracy, has this comment to make regarding the drift toward overcentralization in the affairs of government:

"We all believe in democracy, democracy operated through representative government. Why is it, then, that in a land where everybody proclaims his devotion to it, representative government is withering before our eyes? The bureaucrat is blamed for this. But he

is not the cause. He is the effect. The seat of the trouble lies far deeper.

"Our whole political system is based on the principle of local self-government. But two forces have been destroying this principle. One is the demand of the people for the Federal Government to intervene in problems of every community and every class. The other is the ever-growing practice of passing all these problems on to the Government in Washington. The last war gave this a big push. The post-war dislocation hurried it. The great depression raised it to avalanche proportions. The present war is completing the job.

"Every town and State, every trade association and trade-union, every class and group and desperate minority brings its problems to Washington. And Washington is gladly accepting that responsibility. But Congress is made up solely of mere human beings. And Nature has not endowed any group of human beings with the sweep and grasp of intelligence necessary to handle the multitude of Federal and local problems dumped upon Washington."

The inescapable fact is that if the people want to retain the rights of local self-government, the States and their minor subdivisions must perform the functions which logically fall within their respective spheres, and all of us together must stop asking the Federal Government to render services that it was not intended to perform.

It is often pleaded in attempting to justify the tendency toward over-centralization which has been so strongly in evidence during recent years that with our improved facilities of transportation and communication, State lines and State rights no longer have any particular significance and should, therefore, be disregarded, leaving it to the Federal Government to look after things in a big way in the interest of efficiency and uniformity.

This doctrine is both delusive and destructive. While it is true that science and invention have annihilated time and space, human nature is still the same as it was when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, a century and a half ago. It is fatal to the workings of our free institutions to make the governmental unit so large as to destroy the individual and local sense of responsibility. This Nation, with its wide domain, its diversified interests, and its teeming population, is too great to be wisely and democratically governed, down to the most minute details affecting the daily life of the people, from the seat of the Federal Government at Washington.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and hope to obtain recognition when the morning business is concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1522. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1523. A bill for the relief of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1524. A bill to create United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1525. A bill to amend section 602 (d) (3) (A) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to provide that gratuitous insurance, otherwise payable on the basis of total disability which commenced prior to April 20, 1942, and has continued for 6 months, shall nevertheless be payable where such 6-month period is interrupted by death; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1526. A bill to amend section 531 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HOLMAN introduced Senate bill 1527, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1528. A bill for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER COMMISSION

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, in furtherance of my efforts as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia to make worth-while contribution to a better government for the District of Columbia than it now has, as disclosed by the subcommittee which recently investigated Gallinger Hospital, and to make possible to the resident citizens of the District a government responsible to them and deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed, I introduce a bill in the form of an enabling act which would authorize the organization and functioning of a charter commission for the District of Columbia. I request that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be referred as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1527) to establish a District of Columbia Charter Commission, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1944—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Add at the proper place in the bill the following:

"Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officer, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the employment of tribal attorney, $2,625."

Mr. LUCAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3598, the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 38, under the caption "Rivers and harbors," insert the following:

"Reimbursement for damages on the Illinois River, Ill.: For reimbursement on account of damages arising as a result of projects on the Illinois River, Ill., as authorized by Public Law 168, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved October 23, 1943, $303,500, to remain available until expended."

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69 — INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 1,100 additional copies of Senate Document No. 69, current session, letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 160, a report submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury by a special committee designated to conduct a study of intergovernmental fiscal relations in the United States, be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

INVESTIGATION OF UNDEVELOPED RESOURCES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation in the State of California with respect to (1) the undeveloped irrigation, reclamation, water, power, and all other projects of a public nature with a view to determining the number of workers that might be required in the construction of such projects, the cost involved, and the best manner of financing them, (2) the total amount of unemployment that may be created in the State of California by the termination of the war, and (3) the extent to which the construction of public projects may relieve such unemployment in comparison with the operations of private business and enterprise, and to consider any and all methods that may be deemed advisable in solving post-war problems in the State of California. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and to invite representatives of farm, labor, public, civic, commercial, and other groups in the State of California to participate in and to assist in such investigation. The expenses of the committee or subcommittee under this resolution shall not be paid out of or create a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY

Mr. SCRUGHAM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 206), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the business practices and operations of the alcoholic beverage industry in all its phases, including any matters relating to the production, importation, distribution, purchase, or sale of whisky, gin, rum, brandy, or other distilled spirits, or wine or malt beverages. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date

the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address broadcast by the President in connection with the signing of the agreement setting up the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration on November 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE WISCONSIN CANNERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Wisconsin Canners' Association at Milwaukee, Wis., on November 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT IN REPLY TO TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Vice President in reply to the Transportation Association of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGIONALIZED FREIGHT RATES—LETTER FROM JOHN P. FERRIS

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from John P. Ferris, Director of the Commerce Department, Tennessee Valley Authority, relating to regionalized freight rates, which appears in the Appendix.]

"DAWN OF A NEW ERA"—EDITORIAL FROM ILLINIOS STATE REGISTER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dawn of a New Era," commenting on the recent debate on the so-called Connally resolution, published in the Illinois State Register of November 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLL TAXES—STATEMENT BY HON. CHARLES WARREN

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Charles Warren, formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States, on the subject of poll taxes, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW WAR CAME: EXTRACTS FROM HULL FILES—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How War Came: Extracts From the Hull Files—the Historic and Fateful Sequence of Events Revealed in Reports From Our Diplomats Abroad," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times Magazine of July 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—ARTICLE BY OSWALD F. SCHUETTE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The League of Nations," by Oswald F. Schuette, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROGRAM OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND CANNING—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA CANNERS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by the Minnesota Canners' Association, under date of November 5, 1943, dealing with the food production program as it relates to the canners, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREINDUCTION EXAMINATION OF REGISTRANTS—LETTER FROM ROBERT GRANT WALSH

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Robert Grant Walsh, Government Appeal Agent, Board No. 21, St. Louis, Mo., of the Selective Services System, with reference to the subject of preinduction examination of registrants, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOLDIER VOTE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soldier Vote," published in the Washing Post of November 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ISLAND MILITARY AIR BASES—ARTICLE BY MAJ. ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, dealing with the future value of island military air bases, published in the Washington Star of November 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW BALKAN DANGER—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New Balkan Danger," written by William Philip Simms and published in the Washington Times-Herald of November 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR POST-WAR POLICY—LETTERS TO THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters published in the Washington Star dealing with the post-war policy of the United States, which appear in the Appendix.]

SECRETARY HULL'S RETURN FROM MOSCOW—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press article entitled "Hull Accorded Hero's Welcome on Return From Moscow," published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of November 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DISNEY, Mr. KNUTSON, and Mr. REED of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

SUSPENSION OF OPERATION OF SECTIONS 3114 AND 3115, REVISED STATUTES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3309, Calendar No. 480, a bill to suspend during the present war the operations of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. When the bill was reached on the calendar, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] lodged an objection; but I am advised that he does not wish to press his objection. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3309) to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, when the bill was reached during the call of the calendar, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] objected to its consideration. I have been advised that he has no further disposition to object, and I have none on my part.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has correctly stated my position. I have no further objection to consideration of the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I request that a statement be made regarding the purpose and effect of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to make a statement. I inquire first if the request for present consideration of the bill has been granted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3309) to suspend during the present war the applications of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill would merely suspend the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for a period not longer than 2 years or not longer than the continuance of the war, whichever may be the shorter, so that in no event would there be a complete suspension of the application of the two sections of the statute for a period longer than 2 years, and if the war should end at an earlier date the suspension of the application of the two sections of the statute would be at an end, and the sections of the act would again be in effect.

Sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes provide for an ad valorem duty on all equipment furnished to and repairs made upon American vessels—that is to say, vessels under American registry—in a foreign port. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit American merchant vessels to secure equipment and to make repairs in any foreign country at this time, because of the congestion in our own American yards. The statute provides for a 50-percent ad valorem duty upon the cost of equipment or the cost of repairs made in a foreign port. Under war conditions it is next to impossible to secure invoices promptly, to present the invoices, and to make payment of the tax as required by the sections of the Code to which reference is made.

Furthermore, Mr. President, most vessels now entering and leaving our ports and entering foreign ports, and which, due to a temporary break-down or to accident, must have some repairs made on them, are under the control of Federal or governmental agencies, anyway. Of course, a tax levied against and collected from a Federal agency is refunded, and it is simply a matter of taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another. In other words, private shipping is no longer carried on extensively. There is some, but today most of our shipping is operated through the Federal agency having control of shipping.

That is the whole purpose of the bill. Its provisions are made retroactive to the date of the declaration of war, that is to say, December 8, 1941. There might be some refunds in cases in which the tax had been paid, and of course there might be the filing of some applications for refunds of taxes which had accrued since December 8, 1941.

Passage of the bill is recommended by the Treasury, by the War Shipping Administration, by the Bureau of Customs, and by all other interested agencies of Government.

I ask the Senate to bear in mind also that the bill would not suspend the tariff on any imported article. The only statutes which would be suspended are the two sections which impose an ad valorem duty of 50 percent upon anything purchased for the ship itself, and attached to the ship, or repairs made upon the ship in the port of a foreign country. The tariff would remain in effect; and if any article should be brought in, or if any equipment should be brought in, detached from the ship, and not used as a part of the ship, for necessary or proper repairs, but for sale, then the tariff rates would apply.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that the bill would suspend, for a temporary and definite purpose only, a provision which has been in our law for some time.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. The purpose of the bill is to relieve against great congestion and great difficulty in obtaining the necessary materials for replacements in our shipyards. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; because of the congestion in our shipyards.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that passage of the bill is urged by all the governmental authorities having to do with ship operation and ship construction. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct.

Let me say that the bill was passed by unanimous vote in the other House, as I am informed. The Senate Finance Committee proposed an amendment to the bill because we were of the opinion that the suspension should not remain in effect longer than 2 years in any event, and we so provided by the amendment, but for a shorter period if the war should end before 2 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply desire to explain that when I asked that the consideration of the bill go over, it was not because I had any particular objection. I wanted to look into the matter.

With the explanation just made by the Senator from Georgia, I have no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment reported by the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, after the word "until", it is proposed to strike out "the day following the date of a proclamation by the President that the present war has ended or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President by proclamation, may designate"; and insert "2 years after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the day following the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war (as defined in sec. 780 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code), whichever shall first occur."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

ARMED SERVICES HONOR DAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59), which was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the 7th day of December 1943 be, and it is hereby, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby requested to issue a proclamation commending the observance of that day in honor of all men and women who have served or are now serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America, and in prayer expressing our gratitude to Almighty God for His blessings thus far and imploring His continued favor, protecting care, and aid in their behalf and of the United Nations, the complete victory of their arms, the restoration to health and strength of the wounded and ill, and a righteous, lasting peace.

That the Governor of every State is hereby requested to invoke the cordial cooperation of the people of the State he serves, and that the counties and municipalities are hereby urged to make plans and hold appropriate ceremonies for proper observance of the occasion in every community.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] originally introduced this joint resolution. It was passed by the Senate and sent to the House, which struck out all the language after the resolving clause and inserted its own language, changing the date. It is entirely agreeable that I make the motion which I am about to make.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

TIME EXTENSION FOR APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 722, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

INSPECTION AND GRADING OF SOUTHERN PINE LUMBER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, recently the O. P. A. issued an order effective November 15, relating to the shipment of southern pine boards, either dimension or finish material, which are not grademarked by a qualified inspection agency, and which contain more than 30 percent of No. 1 common or higher grades, requiring that such shipments be accompanied by inspection certificates.

The reason given for this order—and that is what I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country—which applies to southern pine lumber, is that it is alleged that the manufacturers of lumber have resorted to the "illegal device of upgrading." In other words, it is charged by the O. P. A. that the producers of pine lumber in the South have sold No. 2 common, let us say, for No. 1 common, there being a differential of about $3 per thousand board feet between the two grades, in order to evade the price ceilings. So a general order was issued by the O. P. A. requir-

ing that each shipment of pine lumber from southern mills be accompanied by an inspection certificate, from an agency or inspector approved by the O. P. A.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate particularly to note the reason for this order. I now desire to call the attention of the Senate to the act which was approved on July 16, 1943, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and to a provision contained in that act as follows:

Sec. 5 (a). Section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Nothing in this act shall be construed * * * (2) as authorizing the Administrator to require the grade labeling of any commodity."

The Administrator is not requiring the grade labeling of lumber, which is a commodity, but the order is that southern pine boards, if not grade-marked by qualified inspection agencies, must be accompanied by an inspection certificate, or else the price at which the lumber can be legally sold shall be the price fixed for the next lower grade.

Mr. President, I am not disposed to criticize the recently appointed administrator of O. P. A., Mr. Bowles. I have a very good impression of Mr. Bowles and of his intent and purpose; but he is like a new captain brought into a team. The ball is in play all around him, by men who have been there all the time, and he cannot know what is going on in the O. P. A.

Mr. President, I do not seek to raise a sectional issue. I never have done so, and I do not intend to do so in this instance, or so long as I remain a Member of this body. However, if there are any chiselers, cheats, or swindlers, or manufacturers of lumber in the Southern States who have resorted, in the language of the O. P. A. release, to the "illegal device of upgrading" in order to evade price ceilings, then it is the duty of the O. P. A. to prosecute such individuals. It is the duty of O. P. A. to prevent those who would violate the law from resorting to such a device or scheme.

Mr. President, the O. P. A. has a force of more than 54,000 men and women. If it cannot enforce its decrees in a case of this kind without issuing an order applicable to a whole industry in an entire section of the country, then the O. P. A. ought to be abandoned; it ought now to be abolished so far as this sort of function is concerned. One cannot escape the strong suspicion—even more than a suspicion—that the real purpose of this order is to evade the act which was approved by the President of the United States on July 16, 1943, because there can be no possible excuse for an order against a whole industry in a section of the United States based upon the ground that some producers of a commodity in that area have resorted to the illegal device of upgrading.

To borrow a term of the attorneys in the recent Bahama murder trial, I may "suggest" that the chiselers, and those who are disposed to resort to illegal devices, are not confined to the lumber producers of the Southern States, but may be found in the O. P. A. organization itself. If Mr. Bowles wants to do the job which I think he wants to do, he will rid his organization of men who constantly seek, by one device or another, to evade the plain intent and purpose of the price-control legislation, who go into the field of economics and undertake to limit profits, and then undertake to apply grade marketing and grade labeling, which the Congress of the United States has expressly prohibited.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy with the remarks of the Senator from Georgia. It seems to me that the directives which are issued, and which seemingly have all the authority of an act of the Congress, and invariably call for augmented forces of regulators, are contrary to the spirit of our Government and frequently are harmful. But what recourse have we? What remedy does the Senator offer or propose in the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am proposing now to bring the matter to the attention of the country. There are other enforcement practices carried on by the legal division of the O. P. A. which I propose to correct by a bill which I shall introduce, and vigorously and actively press. Certain of the enforcement practices of the O. P. A. cannot be defended. They are un-American. They ought not to be tolerated at all. In this particular instance, unless the O. P. A. means to charge that every manufacturer of lumber in the South is a cheat and a swindler, and that he resorts to illegal practices to evade the price ceilings fixed on southern pine lumber by upgrading his lumber, the order is utterly without excuse or justification. It stands entirely defenseless when one takes into consideration the enormous amount of money that has been appropriated to the O. P. A., and then considers that it has a vast army of more than 54,000 people to carry on its work.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a situation which I need not stress, namely, that nothing which may be wrong with the shipment or the grading of lumber can be hidden under a bushel. Lumber makes a bulky shipment. It moves on freight cars in carload lots, or on trucks in truck lots. Anyone can inspect it or see it. Anyone can determine whether there has been upgrading. Yet, rather than deal directly with those who are said to have given offense against the price ceilings fixed by the O. P. A., a blanket order is issued which will have the general effect of practically eliminating southern pine lumber from the market, or forcing the sale of a higher grade at the ceiling price fixed for the lower grade of the same lumber.

NAZI ATTACK ON MOTION-PICTURE FILM MISSION TO MOSCOW

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a member of our armed forces, a soldier 24 years of age, who had been stationed overseas for a year and a half, who was wounded in the battle of El Guettar Valley, and who is now at Tilton General Hospital in New Jersey.

Simply and unconsciously, by the tales of his own experiences, this boy described the natural bravery of our American soldiers and the great work they are doing on many fronts. Hardly less amazing were the examples of the almost miraculous medical attention which he depicted as typical of the care given our men under hazardous battle conditions. I later learned that this very boy had been flown 800 miles to a base hospital where one of the foremost hand, skin, and bone specialists in the world had given him prompt and skillful care, and saved him from permanent disability.

After hospitalization and medical attention Sergeant Stern was returned to duty and his first assignment was the invasion of Sicily. He tells the following story about his part in this campaign:

On the trek inland his detail was ordered to set up their antitank guns on the fringes of the Comiso Airport, and head for a Nazi airdrome. Halfway there they were halted by an attack of machine-gun fire from a hidden nest of Nazi snipers. Our boys jumped off their half-track and crawled on their stomachs toward an old house which lodged the snipers. After a half hour of painstaking maneuvers they finally managed to kill the Nazis in the house. It was then that they searched the German soldiers and Sergeant Stern found a Nazi newspaper, Eagle in the South, printed for the German Army, which he pocketed for further inspection, and later found that it contained an attack on a motion picture released here in the United States based on Ambassador Davies' book, Mission to Moscow.

After several more engagements, this boy was returned to the United States for medical treatment. Mr. President, imagine how he reacted when at the hospital, looking through back copies of our own newspapers, he discovered the same words and phrases used by that stained Nazi Wehrmacht newspaper picked up outside of Comiso Airport. He felt that we were providing the Nazis with further ammunition for the printed word seemed to him every bit as dangerous as the bullets fired from a Nazi gun.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to express my own personal tribute to Joe Davies and his great book Mission to Moscow. Before I had read it, I was totally unable to understand the transcendent developments in Russia, Germany, and Europe. Afterward, I had some conception of the great ability that Russian leaders were giving to their preparation for the coming war with Germany and to the development of their industrial economy. Mr. Davies' book is undoubtedly one of the noteworthy contributions to our literature and to our international thinking, and I can well understand and sympathize with the concern of Sergeant Stern expressed in his letter to me as he read the same attacks in the newspapers of the United States upon the film made from the book

as he discovered in the German newspaper taken from the body of a dead German soldier. I now ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the letter from Sergeant Stern and a copy of the translation from the German newspaper of the article propagandizing against the film Mission to Moscow.

There being no objection, the letter and the translation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TILTON GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Fort Dix, N. J., November 8, 1943.

Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: First let me introduce myself. It's Staff Sgt. Phil Stern, and I am now stationed at Tilton General Hospital after a year and a half of overseas duty, covering the British Isles, invasion of north Africa, against Rommel in Tunisia, and the assault on Sicily. During the Tunisian fighting I was a member of Col. Bill Darby's First Ranger Battalion.

In the El Guettar battle against the Tenth Panzers I received gun and shrapnel wounds. I caught shrapnel in both legs and machine-gun slugs in my neck and wrist. After 2 months of hospitalization I went back to duty on Stars and Stripes (soldier paper) and my first assignment was the invasion of Sicily.

It was on the trek inland that I discovered something which should interest you. Especially since the papers have often quoted you as speaking out for unity of the Allied Nations abroad and democracy at home. Briefly, this is it: We were ordered to set up our antitank guns on the fringes of Comiso Airport. Hopped into our half-track and headed for the Nazi airdrome. Half way there snipers opened up on us. All of us jumped off the vehicle, crawled on our stomachs toward an old house which lodged the snipers. After a half hour of painstaking maneuvers we finally shot up the three Nazis in the house. One of the Germans apparently had fought in Russia and in his pocket was a Nazi map of Russia. Also he had a Nazi newspaper, Eagle in the South (enclosing photostat of same). The unusual angle is that this sheet contained a blistering attack on the film Mission to Moscow (enclosing translation). I had read the Davies book, you see, and I kept the Nazi paper as a souvenir. At that point my old wounds came up to disable my right arm, hence the Army order sending me home. Now I'm on a 30-day convalescence furlough and I'm sore as hell to find many American newspapers and people swatting at Mission to Moscow in the same words and phrases used by that stained Nazi Wehrmacht newspaper I picked up outside of Comiso Airport. It seems incredible that anyone here in the United States of America would use Nazi ammunition against an ally. I lived in your State for several years and know of your work.

I sincerely hope that you can use this incident to assist Russian soldiers who are stopping the same shrapnel, the same bullets, and the same booby traps used against Pvt. Johnny Smith in Italy.

Sincerely yours,

Sgt. PHIL STERN.

[Translation of movie review from Eagle in the South, a German soldiers' newspaper for the district of the Supreme Commander of the South, May 22, 1943]

MISSION TO MOSCOW

A DISGUSTING HOLLYWOOD PIECE OF AGITATION

One of the worst pieces of agitation about bolshevism which Hollywood has ever created, the film Mission to Moscow, is now running in all the big motion-picture houses in the world.

The result this time is negative. This picture is based on the manuscript of a book by the same name which the former American Ambassador in Moscow, Davies, recently has published.

In this book, Davies glorifies the person of Stalin and those of other high-ranking Soviet functionaries. He reports how he witnessed the big theatrical trials against the so-called Trotskyites before the beginning of the war; although at first he did not believe the accusations made by the state attorneys, he, as legal expert, later became convinced that the condemned marshals, generals, and political agitators actually made genuine confessions.

With great verbosity of admiration, he praises the perfection of Soviet war economy and the reorganization of the Soviet Army. Particularly he is anxious to show how he as American Ambassador succeeded in improving the relations between the Soviet Republic and his own Government.

The film tries to picture all this as well as the claim that the average Bolshevik looks like an American, and lives and thinks like one. This is done in such a hypocritical manner that even the American public, which certainly is not touchy, began to complain.

The reporter of the Swedish newspaper Dagens Nyheter, in New York, reports that "the film Mission to Moscow has become the most discussed war product of Hollywood. The storm of discussions which has begun, is whirling in newspapers and radio in constantly increasing strength."

Again and again the question is asked whether a picture which deliberately distorts well-known facts and historical events with the purpose of presenting the current Soviet-American relations as favorably as possible could really improve the mutual relations for any length of time.

The American public is bound to sense that invention and fact in this case are so far apart that the author did not even try to bridge this gap.

What angers the Americans particularly are the attacks which again and again are made upon the American isolationists and the conservative Republicans who fought bolshevism before this fateful alliance was entered. They are pictured as people blinded by stupid prejudice, whose lack of understanding is directed not only against the Soviet-American friendship but against Roosevelt's foreign policies in general. In this manner the Hollywood authors hoped to kill two birds with one stone. Mission to Moscow is also intended as a propaganda picture for the reelection of Roosevelt in 1944.

It—the picture—most likely will fulfill this aim as well as whitewash bolshevism; it is today a fact * * * (destroyed) the semi-official * * * (the rest is destroyed)

DESIGNATION OF BENEFICIARY OF GRATUITY PAYMENT ON DEATH OF OFFICERS OR ENLISTED MEN

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2188, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "that the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct" (41 Stat. 367), approved December 17, 1919, as amended and supplemented (42 Stat. 1385; 45 Stat. 249; 55 Stat. 796; 10 U. S. C. 903, 903a), be, and the same is hereby further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: '*And provided further*, That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein, such gratuity shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated: *And provided further*, That if there be no widow, child, or previously designated dependent relative, the Secretary of War shall cause the amount herein provided to be paid to any grandchild, parent, brother or sister, or grandparent shown to have been dependent upon such officer or enlisted man prior to his death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And provided further*, That the last foregoing proviso shall be effective as of August 27, 1940.'

"SEC. 2. Nothing herein shall be construed to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments made prior to the date of the approval of this Act, but no gratuity payment shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval."

And the Senate agree to the same.

R. R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina give us some information as to the purpose of the bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to do so.

The bill has to do with the designation of a beneficiary to receive the gratuity of 6 months' pay allowed the widow in the event of the death of her husband while serving in the armed forces. In case the widow should die and there should be no living children the bill provides to whom the gratuity shall be paid.

Mr. WHITE. Is the report signed by all the Senate conferees?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 1457.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program

and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield before his motion is voted upon?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A number of Senators have spoken to me about the desirability of having this matter go over until Monday before it is voted upon. A number of Senators are absent because yesterday was Armistice Day and they went away to participate in Armistice Day ceremonies. Is it the purpose of the Senator to make the bill the unfinished business and then let it go over until Monday without any discussion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct; I do not intend to press the measure at all this afternoon, if we can have an agreement to take a recess until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I shall later move a recess.

Mr. BANKHEAD. After the bill is made the unfinished business, it may then go over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from Alabama proposes to discuss the bill at this time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. The debate will start on Monday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1457.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say that at the conclusion of today's business it will be my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday, so that we can enter upon the discussion of the bill at once upon the convening of the Senate on that day.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I inquire what is in prospect for the remainder of the afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. Nothing; except I will say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] desires to take up a bill which the President has vetoed and which he desires to seek to have enacted over the President's veto. That will, of course, require a quorum; and as soon as we finish any intervening business I shall call for a quorum. I notice that the Senator from Tennessee is now in the Chamber.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to inquire if the bill called up by the Senator from Alabama has been made the unfinished business to come up on Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been made the unfinished business.

Mr. BALL. I submit an amendment to Senate bill 1457, providing for paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, which was just made the unfinished business. I intend to offer the amendment on Monday. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

RAILROAD LABOR'S MAGNIFICIENT WAR RECORD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the magnificient record of railroad labor that has so frequently been praised in the Halls of Congress was again recognized by the President's Emergency Board in its report to the President on May 24 with respect to the railroad wage dispute which has now reached the proportions of a railroad crisis.

Following its comprehensive investigations conducted March 1 to May 7, the Board found that the record of the railroads during the war emergency, including the period of defense activity, has been a magnificient one. In this connection, the Board informed the President that:

> This outstanding performance of the railroads has been the result of the constructive, self-denying, and patriotic attitudes of both the managements and the men. * * * The labor force of the railroads has encouraged and supported every reasonable effort in these directions, has increasingly adjusted its working habits and arrangements to the needs of the emergency situation, and has used its skill and industry without stint in the interest of attaining these objectives. Fundamentally, a spirit of cooperation has vitalized the efforts of the managements and the men. Without free and complete and whole-hearted cooperation between the carriers and their employees the magnificient record of the railroads, as made thus far, could not have been achieved.

It is a most regrettable fact and a matter of grave national concern to find now that this splendid achievement in our Nation's vital transportation industry is being seriously impaired, even dangerously menaced, in this critical stage of our war activities, by the refusal of the Stabilization Director to approve the wage compromise recommended by the President's fact-finding body after such thorough and exhaustive investigations.

The remarkable record of labor productivity in the railroad industry has long been known to the Members of Congress. The long and unbroken record of harmonious industrial relations growing out of the high type of labor leadership in this industry has invoked unstinted praise upon the part of Congress on many occasions. The Railway Labor Act, when permitted to function without interference, has been universally recognized as the most satisfactory labor legislation ever enacted by Congress. In short, the labor productivity, labor harmony, and labor leadership in the railroad industry have long been the ideal that Congress has hoped for in the Nation's industries as a whole.

During 1942 the railroads handled the greatest volume of freight and passenger business in history, and the business has climbed to still higher levels during the present year. In 1942, revenue freight ton-miles were almost 50 percent greater than in the pre-war peak year of 1929, and passenger business was almost double that of 1929.

Due to the economies and deferred purchases which resulted from the 10 subnormal years following 1929, the railroads were called upon unexpectedly to meet these new and staggering war demands with fewer locomotives, fewer freight cars, fewer passenger cars, and with an accumulation of deferred maintenance in both roadway and equipment. The situation was made more difficult due to the fact that material shortages and war restrictions prevented the immediate replacements and rehabilitation of the plant that would otherwise have been made when the tremendously increased war revenues began rolling into the cash drawers of the railroad industries.

But as a result of these war restrictions, the job had to be done by greater effort on the part of management and men with a very limited amount of additional equipment.

Fortunately for the war effort and for the national well-being, it was done and on a magnificent basis. The tremendous contribution made by railroad labor is strikingly shown in the fact that the 1942 peak transportation job was handled by only 1,271,000, employees which was 390,000 fewer than were employed in 1929 when the earlier peak business was handled by the railroads without the emergencies and the other factors incident to the war transportation job handled in 1942. Fewer men handled a bigger job with less equipment and under more difficult circumstances during the year 1942.

In spite of the fact that the railroads entered upon the war period with a plant that had suffered from 10 lean years of business, and from 10 years of subnormal maintenance, they handled, in 1942, about 50 percent more freight business and almost 100 percent more passenger business with about 24 percent fewer employees.

In the case of the railroad industry and its million and a quarter trained workers, the first critical year of our Nation's war effort was not another unhappy instance of "too little, too late." On the contrary, a greatly reduced number of workers, working with a railroad plant that had suffered from 10 years of undermaintenance, turned out the greatest transportation job in world history and made new records in labor efficiency and productivity.

While the total railroad wage bill in 1942 was only $36,000,000 above that of 1929, the operating revenues of the railroads increased by $1,187,000,000 over 1929. This meant that while 46 cents out of each revenue dollar went for wages in 1929, only 39 cents went for wages in 1942.

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee increased from 269,000 to 502,000, which was an increase in transportation output per employee of almost 100 percent.

As a result of this remarkable job by railroad labor, the President's Emergency Board was able to report to the President that, for the year 1942, the operating ratio—the ratio of operating expenses to operating revenues, frequently used as a measure of efficient and profitable railroad business—was more favorable in 1942 than for any other year on record.

It is also true that the 1942 wage ratio, that is to say, the relation of total wages to total operating revenues, also reached a new low when it dropped to the unprecented ratio of 39.3.

As a result of the record business handled in 1942 with a reduced number of workers, the operating revenues climbed to fantastic peaks. Never before had total operating revenues reached the $7,000,000,000 figure. In the earlier peak year of 1929 they had soared to $6,279,000,000. However, in 1942 they reached the astronomic figure of $7,466,000,000.

This tremendous increase in total operating revenues was not accompanied by a proportionate increase in total operating expenses nor in total wages. As a result of this, the net railway operating income for 1942 climbed to the new high peak of $1,480,940,000.

It was on the basis of this increased labor output, this new peak record of labor efficiency, and these higher operating revenues and higher net profits, which were realized without proportionately higher operating expenses that the Board found after 44 days of exhaustive public hearings that the 8 cent hourly increase was warranted by the facts, was justified under the stabilization program, could be met by the railroads without any increase in freight and passenger rates, and was necessary as an aid to the effective prosecution of the war.

The board, in reporting to the President on May 29, summed all this up very concisely when it said, on page 98 of its printed report:

> A careful study and analysis of the entire record leads to the conclusion that the correcting of gross inequities requires the recommended wage increases for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees. The increases constitute the minimum adjustments necessary for this purpose. The addition to the wage bill of the railroad industry will not provide a basis for increases in railroad traffic rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in these rates. The recommended increases are within the existing general levels of production costs in the sense that they do not provide a basis for increases in railroad traffic rates or for increases in production costs in comparable industries and employments. The correction, by means of the recommended increases, of the gross inequities disclosed by the facts of record is indispensable to the maintenance of the railroad industry in a position that will enable it to aid most effectively in the prosecution of the war.

In the light of these findings on the part of the President's fact-finding board, it strikes me that the Stabilization Director in his arbitrary cancelation of this 8-cent hourly increase, has failed to do the job that he was appointed to do, which is to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, and that he has through his rigid determination to freeze wages actually impaired the war effort.

The crisis in railway labor relations has arisen only because a wage increase found by a Presidential emergency board to be "necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war" has been summarily vetoed by Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson. If the Presidential board, composed of experts in the railway labor field, is right, then Judge Vinson has taken a stand which prevents maximum effectiveness in our war effort.

This conflict between Government agencies demands immediate attention. The importance of American railways in our war production jobs certainly needs no proof. These railroads are not only hauling raw materials—the ore, the lumber, the agricultural products—required to keep the war machine rolling, but they also haul the parts of the semi-finished products which must arrive in tremendous volume and on close schedules at every vital assembly and production plant. The finished war materials must get to our seaboard to fit the schedules of overseas transportation. Not just the need for a great total volume of transportation, but also the imperative requirement for efficient and timely transportation of all of our war products rests squarely upon these American railroads.

Before the war emergency, railway staffs were at a minimum level; to meet the demands of the emergency, the railways have had to increase their forces by over 400,000 men. Railway transportation, furthermore, is not only a matter of the number of men and women working for the carriers, but it is also a matter of having enough employees with the necessary skill and experience to provide safe as well as continuous operation of our great railway systems.

To recruit this new army of railway workers and to hold the skilled men already working for the railroads, it is elementary common sense that the railroads must pay wages comparing with some degree of justice to those offered skilled workers in other industries. As a matter of fact, however, railroad wages are and have been far below those paid for similar skills in other industries.

In February of this year an emergency board was appointed, under the Railway Mediation Act and Presidential Executive orders, to consider the wage rates of the million nonoperating railway employees. That Board, after weeks of hearings and consideration of hundreds of statistical exhibits on wage conditions, reported that the wages of these railway men are far below those of workers in comparable occupations in other industries. On 20 specific occupations there were only 3 where the railway workers are paid more than the lowest outside rates; in 10 of the occupations the lowest outside rate was at least 10 cents an hour above the railroad rate. The top rates, in some cases, in outside industries were as much as $1 an hour above railway rates.

It takes no profound knowledge of economics or of human nature to know what has happened under those circumstances. Many thousands of skilled railway workers have gone into other employment. New workers entering railway service for the first time have speedily decided to go into other employment. The Railroad Retirement Board reported that in the year ending July 1, 1943, 1,300,000 employees were hired by the railroads, but 1,210,000 employees were lost. For every 13 men who went to work for the carriers, 12 men quit and went elsewhere.

This tremendous turn-over of railway workers is a serious and devastating loss to the railway industry, but it is much more than that. Such a shift in employment is a net loss of major proportions to the total manpower resources of the Nation. The new railway worker, during his first weeks of service, is of little value. Moreover, the training he is being given takes the time of older workers and of railway supervisors, and his lack of skill endangers all his fellow employees. When that new worker, after complete or only partial training, leaves the railroad and goes into other industries, the Nation has lost the man-days or weeks of his own training as well as the hours of effort expended by older employees and supervisors in that training. Much of this training on the railroad is utterly and completely valueless in any other industry.

That situation is what called forth the recommendation of the Emergency Board, appointed under the Railway Labor Act, that the wages of these railway men should be increased by 8 cents an hour. The Director of Economic Stabilization, in vetoing that wage increase, has made certain that there will be a continuance of manpower shortage on the railways. He has made certain that there will be a continuance of the excessive turn-over. He has guaranteed the continuance of the terrific losses to our inadequate manpower pool that the turnover in the railway industry has caused. This act by Judge Vinson seems clearly in defiance of the Stabilization Act passed by Congress on October 2, 1942. The Congress has directed the administration so to adjust wages as to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. The administration has before it the decision by a competent board of experts that this wage increase is a war necessity. Judge Vinson, in setting aside this recommendation, has thus violated the clear mandates of the Congress, and has placed a major obstacle in the way of the rapid and successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. President, I make these remarks firm in the knowledge that the public at large has not had made available to it by the public press the true facts which are back of the present effort on the part of the railroad workers to have placed clearly before the people the demands which they make, in connection with which a strike vote is now being taken. I deplore the strike vote. I am sorry it had to be taken; but in my judgment I do not know of anything else that the million men laboring upon the railroads could do.

BASIC ARMY TRAINING—LETTER BY PVT. IGOR CASSINI

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I believe the American people are thoroughly

aware of the fact that we have the finest Army in the world, and we are being advised, more and more so every day, that the fine condition of our Army is attributable entirely to the excellent training given its men under the direction of our great chief of staff, General Marshall. The other day I read a description of aspects of the training given to those taking the fundamental basic training in the Army camps. The description was contained in a letter which came from Camp Lee, Va., written by Pvt. Igor Cassini, who was formerly the author of a newspaper column under the heading "These charming people." I note that recently his charming and lovely wife has substituted splendidly for him in the writing of the column. I ask that the article dealing with the life of a private taking basic training be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMP LEE, VA.

DARLING WIFE: I've read your columns here at camp, and I swear I'm proud of you. As a matter of fact, I have shown them to all the fellows here in the barracks and they all liked them, too. I knew you would do well all along, but now I'm sure that none of the readers will be aware of my absence at all. And think how many people must be relieved that I've gone. They may get a bad jolt seeing that I'm back in print again. But let them be reassured I have a new job now. It's the Army. If I write anything now it will be about life in the Army. Washington I leave entirely to you, dearie, and I'm glad, believe me. You continue to handle it as well as you have in the beginning, and when I come back I'm sure publisher and readers together will clamor that you keep on. In that case, I'll attend to housework, for which the Army will have trained me perfectly. You'll support me in the manner to which I, and the rest of the fellows, will have become accustomed.

For I sincerely believe this, darling: When we boys will march back home after the good fight, we may run into a heap of trouble trying to fit in our old jobs, which so many of our wives will have taken. About this point, the fellows in my barracks seem to be of divided opinion. Some, the most optimistic, believe that wives will be happy to surrender their jobs when Johnny comes marching home. Others, however, think there'll be much fussing, and since we, the men, will be tired of fighting, anyway, we'll give in to our wives.

Besides, it'll be no trouble at all for us to take our place in the kitchens. Our long hours of K. P. in the Army will have us fit. In fact, I assure you, darling, when I come home you won't need to bother about the lack of servants. In 2 weeks in the Army I've already learned how to make a bed, without a crease, in a couple of minutes; how to wash my own laundry; scrub floors; wash dishes; light a furnace; dig ditches; sew; press my own clothes; clean my boots as shiny as a mirror; and, in fact, clean spotlessly everything in sight.

Don't think for a moment that the only thing the Army teaches you is discipline and how to shoot a gun. There are a thousand little and not always so pleasant details (at least according to a civilian's way of thinking) that are part of the duties of a soldier. And at the raw start of your military life they hand you dish mops and brooms before they hand you a gun.

The art of defending yourself and killing an enemy will start tomorrow when my basic training begins. At the end of 17 weeks of this I should be a pretty well-trained soldier. But up to now the Army has already made me and all the fellows who came in at the same time a bunch of first-class housemaids.

It's amazing how quick the Army does that for you. Frankly, I had always considered the problem of making my own bed a major enterprise. To tell you the truth, darling, I think that's the reason why many men marry—so they won't have to make their own beds. Some later discover, to their deep regret, that it only means they have to make two beds. You know better than anyone how utterly unprepared and helpless I was about making a bed. Besides, there's an abyss of difference between making a civilian bed and a military bed. The Army way means that everything has to be folded at a certain angle, according to regulations. And if only a line shows, it means a "gig." A "gig" is a terrible thing in the Army. It means hours of kitchen duty or something equally as seducing.

The first day I was at Fort Meade, the reception center, I not only had to make my own bed but also that of my sergeant and of my corporal. Fortunately, a generous soldier, who had been in the Army a full 2 days, showed me how to do it. Otherwise I would have been lost. By now, though, I'm an expert bed maker. Now when I jump out of bed at 5 a. m. I can dress and make my bed, ready for inspection, in the time it takes a civilian to reach out and turn off the alarm clock.

The entire transition from civilian into soldier is prodigiously quick. That's what they do for you at a reception center, when they process you into the Army in a few days' time. By that time you are either a soldier or it's just too bad for you. I've already been shipped out of Fort Meade and assigned here for my basic; that's why I can speak of it with such a distant and light feeling. I couldn't, though, while I was there, trembling every time my sergeant frowned.

So many things impressed me then. The most amazing of all is how 60 of us marched into a barracks in civilian clothes. We went through the barracks, gradually stripping ourselves of our civilian garments and putting on G. I. clothes. It took exactly 20 minutes for the bunch of us to march out smartly, perfectly attired with 65 pounds of equipment on our backs. And, believe it or not, the uniforms fit you. They take the measurements and make the alterations so quickly you only see a blur. That's really a marvelous proof of the efficiency of the Army.

But, darling, I hear the whistle blow and the sergeant bellowing, er, pardon, gently asking for us. I'll write soon again, though, to tell you more about my startling new career—buck private in the United States Army. My love to you and to Washington.

IGOR.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Caraway	Green
Austin	Chandler	Guffey
Ball	Chavez	Hawkes
Bankhead	Clark, Idaho	Hayden
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Bilbo	Connally	Holman
Brewster	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.
Brooks	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Eastland	Langer
Burton	Ellender	Lucas
Bushfield	Ferguson	McClellan
Butler	George	McFarland
Byrd	Gerry	McKellar
Capper	Gillette	Mead
Millikin	Robertson	Van Nuys
Moore	Scrugham	Wagner
Murdock	Shipstead	Wallgren
Murray	Smith	Wheeler
Nye	Stewart	Wherry
O'Daniel	Thomas, Idaho	White
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Willis
Reed	Tunnell	Wilson
Revercomb	Tydings	
Reynolds	Vandenberg	

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is absent, is conducting hearings in the West for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I had intended to bring up the matter of the President's veto of Senate bill 514, for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, who has a claim for an amount somewhat in excess of $7,000. On the question of overriding the Presidential veto, the Constitution requires a yea-and-nay vote. I am quite confident that the President vetoed this bill under a misapprehension as to the facts. I should like to explain the facts, but instead of doing so this afternoon, I am willing to have the Senate take a recess now until Monday, when I will bring the question up.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee tell us whether or not the proposed arrangement will be in conflict with the earlier action taken with respect to the bill of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not. Under the rules of the Senate, a veto message has priority anyway. I have no doubt the Senator from Alabama will be perfectly willing to have it come up.

Mr. DANAHER. I believe that is correct. I merely wished to have that statement from the Senator from Tennessee.

TWELFTH REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H DOC. NO. 353)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a report regarding reverse lend-lease aid to the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For text of the message from the President of the United States, see pages 9521–9523 of the proceedings of the House of Representatives of November 11, 1943.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Albert H. Stevenson, to be assistant sanitary engineer, and Howard J. Woodbridge, to be passed assistant dental surgeon, both in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Peru, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Portugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., to serve as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lincoln MacVeagh to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece, now established in Egypt, and to serve as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Yugoslavia, now established in Egypt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hiram Bingham, Jr., to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew B. Foster to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 12, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Canada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Elaine Beadling, of Coraopolis, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa., in place of Dennis A. Phelan, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from November 1, 1943:

Philip H. Best
John G. Crawford
Mayo L. Emory
William C. Jenkins,
Harry J. Schweigert

The following-named passed assistant surgeon to be temporary surgeon, to rank as such from November 1, 1943:

Frederick J. Krueger

The following-named passed assistant sanitary engineer to be temporary sanitary engineer, to rank as such from November 1, 1943:

Gordon E. McCallum

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from November 1, 1943:

William Hendon Gordon
Leonard A. Scheele
Robert H. Flinn
Frederick W. Kratz

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Frank O'Driscoll Hunter (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Morrison Clay Stayer (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Lewis Anderson, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Westside Torkel Larson (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Howard McCrum Snyder (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Willis Eagles (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Spencer Ball Akin (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert McGowan Littlejohn (colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Edward Raab Covell (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. William Albert Matheny (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Albertus Bethea, Medical Corps.

Col. Charles Bertody Stone, 3d (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Wesley Sullivan (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Dorn (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Ray Tyson Maddocks (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Loomis Booth (major, Field Artillery; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Fuller Davis (lieutenant colonel Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Eugene Harold Beebe (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States—Air Corps.

Col. John Walton Lang, Infantry.

Col. Wilbur Reece McReynolds (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George McCoy, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Alden Rudyard Crawford (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Willard Gordon Wyman (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Frank Stace (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Orval Ray Cook (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Malcolm Fraser Lindsey (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Augustus French, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Frank Dow Merrill (captain, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Carl Brown McDaniel (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Leonard Henderson Sims (lieutenant colonel, Finance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Ridgely Gaither (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Zim E. Lawhon (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Trovilla Myers (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Jeffries Betts (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Leon William Johnson (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Theodore Leslie Futch (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Needham Roberts (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Wrathall Spry (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Oliver Lincoln Haines (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Clarence Paschal, Infantry.

Col. Samuel Egbert Anderson (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Tristram Tupper (lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth Claiborne Royall, Army of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. William H. Hamilton, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Commander, Fleet Air Wing 7, Atlantic Fleet, and assigned to duty in the United Kingdom, to rank from the 10th day of November 1943.

Capt. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of July 1942.

Capt. Clarence E. Olsen, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as the United States naval member on a military mission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of which Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army, is the head, to rank from the 10th day of November 1943.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Earl G. Rose to be a commodore, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard while serving as Commander, Greenland Patrol, to rank from November 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Erline R. Scruggs, Coffeeville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Willie Mae Hancock, Ethelsville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Averell L. Purvis, Spring Hill., Ala., in place of C. C. Hudson, resigned.

ALASKA

Lew M. Williams, Wrangell, Alaska, in place of B. Y. Grant, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Ella S. Anderson, Auberry, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gladys E. Beard, Yountville, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONNECTICUT

Charles J. Schmid, Anston, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John T. Collins, Pequonock, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dorothy E. Wilkinson, Tariffville, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

DELAWARE

Anna A. Anderson, Ocean View, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

FLORIDA

Eva R. Vaughn, Century, Fla., in place of E. R. Vaughn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Thomas M. Crouch, Fort White, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IDAHO

Charles I. Bartlett, Craigmont, Idaho, in place of N. B. Hawk, appointee declined.

ILLINOIS

Fred M. Johnson, Jonesboro, Ill., in place of F. E. Keller, transferred.

INDIANA

Harold W. Barker, Cayuga, Ind., in place of J. S. Auble, resigned.

KANSAS

Fern T. Fencl, Haddam, Kans., in place of J. C. Patterson, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Milton Tackett, Pikeville, Ky., in place of T. M. Riddle, retired.

MAINE

Frances F. Quinn, Ellsworth Falls, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hollis M. Smith, Mount Desert, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John M. Perkins, Sherman Station, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thelma B. Mahar, West Pembroke, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ina S. Knight, West Scarboro, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Florence K. Hazard, Branchville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eleanor S. Canter, Charlotte Hall, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Aquilla Streaker, Daniels, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Esther M. Dennis, Willards, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John H. Dwyer, Worton, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

Anne S. Drake, Cummington, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bertha T. Conners, East Templeton, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rosanna T. Ruel, Granby, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marjorie C. Purdy, Marshfield Hills, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSISSIPPI

Fred G. Martin, Dorsey, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charles Olin Anderson, Tylertown, Miss., in place of C. E. Ball, deceased.

MONTANA

Geneva Heath, Wilsall, Mont., in place of S. C. Brady, resigned.

NEBRASKA

James B. Gordon, Cedar Rapids, Nebr., in place of J. B. Gordon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John F. Cronin, Lebanon, N. H., in place of W. J. M. Tremblay, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Reva Hilborn, Clarksboro, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leon A. Dolan, Ogdensburg, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

I. Morgan Lewis, Rocky Hill, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Matilda E. Lyster, Thorofare, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sara Gertrude Boland, West Berlin, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW MEXICO

Dave G. Cliver, Santa Rita, N. Mex., in place of E. L. Head, resigned.

NEW YORK

Ruth Larsen, King Ferry, N. Y., in place of J. J. Fox, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

E. Burke Gunter, Hamlet, N. C., in place of N. W. LeGrand, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harry C. Duntley, Carrington, N. Dak., in place of F. A. Sommars, resigned.

OHIO

Zoe S. Garinger, Bloomingburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rachel I. Beal, Brady Lake, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kenneth L. Burley, Bridgeport, Ohio, in place of H. A. Schafer, resigned.

Effie L. Kinder, Casstown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Phyllis Hawley, Cheshire, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Willard A. Sawyer, Lockbourne, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John L. Bolin, Monroe, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Viola M. Murphy, Negley, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bruce J. Mentzer, Phalanx Station, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Ralph D. Kester, Enid, Okla., in place of R. D. Kester. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

Clark W. Craig, Shawnee, Okla., in place of K. H. Warren. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hal Files, Talihina, Okla., in place of J. F. Nicholson, resigned.

OREGON

Clare M. Sawyer, Drain, Oreg., in place of O. A. Snook, resigned.

Mildred B. Croner, Oakridge, Oreg., in place of S. B. Jones, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Caroline A. Smith, Lackawaxen, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Loretta M. McCloskey, Mountaintop, Pa., in place of George McCloskey, resigned.

Ralph McKean, Shohola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Helen M. Nichols, Tullytown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Stephen Rohart, Winburne, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TENNESSEE

Maben B. Curry, Henry, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Walter Kurz, Somerset, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Edith E. Payne, Falmouth, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mildred K. Smith, Sterling, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Percy Bradshaw, Zuni, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Lila Luella Henry, Bow, Wash., in place of Grace Hayes, resigned.

Nancy J. Nance, Brush Prairie, Wash., in place of H. E. Pender, transferred.

Josephine F. Johnson, Endicott, Wash., in the place of E. S. Garland, resigned.

Thomas W. Tait, Gig Harbor, Wash., in place of A. L. Hopkins, deceased.

Ruth F. Walters, Moxee City, Wash., in place of C. E. Simon, resigned.

John T. Scott, North Bend, Wash., in place of D. P. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Theo V. Steele, Port Gamble, Wash., in place of Mike Capps, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 12, 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

Lincoln MacVeagh, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt and also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Yugoslavia now established in Egypt.

Hiram Bingham, Jr., to be a consul.

Andrew B. Foster to be a consul.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Ordnance Department

Capt. Horace Freeman Bigelow

To Infantry

Lt. Col. George Allan Miller

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, Infantry

Omar Nelson Bradley
Paul John Mueller
Leland Stanford Hobbs

To be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps

John Frederick Kahle

To be colonel, Air Corps

Edwin Bowman Lyon

To be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps

Reinold Melberg

To be colonel, Finance Department

Clarence Brewster Lindner

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Harvey Robinson Livesay
Raymond Osborne Dart
John Frank Lieberman
Brooks Collins Grant
William Bell Foster
Chauncey Elmo Dovell

To be captains, Medical Corps

Arthur Lynn Burks
Robert Charles Hunter, Jr.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Edward Ernest Rose

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

George Jacob Rife

To be colonel, Pharmacy Corps

Thomas Grimsley Hester

To be colonels, Chaplain Corps

Edward Lewis Trett
Charles Coburn Merrill

To be captain, Chaplain Corps

Arthur Carl Piepkorn

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

Margaret B. Tierney, Kensington.

MISSOURI

Amos A. Ponder, Cardwell.
Jonathan N. Carter, Linneus.
Virginia L. Rutledge, Osage Beach.

NORTH DAKOTA

William T. Wakefield, Mott.
Garfield J. Mauritson, Park River.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, we praise Thee that Thou hast called us to be colaborers with Thee; how wonderful to take some creation of Thine and adapt it to our needs; to make some creature better and happier, even as Thou didst bless little children. Thou who are the cornerstone of our faith, to erase Thy name from the memory of man is to rend the moral foundations of the world. Beneath Thy footfall it is destined to move sunward and only the clouds can mantle at Thy feet.

O God, instill in all our fellow citizens a growing sense of justice and personal honor that they may be God-fearing servants of our country. Grant that each may pursue his own labor, avoiding that which makes for division and disunity. All who have been delivered from affliction, all who have been blest with tidings of great mercies, touched by Thy sacrificial spirit, may they live on the higher levels of their natures, giving Thee free dominion over selfishness, pride, and every evil passion. O Thou who dost bring forth from the mute, unpromising earth harvests rich and abundant, O bring out of our hearts the fruits of peace, love, and brotherhood. Through Christ in whom eternal goodness and love are one. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING APPLICATIONS FOR RELIEF UNDER SECTION 722 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3363, an act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DISNEY, KNUTSON, and REED of New York.

HEARINGS ON RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 857) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on certain provisions in the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended, relative to renegotiation of contracts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON THE CIVIL AVIATION BILL

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committeee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 858) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 351) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the House document room and 500 copies shall be for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes and that the remarks I shall make may appear in the permanent RECORD as in the proceedings of November 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from addresses made over the British Broadcasting Co.'s station in London.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PREEMINENCE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRAGGING AGAIN?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to report to the House that Los Angeles County, in the State of California, leads all other counties in the United States in agricultural production. I shall quote from a letter written by the Director of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, which I shall extend fully in the RECORD. From it I read the following:

Los Angeles County is No. 1 in the tables for value of farm products, gallons of milk produced, value of dairy products, value of fruits and nuts, expenditures for machinery and implements, expenditures for feed, and expense of farm labor.

It was second in turkeys raised on farms, number of cows milked, number of chickens on farms, eggs produced, and total number of orange trees.

I am sure those facts will be of great interest to the Members of the House, and to the Nation.

The letter in full is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, November 11, 1943.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HINSHAW: The preeminence of Los Angeles County as an agricultural section is a matter of common knowledge, but you may be interested to know its relative rank among more than 3,000 other countries in the United States. The Census Bureau has recently ranked the 100 leading counties in 59 farm activities such as crops, livestock, farm expenditures, fruit and nut trees, etc. In 33 items your district appears among these selected counties, standing at the head of the list for 7 items and in second place for 5 farm products.

The State of California leads all other States in the number of times (537) its counties have a place among the first 100, based on a wide variety of farm items.

I am sending you a booklet issued by the Census Bureau, entitled "Ranking Agricultural Counties." This publication shows the 100 premier counties in each of 59 phases of agricultural activities in the order of their rank, with details of their performance. A glance at the tabulation on page 4 should be especially pleasing to you and your district.

Los Angeles County is No. 1 in the tables for value of farm products, gallons of milk produced, value of dairy products, value of fruits and nuts, expenditures for machinery and implements, expenditures for feed, and expense of farm labor.

It was second in turkeys raised on farms, number of cows milked, number of chickens on farms, eggs produced, and total number of orange trees.

The county also figures extensively in other farm items, such as third in number of chickens raised; fourth in square feet of glass for horticultural specialities, and seventh in value; seventh in value of domestic animals, tons of commercial fertilizer purchased, and acres of vegetables harvested for sale; thirteenth in acres of cabbage; fifteenth in acres of green snap beans; sixteenth in cattle and calves on farms; eighteenth in total number of grapefruit trees; nineteenth in acres of cantaloupes (tied with a county in another State); twenty-first in acres of alfalfa and fourth in production; twenty-second in acres of dried onions; twenty-seventh in total number of pear trees and acres of sweet corn; twenty-ninth in acres of strawberries and seventh in production; thirty-first in acres of tomatoes; thirty-fourth in total number of grapevines and twenty-sixth in quantity produced; sixty-fifth in acres of sugar beets and fifty-third in quantity produced; seventy-third in total plum and prune trees and fifty-eighth in production; seventy-eighth in value of farm products used by farm households; and ninty-eighth in acres of hay.

Chambers of commerce, newspapers, school authorities, and citizens in general should find the foregoing information useful.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. CAPT, *Director.*

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next following the disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nonpartisan Farm Machinery Committee of which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is chairman and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is secretary, yesterday conferred with numerous representatives of the Government and various department heads in reference to the serious shortage of farm implements.

At that meeting I was surprised to learn through questioning some of the division heads present that only 125,000 farm tractors in addition to 30,700 units previously allocated have been authorized to be manufactured for the 1944 season. For 6,000,000 farmers in America this is but a drop in the bucket.

I was greatly disturbed to hear at this same meeting evidence brought out that our neighbor, Canada, is to receive 19,565 farm tractors from our factories for the same period and that Lend-Lease will export an additional 21,000 of the tractors our farmers need so badly.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely unwise to allow over one-fourth of our farm-tractor production to be sent abroad at a time when our own farmers are bending every effort toward producing the food that we in America must have to win this war. Our farms have been stripped of labor, necessarily perhaps, but I do protest against our farm power, represented by tractors, being given away with so lavish a hand.

It takes 6 months to manufacture a farm tractor, from the time the orders are placed for the steel to the day the tractor leaves the plant.

I shall have more to say to the House upon this subject at a later date and sincerely hope that this farm machinery problem will be gone into very thoroughly in the coming month as now is the time that we must prepare for 1944 food production or otherwise we have failed in our duty, not to the farmers of America, but to the boys on the front line.

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, Paul Revere Willkie has sounded an alarm to the Republicans of the Nation that they are inviting a repetition of the disastrous results of Warren G. Harding's nomination by pushing favorite sons into the Presidential campaign.

He goes on to say that a campaign is apparently under way to get enough favorite-son candidates into the race so that a dark horse can be pulled out of the hat.

Mr. Speaker, not being a spokesman for the Republican Party, I am unable to advise the members of that unfortunate organization, but I cannot see where there would be much more danger in their pulling a political dark horse, like Dewey, Taft, Vandenberg, Bricker, or MacArthur, out of the hat, as Mr. Willkie expresses it, and as he says they did in nominating Warren G. Harding, than it

would be to permit the utilities to pull a political black sheep out of the bag, as they are alleged to have done at Philadelphia in 1940.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of the legislative program today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the bills on the Consent Calendar will be called. On Tuesday the bills on the Private Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide an increase in the rates of compensation of pensions payable to disabled veterans, and so forth, under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, will be called up for consideration. We expect a rule to be reported out on that next Monday. We hope that the rule will be reported.

On Wednesday the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rates of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 a month will be called up for consideration.

On Thursday the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be brought up for consideration.

The tax bill will not be brought up next week but will be called up on Monday of the following week unless the Commodity Credit Corporation bill debate extends over into the following week, in which event the tax bill will be called up immediately at the conclusion of the consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the House be in session tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, we will meet tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the civil aviation bill and to include therein certain brief extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by Hon. Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Prof. T. B. Charles, head of the department of poultry husbandry and acting extension poultryman, University of New Hampshire, November 9, 1943, in regard to the feed situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a certain letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from the Nebraska Stock Growers and Feeders Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by one of our county agents delivered at the Iowa-Nebraska Kiwanis clubs convention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Robert Nelson Anderson upon the life of Abraham Baldwin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to relinquish that time today and instead ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES—THE WARNING OF HISTORY

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, whether it is "planned that way" or not, the New Deal subsidy scheme may turn out to be America's Munich. This makeshift may be an appeasement scheme as deadly as the appeasement at Munich. How, you may ask, does their subsidy proposal

compare with that tragedy? Where is the parallel?

By building up military might from 1933 on, Hitler at Munich had the peace-loving nations in a dilemma. To refuse Hitler meant war, to appease him meant the sacrifice of a brave ally, Czechoslovakia. Chamberlain took the easy choice; he appeased Hitler, and yet Europe was turned into a flaming hell.

Here in America, from 1933 on, the New Deal has been creating a stock pile of inflation. Ten years of reckless spending and pyramiding debts has resulted in the creation of inflationary forces that threaten the Nation. Now Congress is told it must provide the side-office Caesars at the White House with unlimited funds for socialistic price-juggling schemes, or America will have runaway inflation. It looks like we have the Munich choice before us. Let us consider both possibilities.

First, if we allow their subsidy plans, we increase inflation but postpone its painful effects. The bitter truth about the steady decline in the buying power of our money will then be kept hidden from the people. How long? Perhaps until after election day next year.

Under their subsidy plan we would "baby" inflation along like we babied Japan before Pearl Harbor. We would increase our debts and widen the inflationary gap between swollen consumer income and restricted production. Nothing could be more inflationary. Just as Munich was supposed to assure "peace in our time," so will this rebate scheme assure economic "peace for a time." Munich failed! So will this device.

Consider the other choice of this economic Munich, runaway inflation. Like Hitler's military might in 1936, the accumulated inflation force can be used to blitzkrieg what economic freedom is left in America. Certainly the potentiality of deadly inflation exists. If that Frankenstein monster breaks loose, who is responsible for it?

In 1932 candidate Roosevelt pledged himself to stop the deficits that create inflation and bankruptcy. The deficits that alarmed him then totaled $4,000,000,000. At the time of his pledge, the national debt was $21,000,000,000. Since then the national debt has increased $143,000,000,000, of which $34,000,000,000 were piled up even before the war.

The responsibility for runaway inflation, if it occurs, lies with the administration that piled up these debts and stifled production. Perhaps the people of America, however, might be led to believe otherwise. If Congress could be found holding the sack when inflation broke loose, it would become the goat and the New Deal would evade the responsibility for their ghastly failure.

The two foregoing possibilities face this Congress. It seems that Congress has the Munich choice before it. Can Congress meet that challenge successfully?

I am not too sure that it can. The danger in their subsidy schemes can be camouflaged as cleverly as booby-trap mines. The administration largely controls two great means of public information, the radio and the motion picture. It would be easy for the administration to claim it was trying to keep down the cost of living for the common people, while Congress was aiding profiteers and selfish interests. The people have been fooled before, and perhaps they might feel they can do it again. Take a look at the record.

In 1933 a panic closed all the banks of this country. To this day the people blame Hoover and the Republicans for the panic. What is the truth? The truth is that the bank panic was largely brought about by two New Deal developments. First, the word got around in New Deal circles in January that when Roosevelt took office we would go off the gold standard. Informed insiders made a run on banks for gold. This panicky move was followed by a well-publicized agitation in Congress discrediting the R. F. C. and the banks. Together, these two moves produced the panic that ended in the bank holiday. Ten years have elapsed, yet this truth has never been placed before the American people.

Actually, the smart economists in the executive branch must be getting many a chuckle out of the discussion in Congress of the economic aspects of their subsidy scheme. They know their remedies for high prices are like taking aspirin for appendicitis. They know there is no protection from inflation in adopting a scheme that will benefit millionaires as much as day laborers, pyramid our debts, and multiply the numbers of the bureaucrats. They know blanket subsidies will discourage productio., because the American farmer despises the socialism of their subsidy proposals. They know these facts better than Congress, but they may be thinking about election day. They have Congress over a barrel. Like Hitler at Munich, they hold the trump cards, the mighty pent-up force of live-steam inflation generated since 1933.

Fortunately Congress has a third alternative. It can enact legislation that will protect the standards of living for those groups hurt by the increased cost of living—and no one else. Here are two groups that need help: One is the people of the very low-income class, and the second consists of an important segment of our middle-class population whose medium small income has remained stationery during the past few years of rising taxes and prices. House bill No. 2997, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] provides a plan for helping these groups. Probably the bill needs improvements, but its basic principle fits the emergency created by New Deal bungling.

Administration spokesmen consistently cite the example of subsidies in the production of copper and other metals. But they refuse to carry out the same principle with foods. In copper the Government fixed a ceiling price that was profitable to the low-cost producers, and they subsidized only those who could not produce at that price-level. The producers supported the program, because it gave Government help only to those who needed it. Food producers almost unanimously oppose the Government's present subsidies, but they would support the Herter proposal giving Government aid only to those consumers who need assistance.

Where prices must be increased moderately to stimulate production, let Government meet that challenge by making available the machinery and manpower that will expand production and thus hold prices down. Ask a mother which she would rather have—a price on milk of 15 cents a quart, and no milk; or a price of 16 cents a quart, and sufficient milk for her youngsters? The mothers of America can answer that question, even if the new dealers play ostrich about it.

There cannot be inflated prices of products that are in ample production. Coffee is a good example—the price is ample—production is high, and there is no pressure on coffee prices. Let this administration take the brakes off production, and even the debasement of our money that has been going on for 10 years will not currently develop into inflation. The Republican food-study committee has consistently urged the appointment of a single food administrator—the practical approach to expanded production.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. Gladly.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has made quite a study of the food-subsidy program. During the current week we have heard numerous speeches and discussions about it. We know pretty well the attitude of the administration. We know the attitude of the kept economists in the bureaus of the Government. I wonder if the gentleman, who comes from a great farm State, can tell us something about the attitude of the producers themselves on this important matter of subsidies.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes; I can.

Mr. MUNDT. I would be very happy if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have been in correspondence with many producers and they have all been against the program. This morning I received a resolution from the Iowa Stock Growers' Association, the Nebraska association, and the Kansas association—all opposing this program. The producers are against it. To me, that is one of the amazing things about this problem. On a military matter this House goes to the military men and says, "What do you want?" Then we do what the military want. This is as great a problem in a war as is the military part of it, but we do not go to the producers because the producers are almost unanimously against it.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Does the gentleman find in his own district that it is not only the large farm organizations and producers that are opposed to subsidies but it is the small producer and the small farmer as well?

Mr. BUFFETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, because I have found exactly this situation. Not a single farmer has written me or not a single

farmer has gone on record, as far as I can determine, in favor of subsidies, and no organization of farmers that I have found any trace of has gone on record in favor of subsidies in my district.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I understand the administration farm organization, the Farmers' Union, is in favor of it.

Mr. BUFFETT. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. In fact, is not a subsidy merely taking it off the grocery bill and putting it on the tax bill, plus administrative expenses?

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has answered his own question.

Mr. RAMEY. In view of that fact, is there any means of finding out what the administrative expenses will be, and whether the already great tax bill will be increased because of interest payments going on and on? Can that be reduced to a mathematical certainty?

Mr. BUFFETT. No; I do not believe it can. In that respect I think a page of history is worth more than a volume of logic. History shows that the expenses are usually as much as or more than the benefits received.

The method proposed in H. R. 2997, Mr. Speaker, is the third alternative in this difficult situation. It will cost much less than subsidies and help only those who deserve Government help on their grocery bill. It is the only method that is fair to the two great groups whose voices have not been heard on this problem—the soldiers who are fighting to save America, and the children who must pay the bill for the bungling of this period.

Inflation, Mr. Speaker, is not a new problem. All the financial patent medicines that are being trotted out now have been tried before and they have always failed. Look at the last chapter of the European inflations in the twenties, following the First World War.

An American official assigned to study those social upheavals finished up his analysis as follows:

> The solutions that I have witnessed have all tended to leave the farmer on top, but the methods used were, without exception, damned rough; nor were these methods adopted pursuant to thought or studied preparation. They were spontaneous. They consisted of the country man simply rising up and beating the life out of the city man, a solution that is as simple as it is undesirable. The reasons for such conflict may be complicated, but the termination is simple.

The warning of history is plain here for responsible officials in Government, in labor, and in industry. America must solve this problem with a solution which will deserve and secure the hearty and unqualified support of the producers. That solution is not a socialistic subsidy scheme regimenting producers. It is not unbridled inflation. It is not a scheme designed to protect high salary and high wage earners from paying their fair share of increased costs due both to the war and governmental manipulation. Disguise these schemes as you will, the producer will discover their fundamental dishonesty and revolt against them. The sensible solution is increased production, the adjustment of a few prices, and temporary Government aid for truly distressed consuming groups.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], for 20 minutes.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be granted those 20 minutes on Monday, following the disposition of any business on the Speaker's table and such special orders as have been granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED QUESTIONING OF CABINET MEMBERS DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the matter I am going to discuss today is one that many Members have been thinking of for a long time. It is a variation of an old idea that has been before the Congress from time to time for 80 years. I have 45 minutes at my disposal, and my purpose in asking for this rather long time is because I want to yield freely to any Members of the House who are here, who want to make any statements or observations in connection with the matter under discussion.

On October 19 of this year I introduced House Resolution 327, which is brief, and which I shall read:

> *Resolved*, That rule XXXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "3. There shall be held in the House immediately following the reading of the Journal on at least 1 day in each period of 2 calendar weeks, but not oftener than 1 day in any 1 calendar week, a 'question period,' which shall not consume more than 2 hours, during which heads of departments and independent agencies are requested to answer orally written and oral questions propounded by Members of the House. Each written question shall be submitted in triplicate to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such question, and, if approved by such committee, one copy shall be transmitted to the head of the department or independent agency concerned, with an invitation to appear before the House, and one copy to the Committee on Rules with a request for allotment of time in a question period to answer such question. Subject to the limitations prescribed in this paragraph, the Committee on Rules shall determine the date for, and the length of time of, each question period, and shall allot the time in each question period to the head of a department or independent agency who has indicated to the committee his readiness to deliver oral answers to the questions transmitted to him. All written questions propounded in any one question period shall be approved by one committee. The latter half of each question period shall be reserved for oral questions by Members of the House, one-half of such time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee which has approved the written questions propounded in such question period and one-half by the ranking minority member of such committee. The time of each question period and the written questions to be answered in such period shall be printed in two daily editions of the RECORD appearing before the day on which such question period is to be held, and the proceedings during the question period shall be printed in the RECORD for such day."

The way this rule would work, if adopted, can be illustrated by a hypothetical case. Suppose the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House decided they would like to have Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, appear before the House to tell something of the details of the Moscow Conference. That is a matter in which the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is particularly interested, and in which every Member of the House has a deep, a great, and a far-reaching interest. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House would let it be known that they are going to invite Mr. Hull to appear, and any Member who wanted to have a question asked of Mr. Hull, could file that question with the clerk of the committee, or with some member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and then, prior to 2 days before Mr. Hull was to appear, the committee would go over the questions filed with them, or would originate questions of their own, and then would decide the questions and the topics they wanted Mr. Hull to discuss. Prior to 2 days before his appearance copies of those questions would be sent to the Secretary of State, and copies would be sent to the Committee on Rules. The Rules Committee, after consideration of the importance of the subject matter and the recommendations of the legislative committee as to the amount of time necessary for the discussion would fix the amount of time to be allotted to Mr. Hull. Then, supposing he were allotted 2 hours to answer the questions submitted by the committee, one-half of his time would be spent in answering the questions that had already been submitted to him 2 days before, and published in the RECORD for 2 days.

The remaining half of his time would be consumed by answering questions from the floor of the House. Time for asking questions from the floor to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee. If more than one committee had a request pending for the appearance of an executive officer at the same time, the Rules Committee would fix the priority and order of appearance. I may say that before I filed this resolution I talked about this proposal with many Members of the House. I am especially grateful to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the gentle-

man from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and many other Members of the House, who have made valuable suggestions about this idea. This is, of course, a rudimentary resolution. Experience will have to show us whether it should be changed in one respect or another, but at least it gives us something to start with, something to work on, something to enable us to begin discussion of the subject.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do this to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the constructive thought that he has obviously given to this problem, and to say to him that I think he is striking at what is probably the most important single problem in the American Government today, namely, the relationship between the legislative and the executive. Does the gentleman's resolution limit the people to be questioned to members of the Cabinet, or would it be possible to have the heads of other governmental agencies as well appear before the House?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I may say that I was advised by the Legislative Reference Service that the words used here, "heads of departments and independent agencies," include members of the Cabinet, and that is the usual legislative description which includes members of the Cabinet.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And it also includes the head of such agencies as the Maritime Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, or any of the other independent agencies or commissions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the sessions where they appeared be closed sessions or would they be open sessions?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should think that would be determined by the Speaker or by whoever determines the matter now as to whether they would be executive sessions or open sessions. In the absence of some determination that they should be in executive session, I think they should be open sessions where the public and the press could hear what the Cabinet members and the heads of departments have to say.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It occurs to me there are two problems that may be involved here that the gentleman's proposal may very well be a means of helping to solve. One of those is the difficulty which Members of Congress frequently have in getting to these people who are making decisions; that is, the problem of attempting to reach them. I mean the physical problem, for one thing, and certainly it would be a great advantage to the Congress to be able to have one of the policy-making officials of the Government come before us with reference to matters we have very much in our laps which could be brought out, and he could be requested to discuss them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman's observations are eminently correct. For instance, I am sure every Member of the House would like to go down and talk to Mr. Hull about what happened at Moscow. Yet we know it is physically impossible to do that. We cannot take up that much of his time, so it would be very beneficial to all of us if arrangements could be made so that here, in our forum, and under our rules, we could have him here and could direct the course the discussion is to take. It would serve the purpose and certainly would save Mr. Hull a great deal of time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad I am fortified by the presence of my friend from Alabama, the great constitutional lawyer [Mr. HOBBS], and I would like to have him listen to this discussion inasmuch as I do not believe, under our constitutional system, we can compel the attendance of these witnesses or of these officers, although we could request it. I think likewise that under any rule which might be adopted they would have the discretion as to what questions they would answer and what questions they would refuse to answer. It is obvious from your reference, for instance, to the recent conference at Moscow that there may be certain military matters which were decided there which it would be very bad to have answered even in executive session. I do not think any of us would want to be burdened, for instance, with the knowledge of when and where the second front was to be opened. That is something we would rather not hear about and would rather leave to our military officers for decision. I believe my idea of the constitutional question involved is correct. I would like to be corrected if it is not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the first place, I appreciate the observations which the gentleman has made. I am sure that the Congress, which is composed of the most intelligent and most loyal and most capable men in America, whose great concern is the welfare of this country, as it is the concern of every Member, has no Member who would insist a question be answered by a Cabinet member which would reveal any military secret and hurt the security of this Nation, whether it be in an open session or an executive session.

Now, as to the point you raise relative to the constitutionality of the proposal, I am going to discuss that later, but I want to say that there is absolutely nothing in our Constitution to prohibit the House of Representatives from adopting this rule. Under the Constitution each House of Congress adopts its own rules. This is one of the devices, this is one of the means open to us which I think our forefathers intended we should use. As evidence of that fact I may say that in the First Congress, in which sat many Members who were members of the Constitutional Convention, this practice was very wisely carried out by President George Washington, who was Chairman of the Constitutional Convention. He appeared before the Senate on several occasions, and members of the Cabinet during that First Congress appeared before the House of Representatives in person.

So it has never been considered that this requires any constitutional amendment. The point the gentleman raised as to whether we can pass a law to require Cabinet members to appear, does bring forth an interesting question. The better reasoning on the subject and the one supported by the greatest amount of authority, as I shall point out later, is that since Congress creates these offices and defines their powers and we require them to send written reports to Congress every year, we could require them to come and make oral reports to Congress. But under the wording of this resolution it is entirely permissive. They would not have to come unless they wanted to, under this resolution; but the force of public opinion would be so heavy upon them, if they did not come they would be held up to ridicule, and as Congress controls the purse strings I imagine they would be here unless they had an acceptable excuse. So, as a practical matter they would come and they would be glad to accept the invitation.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield further, I am heartily in sympathy with the gentleman's resolution. I do not want anything I might say to be considered as in criticism of the resolution. But I think it is wise to talk it out. Does the gentleman feel that the President or the President's Cabinet could be compelled to come? Undoubtedly, in that connection, the gentleman with his knowledge of history, remembers the attempt of Chief Justice Marshall to subpena the President in the Aaron Burr trial. The opinion of most lawyers was that that was beyond the power of the courts, since the President was a constitutional officer. I should think the same rule would apply to his official family, the Cabinet.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that Cabinet members are not constitutional officers. They are not created by the Constitution. In the second place, I think the gentleman is entirely right in that Congress cannot require the President to come to a session of Congress. The Constitution provides, of course, that he shall make a report on the state of the Nation, which two Presidents did orally, and then the practice was discontinued until the time of President Wilson, who revived it. That is his duty, and aside from doing that, which he is required to do by the Constitution, Congress has no other control with reference to his appearance before the Congress. But as to the Cabinet, that presents a different question. However, it is academic insofar as this resolution is concerned, because this says only those will be invited who have indicated their willingness to accept the invitation.

In my remarks I will give the gentleman some of the authorities to the effect that Congress could require them to attend in person just as we can require them to submit their annual reports.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama, who is one of the great constitutional lawyers of the House.

Mr. HOBBS. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the way in which he has worded his resolution it would amply safeguard against this secondary embarrassment that might arise. In other words, your resolution requires that the question be submitted to the committee in charge of the particular matter or field of questioning, and also to the Rules Committee. In that way I should think that what the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] had in mind would be more than doubly safeguarded.

I realize, however, that his question is deeper than he made it appear in his statement, in this, that there might be some objection to some of the questions even being asked, just as many times the severest punishment is the indictment rather than the conviction. So here, if a question could not be asked for reasons of public policy, is it not contemplated in the gentleman's resolution that it would be submitted to the committee in charge of that field of investigation, and also to the Rules Committee? And is it not predominantly probable that where there was any question, those questions would be submitted in advance and discussion had between the committees and department head involved?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. The gentleman is correct about the intention of the resolution. There are two problems that face us and have to be dealt with. In the first place, we want to restrict the questions so as to hold them on the subject under consideration because we wish to prevent any embarrassment to the Government or to a Cabinet officer by asking improper questions. In the second place, we want to make it as easy as possible for any Member of Congress to ask a question. It is with those two problems in mind that I have been delving into this subject.

My first impression was that only those questions which were approved by the Legislative Committee and by the Rules Committee should be asked. The purpose of these checks was to see that they were proper questions, to see that they followed the line of the subject matter under consideration and also to see that they were not argumentative, that they were in proper form. In talking with some of the Members it developed that they felt there should be some means for a Member to ask questions from the floor. This resolution, therefore, provides that the last half of the period shall be consumed by questions from the floor. The time for asking questions would be under the control of the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the Legislative Committee which I think would be a protection. As a matter of fact, Members might make some statement here or ask a question of another Member which would be embarrassing to the Government, but it does not happen often; Members have a great sense of propriety. I think with these safeguards we would be fully protected in the matter. There was also some criticism of the idea by several Members on the grounds that a number of Members may rise and ask a lot of irrelevant questions and thereby try to embarrass a Cabinet officer; that is the reason for providing that the Chairman and the ranking minority member should have the power of recognizing a Member for the purpose of asking a question from the floor.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield further to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. I ask this question merely for the purpose of exploring a little further the thought of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman from Tennessee thought of the possibility of limiting the right of questioning or the submission of questions so as to require the committees to consider in advance of publication in the RECORD any question relating to foreign affairs or to the conduct of a war? The answering of such questions could be declined of course on the ground of public policy. It seems to me that the gentleman, who has given evidently so much thought and great care to this resolution and its preparation might give us the light of his reflection on that question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's question. I have thought a great deal about that very thing.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The proposal of the gentleman, to say the least, is very ingenious, but does it occur to the gentleman that we are seeking to break down that barrier set up by our Constitution, by our forefathers that the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of this Government shall be separate and independent of each other? Cabinet officers are members of the President's family; they are a part of his set-up. A Cabinet officer cannot be divorced from the office of the President, because he carries out the functions of the executive branch of the Government. Does not the gentleman believe that to have them brought in here and subjected to cross-examination in this body would just about submerge the executive to the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will answer the gentleman's question in just a minute. Let me first answer the question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], then I will revert to the gentleman's inquiry.

We will, of course, have to be guided by our experience in working out better methods of handling this procedure. I am sure that custom and practice will throw protections around it which will prevent any divulgence of confidential information that should not be given. In the first place, the Cabinet member could refuse to answer on the grounds of public policy. In the second place the committee would direct the course of the discussion, and the chairman and the ranking minority member would have the right to prevent anybody's asking a question unless they knew what the question was going to be. In the third place we could have executive sessions. I believe, therefore, that is not a situation we need worry about. I believe the patriotism and good sense of the Members would take care of it; also, if the protections we already have are not sufficient, we would have to adopt other protections as experience may show them to be needed.

Coming now to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN], I intended to take up this issue later, but now is as good a time as any. He has raised the question as to whether or not this is a violation of the traditions of our constitutional form of government. I am glad he has made this query.

Fortunately, we have three separate and coextensive branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—we are fortunate that this is the case. I do not want to change this form or system in any way whatsoever. I think it is the best form of government that was ever devised, that the writers of our Constitution had almost divine inspiration in creating this plan; but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that while it is often said that the branches of government are separate and distinct, this is not actually the case. As a matter of fact, the three branches are interwoven and fit into a plan where it cannot be said they are separate and distinct in the strict legal sense. It cannot be said for instance that all legislative power is in the hands of Congress. The fact of the matter is that Congress does not have the full say over laws that are passed. Any law that is passed in this body has to be signed by the President; so the President comes into the lawmaking picture. If the law is not signed by the President it has to be passed over his veto. In the event a motion to adjourn sine die cannot be agreed upon, the President can adjourn Congress. The President may call Congress into extra session. The Constitution provides that he shall report on the state of the Union to Congress and our President comes here at every session in order to report on the state of the Union. It is said that all executive powers are vested in the President, yet the Congress can fix the salary of the President; the Congress can decide the executive offices that are to be created and require those executive officers to report to the Congress. Congress can impeach an executive officer; Congress can impeach the President. We say that all judicial powers are vested in the Supreme Court and such other courts as the Congress may create. That is a provision of the Constitution.

As a matter of fact, the Congress can fix the terms of the court, Congress can fix the salaries of the judges, Congress can fix the number of the judges on any court, Congress can even say that a two-thirds majority in a case shall be sufficient for a decision, Congress defines the crimes or the laws that the courts

are to pass upon. Congress is not independent of judicial system. As a matter of fact, to show how much effect the judges have with Congress, any law that Congress may pass may be nullified and declared null by the Supreme Court, and even on occasions in impeachment proceedings involving a President, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court sits in at the impeachment trial. To say we have three separate and distinct divisions of our Government in the practical and actual sense is not correct.

Let me read just one thing that was said in the report of Mr. Pendleton for a select committee of the House of Representatives back in 1864, which I think is about the best answer I can give to the gentleman from Missouri:

> This brief summary shows that the departments of the Government entrusted as they are with the legislative, executive, and judicial power, though separate and in some sort independent, are yet in their organization, in their applications intertwined and interdependent. They cross the boundaries of each other; they come in contact but not in conflict. They cross paths assigned to each without meeting or clashing in the pathways. They are cooperative and harmonious though distinct. They justify the saying of Mr. Adams applied to the lawyers of Cincinnati at a bar dinner given in his honor: "Harmony of conflict in elements is the true music in the spheres."

May I say further to the gentleman from Missouri, he may have the idea this is an invasion on our constitutional traditions because we have not used this useful plan for a long time. As a matter of fact, the record contains many instances where the First Congress of the United States brought in the President and the Cabinet members to advise the House of Representatives and the Senate on various proposals that were being considered. If there were any persons who knew what was meant by the Constitution, it certainly should be the Members of the First Congress.

Another very forceful answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is the action taken by the group of outstanding men who wrote the Constitution of the Confederate States. I think we are far enough away from the Civil War, so that we from the South can be grateful that the Union was preserved and those from the North can appreciate the ability and genius of some of the leaders of the Confederacy such as Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and Alexander Stephens. Alexander Stephens in spite of ill health, was one of the great statesmen and brains of his times. In the convention to adopt a Constitution for the Confederate States, Mr. Stephens was chairman of the Committee on Rules. The provisional government of the Confederacy adopted a resolution reported by Mr. Stephens that the heads of departments be admitted to the floor of Congress both in secret and open session.

The idea was later written into the permanent Constitution of the Confederate States, in the following language:

> Article 1, section 6 (2): No senator or representative shall, during the time for which he is elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the Confederate States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments of which have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office. But congress may, by law, grant to the principal officer in each of the executive departments a seat upon the floor of either house, with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

The Confederate Constitution was very similar to the Constitution of the United States. It followed the idea of the three separate powers. Its framers did not believe it would adversely effect the functions of the three separate divisions.

In 1864 a select committee of Members of the House of Representatives was appointed to consider a provision to enable Cabinet members to participate in debate on the floor of the House. This committee of seven unanimously recommended the adoption of a resolution amending the Rules of the House to make this possible. The report of the committee is a legislative masterpiece. It is found in Miscellaneous Senate Documents, volume 1, at page 15. Congressman Pendleton, who hailed from Ohio, was thereafter elected to the Senate.

In 1881 a select committee was appointed from the Senate to consider S. 227, which provided that the principal officers of the executive departments could participate in debate affecting their departments. This select committee unanimously recommended the legislation. The report was signed by seven outstanding Members of the Senate—Senators George H. Pendleton, W. B. Allison, D. W. Voorhees, J. G. Blaine, M. C. Butler, John J. Inglass, O. H. Platt, and J. T. Farley.

A proposal similar to this has been recommended by such eminent men as President Howard Taft in his message to Congress on January 3, 1913; by President Woodrow Wilson, Hon. Elihu Root, President James A. Garfield, and Hon. John W. Davis.

I could cite many favorable arguments in favor of the propcsal from many noted and thoughtful historians, such as Dr. Charles A. Beard.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is making a very challenging and constructive proposal in this resolution. I have read it carefully several times and, as the gentleman knows, I have discussed it with him at great length and find it to be both intriguing and compelling. Like other Members who have interrogated him earlier, I had some doubts and some reservations about its constitutionality and its workability, but I must say that the longer I consider it, the more frequently I discuss it with the author, who has given it a tremendous amount of thought, the more impelling I feel myself toward the resolution.

I wonder if this is not a correct analysis of the situation brought up by the gentleman from Missouri. There was never intended by the constitutional forefathers to be a barrier set up between these three departments of government. They were intended to cooperate, each independent of the other, but to work together. There was not to be a barrier between the functions of one with the other and anything which steps up the speed of cooperation without destroying the balance of power, which is the essential thing, is what we are driving at. If we can speed up the cooperation and speed up the workability of the three departments without destroying the balance of power, I think we have made a proper achievement. Does not the gentleman feel that if this resolution can be worked out so that neither the authority nor the independence of the cabinet officers nor of the Congress is jeopardized, we will have stepped up the speed of government without in any way destroying the balance of power?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman has made a most valuable statement and has expressed the idea so much clearer and in much more forceful language that I could hope to employ. As the gentleman has said, this is a device that is open to us without interfering with our good system of separation of powers. Our separation of powers is guaranteed by the Constitution in the provision which says that no Member of the Congress shall be entitled to hold any other office in the Government. That means, then, that under that provision there must and will always be a separation of powers.

May I say that I am very grateful to the thoughtful gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for his many suggestions. I appreciate greatly his interest in and support of this measure.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I want to congratulate the gentleman for introducing this resolution and for opening debate on this subject. As the gentleman knows, I have long been interested in it. I have investigated somewhat the conduct of the Canadian and British Parliaments in this respect, and I have seen this parliamentary questioning in action. I feel that it will in some form or other add greatly to the functioning of our Government.

I want to, if I may, offer this comment on the constitutional question. We are quite accustomed to having the Supreme Court receive before it a Cabinet officer, the Attorney General or the Solicitor General as is usually the case, a member of the executive branch, if you please, who argues his case before the Supreme Court, not in chambers, not before a committee of the Court, but before the Court itself. The members of that Court in turn interrogate him most sharply, this member of the executive branch, a lawyer representing the executive, an executive appointee before that Court. However, we never feel that the Court is invading the province of the executive by interrogating the executive in public or that the executive is overpowering the

Court by arguing most strenuously and vehemently for its position before the Court.

It seems to me all that is involved here is a more immediate method of cooperation, so that we bypass a lot of circuitous channels and streamline our Government by getting the executive immediately before those of the legislative branch who have questions involving legislation that the executive wants and we are, therefore, not violating the Constitution, but implementing the proper functioning between the branches of government.

There is one question I would like to put to the gentleman and that is whether there may not be in the Constitution an authority for this sort of thing where the Executive is required to report to the Congress on the state of the Nation.

Would not that obligation be delegated to these Cabinet members and other administrative officials who would come here directly on behalf of the Executive to report on the state of the Nation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman for the very valuable contribution he has made to this discussion. I think that definitely is a precedent in our Constitution, that we do not have to be actually separated from one another in trying to perform our respective duties because the Constitution provides that the President shall make a report, and we, as a matter of fact, require all of these agencies to send their reports to Congress, although these reports are very long and few Members read all of them. The analogy the gentleman draws with reference to the Solicitor General appearing before the Supreme Court proves the point.

Also along the line of what the gentleman said, it is well known that we do receive advice, and we have frequent communication with the judges in considering legislation. The Judicial Conference, which is composed of the senior judges, meets every year, and they have bills under consideration. Their recommendations—and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] will bear me out in this—are very helpful to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the House.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to take up too much of the gentleman's time because he is presenting a very interesting discourse on a very important and timely subject, but I should like to call his attention to an article in the current issue of Fortune Magazine which advocates a course similar to the one the gentleman is suggesting today, and refers to the early practice in our country where the Cabinet officers did appear before Congress. It states that at that time Alexander Hamilton was supposed to be rather arrogant with the Members of Congress, so they decided that they were not going to listen to him.

There is also the precedent of the President himself going before the Senate to discuss preliminarily the terms of a treaty. When the Senators asked rather sharply about it and proposed some modifications, the President got rather huffed, and I believe his words were that he would be damned if he would ever go back. So the practice which apparently was intended by the Constitution was changed in the very first days of the Government. There is no constitutional reason why it cannot be revived if it is in the interest of better government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The article in Fortune entitled "Our Form of Government" is a very challenging one which I hope all Members will read. The reason President Washington and members of the Cabinet did not continue the practice was that, with all due deference to the founder of our country, he was the type of man who had his say and he was not of the temperament to debate or join in arguments. Had he been of a different mood I am sure we would today have the procedure I am proposing. They did not set up machinery for its operation so the practice was discontinued, just as the practice of the President reporting in person to Congress on the state of the Union was discontinued by Thomas Jefferson because he did not happen to be a good speaker before a large audience. He, along with George Washington, was a great man of early American history. I revere Jefferson and Washington. But their particular personalities had a rather unusual effect upon future American history.

When President Wilson revived that practice, many people said that he was upsetting the tradition of the Constitution of the Nation. As a matter of fact, he was doing nothing of the sort, he was just bringing back into practice a very useful device that was given to us and allowed us by the Constitution.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I wish to panegyrize the gentleman for having brought before the House this important proposal. I realize that any encomiums of mine are superfluous, as the proposition speaks for itself. So I merely wish to say that I hope the gentleman will continue working for this worthy reform.

In that connection, I direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the late Woodrow Wilson, following his graduation from Princeton in 1879, wrote a series of articles in the Gentleman's magazine, then a popular magazine, over several monthly issues, in which he discussed this very point and later incorporated them in his monumental work, Our Congressional Government. He pointed out that that was one of the advantages of the English parliamentary system over the American form of government, in that it brought more closely to the elective representatives of the people the functions of the cabinet members of government, as obtained in Great Britain and Canada.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, and I should like as far as possible to put this forth as a good American practice that would be good for us under our form of constitutional government, rather than get too much on the English idea, because the fear that we might be aping the English is really what has defeated this proposal ir the past.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. After all is said and done, is it not in essence a question of distance? Is there any such bulwark or wall or partition between Cabinet officers or executive heads of departments as has been envisioned by our friend the gentleman from Missouri? Do not we consult them and do not they welcome consultation on any of the measures pending before Congress? Is it not done all the time, either in one of these outlying rooms or in their own chambers?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is quite correct. This brings the consultation into the open where we can all hear what is said and where we can all participate, and have open, face-to-face discussion rather than cloakroom discussion or discussion in our offices.

Then, another thing, it prevents a repetition before several committees or Members. It would save a lot of time. It is another way of doing what is already being done, but doing it in a very much better way.

Mr. HOBBS. May I say to the gentleman before he concludes that I congratulate him upon his statement and upon bringing this bill before us. I believe it will be overwhelmingly endorsed. Thereby the gentleman will have rendered a great service to our Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman. I will be satisfied if the resolution is passed, rather than be overwhelmingly endorsed. I am not as optimistic over the outcome as the gentleman from Alabama.

We hear a lot these days about the reform of Congress. I do not think reforms are needed in the sense we usually use the word "reform." There is nothing wrong with the personnel of Congress. By and large, we have excellent membership composing outstanding men and leaders in American life. What we do need is to use some of the mechanisms that fortunately are available to us under our Constitution which will enable us to do our work better. What is needed from the executive branches is information, not ordinary information but expert, detailed information.

We are coming into the most important, complex, and challenging period of world history. We have to improve the administration of laws by our executive departments, and we have to improve the way Congress works. This is one of the most effective methods whereby we can improve our congressional system. We can use this method to secure more and better information. It is impossible to read all of the hearings coming from the various committees. It would be vastly useful to the Members if, on great and important problems, we could meet

those to whom we must look for information face to face and discuss the issues with them. Many matters coming before Congress these days are of interest to the members of all committees. They transcend the special interest and jurisdiction of any one committee. These reports and issues should be discussed in our own forum, under procedure decided by us.

Dozens of resolutions for the creation of investigating committees are filed during each session of Congress. The fact that these resolutions are filed shows that the Members are seeking information and it shows a desire for knowledge of facts. During this Congress we have authorized the appointment of several select committees to make special investigations into the way executive departments are carrying out their functions. After a law is passed, we have no direct method of ascertaining whether the intention of Congress is being carried out. The Smith committee is now making a special investigation of the instances in which the intention of Congress was not followed in the administration of laws. The necessity for most of the investigating committees would be obviated if we could bring the administrators into this forum and here, face to face, require them to give an account of the stewardship of their departments.

A procedure would be inaugurated, if this resolution were passed, which would establish the importance of Congress in the public mind. At present executive administrators hold press conferences. These press conferences are given more play in the newspapers and over the radio than action taken by Congress on important measures. If the plans and proposals for the administration of laws are brought out on the floor of the House pursuant to questions from Members, the important news would arise from what was said on the floor and not what was said at some press conference.

This procedure would be beneficial to the Cabinet members and heads of the departments. In the first place, the President in making appointments would have to take into consideration that they would be called upon to appear on the floor of the House and the President's administration would be judged to a considerable extent by the impression these administrators made. He would be doubly sure that he secured outstanding men as heads of the executive agencies of the Government. The procedure would enable the administrators to obtain the people's view as expressed directly by the people's representatives. The administrators would consider more deliberately their decisions if they knew they would be called upon to give an account of what they were doing before the House. There could be no ghost writing. These men would have to know their departments and be able to give facts.

It frequently happens that rumors or unjust criticism are spread about executive officers. If this criticism comes from a Member of the House, the executive officer has no opportunity to answer except through the newspapers. Under this procedure he would be given an opportunity of appearing and explaining his side of the controversy.

In summing up the advantages, I think I might well use the words of Senator Pendleton's report—

> The advantages of the system proposed are so obvious and manifold that the committee feels relieved from a detailed statement of them.

There are many angles to this question that I would like to discuss this afternoon. Later on I expect to secure more time for a further discussion and on that occasion I expect to bring forth some of the objections that have been or may be raised to this type of legislation and try to answer them to your satisfaction.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I feel confident that the gentleman has offered this proposal, not as being the last word in the machinery for arranging a question period, but as affording a basis for discussion of this subject.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In the same spirit I wish to raise this question, which I mean to be constructive, on the proposed machinery in the gentleman's resolution, which I have read with great interest and with some care. Someone may object that the present proposal loads the question period too strongly in favor of the party in power, the majority, and that in the interest of obtaining order, and an orderly questioning, the gentleman has sacrificed certain of the freedoms which exist under our House rules. Our House rules are an attempt to keep an even balance between the rights of the majority and the minority and the individual Member. It is possible, under the machinery proposed, that the individual Member's rights to propound questions as in other parliamentary bodies could be so circumscribed that they might be stifled entirely, and that the minority would have no voice as such under the machinery set up. I know the gentleman has considered and weighed alternative proposals which might go further in the direction I mention, and I believe that when this matter is taken under study by the Committee on Rules, we will then have time, I hope, to discuss and debate the particular wheels and cogs in this machinery that will make it function so as to protect the Cabinet officer, and also protect the rights of the minority, the majority, and of the individual Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more, in order to answer the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not want to leave the Well without saying something in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio. I do not want anyone to get the impression that this is a partisan issue in any respect whatsoever. I do not want anyone to get the impression that I intended to write the resolution in such a way as to give advantage to one side or the other. This is a device, as I say, that will be helpful to Congress, as a whole, regardless of which party is in power. If it does work out so as to give any party an advantage I want it changed to give each side an equal opportunity. I thought it did as presently written, because it provides as to questions as to be answered, that the time shall be controlled by the committees, and I think committees generally recognize the rights of the minority. The second half of the time is to be controlled, one-half by the chairman and one-half by the ranking minority member. If that does not work out fairly and equitably, I want the resolution changed to do so, because certainly I want the rights and prerogatives of the minority and of the majority fully protected in every way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] for 30 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Did I understand the majority leader correctly today to state that there will be a session of the House tomorrow, Saturday?

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will yield a moment further, I would like to say, speaking as one of the members associated with the drive-for-action committee, that we congratulate the majority leader on having this session on Saturday, which, of course, is rather unusual and departs from the established custom of the House. As announced by the drive-for-action committee, our purpose is to hold the House in session every legislative day except Saturdays and holidays until and unless a definite legislative program is presented to the House by the Democratic leadership.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. A program of constructive and remedial legislation is the goal sought by the drive-for-action committee. Consequently, it is encouraging this morning to find, first, that a legislative program has been announced for next week, and one for the week following has been hinted at. Second, we are gratified that the majority leader has extended the program to include tomorrow, because we feel that certainly there is reason enough for the House to be in session tomorrow, reason enough, in fact, for the House to be in session morning, afternoon, and evening until some of these serious problems concerning America are brought before the House for solution. The drive-for-action committee will be here, as has been true during the week, and the Republicans will be here in three and four and five times the

number of Democrats tomorrow, just as we have been here in a similar overwhelming percentage every day this week. Not only that but we challenge the majority leader to ask for a quorum call tomorrow, to prove that point.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WINTER. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order that I had for today go over to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I cannot yield further at this time; I am sorry.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I notice that the gentleman was very kind in yielding to the members of the drive-for-action committee.

Mr. WINTER. If I have time when I get through my speech I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I cannot yield now.

WHY AN OIL SHORTAGE?

Mr. Speaker, the United States is fast approaching a most serious bottleneck in the discovery and production of crude oil which, if not prevented, may vitally cripple our war effort and most certainly will play havoc with the economic life of the Nation.

The cold, hard facts, are; first: That we are consuming our petroleum reserves much more rapidly than we are discovering new sources of supply, and second, that by reason of the administration's short-sighted, bungling, inefficient policy in dealing with this situation, the production of crude oil has been curtailed and over 500,000,000 barrels of crude oil now in the sands of the oil-producing States of the Nation may be lost forever.

If we continue to permit the petroleum reserves of the United States to decline during the present emergency we must expect paralyzing results in the economic life of the Nation.

The oil industry is entering a period in which an unceasing effort must be made to close the breach between increased demands on the one hand and dwindling reserves on the other. The only practical way our oil reserves can be increased is to discover new pools.

Why has not this discovery effort been made? There are several reasons—foremost of which is the economic uncertainty in the oil industry which has been brought about by the failure of the President and his short-sighted bureaucratic advisers in O. P. A. to allow a price adjustment sufficient to permit the industry to find new reserves and to rehabilitate old fields, which, if properly handled, are capable immediately of increasing the production of crude oil by several million barrels annually.

The only sound and practical way to get more oil is to allow those who take the gamble to go after it a sufficient price to make it a profitable venture if oil is discovered.

The price of crude oil has remained practically static since 1941. During that same period material and equipment costs have greatly increased, labor has gone up in many instances 100 percent or more, and manpower has become scarce.

In the midcontinent area, in which my State of Kansas is located, discovery, development, and production costs of the oil industry are as high, and in many instances higher, at the present time than they were in 1917 and 1918, when crude oil was bringing $2.50 a barrel. The price today is approximately $1.17 per barrel. This same condition exists in every other oil-producing State in the Nation.

The basic reason why our stocks of crude oil above ground and the production of new crude oil has declined is due to the fact that instead of drilling more wells and pumping their stripper wells, many producers have been forced to curtail drilling operations and abandon semidepleted fields and stripper wells in order to avoid bankruptcy. When there is no profit, or, at least, not a chance to break even, there is no incentive for a producer to carry on.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It may be interesting to you to know that the Federal Government at the present time is spending $138,000,000 on this Canadian oil exploration project, known as Canol project, which is 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle. Thus far they have an estimated 3,000 barrels, check this with a daily United States production of 4,250,000 barrels. Just another "boondoggling" project. I am of the opinion that if they spent $138,000,000 exploring for oil in proven territory in the various States throughout the United States we would have secured several hundred thousand barrels of oil a day. Now if they are going to hold the line on oil production in the United States let us hold the line on reckless spending up in Canada. Now it is about time that we afford some relief to a gasoline-hungry American people for civilian use and for war purposes. This requires more oil. And as you state, the only way we are going to get additional oil to meet the demands of the civilian population and for war purposes as well, is to give the producer at least a lifting cost commensurate with his cost to produce the oil. The price on oil was frozen at critically low levels in October 1941.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct.

Mr. GAVIN. In my territory I may say all are stripper wells. The production will be down about 2,300,000 barrels in the field this year. It is the oldest oil-producing area in the United States. Two million three hundred thousand barrels, that would be equivalent to from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 gallons of gasoline that could afford relief along the eastern seaboard where the shortage is acute. The field is on the western edge of the eastern area and it would take care of the people of the New England States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York, who are crying for gasoline and fuel oil. And still there is this short-sighted policy of the impractical theorists over in O. P. A. and their "hold the line" policy that is crucifying the stripper well producer. Economic Stabilizer Vinson came out with a statement to muddy up the waters. They are determined to ration the ever-smaller quantities available instead of giving a fair price to stimulate and increase the production to meet the needs to carry on this fight to win the war. And still they hold the line, cutting the heart out of a business that is striving to do its part in the war effort.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. He is to be congratulated. He has been making an effort to get this very vital question settled. There is one thing that is sure, if there is no profit, at least not a chance for the oil operators in the oil industry to break even, there is no incentive for any of these producers to carry on. You have to have a proper incentive in order to get increased production and discovery of crude oil.

The Petroleum Administrator for War asked the oil industry to drill 4,500 wildcat wells during 1943. In 1942 the industry drilled 3,166 wildcat wells against 4,000 requested by the Government. On this same basis the industry will have drilled approximately 3,300 wildcat wells by the end of this year.

By no means will all of these wildcat wells be producers. The estimated reserves of new pools discovered in 1942, when the industry drilled 3,166 wildcat wells, was approximately 260,000,000 barrels. The average discovery cost is approximately $50,000 per well. You can readily see that the industry has invested in the 1942 reserve of 260,000,000 barrels approximately $156,000,000, or 60 cents per barrel for discovery charges alone, to say nothing of production, maintenance, transportation costs, and taxes.

In 1942 the new oil reserves located failed to equal the oil produced from operating wells by more than one-half billion barrels. This simply means that for every new barrel of oil discovered we are now using two. It also means that we cannot delay vitally needed exploratory operations. We must have new reserves and we must start now to find them and not wait until the economic life of the Nation breaks down completely before we begin to act.

This does not mean that the oil industry is in a failing condition, but it does mean that if we continue to draw from the barrel without replenishing the supply that sooner or later the barrel will be empty, and this is exactly what we are doing. For the past 4 years we have been taking from the barrel considerable more than we have added. For example, in 1941 production of crude oil in the United States was approximately 1,400,000,000 barrels. During the same period of time we only replenished our reserves with new oil discovered by approximately 430,000,000 barrels. This same condition prevailed in 1940–42, and 1943 will show even a larger depletion of our reserves as against new oil discovered.

If we continue to follow this same procedure for a few years more our oil supply will be completely exhausted. When a barrel of oil is produced and used—it is gone—and it cannot be restored as

one blade of grass replaces another. Neither can it be replaced by the magic of bureaucracy.

The public has been led to believe that our oil shortage has been brought about by the extraordinary demands made on the petroleum industry by the war and that by continuing rationing until the war is over that the oil shortage will automatically end. This is not correct. Oil diverted from civilian to military use has contributed very little to the situation. Of our daily production of a little over 4,000,000 barrels only one-fourth is earmarked for our military use—and by rationing we have cut our civilian use by about the same proportion. If our military demands have to be further revised upward civilian use will have to be further decreased by a like amount.

For several years before the war we were producing and using practically as much petroleum products as we are using now. We had 30,000,000 automobiles and trucks averaging about 4,000 miles driving per year, using approximately 240,000,000 barrels of gasoline, to which must be added the fuel oils, the lubricants, industrial fuels, tractor fuels, kerosenes, aviation gasoline and motor oils and many other petroleum byproducts. In fact, it required considerable over 1,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil per year to supply these demands before we entered the war.

The administration is to blame for this erroneous belief by the public on the oil situation. The public was first told that east-coast rationing was necessary because of a lack of transportation and not a shortage of oil. Next, the public was told that it was necessary to extend rationing to the entire Nation to conserve rubber—not to conserve oil. In the meantime the transportation problem was solved by the railroads and by the construction of additional pipe lines from the oil-producing area to the East. Then the public was informed that it was necessary to impose more stringent rationing regulations because military requests have become so great that there is now an actual shortage of oil. Is there any wonder that the public is bewildered?

Unless the administration is forced by Congress, before it is too late, to remove the shackles, which its magicians in O. P. A. have fastened on the oil industry, the public is going to receive the severest shock of all when they are told that rationing of oil may have to be continued for several years after the war because of the refusal of the bungling bureaucrats in O. P. A. to realize that a price adjustment is necessary and not a subsidy in order to increase our oil reserves, so that production of crude oil can keep pace with consumer demand.

Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, recognized the need for immediate action in this oil debacle. On August 13, 1943, when gasoline rationing was being discussed with Mr. Ickes and a congressional committee, Mr. Ickes stated:

> During the last 4 years we have used our known reserves much faster than we have discovered new sources—twice as fast, as a matter of fact * * *.

Mr. Ickes further stated:

> Unless important new discoveries are made * * * a widening gap between the productive capacity of the United States and the anticipated crude-oil requirements will develop. * * * The decline is expected to continue so that daily production will drop another 100,000 barrels by the first quarter of next year.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very clear and fine statement that he is making in connection with this all-vital problem. As the gentleman knows, I come from one of the great oil-producing States, the State of Oklahoma. Out in my home county we are situated in the center of the largest proven gas field in the world, the Hugoton field. Anywhere you drill in my county, from the north border to the south border and for a distance of 35 miles east and west you can get a gas well at an average depth of about 2,700 feet. The geologists and those who know about the oil business are confident that in my home of Texas County and in Cimarron County just to the west where they have recently brought in a huge gas well at a different depth, there must be great pools of oil.

I have talked to various representatives of oil companies about the situation and the reason that they cannot explore is because those wells will probably require exploration to a depth of 8,000 or 10,000 feet.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. And with the increased cost of labor, materials, and everything else, they cannot afford to go in and make this exploration with present crude oil prices. The gentleman mentioned something about subsidies. I wonder if I am correct in assuming that it is the policy of those in charge of the oil program—I mean the O. P. A. crowd who are running the show, rather than the Petroleum Administrator, because everyone will concede that it is the O. P. A. which is now running the oil business, the same as most other businesses—that by refusing this small increase in price they are trying to put this industry in the same condition they are trying to put every other business in the country in, namely to require the industry to embrace a subsidy program.

Mr. WINTER. There is no question in my mind but what the gentleman is correct. I want to thank him for his very fine contribution.

Realizing the seriousness of the situation, Mr. Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator, recomended a minimum raise in the price of crude oil of 35 cents a barrel. This was all he could do. He could not grant an increase, even though he recognized the necessity for it, because that authority is not vested in the Petroleum Administrator. That power is vested in the O. P. A. On May 4, 1943, the O. P. A. Administrator rejected the recommendation of Mr. Ickes, but at the same time admitted indirectly the necessity of a price increase by offering Government financial aid to the oil industry in the form of a subsidy.

Since that time the oil industry's war council together with the Petroleum Administrator for War have been vigorously urging an overall increase in the ceiling price of crude oil in line with exploratory and production costs. The matter was finally taken to the Economic Stabilization Director and on October 29, 1943, the Director isued a directive in which he stated:

> There can be no general increase in the price of crude oil.

Now, gentlemen, I ask you who is formulating the policies for the United States? Is it this Congress, the representative of the people, or these bureaucrats here in Washington?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman on that point if he can explain it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, the Congress would certainly have a right to pass any legislation fixing the price of oil if it wanted to do that. I suggest that the gentleman go through the regular legislative processes, and if a majority of the House and Senate feel that there should be an increase in the price of oil the Congress will pass such legislation.

Mr. WINTER. A majority of the House and Senate has not been able to get a chance at it because the administration, through its policy, is holding up this type of legislation and will not allow it to come to the floor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It seems to me the gentleman is arguing for a minority of the House. If a majority of the House and Senate wanted to do something they certainly can do it.

Mr. WINTER. They can if they can get a chance under the rules.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who just made the remark with reference to what Congress might do about it has signed petition No. 14 which would bring the Disney bill now pending in one of the legislative committees of the House before the Committee of the Whole House for action. Those who are in charge of the administration's program—and the gentleman is on that side, and one of them—have thus far succeeded in seeing that the bill does not reach the Congress for action through the regular channels. My colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] introduced a bill which we believe will afford the necessary relief, and there is a petition on the Clerk's desk now to get the bill before the House so that the Congress can act on it. This bill which we are trying to get before the House for consideration is in the same category with numerous other bills that the people are interested in, stifled in administration-controlled committees, so that the Congress does

not have a chance to speak on the subject.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I do not know about any administration-controlled committees, but I do know that if a majority of the House or a majority on a committee believes that legislation such as the gentleman from Oklahoma has introduced, is wise legislation, the House could certainly pass it. I do not see any necessity for railing at the head of the Interior Department.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman did not answer my question. Has he signed petition 14, so we can get some action on this important legislation?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I certainly have not signed it. I certainly have not. It is not the usual way of getting legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It just happens that I just looked at petition No. 14 on the Speaker's desk, and there are 111 signatures asking Congress to consider the Disney bill. The Disney bill was introduced by the great and good Democrat from Tulsa, Okla. He is a member of the same party as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 111 is less than one-fourth the membership of the House. You evidently do not have a majority.

Mr. WINTER. I would say to the gentleman the petition has only been on the Speaker's desk a few days.

Mr. MUNDT. And it only requires 218 signatures to bring the bill out. If the gentleman will use his vital energy toward a constructive purpose, he can get enough Democrats to sign that petition and we will get it up tomorrow, because we will be in session tomorrow.

Mr. WINTER. However, Mr. Vinson, the Director of Economic Stabilization, in the same directive, indirectly admitted the urgent necessity of a price adjustment when he further stated:

> The Petroleum Administrator is directed to formulate without delay a program to provide additional financial incentives for exploration and development of new fields in conformity with the standards outlined above and, if feasible, additional financial support for marginal stripper-well and repressing operations short of a general price increase. On formulation of selective incentive programs by the Petroleum Administrator consistent with the stabilization program the Economic Stabilization Director will direct execution of the programs by such other agencies as may be concerned.

In other words they are further tightening the web of bureaucracy around the oil industry of this Nation.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it not true that there are hundreds of rigs ready to drill and plenty of money ready to finance the operation of these rigs if their operation would only be permitted by the agencies which are now withholding them from exploration?

Mr. WINTER. Absolutely; and they do not need any subsidy to do it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I have not been privileged to hear all of the very splendid argument being made by the gentleman from Kansas, but I wish to ask the gentleman if he has touched on the possibility of getting much greater production from the 70,000 stripper wells in the country? In my own district in southern Illinois, the Twenty-third Illinois, there are many old stripper wells producing from 2 to 4 barrels of oil a day each.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct; I am familiar with it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Vinson in his report, as I read it, stated that about 17 percent of the total production of oil in the United States now comes from stripper wells; yet thousands of them are being abandoned because they cannot get cost of production, because they cannot get this increase of 35 cents, 40 cents, or 50 cents a barrel.

Mr. WINTER. Every day sees more stripper wells abandoned.

Mr. VURSELL. When a stripper well is abandoned oil that we need for the Army, the Navy, and civilian use in that well is gone forever, because no one will ever drill again to try to get those few extra thousand barrels of oil out of the ground.

Mr. WINTER. I may say to the gentleman in that connection that there are 296,000 of that same kind of stripper wells throughout the United States that are now on the verge of being abandoned, and abandoned forever. I want to thank the gentleman for the extraordinary effort he has been making in his attempt to correct this condition.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the bill that is coming up soon to put in this experimental station is going to bring about the necessity of some action of this kind by the departments?

Mr. WINTER. It is a part of it but mainly the bill provides for the construction of this experimental station. I am not opposed to that, but it will only result in the spending of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 of the taxpayers' money unnecessarily. It could be avoided by raising the price of this basic commodity.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how many marginal stripper wells have already gone out of production because of failure to increase the price of crude oil?

Mr. WINTER. I have such figures in my office, but I do not have them at my fingertips. About 2 years ago what was known as the independent producers controlled about 60 percent of the oil reserves of the Nation. But by reason of the independent producers not being able to carry on because of increased production costs, they have had to abandon and sell their properties until now they control only about 25 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman given the House or the country any reason why the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has not been followed of allowing some increase in the price of crude oil?

Mr. WINTER. I am coming to that in just a few minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. I should like to emphasize what was said. The gentleman is making a very timely and constructive argument on this oil situation. I do not quite understand whether this oil from these stripper and marginal producer wells is lost forever if these wells are capped, but I believe that is the fact. So it is a permanent loss to the Nation that cannot be recovered.

Mr. WINTER. Those wells are lost because once they are abandoned it is almost impossible to get them back in production, as I understand it, except by repressure methods which cannot be carried on successfully at the present price of oil.

Mr. JONKMAN. This seems to me to be a needless and inexcusable policy which will result in the loss of one-ninth of our entire output.

Mr. WINTER. The stripper wells do not represent one-ninth. There are approximately 296,000 stripper wells, with an average daily production of 2 barrels each. There are 105,000 other producing wells, with an average daily production of approximately 35 barrels each.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. HEIDINGER. In answer to the gentleman from Michigan I may say that on the 4th day of October the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma made the statement in the Senate that 10,500 of these wells were abandoned in 1942 resulting in an estimated loss of 44,000,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. WINTER. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois on that point that there are approximately 500,000,000 barrels of oil in these wells in semidepleted pools that is going to be lost if something is not done about it. A great part of it is in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania; some of it is in mine, some of it is in the district of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I may say there is an estimated billion barrels of oil in the Pennsylvania fields waiting to be taken from the sand. From 7,500 to 8,000 of these wells are on the pumps, but in many instances leases are being abandoned, wells closed down and the machinery and equipment sold for junk.

Once they pull the casing on that well there will never be any economic justi-

fication for drilling another hole to secure that oil because the field is an old field and will produce no gushers, although if the lease were kept in production, that quarter- or half-barrel or 2 or 3 barrels they have been getting every day for the past 50 or 60 years would continue to be gotten for years to come. When there is no incentive back of it and they cannot get the lifting cost, they abandon the wells and the result is the casing is pulled and oil in the ground is forever lost to the American people when, as a matter of fact, there is a potential billion barrels of oil there. P. A. W. has said we will be short 337,000 barrels daily in 1944, so we need every drop of oil that we possibly can get. Mr. Vinson favors incentives and subsidies. We do not want incentives or subsidies. Subsidies mean additional taxes. The burden of taxes is carried over until the future, so that our boys who are over there fighting at $50 a month to get their insides punched out on the sands of north Africa, or dying like rats in a submarine or being blasted out of the air will come home and find they have to pay the bill. All we are doing in paying subsidies is handing these taxes on for those American boys to pay, or, in other words, taking the bread and butter out of their pocket to pay for the war. They fight the war and now we want them to pay for it. I want no part of subsidies.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. The gentleman is making a very able address in pointing out the absolute necessity for an increase in the price of oil to bring about production and to keep the production that we now have. In my own district, there is one field known as the Colmer Field in west central Illinois, in which there are 400 stripper wells that are really not paying any reasonable return. Many of them are paying no return. I happen to have an interest with a couple of friends in a few of those stripper wells. We have not had one penny out of them for over 4 years. We are barely getting enough to pay the pumper and to clean them when it is necessary. If it were not for this war effort in the last 2 years we would have closed them up, pulled the casings, sold our engines and everything else for junk and recovered what we could, but we are going along using what little reserves we have in a last effort. If we want to continue, I think the thing to do is to bring this before the House and let the House decide it. If all the Representatives of the great oil fields of the Southwest would sign Petition No. 14 to bring it out on the floor for consideration, it would help a great deal.

Mr. WINTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I was talking about this directive that has been issued by Mr. Vinson. Let us look at it. What does this directive mean? It simply means the payment by the Government of a subsidy—a bonus—and perhaps providing nonrecourse loans for exploratory and development operations. The oil industry wants nothing whatever to do with such a program. All the industry wants is to be given an opportunity to proceed under its own power as an integral part of our American system of free enterprise, unhampered by bureaucratic planners.

The subsidy-bonus-nonrecourse loan plan has been in effect for many months in the lead- and zinc-mining industry, and it has utterly failed to increase the production of lead and zinc or to locate new reserves. If such a system is put into effect in the oil industry, I venture the prediction it will cost the taxpayers of this Nation millions of dollars and not increase our oil reserves by one single barrel of oil.

The only sound way to solve this oil crisis is to permit a price adjustment sufficient so that the basic commodity—crude oil—can be discovered and produced at a reasonable margin of profit on a competitive basis. Such a policy would immediately stimulate exploratory work in an effort to increase our reserves. It would permit our producing wells to step up production nearer to total capacity. In Kansas alone, this would amount to a daily increase of approximately 18,000 barrels, and it would permit the development of a large number of semi-depleted oil fields by pressure methods which would materially add to our stock pile of crude oil above ground.

But the administration, through O. P. A. and the Economic Stabilization Director, has turned thumbs down on the recommendations of the oil industry, the Petroleum Administrator, and the Governors of the oil-producing States and has ordered its power-drunk bureaucratic magicians to reach into the bowels of the earth and bring forth oil.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I think this is a very important matter and that this Disney bill would result in determining whether or not we, the duly elected Representatives of the people, have a voice in the conduct and operation of the Government or whether we must be silent forevermore and the policies and programs involving our respective areas in the United States be determined by an impractical group who are attempting to restrict, strangle, and put this branch of private enterprise out of business. We in Congress ought to determine this matter. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] says, there are certain ways by which we can secure results. We ought to have a show-down with the O. P. A. once and for all and find out whether they are going to run the country with a lot of college professors who have not the slightest conception of what it is all about, or the Congress, duly elected by the people, is going to run the country.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is exactly right.

Members of Congress, it is our duty to speak up and not accept these crackpot theories when they are contrary to sound judgment. There is sure to be a terrible day of reckoning on this issue unless we demand action and get it now.

If the oil industry was able to start today with increased exploratory drilling it would be 9 months to a year and a half before any substantial increase in oil reserves could be expected.

We cannot afford to take a chance on having a repetition of a major catastrophe in oil like the administration permitted to occur in rubber and which is now threatening to break down a major portion of our transportation system.

Congress is the only hope of preventing a major catastrophe in this oil crisis. But we must act and act immediately. Not next year, or the year after, but now.

On June 7, this year, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] introduced a bill (H. R. 2887) which provides:

> That the powers and functions conferred by the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, upon the Price Administrator, with respect to crude oil and the products thereof and the derivatives therefrom, are hereby transferred to the Petroleum Administrator for War.

The bill further provides that in the fixing of prices for crude oil and the products and derivatives therefrom, that the Petroleum Administrator for War shall consider the necessity for exploring for crude oil and the maintenance of a competitive position in the petroleum industry and to that end no price ceiling for crude oil or the products or derivatives therefrom shall be fixed or maintained by the Administrator below a price, the index of which is equal to the price index of "all commodities" as reported from time to time by the United States Department of Labor in its wholesale commodity price index for all commodities as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and has been there since the 7th day of June—5 long months during which time our oil supply has been steadily dwindling. Apparently the Administration leaders have been successful in their efforts to prevent the committee from acting on this bill, or similar legislation, because the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] after waiting all these months for action has placed discharge petition No. 14 on the Speaker's desk in an effort to bring this matter before the Congress.

This crude-oil crisis vitally affects the entire Nation. Without oil we could not operate our mechanized war equipment on land, sea, and in the air; without oil our vast system of transportation would immediately collapse, and without oil the wheels of our gigantic industrial system would cease to turn.

With the exception of the food we eat and the water we drink, oil is without doubt the most vital commodity necessary to sustain the economic stability of the Nation. It is not only of concern to us in the oil producing States but it affects the daily life of every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

In conclusion, I most urgently request every Member of the House to sign discharge petition No. 14 so that we can bring this vital matter before the House of Representatives for action before it is too late.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas for the splendid statement he has made. It might be well to point out here that the request on behalf of the oil industry for an increase in the price of crude oil is not out of line, in that I believe they agree the increase should be 50 cents per barrel, which would increase the price of gasoline approximately 1 cent per gallon, which also would not be out of line. Putting it on a comparative basis, we talk about the question of parity. Crude oil is now about 60 percent of parity, as I understand it.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the price of crude oil could be increase 50 cents per barrel, it would not even bring the price of crude oil up to parity. I think the gentleman from Kansas perhaps pointed out the fact that we are getting now about the same price for crude oil that was paid back in 1939, and the cost of production then, of course, does not compare with the cost of production at the present time.

Mr. WINTER. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas on his splendid statement.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman himself is to be congratulated on the splendid work he is doing on the steering committee to bring this matter before the House.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman's statement that it is the duty of Congress to act, and the opportunity now leads me to suggest that we had a meeting of the steering committee this morning in order to effect plans to get enough signatures to this discharge petition to get the bill onto the floor of the House. There are quite a number of Members here this afternoon. I think it is of great importance that the men who have listened to the gentleman's splendid and able address get busy with their colleagues in an attempt to get enough signatures to this discharge petition to get the bill before the House, where Congress, in my judgment, will do something about it.

Mr. WINTER. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. What the gentleman says about the price is absolutely correct. I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate this matter for the Committee on Naval Affairs. We found that in substance what the gentleman says about the price is true. I for one do not think 35 cents is enough.

Mr. WINTER. I do not, either.

Mr. GAVIN. It is not enough in my territory. We need a dollar a barrel.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman believe that price alone will take care of the serious condition that now obtains?

Mr. WINTER. I do not believe that price alone will do it, but I do believe if we pass a bill something like the Disney bill, which will give authority to the Petroleum Administrator to set the price and take off all the red tape the O. P. A. has hung around the oil industry, those things together will go a long way toward increasing our oil reserve.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman's statement is very fine. I do not agree with him on the political side, but that is the gentleman's business. If we take the red tape off the P. A. W. and the O. P. A. we shall have more millions of gallons of oil in this country than we have ever had before, and this Nation will not be a dependent Nation but an independent Nation.

Mr. WINTER. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. I have taken it upon myself to try to get the members of my delegation to sign this petition. I have signed it and at least two others have signed it. We are trying to get more signatures. We are doing all we can, because we know the condition is serious.

Mr. WINTER. It is imperative that we get something done about this situation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I say to the gentleman that it would cost the consuming public only approximately a cent more per gallon of gasoline, and they would be glad to pay that to get the gasoline.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on six different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] may be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the National Association of Salesmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFEE). Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] for 30 minutes.

"REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR"

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, "Remember Pearl Harbor" and salute the devoted people of Hawaii who have so loyally carried on since December 7, 1941. They never faltered. They never lost heart for a second. They knew what they were up against, but they dug in all the harder. The citizens of my home city of San Francisco have been more closely associated with Hawaii than any other group in the United States. It is fitting that I take this opportunity of expressing the admiration every American holds for our countrymen living out there in the middle of the Pacific.

"Remember Pearl Harbor." Why America has been thinking continually of Pearl Harbor since about 1873, when a survey was made of the Hawaiian Islands as to their military significance to this Republic. Let me read a letter written to Senator John T. Morgan by J. M. Schofield of St. Augustine, Fla., under date of January 13, 1898:

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with the request contained in your letter of January 9, I do not hesitate to write you without reserve in respect to my views upon the pending question of annexation of the Hawaiian Islands.

From the time, 25 years ago, when I made a personal examination for the purpose of ascertaining the value of those islands to this country for military and naval purposes, I have always regarded ultimate annexation of the islands to this country as a public necessity. But the time when this should be accomplished had to depend on natural political development. In the meantime our national interests should be secured by the exclusive right to occupy, improve, and fortify Pearl River harbor so as to insure our possession of that harbor in time of war.

To illustrate my views on this subject, I have likened that harbor to a commanding position in front of a defensive line which an army in the field is compelled to occupy. The army must occupy that advanced position and hold it at whatever cost, or else the enemy will occupy it with his artillery and thus dominate the main line. If we do not occupy and fortify Pearl River Harbor, our enemy will occupy it as a base from which to conduct operations against our Pacific coast and the isthmian canal, which must, of course, in due time be constructed and controlled by this country. The possession of such a base at a convenient distance from our Pacific coast would be a great temptation to an unfriendly nation to undertake hostile operations against us.

One of the greatest advantages of Pearl River Harbor to us consists in the fact that no navy would be required to defend it. It is a deep, land-locked arm of the sea, easily defended by fortifications placed near its mouth, with its anchorage beyond the reach of guns from the ocean. Cruisers or other warships which might be overpowered at sea, as well as merchant vessels, would find there behind the land defenses absolute security against a naval attack. A moderate garrison of regular troops, with the militia on the island, would give sufficient protection against any landing parties from a hostile fleet. Of course an army on transports, supported by a powerful fleet, could land and capture the place, but that would be an expensive operation, one much less likely to be undertaken than the occupation of an undefended harbor, as a necessary preliminary to an attack on our coast or upon our commerce.

The value of such a place of refuge and of supplies for our merchant marine and our cruisers in time of war can hardly be overestimated, yet the greatest value to us of that wonderful harbor consists in the fact that its possession and adequate defense by us prevents the possibility of an enemy using it against us.

So far as I know, the leading statesmen, no less than the military and naval authorities of this country, have always been in accord on this subject. While it has not been proposed to interfere with the continued occupation by foreign nations of their military strongholds in this hemisphere, it has been publicly and emphatically declared that none of those strongholds shall ever be allowed to pass into the possession of any other nation whose interests might be antagonistic to ours. Now, for the first time, the occasion has arisen to carry into effect our long-declared national policy. A little state like Hawaii cannot stand alone among the great nations, all of whom covet her incomparable harbor. She must have the protection of this country or some other great nation. But a protectorate without sovereignty is the last thing this country could afford to assume. In the absence of authority to regulate and control the intercourse between the islands and other countries controversies must arise which would lead to war or to the loss of our invaluable military possession in the islands. No halfway measures will suffice. We must accept the islands and hold and govern them or else let some other great nation do it. To fail now to carry into effect our own great national policy upon the first occasion offered to us would, in my judgment, be one of those blunders which are worse than crimes.

To my mind what may be regarded perhaps as the sentimental aspect of the question is entitled to consideration. A colony of intelligent, virtuous, and patriotic Americans have rescued a country from barbarism and raised it to a high state of civilization and prosperity, until in the natural course of events the government of that country has fallen entirely into their hands. They now ask the privilege of adding that country to their own native land; of returning with their new possessions to the parental fold. Can they be turned away to seek a home among strangers? Not without violating one of the most sacred laws of nature and incurring the penalty which must, sooner or later, necessarily follow.

I am, dear Senator, with great respect,
Sincerely yours,

J. M. SCHOFIELD.

The Senate and House of Representatives of the United States by joint resolution, dated July 6, 1898, ratified annexation. President William McKinley signed it the next day, and so the Hawaiian Islands became an integral port of our Republic.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I am delighted to yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California upon bringing to the attention of the House that historic and significant document, and in connection with the circumstances of annexation I point out that annexation was achieved by joint resolution, rather than by treaty, because of the inability of those supporting annexation to obtain a two-thirds vote in the Senate, indicating that in the face of the foresight of such men as Mr. Schofield, there were still many people in the United States who did not realize at that time, as he did, and as the Americans of Hawaii did, the enormous value to this country of those islands.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much and appreciate his observation. I am calling the attention of our colleagues to the fact that the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii has lived there for many years. He was an infant when his parents arrived in Honolulu. His father later became Governor of the Territory. I feel honored to have the gentleman make his explanation about the way Hawaii was annexed.

Let me repeat one portion of the Schofield letter:

To my mind what may be regarded perhaps as the sentimental aspect of the question is entitled to consideration. A colony of intelligent, virtuous, and patriotic Americans have rescued a country from barbarism and raised it to a high state of civilization and prosperity, until in the natural course of events the government of that country has fallen entirely into their hands. They now ask the privilege of adding that country to their own native land; of returning with their new possessions to the parental fold.

Now let me quote from committee report accompanying Senate Resolution 127. It is Report No. 681 of the Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, and is dated March 16, 1898:

We also hold toward the missionaries, who have brought into Hawaii the light of the twin stars of Christianity and constitutional liberty, a national debt of gratitude that good conscience will not permit us to forget; and to their worthy children we owe protection in the enjoyment of the blessings of free republican government that they have created in Hawaii, under our fostering care, with faithful labor and Anglo-Saxon courage.

To our own people who have emigrated to Hawaii under the open invitation of our national policy and under the pledges given by Congress and our Presidents that no foreign power should disturb their rights we owe all the friendly care that a father can owe to his sons who have with his consent left their home to seek their fortunes in other lands. Not many of them have gone to Cuba, Jamaica, Mexico, or Central or South America, or even to Canada, to reside with kindred people, but, under our encouragement and promises of protection, a large and splendid body of Americans have gone to Hawaii to reside, not feeling that they have expatriated themselves, and have carried with them the highest virtues and the most advanced education in art, science, agriculture, and mechanics, and have established homes there that are, many of them, equal in elegance and comfort to any in the United States * * *. To these people, and also to the preservation of the native population against a speedy destruction, involving property and life, we owe the duty of rescuing them from the silent but rapid invasion of the pagan races from Asia. This invasion is concerted, and is far more dangerous to Hawaii than if it came on ships of war with the avowed purpose of subjugating the Hawaiian Islands. It is the stealthy approach of a "destruction that wasteth at noonday." The immigrants from Japan retain their allegiance to that Empire, and yet they claim full political rights in Hawaii notwithstanding their alienage.

In this demand they have the undisguised encouragement of the Japanese Government. These privileges are demanded as rights.

The only objection to annexation came from Japan; the same Japan which struck below the belt at Pearl Harbor. You and I well remember December 7, 1941, when the stealthy punch was delivered. Japanese emissaries were right here in Washington, ostensibly negotiating with Secretary of State Hull for amicable adjustment of our differences. What a sham—such hypocrisy—yes, my colleagues, millions of Americans yet unborn will "remember Pearl Harbor."

Quoting from the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission statement of January 1943:

"Remember Pearl Harbor," vowed the entire Nation; and nowhere in our country has that vow been upheld more strongly or more resolutely than by the people of the Territory. They, perhaps more than the residents of any other section of the United States, have reason to know the dread devastation and destruction wrought by our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, now let us look at the record to see how those who followed in the footsteps of the early American settlers are acquitting themselves. Let us review briefly Hawaiian developments since 1898.

The United States underwrote a Hawaiian national debt of $4,000,000. At the time cash value of public property in Honolulu and other towns added to value of public domain in the islands was estimated to be at least $9,000,000. The Federal Government actually started with a profit of $5,000,000. But no agreement is worth the paper it is written on unless it proves beneficial to both parties.

At the start, therefore, the United States Government underwrote $4,000,000 of indebtedness. Hawaii had assets of some nine million. Forty-three years later, in 1941, the United States Treasury collected nearly $14,000,000 in tax payments from Hawaii. Twelve States

in the Union actually paid less than the Territory.

How is that for a good business deal for the Federal Government? Now, let us look at Hawaii.

As a separate republic, Hawaiian top yearly sugar movement to the United States was in 1897—192,508 tons, value about $12,800,000. In 1940, Hawaii produced 976,667 tons, valued at $53,000,000. So you see annexation was also extremely beneficial to the islands.

On December 7, 1940, the Secretary of Agriculture estimated the total sugar consumption of the continental United States for 1941 at 6,616,817 tons.

The Secretary estimated the total quota for the year at 8,032,074 tons.

The quotas for the various producing areas at that time were established as follows:

	Tons
Domestic beet	1,862,811
Mainland cane	504,995
Hawaii	1,127,420
Puerto Rico	959,088
Virgin Islands	10,716
Philippine Islands	1,237,764
Cuba	2,297,533
Foreign countries	31,747

In other words, Hawaii's contribution to the Nation's sugar bowl before the war was about 14 percent. The Philippine quota was slightly more. With the Philippines cut off, all domestic sources of supply, which of course includes Hawaii, became increasingly important. The sugar refiners of the United States are working in close cooperation with those responsible for providing food for our armed forces, both home and abroad. Military requirements come first. Refiners are reserving certain of their facilities for the exclusive use of the armed forces. Increasing quantities of sugar are being furnished under lease-lend.

Island population in 1900, 2 years after annexation, was estimated at 154,001.

The 1940 census showed 426,664, made up as follows:

Hawaiian	14,359
Part Hawaiian	50,470
Puerto Rican	8,332
Caucasian	106,381
Chinese	28,834
Japanese	157,990
Korean	6,854
Filipino	52,607
All others	837
Total	426,664

Of the above total, 81,813 were aliens. The two largest groups of aliens are Japanese, 36,678, and Filipinos, 35,498.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ROLPH Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Does the gentleman have the figures for the fiscal year 1943?

Mr. ROLPH. No, I have not.

Mr. FARRINGTON. In the fiscal year 1943 the Territory of Hawaii paid in excess of $76,000,000 to the Federal Treasury, more than did 13 States combined, and more than the citizens of 33 States on a per capita basis. Also, I should add to that that the great progress of those islands is in large measure the result of the very generous policies of the Federal Government, and the decision at the outset to give the people of those islands a large measure of local self-government and control developed in them a keen sense of responsibility and obligation to Uncle Sam.

Mr. ROLPH. In other words, it has been a very splendid and happy relationship from the start. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. As a member of the Committee on Territories, from which committee legislation concerning the Hawaiian Islands comes, I compliment the gentleman upon the very fine address he has made, and I appreciate the situation existing between Hawaii and our own Government here on continental United States. Is it not a fact that the legislation which is sought by the people of the Hawaiian Islands is almost without exception of a very high type? That is, they are not asking for any consideration that the merits of the situation would not grant. We have found them to be very modest in their demands, and the distinguished gentleman who represents them, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] here in the House has the confidence and respect of every member of that committee.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much, and would add that the gentleman's own city of Portland, is one of the cities on the Pacific coast that enjoys a substantial trade with Hawaii. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I know how very much his constituents are interested in the welfare of everything for the benefit of Hawaii.

Hawaii's two basic crops are sugar and pineapple. I have spoken of sugar. Pineapple is also highly essential for the war effort.

Quoting again from Hawaii Equal Rights Commission:

The pineapple industry likewise, despite heavy contributions to the war effort in labor, equipment, and materials, also has been able to continue production in almost normal quantities. Shipments for 1941 were 11,491,000 cases of pineapple and 11,284,938 cases of pineapple juice. The Federal Government purchased substantial quantities of these and has announced that its requirements for the coming year would exceed 34 percent of the canned pineapple pack and 21 percent of the juice pack for Army, Navy, and lend-lease consumption.

These achievements by the sugar and pineapple industries were made possible in a measure by the cooperation of public and private school authorities who reduced the school week in the junior and senior high schools from 5 to 4 days in order to permit thousands of students in these classes to volunteer for work in the fields.

Now, let me quote the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission further:

Any discussion of the contribution of civilian Hawaii to the national war effort should include the paramount record established by the Territory in the purchase of War Savings bonds and stamps, particularly since the Treasury Department began establishing quotas for all States and Territories in May 1942. In that month, Hawaii's quota was $992,000. Its total sales were $5,985,000, or a percentage of 603.3 of the sales to quota, Hawaii leading all of the States and other political subdivisions in this respect. In June the Territory's quota was increased to $1,365,000; its sales were $4,841,000, or 354.7 percent of sales to quota, the Territory again leading the Nation in this respect.

In the first 4 months of the fiscal year beginning July 1942 the Treasury Department at Washington announced that Hawaii led all States, Territories, and other political subdivisions of the Nation in percentage of sales to quota, with a mark of 138.7 percent. * * *

* * * A special War bond drive to commemorate the December 7, 1941, attack was held throughout Hawaii on its first anniversary under the sponsorship of the Treasury Department, the Army, and the Navy. It was hoped that sales of at least $1,000,000 worth of bonds could be effected on this day. The "bargain day" line-ups at the regular bond outlets, as well as 15 additional temporary booths erected at strategic locations in Honolulu were so great on December 7, however, that it was necessary to continue the sale on 2 additional days to accommodate all prospective purchasers. As a result, total sales of War bonds exceeded $5,000,000 on these 3 days. Each of the bonds purchased was inscribed with a special "Remember Pearl Harbor" stamp.

The second anniversary of Pearl Harbor is just ahead of us. The people of continental United States honor our fellow citizens in Hawaii—for steadfast loyalty in the face of dire peril; for consecrated devotion to those principles Americans cherish more than life itself; and for supreme adherence to the tenets which are the bulwark of democracy. Hawaii has kept the faith. Mauna Loa, Diamond Head, and Waikiki are closer to our hearts than ever. As long as there is a Capitol in Washington, we shall remember Sunday, December 7, 1941. Pearl Harbor is the American symbol of resistance to treachery and deceit. The Japanese by one underhanded stab in the back drew Americans closer together than we had ever been before. In years to come, Pearl Harbor will grow in stature and in affection as one of America's greatest shrines. To our fellow Americans out there in the mid-Pacific we send sincere greetings from the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Good luck and God bless you. We on the mainland are with you to the end. Aloha nui.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Before the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] leaves the floor I would like to express my deep appreciation of his remarks about the people of Hawaii and I am sure they will take new courage from what you have said. Finally, in the language of our people, let me say, Mahalo nui loa.

Mr. ROLPH. Thank you very, very much.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the regular business and any special orders already entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of any special orders that may have been allowed, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

RUSSIAN NEWSPAPERS DISTRIBUTED IN AMERICA URGE SLAVIC PEOPLE TO UNITE INTO ONE RACIAL BLOCK

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, within the last 48 hours there was read to the House from the Clerk's desk a report from the President of the United States on lease-lend in the present war. We learned for the first time the amount of lease-lend in reverse that we have received from the British Empire. Contrary to the general impression in the United States, we are also receiving in reverse lease-lend from Russia. But it is of a character and nature which I do not believe the American people will look upon with favor. Since we entered this war as an ally of Russia, the Russian Government, by its voluntary act which the American people applauded, dissolved what is known as the Comintern, an agency set up in its own Government to breed and foment world revolution for the purpose of destroying capitalistic governments on this earth, including the United States of America. That act of the Russian Government strengthened the ties of friendship and encouraged our confidence, faith, and sincerity in the Russian Government and her people. Recently there was held in Moscow a conference attended by four of the great Allied Nations, in which the United States participated. We sent our very distinguished and illustrious Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, as the representative of this Government. The purpose of the conference was to coordinate, as I understood, the efforts of the Allied Nations in this war, to bring about greater efficiency and understanding.

We commend the purpose of that meeting. We are informed that it was a success and I believe it was. We welcome our Secretary of State on his return from his successful mission to the Soviet capital.

But there has just come to my attention information which in some degree is a discordant note in the otherwise harmonious relationship existing between the United States and Russia that I want to give to the House and to the country. We all know that our ships have been taking lend-lease material and aid to Russia. The ships that have been taking butter, munitions, trucks, machine tools, a whole tire factory, and other materials of war to Russia, have been returning, lately with tons of printed matter in the form of newspapers to the extent of 300,000 copies monthly. Those ships have been arriving at ports on the Pacific coast of the United States. These newspapers are printed in a number of foreign languages. Some of them, I am reliably informed, are on sale at newsstands in the city of New York and others are destined for distribution among workers in Michigan, Illinois, New York, and the mining regions of Pennsylvania. This printed matter comes from Moscow. What is the purpose of the distribution of these papers in the United States at this time, printed by a friendly nation, one with whom we are in the closest cooperation in the greatest conflict the world has ever seen and a nation that we today respect and admire? The courage and patriotism of the Russian soldiers and the Russian people in their determination to free their own land from the heel of the oppressor is most praiseworthy. We join in every effort that they make in that respect. But why should they in this hour, when we are granting aid to them, permit the distribution in this country of newspapers containing articles urging the formation of racial blocks in the United States? These papers are to be distributed in the settlement of the Croats, the Lithuanians, the Ruthenians, the Ukrainians, the Poles, the Serbs and other groups of Slavonic origin in this country. They are printed on good paper. They are well illustrated and ready for distribution. They have the widest circulation among these groups in the States I have mentioned. This newspaper route between Moscow and the United States is of recent origin. It was organized after the very widely publicized dissolution, as I say, of the Comintern. The largest edition comes out in the Polish language and is known as the Walna-Polska. It is edited by a very remarkable Polish woman named Wanda Wassilveska. This woman is known as the Polish Earl Browder. She is a citizen of Russia and is the wife of the Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Alexander Kornijesuk.

This woman has earned the distinction of being made an honorary colonel in the Red army, but her activities have been more literary than military. All of these foreign-language newspapers which originate in Moscow have one editorial theme, the necessity for the organization of a Cominslav movement in the United States. American citizens of Slav origin are urged to unite in one racial block within the borders of this country. Why should they urge an organization of racial blocks in the United States? There is no place in this country for any racial block. I think it is a reflection upon the people of foreign extraction in our country. They are as loyal, patriotic and devoted to the United States and to the cause in which we are now engaged as other citizens of the United States.

The idea of circulating among them newspapers containing that kind of an appeal, coming from a country with whom we are now allied, in my judgment is in bad taste at this time. What is the purpose? Will it not raise a large question mark in the minds of many American people as to what purpose is behind the organization of this Slavic bloc in the United States? Let us hope that one of the things that was discussed at the Moscow Conference might have been the subject to terminate the distribution of any propaganda in this country, that might tend to divide the American people in their united effort to win the war.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. To clear up a thought in my mind, with reference to the gentleman's statement, which is exceedingly interesting, were those publications, official publications, sponsored by the Russian Government?

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot answer that, but I would like to comment on the gentleman's question and say that I do not believe that any kind of literature is permitted to leave Russia without the consent of the Russian Government.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe that is correct, of course. Another question along the same line: Can it be inferred from this work that you have described that the Comintern is in fact still functioning?

Mr. DONDERO. That I do not know. I am simply stating the information as it has come to my attention. I might say this is neither private nor secret. It was made public on the 9th of this month, through the column of Helen Lombard entitled "Wartime Washington," writing for the Bell Syndicate.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think the gentleman's remarks are a splendid contribution toward better relations with Russia. I think anything of this kind should be brought into the light, just as the gentleman has brought it out, and that we should not only hear the discussion here, but that it should be fully and thoroughly investigated by our State Department and an understanding reached with Russia.

Mr. DONDERO. We have shown every evidence that we desire to stand united in a supreme effort to win this contest, not only for the United States, but for Russia as well. Let nothing come between us to interfere with that effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRANT of Indiana, for 10 days, on account of Naval Affairs Committee business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day deliver to the White House for forwarding to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norma S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.;

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith; and

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, November 13, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

909. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of his annual report for the fiscal year 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

910. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 of the December 31, 1943, Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

911. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Distribution Methods and Costs, Part 1—Important Food Products"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

912. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting copies of the Quarterly Estimates of Personnel Requirements for each of the department's reporting units for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on the bills H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015, to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 857). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 351. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the investigation of certain transactions of the Waterman Steamship Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Resolution 52. Resolution on the investigation of certain transactions of the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 3655. A bill to impose tax upon income derived by nonprofit organizations from dividends as a result of ownership by such organizations of substantial or practical voting control of private corporations for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 3656. A bill to grant men and women of the armed forces of the present war base pay and family allowances for 1 year after their separation from the service or release from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3657. A bill to provide adjusted-service compensation and to provide a 3-month furlough with pay prior to discharge for persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting by members of the armed services of the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 3658. A bill for the relief of the dependents of John Richard Schulz, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3659. A bill for the relief of Anne Loacker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELMER:

H. R. 3660. A bill for the relief of Perry Bryant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3661. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 3662. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Grim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 3663. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the district court for the district of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of residents of St. Georges, Del.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3533. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the employees of the Columbia Brewing Co. and signed by 56 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3534. Also, petition of Joseph F. Dedeck and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3535. Also, petition of Ed. Mueller and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3536. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Resolution of the Des Moines Club of Printing House Craftsmen, Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Burch bill (H. R. 2001); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3537. By Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: Petition of Rev. A. L. Allison and 10 other signers of the First Presbyterian Church, of Monmouth, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3538. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of the citizens of Arthur, Ill., asking legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3539. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Trowbridge and Strasburg, Ill., requesting the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3540. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Licking County, Ohio, presented by Mrs. W. G. Hoover, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3541. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the State bar of California, recommending to the Congress of the United States that sections 811 (d), (5), 811 (e) (2), 811 (g) (4), and 1000 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code be repealed as of the date of their enactment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3542. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of J. S. Allen and 13 other citizens of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3543. Also, petition of Paul W. Duffy and 65 other citizens of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3544. Also, petition of George M. Gibson and two other residents of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3545. Also, petition of W. H. Farmer and 17 other citizens of Twisp, Wash., requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on the McNary sustained-yield forestry bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, at the secret shrine, the sanctuary of the soul, be pleased to hear our prayer. Make us strongly conscious of the efficacy and merits of divine guidance. The spirit of our glorified Lord makes the difference in our lives, cleansing from our hearts smoldering hatred and muttered irreverence from our lips.

Amid the brawl of clashing selfishness, help us to offer to our country an advance in sacrifice. O give us the spirit of our chivalrous ranks who are forgetting self that God's clean winds may again fill the lungs of a world in unspeakable tragedy. Let us catch their spirit, proving that because they are fighting and dying we shall be a nobler people; thus in the end the bitter loss shall be a glorious gain. O mighty Son of Israel, come and restring the broken harps of men and retune them to the harmony of that peace which is destined to leap from the horizons of the world; with the incense of Thy holy altar, fill the whole temple of our Republic, we beseech Thee. Do Thou take all confined hearts, grasp all selfish minds and use them as Thy earthly vessels to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3363) entitled "An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. DAVIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) entitled "An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.

ABSENTEE SOLDIER VOTING

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein parts of a resolution I have introduced providing for the absentee soldiers voting, and also to include parts of a bill that has been introduced setting up a Federal election commission ostensibly for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to House Joint Resolution 190, which I have introduced, recommending to the various States that have not already done so that they make such provisions as are necessary for the men in our armed forces to vote by absentee ballots.

It also makes it mandatory on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department to do everything possible to expedite the distribution and return of these ballots.

It also provides free air-mail service for these absentee ballots and communications in connection therewith.

The resolution reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 190

Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting by members of the armed services of the United States in time of war

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general, primary, or special election held in his election district or precinct in time of war.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

This resolution should be passed instead of the dangerous, drastic, and unconstitutional measure now pending, which would set up a Federal election commission here in Washington, four members to be appointed by the President and one by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from among the Justices of that Court. That measure would violate the Constitution of the United States, override State laws, and subject every person who helped to hold an election in any precinct in any State of the Union to indictment and prosecution in Federal court for alleged violations of its provisions, and impose a penalty of $5,000 fine or 5 years in the penitentiary, or both, in each case.

My resolution would enable the men in our armed services to vote by absentee ballots, and speed the ballots to them and back by free air mail, without violating the Constitution, overriding State laws, or wrecking the election machinery of any State. It would save those sacred attributes of our American system for which our men in the armed forces are now fighting on every battle front in the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a speech by General Hines, Administrator of the Veterans' Bureau, and in the other to include a release in reference to the Naval Laboratory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DAVID PARKINSON

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honor and a privilege to inform the Members of the House that one Dr. David Parkinson, son of Mr. and Mrs. T. D. Parkinson, of Green Bay, Wis., is the inventive genius who developed a device known as an electrical brain, which can spot enemy planes and blow them from the skies by shifting the switches of its electrical intellect. The device was pronounced by Maj. Gen. L. H. Campbell, Jr., to be "one of the greatest advances ever made in the art of gunfire control." Campbell stated:

> Our men are knocking down an average of 1 plane to every 90 shots of 90 millimeter ammunition. In the last war we used to hit a plane on an average of every 17,000 shots, and then rarely knock them down.

In a demonstration last Wednesday, a simulated enemy plane flew into sight. A gun crew, equipped with four 90 millimeter antiaircraft guns, spotted them with electrically controlled range finders and trackers. The electrical computer instantly measured positions and the guns concentrated simultaneous fire on the target. The electrical pointer already has been used successfully by our troops on various battle fronts.

The inventor, upon his graduation from West High School in Green Bay, Wis., in 1928, was valedictorian of his class and was awarded a gold medal for scholarship. He took his first 2 years of college work at the university extension division in Milwaukee and received his bachelor's degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1933.

We, of the State of Wisconsin, proudly hail Dr. Parkinson for his contribution to the war effort.

Today I rejoice that it should fall to the lot of a son of the great State of Wisconsin to make this valuable contribution to the war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a farm report from Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received permission to extend my own remarks and to include therein an address by S. A. Harper, Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Public Printer advises me that this exceeds the customary allowance by one-third of a page, making an extra cost of $15. Notwithstanding this I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE BURDEN OF RATIONING

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend in my statement a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last evening's papers mentioned the fact that the O. P. A. is preparing 900,000,000 plastic ration tokens to be distributed among our citizens. I am wondering if they have considered the additional burden that will be placed upon the housewives and others who are making the family purchases. I have here a short statement written by Miss Marion Ellet, of Concordia, Kans., in her column entitled "Mugwump Musings." Miss Ellet is one of the well-known writers in the Middle West. In this article she discusses the irritation that besets our people by Federal bureaucratic control. She calls attention to the housewife who makes the purchases for a family of 12 and at the present time carries 53 ration books, 4 for each member of the family, plus a fuel-oil book, her kerosene book, a basic A book for gas, a supplemental mileage book, a nonhighway book, and a truck book, a total of 53.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask what situation this lady will find herself confronted with when she is given her share of the 900,000,000 ration tokens. Is it any wonder our people are driven to distraction?

MUGWUMP MUSINGS

(By Marion Ellet)

WHO GETS SLAPPED?

The other day at the grocery I was stewing and fuming and fumbling in my purse and cursing all ration books and all third and fourth spawn of ration books. My butcher smiled tolerantly and told me about a farm woman who is custodian of the ration books for a family of 12. She carries 53 ration books in her purse.

She has, of course, the 48 food ration books for a family of 12. In addition she has her fuel oil book, her kerosene book, a basic A book for gas, a supplemental mileage book, a nonhighway book, and a truck book.

Laugh if you want to. But if you are a Democratic politician laugh quickly while the laughing is good. Because you may not laugh again for a long time. All this voluminous confusion in rationing may be necessary and again it may not. At any rate it might have been handled more simply and efficiently. But, right or wrong, I doubt that any political organization can survive it for long.

Washington bureaucrats, most of them, should really be forgiven, for they know not what they do. They have families of one and two. They live in small apartments and swank apartment hotels. They take their living, all their living, in prepared pellets, as it were. They simply have no notion of the paralyzing tangle of red tape which they have wound around communities where food is hatched and grown and raised, where people still beget their kind in rather large numbers and where they still cook with their own hands and eat three meals a day.

I know of one Kansas farm woman who used part of her own sugar allotment to cook for harvest hands this summer. So, of course, she has recently been running short. And now comes time to fill silo. In the interest of adequate nourishment for the essential war workers who will soon feed at her table, she applies for a conservative 5 pounds of extra sugar. The authorities slap her wrist, figuratively speaking, and tell her she needs but 3 pounds.

My guess is that there will be more wrist slappings come next Presidential election. But it won't be the farm woman who will get slapped.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address on the future of the beet-sugar industry delivered at the National Reclamation Association meeting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

THE WAGNER-MURRAY BILL, S. 1161

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Red Oak Express.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, of all the un-American bureaucratic bills that have ever been cooked up by the socialistic new dealers in and out of Washington, S. 1161, known as the Wagner-Murray bill, takes the prize.

If this bill should become law, our returning veterans would certainly make good use of all the shooting experience they have had over there in order to cleanse the home front of the very thing which, supposedly, they were sent to foreign lands to stop before it reached our shores, namely, nazi-ism, fascism, or any form of communism or collectivism which would destroy our cherished Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, are we to inherit all the ills of our enemies here at home while our boys are fighting and dying to destroy them in the rest of the world? If so, all I can say is God save us from the wrath of our returning veterans.

Please listen to what Ralph Overholser, editor of the Red Oak Express, of Red Oak, Iowa, has to say about this rotten, un-American, revolutionary bill:

HOW WOULD YOU LIKE A RED-TAPE BUREAUCRAT AS YOUR FAMILY DOCTOR?

While you are going about your business keeping up the home front, the Washington Socialists are planning a new system for America. They are busybodies.

In the maze of stuff coming out of the Washington gristmill you no doubt overlooked the Wagner-Murray bill which was presented to the Senate last June.

Stripped of all its folderol it is a bold attempt to substitute State medicine for private medicine. Hospitals, nurses, dentists—all medical groups would become subservient to the New Deal merry-go-round.

The health of 130,000,000 Americans is involved. Their very lives would be in the hands of a bureaucrat in Washington. He would decide whether you were to receive care. He would decide whether you needed a doctor. He would decide whether you were entitled to an operation or hospital care or medical care.

Oh, sure, he would not forget to collect 6 percent of your wages every Saturday for this New Deal money-grabbing bonanza whether you had medical care or not.

And your employer would fork over another 6 percent; that would amount to 12 percent of every pay roll in the United States. Every self-employed individual (farmer, professional and small business individual) would be taxed 7 percent.

But Government employees would be taxed only 3.5 percent of their salaries. We want to know why?

How much? Ah, mister, just a mere $12,000,000,000 a year for another bureau to play with in Washington. The Surgeon General would have control of all this wealth and parcel it out as he saw fit. And under the proposed medical social security law "all authority and power is invested in the Surgeon General."

How do you like that bit of high financing?

Sure, you can select your doctor, but "only in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Surgeon General."

If your baby is sick tonight you know that your family doctor will come at your call.

Just imagine what will happen when the bureaucrats get to medicating your family. You will call the Government doctor, he will call a bureau in some far-away city, which bureau in turn will call Washington to see what can be done.

The Washington bureau will go into a huddle for a few weeks, finally send out blanks to be filled out sextuplate. By the time you have filled out these 28-inch blanks (small type, both sides) and returned them, your baby is either well or dead. The papers remain in the Government file for future reference. Six months later you will receive a letter from Washington wanting to know what disposition has been made of the case.

In the meantime the Government doctor whom you first called was not concerned at all; when you first called it was after working hours anyway; he had sat in his office twirling his thumbs for 6 hours, and his day was done; no night calls for him.

Absurd? Not at all. Anyone who has had anything to do with a Government bureau or agency knows full well that it takes days and weeks and months before the bureaucrat can be stirred. He takes his own sweet time in a go-to-hell attitude toward the public.

When it comes to illness, life and death, we don't want any Government doctor, bossed by a Washington superbureaucratic doctor, looking after the health of our family. Neither do you. Your loved one would die before the Government doctor got around and you'd be strangled to death in a maze of red tape before anything happened.

The Wagner-Murray bill is vicious in concept. It proposes to knock out all private, competitive, medical, and scientific research and to replace it with a gigantic monstrosity that would rob the people and let them die unattended.

And here is the joker: For every dollar paid to a Government physician for medical care (by the Government) another dollar would be spent for administrative cost, just another method of getting the people's money for more bureaus, more politicians, more inspectors, more snoopers to revel in the lap of luxury at the taxpayer's expense.

How would you like to have a collection of New Deal quacks using you as a guinea pig? Social medicine in England has proved that all too frequently the patient was exploited to prove some pet government theory. One individual is good for just one experiment. The undertaker knows that.

And of all the cockeyed experiments in the world, the New Deal has 'em. Boy, how they would like to operate on 22,000,000 Republicans. And of course if you did not belong to the right party or have your party dues paid up, your case, my friend, would be hopeless.

No. Give us practical medicine, the family physician, the doctor who knows his patient, who responds to call night or day to allay the fears of worried mothers and who bring solace, comfort, and restored health to the loved one on the pillow.

Medicine is a humane business. Government bureaucrat doctors would make it an abstract business. We want none of it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]?

The was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other special orders today I may be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

SATURDAY MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation for the meeting of the House on Saturday. I know we have not been accustomed to doing that for some little time, but I find I am up here on the Hill a good deal of the time, I think more than the average Member, and although I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee I also appreciate the opportunity of meeting on Saturday.

There are a good many bills pending before committees which probably cannot be touched upon unless we spend some extra time as we are doing in Saturday session. Many of these bills are of general nature, not financial, and cannot well be considered at the beginning of a session. I believe more of these bills ought to be considered this year and not be held over until the second session of this Congress when they would be caught in the haste of election year. I have in mind, for instance, H. R. 2533, a bill looking to the future. However, I have other bills not in any way connected with the war at present but needed after the war. I should like consideration of such bills. I hope we shall not only meet daily as a House but that the committees of the House shall function to the end of the session.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the November 10 issue of Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., entitled "Tragic Spectacle."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on Secretary Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, along with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and others who have expressed their appreciation for the House meeting on Saturday, I also want to express my appreciation for the activity that is now being shown in connection with the legislative program. I had hoped when the distinguished majority leader announced yesterday that we would have a session of the House today that there would be some legislative program for the day. There are, as the distinguished gentleman from Arizona said, many important bills in which the country is interested that are now lying in committees and elsewhere and which ought to have consideration before the end of this year. However, since there seems to be no legislative program, I want to discuss briefly one of the bills which I think should be taken up at the earliest possible moment and considered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I recall reading many years ago a story that Confucius, while passing along by the side of a mountain, came upon a woman who was weeping bitterly by a grave. He pressed forward and drove quickly to her side and proceeded to question her. "Your wailing," said he, "is that of one who has suffered sorrow on sorrow." She replied, "That is so. My husband's father was killed here by a tiger. My husband was also killed here by a tiger, and now my son has died in the same way." The master said to her, "Why do you not leave this place?" The answer was, "There is no oppressive government here." The master then said, "Remember, oppressive government is more terrible than tigers."

The question was once propounded to Jefferson, "What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has existed under the sun?" His reply was, "The generalizing and concentrating all power into one body, or to one group." Lincoln once remarked, "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Congress this summer, I made quite a thorough and complete tour of my congressional district. It was the first opportunity since my election in 1940 that I had had to visit and talk to any extent with the people who had elected me. It was the first opportunity that I had had to personally survey the actions and reactions, the attitude and feelings of my constituency with respect to this terrible war which has touched directly

practically every home in my section of the country, as it has throughout the United States. I learned first-hand that there was no disunity; that they were all of one accord insofar as the prosecution of this war is concerned, to a decisive and successful conclusion with as much speed as possible, with a hopeful prayer that a just and lasting peace might result therefrom.

My section of Oklahoma, perhaps more than any other in the State, was settled by people from almost every State in the Union. A large part of my district embraces what is known as the Cherokee Strip. A vast part of the population is made up of those early pioneers and their offspring who made the run in 1889, and who have converted the broad prairies into one of the richest agricultural communities in the Union of States. Much of the land is underlaid with, and is rich in, oil and gas. Vast herds of the very best Hereford cattle graze along the creeks and rivers and in the pastures of buffalograss and blue stem. Fine dairy herds and poultry farms are found throughout the district.

These people, whose forebears were the early pioneers of the great southwest, and who made this vast wilderness blossom as a rose, hold steadfast in their loyalty to the fundamental concepts upon which we have built the greatest and happiest civilization the world has ever known. And from visiting and talking with them this summer in their homes, their places of business, in their civic clubs and farm organizations, and in their churches, I am convinced that their greatest apprehension—which to some extent has reached almost a genuine fear—is that their elected representatives have failed to properly safeguard their fundamental rights in much of the legislation that has been passed during the past decade, and particularly in the past few months in the name of emergency or war emergencies.

They know their sons will whip the Germans and destroy the Japs. They are certain that their brave fighting boys will destroy every vestige of aggression and totalitarianism and brutality which the inhuman Japs and Hitler stooges have forced upon free peoples throughout the world. But when they come in daily contact with many of the methods that are being employed on the home front, and more particularly in the interpretation of and the administration by those whom the President has placed in charge of the various governmental agencies to administer the laws that have been passed by the Congress—which were definitely understood and intended by the Congress to be limited strictly to the emergency—and when they are confronted with hundreds of directives that have been issued without a semblance of congressional sanction and authority, and ofttimes contrary to the expressed intention of their Representatives whom they elected, they become frightened and disturbed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the question which was propounded to me more than any other—and I think I could safely say more than all others—during the congressional recess was this: "Will the Congress be able to recapture and take back after the war much of the power that it has delegated; and will the Congress, immediately and without waiting for the war to be over, protect and safeguard certain fundamental liberties, rights, and privileges which war or nothing else ever intended to suspend in a free government, and do it now, before our farms, our businesses, and our free institutions are completely destroyed or beyond repair?"

This question was not confined to my home State alone. As a member of the Cooley committee I traveled extensively in connection with the investigation that we are making of the Farm Security Administration in Texas, Arizona, California, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, and a number of other States. This question was propounded by people in every walk of life—businessmen, laboring men, farmers, professional men, and women.

I have heard some gentlemen who profess at least to believe that the people are not alarmed about the trend toward national socialism in this country, say that these folk who are asking such questions "just cannot take it," that they are not willing to sacrifice, that they are not willing to undergo inconveniences even though we are at war. Such statements are, in my humble opinion, ridiculous. The American people can take it, and there must be something, or a combination of circumstances, that has caused this fear and apprehension.

I have decided that the war and these necessary restrictions because of the war, have played only a minor part in bringing about this apprehension. Many things have contributed to it, and, Mr. Speaker, here are a few which even prior to the war, have had much to do in bringing about this fear and apprehension on the part of our people, which I am talking about. I can only mention, I will not have time to discuss them this afternoon, but I expect to discuss many of them singularly and collectively at a later date. They are as follows:

First. Attitude toward sit-down strikes.

Second. The Supreme Court packing bill.

Third. The reorganization bill of 1938.

Fourth. The attempted purge.

Fifth. The fanning of class hatred.

Sixth. The fascistic administration of the S. E. C.

Seventh. N. L. R. B. favoritism.

Eighth. The use of relief funds, public work, and subsidy payments to corrupt the ballot and control elections.

Ninth. Bureaucratic growth.

Tenth. Gross waste.

Eleventh. Continued invasion of States' rights.

Twelfth. The Tugwell and Hopkins philosophy of doing away with the fee ownership title in real property.

Thirteenth. The belittlement of the press.

Fourteenth. The invisible government of radio.

Fifteenth. The protection and retention of those in high Government places who are opposed to the capitalistic system with evident hostility toward free enterprise, and a constant—though camouflaged—march toward national socialism.

Sixteenth. Building new instruments of public power which in other hands would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

Mr. Speaker, further indicative of what I am trying to say to you and to my colleagues this afternoon, and to bring to your attention some of the things that are causing this fear and apprehension among the people in my section of Oklahoma, is a letter that I received from a doctor who resides in one of the towns in my district and whose reputation is beyond reproach and whose word no one questions. Here is what he says:

I received by special delivery, registered mail No. 215494, a notice of hearing, docket No. 439, charging me with a violation of ration order No. 5-C, and which reads in part as follows:

"You are charged with having used preferred mileage ration to make a fishing trip to Colorado, which constitutes an abuse of tires under the regulation."

A special hearing of the charge was set for hearing in the offices of the O. P. A. At the hearing I took my attorney, and I demanded and asked who made the charge and upon what it was founded. The O. P. A. official presiding refused my request, said the information was confidential. I replied, "Since when in this country of the United States of America is evidence being used against a citizen so confidential that he can be deprived of knowing the basis for the charges against him?"

His reply was, "Because we have made it that way."

I told him I was prepared to prove that I had not been to Colorado since I was a small child, and he dismissed the charges but refused to tell me who the informer was, or upon what they based the charges.

Four other citizens of our town also had charges preferred against them, all of which were dismissed, but in every instance they refused to give the names of the informers or any basis for the charges.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. What would have happened had not the charges been dismissed, and that gentleman had been found guilty of those charges? Would he have had any right of appeal to the local courts?

Mr. RIZLEY. None whatever. That is the point I am coming to. I am going touch on that in just a few minutes.

The only newspaper in that thriving town of about 3,500 people is run by a fearless editor who is well known throughout the State of Oklahoma. A year or two ago he was president of the State press association. If you want to find out what is going on in an average community, read the local newspaper. Its editor pretty clearly reflects what the people are thinking about. This is what this editor had to say:

Five respected citizens of the community were called in to answer veiled charges of using gasoline coupons for questionable purposes. Every single one of the charges were without basis of fact. The O. P. A. attorney (one of the 10,000) who held the court was,

behind his proper up-front, extremely embarrassed with his position. He merely acted like a man who was trying to earn a good salary by carrying out orders from above.

It wasn't so much the men and the rules they were trying to enforce as it was the methods used. Secret accusations. Gestapo methods. Unfounded hearsay. Grade-school students would be able to do a better job.

When one of the accused men asked the elegant O. P. A. attorney as to what the charges were and who made them, the elegant one said, "That's a military secret." Military men must have been blowing their noses about that time. Any court of justice this country has ever known has always demanded charges be made in the open, not in Germanesque secrecy.

A local O. P. A. worker is authority for the statement that probably the charges were grudge reports. That is, someone who has a grudge against you may write O. P. A. office at Oklahoma City making any sort of charge and you must then appear in the so-called court to answer said charges. This may or may not be the truth of the matter. The mere truth is those charged are secretly charged.

By far the worst thing about the O. P. A. kangaroo court has been and will be the public reaction toward the county rationing boards. Rationing is not popular with the American people. Whenever rationing becomes popular then America will cease to be America.

Rationing, they tell us, is a war necessity. With that thought in mind the people are putting up with it. The local people who have been selected and who are sacrificing their time and ability in an attempt to carry on a mean job as graciously as possible, are bound to have their troubles increased because of the "snoop court." Let's be careful not to blame these fine local men for something that is beyond their control and which this column assures everyone, is as distasteful to them as it is to every true American.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. What is the composition of this kangaroo court? What constitutes it?

Mr. RIZLEY. It is a court that was set up by the O. P. A. presumably under the terms of the act in respect to establishing their own courts to administer the act and punish violations. Their edicts are apparently supreme and from which there can be no appeal.

Mr. CASE. Does the O. P. A. organization select the personnel?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am not informed as to who selects the personnel. I am sure, however, the selections are made by the Administrator of the O. P. A.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. When the act was set up bringing into being the O. P. A., was it the intent of Congress that penalties could be provided and that people could be denied their rights in court, and that they could be yanked into these kangaroo courts, or is the O. P. A. exceeding the authority under the basic regulation that set it up?

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the O. P. A. is exceeding its authority under the basic act setting it up particularly in the administration of the act, but we did not properly safeguard the rights of the people when we passed that law.

Mr. VURSELL. Is there not a petition on file known as the Dirksen petition to bring back to the people their opportunity to go into a court of appeal in order to get their matters adjudicated after they have gone to the O. P. A. kangaroo court?

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is correct. I am about to touch on that very thing right now.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Is it not true that you are presumed to be guilty and have to prove yourself innocent?

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly; but even so, the thing that disturbs the folks more than that is the fact that when they go there to answer charges, they cannot find out who made the charges. As was suggested here by the newspaper to which I referred, if a man has a grudge against you, he can write a letter to the headquarters of the O. P. A., which happens to be in Oklahoma City, in my State, charging you with an offense, and apparently without investigating the truth or falsity of the charge. Decent, respectable citizens who have built the community, and who are buying the bonds and doing everything to carry on the war, and whose boys are over there fighting and dying, have to bear the onus of such a charge and be humiliated by these gestapo methods. That is the thing I am talking about and trying to get over to you this afternoon.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. What has happened to the first sentence of section 1 of article III of the Constitution, which reads:

> The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

Mr. RIZLEY. I may say to my friend from South Dakota that the same thing has happened to this provision of our Constitution that has happened to many other of its provisions during the past 10 years and I shall have more to say about that a little later on in the discussion.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman does not think that in the price-control law the Congress set up any inferior courts?

Mr. RIZLEY. These are not the only cases of this character, and the approach and methods that were used. If it were, we might forget it; but several hundred people in my State have received similar treatment, and similar conditions exist throughout the United States. We cannot fool the people in this country and keep them in the dark as to what is going on. They know that, contrary to the expressed will of the Congress, the O. P. A. has endeavored, and has been successful in many instances, of changing well-established trade practices in order to promote some pet scheme of some theorists who have been trying to put their schemes into effect for years, and were unable to do so, and are now taking advantage of the war emergency to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Right at that point, I noticed from the newspapers this morning that one of the great Senators from the South made a speech in the other body yesterday on that very thing, that the O. P. A. was attempting, notwithstanding not only the intent but the express act of this Congress, to put grade labeling into effect now, because they have a crowd down there who are in favor of taking advantage of the war emergency to put into effect grade labeling and many other controversial trade practices notwithstanding the price-control bill as enacted by Congress expressly forbids them from changing well-established trade customs and practices.

They know that repeatedly and from day to day as directives and orders are made affecting their businesses, that those who are making the orders and writing the directives do so without consulting the industry or business to be affected. They read the newspapers and ascertain that the judges of the regular constituted courts, after listening patiently and attentively to the petitions of an aggrieved public, inform the petitioners that the courts have been divested of their power and authority to exercise jurisdiction of the matters complained of in the petitions, and that their rights and liberties have been vested in special courts set up by the same agency who promulgated the rules, regulations, and directives which affect their rights.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that in the set-up of these so-called administrative tribunals established by O. P. A. to enforce its regulations there is no appeal to the courts.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. KEEFE. Thus is it not clear that there is a very grave differentiation between the administrative action of an organization such as the O. P. A. and the administrative action of the workmen's compensation board, for instance, that makes findings from which there is a direct appeal to the courts? Would the gentleman feel that this procedure that has been established would stand better in the public eye if there were provision for a direct appeal from the judgments or adjudications of these kangaroo courts to the regularly established judicial system of this country?

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, and I thank my friend for his valuable contribution.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. But there is a court, and there are Federal judges on that court, composed of three judges—a circuit court judge and two United States district judges, and they try these cases immediately, and they try them in the locality. They have heretofore, and they expect to in the future. They have a hearing before regularly appointed judges.

Mr. RIZLEY. May I say to my very able friend from Texas—a distinguished member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which committee has charge of legislation affecting O. P. A.—that the judges to which he refers have repeatedly dismissed petitions of aggrieved citizens saying that this emergency court, this O. P. A. court which the gentleman helped create, has divested the regular Federal courts of jurisdiction.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the emergency court to which the gentleman from Texas refers, but it is virtually impossible for the average man in business to get into the emergency court, due to the delay on the part of the O. P. A. in being slow, and trying to prevent him from getting into court.

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, and the gentleman from Texas knows that.

Mr. KEEFE. And this so-called emergency court is not the tribunal at all that the gentleman from Oklahoma is complaining about and that I complain about. It is these little panels that are set up by the O. P. A. in all the communities of the country, established and staffed by their own personnel and investigators, that have the power of life and death over business by curtailment of ration points and the curtailment of ability to stay in business. That is what we are complaining about, and the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has no application whatever to the complaint being raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is correct, and now if I may proceed——

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. JARMAN (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of order and make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 25, noes 41.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 159]

Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	Morrison, La.
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Morrison, N. C.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gavegan	Mott
Andrews	Gerlach	Mruk
Arends	Gifford	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gillie	Myers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Goodwin	Norton
Barden	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Barry, N. Y.	Gossett	O'Connor
Bates, Mass.	Granger	O'Hara
Beall	Grant, Ind.	O'Leary
Beckworth	Green	O'Neal
Bender	Gross	O'Toole
Blackney	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Outland
Bland	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Bolton	Hare	Pfeifer
Bonner	Harness, Ind.	Philbin
Boren	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Boykin	Harris, Va.	Ploeser
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Plumley
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Poulson
Brooks	Hébert	Powers
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Pracht
Buckley	Hendricks	Rabaut
Burchill, N. Y.	Hoch	Randolph
Busbey	Hoffman	Robertson
Butler	Holifield	Robinson, Utah
Byrne	Holmes, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.
Canfield	Hope	Rogers, Calif.
Cannon, Fla.	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Capozzoli	Izac	Rowe
Carter	Jackson	Sabath
Celler	Jeffrey	Sasscer
Chapman	Jennings	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Johnson, J. Leroy	Scanlon
Clason	Jones	Schiffler
Coffee	Kearney	Schuetz
Compton	Kee	Shafer
Cooley	Kelley	Sheridan
Costello	Kennedy	Short
Courtney	Keogh	Sikes
Cox	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cravens	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Crawford	Kilday	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Kinzer	Sparkman
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Spence
Dawson	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Delaney	Klein	Steagall
Dewey	Knutson	Taylor
Dickstein	Kunkel	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	LaFollette	Thomas, Tex.
Dingell	Lane	Tibbott
Dirksen	Lanham	Towe
Ditter	Lewis, Colo.	Treadway
Domengeaux	Luce	Troutman
Douglas	Lynch	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	McGehee	Wadsworth
Durham	McGranery	Ward
Eaton	McLean	Wasielewski
Ellison, Md.	McMurray	Weaver
Engle, Calif.	McWilliams	Welchel, Ohio
Fay	Maas	Weiss
Feighan	Madden	Wene
Fellows	Marcantonio	West
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Whelchel, Ga.
Fish	Martin, Mass.	White
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Willey
Fogarty	May	Winstead
Forand	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ford	Miller, Pa.	Woodrum, Va.
Fulmer	Mills	Worley
Furlong	Morrison, La.	Wright

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. RAYBURN and he answered "present."

The SPEAKER. On this call 217 members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] suggested the absence of a quorum I was discussing the O. P. A. emergency court, and particularly some legislation that I am anxious to see enacted to relieve our people of some of the things that that court is doing.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I simply rise to compliment the gentleman on his statesmanlike address.

Mr. RIZLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must accept its share of the blame and responsibility for these conditions which have made our people fearful and apprehensive. When the O. P. A. Act was being considered, the Congress set up a special emergency court and divested the regular constituted courts of jurisdiction. Many of us remember how deeply solicitous Mr. Ginsberg and others in the O. P. A. apparently were at the time, of the rights and liberties of the people. Mr. Ginsberg's memorandum to the Banking and Currency Committee considering the legislation, said:

> We are going to make it possible for this court to operate in divisions to make justice accessible to all citizens of the country, to every litigant, rich and poor alike.

He said:

> We want to relieve the Federal courts of congestion.

And so the Congress, deeply moved by Ginsberg's persuasive language, provided in the O. P. A. Act:

> No Federal, circuit, or Territorial court shall have jurisdiction over any controversy involving a price regulation or a price schedule.

An attempt was made by some of us, Mr. Speaker, to retain the power of review in the Federal courts. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered an amendment to that effect, but the amendment was not permitted to remain in the bill.

Further attempting to safeguard the citizens of this country, and especially after observing the workings of this special O. P. A. court, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] on May 13 this year, introduced H. R. 2705, which contains the provision, among others:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination, the right of any person to a judicial review of grievances resulting from the promulgation of any order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination under this act, shall not be denied.

The Congress has had since May 13, this year, to do something about this bill. We have been back since the 14th of September. Day after day we have

recessed under the flimsy excuse and pretext that there was no "business for consideration."

H. R. 2705 is peacefully sleeping in the committee to which it was assigned for consideration. Apparently the only way it can reach the floor for consideration is through the petition route. There is a petition on the Speaker's desk to bring it to the floor of the House for consideration. The people of this country are entitled to the protection which this bill would afford. I plead with my colleagues to sign the discharge petition so that we may have action now on this important measure.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], who has just spoken, has referred to the fascism of the S. E. C., the Securities and Exchange Commission. Of course, that is the argument of the reactionary element of the country. We know that under the guise of war, the Republican machine throughout the country is undertaking to whip into operation the power of money and big business, and get back to the reactionary control of our country. Is it fascism to protect the investor? Is it fascistic to regulate the stock exchange so that men in power cannot do as they have in the past, make contributions to a depression, as they did in the past, especially the depressions in 1920 and 1921, of 1930, 1931, and 1932? Is it fascistic to prevent people from being robbed of from seven hundred million to one billion dollars a year? If that is fascistic, well and good, but I call it the purest type of democracy that I know of.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from yesterday's edition of the New York Times, November 12, 1943, entitled "Lend-Lease Into Mutual Aid."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. After listening to some of the things the majority leader has just told us, I feel that I should bring my testimony as to some experiences that I have had with the Securities and Exchange Commission in trying to force it to do what the law requires it to do with reference to fraudulent sales. Some oil swindlers came up into my territory and they swindled hundreds of people. It took me weeks and months to get the Securities and Exchange Commission to do anything. After they had completed their inquiry it took me 3 months and a threat on my part to come before the House with the thing before I could persuade the Chairman of the Commission to turn the material over to the Attorney General who immediately proceeded with an indictment. That is the kind of a job the Securities and Exchange Commission has been doing; and it is reactionary to try to correct and speed up that activity so they will do a decent job!

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, the 22d of November, immediately after the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I be allowed to address the House for 50 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DROUGHT FEED AND SEED LOANS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, back in 1934, nearly 10 years ago, a great calamity, that of drought, spread over the Middle West. In my recollection, this was the one year since 1901 that western Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and that segment of our Nation was completely wiped out so far as any crop was concerned. Dust storms filled the roadside ditches with fine silt and it looked as though a new Sahara was in the making.

Coming upon the heels of the ruinously low prices received for the 1932 and 1933 crops, the hundreds of thousands of farmers in that region were next door to bankruptcy. Taxes and ordinary expenses had to be met, and there was no income to meet these with.

If any of you had witnessed late in the fall of 1934 and the following winter the shipment out of that area of the starving livestock, it would have made a lasting impression upon your memory. Unable to feed their herds, a good portion of these were sacrificed of necessity.

Naturally, what cattle, horses, hogs, and poultry remained had to be fed, and there again was the farmer of that region penalized. No ceilings were placed on the corn and hay that was shipped in from more favored territories. Ordinary straw was brought in by the Government and sold to the drought sufferers at high prices per ton, as was old, moldy slough-bottom hay, brought down from the near Canadian border. This makeshift roughage at any price up to $20 a ton or more was paid for by giving the Government notes under the feed-and-seed-loan system.

The spring of 1935 saw the farmers paying $1 a bushel for seed oats and $1.35 a bushel for barley and like prices for other seeds, where just 2 years before they had to sell oats and barley at 10 and 17 cents a bushel. Up and up went the total amount of drought-relief loans until nearly one hundred millions were in force.

Coming back slowly, in spite of a near repetition of the drought situation in 1936, that great country, the heart of our agricultural America, has endeavored to pay back these obligations to the United States. Thousands of farmers have paid up in full, but many more thousands have been unable to do so, and for years judgments against their property for these disaster loans have piled up. In hundreds of instances the badgering that these farmers have received by collectors for our Government has been the straw that broke the camel's back and otherwise good men have gone from the farm to join the migration to industrial areas rather than to produce food, as was their chosen vocation.

Let me call your attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REID MURRAY], on November 10, page 9399 of the RECORD. Here is direct evidence that while our good old United States of America has collectors out in my territory and in many Congressmen's districts, hounding farmers for interest and principal of their 1935 loans, this same good old country of ours is lavishly subsidizing certain Eastern States to the extent of $14 a ton for hay, and there is no comparison in the conditions as existed in 1934.

If our Government can give dairymen in Maryland and Virginia a gift of $210 a carload of hay and a generous allowance on the cost of the corn and grain shipped in, certainly this same Government can show a little humaneness in the collection of the old drought loans back in our area. In the first instance, the bulk of the 1935 loans should have been considered direct relief, considering the calamity of that era.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am mighty glad the gentleman is discussing these feed and seed loans which were made available by the Government as aids to farmers in the black period of the drought. One of the serious injustices that has taken place in the last 10 years is the fact that these men who, in good faith, borrowed from the Government to try to rehabilitate themselves found when the loan did not bring results the Government walked away and left them and became an Uncle Shylock and tried to collect it back.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is absolutely correct. The high prices our farmers had to pay at that time for normally unusable roughage was a disgrace, but it was that or let their livestock starve.

Mr. MUNDT. I join with the gentleman in his effort to have these amortized and scaled down or adjusted in some way.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I just want to say that as a Member of Congress I am always anxious to hear the gentleman talk on farm problems. He is a dirt farmer himself, and it seems he has the faculty

of clearing the air and showing us what the farmer's problems really are and really what the farmer wants.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Twice in the past few years I have introduced legislation which would take off the necks of those farmers unable, because of years of farming without a profit, to pay the old 1935 drought-relief seed and feed loans. Once the measure passed the House, only to be refused right-of-way by the administration in the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to say to my colleague from Minnesota it has always been a regret to me that the one outstanding practical farmer in Congress has not had the opportunity to be on the Committee on Agriculture, and I think that there has not been a man in Congress in the 5 years that I have been here that has shown greater understanding or given a better picture of what the needs of the rural people of this country are than the gentleman now addressing the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who is now speaking, is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I do not know what we would do on that committee if we did not have a man on it that knows a lot, and almost more than any other Member of Congress does, about agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's speech, but I only want to add my word of commendation on the splendid work that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has done over the period of years since he had been a Member of this House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House further for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders that have been entered.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will ask that permission, as is customary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not customary for a Member to double his time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am waiting for an objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to proceed for 10 additional minutes? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The gentleman is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the very able majority leader of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I was going to say to the gentleman is this: I do not know much from a practical angle about the problems of farmers because there are no farmers in my district. However, I want the gentleman to know that without regard to which side of the aisle a Member may sit, if he has any proposition or any thought or any idea which he thinks will help the Congress and the people of America to solve the trying problems of the day in relation to the farmers or any other group of our people, I would be very glad to have him call it to my attention. I will look into it and if I agree with him I will do the very best I can to have the matter given attention. If I have no knowledge because of my lack of experience, for example, along the lines of agriculture, and I am unable to form an opinion, I will be only too glad to transmit to the proper agency or the proper official the views of any Member of this body which they think will be helpful in the solution of any one of our problems, and that particularly applies to the problems of agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement, then I will yield, although I particularly wish to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota. Shall we continue to harass the farmers of the Dakotas, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas for years to come to squeeze out the sixty-odd millions and accumulated interest on the disaster loans of 9 years ago? Note Mr. MURRAY'S remarks and see where one large dairy has given to it over $4,000 in subsidy. I wonder if that man was in as dire need for the help as were the men who today have these loans yet to pay.

Or shall we aid them, as the Maryland and Virginia farmers are being aided, in an effort to continue the production of food. Let us apply a little good judgment to these loans, made to preserve the food basket of America, and cancel or perhaps moderate the bulk of them today. Or shall we still permit these court judgments to weigh down those who have grown old in the poorest paid profession in America, that of farming. All we need to decide is what kind of judgment we care to exercise.

Can we not be as generous to these people—our own people—as we are through lend-lease to all the Allies? If we collect with as much tenacity the lend-lease billions of dollars of obligations as we do from farmers of the Midwest the millenium will have come.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. May I suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota, in regard to my bill to outlaw these debts after 6 years, the same as they are generally outlawed in every State, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has reported that bill of mine up to the Department and the Department objects to it, as it always does when any farmer asks for anything. This Congress remitted the so-called franchise tax for the Federal Reserve Bank System long years ago. We remitted dividends in excess of 6 percent to the railroads, but we insist on taking the funeral expenses away from these farmers because they tried to feed the Nation years ago during the drought. It is about time that this House woke up and did justice to those who fed the Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from my own State who has worked for years for the good of agriculture and is a recognized authority on the subject.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has made a fine speech. Before the gentleman spoke, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] made reference to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Not being a market operator, I do not know what they do, but I try to watch what happens, and I find that the Securities and Exchange Commission was created to protect the investors of the country, but I also observe that in the past week the securities market has dropped $2,000,000,000 in value. I would like to have the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] find out from the Securities and Exchange Commission who is selling the market short in order to cause this big slump in security values. I would also like to have the gentleman find out why the Office of War Information and other agencies have issued news that the war is soon to be over, causing this slump, and why the Securities and Exchange Commission does not do something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, my time is running short. We have heard about the markets being sold short. I want to finish by thanking my friends here for their very kind reception of this plea from the farmers of the Midwest for whom I have tried to state the case in this particular instance.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to reply because I do not want to have the gentleman's speech on agriculture confused by a colloquy between my friend and myself on the question of the S. E. C. at this time. On some other occasion, if my friend will ask his question where it will not confuse the strictly agricultural speech of my friend from Minnesota, I will undertake to answer the question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to my friend from Massachusetts that when the securities market goes down it also depresses agriculture, so there is a direct relationship between the two.

Mr. McCORMACK. The ingenuity of the gentleman is always outstandingly pleasant and remarkable.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the majority leader that what is disturbing and irritating the people who live out in the Midwest in connection with this situation is the fact that we have a most efficient staff in the collecting business. They collected around $5,000,000, and are going to collect about $5,000,000 next year. All at once, without anyone knowing how it was done, we find a new drought-relief agency as one of the many children of the Commodity Credit Corporation that has sprung into existence with blank checks. These things make it just a little difficult to understand the situation. I feel that the gentleman from Minnesota is perfectly within his rights in asking that you try to iron this thing out to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and thank all of you for your close attention to my remarks today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PROBLEMS DEMANDING IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, since the congressional recess we have been in session 9 weeks. Very little, if anything, has been done to solve the vital problems of our Nation. There is much to do. It is our job to bring up for legislative action pending bills destined to improve conditions on the home front and advance the war effort. America is holding the Democratic leadership responsible for the stalling and confusion.

Some of the problems needing immediate attention are:

First. Increase food production and stop the wasting and hoarding of food. The appointment of a single food administrator to bring order out of chaos and give America production of the farms, rather than buck-passing on the banks of the Potomac.

Second. Increase the production of crude oil so that existing gasoline and fuel-oil shortages may be relieved.

Third. The passage of legislation to provide American citizens an appeal through regularly established judicial channels from any bureaucratic directive or regulation.

Fourth. The immediate passage of legislation giving all of our persons in the armed services a right to vote.

Fifth. The double checking and careful investigation of all appropriation measures.

Sixth. The adoption of a better system of protection for our disabled and old folks.

Seventh. The roll-back of Federal bureaus to give relief to the American taxpayers.

This is not a complete analysis of legislative jobs which are begging for action.

When I left my district, after the congressional recess, my people expected to see some action in the Halls of Congress. Many Members waited patiently for this vital legislation. However, the Democratic majority which controls the Congress and every committee in it has failed for 9 solid weeks to permit the floor consideration of legislation to correct or alleviate the foregoing problems. Therefore, a group of us got together and decided to form a drive-for-action committee in order to fulfill our pledge to our people back home.

Mr. Speaker, over a year ago I warned the Nation of a food shortage. I have talked to farmers, canners, food processors, and distributors about our food problem. Right now many cities are short of canned foods, many more are short of butter, some are voluntarily rationing fluid milk, and a number of our citizens are doing without foods that they should have. Why? The principal factors which are causing the food shortage are not only frosts, floods, and droughts but also low price ceilings, the New Deal philosophy of scarcity, dumping and wasting of food, scarcity of farm labor and machinery, too much regulation and red tape from Washington, subsidies instead of fair prices, and the administration's lack of confidence in the patriotism of food producers, processors, and distributors.

The American Dairy Association told us that there would be a milk shortage unless corrective measures were taken immediately. The Livestock and Meat Council warned us of a beef shortage unless quick remedial steps were taken. Many farm auctions are being held daily in the Midwest. Crops have rotted in the fields and warehouses. The canners have lost part of the 1943 pack because of labor shortage, red tape, and bungling by the O. P. A.

The American farmer did a splendid job of production in 1942. He has tried to do a better job in 1943, notwithstanding the New Deal restrictions placed upon him. Processors and distributors have done their best within the limitations set up by the bureaucrats.

Our food problem is of vital importance to every American citizen. Food production and distribution must be divorced from New Deal politics and placed in the control of a single Food Administrator, as proposed by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

We must stop the wasting and hoarding of food. The same inexperienced new dealers who wasted money and manpower on boondoggling projects are wasting food produced by patriotic farmers. It was this serious waste that prompted me to introduce a resolution in Congress to investigate the wasting of food. My resolution is in the hands of the House Rules Committee. I would like to see some action on it now.

The new dealers tried to whitewash the potato dumping at Vincennes, Ind., by giving out a release that there was only 1½ carloads of potatoes lost, but the War Food Administration finally reported to me that there were 22 carloads lost at Vincennes. According to the testimony of the Food Administrator, before the Banking and Currency Committee, Federal officials purchased 9,000 carloads of potatoes and lost 475 carloads.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is making a very fine statement on this matter. I listened to the gentleman some weeks ago on the radio discussing practically this same question that he is discussing now. He made some very serious charges at that time as to the O. P. A. and other administration agencies. Has anyone in any of these agencies ever denied any of the allegations that the gentleman charged over the radio?

Mr. LANDIS. None of them have been denied up to date.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. It is possible, of course, that these bureaucrats may not have heard the radio address of the gentleman. I heard it and admired it very much; but is it not a fact that the gentleman's radio speech was also published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. We know, therefore, it was given very careful reading downtown.

Mr. LANDIS. But this is just one drop in the bucket to the amount of potatoes that were lost last week in Maine, Idaho, and Oregon. Over 11,000,000 bushels of potatoes were lost due to frosts, snow, and rains. I understand the Idaho growers suffered a setback when the War Labor Board refused to grant drivers a pay increase, which delayed the harvest. The shortage of manpower in harvesting also entered the picture. However, this may not be all of the potato losses unless something is done about the potatoes already in storage. Many potatoes are stored in barns and sheds and we may lose some of them due to the cold weather.

Due to the Government policy of hoarding of food we have lost millions of cases of condensed milk, many carloads of dried milk, many carloads of dried beans, and many thousand bags of rolled oats. Millions of cases of canned goods are being held for months by the Government and then turned back to the civilian population.

I understand the Government has an extensive plan to purchase and resell the new crop production of most major foods. If they handle the rest of the food as they have handled the potatoes and milk I am afraid very little food will ever reach the American table.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Has the gentleman concluded his reference to potatoes? Is the gentleman through discussing the potato situation?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I wonder if the gentleman heard of this incident; I

had it on very authentic authority a short time ago that they got something like a thousand carloads of potatoes in the South, somewhere down in the Carolinas, which were about to spoil and took them up to the northern section of the United States to be transformed into starch. The starch factory that made this starch I think used to sell the starch at 5 cents a pack. I understand from the authentic authority I mentioned before that this particular starch cost the Government 33 cents a pack. I understand further that a short time after they brought those thousand carloads from the South up to the North to make them into starch, that they sent a large number of carloads of potatoes, I do not know how many, from Maine and New Jersey down into Mississippi and had them made into starch.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman know whether or not the officials who were responsible for all this bungling have been discharged as a result of their failure and bungling?

Mr. LANDIS. I do not believe they have discharged any of them. They may have discharged a few but there may have been some transfers because of the bungling. We have been talking about it for months. I warned of a food shortage over a year and a half ago and have been warning ever since in this House. It seems like they do not care whether they do anything about it or not. These potatoes were bought with the taxpayers' money. These bureaucrats did not have to use their own money. When they handle the public money it does not seem to them like handling their own money. Handling the taxpayers' money does not seem to make much difference to them.

Mr. BUFFETT. The tragic failure of the administration has not resulted in any corrective measures whatsoever so far as they personally are concerned.

Mr. LANDIS. That is the reason I introduced my resolution. It is now before the House Rules Committee, and I am trying to get some action on it, trying to investigate the proposition.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. These bureaus and agencies about which we are talking that waste so much food and that ships back and forth such large quantities of things needlessly and at such great loss to the taxpayers, were those agencies the agents of the Congress or of the Executive?

Mr. LANDIS. Of the executive departments.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Congress appoint them or have anything to do with their hiring?

Mr. LANDIS. It has nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. CURTIS. There is considerable confusion throughout the country. The people see these things happen. There are so many alphabetical agencies that they do not know what is wasting potatoes today and who is going to waste them tomorrow, and there should be brought home to the taxpayers of the country the delegation of power to these agencies. I did not vote for that delegation of power, and I do not think the gentleman did either. That delegation of power places the responsibility on the executive branch of the Government. They are agents of the Executive or President.

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that, and there are 3,000,000 on the pay roll down in the executive departments. They could have saved part of the potato waste in Maine and Idaho if even a small percentage of unnecessary Executive employees had been there to dig those potatoes.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I think we might make a constructive statement that the Rules Committee now has the Fulmer bill in its files that would correct this situation by giving us a food director or a food manager who would do away with all this duplication of agencies. That has been in the Rules Committee ever since last summer.

Mr. LANDIS. And we would like to have action on that bill. We have also a bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], a Republican, and also one introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], a Democrat, on the same proposition.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman know which one of these executive agencies it is that is always giving food away by the carload lot to the various penal institutions and the like at a time when the housewives of the country cannot buy any food?

Mr. LANDIS. They have that pretty well confused. We have the War Food Administration, then we have a distributing administration, then we have of course, the Department of Agriculture. We have about nine agencies and there is nobody in control. We may say that there is a Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, but sometimes the O. P. A. tells Mr. Jones what to do and bypasses him on different things, so we really do not have a Food Administrator with authority.

Mr. CURTIS. It so happens that certain penitentiaries in the country have received as much as a carload of carrots all tied up in bunches and all iced, that have been shipped to the convicts, although none had been ordered, so it did not cost anybody anything. That happened also in connection with institutions where the inmates of the institutions raised all the vegetables they could use and they took that much away from the market. That amount of food was not available either for the civilian population or the military.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I know the new dealers will tell you that a few million dollars' worth of potatoes, a few million cases of condensed milk, a few million dollars' worth of other fruits and vegetables, and a few million dozen eggs do not amount to much. But the American people who are paying the 20-percent withholding tax will have to pay the bill. The New Deal even wants to increase the withholding tax to 30 percent.

The cost of maintaining 3,000,000 Federal employees is too great a burden to ask the American taxpayer to carry. In my opinion, there are too many glamour boys on the Federal pay roll. The taxpayers cannot afford any more glamour at these prices. We are all learning that when the bureaucrats spend, we pay.

At this point I would like to quote from an article appearing in the Weekly Digest, Food Distribution, October 30:

OUTLOOK FOR CANNED GOODS

Packers, brokers, wholesalers, and retailers are concerned principally about what is likely to happen to canned foods during probable adjustments in next 12-months' trade supplies, civilian demands, and changes in prices.

Present shortage for canned foods for trade selling is primarily due to very large buying for Army and Navy, coupled with the fact that the Food Distribution Administration holds about 2,000,000 cases of canned fruits and about 10,000,000 cases of canned vegetables, principally from the 1942 pack.

The outlook for trade supplies of canned foods during months ahead depends principally on starting to release any excessive Government holdings in an orderly way, and downward adjustments of Government takings from 1944 packs.

Several million cases of canned foods under option to Army are to be released shortly. That process should be speeded and early cuts made in demands from 1944 packs starting with what seems excessive Government reservations of grapefruit juice.

Outlook for healthy markets is important because of need for protecting canners who must plan investing a very large amount of money in a hazardous venture. Most canners are so discouraged by ineffective managing from Washington during the last 12 months that it will not be easy to get them to plan really large production in 1944.

Obvious solution for this situation of real importance to our national interest is reducing Government hoarding of canned foods as rapidly as practical and Government plans for 1944 packs so sound and fair that canners will proceed with confidence that their markets will not be temporarily depressed by trade fears while Government is making startling reductions in its reservations from 1944 packs.

From the October 23 issue:

Our people are willing to make extreme sacrifices to win the war, protect our allies, and win the peace, but they are up in arms against sacrifices forced by absurdly bad managing of the Federal Government.

I also wish to quote from the Washington food report by the American Institute of Food Distribution, November 6:

CANNERS NOT EAGER TO TAKE BACK JUICE

F. S. C. C. is offering for sale 2,700,000 cases of 1942–43 pack grapefruit juice. Canners are complaining about taking this merchandise back right now for several reasons. New pack is starting, and it is difficult, or impossible, to sell old pack to the trade except at a discount. The old pack was grade A, but now couldn't pass for much better than C. Government has offered the juice on an "as is" basis, but not allowing for any

increase in the canners' ceiling or the probability that quality has deteriorated. Canners must also relabel and repack, but cannot include this cost in the form of an increased ceiling. This canned grapefruit juice should have been released 60 or 90 days ago, when there was a demand from distributors, but the Government has waited too long and expected the canners to take the merchandise at a clear loss.

I also wish to quote from a broker in Mobile, Ala.:

The Government is buying up entirely too much canned foods, and the wholesalers cannot get enough to supply the civilian trade. We have been in the business here for 29 years—we specialize in dried beans and canned fish—and we cannot get enough merchandise to pay our overhead expenses. We have never seen so much dissatisfaction among the farmers and civilian business as we have to contend with right now, and the country is getting into a critical state of affairs day by day in every way.

People are leaving the farms by the thousands, going to shipyards and other public works; lots of them have quit farming on account of Government control. We have talked with several of them, and they claim that they pay out more money to the Government than they can make under Government control. And we still contend if the Government control was abolished altogether it would be better for all parties concerned; this would cut down our overhead expenses and help out with the war effort. If something isn't done along these lines within the next few months, we are headed for a food famine in this country. We very much agree with you that if the President would appoint a single food administrator and give him authority to handle the situation he would soon get this mess cleaned up.

If our boys in the armed services and the civilian population are to be adequately fed this winter, the American people must demand that some sensible food policies be adopted by the administration. We must insist that the New Deal philosophy of scarcity be abandoned; men must be placed in charge of our food program who know something about such problems; farmers must be given the necessary tools and machinery to do the job; enough men and women must be retained in food production and processing; fair prices must replace subsidies; and we must insist that full control of the food program be placed in the hands of a single food administrator.

Let us stop the wasting and hoarding of food and give our men in the fighting forces and the American people an opportunity to secure more food. Let us remain free; that is what our men are fighting for on the battlefields of the world. Our big job is to win the war against our enemies. We must do our part to win the battle on the home front and keep America free.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me revert to the statement that I made at the beginning of these remarks, calling attention to the vital problems on which action is needed now if we are to advance our war program at home and abroad with maximum speed and effectiveness. Many members of the minority and some on the majority side of this House are asking, "What can we do to get action and to secure results so long as the Roosevelt forces in charge of Congress fail or refuse to take action to meet these problems?" Mr. Speaker, there are several answers to this question. One very specific and definite thing which each of us can do, however, is to sign our names to two very important discharge petitions now on the Speaker's desk. These are petitions Nos. 13 and 14.

There is an opportunity for direct and immediate service to his constituents confronting every Member of this House, on both sides of the aisle, from the standpoint of taking action to correct the existing shortage in gasoline and fuel oil. In many of our home communities people are facing a fuel shortage as cold weather moves in upon them. In many more communities, especially in rural areas, domestic economic activities have been disrupted and our war-production program crippled by a shortage of gasoline, so that citizens with important work to do cannot secure sufficient gasoline to go about their business. By signing petition No. 14 every Member of Congress can take a direct step to the correction of this New Deal-made difficulty. When the necessary 218 signatures have been signed to petition No. 14—and the petition now has well over half enough signatures to get results—it will bring before Congress legislation by which we can bring about the increased production of gasoline and fuel oil without delay and without the loss of a single gallon of gasoline or quart of oil to our fighting forces. The legislation which petition No. 14 would bring up for immediate action provides the means for bringing into production stripper wells and for promoting the discovery of new wells. It would enable the oil industry, without cost to the Government, to utilize its full productive capacity to supply the gasoline and fuel oil which we need. Fulton Lewis, Jr., has repeatedly pointed out to the American public the necessity for quick action on this matter after personally conferring with the Governors, Democrats and Republicans alike, of the oil-producing States. The path to action is clear. Any Member really desiring to do something now to correct the gasoline and fuel situation can help get that action by walking up to the Speaker's desk and signing discharge petition No. 14. Until he does that he should not confine his activities to cussing the bureaucrats, because by signing petition No. 14 he can give Congress the direct authority to straighten out the mess which the bureaucrats have created. Criticism is an interesting pastime, but if it is action that is wanted and relief for our constituents which is desired the way is open by signing discharge petition No. 14.

As was pointed out on the floor yesterday, Mr. Speaker, if the Members of Congress from the great oil-producing States alone, Democrats and Republicans alike, will sign discharge petition No. 14 without delay we should be able to secure the necessary remaining signatures to that petition before the end of next week.

Petition No. 13 would bring before the House legislation to provide private citizens with a means for securing justice from O. P. A. directives and mandates by resorting to action through the regular judicial channels after the manner of government by law so long a part of the operation of government among Anglo-Saxon peoples. Until a Member has signed discharge petitions Nos. 13 and 14 he has not done for his constituents all he can do to protect them against unjust and unwise bureaucratic bungling and oppression.

Mr. VURSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman raises an interesting question. The gentleman will recall when the Government went out and bought food and gave it away. For instance, it shipped pears in from California at an enormous price for freight and gave them away in southern Illinois when the poor people who needed pears were too lazy to go out and pick them and the pear crop in southern Illinois rotted in the orchard. I think it would be very unwise to continue with any policy where the Government buys food and sells it.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I notice that some of the drive-for-action committee members are not present. I suggest the lack of a quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I intend to move a call of the House, and if that is defeated, I will move to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 160]

Allen, Ill.	Byrne	Disney
Anderson, N. Mex.	Canfield	Ditter
	Cannon, Fla.	Domengeaux
Andrews	Capozzoli	Douglas
Arends	Case	Drewry
Baldwin, Md.	Celler	Durham
Baldwin, N. Y.	Chapman	Eaton
Barden	Chenoweth	Ellison, Md.
Barry	Clason	Engle, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Coffee	Fay
Beall	Compton	Feighan
Beckworth	Cooley	Fellows
Bender	Costello	Fernandez
Blackney	Courtney	Fish
Bland	Cox	Fitzpatrick
Bolton	Cravens	Flannagan
Bonner	Crawford	Fogarty
Boren	Cullen	Forand
Boykin	Curley	Ford
Bradley, Mich.	D'Alesandro	Fulmer
Bradley, Pa.	Davis	Furlong
Brooks	Dawson	Gallagher
Brown, Ohio	Delaney	Gamble
Buckley	Dewey	Gavagan
Burchill, N. Y.	Dickstein	Gearhart
Burdick	Dies	Gerlach
Busbey	Dingell	Gifford
Butler	Dirksen	Gilchrist

Gillie	Larcade	Robsion, Ky.
Goodwin	Lea	Rogers, Calif.
Gorski	LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.
Granger	Lewis, Colo.	Rowe
Grant, Ind.	Luce	Sabath
Green	Lynch	Sasscer
Gross	McGranery	Satterfield
Hale	McLean	Sauthoff
Halleck	McMurray	Scanlon
Hare	McWilliams	Schiffler
Harness, Ind.	Maas	Schuetz
Harris, Ark.	Madden	Shafer
Harris, Va.	Magnuson	Sheridan
Hart	Marcantonio	Short
Hartley	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Hébert	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Mason	Smith, W. Va.
Hendricks	May	Snyder
Hobbs	Merritt	Somers, N. Y.
Hoch	Miller, Pa.	Spence
Holifield	Mills	Starnes, Ala.
Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, La.	Steagall
Hull	Morrison, N. C.	Stewart
Izac	Mott	Talbot
Jackson	Murphy	Taylor
Jeffrey	Myers	Thomas, N. J.
Jennings	Norton	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Brien, Ill.	Tibbott
	O'Brien, Mich.	Tolan
Johnson, Ward	O'Brien, N. Y.	Towe
Jones	O'Connor	Treadway
Kean	O'Hara	Troutman
Kearney	O'Leary	Vincent, Ky.
Kee	O'Neal	Wadsworth
Kelley	O'Toole	Ward
Kennedy	Outland	Wasielewski
Keogh	Peterson, Ga.	Weaver
Kerr	Pfeifer	Weichel, Ohio
Kilburn	Philbin	Weiss
Kilday	Pittenger	Wene
Kinzer	Ploeser	West
Kirwan	Plumley	Wheichel, Ga.
Kleberg	Poulson	Willey
Klein	Pracht	Winstead
Knutson	Price	Wolfenden, Pa.
Kunkel	Rabaut	Woodruff, Mich.
LaFollette	Randolph	
Lambertson	Reed, Ill.	Woodrum, Va.
Lane	Robertson	Worley
Lanham	Robinson, Utah	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 200 Members have answered to their names, not a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 89, noes 55.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, November 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3664. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3665. A bill to amend the United States Arbitration Act of February 12, 1925, in order to permit departments and agencies of the Government to use the procedures established by such act in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution to assist in making additional manpower available during the war emergency and for 6 months thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELMER:

H. R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Ancel Adkins and Mrs. Alma Mallette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3667. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schilbred; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of C. C. Evensen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3669. A bill granting a pension to Nellie M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3546. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Gladys Hinshaw, of Clemons, Iowa, and many other residents of Marshall County, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3547. Also, petition signed by many residents of Conrad and nearby towns in Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2082 which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of liquor in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3548. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Nellie E. Copley, of Vancouver, Wash., and 159 others, expressing their belief that it is inconsistent for the Government to ration food and also permit the waste of grain in the manufacture of beer and other intoxicating beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3549. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Howard C. Cross and other citizens of Wellsburg, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1943

(Legislative day of Friday, November 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, eternal, immortal, invisible, we would hush our busy thoughts to silence as we wait for Thy word. Unless the whisper of Thy guiding voice is clearly heard and heeded in the inmost shrine of our hearts, in the clamor of the world without, we will lose our way, our purpose, our peace, and our poise. Without Thee all is vanity and life itself barren, joyless, dead, robbed of its meaning, its dignity, and its beauty. In Thy presence even failure, disappointment, and bitterness are redeemed to radiant expectations.

As we turn now to our waiting tasks may the chilling breath of cynicism not dim the shining mirror of wonder that reflects for eyes that see the radiant glories of the Father's world and the dawning splendor of this day of Thy visitation. May the world invisible in which our spirits really live be real to us today, and in that inner fellowship may there come light out of darkness, peace out of discord, steadfastness out of turmoil, forgiveness out of guilt, and faith instead of fear. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 12, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 12, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 12, 1943, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Maybank
Andrews	Eastland	Mead
Austin	Ellender	Moore
Ball	Ferguson	Nye
Bankhead	George	O'Daniel
Barbour	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Gillette	Overton
Bilbo	Green	Pepper
Brewster	Guffey	Radcliffe
Brooks	Hatch	Reed
Buck	Hawkes	Revercomb
Burton	Hayden	Reynolds
Bushfield	Hill	Robertson
Butler	Holman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Caraway	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Taft
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Davis	Maloney	Tobey

Truman	Wagner	White
Tunnell	Wallgren	Wiley
Tydings	Walsh	Willis
Vandenberg	Wheeler	Wilson
Van Nuys	Wherry	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator From Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent from the city on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY HULL TO THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that arrangements have been made for the Secretary of State to address a meeting of the two Houses of Congress at 12:30 o'clock Thursday next in the Hall of the House of Representatives regarding his mission to Moscow and the results thereof. The meeting will not be a joint session of the two Houses in the sense in which a joint session is addressed by the President. Both Houses will be in recess, but will meet at 12:30 in the Hall of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of State will address the Members of the two Houses at that time.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 355)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying agreement, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am happy to inform the Congress that on November 9, 1943, representatives of 43 nations and peoples joined with our own Government in signing the accompanying U. N. R. R. A. agreement, setting up an International Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to give first aid in the liberated areas. This agreement provides only the framework. The implementation is left to the constitutional lawmaking body of the member states.

The task of the organization will be to assist in furnishing the medicine, food, clothing, and other basic necessities and essential services which are required to restore the strength of the liberated peoples. They have been deliberately stripped by the enemy in order to support the Axis war machine. More than that, the Axis leaders have boasted that as they withdraw, they will leave only devastation—what they have not stolen, they will destroy. As our American soldiers fight their way up the Italian boot, they are discovering at first hand that the barbarism of the Nazis is equal to their boasts. Their only rivals in this respect are the Japanese.

U. N. R. R. A. will be able to make only a beginning in the vast task of aiding the victims of war. The greatest part of the job will have to be done by the liberated peoples themselves. What U. N. R. R. A. can do is to help the liberated peoples to help themselves, so that they may have the strength to undertake the task of rebuilding their destroyed homes, their ruined factories, and their plundered farms.

The length of the war may be materially shortened if, as we free each occupied area, the people are enlisted in support of the United Nations' Armies.

Already, for example, a new French Army has been created and, as we strike toward Berlin, increasing numbers in Sicily and Italy are falling in step beside the soldiers of the United Nations. Others construct roads and military installations required for our military operations. Millions more are waiting for the moment when they, too, can strike a blow against the enemy.

They do not want charity. They seek the strength to fight, and to do their part in securing the peace. Aid to the liberated peoples during the war is thus a matter of military necessity as well as of humanity.

U. N. R. R. A. will not, of course, be expected to solve the long-range problems of reconstruction. Other machinery and other measures will be necessary for this purpose. What U. N. R. R. A. can do is to lay the necessary foundation for these later tasks of reconstruction.

The devastation and disorganization caused by the Nazi and Japanese war machines is so great that this world disaster can be met only by the united action of the 44 United Nations and associated nations. Accordingly, under the agreement establishing U. N. R. R. A., it is proposed that each nation will contribute in accordance with its ability. Each will determine for itself the amount and character of the contribution which it can make.

A small fraction of the national income of the contributing member states will, it is hoped, be sufficient to meet the needs. Some of the liberated nations may be able to make payment for the supplies and services rendered. But only by bringing to bear the resources of all the United Nations will we be able to relieve a substantial part of the suffering of the millions who will need help.

The nature and the amount of the contribution to be made by the United States will, in accordance with the terms of the U. N. R. R. A. agreement, be determined by the Congress of the United States under its constitutional procedure.

At this time I recommend to the Congress the enactment of a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds as Congress may from time to time determine to permit the participation by the United States in the work of U. N. R. R. A. I am not now recommending the appropriation of a specific sum. At a later date after the conclusion of the Atlantic City meeting, I shall send to you a further recommendation, informing you of the result of the meeting and requesting the appropriation of specific funds.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 15, 1943.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Department of Agriculture for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE, UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrative Office, United States Courts, for the fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REPORT ON DISTRIBUTION METHODS AND COSTS—PART I—IMPORTANT FOOD PRODUCTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, submitting a report covering the results of an inquiry respecting selected food products made by the Commission as a part of an inquiry respecting the distribution of consumer goods including selected items of foods, wearing apparel, building materials, petroleum products, automobiles, tires and tubes, and electric household devices (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

FINANCIAL REPORT BY T. V. A. ON USE OF TRAILERS IN NORTH CAROLINA AND TENNESSEE

A letter from the General Manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts and expenses in connection with the use of trailers at Murphy and Fontana Dam, N. C., and Douglas Dam and Camden, Tenn., for the period from March 1, 1943, to August 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

RESOLUTION OF TURTLE LAKE LOCAL, BARRON COUNTY (WIS.) FARMERS UNION—BUTTER AND OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution adopted by the Turtle Lake Local, Barron County, of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, relating to butter and oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has raised the point value of a pound of butter to 16 and left its so-called substitute, oleomargarine, remaining at its former point value of 4 points per pound; and

Whereas this advantage of fewer points being required will give the margarine interests an unfair advantage to boost their product now during wartime and to build up their industry for large sales after the war, thus ruining our dairy industry; and

Whereas the health of our Nation will be affected if the people are deprived of this wholesome product by this increased value in points; and

Whereas we of the dairy industry feel that it was unnecessary for the O. P. A. to raise the point value of butter since there are reports to show that the stocks of butter held in storage this year are much greater than in 1942: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we demand an equalization of the point values of butter and oleomargarine; further

Resolved, That the promotion of margarine will not be allowed under any circumstances after the rationing of any dairy products is discontinued; further

Resolved, That any attempt to disturb the law relating to the control of oleomargarine or the tax on it should be fought by our Representatives and Senators; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators, Representatives, Governor of Wisconsin Walter S. Goodland, O. P. A. Administrator Prentiss M. Brown, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard.

This resolution was adopted by the Turtle Lake Local, Barron County—a local unit of the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

HENRY GRAUNKE,
Local Secretary, Clayton, Wis.

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL CONVENTION OF FARMERS EQUITY UNION—OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Leroy Melton, president of the Farmers Equity Union, a copy of a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the national convention of his organization expressing opposition to Senate bill 1426, which would remove restrictions from and repeal taxes on oleomargarine. I am in full accord with the stand taken by this organization, and I ask unanimous consent to present the letter for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS EQUITY UNION,
Greenville, Ill., November 1, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this letter as our organization does not attempt to maintain a lobby in Washington. We are operating along cooperative marketing lines handling primarily dairy products and grain under the cooperative plan. However, we find our business at times hindered by laws that may be introduced in Congress from time to time. I refer particularly to the Fulmer bill, H. R. 2400, and S. 1426. These bills, if enacted, will remove all restrictions and taxes from oleomargarine and neither the consumer nor the farmer will have any protection.

Our national convention which was in session on Wednesday of last week at Lima, Ohio, adopted the following resolution by a unanimous vote of the delegates:

"Whereas there are two bills before Congress, known as H. R. 2400 and S. 1426, which bills provide for the repeal of all taxes on oleomargarine and the removal of all restrictions on color, body, and texture: Be it

"Resolved, That we, the delegates of the national convention of the Farmers Equity Union, in Lima, Ohio, protest strongly the enactment of these bills and ask that no such changes be made in the oleomargarine laws. We recommend that local exchanges, creamery organizations, and local members write their Senators and Representatives in Congress asking their support in the defeat of these bills."

We are asking your support to defeat these bills.

Very truly yours,

LEROY MELTON,
President.

RESOLUTION BY STOCKHOLDERS OF MANDAN (N. DAK.) PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION—PRODUCTION CREDIT SYSTEM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Mandan (N. Dak.) Production Credit Association at the stockholders' annual meeting on October 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Bankers Association is making an attack on the production-credit system throughout the United States, and whereas such organization is exerting a great pressure on Congress at the present time to curtail or eliminate the production-credit system, which would work an extreme hardship on American agriculture; and

Whereas it is believed that the production-credit system has offered to the American farmer a sound, workable, dependable credit, which should be maintained at all costs, and supported by our Government: It is hereby

Resolved at a meeting of the stockholders of the Mandan Production Credit Association, assembled at the annual stockholders' meeting at Mandan, N. Dak., on October 27, 1943, That Congress weigh carefully all evidence and not be prejudiced by selfish interests that at present are making vicious attacks against the production-credit system;

That the United States Government keep intact the $120,000,000 set up as capital in Production Credit Corporation and Production Credit Association to support the system, bearing in mind that such capital is only a fraction of the amount that private interests have received and are receiving from the United States Government;

Bearing in mind also that the $120,000,000 set aside for production credit has grown in value to more than $145,000,000; therefore the Government is suffering no loss, nor any anticipated loss whatsoever in supporting the system.

That Congress be reminded of the fact that such capital takes care of the supervision of the associations throughout the United States, which supervision not only protects the members' investment in the associations, but also protects the Government's investment in such associations;

That Congress also be reminded that private lending agencies also necessitate supervision, the costs of which are supported by direct appropriation by Congress, which is not made necessary in the case of production credit associations under the present provision;

That production credit associations have proven their worth, and at all costs should be maintained to assist agriculture with a sound and sympathetic credit during the post-war period;

That elimination of the system and the withdrawal of the capital from the associations by the Government at this time would be nothing short of a tragedy;

That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and the Representatives of the States in the seventh district, and to the Farm Credit Administration at Kansas City, Mo.

O. P. A. CEILINGS ON CORN: ELEVATOR PRICE—PETITION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, and appropriately referred, a letter in the nature of a petition signed by 25 citizens of Shelton, Nebr., relative to the O. P. A. ceilings on corn and ceilings on the elevator price. The letter is addressed to me.

There being no objection, the letter, in the nature of a petition, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

SHELTON, NEBR., *November 8, 1943.*

Senator HUGH A. BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUTLER: A group of 31 farmers met at the Dale Stubblefield home tonight at our monthly meeting, at which time we discussed the article you wrote relative to the O. P. A. ceilings on corn and the ceiling on the elevator price and that the elevator would be more than willing to take less margin on this corn and give the difference to the farmer, but the O. P. A. continually is interfering with the farmers' prices, and this is one that should be broken up at once.

We hereby all feel the same and hope that you will continue your fight on this matter, and, in fact, as far as we are concerned you can do anything you want with the O. P. A. and the worse will not be any too good.

H. R. LIPPINCOTT.
A. B. HOLMBURY.
B. M. BENTLEY.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 2080. A bill to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 531).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 620. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 533).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 469. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the emblem and name of the Red Cross; with amendments (Rept. No. 534).

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I ask consent to report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes—the so-called soldiers' vote

bill—and I submit a report (No. 532) thereon.

This morning the committee voted, 12 to 2, to instruct me to report the bill favorably. The 2 Senators who voted against it asked me at the same time to state that their vote did not necessarily mean that they were opposed to the bill, but simply that they wished more time to study it.

I hope by tomorrow to have sent to each Senator a copy of the bill, the report, and the printed hearings before the subcommittee, and I trust that each Senator will give the matter careful consideration, because it is very desirable that the bill be passed at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69—INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL RELATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I report back, favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 204, and ask for its immediate consideration.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 1,100 additional copies of Senate Document No. 69, current session, letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 160, a report submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury by a special committee designated to conduct a study of intergovernmental fiscal relations in the United States be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator is asking for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I am reporting the resolution favorably from the Committee on Printing, and asking for immediate consideration.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that I have contacted the minority members of the Committee on Printing, and find no objection on the part of either of them to the present consideration of the resolution, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1529. A bill to appoint a commission to settle the claims of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 1530. A bill to centralize the administration of certain functions relating to the production, transportation, distribution, sale, and price of petroleum, natural gas, and coal; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1531. A bill authorizing employment of engineers in private practice for Government projects; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

(Mr. GILLETTE introduced Senate bill 1532, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1533. A bill to amend section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to make authorization for deductions of the premiums for national service life insurance from active service pay effective whether or not such deductions are in fact made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

IMPOSITION OF TAX UPON CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF AGRICULTURAL REAL PROPERTY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, no one who lived through the land boom in the years following the last World War, in the twenties, and the inevitable collapse which succeeded those boom years, can view with equanimity the situation which prevails throughout the country today and constitutes at least the threat of a repetition of that situation.

Some of the factors are already existing. There already exists a large surplus of investment funds looking for sound investment; there are funds in the hands of people who earnestly look forward to the time when they will again own a farm home and who wish to buy a farm home. If those elements were the only ones which enter into the picture, there would be no question that the level of farm land prices would be determined on a sound investment security basis, on an income-producing basis; but the principal factor that brought about the land boom of the twenties was the entrance into the picture of the speculator, the man who had nothing at stake, perhaps made a small nominal payment down on a farm and immediately put it up for resale. Everyone who is at all familiar with the situation knows that farms changed hands 8, 10, 12, and as many as 20 times during a month, and each time at an advanced figure; so the sound investor and the home seeker could not fix the price level and could not buy except at an artificial price level that was established for him by the speculator.

From all over the country, Mr. President, there has come to me, and I presume to most other Members of Congress, requests for legislative action to forestall, if possible to prevent, or at least, deter the entrance of the speculative interests into this field, with the inevitable consequence of disaster to the entire economy of the Nation. The Department of Agriculture and the Treasury Department have been giving consideration to the matter; I have given some little thought to it; and there are suggestions which have emanated from this consideration and these discussions. One is the imposition of a tax to absorb the profits; the other is the imposition of a transfer tax on resales within a limited period after acquisition of title. Both these suggestions, if adopted, Mr. President, would prostitute the purposes of the revenue-raising power by taxation, and transfer the revenue-raising function to the field of punitive or penalizing action.

In the hope that something might be offered by way of deterring, I shall introduce a bill taking up one phase of this matter. I am fully aware of the fact that a revenue-raising bill, even if it is called a punitive tax measure, cannot originate in this body. I assume that the Department of Agriculture will send up another bill in the next few days covering the other phase of the matter, and I am now introducing my bill for information only, having in mind that, of course, it cannot be passed on, originating in this body, but with the notice that I expect to offer it at the first opportunity as an amendment to the revenue bill soon to come over from the House of Representatives. I ask consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1532) to levy a tax upon certain transfers of agricultural real property was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL SALARIES, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (S. DOC. NO. 128)

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present the report of the special committee on judicial salaries, submitted to the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on August 25, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report presented by the Senator from Delaware will be printed as a document.

CONTINUITY OF ACTION IN THE PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, in the event any person is elected in 1944 to the office of President to succeed the incumbent President, such President-elect shall be associated with the Government at the earliest possible date after such election in a capacity that will best insure continuity of action in the war effort, a consistent policy in our foreign affairs, and the establishment of a just and enduring peace.

ROBERT L. BAILEY AND JAMES E. BAUGH

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a statement with reference to the splendid services to the Senate and to the House of Representatives rendered by two faithful employees of the Civil Service Commission—Robert L. Bailey, congressional contact representative, and James E. Baugh, who for years was the head of the old Application Division of the central office. Both these men have been cooperating with our offices in the House and Senate,

and I believe they merit the recognition which the insertion of this statement will give them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL CONTACT REPRESENTATIVES RENDER VALUABLE SERVICE

If you should stroll into almost any Senator's or Congressman's office on Capitol Hill in Washington and ask the courteous secretary in charge about civil-service matters, it is a 10-to-1 bet that they would ask you to wait a bit, or take your name and tell you they would find out about your inquiry. Their next move would be to call the office of Bob Bailey. Robert L. Bailey, congressional contact representative, is the way the pay roll reads, but every Congressman knows him as Bob. A former civil-service investigator, since January 1939 Bob has been making friends and getting the answers to civil-service problems for the House. In October 1941 the work had grown to such an extent that he secured the services of James E. Baugh to handle Senate inquiries, that body having found out about the work of Bailey and demanded service also. Jimmie Baugh, for years at the head of the old Application Division of the central office, gives the Senators the same fine cooperation that has made these contact offices on the Hill the valuable services that they are. Day after day, every sort of problem comes to the various offices in Congress, and day after day the contact offices furnish answers, secure information, distribute circulars and books, give interviews, soothe angry constituents, and, in general, provide a service that most Congressmen and Senators would now tell ycu they could not get along without. Many a regional director has found these offices of help, and many a problem has been taken from a regional director's workday by proper handling through congressional contact channels. They are doing a really valuable service for the Commission and the Federal Government.

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF STATE HULL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on last Friday, November 12, 1943, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., published a most complimentary editorial about our distinguished Secretary of State and his signal success at Moscow. I take great pleasure in asking that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HULL'S GREAT STATURE

When Secretary of State Cordell Hull—Judge Hull to Tennessee—returned to Washington from his fateful journey to Moscow he was met by the President of the United States. Thereby was history made, for there is scarcely a handful of living men to whom such honor would be paid, and they would have to be chiefs of great states. Never before has honor so great been done a subordinate American official.

That gesture of appreciation for accomplishment symbolizes more than anything else which has happened the great length of the shadow which Judge Hull's stature casts across his native land, and when one thinks back just a few weeks when Judge Hull's leftist detractors were decrying him as the man who betrayed Russia, retributive, indeed, was the justice of a President's warm and grateful welcome home to his senior Cabinet member.

There are many aspects of Judge Hull's far journey and its result which challenge the imagination and admiration, not only of his friends, but of all the world.

His burden in the State Department has for many years been a crushing one. In the face of strong antagonism and suspicion he made pan-Americanism such a real and practical thing with his trade pacts, his obviously sincere desire of a good neighborliness of more than mere words that when war did come to us only one of the Pan American Union—Argentina—failed to fall quickly into step with the United Nations.

Because necessity compelled it, his was the tremendous task of preventing a climatic break-down in Japanese-American relations any sooner than it did come. A year before the break Judge Hull warned it was inevitable. It was not his fault that it was so totally disregarded.

The journey to Moscow was undertaken immediately after there had been a grave transition in the State Department which had its culmination in the resignation of Under Secretary Sumner Welles, an occurrence which, unquestionably, put further great strain on Judge Hull. Nor was that all. His detractors had done all they could to add to his burdens, to misrepresent him to the Russian people—to establish the lie in their minds that he was their enemy rather than the friend he is and has been.

In that sort of atmosphere did a 72-year-old man set forth on his first air journey of thousands of miles—a journey fraught with great dangers, and one which would have taxed the endurance of much younger men.

Judge Hull was a predominant figure at the history-making conferences which brought forth the momentous Moscow declarations. Stalin likes him. Russia likes him. They couldn't help it, because they like and understand virility of character and plain speaking, and there's much that is homespun in them. In Judge Hull they found a type of international statesman they hadn't encountered before—one who would deal across the board and say what he thought without any superfluous sugar-coating, and he doesn't double-talk.

Now he is home in triumph, and the Nation seems to be suddenly discovering what Tennessee has known these many years—that in Judge Hull the people have a spokesman and representative whose capabilities and accomplishments are not dwarfed by those of any who have ever preceded him in direction of America's foreign policy.

Tennessee knows the hill country wherein lie the taproots of Cordell Hull's background—his strength, his vision, his honesty, his forthrightness. Have his accomplishments belied his years? The Tennessee mountain folk are lean folk and as rugged as the hills unto which they daily lift their eyes. They live and work long.

As for politics, "the Judge" was schooled in Nashville's old Maxwell House, and thus was his an education denied Marshal Stalin, President Roosevelt, and Prime Minister Churchill, past masters though they be in the art of international politics.

When Judge Hull sat down at the Moscow table there was none there who knew better than he how to play that particular game. Play it he did—to win, we hope, for all mankind.

McCARTHY OF WISCONSIN—STATEMENT BY EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement entitled "McCarthy of Wisconsin." Charles McCarthy was an adopted son of our State who performed a service of far-reaching importance. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president of Mount Mary College, has written a book entitled "McCarthy of Wisconsin." My statement relates to that book and Mr. McCarthy's life work.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M'CARTHY OF WISCONSIN

The son of Irish immigrants, brought up in a Massachusetts shoe town, Charles McCarthy became in turn a football hero, a coach, a doctor of philosophy, the creater of the Legislative Reference Library, and a powerful and picturesque influence in Wisconsin politics during the regime of the older La Follette. He helped both Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson draft their platforms when they ran against each other for the Presidency, was active in agricultural organizations, investigated industrial relations, and played an important role in building up the reputation of the University of Wisconsin, developing its extension division, and establishing continuation schools throughout the State. In these and many other fields, he worked untiringly, fathering ideas and programs for which he let others take the credit. Of his own life's work, and particularly his unique contribution, the Legislative Reference Library, he said humbly, "It is something where there was nothing." Just how great that something was is revealed for the first time in Colonel Fitzpatrick's biography of the man who was a constructive worker behind the scenes, a social inventor of the first magnitude, a warm-hearted, imaginative Irishman, and a true public servant in the highest meaning of the term.

Colonel Fitzpatrick was a personal friend of McCarthy during the last 10 years of his life and worked under him in Madison. From 46 boxes of manuscript in the Wisconsin Historical Society and other material in the family's possession and in the Legislative Reference Library, he has constructed a warm and glowing account, which will be of particular interest to librarians, legislators, political scientists, and educators and will be a revelation to the general public, which has not heretofore realized the greatness of McCarthy of Wisconsin.

Contents: 1. Early Years; 2. Education, Marriage, and a Job; 3. The Wisconsin Soil; 4. The Legislative Reference Library: Its Beginnings; 5. The Legislative Reference Library: Buttress of Democracy; 6. The Legislative Reference Library: New Methods and Materials; 7. A Political Blitzkrieg against McCarthy; 8. McCarthy's Personal Influence on Legislation; 9. The Legislative Reference Library and Progressive Legislation; 10. Good Laws, Good Administration, and the Judges; 11. The State Board of Public Affairs; 12. Charles McCarthy, the Bull Moose, and Theodore Roosevelt; 13. Better Business, Better Farming, Better Living; 14. The Federal Commission on Industrial Relations; 15. The War Years; 16. Two Extraneous Episodes; 17. The University of Wisconsin and University Extension; 18. The Continuation School: The Educationally Disinherited; 19. The Significance of McCarthy; Appendices; Index.

Charles McCarthy: Librarian, lecturer; born Brockton, Mass., 1873; son of John and Katherine (O'Shea) M.; Ph. B., Brown University, 1896; scholar in history, University of Wisconsin, 1900, fellow in history, 1901, Ph. D., 1901 (Litt. D. Brown, 1913); married Lucile Schreiber, 1901; legislative librarian for Wisconsin, 1901——; originator of legislative reference department in State libraries for the drafting of laws at request of legislators. Author: The Wisconsin Idea, 1912. Was member United States Commission on Industrial Relations (resigned 1915). Was assistant to Mr. Hoover in United States Food

Administration, Washington, and was sent to Europe on a mission for that department and for War Labor Board. Home: Madison, Wis. Died, March 26, 1921.

ARMISTICE DAY, 1923—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by Raymond Clapper, entitled "We Shall Prevail." The article is a review of Armistice Day, 1923, and was published in the Washington Daily News of November 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE SHALL PREVAIL

(By Raymond Clapper)

Armistice Day 20 years ago was cloudy and raw in Washington, as it is now outside my window.

I have always remembered the story I covered that day for the United Press. The war had beeen over 5 years. Woodrow Wilson had become a broken old man, living in seclusion at his home on S Street, and what he said that day has come true, it seems to me, although you may not agree.

One felt very sad for him. Remember the times, if you can. By then Harding had been President and had died. Coolidge was in office and was feeling rather pleased—as he said at the time—because rigid economy had brought our expenditures within our income, and he hoped, as we all believed, that we were on the threshold of a new era.

Yes, one felt that the times had moved far beyond Wilson. Harding had said the League of Nations was dead. It had been a rather fanciful dream of a college professor who did not know his way around in the practical world.

Democratic politicians felt it was not good politics to be publicly associated any longer with the Wilson dream. The following summer there was to be a strange scene in the Democratic National Convention in Madison Square Garden.

I remember that scene, too—Newton Baker, faithful to Wilson, standing before that convention of cynical trimmers, tears on his face and in some eyes in the press section, pleading with the Democrats not to betray the spirit of Woodrow Wilson.

Pardon an old reporter's memories. I wander too much.

That Armistice Sunday of 1923 was gray and the faithful followers of Wilson were a bedraggled crowd in the street in front of the house on S Street. They went there every Armistice Day and knelt down to pray in the street.

It always was a fairly good human-interest story. Nobody very prominent in the crowd, of course; mostly fringe sentimentalists, cranks, and not very realistic people. Most of them were women, probably many of them mothers mourning for a son with a silent grief that would never pass. They were bound to grow misty over a broken idealist like Woodrow Wilson.

I think there was a minister in the crowd and, as I remember it, he said a prayer.

Then somebody went up and knocked on the door and in a few minutes Wilson came out on the stoop.

I have a photograph of him as he came out of the door and I stood about 10 feet away. He dragged himself through the door with some difficulty, for since his illness in the White House 4 years earlier he had not been able to move about freely. He leaned on a heavy cane. He had changed much since I had seen him last, and especially since the day when he strode confidently down the center aisle of the Senate bringing the huge text of the Treaty of Versailles under his arm to ask for its ratification.

His hair was all white and hung in a fringe on his neck. But he wore his silk hat and a long cloak and pulled himself together for a dignified appearance.

Wilson lived only 3 months after that. The feeble man had difficulty in responding to the greeting of his admirers. After a few words of thanks he choked and apologized for his emotion.

Then for just a few seconds he fired up and spoke like an implacable prophet out of the Old Testament.

I looked up his words today in a yellowed copy of the World Almanac. They still vibrate and now I can hear them plainly:

"Just one word more. I cannot refrain from saying it: I am not one of those that have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. I have seen fools resist Providence before and I have seen their destruction, as will come upon these again—utter destruction and contempt. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

Those, I believe, are the last public words Woodrow Wilson ever spoke.

WOODROW WILSON'S CRUSADE TO PREVENT WAR

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article written by the well-known newspaper writer, the publisher of the United States News, David Lawrence, entitled "The Crusade That Failed But Lives On." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUSADE THAT FAILED BUT LIVES ON—THIS IS THE STORY OF WOODROW WILSON'S LAST EFFORTS TO PREVENT THE WAR WE NOW FIGHT—A STORY THAT HAS DEEP MEANING FOR US TODAY

(By David Lawrence)

Tears were streaming down his face as he spoke. The audience listened in awe-struck silence. Outside an autumn sun streaked its warm rays to the little auditorium. We were in Pueblo, Colo., the afternoon of September 26, 1919. It was the last public utterance of Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States. As usual, the President was talking extemporaneously—the fluent style of the orator whose eloquence is wholly in the power of his thought and the smoothness of his diction. But there was something different that day—something in his tone that revealed the depth of his grief as he seemed to realize he was talking to a world already indifferent to the lessons of the World War.

We correspondents who had heard him deliver 40 addresses on that memorable trip—40 speeches in 22 days across 17 States, and not a speech written out in advance—had traveled on his special train for some 8,000 miles. But that afternoon we little dreamed that this was his last address. We were uneasy, to be sure—for once before on the tour he had shown signs of emotional strain and nervous exhaustion.

"On last Decoration Day," he was saying, "I went to a beautiful hillside near Paris, where was located the cemetery of Suresnes, a cemetery given over to the burial of the American dead. Behind me on the slopes was rank upon rank of living American soldiers, and lying before me on the levels of the plain was rank upon rank of departed American soldiers.

"Right by the side of the stand where I spoke, there was a little group of French women who had adopted these graves, had made themselves mothers of those dear ghosts by putting flowers every day upon these graves, taking them as their own sons, their own beloved, because they had died in the same cause—France was free and the world was free because America had come.

"I wish some men in public life who are now opposing the settlement for which these men died could visit such a spot as that. I wish that the thought that comes out of those graves could penetrate their consciousness. I wish that they could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see the thing through, to see it through to the end and make good their redemption of the world. For nothing less depends upon this decision, nothing less than the liberation and salvation of the world."

Once before, on September 11, at Helena, Mont., Mr. Wilson had expressed the same thought, the same misgiving about the fulfillment of the pledges he had given to the American boys he had led into war. These pledges were deeply imprinted on his conscience. He felt them as a personal commitment—he had asked the young men of America to give their lives to a cause—a war to end war—and now he of the living was not succeeding in persuading his countrymen to adopt the steps necessary to prevent another war. The warning was pointed, the prophecy all too plain.

"Stop for a moment to think about the next war," he said to his audience. "For I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it.

"What shall I call it? The final war? It might be the final arrest, though I pray only the temporary arrest, of civilization itself; and America has, if I may take the liberty of saying so, a greater interest in the prevention of that war than any other nation. America is less exhausted by the recent war than the other belligerents. She is not exhausted at all.

"America has paid for the war that has gone by less heavily, in proportion to her wealth, than the other nations. America still has free capital enough for its own industries and for the industries of the other countries that have to build their industries anew.

"The next war would have to be paid for in American blood and American money. The nation of all nations that is most interested to prevent the recurrence of what has already happened is the nation which would assuredly have to bear the brunt of that great catastrophe. It is not likely that, with the depleted resources of the great fighting nations of Europe, there will be another war soon, but, unless we concert measures to prevent it, there will be another and a final war just about the time these children come to maturity; and it is our duty to look in the face of the real circumstances of the world in order that we may not be unfaithful to the great duty which America undertook in the hour and day of her birth.

"The next time will come. It will come while this generation is living, and the children will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives.

"I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and

shot into the heavens went for a hundred miles and more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers know what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the absolute destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization."

But it was in vain. The audiences were but a few thousands here and there. They applauded. They respected their President who had led them to victory through a world war. But the people as a whole were preoccupied with other things—mostly the self-interest of their economic being. They were bewildered by talk of European affairs.

But the leaders, our spokesmen, our representatives, our statesmen to whom the people cusomarily relegate such matters for settlement—where were they and what did they think?

Domestic policies in the Wilson administration had gone awry. Grievances in 1919 and 1920 were numerous. The irritations of wartime restriction had multiplied. The demobilized, if not disillusioned, troops coming home to see many of their able-bodied brethren—who had been highly paid in the shipyards—thriving in what was then known as the "silk shirt" era, entered the scramble for economic sustenance. No one was thinking of another war—ah, Germany was disarmed, she had no fleet, her armies had been discharged and by the terms of the treaty she was saddled with such a heavy economic and financial burden as to make it seem improbable that she could ever again raise an aggressive hand in Europe.

In talking to the Peace Conference in Paris, Marshal Foch had summed it up thus:

"The treaty secures complete guaranties for a period of 5 years during which Germany will doubtless not be in a position to do any harm, but from that moment onward, in proportion as the strength of Germany may recover and the danger increase, the guaranties become less and less until they finally disappear after the lapse of 15 years. * * *

"There is only one military means of compelling the enemy to carry out his engagements, and that is to maintain the occupation of the Rhine. For on the Rhine a comparatively slight force is sufficient to forbid Germany any action and to keep every kind of action in hand for ourselves."

But the French people became indifferent, too, and all the world now knows that when Hitler marched into the Rhineland in 1936 in defiance of the Versailles Treaty and the League of Nations, he tested the willingness of the whole allied world to say him nay. And the record shows acquiescence. Thereafter, Hitler knew he could build up the might of Germany with impunity.

Woodrow Wilson's proposal to prevent this was a League of Nations pledged to preserve the peace by moral force if possible but by military means if necessary. He saw in the Covenant of the League a constitution for the peace-loving nations of the world. They surrendered no sovereignty. They retained freedom to act under their respective constitutional processes, but they remained pledged to contribute to an international police force as much of their military strength as they could mobilize in order to prevent or stamp out aggression.

America was the most powerful nation of the world at the end of the last war. When she decided to remain aloof from the League the most powerful physical force for the preservation of peace was subtracted from Europe's aid. Britain and France were depressed by our attitude and they sought feebly by a return to the old system of balance of power to set up buffer states and alliances.

The people of France and Britain, too, were horrified by war. They would not listen to urgent appeals for rearmament. Taxes were already breaking their backs. They disparaged the coming of air power and they were indifferent to the press reports of mechanized warfare as Germany rebuilt her army and navy.

The League of Nations had provided a commission for international inspection. Armaments could not be developed without world-wide publicity. The facts were to be available for the asking—and they were. But the League without America was a supine collection of governments whose leaders were afraid to risk their political lives or the ire of their commercial interests in a rearmament campaign.

What then had prevented America from heeding the advice given by Woodrow Wilson in 1919 and 1920? A small group of men in the Senate started the opposition to the Versailles Treaty and to the Covenant of the League of Nations. The principle of a league to enforce peace had been espoused in 1915 by William Howard Taft and other prominent Republicans. Mr. Wilson publicly acknowledged that the idea was not his own, but had been nurtured in the minds of peace-loving statesmen for generations.

Several weeks before the Covenant was laid before the Senate for final action Mr. Wilson brought back from Paris a draft. He asked for advice. Republican leaders, including William Howard Taft, Elihu Root, and others, made specific suggestions. He took them back to Paris. Every one of these suggestions was finally adopted in substance. When Mr. Wilson came back from France and laid the finished Covenant before the Senate he felt he had met all sincere objections. The Covenant had in it, therefore, a clause requiring that the treaty be ratified without reservations.

This did not mean that the clauses could not be interpreted, as indeed was the case with Senator Hitchcock's reservations, which Mr. Wilson was glad to accept as interpretive. The Lodge reservations, on the other hand, said in effect that America in ratifying "assumed no obligation." This, Mr. Wilson, felt was a nullification. He refused to accept the Lodge reservations. He may have been wrong. As time goes on, many of us who stood with him feel he was right because he perceived then, as the record indeed unhappily shows, that the Lodge reservations were designed to kill the League altogether.

The acid test came in the 1920 election. Thirty-one Republicans, including Taft, Root, Wickersham, and Charles Evans Hughes, told the American people during the campaign that they favored the election of Warren Harding. They said "a vote for Harding is a vote for the League." For had he not, as a member of the Senate, twice voted for the League with the Lodge reservations?

Election came. President Harding won and was inaugurated in 1921. He had a chance then to submit the League Covenant with the Lodge reservations. He never submitted it at all. He turned his back on the ablest Republicans of that day. That's the record.

Woodrow Wilson well knew the defects in the Covenant of the League. No contract could be made to work if the parties to it wanted to scuttle. No compact was worth while if the parties had not the courage or the will to enforce its provisions. The Covenant was a self-correcting device by its specific provisions. It provided for constant check and recheck. It was flexible. It stipulated that the territories conquered should be kept under trusteeship—that there be no annexations—and it provided for reduction of and supervision of armaments. But the United States, whose moral influence and physical force were paramount, did not join. Europe was abandoned, and so was the peace of the world.

Twenty years ago this month Woodrow Wilson made his only speech as an ex-President. It was the night of November 10, 1923—the eve of Armistice Day. Radio networks had hardly been developed into the national forums they are today, but the radio microphone was hooked into the Wilson home on S Street in Washington. That was Woodrow Wilson's farewell. He was a broken man. The stroke he suffered in the autumn of 1919 had paralyzed his left side and for a time impeded his speech. But he spoke clearly that night, bravely, with his customary resonance. It was again in the spirit of tragic prophecy.

"The anniversary of Armistice Day," he said, "should stir us to great exaltation of spirit * * * although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered, chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

"This must always be a source of deep mortification to us, and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligations of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect, and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

"That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

"And now, as if to furnish a sort of sinister climax, France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles and the whole field of international relationship is in perilous confusion.

"The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest and most determined exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail."

We can turn back the pages of history and read the promises and the resolutions in the congressional debates of 1919 and 1920. They bear a strong resemblance to the Connally resolution and the Fulbright resolution and the Mackinac charter of today. We can hear the so-called irreconcilable group of 1919 in the Senate shouting that the League Covenant "means more war." Will some Senators soon be saying the same thing about the "general international organization based upon the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states" which was proclaimed to the world through the Moscow agreements as the new pledge for the maintenance of peace?

We can hear the voices of 1919 saying that article X, which created an international force to police the world, deprived us of sovereignty. Does the 1943 emphasis on the word "sovereignty" mean that we are going to quibble again about our obligations, and that we will have some day amendments or reservations proposed that seek to limit American participation and avoid all obligation again?

We can hear the passionate addresses of 1919 to the citizens from coast to coast by Senators telling the mothers of the Nation that the League Covenant contained in it only "the seeds of more war" and as such must be shunned. The appeal to fear, to selfishness, to isolationism was coupled then with the confident assurance that because of the two vast oceans which wash our shores we could never be attacked from abroad and Europe should "stew in its own juice."

When the writer went across the country in February 1919 to make a survey of public sentiment on the League of Nations just about the time that President Wilson returned for a brief interval to consult with Congress, newspapers from coast to coast, Republican and Democratic, were supporting the League of Nations. Sentiment then was not unlike what it is today in the first flush of enthusiasm after the Moscow agreements.

But little by little, the boring from within started. And the voices of propagandized fear won out before the year 1920 ended.

The voices of men who reflected the sentiments of hyphenated groups embittered by the war won. The voices of conscientious but timid conservatives—who advised against assumption of any international obligation that would conceivably have to be fulfilled to maintain the peace of the world—won. The voices of the shrewd politicians—who could capitalize domestic grievances and saw a chance to mobilize all the dissents behind a triumphant political party whose platform was negative—won. And, above all, Woodrow Wilson—the liberal, the man whose "new freedom" had touched adversely the pocketbooks of the conservative class and who was hated for his liberalism—did not win.

Did he lose only temporarily? He looked ahead always for the verdict of history. He once said: "I would rather fail in a cause that some day will triumph than to triumph in a cause that I know some day will fail."

Today all the fortunes of the financially strong, all the prides of the politically ambitious, all the cautions of the nationalistically aloof and all the material possessions of the Nation itself are forfeit as the lives of America's finest are being offered again on all continents and over the seven seas in a second great crusade to establish once and for all that man is indubitably his brother's keeper and that the future of civilization, indeed the peace of the world, must rest upon the spirit, if not the letter, of Woodrow Wilson's memorable pledges to mankind.

SHORTAGE OF BOX CARS FOR SHIPMENT OF GRAIN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD approximately 25 telegrams received by me from various grain dealers, grain companies, and elevator companies, relative to the matter of the boxcar shortage in the Northwest, and specifically relating to the fact that hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat are lying on the ground.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANLEY, N. DAK., *November 10, 1943.*
ATWOOD, LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
Estimate about 45,000 bushels grain on ground and temporary storage.
FARMERS UNION CO-OP ELEVATOR CO.

HEBRON, N. DAK., *November 6, 1943.*
ATWOOD, LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
Still piles of wheat on ground and thousands of head of cattle must be left out in the snow and cold account of many barns are filled with grain. We have had only 2 cars the past 10 days. Elevator blocked.
HEBRON FARMERS UNION ELEVATOR CO.

CARPIO, N. DAK., *November 8, 1943.*
ATWOOD, LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
About 30,000 bushels grain on ground, some in bad shape. Cannot bin. Must have cars to load it out.
BERT AMDAHL.

PARSHALL, N. DAK., *November 8, 1943.*
ATWOOD, LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
Will take from 200 to 250 empties to clean up grain on ground and in open bins in Parshall territory. About 8 inches of snow on level, causing serious damage to grain.
PARSHALL GRAIN CO.

GLADSTONE, N. DAK., *November 8, 1943.*
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Chamber of Commerce, Minneapolis:
About 10,000 bushels piled outside in north territory.
BIRDSALL ELEVATOR.

ARNEGARD, N. DAK., *November 8, 1943.*
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
About 30,000 bushels grain still out.
FARMERS COOPERATIVE ELEVATOR CO.

UPHAM, N. DAK., *November 8, 1943.*
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
Estimate 25,000 bushels on the ground tributary this station.
FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.,
B. T. BENSON, *President.*

BOWBELLS, N. DAK., *November 8, 1943.*
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
This territory needs 80 cars to take wheat off the ground.
A. C. WIPER ELEVATOR CO.

AMBROSE, N. DAK., *November 6, 1943.*
ATWOOD LARSON CO.:
Retel approximately 95,000 bushels of grain not under cover in our territory at this time.
AMBROSE FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

CROSBY, N. DAK., *November 6, 1943.*
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis:
Would estimate 200,000 bushels grain not under cover tributary to our station.
CROSBY FARMERS GRAIN CO.

COLGAN, N. DAK.,
November 6, 1943.
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
Thirty-five thousand bushels on ground. Ducks destroying much of this grain. Heavy snow in this territory.
FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

FORTUNA, N. DAK.,
November 6, 1943.
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
Grain on ground, 35,000.
FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

ALKABO, N. DAK.,
November 6, 1943.
ATWOOD LARSON,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
About 20,000 bushels grain on ground without cover.
FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

DOUGLAS, N. DAK.,
November 6, 1943.
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
Grain not under cover this territory at least 60,000 bushels.
DOUGLAS FARMERS ELEVATOR CO.

GRENORA, N. DAK.,
November 8, 1943.
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
Over 50,000 bushels of grain piled on ground and in exposed bins in this vicinity.
D. & B. ELEVATOR CO.

GARRISON, N. DAK.,
November 8, 1943.
ATWOOD LARSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn.:
I estimate about 50,000 bushels still out. Loaded some today and in a tough state.
A. P. MISSLIN.

POST-WAR PROBLEMS—ARMISTICE DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Post-War Problems, delivered by him on Armistice Day, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO JEWISH DEAD OF WORLD WAR NO. 1—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him in Pittsburgh, Pa., on November 7, 1943, at the B'nai B'rith Centennial Anniversary and Community Committee Day Program, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THIRD IMPERATIVE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Third Imperative," delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations on November 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES DURING AND AFTER THE WAR—ADDRESS BY E. B. STAHLMAN

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by E. B. Stahlman, owner and editor of the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., delivered at a meeting of the Sons of the American Revolution, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES BEFORE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN SOVIET FRIENDSHIP; INTERVIEW WITH COL. ROBERT R. MCCORMICK; AND EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War, at the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship Meeting, Madison Square Garden, New York, on November 8, 1943, together with a newspaper account of an interview with Col. Robert R. McCormick, and an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. RALPH A. BARD BEFORE CATHOLIC MEN'S LEAGUE OF THE BROOKLYN NAVY YARD

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by The Assistant Secretary of the

Navy, Ralph A. Bard, before the Catholic Men's League of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, on November 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD REVIEW OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS—ADDRESS BY FRANK W. HERRING

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Frank W. Herring at the annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, Denver, Colo., October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AUTHOR OF UNDER COVER—EDITORIAL FROM FORT WAYNE NEWS-SENTINEL

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Shameless Smear-Artist," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of November 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—ARTICLE BY LOUIS BROMFIELD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Voice From the Country," written by Louis Bromfield, published in the Washington Evening Star of November 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUSINESS PROFITS SOAR DESPITE TAXES—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Business Profits Soar Despite Taxes," published in the August 10, 1943, issue of PM, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROFITS SOAR WHILE PACKERS COMPLAIN—ARTICLE FROM KIDDER COUNTY (N. DAK.) NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Profits Soar While Packers Complain," published in the Kidder County (N. Dak.) News, of November 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UTILITIES' SWOLLEN PROFITS—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Utilities' Swollen Profits," published in the October 4, 1943, issure of the New Republic, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me so that I may make a 5-minute statement, which I am sure will be of interest to the whole Senate, and then that I may insert something in the RECORD?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall do so reluctantly, and I hope other Senators will not delay my statement about the pending unfinished business. We spent so much time Friday on other business that we were unable to make any progress with the bill. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall not take more than 5 minutes, and I would not ask for this privilege if it were not for the fact that the office of practically every Senator is calling my office and asking questions regarding war prisoners held in the Far East.

In the summer the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs appointed a subcommittee of three—the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and myself—to ascertain what could be done for American prisoners in the Far East, especially those held by the Japanese. We have held several meetings with intelligence officers of the Army, intelligence officers of the Navy, and representatives of the State Department. We have acquired much information, and while we have not a report to submit, we have a formal statement prepared as a result of our meetings, which statement I shall later ask to have included in the RECORD.

I merely wish to say a word in the Senator's time. The prisoner problem is, of course, one of the important problems facing us. It is important primarily because of the universality of the war, and because, so far as able-bodied persons are concerned, there has never been an international treaty providing for their exchange, and we have not been able to do much for these persons.

Two exchange ships have brought persons out of the Far East. One is on the way home now. On the other side of the world, the Germans are living up to the provisions of the treaties to which they are parties, so far as the exchange of injured persons is concerned, and already there are being returned to the United States men, injured or wounded, who were captured in Germany or in Italy by Germans.

I think I should say that our committee has seen the packages which are being sent by persons in our country to our men who are prisoners in the Far East. We have seen the packages which are being sent by German nationals to Germans held prisoner by us. We know what the Red Cross is doing, and we know what the various churches are doing in an attempt to afford relief. But, Mr. President, we find ourselves confronted with problems which are almost insurmountable. For instance, Japan makes a differentiation between the prisoners held in the Philippines and the prisoners held in Japan proper. Japan assumes that the Philippines are captured territory and that the persons captured are in a different category from those interned in Tokyo.

The only way we can come into contact with a country such as Japan is through Switzerland. Switzerland represents Japan in negotiations with us. The one place in the world where we could meet Japan to the best advantage is in Russia, but the Swiss do not have a legation or an embassy in Moscow. In other words, the difficulties which are facing us are practically insurmountable, and the only thing I can say to the Senate and to the people of the country, so far as the investigation by the committee is concerned, is that conditions are not so bad as it is generally assumed they are, and that where rules and regulations and treaties are in effect they are, in the main, being lived up to.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume more time than I said I would. Therefore, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a summary of steps taken by the Department of State in behalf of American nationals held prisoners in the hands of the Japanese, and preceding it a statement which I myself have prepared. In addition thereto, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the State Department on May 25, 1943, and an earlier statement of procedure to be followed in extending financial assistance to American nationals in territories where the interests of the United States are represented by Switzerland. I ask that all these documents may be printed in the RECORD particularly for the benefit of the office staffs of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

The Members of the Congress of the United States, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, maintain contact with the Department of State and with the other agencies of the Government which are interested in alleviating the condition and effecting to the extent possible the repatriation of our fellow nationals who are in the hands of the Japanese. We have assured ourselves that these agencies are fully aware of the situation, that they want to do everything in the power of this Government to alleviate the conditions under which our nationals are held in the Far East, and that their efforts in that direction have been unremitting. I attach for your information a summary of these efforts which has been made available to me by the Department of State, and I hope that a perusal of this memorandum will reassure you that this Government is constantly mindful of its unfortunate nationals who are still in the Far East.

SUMMARY OF STEPS TAKEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE IN BEHALF OF AMERICAN NATIONALS IN JAPANESE CUSTODY

1. TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIAN INTERNEES

Upon the outbreak of war between the United States and Japan the United States Government, in an endeavor to insure humane treatment for American nationals in Japanese hands, confirmed its intention to observe the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention (convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and ratified by the United States in 1932), and to apply its provisions to prisoners of war and, so far as its provisions might be adaptable, to civilian internees. The Japanese Government, which had signed but had not ratified the convention, thereupon notified the United States Government that it would apply the provisions of the convention, mutatis mutandis, to the treatment of American prisoners of war and to the treatment of American civilian internees so far as its provisions might be adaptable to civilian internees.

The United States Government has also obtained assurances from the Japanese Government that it is applying the Geneva Red Cross Convention (convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and the sick of armies in the field, which was also signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and which was ratified by the United States in 1932 and by Japan in 1934).

The conventions named above provide a humanitarian standard of treatment for prisoners of war. Specifically, they provide that prisoners of war shall be treated humanely and held in honorable captivity—not imprisoned as criminals. They establish as the standard for the shelter and diet of

prisoners of war, the corresponding treatment of the garrison troops of the detaining power and they establish fundamental rights regarding correspondence, medical care, clothing, pay for labor, satisfaction of intellectual, recreational, and religious needs, and the continued enjoyment of full civil status. For persons generally referred to as "protected personnel," that is doctors, nurses and other sanitary (medical) personnel and chaplains, they provide certain special rights and protection.

The Department of State is constantly alert to insure observance of the conventions. Whenever it is learned through the Swiss Government, which represents American interests in Japan and Japanese-occupied territories, through the International Red Cross, or otherwise, that the terms of the conventions are not being observed, the United States Government draws to the attention of the Japanese Government that Government's obligations under the Red Cross convention and under its agreement to apply to the treatment of interned American nationals in Japanese hands the provisions of the Prisoners of War Convention.

2. EXCHANGE OF CIVILIANS

Negotiations between this Government and the Japanese Government lasting more than a year have culminated in the conclusion of arrangements for a second exchange of civilians which will effect the return to the United States of approximately 1,240 nationals of the United States, including a small number from the Philippine Islands, and 260 nationals of the other American republics and Canada. In the first exchange, which took place in the summer of 1942, over 1,300 United States officials and nonofficials were repatriated from the Far East.

The Japanese government refused to apply the provisions of the civilian exchange arrangements to American civilians who were captured on American soil, such as the Philippine Islands, Guam, and Wake Island. Although it finally agreed to permit the repatriation of a small number of American civilians from the Philippine Islands in the second exchange, it reserved to itself the right to select them. In the current exchange, the repatriates were thus drawn chiefly from Japan, China, Hong Kong, and Indochina. The Swiss representatives in the Far East, under broad directives issued by the United States Government, were authorized to select the persons to be repatriated, giving preference to the following categories of American civilians in Japanese hands: (1) those under close arrest; (2) interned women and children; (3) the seriously ill, and (4) interned men, with preference being given, other things being equal, to married men long separated from their families in the United States. The list of repatriates was made public on October 13, 1943.

The motor vessel *Gripsholm* left Jersey City on September 2, 1943, and was scheduled to arrive at Mormugão, the principal port of the Portuguese colony of Goa on the western coast of India, in sufficient time for an exchange of American and Japanese nationals during the 6 days commencing October 15. Upon the completion of the exchange the *Gripsholm* will return via Port Elizabeth and Rio de Janeiro, and is expected to reach New York City early in December.

The Japanese Government has indicated that it will not enter into negotiations for additional exchanges until the present exchange is completed. The Department of State will proceed immediately with such negotiations and will not relax its efforts to obtain the repatriation of all Americans in Japanese hands. It hopes eventually to obtain Japanese agreement to further exchanges so that all American civilians detained in the Far East and not included in the current exchange may have an opportunity to be repatriated.

3. REPATRIATION OF SICK AND WOUNDED PRISONERS OF WAR

Article 68 of the Prisoners of War Convention provides that:

"Belligerents are bound to send back to their own country, regardless of rank or number, seriously sick and seriously injured prisoners of war, after having brought them to a condition where they can be transported.

"Agreements between belligerents shall accordingly settle as soon as possible the cases of invalidity or of sickness, entailing direct repatriation, as well as the cases entailing possible hospitalization in a neutral country. While awaiting the conclusion of these agreements, belligerents may have reference to the model agreement annexed, for documentary purposes, to the present convention."

The model agreement defines the degree of incapacity that shall be considered sufficient to qualify a prisoner of war for repatriation. Although the Japanese Government indicated no intention to observe such provisions of the convention, this Government proposed to the Japanese Government that the model agreement be observed on a reciprocal basis and made insistent demands that the Japanese Government honor the obligation imposed by the convention to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners. The Japanese Government replied, after long delay, that it could not make a favorable response to the United States Government's proposal. The Department of State has formulated, in consultation with other agencies of the Government, further proposals in an effort to induce the Japanese Government to enter into negotiations for the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war, and these proposals are being transmitted to the Japanese Government in connection with proposals for the continuation of the repatriation of civilians.

4. REPARATION OF SANITARY PERSONNEL

Article 9 of the Red Cross convention provides, in part:

"The personnel charged exclusively with the removal, transportation, and treatment of the wounded and sick, as well as with the administration of sanitary formations and establishments, and the chaplains attached to armies, shall be respected and protected under all circumstances. If they fall into the hands of the enemy they shall not be treated as prisoners of war."

Article 12 of the same convention provides, in part:

"The persons described in article 9 may not be detained after they have fallen into the power of the adversary.

"Unless there is an agreement to the contrary, they shall be sent back to the belligerent to whose service they are attached as soon as a way is open for their return and military exigencies permit.

"While waiting to be returned, they shall continue in the exercise of their functions under the direction of the adversary; they shall be assigned preferably to the care of the wounded and sick of the belligerent to whose service they are attached."

Pursuant to the provisions of article 12 of the Red Cross Convention, it was proposed to the Japanese Government that the repatriation of the personnel protected under the convention be begun, since facilities for their return to the United States could be made available on the vessels employed for the exchange of civilian nationals. In order, however, not to deprive American prisoners of war of the care that they may require and might not otherwise receive, the United States Government also proposed to the Japanese Government, on a basis of reciprocity, that the right of repatriation be waived for protected personnel needed and permitted in prisoner-of-war camps or hospitals to render spiritual and medical assistance to compatriots who were in the care of that personnel at the time of capture. This Government further proposed that the selection of protected personnel to be repatriated be made by the senior officer of the unit captured.

The Japanese Government agreed in principle to the repatriation of protected personnel in connection with exchanges of civilians but reserved to itself the decision whether the retention of that personnel was necessary for the care of American prisoners of war and civilian internees under Japanese control. The Department accordingly requested the Swiss Government to endeavor to arrange for the accommodation of American-protected personnel in future American-Japanese civilian exchange operations.

Although it repatriated five nurses from Guam at the time of the first civilian exchange, the Japanese Government apparently did not find that it had in its power surplus American protected personnel available for repatriation in the second exchange as no such personnel was included in the lists for that exchange. However, the Department intends, when conducting negotiations for further exchanges of civilians, to convey again to the Japanese Government the expectation of the United States Government that protected personnel whose repatriation proves possible will be included in future exchange operations.

5. EXCHANGE OF ABLE-BODIED PRISONERS OF WAR

As indicated in press release No. 211 of the Department of State, dated May 25, 1943, a copy of which is attached to this summary, there is no customarily accepted practice among nations, nor provisions of international law or conventions for the return or exchange during hostilities of able-bodied members of the armed forces of one belligerent who may be captured by the forces of an opposing belligerent. In the circumstances, there is no immediate prospect of obtaining the release and return to the United States of able-bodied members of the American armed forces taken prisoners of war by the Japanese.

6. SHIPMENT OF RELIEF SUPPLIES TO THE FAR EAST

Early in 1942, the American Red Cross in conjunction with the interested agencies of the United States Government, made efforts to find a means acceptable to the Japanese Government of forwarding to our prisoners of war and civilian internees in the Far East necessary supplies of food, medicine, clothing, and comforts such as are regularly sent to American citizens in corresponding circumstances in other enemy-held areas. A neutral vessel to carry such supplies to Japan was obtained and chartered in the summer of 1942. The Japanese Government, however, refused to give its safe conduct for the voyage of the vessel to the Far East. In response to repeated representations the Japanese Government indicated that it was unwilling for strategic reasons to grant any non-Japanese vessel safe conduct to move in Japanese waters and that it had no intention of sending one of its own vessels to any neutral area in order to pick up relief supplies for United States and Allied prisoners of war and civilians as was suggested by the United States Government. Upon the receipt of this Japanese reply the United States Government pointed out its expectation that the Japanese would modify their position as soon as strategic reasons would permit and suggested for the interim the immediate appointment of International Red Cross delegates to Japanese-occupied territory who might receive and distribute funds in behalf of American nationals. This suggestion was eventually accepted by the Japanese only for Hong Kong

and certain areas in occupied China. They have not accepted it so far for the Philippine Islands, Malaya, and the Netherlands Indies. Efforts to induce the Japanese Government to abandon its position against the use of neutral ships to carry relief supplies into its waters were continued and new avenues of approach were fully canvassed, including the possibility of sending relief supplies in transit through Soviet territory. One suggestion proposed the sending of supplies by air to some point where the Japanese might lift them, with particular reference to medical supplies which might be scarce in Japan. No reply to this particular proposal was ever received. Another proposal was that the American Red Cross would provide a cargo ship to go to some point in the Pacific where a Japanese crew might take it over in order to conduct it to the ports where relief cargo should be discharged. This proposal was rejected by the Japanese. Numerous other proposals were considered but were either abandoned because of obstacles interposed by other enemy governments or were found to be otherwise impossible of accomplishment.

In March 1943 the Japanese Government, in response to repeated representations stressing its responsibility to cooperate in solving the problem, stated that strategic reasons still prevented neutral vessels from plying the Pacific waters, but that it would explore other means of permitting the delivery of relief supplies. In the following month the Japanese Government stated that it might consent to receive supplies overland or by sea from Soviet territory. There have ensued since that time long and complicated negotiations with the Japanese and Soviet Governments, the progress of which was impaired by the fact that the Japanese Government would not discuss the problem direct with the Soviet Government while the Swiss Government, which is in charge of our interests in Japan, is not represented at Moscow, since it maintains no diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government. Each detail of the negotiations had, therefore, to be dealt with through a long and complicated procedure involving the handling of communications at Tokyo, Bern, Washington, and Moscow, and in reverse direction through the same channels. Despite these difficulties, it has now been possible with the Soviet Government's cooperation to create a stock pile of prisoner of war relief supplies on Soviet territory. Moreover, the Soviet Government has given assurances that it will facilitate the transit through the Soviet Union of such relief supplies on a continuing basis when a satisfactory arrangement for the onward shipment of these supplies is reached between the Japanese and American Governments. In spite of the Department's repeated endeavors to bring this matter to a conclusion, the Japanese Government has not thus far indicated the means by which it is prepared to receive these supplies. The Department is continuing its efforts in this regard, and it is hoped that a definite arrangement can soon be made whereby relief supplies will move on a continuing basis to all American nationals detained by the Japanese.

While the foregoing negotiations have been in progress it has, fortunately, been possible to take advantage of two exchanges of civilians with the Japanese Government, one at Lourenço Marques, Portuguese East Africa, in July 1942, and the other at Mormugão, Goa, Portuguese India, in October 1943, to send to our nationals in the Far East an important quantity of relief supplies by means of the exchange vessels.

Reports of the distribution of relief supplies which left the United States by this means and which were transferred to Japanese vessels at Lourenço Marques were in due course received from the Far East. There was placed on the motor vessel *Gripsholm* when it left this country to effect the second exchange of civilian nationals between the United States and Japan another large cargo of assorted relief supplies, American Red Cross standard food parcels, next-of-kin parcels, and mail for distribution to American prisoners of war and American civilians interned in the Philippine Islands, occupied China, Hong Kong, Japan, the Netherlands East Indies, and Malaya. Valued at over $1,300,000, and weighing 1,600 short tons, these supplies include 140,000 food parcels of approximately 13 pounds each; 2,800 cases of medical supplies, including surgical instruments, dressings, 7,000,000 vitamin capsules, etc.; 950 cases of comfort articles for men and women; 24,000,000 cigarettes; from 20,000 to 25,000 next-of-kin parcels; and important supplies of clothing for men and women. This entire cargo was transferred to the Japanese exchange vessel at Mormugão and dispatched eastward.

In addition to the shipment of relief supplies on the exchange vessels and the other measures above mentioned, the Department of State and the American Red Cross are continuing to give close attention to all other phases of the subject.

7. PROVISION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN NATIONALS IN THE FAR EAST

Since the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, prohibits, among other things, individual remittances to enemy and enemy-occupied or enemy-controlled territory unless licensed, and since the issuance of such licenses is contrary to the policy of the Government, the Department of State shortly after this country's entry into the war made provision for the extension of financial assistance from public funds in the form of loans to Americans in such territories through representatives of the Swiss Government representing American interests there. Appended to this memorandum is an information sheet explaining how such assistance is extended and how funds so advanced may be reimbursed to the United States Government. With certain exceptions in territories occupied or controlled by Japan, the enemy governments have permitted payments to be made to qualified American nationals in the manner described. The Japanese authorities, however, have thus far refused to permit the Swiss Government's representatives, in certain areas under Japanese control, to extend financial assistance to American nationals in those areas on the same basis as elsewhere. The Department, therefore, has had to find other means of making funds available to Americans in such areas.

At Hong Kong, where the Swiss Government has not been permitted by the Japanese Government to act in behalf of American nationals, the International Red Cross delegate has been authorized to provide assistance to qualified American nationals there from public funds made available for the purpose by the Department.

Immediately after the fall of the Philippine Islands, the Department endeavored to arrange for the extension of financial assistance to qualified American nationals there. In June 1943, the Japanese Government permitted the transfer of $25,000, representing a contribution by the American Red Cross, to be made to the executive committee of the Santo Tomas internment camp at Manila, and the Department subsequently requested that the Swiss Minister at Tokyo endeavor to effect the transfer of a second contribution of $25,000 made by the Red Cross for the relief of American nationals at Manila.

It was not until July 1943 that the Japanese Government indicated that it would agree in principle to permit payments to American nationals interned in other parts of the Philippine Islands and to allow further payments to the internees at Manila. Accordingly, the Department in August 1943 authorized the Swiss Government to make remittances, in accordance with the need and the number of eligible individuals, to the executive committee of the American internment camps in the Philippine Islands beginning with the month of August or as soon as feasible thereafter. Funds delivered to the executive committees under this authorization may be used (1) for the purchase of available supplies considered necessary to supplement the diet provided by the Japanese authorities, (2) to pay for essential services obtained outside of camp, (3) to provide each internee with a small amount of money for personal use, and (4) to advance funds, against promissory notes if possible, to indigent internees for delivery to such members of their families as may be at liberty.

The Japanese Government has recently consented to monthly transfers of United States Government funds to the executive committee of the Santo Tomas internment camp. Such transfers are being effected from funds on deposit with the Swiss Government, and it is understood that they will be used for the purposes mentioned above.

The Department's standing instructions to the Swiss representatives in charge of American interests in enemy-held areas are that funds provided by this Government may be made available to American prisoners of war as well as to interned American civilians for necessary personal expenditures in accordance with their established needs over and above the food, shelter, and other necessities provided them by the detaining power. Such assistance has already been made available through the local international Red Cross delegates to American prisoners of war near Shanghai and Hong Kong. The Department of State is pressing for the extension to American prisoners of war in the Philippine Islands of the system of financial assistance referred to above which the Japanese have agreed to make available to civilian internees.

8. PRISONERS OF WAR CONVENTION AND RED CROSS CONVENTION

Any person who wishes to obtain the complete official text of the Prisoners of War Convention or the Red Cross Convention may do so by writing to the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., and enclosing 10 cents for each copy of the Prisoners of War Convention and 5 cents for each copy of the Red Cross Convention. The Prisoners of War Convention is Treaty Series No. 846, and the Red Cross Convention is Treaty Series No. 847.

Relatives and friends of Americans held as prisoners of war by the Japanese military authorities have inquired of various agencies of the Government concerning the prospects for their early repatriation, suggesting in most cases that Japanese prisoners of war be offered in exchange for the Americans.

There are three distinct categories of American nationals in Japanese custody, namely:

1. Prisoners of war, that is, members of the American armed forces who have been captured by the Japanese armed forces;

2. Sanitary and religious personnel captured while serving with the armed forces; and

3. Civilians in Japan or Japanese-occupied or controlled territory, the majority of whom have been interned.

The status of negotiations for an exchange of civilian nationals between the United States and Japan was discussed in press release No. 206 of May 22, 1943.

There is no customarily accepted practice among nations nor provision of international law or conventions for the return or exchange during war of able-bodied members of the

armed forces of one belligerent captured by the forces of the opposing belligerents. It is a major objective of warfare to deplete as rapidly as possible the forces of the enemy, and it has so far been deemed inexpedient for military reasons to propose the release and return of able-bodied prisoners of war. In the circumstances, there is no immediate prospect of obtaining the release and return to the United States of able-bodied members of the American armed forces taken prisoners of war by the Japanese.

The only prisoners of war whose release and return to their own country is provided for and sanctioned by international agreement and practice are the seriously sick and seriously wounded who are no longer capable of contributing to the enemy war effort. The release and return of such prisoners is provided for in the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929, which both Japan and the United States are applying in this war. Steps are already under way for implementing the relevant provisions of that Convention. Military operations and the difficulties of transportation through military zones are the principal obstacles at present in the way of such a movement.

Negotiations are also under way for the release and return of such captured sanitary and religious personnel as may not be needed to care for their compatriots who are prisoners of war.

Every endeavor is being made to obtain the release as quickly as possible of those eligible therefor and all feasible steps are being taken to provide for the well-being of all our nationals of whatever category in enemy hands until such time as they can be offered an opportunity to return to their homes in the United States.

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN EXTENDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO AMERICAN NATIONALS IN TERRITORIES WHERE THE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES ARE REPRESENTED BY SWITZERLAND

The Department of State has completed arrangements for financial assistance to American nationals in territories where the interests of the United States are represented by Switzerland.[1] Those able to qualify for such assistance will be entitled to receive from the Swiss representatives monthly payments corresponding to their established needs and the prevailing cost of living in the country concerned. All recipients will be limited to the monthly payments established for their place of residence, regardless of their ability or the ability of others interested in their welfare to repay amounts greater than the sums advanced. It is realized that a limitation upon the amount that American nationals may expend in enemy territory, even from their own resources, will entail some hardship. The conservation of foreign exchange, however, is an essential factor in the present economic policy of the United States and it is expected that Americans everywhere will willingly share with those in the armed forces the sacrifices that must be made in winning the war.

Based upon the latest ascertained cost of living in the various countries concerned, the maximum monthly payment for the head of a household will range from $60 to $130, with smaller allowances for additional members of the household. The monthly payments are subject to revision from time to time to meet changing living cost. In addition, the Swiss representatives are authorized to make special advances for such extraordinary expenditures as may be essential to the health or safety of American nationals for medical, surgical, or dental care, for hospitalization, for reasonable legal defense against political or criminal charges, or for a decent though modest burial where such is not provided by friends or relatives locally nor by the local authorities.

Wherever prisoners of war and interned civilians are supported by the detaining power, it is expected that payments made to them will generally not exceed a small sum sufficient to provide spending money for miscellaneous personal needs not supplied by the detaining power. However, no payments will be made to officers or to persons of equivalent status held as prisoners of war, who receive pay under the convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war, signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929.

Aliens, including alien spouses and alien children of American nationals, cannot qualify for payments from funds of the United States Government.

Swiss representatives charged with the representation of the interests of the United States will explain to the recipients that such financial assistance should not be considered as public bounty but as loans from public funds to American nationals finding themselves in an abnormal position by reason of the war. It is accordingly expected that all sums advanced will be repaid either by the recipients themselves or by relatives, friends, business associates, employers, or legal representatives in the United States.

Receipts embodying promises to repay without interest the sums advanced will be taken for all payments. Private deposits to reimburse the Government for sums advanced should be made with the Department of State. Persons wishing to make such deposits should indicate the names of the beneficiaries and should remit by postal money orders or certified checks payable to The Secretary of State of the United States.

The foregoing arrangements do not apply to the Philippine Islands.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 4, 1943.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me so that I may ask one question of the Senator from Utah? I assure the Senator from Alabama I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HATCH. No people in the United States are more interested in the question just discussed by the Senator from Utah, particularly with respect to the prisoners held by the Japanese in the Philippine Islands, than are the people of my State. I know the Senator cannot go into detail as to what his committee has found out, but merely for the assurance of the people of my State may I ask the Senator if the report he has made is in the nature of a final report, or is his committee going to keep active in this matter and continue to work on it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The committee will keep active so long as it is allowed to function. Its activity will be entirely in the nature of gaining information and making the information it receives known to the country and to the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator. I simply wish to express my personal approval of the action taken by the committee, and to indicate that I wanted the committee to continue to be active.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF R. HENRY NORWEB

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I cannot very well decline the request made by the Senator from Texas, but——

Mr. CONNALLY. The matter I have in mind is very important.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator, but Mr. President, I give notice now that I shall not yield further.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I have not asked the Senator to yield for a personal matter. If it were such a matter, I should not ask him to yield.

As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nomination of R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Peru, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Portugal. My reason for making the request is that it is urgent that the nomination be confirmed so that Mr. Norweb may depart at once to his destination. It is desired to speed his departure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Henry Norweb, of Ohio, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Portugal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, after the words "*Provided*, That", it is proposed to strike out the words "not less than."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on the pending bill for 4 days. Numerous witnesses were heard, including a number of representatives of the National Editorial Association and representatives of State press associations. The National Editorial Association, commonly referred to as the N. E. A., has a membership of more than 5,000 newspapers. Its president and the chairman of its legislative committee testified before the committee.

Mr. Albert S. Hardy, president of the N. E. A., stated that in the spring of this year a questionnaire was mailed to their members asking for a number of specific answers. A total of 2,704 replies was received and since that time a number of publishers who did not respond directly to the questionnaire have written their views on the subject covered by the pending bill. Mr. Hardy stated:

A brief analysis of the returns to this questionnaire should settle any doubts as to the attitude of the 2,704 newspapers reporting. Roughly, 94 percent, or 2,545, replied in the

[1] Switzerland represents the interests of the United States in Germany, Italy, and Japan, in territories occupied by those countries, and in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania.

affirmative to question No. 1, which read: "Do you think the Government should pay for bond advertising?" Six percent, or 155, were negative. Question No. 2 related to locally sponsored advertising. It read: "Are you now using signature pages?" The returns showed 2,066, or 79 percent, replied affirmatively, and 21 percent, or 575, in the negative. Question No. 5 was as follows: "Are your merchants and professional men complaining about using signature pages?" Of the 2,668 replies, 1,879 answered Yes and 789 No. This ratio has greatly increased since this poll was taken.

Various witnesses representing State press associations stated that the membership of their associations nearly all favored the passage of the pending measure. In New York a post-card ballot of 400 weekly publishers showed 95 percent of those replying were in favor of the bill, and 2.3 percent opposed, and 1.7 percent were noncommittal.

The sixth question in the questionnaire read as follows:

Are you heartily in favor of the National Editorial Association supporting this bill to sell more Government securities through the purchase of paid advertising by the Treasury Department in our home-town newspapers?

Mr. Hardy stated that returns showed that 2,519 answered in the affirmative and 172 in the negative. Forty State press associations, a majority of which is composed of both daily and weekly newspapers, have passed resolutions approving the bill. There can be no doubt about the overwhelming support of the small city dailies and weekly newspapers of the country.

In reply to a questionnaire asking if the money spent for advertising in each paper would influence the editorial policy, 87 percent of the editors gave negative replies and the same percentage answered that they did not believe the expenditure of Federal funds for the purchase of newspaper space would be considered a newspaper subsidy.

SUBSIDY

Many of the large metropolitan newspapers that do not want the present newspaper advertising status changed because they are getting rich out of the sponsored advertising programs, have constantly referred to the pending bill as providing subsidies for newspapers. The word "subsidy" has been used as a catchword and one intended to bring reproach on the program. These newspapers understand the effectiveness of constant asseveration.

What is a subsidy? Webster's dictionary defines subsidy as follows:

A Government grant to assist a private enterprise; any gift made by way of financial aid.

The bill is one requiring the Government to purchase advertising space in all newspapers of general circulation which are entered as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879, as amended. One of the chief sources of income of newspapers is the sale of advertising space. The purchase of that space is a legitimate business transaction for which the newspapers give value received. Under the bill no favoritism can be shown. Each newspaper is entitled to the same space to be paid for at the prevailing published rates of the respective newspapers. The Government has no right to select newspapers in which the advertisements are to be carried. The Government can neither bestow favors on a newspaper nor withhold its rights under the bill.

Therefore, there is no possibility of placing the newspapers under obligation to the administration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the Senator prefer to complete his statement before being interrupted?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should prefer to complete it, I think.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it would be better to do so, and would present the statement in a more orderly way. Then, of course, I shall be ready for questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is no phase of the program which imperils the freedom of the press.

There is no gratuity of any sort involved. There is no single phase which in any way constitutes an element of a subsidy.

The Government is constantly advertising in newspapers. During the hearings I presented separate letters from the Secretary of War and from the War and Navy Departments. The War Department during the last fiscal year expended $1,967,500 for newspaper advertising in general newspapers, and $252,300 for advertising in magazines. Approximately 1 percent of the amount reported was spent with the weekly newspapers. The Navy spent $1,275,814 for advertising in newspapers and other periodicals for the fiscal year 1943, and none of that amount was spent for advertising in weekly newspapers. No one has suggested that these advertisements constituted a subsidy. No one claims that the independence of the press has been threatened.

Legal advertisements have appeared in newspapers for many years by States, counties, districts, and cities, and many of them are mandatory. Selection of the newspapers from whom the advertising space is bought is usually left, by statute, to administrative public officials. Such advertising is not regarded anywhere as a subsidy, and has not weakened the independence of the press.

There are two kinds of paid advertising for the sale of War bonds; one is institutional or national advertising, and the other is sponsored or signature advertising. A very large amount of money is being spent by business corporations in carrying on institutional advertising for the purpose of keeping the name and business of such corporations before the public. These advertisements have been placed only in newspapers published in cities with more than 25,000 population. They have not been uniformly placed in all of those papers. Someone has selected the papers in which the advertisement are carried. It is wondered if such selections, accompanied by large payments for advertising, have a tendency to destroy the independence of the newspapers carrying such advertisements. Does it put them under obligation to the business institutions which bestow such alleged favors? The corporations engaged in such advertising are permitted under the law to charge the cost of the advertising as a part of the cost of operating the business. In that way, very large deductions are made from net income on which income tax is paid. Thus the Government is indirectly paying the cost of these advertisements in many of the metropolitan newspapers and some other newspapers.

Does the fact that payments are indirectly made by the Government to the newspapers make it any less a subsidy than if such newspapers were directly paid by the Government? The Treasury Department keeps no separate record of the amount of deductions of income tax resulting from these newspaper advertisements. That presents a situation of unknown and concealed payments by the Government, and if these payments constitute a subsidy to the advertisers it is a concealed subsidy, in which transactions the newspapers participate and get most, if not all, of the actual money involved, which accrues from a reduction in the amount of income tax to be paid. These transactions under the law are legitimate, but unfortunately most of the money goes to large newspapers in cities of more than 25,000 population. The newspapers in smaller cities and the country newspapers get practically none of this institutional or national advertising.

In the small dailies and weekly newspapers, the volume of sponsored or signature advertising is governed in large measure by the spirit of the small business concerns in such communities, often expressed by the phrases "The Man on Main Street," as well as their lack of requirements for advertising when their stocks are depleted and are difficult to replace. Other factors, of course, enter into the picture, such as being put on the spot by committees to participate in such advertising. Reductions of the cost of sponsored advertisements as a part of the cost of business operations are in exactly the same class as deductions for the institutional advertisements, so far as constituting unknown and concealed deductions of income tax by the Government.

The metropolitan newspapers, most of whom are fighting the plan for Government paid advertising on the asserted but false ground that if put into operation it would constitute a subsidy and would imperil the freedom and independence of the press, are being enriched by the sale of space to corporations and other business advertisers, most of which advertisers have neither services nor goods available for sale.

I have before me sheets from newspapers carrying such advertisements. One advertisement is of the Pullman Company's service. Another is an advertisement for the sale of beer. It says, "Why wait until the war is over? Drink it now." Down at the bottom appear the words "Buy bonds." The cost of those advertisements is deducted as a part of the cost of operating the business.

The newspapers receive the money, the corporate taxpayers get the credit, and the taxpayers pay the cost.

To some newspapers the purchase of space in all newspapers on equal terms if done by the Government is dangerous and seductive, and constitutes a subsidy; but the purchase of advertising space by business corporations, some of whom are interested in passing or in preventing the passage of legislation, does not in the slightest endanger the independence of such newspapers or constitute a direct or indirect subsidy.

Some Senators have indicated that an administration might use the paid advertising program to bring about political influence upon the newspapers, and thereby gain political advantage for the party in power. It is impossible to accomplish that result, Mr. President, in view of the provisions in the bill requiring exact equality among all eligible newspapers, both in the matter of the purchase of space and of payments therefor, and of the cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury by representatives of outstanding newspaper associations, both daily and weekly. That idea has so little substance and so little justification based upon our experience for 150 years that the implication promptly arises that it is being advanced by special pleaders, in the absence of sound arguments with which to oppose the passage of the bill.

Bear in mind that the bill requires the offer of the purchase of space to all newspapers, and not to selected newspapers, as in the case of institutional and sponsored advertising. The offer must be made to all newspapers which are eligible under the provisions of the bill; and they are all eligible when they qualify under the postal laws. It is required that they all be offered the same space, so that there can be no discrimination and no partiality. No favors can be shown, because under the provisions of the bill the same amount of space must be offered to all newspapers.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad the Senator has brought out that point. In conversation during the past 24 hours with a Senator he pointed out his apprehension that the administration in power would select the newspapers, and use the subsidy not only as a threat, but as an inducement, to curry favor. The Senator has brought out very clearly that the provisions of the bill apply to all newspapers uniformly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has considered the bill, and is supporting it, following the hearing. The provisions of the bill are well known. I have heard of no controversy among those who understand the provisions of the bill, about the impartiality of its provisions.

As one who has observed for many years the independent and honorable attitude of the great mass of editors and publishers as a class, I am impressed that the objection to the bill, based upon suspicion of convenient consciences, is totally unworthy of serious consideration. There is nothing in the bill that threatens in any way the right of the press to maintain complete liberty and independence. Adequate protection and safeguards against unworthy efforts of the Treasury Department to exert improper influence on newspapers are contained in the bill. Any administration which undertook in any way to corrupt or improperly influence the political and moral standing of newspapers by the use of Government money would be denounced by all of the newspapers in this country, regardless of political complexion. The amount of money going to separate newspapers under this bill is so insignificant—not more than $800 or $900 in the case of small newspapers—when considered in connection with the honor and independence of such newspapers, that a dishonest or beguiling offer would operate as a contemptible insult to editors and publishers; and all intelligent persons realize that such action would have most unhappy results for any person or administration making such offer. The mere suggestion of the loss of the independence of the press through the use of Government money to which it would be justly entitled is clearly based on an unsound political fancy and, though made by some editor, is, in fact, an insult to the press. In this connection I wish to quote from the statement of Mr. C. W. Brown, president of the Wisconsin Press Association, who appeared before the committee:

> The amount of money involved in this bill is only a small fraction of the sums spent by private advertisers in newspapers. On the basis of advertising in newspapers last year, the amount proportionately proposed for the purchase of paid Government advertising is about 4.3 percent of the total.

According to the statement of Mr. Chester LaRoche, chairman of the War Advertising Council, $580,000,000 was paid by private corporations and industries to newspapers selected by them; and yet during those years we have heard no complaint that the newspapers have lost their independence, or of improper influence being exerted on them because corporations and business institutions have paid them such a tremendous sum of money. It is a high testimonial to the purity and integrity of the press of the country.

I continue to quote from the statement of Mr. Brown:

> Has commercial advertising wrecked the freedom of the press or showed as a subsidy? Argument that press freedoms would be endangered falls under its own obvious weakness.
>
> How can men honestly fear loss of the freedom of the press (if they do) when ample evidence exists to show that this is not so? The Government has bought advertising space in the past and the payment was not in subsidy checks. Was freedom of the press lost in 1864 and in 1919 as the result of Government advertising done then? Is there a cry of subsidy or any loss of freedom by the newspapers from Government advertising now in large newspapers? Did any newspaper change its editorial policy as a result of this Government advertising? Counties, cities, and schools buy advertising, and have for years. Do they control the press?
>
> Commercial advertisers buy space to do a business job—not for free news comment or influence. To charge that they do is an insult to them and the newspapers. Business buys space because it is good business, because the investment is worth more than the dollars spent. Business is not subsidizing the newspapers, neither is it playing Santa Claus.
>
> Is it not logical for the Federal Government to do the same as business, instead of passing the hat? And can our great Government afford to be the beggar?
>
> The subsidy cry and talk of loss of freedom of the press hardly needs a defense based upon the record, and the fact that the same Government officials have expressed fear of the loss of sponsored advertising clearly indicates that their real reason is their fear of the loss of this advertising space now tincupped from business.
>
> The cry has been raised that the fund might be used for political purposes. If that were true, or possibly, why is that cry coming from the opposition to the administration when administration officials themselves also oppose establishment of the fund for paid Government advertising?

Do not forget that the agency which it is alleged would be given the power under the provisions of the bill improperly to influence the newspapers is the chief opponent of the proposal. The officials of that agency know better. They understand the situation.

Numerous witnesses before the committee stressed the fact that the Government is begging free newspaper space to promote the sale of War bonds.

It was made clear before the committee that there is a definite need for newspaper advertising to maintain the sale of War bonds and that as we go along further in the war that need will grow greater. Mr. Wilbur Peterson, ex-president of the Minnesota Editorial Association, stated:

> The people in my area are war-conscious in many respects, the purchase of War bonds among them, but they are not war-conscious to the degree where they will buy War bonds as they should without a great amount of effective persuasion. Between war-loan drives, the purchase of bonds is only half-hearted; during war-loan drives, it takes a veritable crusade to make the quotas assigned, and even then a large number of persons are not buying bonds at all or in anywhere near the amount that they should. We need advertising, advertising that carries the full sanction of the United States Government, to maintain the sale of bonds between drives, and we need advertising, similar advertising, during drives as a basis and as an encouragement for the present sponsored advertising that the Treasury Department so powerfully insists that we either sell ourselves or give ourselves.
>
> The so-called signature or sponsor page is "running out" with many newspapers as it becomes increasingly more difficult to sell. Similarly with the sponsored extra ads that we are asked to run during drives. Despite unusual success on my own paper during the recent Third War Loan, I know from personal experience, because I still solicit part of the advertising, that we shall not much longer be able to obtain any measurable volume of sponsored ads, or in anything like the degree to which we must obtain them to reach our quotas. And I know from examining many other small-town papers that most of them have encountered a lack of support for and an inability to support such

ads in much greater measure than on my own paper.

This is all we have to go on in running War bond ads at present: Either we must give the ads ourselves or we must find a sponsor. We ourselves have given freely, and will continue to do so. The only sponsors we in the small towns can find are the businessmen along Main Street. At only rare intervals does a War bond ad come along to communities the size of ours in what we call national or company advertising. Big company bond advertising does not get down to us.

The big company War bond advertising is not getting to the place where War bond advertising is most needed—that place is the small town and the rural community.

I quote further from Mr. Brown's testimony, concerning the resistance of local sponsors:

Senator DANAHER. In your own case did you find any private sponsors refusing to sponsor the third war loan drive advertising promulgated by the Treasury?

Mr. BROWN. In our particular case that circumstance was different. We had that objection come up early to a point where we were accused of commercializing the war. Some of my friends that we do business with regularly, laid that to me. The chairman of the bond committee came in with one of these paid ads, to be sure it got in—he came in and suggested, "We want you to go out and sell it." I told him I wouldn't do it, that we would run it ourselves.

That is, rather than beg the people on Main Street to pay for it.

I told him why. We were between two fires, lack of patriotism on the one hand, and lack of understanding of the merchants who were removed from the war and who didn't feel that their money should go into that channel. I didn't make the solicitation myself. I said we would do it ourselves.

I assume he means to publish it free.

Since that time the bond committee has been doing the soliciting. They are getting the same thing from the merchants instead of us. They relieved us of that because of the existence of this feeling. The committee tried to do it on a continuing basis; however, there has been a shrink on that. In making the arrangement there is no strings on it. They can do as they wish, the same as anybody else.

Senator DANAHER. When you say there has been a shrink on it, do you mean the advertisements are not continuous, or that the sponsors are declining?

Mr. BROWN. The ads are continuing, but the sponsors are declining. Incidentally we are running them at three-quarters of the regular rate.

Senator DANAHER. Did that particular copy come from the Treasury Department?

Mr. BROWN. In part. Some of it is localized. It depends on the circumstances. It is not all bond sales. Some of it is in connection with other drives—the salvage drive, and so on.

Senator BUCK. Is the prime purpose of this bill to sell more bonds, or to help the small newspapers?

Mr. BROWN. Definitely to sell more bonds.

Senator BUCK. Do you think there is where you are going to create sales?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator BUCK. Is the money there?

Mr. BROWN. The witness before me spoke of a bank account of $20,000, from which was drawn $18.75. In our case we had exactly the same word from my bank concerning a customer, without naming him.

Senators will find throughout the hearings statements by responsible witnesses, such as presidents of State press associations, that the resistance on the part of those who are sponsoring advertisements and paying for them out of their own pockets is constantly increasing. They express the fear that such advertisements are diminishing to the point where, before very long, the problem will become most serious. I could cite many witnesses and read from their statements, but I shall not detain the Senate in order to do so.

I quote another statement made by Mr. Hardy, president of the national association:

I am sure it can be shown that the present volunteer contributions of space, though reaching impressive figures, do not reach the eye of many millions. With these limitations on coverage, it seems reasonable to conclude that the best solution to the Treasury's perplexing problem of selling securities to individuals rather than to banks and other large buyers lies in a marked revision of its existing advertising promotion policies. With definite limitations on coverage of space donations by national advertisers and our questionnaire disclosing increased resistance to locally sponsored advertising, it is apparent that the Treasury, notwithstanding its protestations that all is well with the donation system, is in reality confronted with an unmistakable need to vitalize its selling problems.

Mr. Peterson quoted a statement from Mr. Gardner Cowles, Jr., then Director of O. W. I.'s Domestic Branch, as follows:

War-related advertising has been increasing in volume and going too much to the larger newspapers and radio stations. That is regrettable.

The national advertisers who are engaging in extensive advertising under the general name of institutional or national advertising do not place advertisements in newspapers in cities of less than 25,000 population. The census of 1940 shows that 52 percent of all the people in this country live in places of less than 10,000 population.

That is the reason for the dividing line in the pending bill, providing that at least half of the money shall be applied to advertisements placed in newspapers in cities of less than 10,000 population. By so doing more than half of the entire population of the country would be reached.

The people are not being adequately reached by War bond advertising except through the present hit-and-miss method of locally sponsored advertising. From the 1940 census only 412 cities had a population of more than 25,000. It is thus apparent that a very high percentage of the population does not read newspapers carrying the advertisements which are confined to newspapers in cities with a population in excess of 25,000. In some entire States there are but very few cities of 25,000 population.

The committee had before it a chart showing the location of those cities. I regret that I do not have it before me. It shows how far apart, in great areas of this country, are cities of as many as 25,000 population.

In this connection, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] made the following statement during Mr. Peterson's testimony:

I live in a small town and I know how widely read are the weekly newspapers and the pulling power of the ad in the weekly papers in the smaller communities. They are systematically read and reread from cover to cover, in contrast to the skimming process that goes on in the average large metropolitan daily newspaper.

Mr. Charles E. Moreau, of New Jersey, a publisher of several weekly newspapers, some of them in country areas and some of them in suburban metropolitan areas, testified as follows:

Surveys that we have made show that even in a State as close to metropolitan areas as New Jersey is, the farmers and residents of the smaller villages do not get daily newspapers except on their occasional trips to town on Saturdays and market days. The surveys also show that even in the suburbs where most of our readers also read a daily newspaper, the daily stays on the living-room table one evening, whereas the local weekly is kept the whole week for reference to what is scheduled in the local movie houses, local churches, or elsewhere in the community, and for more general reading. University research departments in several States have made surveys showing that a reader spends on the average 28 minutes on his large daily, in comparison to 45 minutes to an hour on the smaller weekly. These surveys are available for the record if the Senators desire them.

Mr. Moreau made another statement of great importance, as follows:

I want to express the conviction that much of the lack of war morale arises from confusion and lack of understanding of Government war aims. Several news associations, many columnists, hundreds of Washington correspondents, scores of Government publicity agents, are sending out news releases. Some of them are actually contradictory.

They cannot, of course, be controlled.

They are used at different times in different ways by different newspapers. I believe that one clear, definite Government announcement the same day in every newspaper in the country would avoid this confusion and surprise all of us with the results it would bring.

Numerous witnesses expressed the view that a Government advertisement, one prepared by and signed by a suitable Government official, would be much more effective and have a greater sales power than would many similar advertisements signed by local merchants or other individuals or corporations sponsors of advertisements.

In that connection allow me to say that the evidence before the committee showed that the Treasury Department does not have control over the contents of the locally sponsored advertisements. They are prepared by merchants. The Treasury Department sends out suggestions, but it does not reserve the right to have any of them carried in connection with the advertisements placed in newspapers. It has no control over the distribution of the suggested advertisements which it sends out, or over the advertisements which are accepted and published by the newspapers. Mr. Edward M. Anderson, chairmen of the Legislative Committee of the National Editorial Association, expressed the same view. He made

a very convincing statement concerning direct Government advertising.

The Treasury Department's principal objection to the bill is the expressed fear that if the Government engages in paid newspaper advertising the Government will lose the benefit of much of the sponsored and institutional advertising. The record shows by the evidence of a committee of Michigan editors who went to Canada to investigate the subject, and by a letter from a Canadian Government official, that exactly the reverse is true in Canada. Dr. W. C. Clark, Deputy Minister of the Department of Finance in Canada, having been informed that opposition existed to the bill for Government advertising on the ground that if the Government pays for this type of advertising the present free publicity will all be lost, and having been requested to state the Canadian experience wrote a letter on the subject. I am advised that Dr. Clark is a civil-service employee and that for many years he has been in the service of the Government of Canada. Under the Department of Finance of Canada he is Chief Deputy of Canada's advertising campaign. I quote from Dr. Clark, as follows:

> Our experience is that exactly the opposite condition takes place. Direct Government advertising, with definite and space insertion dates during a campaign, provides an impetus that is the basis of a tremendous drive for sponsored advertising by publishers of dailies, weeklies, and other media.
>
> The effect has been cumulative. We are starting our seventh war or victory loan and by now these sponsored efforts have achieved such momentum that it has become the accepted practice of national and local advertisers to plan their own publicity during our campaign periods to assist the loan drives. * * * While it is difficult to establish an exact ratio, we would be safe in suggesting that the volume of space for free and sponsored advertising is at least equal to three times the amount of space paid for by the Government. Without this Government portion we feel that the enthusiasm toward sponsored space would by no means be so heavy.

That is, in effect, the only objection our Treasury Department made to this program, namely, the loss of voluntary advertising. I have Dr. Clark's letter in full, but I shall not take the time to read it.

The total cost of all press advertising for bond sales in Canada amounts to four one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount of the bonds sold. Assuming the pending bill shall be passed, and our bond sales amount to $40,000,000,000 a year—and they probably will; they went far below that this year; sales were approximately $19,000,000,000 in one campaign—but assuming the pending bill shall be passed and our bond sales amount to $40,000,000,000 a year, and the cost of all the press paid advertising is $30,000,000, which is the maximum amount provided by this bill, the total cost would amount to three-fourths of one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the amount of bonds sold. Assuming the bond sales amount to only $20,000,000,000 and the cost of advertising is $30,000,000, the total cost would amount to fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount of bonds sold.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. From a reading of the report I do not see where it shows the amount of money that was spent on newspaper advertising or allocated for newspaper advertising this year. Has the Senator that figure in his mind?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that is private information and is not available to us. It was paid for by the advertisers.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was wondering, merely for information, how the figure of $30,000,000 was arrived at in the bill for next year, for example.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was based practically upon the ratio to Canada. Canada has about 10 percent of the population we have; it does not have the wealth, of course; and Canada spent on a program of this sort more than $3,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. My purpose in asking the question was to find out whether or not, in the Senator's opinion, if we appropriated more for next year than was used this year or about the same amount but divided, as the Senator says——

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have not used any to pay for this type of advertising. The Government has engaged in paid advertising for other purposes but not for the sale of its bonds. So there is no analogy there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator stated correctly that the volume of advertising to which he referred was paid for by private concerns, and that, therefore, there are no figures on it. I understand that is entirely correct; but it is also true, is it not, that this tremendous volume of advertising having nothing to do with the sale of goods of any character, this patriotic bond-sale advertising, which is inserted, very largely, at the instance of some of the very newspapers that are so fearful of Government control, is actually paid for, in very large part, by the public in the shape of deductions for tax purposes?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, to that extent it is a Government subsidy for advertising, except that the national advertisers have control of the distribution rather than the Government which is getting the benefit of the advertising?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is entirely true.

I mentioned a short time ago——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me finish this——

Mr. OVERTON. I want to bring out a thought in that connection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Just a second. Here [exhibiting] is one type of advertising. Under a picture are the words:

> A blueprint for building better men.

Then there is practically a whole page of advertising matter, and down at the bottom it says:

> Buying more War bonds and stamps backs up the men who man the guns.

I may say that the advertisement is by the Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, up to 90 percent of that advertisement may be paid for by the Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. All of it may be; there is no limitation in the statute.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me finish with this while we are on the subject. I desire to call attention to this advertisement [exhibiting]. It says:

> You don't have to wait until after the war—Schlitz.

I do not know whether they have anything to sell, but they are advertising a whole page—

> You do not have to wait until after the war to get your—Schlitz.

In the right-hand lower corner appear the words:

> Invest in liberty. Buy War bonds.

There is a Schlitz beer advertisement. All that is said in behalf of the purchase of Government bonds is what I have indicated, and still the taxpayers are paying for that in this newspaper, one of the Scripps-Howard papers, of Birmingham.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a fact, is it not, that whenever a business concern pays for advertising it is deductible from gross income unless it is carried to an extreme?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is a fact.

Mr. OVERTON. It is also a fact, is it not——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have said this form of advertising is not illegitimate; it is authorized, and I am not making any criticism about its legality.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a fact, is it not, that these business concerns utilize a certain amount of space for advertising their wares, and that during the War bond drive, instead of advertising their wares, for the most part a great many of them advertised War bonds, and therefore there is not any more deduction from their operating expenses than there would be if they had been advertising their wares?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true, but if they had wares to sell they would not be engaging in it; they do not need any advertising; they are about sold out; their stocks are depleted, and they cannot get any more.

I have been trying to buy in Washington an undergarment, and I cannot find one in the big stores here and they say they cannot get any from the manufacturers. Still I imagine they are engaging in heavy advertising. I noticed in the Washington Star on the front page a few days ago an appeal to advertisers not to bring them any more advertising. I cannot be exact as to the language, but that was the idea; they wanted to cut advertising down.

Mr. OVERTON. But the whole cost of such advertising is not borne by the Government; it is simply deductible from gross income by the advertiser. Only a proportionate part is borne by the Government, and it would be borne, anyway, because business enterprise would be advertising its wares.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will recall, as he is a member of the Appropriations Committee, that we have appropriated large sums for posters, and I think letters, and even made allowances for gasoline expenses for certain cars, and I would presume that if we made this appropriation it might be possible, correspondingly, to scale down some others, for the reason that the advertising would reach communities into which now very little advertising is going and, correspondingly, we would have to appropriate less for posters and letters and rallies and gasoline expenses, and the like. Is not that correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct. Furthermore, the Treasury Department is spending a very large sum of money in the preparation of mats and all sorts of literature and material which they send to all the newspapers in the United States. The evidence before our committee tended to show that very few of those things were in fact used by the newspapers, but that the expenditure was a total waste, which the pending bill would eliminate, because if the Government is permitted to send out an advertisement straight to each paper in the country, then it would not be necessary to send out all these mats and suggestions. Some of the material that was presented to the committee I have in my office, and I say that it is a total waste. It does not promote the sale of bonds.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but will he yield for one more question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am at a loss to know why the Treasury Department would not state the amount of money it has spent in advertising in connection with the sale of War bonds. I cannot see why there should be any secrecy about that. I inferred from what the Senator stated, that before the committee the Treasury Department was reluctant to say what the advertising expense was.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the Senator misunderstood me. The Treasury would not make a statement as to that because it did not know what deductions were being made from the income-tax returns of the advertisers. There is no record. I say it is concealed. If the payment is a subsidy, as the opposition claims, it is a hidden subsidy. The Government itself does not know about it.

Mr. BUCK. Will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. In connection with the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, the figure at the top of page 5 of the report is not correct, is it? The statement is:

Letters from the present Secretaries of War and Navy show that nearly $4,000,000,000 of Federal funds were devoted to advertising by those departments during the last fiscal year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that was a clerical error, which the Printing Office promised to correct.

Mr. BUCK. It was intended to say $4,000,000, was it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, approximately $4,000,000. I have the exact figure here. That was a clerical error. When the attention of the Printing Office was called to it, they stated they would have the report reprinted, and the new print placed on the desk of each Senator. I have not followed that up.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The new report contains the figure $4,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The corrected copy of the report is on Senators' desks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has been customary for the Government in normal peacetimes to run paid advertising for recruiting purposes in connection with recruiting for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and no one ever suggested that by such advertising the Government was controlling the editorial policy of any newspaper.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The small-town newspapers in the places where there were boys susceptible to being influenced by such advertising did not get it. The advertisements were put in the city newspapers. That is included in the $4,000,000, I understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No one ever suggested the Government was controlling the editorial policy of papers by such advertising.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, and I do not think any one believes any such thing, anyway; I really do not.

Now, I wish to call attention to the need of some change in the program. The compilation of results of the Third War Loan, issued October 18, 1943, showed an oversubscribed total for the quota, but it also showed that 19 States failed to meet their quotas in regard to individual bond sales, while only 2 States failed to meet their quota for corporations. It is an impressive fact that 38 States failed to sell their quota of E bonds, the principal bond for small investors. The total subscription for E bonds was only 82 percent of the quota.

Mr. President, that is the most significant fact in this situation. It has direct application to the program for advertising in the newspapers in the small towns of the country, where we would ordinarily find the great outlay for bonds, on the part of small investors, but the bonds are not being bought in those places. The small investors are not being reached, because they do not read the dailies published in the large cities, and unless individual canvassers reach them, or unless they see the advertisements in the county newspapers signed by merchants and other local sponsors, they are not educated on the subject, and the appeal does not affect them.

I am sure that anyone who has given consideration to this subject realizes the very great importance to our financial institutions, which recognize the importance of this matter in connection with possible inflation, of reaching the great multitude of small investors. In my judgment, and in the judgment of the great mass of editors and publishers throughout the country, the sale of War bonds must be accomplished by local advertisements, by local effort. I shall refer to that further in a moment.

Now let us look at the matter of redemptions. Whenever we go into a post office or a revenue office we find a line of bondholders waiting to get to the window to redeem the E bonds. That is going on all over the country. The bonds are not being sold effectively under the present methods. In my humble judgment, purchasers are not being reached as they could be reached, and shown the importance of keeping the bonds after they have been persuaded to buy them.

Advertisements prepared in large part by sponsors have not adequately sold the public on the importance of holding bonds after they have been purchased. Many people redeem bonds soon after they have been bought. There is a steady business at post offices and internal revenue offices throughout the country, exchanging bonds for cash. Redeemed bonds must be sold again. Direct Government advertising, pointing out the importance to the war effort and to the Government of the owners of bonds to keep them, would doubtless reduce bond redemptions. Since December 1941 to October 1943, redemption of E bonds amounted to $1,190,000,000, or 7.3 percent of the total sales.

The absorption of the new interest-bearing public debt is of interest. From January 1, 1943, to September 30, the public debt outstanding had increased $49,400,000 000. Senators who are familiar with conditions in the cities, and who study the financial affairs of the country, should take note of these facts.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield in a moment, when I finish this particular statement. I repeat, the absorption of the new interest-bearing public debt is of interest. From January 1, 1943, to September 30 the public debt outstanding had increased $49,400,000,000. Of that amount, commercial banks have taken $17,600,000,000, Federal Reserve banks $2,700,000,000, mutual savings banks $1,400,000,000, insurance companies $3,200,000,000, Federal Government agencies and trust funds $3,600,000,000. All other investors have taken $21,000,000. The last group includes individuals, industrial and commercial corporations, and all types of business not included in the groups above listed. The Treasury has no record of the amount bought by individuals. It is perfectly clear, however, that the amount of the debt held by individuals is totally insufficient, and the sale of more bonds to individuals greatly needs acceleration and emphasis.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator spoke of the amount of E bonds that had been redeemed since 1941. It is my recollection that the Treasury Department issued a statement with respect to the percentage of bonds redeemed compared with the total of bonds issued. Has the Senator that statement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, I have not. I made inquiry to find out what redemption of E bonds was taking place, because as a rule nearly all the other issues of bonds are taken by banks and corporations.

Mr. OVERTON. And many of them are not redeemable.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The businessmen who buy those bonds understand the importance of holding them as long as they can. I wish to say that the banks and the corporations have taken a great part in this program, but from many standpoints it is a dangerous thing that they should feel responsible for such an overwhelming percentage of these bonds.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the number of bonds redeemed is not alarming. On the contrary, I think the picture is very encouraging. Has the Senator figures with respect to the quantity of series E bonds issued? The E bonds are redeemable. As I understand, only one-billion-seven-hundred-odd million dollars of E bonds have been redeemed. Has the Senator the exact figure?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. OVERTON. At any rate, the E bonds redeemed represent a small fraction of the total issued.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The percentage of E bonds redeemed is 7.8, as I read a while ago. I think that is quite a large percentage. It amounts to $1,190,000,000. That is a very substantial figure, indeed.

Mr. OVERTON. That figure of redemption of E bonds given by the Senator does not represent the percentage of the total outstanding issue of all bonds?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. That represents the percentage of the total sale of E bonds specifically.

BANK DEPOSITS

Bank deposits have increased $25,729,000,000 from December 31, 1941, to August 31, 1943. Bank deposits totaled $92,000,000,000 on August 31, 1943, probably the highest in the history of the country. It is evident that the people have a great abundance of money available for the purchase of bonds, and such purchases would to that extent reduce the danger of run-away inflation.

Prevention of inflation and securing stabilization is one of the most important objectives of the bond sales. Distribution among the masses of the people has not yet reached a satisfactory position. We come to that conclusion when we see the many States that have not sold their quotas of bonds to individuals. We may know then that there is need for improvement in that respect.

The estimates show that there are still 13,000,000 of the estimated 36,000,000 families in this Nation, 1 out of every 3, who do not own a single War bond. That applies not only to the small towns in the country but all over the country. Banks, corporations, and various financial institutions and many individuals with large means have bought liberally, and so have many employees through the pay-roll deduction plan. But what about the people who are making good wages and salaries and profits from their farms? These people are many in number and have more or less surplus money to bid against each other for the limited supplies of goods, thereby making rationing more difficult. What is the reason? Mr. Anderson, at the conclusion of the hearings, summarized, in part, as follows:

The Government has failed to use its great home-town weapon, wartime advertising, to the greatest advantage. It has followed the hit-and-miss system, the volunteer system, the pass-the-cup system, and this system in many instances, has been great, but lacking in effectiveness. In the second place, it has failed to reach masses of people.

Other witnesses have clearly shown that in our neighboring country of Canada, the individual sale of Government bonds has been so phenomenally extensive. Today records show that just about every family in Canada owns a War bond or War bonds.

This individual bond sales' success was due, in a large measure, those witnesses stated, to the well-planned, well-placed consistent paid government advertising program.

I quote from a speech I recently made to the Alabama Press Association:

The weekly newspapers are the greatest sufferers from war conditions. Many weeklies have found it necessary to fold up. These papers are prized institutions in the towns and rural areas where they circulate. They have given to their Government until it hurts. They have not threatened to strike. They are going through to the end or as long as they can endure. It is not right for the Government to oppress them as is being done by sending them countless pamphlets, mats, suggestions, arguments, and sales material for publication, but withholding all compensation for services and space acquired. These newspapers are close to the people and capable of rendering far more service than the present uncompensated system permits.

In 1941, 45 weeklies and 17 dailies were discontinued. In 1942 the figures had greatly increased and stood, for weeklies, at 507, and dailies, 88. I have been unable to obtain figures for 1943.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have observed comments made upon the success of the Canadian Government in disposing of its war bonds to the public, and the rather unusual and remarkable difference between their success and ours, when we consider the populations of the two great countries. I wonder if the Senator's investigation of this subject indicates that the policy of the Canadian Government has been to advertise in order to reach the private purchaser.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that I went into that subject before he came into the Chamber, and I read a letter from Dr. Clark, which I will read again. Dr. Clark is in the Department of Finance. He really handles the bond sales program. The report was made and placed in circulation—it was really an answer to Mr. Morgenthau's letter—that paid advertising would displace free-sponsored advertising, and would result in the loss to the Government of the free advertising. So I wrote to my brother, who was at Ottawa, and asked him to submit the question to Dr. Clark, and to get from him a statement, whatever it might be. I was searching for the facts upon the matter.

Here is Dr. Clark's letter, written to my brother:

I note from your letter of October 7 that your brother, Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, expects considerable opposition at the committee hearings in the United States Senate to his bill for a Government advertising appropriation, on the grounds that if the Government pays for this type of advertising the present free publicity will all be lost.

That was exactly the position taken in the report by the Treasury Department.

I read further from the letter:

Our experience is that exactly the opposite condition takes place. Direct Government advertising, with definite and spaced insertion dates during a campaign, provides an impetus that is the basis of a tremendous drive for sponsored advertising by publishers of dailies, weeklies, and other media.

The effect has been cumulative. We are starting our seventh war or victory loan, and by now these sponsored efforts have achieved such momentum that it has become the accepted practice of national and local advertisers to plan their own publicity during our campaign periods to assist the loan drives.

In our own publicity, certain definite statements regarding the methods of purchase must necessarily find a place, and controversial themes are usually avoided. Assisting or sponsored advertising, however, has no restricted elements, and can therefore be of excellent use in directing its appeals toward factions that might otherwise not have been approached.

A further effect of the cumulative barrage of direct and sponsored advertising, both in the press and by radio, is that editors also find it advantageous to play up the news value of Victory loan items, resulting in more liberal treatment in the editorial columns.

While it is difficult to establish an exact ratio, we would be safe in suggesting that the volume of space for free and sponsored advertising is at least equal to three times the amount of space paid for by the Government. Without this Government portion, we feel that the enthusiasm toward sponsored space would by no means be so heavy.

As I have said, Dr. Clark is a civil service Government official in Ottawa, and has been connected with the Government service for many years.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, of course, we must remember the value of this type of advertising in considering the difference in value between the fiscal policy of the United States and the fiscal policy of Canada on this point.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A further thought which comes to my mind is that such advertising is a direct appeal by the Government to the public to come forward and promote its needs and necessities. Stating certain facts, whatever facts they wish to present, is a much more effective way. That was agreed upon by practically every witness who was asked about it at the hearings held by the committee. It is much more effective than hit-or-miss advertisements, as they are called,

in many of which the advertiser inserts what he thinks should go into the advertisements, and the Treasury Department does not control what goes into them. So, in preparing such advertisements, one community will make one argument and another community will make another, and very often they are in conflict. They are unofficial, and without definite authority. They do not create the effective appeal to the people that a direct appeal from the Government, especially during wartimes, and on patriotic subjects involving the continuance of the war, would have. Of course, an appeal of that sort is more impressive and effective.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator tell us whether the Canadian law is mandatory and requires the Government to advertise?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; it is not mandatory, because it is not necessary to have it mandatory.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's bill provides that it shall be mandatory, does it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct, because the Treasury Department would not do it but adopted a different policy. In Canada the advertising policy pursued was adopted without any requirement to do so.

My secretary is now looking among my papers for a newspaper clipping giving the results of the last newspaper advertising campaign in Canada. The report, which was published in the Washington newspapers, states that the campaign has been highly successful, and that, although they have had seven campaigns, they have sold more bonds this time than they previously sold under the same type of program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Canadian law require the Government to do any advertising? Does it require them, for instance, to use all newspapers or any particular group of newspapers?

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I stated to the Senator, the whole matter is voluntary and is left to the discretion of the administrative officials—whether they will advertise, in what newspapers they will advertise, and all such matters. However, they have set up machinery, without any law requiring it, under which they cooperate with the press associations. In fact, the program has been largely turned over to the newspaper associations. The newspaper association in Michigan sent a delegation to Canada to make an investigation this summer. The delegation found the program to be most successful and satisfactory. The members of the delegation appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency and gave an account of the program. The Senator will find it in the hearings.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am familiar with it, but I am not certain about the Canadian law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think the details are stated. The Government of Canada had the cooperation of the association in handling the program and in making it a smoothly managed one, and in making it successful in bringing in money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Canadian Government have a cooperative program for advertising?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, for the sale of bonds and for other matters.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's bill would make it mandatory for bond sales; would it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. It would work well in this country. In former years it worked well in England and worked well in the United States. It worked well in World War No. 1. The program is not a new one for this country.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Is it not a fact that the situation in the United States is identical with the situation in Canada?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is now; yes.

Mr. MALONEY. Without the bill, the situation in the United States is exactly the same as the situation in Canada; is it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator seemed to lay emphasis upon the fact that the present advertising practice, whereby the newspaper people themselves, or through committees, solicit contributions from local residents, results in the publication of advertisements which do not have the official approval of the Treasury Department, and which thereby are not effective.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not say they were not effective.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator have any criticism of that kind of advertisement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. MALONEY. Has the Senator ever heard any criticism of it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I have heard a good deal of criticism before our committee.

Mr. MALONEY. I mean aside from the newspaper publishers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not talked about the matter elsewhere, but I can readily see that there is criticism of the plan, although it has not been pressed. I make no charges against the diligence and serious effort of the Treasury Department on that subject, but I think the Senator can well recognize that when merchants or small or large business concerns sign an advertisement, many persons who read it say, "Oh, that fellow does not know what he is talking about. I know as much about it as he does." They know the advertisement was inserted because of some pressure by some committee.

As I stated before, the Treasury Department has nothing to do with those advertisements, and does not place them.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes; and that suits me. I am more satisfied by the effort of the local merchants.

I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Does the Senator have any fear that if the bill were to become law the owners of billboards, the outdoor advertising agencies, the radio, the foreign-language newspapers, State magazines, and other similar publicity instrumentalities would ask for the same thing?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whether they would.

Mr. MALONEY. Would the Senator feel he could deny it to them?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. On what ground?

Mr. BANKHEAD. On the ground that when a billboard is erected, everyone sees it, so what is the use of paying anything for that service?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator does not mean that, I am sure.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Everyone sees the billboards. The country people, the small-town people, and the poor people generally do not read newspapers, but they do see the billboard advertisements.

Mr. MALONEY. Why not spend all the money for billboard advertisements?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not needed.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Connecticut asked a question about the difference between the Canadian situation and the situation in the United States. Certainly there is a very great difference between the policies of the two governments.

On page 41 of the hearings Mr. Doyle L. Buckles, field manager of the Alabama Press Association, called attention to a statement by Mr. G. H. Lash, director of public information for Canada. In that statement Mr. Lash makes very clear the policy of the Canadian Government, and what the Canadian Government is doing. Mr. Lash stated:

> We are operating a democracy. Therefore, we do not demand that newspapers run government ads without payment for them.

Mr. Lash further stated:

> Display advertising may be likened to a heavy artillery barrage under which advances are made and objectives reached and consolidated.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In Canada, the Government has paid for its press advertising as it has paid for any other commodity.

Mr. Lash further stated:

> The British Government is the largest single advertiser in the English press.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Alabama has dwelt at some length on the apparent success of the Canadian Government in selling individual War bonds by means of advertising, as a method of controlling inflation. I think most of us recognize that in another sector of the inflation-control front, that of controlling prices, the Canadian Government has also been much more successful than has our Government to date. It has used subsidies to a much wider extent than we have used them here. I am wondering if the Senator from Alabama would be in favor of following the same precedent

he now advocates, and adopting a much wider use of subsidies in this country to control prices.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will not be diverted on that subject.

I have a bill pending before the committee of which the Senator is a member, and he can ascertain my views there.

Mr. BALL. In that particular field, it is my impression that the Senator from Alabama does not think the Canadian experience is a very good guide.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is a splendid guide on most subjects. It may be on that subject. I am not against all subsidies. I am in favor of good subsidies. I favor a number of subsidies, and do not favor others. I am selective about it. I have so stated on the floor of the Senate time and again. However, I am opposed to roll-back subsidies as a general policy. I am not going into that subject at this time.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an impertinent suggestion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I think the Senator's sponsorship of this bill conclusively proves that he favors subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not agree to that statement at all. If the Senator had done me the honor to remain in the Chamber and hear my argument, I doubt if he would have made such a statement. He is jumping at conclusions.

Speaking further about the Canadian system, it is reliably reported that every family in Canada has bought a War bond. That fact has been published time and again in the Canadian newspapers. The Canadian Government prides itself on that statement. In the United States, a third of our families have not bought War bonds.

Banks throughout the country are overflowing with money belonging to individuals who are restless for trade action. As goods for sale steadily and rapidly become less in quantity, and in many cases inferior in quality, the danger of inflation is being accelerated. It grows more threatening and alarming. The sale of "E" bonds to individuals will take money, to that extent, out of competition for the purchase of goods. It will reduce the increasing strain on commercial banks as it is found necessary from time to time to absorb in larger amounts the bonded debt of the country.

The sale of bonds to individuals, many of whom have spare money but who have bought no bonds; the sale of bonds to millions who have bought some bonds and who are in position to buy more; and convincing bond owners that they should not redeem or otherwise dispose of their bonds are important factors involved in the pending bill.

It is the judgment of an overwhelming majority of editors and publishers, ascertained through action of the National Editorial Association, 40 State press associations, and numerous polls, that direct appeals by the Government through campaigns of responsible paid advertising will effectively convince millions of people who are not now sufficiently interested that in the public interest and in the interest of the war effort there should be a much wider distribution of Government bonds among the masses of the people. These editors and publishers live in the domain of advertising and study its effectiveness. No group has more unselfishly devoted its time without pay to our war effort than they have done. They are not backing this bill merely to get more advertising for their newspapers. They have been most reluctant to bring into the hearings on this bill the effects upon their business of the present operations of the Treasury Department in conducting War bond sales campaigns.

Business groups have always advised congressional committees on taxes, price control and rationing, food problems, appropriations, and all other subjects of legislation. In the same way, and in a spirit of helpfulness, the editors and publishers who have membership in the National Editorial Association—more than 5,000 in number—and the members of 40 State press associations, speaking through their associations, have recommended to Congress the passage of this bill. They strongly believe its passage is definitely in the public interest. I fully agree with them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have waited for the Senator to complete his statement before interrupting him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I appreciate the patience of the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. First, let me say to the Senator that I have no fear that the Government is going to impair the independence of the American press by buying advertising space. That thought does not remotely enter my mind.

I should like to ask the Senator what the language of the bill means. In line 9, on page 2, the language is:

> The advertising space so purchased shall be divided equitably among all newspapers—

In line 8 on page 3, the provision is that the space shall be fairly distributed.

Are not those two qualifications completely nullified by the committee amendment, which eliminates all discretion on the part of the Treasury Department, and requires the purchase of all available space in every newspaper?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not all available space.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I mean all the space which is available for a given campaign. The provision is that the space shall be divided equally among all newspapers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Within the funds available.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly. What do the terms "divided equitably" and "fairly distribute" mean under those circumstances?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the definition is completed by the committee amendment, which provides that the same space shall be offered to all newspapers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The point I am making is that the Senator must rely upon the committee amendment, and therefore we must adopt the committee amendment in order to prevent the act from being used, let us say, for punitive purposes, if the Administrator should wish to use it for such purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Administrator would have to violate the express order of Congress in order to make an unfair distribution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The committee amendment was not included in the original bill, and it changes the character of the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not agree with that statement. I think it makes fair and equitable distribution more certain. It makes impossible the unfair or inequitable administration of the law.

As the Senator knows, from time to time during the pendency of this bill I have suggested to Senators that if they had any amendments to propose which would make more certain the fair and honest distribution of space, and the proper administration of the program, they should submit such amendments. If the Senator can suggest any language which would achieve that result, I shall be happy to have him do so, not in the spirit of opposition but in an effort to improve the bill. Of course, if the Senator is attacking the bill, that is another thing. I want a fair bill. I want a successful bill. I want a bill which will not subject the Congress to criticism and which will help to advance the war effort. I have worked on it to the best of my ability. The Senate committee has worked on it. Newspaper associations have worked on it. Leaders of the national association met at Chicago to consider the question. The supporters of the program are, of course, intensely interested in its successful administration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish I could help the Senator with some specific suggestions, and I shall make one or two in a moment; but I say to him frankly that I find myself on the horns of this dilemma: If the committee amendment is not adopted——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, the Senator can conceive of something that would make it absolutely certain that the law would not be administered fairly. The measure will not be adopted if there is capricious objection to the program, whether right or wrong, in an effort to defeat it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to complete my observation, I find myself on the horns of this dilemma: If the committee amendment requiring the purchase of equal space in every newspaper of the United States is not adopted, then obviously the bill is open to partisan use—using "partisan" in a broad sense. On the other hand, by the insertion of the amendment eliminating all discretion in the purchasing of advertising space, it ceases to be a commercial operation, because advertising is never commercially purchased on that basis.

So I say to the Senator that I find myself in that dilemma, although I totally sympathize with him in his belief that

the smaller publishers have an exceedingly difficult challenge when they have to get sponsored advertising space for Government purposes.

But I wish to go one step further into the inquiry. May I ask who prepares the copy of the advertisements which are to be paid for by the Government?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suppose they would be the same persons who are preparing it now, except that under this bill it must be prepared in cooperation with the representatives of the two great national press associations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point to which I was coming.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the cooperation involve approval on the part of the publishers' associations?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know what form of approval would be required, but I do not think the Senator has any doubt that if they are authorized to cooperate they will do so. The members of both associations are interested in this program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can conceive of this space being used, let us say, in an October bond drive preceding a November election. I can conceive of it being used in a totally legitimate way for bond promotion, let us say, with a great picture of the Commander in Chief, and with the chief slogan which was used in the last bond drive, namely, "The Commander in Chief wants you to buy War bonds." I am sure the Senator will agree that in an October preceding a November election that sort of copy, otherwise legitimate, would not be legitimate at Government expense under those circumstances. That is the reason I am asking where the final approval rests with respect to copy, in view of the fact that the bill at least pretends to permit the publishers' associations to have something to say about the copy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would rest right where the bill now provides. The situation would not be improved any by defeating the bill. It would be wide open as it has been all the time. The bill provides a limitation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So the Secretary of the Treasury, in the Senator's conception of the bill, would have the final authority on the approval of the copy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, he would have to operate under the law. We have to trust our officials. The Senator knows the Secretary of the Treasury is opposing the bill. He is not seeking the power provided by it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator a practical question. Fifteen percent of the $30,000,000 would not go to the publishers at all if the advertising were placed through advertising agencies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know about that. I think it would all go to the publishers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Fifteen percent would go to the advertising agencies placing the copy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Where does the Senator find that in the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is newspaper practice.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no need for it under the pending bill. This is a different program than has ever been enacted, because there are but two things to do in order to get out the advertisements; one is to prepare the copy, and the other is to market it. Why does the Senator want to pay 15 percent to anybody?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, the Senator does not intend that the advertising copy shall be placed through advertising agencies? Am I correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no more control over it than the Senator has. The Senator would know more about it than I would because he knows about the newspaper business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am asking for a practical suggestion from the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under the proposed program of supplying copy to all newspapers alike, I do not see any need for paying 15 percent commission for placing the copy. Does the Senator see any need for it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I certainly do not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not either.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But the committee amendment in the Senator's bill would require that the space shall be paid for at the prevailing published rate for the respective newspapers, and the prevailing rate for newspapers contemplates and is made in view of an expected 15-percent commission payment to advertising agencies. I am suggesting to the Senator that the bill be amended to read that the space shall be paid for at the prevailing published rate for the respective newspapers with the same discounts available to the Government as are available to advertising agencies. What does the Senator have to say about that? That is four and a half million dollars of the $30,000,000. I say that the prevailing published rate which has to be paid includes the contemplated 15-percent payment to advertising agencies. That is common standard newspaper practice.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That may be true so far as the large cities are concerned, or such cities as that in which the Senator lives.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I beg the Senator's pardon; that is standard practice down to the smallest publication in this country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know that that is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sure that the Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, I am correct. I have not been in the business for more than 30 years for nothing.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When a merchant comes in and places an advertisement in a weekly newspaper, does he pay a 15-percent commission?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not talking about local advertising. There is no advertising agency commission, as a rule, on local advertising. There is a standard 15-percent commission, however, on all so-called national advertising. Such advertising comes from the outside. If the Government advertising were to be placed through agencies the agencies would receive 15-percent commission for every publication in which the advertising is placed, and I will say to the Senator that if it is to be placed directly by the Government that four and a half million dollars should either remain in the Treasury or be used to buy that much additional advertising space.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Possibly the Senate committee had the same thing in mind. It is my understanding that in the hearings it was brought out by the proponents of the proposed legislation that it was expected it would be necessary to pay 15-percent commission. Am I correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly it is expected to be paid. It is standard practice.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether he has any knowledge of advertising being placed by the Government. I understand that some has been placed by the Government with newspapers through agencies at the 15-percent commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no information on the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, it is not necessary to place the advertising through agencies.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That may be true, but the committee amendment provides that the space has to be paid for at the prevailing published rate, and I am saying that the advertising should cost 15 percent less than the prevailing rate if it is not to be placed through advertising agencies.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course I am. There can be no question about it.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator if it is customary to place Government advertising through agencies?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Whether it is placed through agencies or not, I want the four and a half million dollars saved, if the bill shall be passed, and I should think that I would be serving the ends of the Senator from Alabama by making such a suggestion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would the Senator have much inclination to vote for the bill if his suggestion were adopted?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should not have much inclination.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I thought. I did not think the Senator had much interest in seeing the bill passed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator a further question as to how the figure of $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 was arrived at in striking the total.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was arrived at in relation to the Canadian program. The amount is, of course, necessarily arbitrary. We have about 10 times the population of Canada. Canada was spending approximately $3,000,000 on its program and we adopted a figure representing 10 times that amount. There is a margin allowed between the $25,000,000 and $30,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement. I want to amend to this extent the answer I gave to his last question. I find myself greatly perplexed by this bill because I have always felt it was rather an anomaly that the Government of the United States should pay for the commodities of everybody else except the newspaper publishers. I can see a very good reason for experimenting in the Government purchase of newspaper advertising space, even though I think it has dangerous implications. I am inclined to think I would support a limited experiment in this direction to see how it works; and if the Senator were to accept the amendment, which I understand will be proposed, to make this experiment on a 50-percent basis instead of the rather substantial extent which he now indicates in the bill, I might go along. I am not hostile to the objective, but I think that in its pending form it is subject to very serious criticism.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think all of us perhaps have a sympathetic feeling toward the idea of newspapers being paid for the only merchandise they have to sell; but there is one aspect of the subject which has troubled me ever since this bill has come up. So I desire to propound a question to the Senator from Alabama. At the present time there is, as I understand, authority in the Secretary of the Treasury to do this advertising, and he also has ample funds to do it without this bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; he does not have.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He is doing it every day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; he is not.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. What about the advertisements that are appearing in magazines and newspapers?

Mr. BANKHEAD. They are put in by the War and Navy Departments, and not by the Treasury Department.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is just beating the devil around the bush in another way.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Appropriations are not made in such a way that the amounts provided for one department may be spent by another.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It is all Federal money, is it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. One department cannot spend money appropriated for another department. I was told the department had the authority, but needed the money.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. They needed the money?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, they did not have sufficient money for this purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Alabama whether he or the committee have given any consideration to requiring war industries, which are spending such tremendous sums in advertising and which I understand are allowed to deduct the cost from their income tax, to spend a percentage of this immense sum with the smaller publications in the smaller towns.

I do not know what the percentage should be, but it seems to me that if it were handled in that way, there would be no question of anybody in the Government having an opportunity to use such advertising for political purposes if they were so minded; and, of course, no Government is entirely free of such things. Was any consideration given to that means of helping the smaller newspapers and publications?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, we did not go into that phase of it.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not that be a better way to handle it? It seems to me that it would be.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We did not think so. Of course that would complicate the matter, would involve one program with another, and would naturally bring insistence from others who are interested in other phases.

Mr. AIKEN. I should say that if the great war industries are permitted to spend the immense sums they are spending and to deduct the amount thus spent from their income tax, they should be required to distribute these sums equitably so as to cover the smaller newspapers. If that were done, it seems to me we would eliminate a good deal of the objection raised to the pending bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know of the extent of the advertising programs they engage in, but, of course, the Senator has opportunity, as every other Senator has, any time an appropriation bill comes before the Senate, to endeavor to limit the use of the funds in line with his ideas.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say to the Senator, that if the sums so expended are to be deductible from their incomes, it could be provided that they would have to spend a certain percentage of the amount above what they spent for the years, say, 1937, 1938, and 1939, for advertising space purchased in newspapers directly in support of the war effort; otherwise the deduction would not be permitted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 1, line 3, the bill refers to idle currency. What does the Senator have in mind? What is meant by the words "idle currency"?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The tremendous deposits which I just mentioned in the banks, which are not being used, and the danger of such idle currency held by individuals and others being spent in a dwindling market for supplies and commodities.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make another inquiry. Question was raised this morning about industrial advertising which now appears in the newspapers and magazines. Does the Senator think if the Government were compelled to spend the amount of money provided by the bill that the same amount as is now expended would be spent by private agencies, or might it be that they would quit and the bond advertising in the newspapers would then have to rely solely upon the $30,000,000 proposed to be appropriated?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The most effective answer—and I presume the Senator heard me refer to it—is the actual experience of Canada, where instead of abandoning their advertising they increased it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator means private advertising?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was increased?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was increased by Government-paid advertising, which accelerated the whole program and worked up greater enthusiasm, all operating together.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand that that is a known fact in Canada?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, yes; it was so stated in a letter which I read from the chief assistant in the finance department, the man in actual charge of the bond campaigns in Canada.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask another question in regard to paragraph 4.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that question, if he will allow me, I should like to know how the Senator from Alabama squares that answer with the fact that the chief reason given for the necessity of the pending legislation is that the local sponsors are now declining to sponsor bond advertising, and this is proposed as a substitute for it? That is one of the reasons here given in behalf of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not what the man I have quoted says, but it is stated that the fact that the Government of Canada is participating encourages the sponsors, and the net result is three times as much private sponsorship as is paid for by the Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; Canada says it has increased sponsored advertisements, but the Senate hearings are full of argument that this appropriation is necessary in lieu of sponsored advertising, which is now becoming very difficult to get, and the Senator has repeatedly emphasized that fact in his speech.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I never did argue that it was in lieu of; I said all the time that it encouraged private advertising and made it more effective.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I should like to ask another question. Section 4 on page 3 reads:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

I assume it is going to take another bureau, or at least, the enlargement of an existing bureau, in order that the advertising matter may be placed in the various newspapers throughout the 48 States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see, in fairness, why the Senator assumes that. Why does he assume it?

Mr. FERGUSON. How would the work be done?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Just as it is now done by the Treasury Department. They are sending out more material now than they would under this program.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, the cost would be covered by the twenty-five or thirty million dollars, and if they used any money for that purpose, it would be taken out of that sum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They have an appropriation already which we made to them for carrying on these campaigns and programs. There are general funds. I do not know what they would take it out of; it would not make any particular difference which one they took it out of. It is all Government money, and the Senator knows there would be no new bureau and no additional bureaucracy. The Treasury Department are carrying on the work now. They have their organization set up. They are sending out this material all the time, a countless number of pieces, many of which it is not necessary to send out. I think it would reduce instead of increase the number of employees.

Mr. FERGUSON. But if used in some way, it would be included in the $25,000,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot say that. That would be up to Congress. It is not provided for in the bill either way.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. There may be some place in the report of the hearings where the information I am seeking was brought out, but if so, I have failed to see it. I have wondered about the number of newspapers the Senator figures would be affected by the bill. How many would participate in the program?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would be voluntary on the part of the newspapers. There is no provision in the bill and there is no law requiring them to take advantage of it. The whole program is voluntary.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator have in mind the total number of publications?

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are about 9,000 weekly newspapers and about 1,700 daily newspapers, making approximately 11,000 altogether.

Mr. BUTLER. A few days ago I received information from the Congressional Library showing the number of publications of various kinds, beginning with the dailies, numbering 2,100, and weeklies 11,000 plus, then miscellaneous, monthly, semimonthly, biweekly, and so on, the total number on January 31, 1942, being 14,100, and 13,450 on January 31, 1943. Using the round number of 14,000, if we divide that into the $30,000,000 that is supposed to be appropriated, it will give something over $2,000 to each publication, provided the money is distributed equally. I want to know a little more, if the Senator can tell me, about how he proposes that the $30,000,000 shall be distributed to the 14,000 publications.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the first place, there are not that many which would qualify. There are a great many included in the newspaper books and lists which are not qualified. The periodicals issued by some organizations are not qualified to make use of the mails under the statute mentioned in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I rather think the statement the Senator makes that all of them cannot qualify is true.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the second place, I do not attach any importance to that because it does not affect the amount of money.

Mr. BUTLER. If 10,000 qualified, there would be $3,000 per newspaper. I wondered if the thirty million would be prorated among the 14,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has a fundamental misunderstanding about the distribution of the money. The money is to be distributed on the space basis, and the pay is to be based on established rates. The New York Times, for instance, with its advertising rate very much higher than that of the weekly newspaper in the Senator's home town, would not get the same amount of money. They would get the space just the same. It would result, of course, in the high-advertising-rate newspapers getting substantially more than the little newspapers get. In other words, it would bring about a fair distribution, each paper being paid on its circulation basis, because the rates are conformed and established, and advertisers are paid according to the circulation.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, if I understand the Senator correctly, half of the $30,000,000 would go to the large newspapers, which are not particularly anxious for this source of income. In fact, I might say that just yesterday a gentleman who was in charge of the recent bond program in Nebraska told me over the telephone that they did not favor the bill because, under the proposed program, there would not be as much advertising pushing the sale of bonds as there was under the program under which they made the last sale of bonds. That was his opinion. Of course, I am not in a position to say whether that is a fact or not, but it is the opinion of the man who was chairman of the bond drive in Nebraska.

The $30,000,000 would be divided between the two classes of publishers—those in towns with populations above 10,000 and those in towns of 10,000 and below. The question arises, Would we satisfy the man with the small circulation by giving him a paltry two or three hundred dollars and letting the large portion of the appropriation go to those with the larger circulation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not at all the basis of the program, as I have pointed out to the Senator. The little newspaper will get exactly the same amount of money it would get if the advertising was paid for by a merchant in its town, and so would the New York Times, or any other newspaper.

Mr. BUTLER. It would not be divided pro rata, then?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not numerically; of course not.

Mr. BUTLER. I have been besieged with requests from those who operate radio stations, in my own State and elsewhere, and those who operate billboards, and those who operate what they call controlled circulation. They want to know where they are to come in on this appropriation. I suspect that without an amendment of some kind they would not be included; would they?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I would not include them. This is not a program for them. The radio stations, generally speaking, have more business than they can handle.

Mr. BUTLER. Some newspapers have, too.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The radio industry reported to the Treasury that last year they had $60,000,000 of sponsored advertising.

Mr. BUTLER. I doubt if the radio companies in operation are more successful than the same percentage of those publishing newspapers; but they are an advertising medium, and I do not know why we should select one group of advertisers, and not another.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can tell the Senator why he does not know; it is because he is opposed to the whole program.

Mr. BUTLER. No, I am not, because I am willing to admit, as well as is the Senator who sponsors the bill, that the editors of the weekly newspapers are among the best friends any of us have. I merely want to see those who are running billboard advertising put on an equality with them. There are in my State many papers which are distributed otherwise than being sent through the mail. They feel they are entitled to a share of the benefits proposed, and I should like to see the advertisers all treated alike.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly what is done by the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And I have not heard of such a complaint from beginning to end. The Senator is a member of the committee, and I have not heard the complaint from anyone else that the program would not treat all alike.

Mr. BUTLER. It includes the newspaper group; but the Senator himself says that it does not include all those who sell advertising.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Do not newspapers sell it?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but those operating billboards as well sell it, and the radio sells it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is not intended to cover all phases of publicity.

Mr. BUTLER. Then should not the appropriation be doubled so as to include all the advertisers?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think so, because there is not sufficient need.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Has the Senator any information concerning statements which have been made to me repeatedly that the daily newspapers do not want this advertising?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Most of them do not, according to my information, because they are getting all of what is called the institutional or national advertising. They do not allow that to go into any newspaper in a town of less than 25,000 population.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then I ask the Senator, What is the use including them if they do not want it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is a good question, if they are in good faith about it. I do not know of anyone complaining about them not being included. The complaint voiced by the Senator from Nebraska was the first I have heard on that subject.

I have already referred to a notice in the Evening Star of this city begging people not to bring them any more advertising. It appeared on the front page of the Star just a day or two ago, and read:

Notice to readers and advertisers. It is necessary to limit the size of each day's paper in order to control the amount of advertising that can be printed in the Star.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have had assurances from various newspapermen with whom I am acquainted that they did not want this advertising.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is my information from all around. They are afraid they might lose some advertising. They want to keep what they have. They cannot publish any more.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call attention to the words of the bill in line 10, page 1, "and directed to purchase." Is it the Senator's feeling that they mean that the Secretary of the Treasury must do this whether he wants to or not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; because it will not be done otherwise. The Secretary of the Treasury states frankly that he is opposed to the proposal, and that he does not wish to do what the bill proposes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to that very effect. I notice the statement in the report made by the committee that the Secretary of the Treasury did not favor the proposal, but what he said was not included, so I wrote the Secretary and asked him what the present feeling of the Department was with respect to this matter. I have not only a copy of a letter addressed to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but also the answer to my inquiry, which is as follows:

NOVEMBER 11, 1943.

Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your letter of November 10 you inquire as to the position of the Treasury Department with regard to S. 1457, the bill which would require the expenditure of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 each year for newspaper advertising of the sale of Government bonds.

The Treasury Department is opposed to the enactment of that bill. The Secretary of the Treasury expressed his opposition to the bill in a letter to Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, dated May 27, 1943, a copy of which is enclosed. While that letter had reference to S. 1073, an earlier version of the present S. 1457, yet the objection in principle applies with equal force to the latter bill.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD the letter written by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], under date of May 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 27, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have requested my opinion as to the merits of the Bankhead bill (S. 1073), to require the Secretary of the Treasury to spend $25,000,000 per year for newspaper advertising of Government War bonds, with at least $12,500,000 of advertising required to be placed yearly with weekly, semiweekly, triweekly, and monthly newspapers. In addition, the bill would in effect establish the Secretary of the Treasury as advertising administrator for the Government, in control of the advertising budgets of other Government agencies and under duty to prescribe regulations to safeguard the freedom and independence of the press and its right to criticize public officials.

I am opposed to the enactment of this bill, primarily because it might jeopardize the continued success of the Government's vital war-loan program under my direction. Moreover, the broad regulatory powers over the press which the bill would confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury are foreign in nature to the functions of that office, and I would not care to assume the exercise of such powers.

The war-loan campaign has been a voluntary, united effort of the whole American people. The Second War Loan drive, concluded early this month, was, as you know, an overwhelming success. The total goal of $13,000,000,000 was exceeded by $5,000,000,000.

An army of volunteers labored devotedly to realize that success. Workers, advertisers, advertising media, retailers, theaters, and others contributed wholeheartedly to this vital cause. Newspapers, both country papers and the great metropolitan dailies, gave invaluable support in the handling of news and features and in the promotion of sponsored advertising. Magazines, farm publications, outdoor advertising, and other media cooperated splendidly. The radio stations of the country gave us hundreds of shows throughout the drive. The movies placed their Nation-wide facilities at our disposal all during the campaign. Advertisers, as a patriotic service, contributed unparalleled amounts of their own space and time to War bond advertising. Business houses, industrial firms, stores, and theaters all cooperated earnestly in promoting the drive. In sum, the war-loan campaign has been a national voluntary effort which has received the unstinted support of all segments of business and industry without thought or expectation of compensation.

Our successful financial mobilization will require other war-loan drives in proportions at least equal to the Second War Loan drive just ended. The full total of our war expenditures this calendar year will be more than $100,000,000,000. About $70,000,000,000, less whatever amount of new taxes Congress may provide, must be raised by borrowings from all sources during the calendar year. New money raised during the 4-month period January through April, including that raised during the second War Loan drive just ended, amounted to $25,000,000,000. We must, therefore, raise the remaining $45,000,000,000 during the balance of this year. With this staggering task before us, I should be disappointed to see our efforts impeded, or perhaps even thwarted, as I believe they might be, as a result of the enactment of the bill under discussion.

The bill makes provision for purchase of advertising space only in newspapers. It makes no provision for expenditures in magazines, farm publications, outdoor advertising, radio, movies, or other media. The Treasury has received, and is continuing to receive, tremendous amounts of free space and time from these media. Individual advertisers also continue to donate large amounts of their own space and time to War-bond advertising. I fear that the discriminatory selection of one class of advertising media for Government support would tend to discourage continued contributions by other media and their advertisers and would have an unfortunate effect upon the heretofore remarkable voluntary responses of all classes of business concerns and individuals. It has been the purpose to make the bond-purchase program an integral part of our national war effort springing from a patriotic sense of obligation and a desire to contribute all one can to the national effort. That purpose has in large measure been achieved, I believe, and I should dislike now to see introduced a confusion of motives or a policy of discrimination with reference to any class or group.

One in my position, responsible for our tremendous war-financing program, must be sensitive to the great contributions made to that program by the newspapers of this country. I do not profess to have an especial understanding of the economic position of any classes of newspapers that are intended to be the beneficiaries of the present bill. I do believe, however, that there would be grave danger to the success of the war-financing program if it were to be made the specific vehicle for an avowed policy of Government assistance to any classes of newspapers.

I have confined my comment to those aspects of the bill of immediate concern to me in my official capacity as Secretary of the Treasury. Beyond that, however, I hold strong personal feelings as to the unwisdom and danger of the bill in opening the road toward Government subsidy of the press. On that score, I expect that the committee will invite the views of Government officials directly concerned with relations between the Government and the press.

I urge that the bill not be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the language at the bottom of page 1 to which the Senator from South Dakota has called attention, the reply of the Senator from Alabama was that the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to place the advertising, that it was not left to his discretion. Does that mean

that the Secretary would be required under the terms of the bill to place the advertising in newspapers which did not want it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; it simply means that he is required to offer it. He cannot require a newspaper to take the advertising if the newspaper does not desire it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the terms of the bill he is not required to place the advertising in a daily newspaper, for example, which does not desire it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No. To begin with that cannot be done under the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder whether the newspapers to which the advertising is offered would regard it as a mandate that they must carry it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I should not think so at all. It is not the purpose of the bill in any way to make it mandatory. If a newspaper does not want to take it, that is the newspaper's privilege.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I wonder if the Senator has seen the estimate made by the O. W. I. of advertising time contributed by the radio industry per annum? The O. W. I. has issued a statement estimating that the radio industry is contributing at the rate of $103,000,000 a year in advertising time without charge for the various Government information programs, bond selling, and so forth.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I saw a statement to the effect that the radio industry had contributed, I think, $62,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a short article published in the weekly magazine Broadcasting, under date of November 8, 1943, summarizing the O. W. I. estimate of $103,582,000 in time contributed by the radio industry free of charge.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THREE MILLION DOLLARS IN TIME, TALENT GIVEN WAR BY RADIO—NEW O. W. I. COMPILATION SHOWS PART INDUSTRY PLAYS IN DONATING FACILITIES FOR WAR CAMPAIGNS

Year-round cooperation given by the broadcasting industry to war information campaigns scheduled through the Radio Bureau now exceeds $103,000,000, the O. W. I. estimated last week. The figure is based on the net value of time and talent donated by networks and stations.

In presenting its estimate, the Bureau revised a figure of $86,000,000 given last January. The new estimate does not include $1,000,000 in time and talent voluntarily contributed by stations and sponsors aside from O. W. I. commitments, the Bureau asserted.

NETS GIVE $43,000,000

The revised figure includes an estimated total of nearly $43,000,000 for the value of network programs carrying war messages under the network-allocation and special-assignment plans. Commercial programs in the national-spot plan accounted for $1,433,000 and local station time and talent for local war programs, Government transcriptions and O. W. I. announcements aggregated more than $59,000,000 net.

A break-down of the estimate by O. W. I. radio facilities follows:

In computing the value of time and talent, the Bureau explained, O. W. I. based its estimates on card rates after deducting maximum quantity and frequency discounts and adding average talent costs on basis of 30 percent of gross time cost for evening shows, 20 percent of gross time for daytime, sustaining, spot and local shows.

The Bureau estimated that 7,500 network programs are scheduled for war messages during the year under the network-allocation plan. Under the national-spot plan, 2,500 regional and spot programs are slated. Under the special-assignment plan 2,500 network programs are assigned.

A total of 3,280,715 separate 1-minute announcements are broadcast annually under the station-announcement plan. In computing the value of local war programs, it was estimated the average station contributes $1,200 a week in time and talent. This classification includes programs cleared through O. W. I. regional station relations offices.

Net allocation	$32,223,000
Net spot allocation	1,433,000
Special assignment	10,741,000
Station announcement	17,065,000
Local war programs and transcriptions initiated by stations, O. W. I., and Government agencies	42,120,000
Total	103,582,000

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Again referring to lines 9 and 10, page 1, of the bill, we find the words, "The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase." If the Secretary of the Treasury approaches a newspaper under a direction to purchase, I wonder whether there would not be a sort of a moral duress which would have an influence with the operator of the newspaper, whether he wanted to sell any space or not. Would the Senator agree to change that language so as to read "is directed to offer to purchase"?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that is what I had in mind. I shall be glad to make that change. That sets forth the spirit and objective of the measure. If the Senator offers that language, I will accept it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot offer it now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Unless some Senator has a further question, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to the Senator making the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, but I desire to obtain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not care for a quorum unless the Senator wishes the presence of a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think we ought to have a quorum if there is to be further discussion of the measure.

Mr. OVERTON. Very well; I have no objection to the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so long as I do not lose the floor. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a qurum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Revercomb
Andrews	Gillette	Reynolds
Austin	Green	Robertson
Ball	Guffey	Russell
Bankhead	Hatch	Scrugham
Barbour	Hawkes	Shipstead
Barkley	Hayden	Smith
Bilbo	Hill	Stewart
Brewster	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Langer	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Connally	Moore	Walsh
Danaher	Nye	Wheeler
Davis	O'Daniel	Wherry
Downey	O'Mahoney	White
Eastland	Overton	Wiley
Ellender	Pepper	Willis
Ferguson	Radcliffe	Wilson
George	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think I shall begin by making the observation that there is no Member of the Senate or no one within the range of my acquaintance for whom I entertain a higher regard or a more sincere affection than I do for the author of the bill, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]; and if I make any remarks which in any way would seem to question the motives back of the bill, I do not wish the senior Senator from Alabama to think they refer to him; because not only in my estimation but in the estimation of all other Senators and in the estimation of the entire country there is no one who can successfully impugn either the motives or the high character and standing of the senior Senator from Alabama. Nor do I wish to have anything which I may say considered as reflecting upon the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who voted in favor of reporting the bill. I understand there was a sharp division among the members of the committee. I do not see any minority report, but I have been advised by one of the members of the committee that there was a division among the members of the committee as to the propriety of reporting the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the committee the vote was 11 in favor of reporting the bill and 5 opposed to reporting it.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I did not hear the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, the author of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Alabama said there were 11 members of the committee who voted for reporting the bill and 5 who voted against reporting it.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think there were five of us, including myself, who voted against reporting the bill. But no minority report was filed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have no prejudice against newspapers as such, and especially have I none whatsoever—on the contrary, I have a very warm feeling—for what are known as the country newspapers, the weekly newspapers, and the biweekly newspapers.

The first money I ever earned was earned while I was working in a country newspaper office. I folded the entire output on Friday afternoons and mailed the entire issue, for which I received 25 cents; and generally I would have to walk about a mile to the home of the owner of the newspaper, who was also the editor and the publisher and the reporter, in order to collect my 25 cents. But I appreciated this opportunity to work, and I look back with fond recollection to the first employment I ever had in that little country newspaper office.

The report of the committee does not disclose what, to me, is an important fact to be considered at the outset of our passing upon the proposed legislation. The committee referred the bill to various departments and agencies of the Government, and each of these departments and agencies reported against the passage of the bill. As has already been pointed out, the Secretary of the Treasury submitted a very strong report against the passage of the bill and gave very cogent reasons why the bill is unwise and unsound. That report has already been submitted today for inclusion in the RECORD.

The committee also sent the bill for a report to the Office of War Information, and Mr. Elmer Davis, representing that agency of the Government, made a very strong report against the bill.

The committee also sent it to the agency known as the War Food Administration, and that agency reported against it. The bill was sent to the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, has reported against the bill. It was sent to the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the Office of Price Administration, and none of those agencies has made a report in favor of the bill. I think we can readily understand why.

Mr. President, we are engaged in the most herculean task in which this country has ever been engaged. Overnight, as it were, we have transformed a peace-loving people, a Nation which was bent on following the paths of peace, into the greatest instrumentality of war that the world has ever seen. Our planes are in the ascendent today in the skies of Europe and in the Pacific Ocean. Our fleet is the largest in all the world, and is master of the Pacific Ocean as well as of the Atlantic. In this great undertaking, in this stupendous and overwhelming movement on the part of the Government to protect its citizens and preserve its democracy, there has been a coordination of patriotic effort which I think is one of the most outstanding contributions on the part of this Government to the war effort. It is a contribution which the world admires. Churchill speaks of it in words of praise. Hitler fears it and continues to fear it. Stalin speaks of it with the highest commendation. All the nations united with us realize the splendid work and cooperation which this Government is contributing in men, weapons, food, and finance to the war effort. It is a wonderful demonstration of American patriotism.

So far as I know, this bill represents the first harsh note in this otherwise splendid effort. It is the first time, if I may use the expression, that a venal voice has been raised in behalf of patriotism. Let me say that I do not refer to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. It is the first time that it has been suggested that the Congress of the United States ought to pay for patriotism.

The newspapers of this country have done a glorious work in the War bond drives. They have done a glorious work in all our patriotic efforts. They are to be commended. I am not at all surprised at the statement which has been made by Senators much more conversant with the details than I am, that a majority of the newspapers are against the passage of this bill. I assume that an overwhelming majority are against its passage. I know that from the State of Louisiana, where we have more than 100 weekly and biweekly newspapers, I have received only 5 letters asking me to support the measure. Notwithstanding what may be said by accredited representatives of various newspapers who appeared before the committee conducting the hearings, I believe that down in their heart of hearts a majority of the weekly and biweekly newspapers and country newspapers, as well as the big dailies, are not in favor of the passage of the bill, or at least, not advocating its passage.

The Senator from Alabama objects to the use of the expression "a subsidized press." Mr. President, we already have a subsidized press. I do not say that in an invidious sense. Today the newspapers throughout the United States are receiving more than $40,000,000 a year from the Government of the United States. They are receiving that amount in reduced postage. Unquestionably that represents a subsidy. I am not making any argument against the continuance of that policy. I notice that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is present in the Chamber. He knows that annually the Appropriations Committees in both the Senate and the House must vote $40,000,000 more of the hard-earned taxpayers' money in order to make good the deficit in the Post Office Department caused by reduced postage in favor of the newspapers. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Does that mean that we are now giving, so to speak, $40,000,000 in postage to the newspapers, and that an additional $40,000,000 is necessary?

Mr. OVERTON. That is the suggestion which is made by this bill. In addition to the $40,000,000 which they are already receiving as an unquestioned subsidy, it is now proposed that newspapers throughout the country be paid at regular published rates for the patriotic purpose of advertising War bonds.

Mr. President, if there be any private agency which ought to undertake to aid in the furtherance of the war effort whether through the medium of War bond drives or in whatever form it shall manifest itself, it should be the newspapers of the country. They are a quasi-public institution. They boast—and correctly so—that they are the molders of public opinion of this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator a question which I intended to ask earlier today of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, but failed to do so.

Can the Senator tell how much the Treasury Department spends on newspaper advertising at the present time, that is, how much a year?

Mr. OVERTON. I am sorry that I do not have that figure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me in order that I may ask the question of the Senator from Alabama? I assume that he knows the answer.

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What kind of advertising does the Senator refer to?

Mr. McKELLAR. Bond advertising.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Nothing.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Treasury Department does not spend anything?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. OVERTON. Some advertising is paid for by the Federal Government. The Federal Government advertises for contracts and material, and of course that is a part of the business of the Government. I am not referring to that kind of advertising. The pending bill provides for paid advertising to encourage the quasi-public institutions, the newspapers, to aid the Federal Government in the very laudable and very patriotic purpose of inducing the citizens of the United States to make contributions to the war effort through investment in governmental securities.

Mr. President, it may not be a subsidy, because the Government would, under the bill, pay for advertisements inserted in newspapers. But I will say to the Senator from Alabama that it is paid-for patriotism. It is a "dollar brand" of patriotism. It is making out of the beneficiaries merely hired Hessians on the home battle fronts. I do not think there can be any reasonable escape from that conclusion.

Why should not the newspaper fall in line, as have other private agencies, such as the radio stations, for instance? During the War bond drives, and even after they were concluded, nightly and daily we heard over the radio appeals made to the people of the United States to invest in securities of our Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask at that point whether or not the appeals are paid for?

Mr. OVERTON. Absolutely nothing is paid for them. A representative of the radio stations appeared before the committee and said they gladly contributed that service free to the Federal Government without asking anything in return.

Both the newspapers and the radio stations do receive payment for some advertising in connection with War bond drives as well as other drives. Instead of using the space which they have already bought for advertising their wares, the advertisers use it for the advertising of War bonds, and for such space they have paid.

The radio stations have certain time of their own. They contribute freely out of this time to the War bond drive without any charge whatsover.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have very frequently seen probably a whole page in a newspaper devoted to the advertising of wares of some individual, corporation, or other organization, and right at the bottom there would appear the words "Buy bonds" or something of that kind.

As I understand, under our revenue laws, the cost of all of such advertisements is deducted from the tax returns.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct. The costs are deducted from the gross income when making income-tax returns.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; in making the income-tax returns. I can understand that more money is spent for advertising because of the deduction permitted to be made in tax returns.

Mr. OVERTON. That may be very true, but the deduction is not allowable under the law because the business houses, industries, and what not, are advertising War bonds, but because the cost of such advertising is a part of their operating expenses regardless of what the sponsor may advertise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The advertisement of the type referred to by the Senator from Tennessee is a business advertisement. The mention of War bonds is more or less incidental. The advertisement would probably go into the newspaper anyway, if there were no War bond drive in progress, and the advertiser would receive a deduction for such expense as a part of his operating costs. The mere fact that it is stated in the body or at the bottom of the advertisement that people ought to buy bonds has nothing to do with deductibility, as I understand.

Mr. OVERTON. Nothing whatever. The advertisers usually buy space in newspapers and they can devote the entire space to urging the people to buy War bonds, and the expense of it would be deductible just as is the expense of any other advertisement. It would be deductible if they devoted the same space to advertising their wares.

Mr. McKELLAR. When they carry a page advertisement and merely add the words "Buy War bonds," it is done to make the advertisement popular and to take advantage of the deductions now allowable by law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to divert the Senator, but the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Louisiana both must certainly have seen page after page of advertisements in newspapers and magazines which did not purport to advertise anything but War bonds. I have seen many advertisements in which it was said in effect, "We have nothing to sell. We are not advertising anything that we may have to sell, but buy War bonds." In other words, those advertisements are paid for by the Government to the extent of more than 90 percent of their total cost, but they are placed through national advertising agencies. It does not cost the advertiser anything to speak of, because the Government is paying for it when the advertiser deducts the cost from his tax. He is acting the part of big-hearted Jim, putting out advertising at Government expense. The only thing he receives back is the value of having his name connected with the advertisement. Why is that any more of a subsidy than an advertisement by the Government of the United States, and paid for by it, to carry on governmental functions such as advertisements which the Government was for years in the habit of carrying in connection with recruiting drives for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and other governmental agencies?

Mr. OVERTON. I have made the observation that business has bought space in magazines and newspapers, and it utilizes that space in urging people to invest in War bonds and securities. The cost of such space is deductible and if there is any fault about it, it lies in the revenue law. The revenue law provides that within certain reasonable limitations, advertising expenses are deductible from gross income as operating expenses. The advertiser may use space to advertise his own wares, or he can patriotically use it to encourage others to invest in United States securities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the theory on which these deductions are permitted is that they are necessary to the operation of the business of the advertiser. That is the only justifiable theory. Now these people, because it does not cost them anything or very little, are actually having printed all sorts of advertisements for governmental purposes. That is all right, but the point I make is that the big concerns that have these advertisements printed do so through national advertising agencies, and the advertising goes to the large newspapers and magazines and not to the places where it would do a great deal of good in the rural communities, and the very same newspapers and magazines which are getting this subsidized advertising, subsidized at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States, are the ones that are raising the cry that if the little country newspapers get any direct Government advertising that amounts to a newspaper subsidy.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator from Missouri object to that? Does he wish to have enacted a law that will prevent such deductions being made where an industry is advertising Government bonds?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say they ought to be put on the same footing.

If the Senator will permit me a moment further, I think it was in the testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee that when these newspapers went to Secretary Morgenthau and talked to him about it Secretary Morgenthau said, "No," he was opposed to direct Government advertising but he was in favor of encouraging this form of advertising by private concerns even though the Government pays for 90 percent of the cost. I do not see any rhyme or reason in that. I do not see why they should not all be treated alike.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he thinks the War-bond campaigns we have had heretofore have not been successful.

Mr. OVERTON. They have been very successful.

Mr. MOORE. Then, what is the occasion now for paying out money for advertising in connection with a program that has already succeeded and promises to succeed in the future?

Mr. OVERTON. None that I can see. Every issue has been oversubscribed, so far as I know.

Mr. MOORE. Would it not mean that the $30,000,000 proposed to be appropriated would be a gratuity?

Mr. OVERTON. That is the way it seems to me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Louisiana, fine man that he is, does not want to leave a wrong impression.

Mr. OVERTON. If I made an erroneous statement, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator heard me say, I think—he may not remember it—just exactly the opposite from what he says, that all the issues have been subscribed by individuals.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator say that they have not been subscribed?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Only 82 percent of the E bonds which were available to individual investors have been subscribed, and in 38 States the quota was not

reached. On individual bonds in 19 States the total quota was not reached.

Mr. OVERTON. I never made any such statement as that. I view it from the national standpoint.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But the Senator agreed with the Senator from Oklahoma when he asked if the campaigns for the sale of War bonds had not been successful and had not been subscribed. I went to great trouble to give the figures showing that the Government's effort to sell bonds to individual subscribers had fallen down in the majority of the States of the Union.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator be patient with me and hear my statement; then, if I am in error, he can correct me. So far as I know, and have been informed, every national issue of War bonds since the emergency started has been not only subscribed but oversubscribed. I am not making a break-down by States; I am not making a breakdown by cities and towns and hamlets or townships. I am talking about national issues, and the national issues have been nationally subscribed in each and every case.

Mr. BANKHEAD. By loading up the banks.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not talking about where the money for the bonds came from. We are discussing the question of the necessity of selling Government bonds through advertising and spending $30,000,000 upon newspaper advertising solely for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Alabama interjected the remark "by loading up the banks." In the case of the last bond issue the banks were not permitted to subscribe anything at all. In two of the bond issues that have gone before the banks were permitted to subscribe and did subscribe largely, but in the last one, as everyone knows, the banks were not allowed to make any subscription at all for the bonds.

Mr. OVERTON. And they were oversubscribed by some four or five billion dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know that that has anything to do with the merits of this bill, but I would not want the remark to go unchallenged that the banks had been overloaded with bonds in order to sell them in the various drives.

Mr. OVERTON. I was merely answering the question asked by the Senator from Oklahoma who desired to know whether or not in every case of a drive affecting a national issue it was subscribed, and my reply was, that, so far as I know, they all had not only been subscribed but oversubscribed.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, in studying the report on this bill I find the Canadian system cited as a reason for adopting the pending bill and it is pointed out that in Canada there is a widespread distribution of bonds in the hands of families. It has not been pointed out thus far that by no stretch of the imagination is the Canadian system being advocated here. In Canada the problem of financing the war bond drives was presented to the publishers of the newspapers, who were to work out a program. They organized their own committees. The program included advertising in newspapers and magazines, cartoons, editorials, movies, the radio, the billboards; a complete program was worked out by private enterprise for the Government and submitted to the Government. The Government said go ahead, and then advertising was distributed through every media in Canada. The Government did not determine it; they merely approved what the newspapers and the other agencies had worked out.

That is not this bill at all. This bill does not include the radio stations; it does not include billboards; it does not include the things that Canada included to bring about the desirable result accomplished there. It seems to me this bill picks out a certain group in this country who are to receive the money to be appropriated. But what shall we do about the others? Shall we do nothing about the other agencies at all? Or will there follow quickly after this bill shall have been passed another measure to take care of them?

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The argument has been made by the Senator from Missouri that we ought to treat all alike. He is referring, of course, to the newspapers, and he says the big city newspaper gets most of the advertising in the War bond drives and that the small weeklies and semiweeklies get the least. If we are going to adopt the policy of treating them all alike, why merely take the newspapers? Are they the only publications in this country that are furthering Government bond drives? What about the magazines? What about the farm publications? What about other periodicals which are published and which every week and every month contain strong appeals to the public, eloquently phrased and clearly couched, with long articles in support of the bond issues? Are they to be left out? Are we going to treat them all alike? Then what are we going to do about the radio stations? Will the Senator from Missouri or any other Senator upon this floor say that the radio stations are not making a valuable contribution in the War bond drive efforts? They are making, I dare say, just as effective contribution as are the newspapers. They reach into every home and hamlet; they reach out into the country farmside; they can be heard by day and by night; when the farmer comes back from his work and he sits by his hearth fire with his family, there is the radio, and the radio is appealing to him to invest in War bonds.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. Every Senator, no doubt, has received letters from radio stations stating that if newspapers are going to be permitted to participate in advertising they would like to be included; and also the billboards. There is no reason that I know of, if we pass this bill, why we should not immediately respond by the passage of another bill for other advertising agencies.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not include them in this bill; why another bill? I think if $30,000,000 are to be appropriated for newspapers, there ought to be $30,000,000 additional for radio stations. Then, there are other media that I want to comment upon for which we ought to make appropriations.

Mr. MOORE. Yet the Senator says none of it is needed.

Mr. OVERTON. I am against the whole bill; I am against paying for patriotic efforts of that character.

Mr. MOORE. I understand the Senator to say it is not necessary to use this money——

Mr. OVERTON. It is not necessary so far as results are concerned.

Mr. MOORE. And to distribute it among a number of agencies?

Mr. OVERTON. If we undertake to give it as largess, then, let us distribute it to all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have prepared an amendment, which I shall offer, providing that $5,000,000 of the $30,000,000 shall be used for radio stations and billboards.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not in favor of any contribution whatsoever.

Mr. LANGER. I understand the Senator is not.

Mr. OVERTON. I think we can depend on the patriotism of the radio stations and their operators and managers, and the patriotism of the newspapers, be they big city newspapers or be they small country newspapers, to aid us in putting over these War-bond drives, or any other drives, which will carry the American flag to an earlier victory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am wondering what will happen if the bill shall become a law. Is it not already perfectly evident that it would be a case of the camel getting its head under the tent? Will not bills be introduced immediately or amendments offered to the pending bill, to include radio stations, magazines, billboards, and the like? The Senator is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the question I want him to answer is, Where are we to get the money with which to pay all these bills? Can the Senator tell me?

Mr. OVERTON. I suppose that if the Congress shall pass such a bill, we might well do as we have in the past—undertake to get the money somewhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not pretty certain that if we keep on making large appropriations for every purpose we will have to resort to the printing press to get the money?

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Throughout the debate the only reference to sales I have heard made has been to the sale of War bonds. That term has been used throughout the debate. There is nothing in the bill referring to War bonds. I am curious to know what the Senator's comment is upon that distinction. Is the advertising referred to to be used only for the sale of War bonds, or for any Government securities; and if so, how long is it to continue?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad the Senator called my attention to that point. I had not noticed it. All the hearing and all the argument presented by the Senator from Alabama referred to War bonds, and I thought possibly that was provided for in the bill. Section 5 does provide that—

> The authority conferred by this act shall terminate 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President—

Presumably referring to War bonds.

I thought the Senator was going to make the point, which I think is a very good one, that if the United States Treasury is to go into the business of advertising War-bond drives, why not pay for advertising other drives? What about the scrap drives? They are very important. What about the drives connected with civilian defense? What about the drives to make rationing more popular?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. What about a drive to control inflation? What about drives for the Red Cross, and for Chinese and other foreign relief? What about a drive to make the tax policies of the Secretary of the Treasury palatable? The program of the Secretary of the Treasury seems not to have taken so very well, insofar, at least, as the House Ways and Means Committee is concerned. The administration wanted new taxes to raise over $10,000,000,000, but out of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House comes a bill providing for the raising of only $2,000,000,000 by additional taxes. The sale of War bonds is one way in which to raise money, but when the Government raises it in that way, it has to pay it back some day. Ultimately it will have to pay it back. It is an obligation. But another way is to impose taxes upon the people, and when the taxes are paid, the Government is under no obligation to refund them. I think it would be much better for us to undertake to make an appropriation, if we are to make any at all, for a tax drive, instead of for a bond drive.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The point I was calling to the attention of the Senator is found in the purposes set forth in the bill itself, on page 2, lines 4 and 5, where it is stated "for the purpose of advertising the sale of bonds, notes, and other obligations." Of course, that is all-inclusive, but all the debate has been about War bonds, and not as to general securities of the Government.

Mr. OVERTON. That is a good point.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator were the advertising manager of a manufacturing company engaged in the production and sale of alarm clocks—and, by the way, we need more alarm clocks in America, in my opinion, to awaken the American people—and if the Senator's company manufacturing alarm clocks was producing only 10,000 alarm clocks a year, selling at a dollar apiece, I wonder if he, as advertising manager of that firm producing 10,000 alarm clocks a year, would spend $20,000 to get back $10,000. The Senator would not, would he?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think I would.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wonder if during the debate any thought or discussion has been devoted to the proposition of making inquiry of the Treasury officials as to how many bonds they expect to try to sell to the American people. If we are to spend $30,000,000 a year for the purpose of advertising the sale of bonds, I should like to know what Mr. Morgenthau has in mind, as to how many billions of dollars of bonds are to be sold.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope the Senator will not ask me to advise him what Mr. Morgenthau has in mind. I do not think Mr. Morgenthau could answer that question. It depends on how long the war shall last. We will continue to sell bonds in order to supplement what is raised by taxation so long as the war continues.

Mr. REYNOLDS. May I make another statement in regard to that, in the Senator's time?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It strikes me that if we spend $30,000,000 a year for the purpose of selling Government bonds, we are encouraging the increase of our national debt, and I am worried about that, because I understand that up to the present time our appropriations and authorizations amount to more than $300,000,000. I am worried about that tremendous debt, because I am afraid that if we continue to encourage the sale of bonds our national debt by the time the war shall end will be in excess of $500,000,000,000, and we will not have any money with which to take care of our soldiers and the families of the men who have bled and died to save the "four freedoms." That is worrying me.

Mr. OVERTON. If I understand the Senator correctly, if any appropriation is to be made, he favors an appropriation for an antibond drive?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my position exactly.

Mr. OVERTON. I was about to remark—and I have been very glad to yield to any Senator——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not want to be misunderstood on the record. I am not against bonds. I have bought all the bonds I could. I encourage every one to buy bonds; but I do not want to leave the record as the Senator left it, perhaps putting me in the position of being against the sale and purchase of bonds. Not at all; I am entirely in favor of the purchase of bonds. At the same time, I do not favor spending $30,000,000 annually in promoting the sale of bonds, when, as the Senator has already stated, the patriotism of the American people has inspired and impelled them to buy, and they will continue to do so as long as they feel that their Government needs the money. But I think that instead of building up the tremendous debt——

Mr. OVERTON. I yielded for a question, but not for a speech against War bonds.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all; I think we should be cutting down governmental expenses.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the suggestion made by the Senator from North Carolina as to cutting down unnecessary expenses.

Mr. President, I shall be very glad to continue to yield, but I have a few additional observations I should like to make. The newspapers are not the only ones who are interested in War bond drives. I have already referred to the radio stations, and I have referred to farm publications, in which I am sure the Senator from Alabama is interested, and to other periodicals.

Then, Mr. President, there are the movies. Certainly the movies are great sellers of War bonds. They dramatize the whole thing. They make personal appeals on the screen. They do a very effective work. Following the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], are we going to treat them all alike? Why leave out the moving-picture industry? Are they not doing the same kind of work? Is not the laborer worthy of his hire? If the newspapers are to be paid for the display of patriotism, why not the movies? Why not the magazines? Why not the radio stations? Why not all other media of publication?

I go further. Down in Louisiana, and I know in every State the Kiwanis clubs, the Rotary clubs, the associations of commerce, citizens' organizations form committees; they go into business places; they go into homes; they go into byways of the country roads; they visit the farmers, and they solicit investment in the bonds of the United States Government. They do it without compensation, and you would insult any one of them if you offered to pay them for undertaking as best they can to fight the battle here at home, while their sons and their brothers are fighting the fight on the battlefields of Europe, the isles of the Pacific, and other theaters of the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can speak for the movies. I happen to be a movie fan. I like very much to see the movies, and go quite regularly to see them. Not only do

they show War bond advertisements on the screen, but in almost every movie house I know of, and I have been in a great many of them, we find young people selling War bonds and War stamps. Surely if one class of our citizens is to be paid for this kind of work, we ought to include them all, and if we include them all I do not know what the bill may be.

Mr. OVERTON. I am quite sure that the Senator from Tennessee during World War No. 1 made speech after speech in connection with the sale of Liberty bonds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Hundreds of them.

Mr. OVERTON. I did. I went all over Louisiana and made speeches. I closed up my office and went out and made speeches. So did my law partner. We did everything we could to sell War bonds. Did we think for a moment of putting in a bill to the United States because we were doing our bit toward the great war effort? I cannot conceive that the newspaper owners that I know, that the little newspaper publishers that I know, are really in favor of this bill. I do not think they want any largess bestowed upon them for the patriotic effort they are making and that they will continue to make. I do not think they want to be paid for their patriotism. I think they are very glad indeed to render what service they can.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of my remarks the reports made by the different departments and agencies on the pending bill. They are to be found on pages 132 et seq. of the Senate committee hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I had intended to read from some of the reports made by these agencies and departments, and especially from the report made by the Secretary of the Treasury, but I have already consumed more time than I had anticipated I would. I wish to say in conclusion that if we pass this bill—and I wish to say it in all seriousness—I think we are going to establish a very bad precedent. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that there is no reasonable apprehension that the freedom of the press will be destroyed, that the newspapers will be unduly controlled by the Federal Government through the operations of this bill, but if we make an appropriation for this kind of effort, we will be making an appropriation for other kinds of efforts, there will be no end to them, and the time will soon come when insofar as the small country newspapers are concerned the great advertiser will be the United States Government, and they will depend upon this payment in order to continue their existence, and if the payment is withdrawn then they will die. I think it is best to leave the newspapers of our country, as far as we can, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion—any suspicion of Federal control and Federal domination.

EXHIBIT 1

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 27, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have requested my opinion as to the merits of the Bankhead bill (S. 1073), to require the Secretary of the Treasury to spend $25,000,000 per year for newspaper advertising of Government War bonds, with at least $12,500,000 of advertising required to be placed yearly with weekly, semiweekly, triweekly, and monthly newspapers. In addition, the bill would in effect establish the Secretary of the Treasury as advertising administrator for the Government, in control of the advertising budgets of other Government agencies and under duty to prescribe regulations to safeguard the freedom and independence of the press and its right to criticize public officials.

I am opposed to the enactment of this bill, primarily because it might jeopardize the continued success of the Government's vital War Loan program under my direction. However, the broad regulatory powers over the press which the bill would confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury are foreign in nature to the functions of that office, and I would not care to assume the exercise of such powers.

The War Loan campaign has been a voluntary, united effort of the whole American people. The Second War Loan drive, concluded early this month, was, as you know, an overwhelming success. The total goal of $13,000,000,000 was exceeded by $5,000,000,000.

An army of volunteers labored devotedly to ealize that success. Workers, advertisers, advertising media, retailers, theaters, and others contributed wholeheartedly to this vital cause. Newspapers, both country papers and the great metropolitan dailies, gave invaluable support in the handling of news and features and in the promotion of sponsored advertising. Magazines, farm publications, outdoor advertising, and other media cooperated splendidly. The radio stations of the country gave us hundreds of shows throughout the drive. The movies placed their Nation-wide facilities at our disposal all during the campaign. Advertisers, as a patriotic service, contributed unparalleled amounts of their own space and time to War bond advertising. Business houses, industrial firms, stores, and theaters all cooperated earnestly in promoting the drive. In sum, the War Loan campaign has been a national voluntary effort which has received the unstinted support of all segments of business and industry without thought or expectation of compensation.

Our successful financial mobilization will require other War Loan drives in proportions at least equal to the Second War Loan drive just ended. The full total of our war expenditures this calendar year will be more than $100,000,000,000. About $70,000,000,000, less whatever amount of new taxes Congress may provide, must be raised by borrowing from all sources during the calendar year. New money raised during the 4-month period January through April, including that raised during the Second War Loan drive just ended, amounted to $25,000,000,000. We must, therefore, raise the remaining $45,000,000,000 during the balance of this year. With this staggering task before us, I should be disappointed to see our efforts impeded, or perhaps even thwarted, as I believe they might be, as a result of the enactment of the bill under discussion.

The bill makes provision for purchase of advertising space only in newspapers. It makes no provision for expenditures in magazines, farm publications, outdoor advertising, radio, movies, or other media. The Treasury has received, and is continuing to receive, tremendous amounts of free space and time from these media. Individual advertisers also continue to donate large amounts of their own space and time to War bond advertising. I fear that the discriminatory selection of one class of advertising media for Government support would tend to discourage continued contributions by other media and their advertisers and would have an unfortunate effect upon the theretofore remarkable voluntary responses of all classes of business concerns and individuals. It has been the purpose to make the bond purchase program an integral part of our national war effort springing from a patriotic sense of obligation and a desire to contribute all one can to the national effort. That purpose has in large measure been achieved, I believe, and I should dislike now to see introduced a confusion of motives or a policy of discrimination with reference to any class or group.

One in my position, responsible for our tremendous war-financing program, must be sensitive to the great contributions made to that program by the newspapers of this country. I do not profess to have an especial understanding of the economic position of any classes of newspapers that are intended to be the beneficiaries of the present bill. I do believe, however, that there would be grave danger to the success of the war-financing program if it were to be made the specific vehicle for an avowed policy of Government assistance to any classes of newspapers.

I have confined my comment to those aspects of the bill of immediate concern to me in my official capacity as Secretary of the Treasury. Beyond that, however, I hold strong personal feelings as to the unwisdom and danger of the bill in opening the road toward Government subsidy of the press. On that score, I expect that the committee will invite the views of Government officials directly concerned with relations between the Government and the press.

I urge that the bill not be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, May 13, 1943.

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I have your letter of May 10 and the attached copy of S. 1073, on which we are glad to give you our opinion herewith.

Let me say at the outset that we are concerned over the plight of the smaller newspapers, and have only recently been discussing the matter with various representatives of these papers as well as with representative of the advertising agency business and advertisers.

In spite of that we do not favor the proposed bill. First, because we believe the chances are that total advertising, now running in all media in behalf of War bonds, would be decreased rather than increased, if the bill became law * * * even though the total amount of money suggested were spent for this one purpose. And, second, because we believe such a bill would tend to jeopardize the freedom of the press.

First, as to the possibility of a decrease in effective Government advertising as a result of the bill, you are no doubt cognizant of the large amount of free advertising now being made available to the Treasury on War bonds by national and local advertisers, newspapers, radio, outdoor advertising, car cards and other media. It has been estimated that

last year the Treasury received a total of $88,000,000 for this purpose. Unquestionably, this year the figure will be substantially higher due to the fact that probably there will be three bond drives which bring about increased interest and cooperation from advertisers and from the various media. In our opinion, it is well within the realm of possibility that the figure for the year 1943 might reach $125,000,000.

Were the Government to appropriate a fund for one medium and not for others it would be, in our opinion, both unfair and impractical.

It would be unfair because others have given generously of the time and space they have to sell. Their cooperation with this national effort is a source of pride in each business and they would be justified, we believe, in claiming a share of any Government advertising fund for their own medium which in each case can demonstrate results in returns of War bond sales.

It would be impractical because it might well result in less total advertising. If only newspapers received Government revenue for War bond advertising, it is very likely that many individuals in other media, and many advertisers, would decide to terminate their cooperation, thus jeopardizing the results of what now appears a very successful operation. It is our opinion that it would be unwise to run the risk of upsetting this productive and voluntary effort.

Further, it would be impractical because of the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of seeing that the advertising space is "divided equitably" and of "fairly allocating advertisements to individual newspapers." Even those who are experts in the business of selecting media for various advertisers and who have at their disposal all the available yardsticks for making the best selection, cannot come to a precise decision in the matter of selecting the best markets for particular merchandise or particular papers in each market. Under the proposed bill, any selections made would be open to criticism and charges of discrimination.

The above assumes that all the money appropriated would be spent by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of promoting the sale of War bonds. As the amount of money suggested would, we believe, result in a decrease in War bond advertising in all media, the Secretary of the Treasury could not conscientiously allocate funds to certain other Government purposes as suggested in the proposed bill, under section 4.

As to the second point, our rough calculations indicate that if one-half of a Government fund of $25,000,000 were spent in weekly, biweekly, triweekly, and monthly newspapers, the Government might account for from 20 percent to 25 percent of the total amount of advertising revenue received in a year by such newspapers. In the case of these papers, certainly the Government would be the one dominant advertiser probably doing more business than the volume of the next six advertisers added together. Quickly, if not immediately, many smaller newspapers would come to depend upon this business for their very existence.

To a lesser extent, the same would hold true for daily newspapers.

We note that the bill, under section 3, attempts to deal with the problem, in that it calls for regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury to "safeguard the freedom of the press," "avoid interference with the independence of any newspaper," "protect editors and publishers in their right to publish criticism of the policies or conduct," etc., but we do not believe this could be effectuated under the circumstances of what might come to be looked on as a sizable subsidy.

In this Office we have done everything possible to so conduct our affairs to assure a free and independent press. In a free and democratic country the Government draws its strength from the confidence of an informed and understanding people, who must have faith in their media of information. This faith is based upon independence of the media. We see in the proposed bill the possibility of the destruction of this independence, particularly among the smaller newspapers, and so are not in favor of it.

Cordially yours,

ELMER DAVIS, *Director.*

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 3, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on
Banking and Currency,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: This is in reply to your request of May 5, 1943, for a report on S. 1073, a bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes. The bill authorizes expenditures by the Treasury to purchase newspaper advertising space to promote the sale of War bonds and the understanding and participation of citizens in other parts of the war program, including the food-management program carried on by this Administration.

The War Food Administration opposes the enactment of the bill (1) because we think it contrary to sound policy, and (2) because we believe it would hinder the wartime food-management program.

In our view, the matter of public policy involved is basically freedom of the press. The media whose services the bill proposes to buy are media not alone of advertising but of free expression of opinion and reporting of news. Their freedom from Government intervention is stated in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States as one of the major principles guiding the conduct of public affairs.

Though obviously the authors of the pending bill do not so intend, it seems to us the bill departs from this principle. Once the purchase of advertising services by Government begins, there is danger that the people will think that the men in charge of the administration of the Government are influencing the reporting of news or the stating of opinion by the press. Now, this might not—in fact, almost certainly would not—be true. I have faith in the integrity of publishers and editors and believe they are on the whole free from influence by advertisers. Nevertheless, there would be public feeling that Government views influenced the papers carrying Government advertising. This would be bound to lessen public insistence that the freedom of the press be preserved. That would be unfortunate for the press and even more so for the public it serves. To avoid such an outcome, we oppose starting a policy of Government purchase of promotional advertising.

In the second place, we oppose it for a practical operating reason. Under the present system of handling Government information campaigns, we are receiving the cooperation of thousands of advertisers who devote space which they have purchased to sending farmers and consumers facts about the wartime food programs and appeals for their participation in these programs. It is estimated that more than $18,000,000 worth of space in the first 6 months of this year will be devoted to this purpose by national advertisers. In addition other millions of dollars' worth of space has been devoted to the purpose by local advertisers. We have made it a continuing part of our information programs to provide either direct, or in cooperation with the newspaper advertising services, matrices, and text which can be used by local advertisers to carry messages on the wartime food program to the readers of the press. They are widely used, and much advertising revenue has thereby accrued to the weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers in which half of the appropriation proposed in S. 1073 is directed to be spent. We are sure that not so much could be allotted for food programs from Government funds proposed in the bill as will be spent by local advertisers on a voluntary basis in promoting the war food production and distribution programs.

To sum up, we now are receiving advertising support for the dissemination of wartime food information far greater in amount than could be provided under the pending bill for the food part of the war program; this support would tend to drop off if Government direct advertising expenditures were begun. To maintain effective advertising support for the war-food programs, and the revenues of the press from this advertising, and, most important of all, to safeguard freedom of the press, we believe S. 1073 should not be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 4, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and
Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATER WAGNER: This is in reply to your request of May 5, 1943, for our opinion on S. 1073, a bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes. The bill authorizes expenditures by the Treasury to purchase newspaper advertising space to promote the sale of War bonds and the understanding and participation of citizens in other parts of the war program, including those carried on by this Department.

It seems to us that the enactment of the bill authorizing the Treasury to buy advertising space in newspapers in order to help citizens take part in various war activities such as the purchase of War bonds, would create a situation perilous to freedom of the press. The public is likely to believe that Government advertising in some way brings about Government influence on the handling of news and comment by newspapers. I do not believe that this would be so, and certainly the gentlemen who drafted and submitted the bill have tried to include provisions that would prevent it from being so. Nevertheless, there is danger (voiced already in the press itself) that the public would think Government was influencing the press. Under such conditions, public support for maintaining freedom of the press would be likely to be lessened.

Of course, we might have to run this risk if it were necessary in order to procure news, editorial and advertising service to citizens in furtherance of various parts of the war effort. However, it is well known to everyone who has taken part in management of the war effort that without Government advertising the newspapers will continue to report and support the Government appeals for action in such matters as the purchase of War bonds. It is also well known to all of us connected with the wartime programs that advertisers have contributed millions of dollars' worth of space on a voluntary basis to the promotion of these programs. This certainly has been true of the food programs.

Since it is not necessary to purchase newspaper space in order to keep citizens informed, and since the purchase of newspaper

space would run the risk of weakening the principle of freedom of the press, it seems to us the pending bill should not be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., October 13, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: This is in reply to your letter to Mr. Nelson of September 28 asking for his opinion as to the merits of S. 1073, a bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

In Mr. Nelson's absence, as Acting Chairman of the War Production Board, I beg to submit the following report:

The bill has a desirable purpose, to assist the stabilization program, with which I am in complete agreement. I do not feel qualified, however, to give a detailed opinion on the merits of the bill as it is not directly related to war production, but is a matter of primary interest to the Office of Economic Stabilization and the Office of War Information.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON,
Acting Chairman.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: Reference is made to your request for my opinion concerning S. 1073, a bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

Inasmuch as S. 1073 would place upon the Secretary of the Treasury the primary responsibility for its effectuation, I should prefer that deference be given to the Secretary's views concerning the desirability or undesirability of the measure in question.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1943.

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have asked my opinion of S. 1073.

That policy, of course, is a primary concern of the Treasury.

This bill authorizes the expenditure of $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year for newspaper advertising for the sale of Government bonds.

The bill also authorizes several agencies, including the Office of Price Administration, to buy newspaper space "for the purpose of carrying out the advertising programs in their respective agencies."

At the present time we have no advertising programs which contemplate the use of paid space, nor have we funds for this purpose. There is always the possibility, however, that the advertising authority here specifically set out may be of value to us at some future time. To be of use to the Office of Price Administration, such legislation would have to carry an appropriation.

Very truly yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN, *Administrator.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended.

THE PART OF BASEBALL IN PROMOTING THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the course of the debate this afternoon a number of different organizations have been named which have made valuable contributions to the war effort. I wish to discuss briefly another organization which has also made a tremendous contribution, and that is the organization of professional baseball clubs of America.

Mr. President, now that the professional baseball season for 1943 has come to an end, it seems advisable to discuss for the benefit of the Senate and the country the unusual and prominent part that baseball has played in promoting the war effort. In the course of this discussion I shall also place in the RECORD a break-down of the manpower, showing the number of players in the baseball leagues and their classification insofar as their war-service status is concerned. Other contributions in the way of admission taxes, bond sales, and so forth, will also be given in some detail. The information I present to the Senate comes officially from Ford Frick, president of the National League of Professional Baseball Clubs.

Before proceeding into a careful compilation of facts and figures, I think it appropriate to say that the Senator from Illinois is exceedingly familiar with professional baseball. While attending college a good many years ago the opportunity came to me to play professional baseball. I followed that course for 3 years. Needless to say, the money made and saved in that profession was quite instrumental in helping me obtain a degree in the law school at Illinois Wesleyan. Obviously, I have ever been grateful for that opportunity. I have throughout my life constantly followed this national pastime with keen interest and have done all within my power to promote the welfare of this beneficial sport.

While during this emergency there have been a few who have advocated the elimination of all sports, I am confident that they are a hopeless minority. In this connection, I would like to quote an expression of President Roosevelt on the question of recreation and amusement during this war effort:

> It is, of course, obvious that the war effort is the primary task of everybody in the Nation. All other activities must be considered secondary. At the same time it has been proven beyond doubt that human beings cannot sustain continued and prolonged work for very long without obtaining a proper balance between work on the one hand and vacation and recreation on the other. Such recreation may come by participation in or attendance at various sports and amusements. All of them have a necessary and beneficial part in promoting an over-all efficiency by relieving the strains of war and work. Within reasonable limits I believe the war effort will not be hampered but actually improved by a sensible participation in healthy recreational pursuits.

It may be of some information to the Senate and the country to report that England and Russia are maintaining sports. Quentin Reynolds, noted magazine war correspondent, upon his return from the European and African fronts, said:

> I am one of the 60,000,000 baseball fans, practically a charter member, and I deem baseball not only useful but necessary.

He further stated:

> On my last day in England they played 66 games of football, and when I was in Moscow they played a game of soccer for the world's championship. The game was held in Dynamo Stadium before 50,000 people. They even closed some of the war plants so the workers could go out and see the game. The newspaper Pravda printed a million extra copies and sent them to the troops at the front.

Reynolds pleaded:

> Hitler has killed many things in the past few years, but don't let him kill baseball.

It is also interesting to know that the treacherous Japs dropped baseball because it was an American game—another added reason for us to keep the game going.

Elmer Davis sometime ago, in speaking at a dinner in New York, said:

> I have 1,500,000 customers on my short-wave broadcast list, and if I don't send them any baseball news, my customers are going to get up a hell of a squawk.

In other words, what Davis meant was that the boys in the camps in this country and overseas were some of his best customers and they were anxious to follow the teams in the National and American Leagues.

Recently I received a letter from a soldier in Sicily who said that he and his buddies heard every inning of the last game in the World Series. One-half of his letter was devoted to explaining the enjoyment of these men in listening to that world championship game.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the manpower and transportation problems that must be considered and adjusted in carrying on professional baseball. Therefore, it is intensely interesting to find that a break-down of the manpower question shows definitely that baseball requires an infinitesimal part of the

manpower of this Nation. Let me illustrate:

Manpower break-down

National League players in service (as of Oct. 15, 1943)	151
Married (in service)	59
Fathers	21
Pre-Pearl Harbor	7
Over 30 years old	23

1944 Reserve list

Total players reserved (all clubs)	263
Classified IV-F (disability)	37
Aliens	3
Over 35 years of age	20
Over 30 years of age	31
Under draft age	2
Pre-Pearl Harbor fathers	85
Married and children	31
Married (no children)	11
Reclassified 1-A [1]	21
Called for examination (inducted) [2]	10

[1] Of the men notified of reclassification by their local draft boards, 6 are over 30 years old, 2 are over 35 years old, and 4 are pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

[2] Of the men awaiting induction, 3 are over 30 years old and 2 are pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

DEFENSE WORK

Of the men on the 1944 reserve list, 57 are known to be in definite war work and essential industry. Many others announced their intention of entering essential industry following the close of the season—but I have no check at present on what they are doing.

While facts and figures on the manpower question for the American League are not available, it is reasonably supposed that they will be comparable to those applicable to the National League.

With respect to the problem of transportation, Senators should know that the American and National Leagues have reduced their travel to a minimum. They advise me that without question they can conduct their travel to the entire satisfaction of the Office of Defense Transportation. There was little or no complaint during the past season from the transportation angle.

Now let me give to the Senate and the country facts and figures demonstrating beyond a shadow of a doubt the heavy contributions that baseball has made to the war effort, and in this connection I am not discussing the fact that baseball reaches almost every home in America and that it has been a part of our national life. I am not going to discuss baseball from the standpoint that it is the passion of every American boy, and that through participation in it the youth of America has been more fully developed beyond that of any race of people on earth, but I am going to talk about cold cash, about that necessary fiscal ingredient which means so much to the successful winning of the war.

BASEBALL CONTRIBUTIONS TO WAR FUND (CASH)

Since Pearl Harbor the following contributions have been made:

To United Service Organization (Detroit all star)	$53,226.27
To United Service Organization (1942 world series)	362,826.65
To Army-Navy Relief (American League)	238,205.24
To Army-Navy Relief (National League)	267,895.55
To Army-Navy Relief (1942 all star)	60,925.72
To Red Cross (1943 season)	163,279.42
To national war fund (1943 season)	$163,279.42
To Red Cross (1943 world series)	154,186.74
To national war fund (1943 world series)	154,186.74
To baseball equipment fund	250,814.96
By national association, 1942	259,871.87
Total	2,128,698.58

Not included in the above amounts is the sum contributed by the national association in 1943. The 1943 figures were not available at time report was compiled.

GOVERNMENT INCOME—ADMISSION TAXES SINCE PEARL HARBOR

As the Senate knows, Congress passed a law which compels every individual attending a baseball game to pay an admission tax. The following presents a complete picture of the total amount paid to the Government through the American and National Leagues for the 1942–43 season:

1942 All Star game, New York	$8,566.20
1942 All Star, Cleveland (approximate)	6,211.40
1942 World Series	109,625.30
1943 World Series	107,678.45
1943 All Star game	6,518.40
National League, 1942 season	579,672.99
National League, 1943 season	445,878.51
American League, 1942 season (approximate)	579,672.99
American League, 1943 season (approximate)	445,878.51
Total	2,289,702.75

This includes only the tax paid on regular season and scheduled games. It does not include taxes paid on exhibition games, nor does it include other taxes paid by individual clubs—that is, franchise taxes, corporation taxes, income taxes—club and players, taxes on equipment; on railroad and Pullman fares, and so forth.

BOND SALES

The major contribution which was made by those interested in professional baseball came through the sale of bonds and stamps. There was organized in the profession a Baseball Bond League, which was responsible for the sale of bonds totaling $947,300,000 during the past baseball season. This sale of bonds came through the cooperation of sports writers, the Treasury Department, and officials of the two leagues. The Baseball Bond League took in the three metropolitan clubs, namely, the Giants, Yankees, and Brooklyn. Twelve outstanding players were picked from each of the clubs. At a luncheon in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria, sponsorship of these players was auctioned off in bond pledges; each sponsor bidding on a player agreed to purchase his bid price for that sponsorship.

In addition to that, the sponsor agreed to purchase $2,500 in bonds for each single his player made, $5,000 for each double, $7,500 for each triple, and $10,000 for each home run. In the case of a pitcher, the pledge was to buy $25,000 in additional bonds each time the pitcher won a game; $50,000 in additional bonds if he won by a shut-out.

In order to get public participation, it was announced that within the Bond League a player popularity contest would be held. Every individual purchaser of a bond in the denomination of $25 or more was entitled to a vote in this popularity contest. In order to stimulate voting interest, it was announced that at the end of the contest those players obtaining the greatest popularity vote would constitute an all-star team which would play a team of servicemen at the Polo Grounds, admission to this to be by bond purchase. That in brief was the set-up for league operations.

The results of this speak for themselves; bidding for player sponsorship at the opening luncheon was surprisingly heavy. The highest bid was made by the Brooklyn Club, an old-time social organization in Brooklyn, which bid $11,000,000 in bonds to obtain the sponsorship of Player Dixie Walker. While other bids were not nearly so high, the total bids on sponsorship amounted to about $100,000,000, with, of course, the additional bonds represented by the performance of each player.

The popularity vote also developed surprising interest. A total of 18,383 individual votes were cast. Each of these, of course, represented the purchase of a bond of $25 or more. The climax came on the day of the all-star game, when 40,000 bond purchasers came to the Polo Grounds to witness the game. The final event was the ball game between the team selected by the bond purchasers and a service team from Cumberland. An official program was also issued, with advertising space sold on bond pledges. The net result of the whole league operation was, as stated, the sale of bonds totaling $947,300,000—official Treasury figures.

There is another item of bond sales known as the Brooklyn player drive, which netted $80,000,000. These bonds were sold by personal solicitation by players working in teams of two men each. These flying squadrons visited industrial plants, manufacturing organizations, and business houses in the Brooklyn area, addressed meetings of employees, and took individual subscriptions from the employees. According to Treasury estimates, this $80,000,000 sale represented 175,000 individual purchasers.

The Cleveland all-star, $1 admission stamp, netted $62,094; St. Louis, bond and stamp sale, $239,230; Cincinnati, bond and stamp sale in park, $50,000; New York, sale in park, $66,900; Pittsburgh, sale in park, $59,973.25; Chicago, bond and stamp sale, $145,027.25.

Recapitulation—bond sales

Baseball Bond League (figures authorized by Treasury Department)	$947,300,000.00
Brooklyn player drive (Government figures)	80,000,000.00
Cleveland all star ($1 admission stamp)	62,094.00
St. Louis (bond and stamp sale)	239,230.00
Cincinnati (bonds and stamps in park)	50,000.00
New York (sale in park)	66,900.00
Pittsburgh (sale in park)	59,973.25
Chicago (bond and stamp sale)	145,027.75
Total	1,027,923,225.00

It is also interesting to note that the official figures for the American League bond sales in parks are not available, but it can be assumed that their sale was similar to that in National League parks. For instance, in Washington alone one bond game resulted in 29,000 individual sales of bonds, totaling $2,125,000 in bond values.

I have given to the Senate information concerning the financial contributions made through admission taxes and sale of bonds and stamps, which represents a unique picture from the standpoint of substantial contributions to the prosecution of the war. But, Mr. President, that is not all. Financial assistance to the war effort is not the only important reason for the continuation of baseball. Servicemen in every part of the globe are interested in this great national pastime. Those in charge of professional baseball in this country have been most generous to the servicemen, either in admitting them to the baseball parks to witness the games, or in connection with the donation of athletic equipment for the benefit of boys in the camps. I submit the figures showing admissions to parks in connection with service activities.

In the National League the following free admissions, properly chargeable to war activity and contribution have been made:

Servicemen (in uniform)	531,931
Blood donors (Red Cross)	51,685
Scrap donors	72,312
Fats donors	11,732
Bond purchasers (not listed elsewhere)	5,707
Total	673,667

Mr. President, what is true of the National League is also true of the American League. It certainly is true in the case of our old friend, Clark Griffith, in Washington, who always permits servicemen to his baseball park, when baseball is being played there, without any admission charge; and I congratulate him for it.

In the scrap and salvage campaign it is interesting to note in 2 days—offering free admission for 10 pounds of scrap metal; 2 pounds of scrap rubber or 1 pound of fats—the following was collected:

	Pounds
Scrap metal	1,308,389
Scrap rubber	2,813
Fats	12,314

While figures are not available, it is reasonable to suppose that figures for the American League will be comparable to the above.

BASEBALL EQUIPMENT FUND

The Baseball Equipment Fund, organized to provide baseball equipment for the men in the Armed Forces, has been handled entirely by major league baseball, working in close cooperation with the Army and Navy.

Funds totaling $250,814.96 have been raised, entirely within baseball and without any outside solicitation. The fund has been collected without any paid workers and with the expense of operation contributed by the men involved.

Through this fund there have been distributed to date 13,491 dozen baseballs, 40,473 bats, 26,982 rule books, 1,360 official guides, 1,438 catching gloves, 1,438 masks, 1,438 shin guards and protectors, and 12 sets of uniforms.

In addition to the above new equipment, there also have been distributed some 1,200 dozen baseballs, hit into the stands and returned by fans.

This equipment has gone into camps throughout the continental United States and to every active war theater. Equipment also has been furnished to outposts in Greenland, Bermuda, Virgin Islands, India, China, Canal Zone, Hawaii, British Guiana, Trinidad, Iceland, and so forth—and has been sent to American prisoners in prison camps in Germany.

SERVICE EXHIBITION GAMES

In addition to the foregoing, throughout the season of 1942 and 1943 both the American and National Leagues, wherever possible, played games in camps for the entertainment of the armed forces. In 1943 alone the two major leagues played approximately 115 games in Army and Navy camps.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Here is another interesting item: With the present player limit, the National League is conducted with a playing strength of 400 men (25 per club) exclusive of managers and coaches—all of whom are beyond the draft-age limit.

In addition to players, however, the league employs a vast number of other persons—office personnel, ticket takers and sellers, police, ground-keepers, scoreboard men, vendors, caretakers, telephone operators, engineers, electricians, carpenters, scouts, and so forth.

In the National League these outside employees approximate 7,500 men and women. Of that number approximately one-third—2,500—are year-round employees and the remainder—5,000—are employed on the seasonal basis.

Eighty percent of these employees are women or men beyond the draft age. About 11 percent are boys under draft age. Only about 9 percent come within the 18- to 38-year limit of selective service.

All of these employees are contributors to a bond subscription plan. All of them are dependent to a large degree on baseball for their livelihood. The elimination of baseball would, of course, throw them out of employment.

MISCELLANEOUS CONTRIBUTIONS

In addition to all of the foregoing, there are divers and sundry miscellaneous contributions, which I herewith report.

Use of park: Free use of baseball parks throughout the league has been given for various war purposes such as Red Cross rallies, recuiting drives, war shows, Army-Navy and War funds drives.

Blood banks: All clubs have worked with the Red Cross in securing blood donors. This particular service has been plugged and boosted over the radio during baseball broadcasts. It is impossible to obtain accurate figures, but in Brooklyn alone the Red Cross chapter officially attributes 65,295 blood donations to the direct efforts of baseball.

Bond drives: In addition to the direct bond sales listed elsewhere all clubs through broadcasts have urged bond sales and have asked listeners to call the station immediately with their subscriptions. This, too, is impossible to estimate accurately, but in one broadcast alone in the New York metropolitan area, sale of $3,745,000 in bonds was subscribed by direct phone call during the progress of one Sunday double-header.

Fund games: In addition to the official games listed elsewhere, various games were played by individual clubs for war-fund purposes. In one game in Boston, for instance, $8,835.14 was raised for the Red Cross.

Scrap drives: In addition to the scrap drives reported in the foregoing, various clubs also held aluminum drives and something more than 14,000 pounds of aluminum was turned in as a result of this effort.

Motion pictures: The motion-picture department of the major leagues showed their baseball motion pictures to approximately 4,000,000 soldiers in camps in the continental United States and overseas. A movie of the 1943 world series has been prepared for overseas distribution at a cost of $75,000.

Mr. President, the picture which has been presented through these rather detailed facts and figures is one to conjure with insofar as the future of baseball is concerned.

Those connected with the management of professional baseball have demonstrated a highly patriotic purpose in this great emergency. I doubt that any Senator will disagree with me that professional baseball is absolutely essential to keep up the public morale, both on the military and civilian fronts. The record made since Pearl Harbor by the owners, managers, and players in professional baseball in this country is one of which every American should be proud. My sincere hope is that nothing will be done by any agency of the Government which will in any way disturb the continuation of this great American institution during the emergency.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON AMENDMENT OF SIXTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1942

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 53, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which I introduced in the Senate on January 7, 1943, and which I had introduced at the previous session, providing for the abolition, by a constitutional amendment, of poll taxes as a qualification for voting.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any tax or on account of any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in addition to the joint resolution, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, transmitting a copy of a letter which he wrote to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. VAN NUYS] and a copy of the letter which I wrote to Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays in response. I think a fitting title for these documents would be "The Constitution or Confusion."

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, November 3, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We address you as a member of the Judiciary Committee to call your attention to the enclosed copy of a letter to Senator VAN NUYS concerning the anti-poll-tax bill.

We trust you will concur in our view.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
Counsel.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, November 3, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VAN NUYS: The constitutional issue in relation to H. R. 7, the anti-poll-tax bill, raised again by Judge Charles Warren, should not, in our judgment, occasion further delay in reporting that bill favorably.

Your committee reported it last year after hearing the constitutional arguments. We had assumed that the committee was reasonably satisfied on the constitutional points and felt, as we all do, that any doubts should be resolved in the courts.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that, although there is a substantial argument on the other side, it is being used primarily to confuse the issue and to prevent a vote on the bill. We trust that prompt and favorable action by the Judiciary Committee will dispose of any such suspicion.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
Counsel.
JOHN P. FINERTY,
Counsel.

NOVEMBER 13, 1943.

Mr. ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HAYS: Your letter of November 3 transmitting a copy of your letter of the same date to Senator VAN NUYS about the anti-poll-tax bill prompts me, although the committee has now reported the bill, to remind you of the old saying that if anything is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well.

To those who believe in the abolition of the poll tax, H. R. 7 offers only another filibuster in the Senate and thereafter, in all probability, litigation. The basis of this litigation is recognized in your letter to Senator VAN NUYS in your sentence, "It is difficult to resist the conclusion that although there is a substantial argument on the other side, it is being used primarily to confuse the issue and to prevent a vote on the bill."

As you know, I have had a constitutional amendment pending before the committee since the early days of the controversy. This amendment offers the opponents of the poll tax a sure, certain and, I believe, speedy method of gaining the reform they desire. There can be no substantial argument against the effectiveness of a constitutional amendment, and since there are only eight States in the Union which cling to the poll tax, it is difficult to believe that there would be any delay in procuring its enactment. In any event, it ought to be tried.

May I not add the suggestion that of all organizations the American Civil Liberties Union should support the constitutional amendment approach. It is the Constitution which protects civil liberties against waves of passion. It is the Constitution which is the most effective guardian of minority rights. If you write this reform into the Constitution the task will have been done. If you are content only to follow the road of statutory procedure then you create the precedent whereby a majority in the Congress can override other civil liberties and State's rights which are now protected by the Constitution.

Very sincerely yours,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reorganizing Congress," published in the New York Times of November 11, 1943, and an editorial entitled "Reforming Congress," published in the Washington Post of November 12, 1943, both of which have reference to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which I submitted in the Senate several days ago.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 11, 1943]

REORGANIZING CONGRESS

It is encouraging that Senator MALONEY and Representative MONRONEY have introduced identical resolutions in the House and Senate to create a bipartisan joint committee to recommend ways to improve the efficiency of Congress. Studies of the proposed committee would include: (1) The organization and operation of each House of Congress; (2) the relationship between the Senate and the House; (3) the relationships between Congress and other branches of the Government; (4) the employment and remuneration of personnel by members and the committees of Congress, and (5) the structure and the relationships between the various standing and special select committees on both sides of the Capitol.

Such a study would be of the very first importance. The responsibilities now laid upon Congress are greater than ever before in its history. The unparalleled functions that it is called upon to perform are revealing the weaknesses of its internal organization as they have never been revealed before. If Congress is to operate with any efficiency, if it is to have any coherent program of its own, it must have some central committee to which the other committees are subordinate. The chances for an internal reorganization of Congress are, fortunately, perhaps now better than they have been in generations. If a resolution along the lines of the Maloney-Monroney proposal is passed, the first condition for its success would be the selection of a committee that included the present minority and majority leaders in both Houses, the chairmen of a few of the most powerful committees, and natural leaders who have successfully taken the initiative on important legislation in the last few years.

[From the Washington Post of November 12, 1943]

REFORMING CONGRESS

Of all the recent moves to reform Congress, we believe the Maloney-Monroney resolution has the best chance of success. For Senator MALONEY and Representative MONRONEY are not attempting to tell Congress offhand how its business should be conducted. They propose a 12-man joint committee drawn from both parties to investigate congressional procedure in the light of modern demands upon Congress and then to report its findings and recommendations to the House and Senate. We have suggested such a committee many times in the last few years in the belief that Congress can be reformed only by Congress itself.

The need for modernization of our legislative machinery of government is no longer open to question. That is evident in many actions of both the House and Senate as well as in their failure to act on some vital issues. The simple fact is that neither House is properly organized to handle the staggering questions of policy that crowd in upon it. Power over legislation is carelessly diffused among too many committees with no central cohesiveness to keep Congress as a whole operating in the national interest. Congress does an enormous amount of work, but much of its effort is wasted because of this loose organization.

One other difficulty is that Congress tries to do too much work without expert assistance. Recently it has begun to hire more investigators and research men. This practice probably ought to be greatly expanded and regularized, as it has been in the case of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. If Congress is to remain a great legislative body in this complicated age, it must have the tools to work with and the expert assistance that is accorded every administrative bureau as a matter of course.

Which reforms should be undertaken and which are impracticable, however, must be left for Congress to decide. Reform from within will not be easy because of the vested interests of committee chairmen in their present or prospective jobs and because of

the general inertia that works against change. Yet it is obvious that only a program of modernization sponsored by a strong joint committee has any real chance of being accepted. The political scientists behind this move can do their best work after a congressional study group has taken the leadership. Friends of congressional reform may well turn their wholehearted support, therefore, to the Maloney-Monroney resolution.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported the pending bill favorably to the Senate, I wish to take a few minutes to express my opposition to the proposal.

Earlier in the afternoon, when I asked the Presiding Officer to recognize me in connection with this discussion, I had intended to discuss the bill at some length; but since that time, in a most unusual debate—unusual because so many Senators, including myself, have interrupted to contribute to the debate during the course of speeches—the views which I hold have been pretty well covered.

I merely wish to say that I regard the bill as very dangerous. It would establish precedents which we can foresee, and I fear precedents which, in the limited time we have had to think about it, we cannot begin to foresee. Many of the dangers have been suggested during the course of this afternoon's discussion.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me state that I have no fear that the proposed subsidy—and I think it is a subsidy—would disturb the freedom of the press. I have too high a regard for the publishers of the country, large and small, to believe that they, who have at considerable self-sacrifice devoted themselves to the field of journalism, would yield their independence to the Federal Government. However, I am not so certain that the politicians might not be seeking to invent ways to take advantage of a Federal contribution to the newspapers of the country.

One of the things particularly disturbing to me is the terrific costs which might follow should we now appropriate $30,000,000 for this press subsidy. I think, as many other Senators think, as has been pointed out here this afternoon, and as I myself endeavored to emphasize during the course of the committee consideration of the bill, that if we should enact the bill it could not be other than a step toward like proposals for other advertising media in the future. Among my other fears, Mr. President, I am especially concerned that if we should appropriate $30,000,000 to be spent in large part among the small newspapers of the country, we would give occasion for offense to those already contributing hundreds of millions of dollars to the Government war effort, and largely toward the sale of War bonds.

As has been pointed out here this afternoon, millions of dollars have been contributed by the motion-picture industry. We all know that untold millions of dollars have been contributed by other advertising people of the country—the press, the magazines, outdoor advertising, and agencies of other sorts.

We all know that in the field of advertising there are scores of opportunities to spend money. If we should open the door or let down the bars in this instance, it is quite beyond me how we could expect to avoid other heavy expenditures. Advertising people are as frail as other people; and I do not think, Mr. President, we can afford to take any step so dangerous as the one suggested.

During the course of the committee hearings it was pointed out that if the Federal Government undertook to advertise the sale of War bonds, notes, or Federal obligations by way of Federal moneys directly appropriated, it would—and again because the newspaper publishers are as frail as other persons—be undertaking a little later to advertise for the employment of men under another W. P. A. I am referring to what occurred in the committee meeting.

If we shall do this for the sale of War bonds, is it farfetched to say that we will be doing it under all the other programs? Once we establish a precedent in one particular field, what excuse do we have to resist a demand for similar treatment in any other field—for example, advertising any regulation of the Office of Price Administration, or regulations of any of the other agencies of Government? If we take the step, Mr. President—the first time it has been proposed in more than 100 years—of telling those to whom we appropriate money how and where to spend it, might we not do it in connection with all the things the Government buys? Might we not tell the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments of the Government where they should purchase their automobiles and their trucks? Might we not, for the identical reason, just as well tell the Government Printing Office where it should purchase its printing? I cannot see the end of the proposal. It is a strange one. To me it is amazing. I have in my State, as does every other Senator, friends who are engaged in the publication of weekly, biweekly, and semiweekly newspapers. There are some in my State who I know favor the pending bill. But, Mr. President, I think they favor it on the basis of hurried thought, hasty judgment, because they have made some sacrifice in the advertising of War bonds, because they have not, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan earlier today pointed out, received from the Government the help that almost everyone else has received.

But to me the press of the country is something apart. It is a semipublic institution. Just as it requires our protection as to freedom, in my judgment just so does the press have a right to our complete protection in this particular instance.

I do not believe the bill will pass, Mr. President. But there is always the danger, unless Senators stay with the proposal and consider it carefully, that during the period of stress, smaller appropriations, which no longer excite Members of Congress very much, might get by. It is for that reason that I take the time of the Senate, after hours of discussion, as well as for the reason that, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I was denied a chance, because of circumstances over which I had no control, to vote in committee. I therefore join in the plea of those who have heretofore spoken against the bill, and express the hope that it will be overwhelmingly defeated.

TIME EXTENSION FOR APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 722, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, and also extending the time for the approval and qualifications of pension trusts, agreements, and so forth, to which the Senate agreed.

The House conferees accepted Senate amendments 1, 2, and 3. However, the House conferees would not accept an amendment which was offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], which related to the period of time of application for a certificate of necessity for the amortization of payment under section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code.

However, with reference to that particular matter the conferees expressed themselves as favoring a general reconsideration, and probably a further amendment of section 124, relating to the time for filing applications for certificates of necessity under section 124, and indicated that it would be agreeable to consider the matter in the bill which is to follow the revenue bill, which will deal with technical and administrative provisions of the Revenue Code.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the conference report signed by the minority members of the Senate conferees?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I was authorized by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to sign for him. I was not authorized by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is a conferee on the bill, and therefore he did not sign. He happened to be out of the city Saturday, when we met.

Mr. WHITE. There is nothing to indicate that the Senator is in opposition to the decision arrived at?

Mr. GEORGE. Nothing that I know of; no.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3; and agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
Managers on the part of the House.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the so-called Bankhead newspaper advertising bill, because, in principle, I think it is bad and I believe it to be dangerous. As the able senior Senator from Alabama has explained to the Senate, the bill provides for an appropriation of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 annually, to be used to pay for the advertising of Government bonds in newspapers; and one-half of the money would be used to pay for advertisements in newspapers in towns of 10,000 population or less.

We understand that the Treasury Department is opposed to the bill. The Secretary of the Treasury is known to be opposed to it. That being true, it would appear that the support comes from the smaller newspapers of the country. I say "smaller" advisedly, because the larger newspapers, or certainly some of them, are opposed to the bill.

I should like to have printed in the RECORD several replies I have received from metropolitan newspapers in answer to a telegram I sent them. I inquired what their opinion was of the so-called Bankhead bill. The Philadelphia Inquirer replied:

We disapprove Bankhead advertising bill.

The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin replied:

No comment.

The Chicago Tribune telegraphed me as follows:

In recent months we have published several editorials opposing Government appropriations for newspaper advertising such as are provided in S. 1457.

The Herald Tribune of New York telegraphed:

We are opposed to Bankhead newspaper advertising bill. Letter follows.

That letter was duly received, and it developed to be a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. It was written by Linwood I. Noyes, president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. In his letter to the Senator from New York, Mr. Noyes quoted from an address which his predecessor, Mr. Dear, former president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, delivered at one of the association's annual conventions. I should like to read two paragraphs:

Another phase of this problem has developed through the announcement of a bill to be introduced in the Congress. Briefly it is proposed that an appropriation of twenty-five to thirty million dollars shall be voted by Congress for advertising in newspapers of Treasury bond sales, the appropriation to be equally divided between daily and weekly newspapers. This provision smacks of subsidy.

Some newspaper groups have publicly acclaimed approval of the idea and through overenthusiasm or because of economic pressure have expressed advocacy on the ground that such expenditure, particularly in the case of the small newspapers, would serve as a stopgap for the economic depression which endangers the continuation of such publications. While we have the deepest sympathy for any of our fellow publishers who may find the going difficult, and realize the value and importance of the weekly press, we cannot subscribe to the wisdom of accepting a subsidy. Such a program would prove disastrous. Under such circumstances, no longer could the American newspaper maintain its claim of a free and independent press.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to read an editorial from the Washington Post of November 2, which is headed Newspaper Subsidies. The editorial is as follows:

NEWSPAPER SUBSIDIES

Senator BANKHEAD'S newspaper subsidy bill reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency last week is put forward as a means of helping the Treasury sell War bonds. It would permit the expenditure of up to $30,000,000 for Treasury advertising chiefly in small-town papers. We think it quite probable that the bill would hurt rather than help War bond sales. In the recent successful Third War loan drive both small-town and metropolitan newspapers gave an enormous amount of free space to encourage the sale of bonds. The mere pittance of advertising that could be bought with $30,000,000 a year might dampen the enthusiasm of both the newspapers and their commercial advertisers for giving space to bond drives without charge. The opposition of the Treasury to the Bankhead bill should be sufficient to shatter the idea that it would be of assistance in financing the war.

Congress will pass this bill only if it concludes that newspapers should be subsidized. So the measure involves a principle of very great importance and we hope that this fact will not be overlooked, because the amount of the subsidy proposed is comparatively small. Should the principle itself be accepted there would probably be pressure from the subsidized press to increase the subsidies. And in all fairness, as Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo pointed out as long ago as 1917, the benefits would have to be equalized among all media of expression. Magazines, broadcasters, and perhaps the motion-picture industry, too, would demand their share of this easy money. Where would the process of subsidizing expression of opinion end?

No reasonable person will deny that payments direct to newspapers from the Government would endanger freedom of the press. The editor of a country paper drawing any substantial portion of his income from the Government would certainly not feel as free to criticize public policy as he otherwise would be. Congressmen would be in a position to intimidate small publishers in financial straits by threatening to repeal the subsidy act. We cannot avoid the conclusion that the influence of the Bankhead bill would be sinister, aside from the fact that it would involve a useless expenditure of public funds. The people of this democracy are still intelligent enough to decide for themselves which newspapers should live and which should perish. If there ever comes a time when they are incapable of making such decisions, we may as well begin looking for a dictator, for democracy itself will be on the way out.

Moreover, Mr. President, I am unable to agree with the proponents of the pending bill that the payments provided would not be a subsidy; I think they would be. But, regardless of what definition may be attached to the word, the financial assistance which this bill would provide could not fail to place some of the newspapers under obligations to the Government, and when that happens, I say, Mr. President, that, whether the administration is New Deal, Democratic or Republican, the possibilities of influencing the editorial policies of some of the newspapers will remain a danger and a threat to the free press of the country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from Ed Franta, secretary of the North Dakota Press Association.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANGDON, N. DAK., *November 9, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

North Dakota newspapermen expect and will appreciate your vote favoring Bankhead bill.

ED FRANTA,
Secretary of North Dakota Press Association.

CELEBRATION OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on Thursday last, on the east steps of this historic Capitol Building, I had the rare privilege, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, which joined with the House Committee on Naval Affairs in arranging the meeting, of attending the inspiring ceremony marking the 168th anniversary of the United States Marine Corps. The meeting was presided over by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The ceremony—serious and soul-stirring occasion that it was—was climaxed by the raising of a battle-scarred American flag which was first raised on the island of Guadalcanal—to proclaim to the world in this war, as in all other wars, "the marines have landed, and the situation is well in hand."

Mr. President, on this inspiring occasion General Thomas Holcomb, commandant of the United States Marine Corps, delivered a remarkable address—an address as memorable and as penetrating as it was brief and unpretentious. I shall now read his address to the Members of the Senate. General Holcomb said:

I have the pleasure of reading the following letter from the President of the United States:

"I am sorry that I cannot be with you on Wednesday and with you salute the Guadalcanal flag as it is raised over the Nation's Capitol. But, with the rest of the Nation, I can and do enjoy the significance of this ceremony which will honor the Marine Corps on its one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary.

"Even now the corps, which never rests on its laurels, is busy attending the baptism of more battle flags, on the road to Tokyo.

"Eventually, these flags, too, will come home, to be grouped with the flags of all our victories, as a new inspiration for future generations—generations who will always have good cause to gather on the 10th of November to celebrate the birthday of the United States marines."

After reading the letter from the President of the United States which I have just quoted, General Holcomb, the able and distinguished Commandant of the Marine Corps, continued his remarks, as follows:

A Japanese war lord once announced that he would dictate the terms of peace while the Japanese flag was flying over Washington.

One of his stepping stones on the way was Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands. He believed his own rising sun was planted securely there. But American fighting men shot it down, and with it, in its fall, went the enemy's dream of conquest.

For this flag, rising to take its place, symbolized the first show of American power in amphibious warfare. And the enemy knew, as well as did we, how vital amphibious operations were to be in the coming battles of the Pacific.

Those who fought on Guadalcanal, wherever they are, will hear of today's kind honors with gratitude and pride. And with us, they will pledge anew to carry forward to final victory the great offensive promised the enemy on December 8, 1941, in this Capitol Building, by the leaders of our Nation.

Mr. President, rarely is it given to one who was born in a foreign state, to one who immigrated to this land, America, in the early and formative years of his life, to one who has labored in the cause of freedom and justice which this country typifies, to know the gripping spirit of such an hour.

There, while the band played the historic marine hymn—there, while Lieutenant McClanahan raised that tattered flag—there, while the members of the corps, alert, clear-eyed, and stalwart American men in the very flower of their lives, marched abreast in even ranks—there, Mr. President, breathed the very heart and fiber of America.

Every man, every woman, every child in that assembled throng knew the drama of the moment. No eyes more bright, no heads more high, no hearts more proud than theirs, in that brief hour when the full, fine spirit of America dwelt with them in the shadows of the day.

Mr. President, the members of our present-day Marine Corps are indeed worthy to carry on those great traditions of gallantry and honor which are implied in and synonymous with the very name marine. Those gallant young men of this generation who stormed up the steaming shores of Guadalcanal are fitting comrades to that first generation of marines who, in 1775, stormed ashore at New Providence to capture old Fort Montague in the Bahamas.

And the modern marines, who, in that darkest hour on Wake Island, sent out to the world the immortal message, "Send us some more Japs," are worthy compatriots to that other generation of marines who bagged the pirate in his lair and hoisted the Stars and Stripes of freedom at Derna, Tripoli, in 1805.

And our unyielding marines of today who now grapple with the foe at Bougainville are fully deserving of that same name marine which men of another era carried with them when they stood with Jackson at New Orleans and attacked with Perry on rough Lake Erie in the War of 1812.

It has always followed, Mr. President, that whenever this nation has been called upon to defend itself or to protect the stricken, the United States Marine Corps—from the days of the Revolution to the days of Bougainville—has always conducted itself with a bravery, an honor, and an efficiency unsurpassed by any other military organization in all the world.

Mr. President, General Holcomb uttered a profound and prophetic truth when he said that Tojo's dream of world conquest was forever shattered with the shooting down of the rising sun on Guadalcanal.

It is true that the fanatic forces of infamy, unleashed by the Japanese war lords in Tokyo, have overrun and despoiled great expanses of empire. They have devoured the Philippines, the East Indies, and Singapore. They have infested Burma and menaced India. They have continued their ways of wanton slaughter against the peaceful lands and the indomitable peoples of historic China. Theirs is a record of rape and pillage unequaled in all the annals of the world.

But the little men of Nippon have met and recognized their masters. The fighting marines, who endured the heaviest fire for interminable weeks, stopped the forward lunge of the Japs at Guadalcanal. They rocked the doughty enemy back upon his heels. They drove him into retreat. And they now pursue him relentlessly along that rough and bitter road which leads ultimately to Tokyo, nerve center and locus of modern treachery.

Mr. President, so long as the United States of America knows the service and sacrifice of such men as comprise the Marine Corps, so long as America knows the service and sacrifice of such men as now comprise our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force, we need harbor no fears that the war lords of Japan or Germany or any other aggressor nation will ever dictate the terms of peace here in this Capital City of Washington.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that unless the white flag of unconditional surrender is raised by our enemies, the fighting men of America will blast and bomb and burn their way into the heart of Tokyo itself, and that the American flag will be seen to fly in the very shadows of the Japanese Imperial Palace.

But unlike that blood-smeared flag of conquest which bears the seal of the rising sun, the flag which the American fighting men bring with them shall denote neither conquest nor plunder. That flag shall signify the coming of a new era of peace and freedom for the world. That flag shall sound the knell of death to war lords and the makers of war lords. For never again shall such benighted men as these be permitted to poison the minds of a whole people and through them plunge the entire world into the horrible holocaust of global war.

The victory of our fighting men shall bring with it, God willing, a new vista of peace, of understanding, and of mutual growth among all the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, that flag which was raised at Guadalcanal has now taken its place along with the other immortal banners of history in the archives of America. And before this war has run its course other banners of triumph will undoubtedly be placed there.

But, Mr. President, it occurred to me as I watched the ceremony which I have just described, that these flags are a symbol of the strength, the will, and the integrity of the American people and the American fighting men. It occurred to me that the men who carry these flags and win these battles pay a full and awesome price. It occurred to me that the men whom we send into battle are looking to us to keep their America at home as strong, as free, and as progressive as when they first went forward to pledge their lives to its cause.

Mr. President, the fighting men of America are winning the battles of freedom abroad. Let us here not fail in our solemn and oath-sworn duty to preserve those standards of freedom at home. Let us prove worthy of the men in the United States Marine Corps and our other fighting forces. Let us prove worthy of the resounding blows for flag and freedom which were struck by our gallant sons on the distant island of Guadalcanal.

PRODUCTION OF MILK AND PROPOSED MILK SUBSIDY

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a few days after Congress reconvened in September a special meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee was called, to which the Federal Food Administrator, Judge Marvin Jones, was invited. He wanted to talk to us, it developed, about the milk situation and the dairy difficulties generally. After several hours of discussion among members of the committee, and after testimony by Mr. Jones and others, he submitted to us three proposals for subsidies for dairy producers. He did not offer us a choice between subsidies on the one hand and some other method of operating on the other, but rather a choice of some one of three

methods of subsidies. The Senators present, having been invited to give their views, seemed almost unanimous in their opposition to any of the subsidy plans proposed by Judge Jones.

Over the ensuing week end it further developed, however, that activities with reference to a subsidy were growing apace. I talked one day with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] about the situation, and we invited a group of Senators to meet the following Wednesday, and on the 22d of September we met. There were some 33 or 34 Senators present, and Judge Vinson, at our invitation, came up from the White House. Various speakers representing the viewpoints of different sections of the Nation set before Judge Vinson all the views that lay within our possession as to the difficulties and the growing problems attendant upon continued dairy production in this country. At the conclusion of that meeting informal expressions of views—since the meeting was informal after all—reflected again almost unanimous opposition to the subsidy program which Judge Vinson discussed with us. At that time, Mr. President, I submitted tentatively, as expressing the policy of the group present, a program in four points, a copy of which I send to the desk and ask to have printed in full in the RECORD, without reading at this time.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DANAHER TO MEETING ATTENDED BY JUDGE VINSON, SEPTEMBER 22, 1943

That the committee declare a policy with reference to fluid milk in particular and the dairy industry in general as follows:

1. Milk is entitled to special treatment as an indispensable item of our wartime diet.

2. That to guarantee continued production, regional support prices should be declared at once by the War Food Administration.

3. If to maintain or increase production of milk a price increase is indicated in certain regions, that method should be followed by the proper authorities.

4. That feed be requisitioned if need be, or purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation and made available to producers with priorities established for feed in favor of dairy production, to be allocated by county war boards or certificate of need.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as matters have progressed from September 22 down to the present time, the dairy situation in distress areas is rapidly growing worse. In my own State of Connecticut, a deficit area, the problem is positively critical. Today I received from Governor Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut, a letter reading as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, November 12, 1943.

I have today sent the following telegram to the President:

"Milk production in Connecticut continues to decline and an adequate supply for our war plants, our schools and our consumers generally is dangerously threatened. This will seriously affect the health and vitality of our people. I strongly urge an opportunity to present facts to a joint meeting of Director James F. Byrnes, Administrator Frederick M. Vinson, Administrator Chester A. Bowles and Administrator Marvin Jones. I would personally attend such a meeting and bring with me the most reliable information that our people can supply. Our milk producers have gone ahead loyally and faithfully but many of the smaller producers and dealers who supply a large part of our market are daily being forced out of business. Power to cure this situation rests with the Federal Government and I earnestly hope that working with you we can evolve a program which will put a stop to the falling off of our production and will encourage our farmers to stay in business and in due time increase their production of this vital food."

The Governor further said:

Our milk producers are vehemently opposed to subsidies. They feel so uncertain about the situation that, as you no doubt already know, many of them are going out of business and our supplies are dwindling.

I am hopeful that in such a meeting as is proposed in the telegram, some policy can be evolved to help the situation. It would seem to me that that policy must pay particular attention to the peculiar situation in each State. At the present time, under a distribution plan, we are importing milk from outside of the State, and that in turn is disrupting the sources of supplies in other areas. Other States, with a deficit situation, are doing the same thing, which adds to the confusion. At the present time, however, we are compelled to go out of the State to try to make up this deficit, and any interference with that situation would harm us greatly. How long we can keep it up is another matter, because if deficits increase in other States it is going to directly affect us.

Mr. President, in this very particular, the Governor delivered over radio station WTIC, in Hartford, on Saturday, October 16, a most illuminating address on the general problem confronting the dairy industry in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England. I ask unanimous consent that the address by Governor Baldwin may be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor BALDWIN. Good evening everybody. I want to talk to you tonight about our milk supply. This concerns us all—every man, woman, and child in Connecticut, for milk is food and food will win the war.

Our supply of milk right now is dangerously threatened. Deliveries of milk to Connecticut milk dealers' plants this week end will be short of the requirements of their customers. We do not have enough milk—tonight—to meet the full demands of Connecticut milk consumers.

This has not been a good production season. We have had a very long period of dry weather. Pastures have been of little value for a month or longer. That is one of the immediate reasons for the milk shortage we now face.

But that is only a temporary condition, one of the hazards of the weather to which farmers in New England are accustomed. There are more serious man-made reasons for the difficulty we are now facing.

The situation they have brought about will not be cured by a change in weather. Its roots go deep into the fundamental policies of the Nation on its food supply.

We have been proud of our milk industry in Connecticut. Until now, milk was one food commodity that we could furnish, in full supply and of finest quality, for all our people. Most of our meat, much of our fruit and vegetables, nearly all our cereals, we buy in other States. But through bad times and good—until this fall—we have produced the milk we needed, and some to spare.

We have about 3,300 wholesale dairy farmers in Connecticut, about 1,900 who sell their milk retail, and about 400 dealers who buy milk from farmers, bottle it, and deliver it from door to door. Over the years this industry has kept pace with a constantly growing demand for milk.

Then came the war. Thousands of men from other States came into Connecticut to work in our war plants. Many of them brought their families. Many thousands of our own people went to work in these same factories. They all needed milk. Many other foods were rationed or were hard to get and people had the money to buy more milk. Comparing the first 6 months of this year with the first 6 months of 1941, total sales of milk in fluid form had increased more than 20 percent throughout Connecticut.

Our dairy farmers foresaw this increase in demand and tried to meet it. They worked harder and they increased production. Their workday began by lantern light and ended by lantern light. Until the weather turned against them in late summer they were producing milk in larger quantities than they ever had before.

But even then they were losing in their race to keep up with increased demand. Total production on Connecticut farms during the first 6 months of this year was 6 percent higher than 2 years ago, but—remember—fluid milk sales by Connecticut dealers were 20 percent greater.

During all this time the dairy farmers were working under handicaps and against odds. They have been unable to get new farm machinery or even repairs for old machines. They have been desperately short of help. The price of the grain they buy is continually going up and the quality of the grain is going down. Now the grain, of whatever quality, is disappearing from the market. The price of cows has gone to figures that would have seemed fantastic a few years ago. Wages of farm labor have been considerably increased.

But—since December 1941, there has been no increase in the basic price of milk. It was 16 cents a quart then. It is 16 cents a quart today. Our State milk administrator, as long ago as May, after a public hearing, made a formal finding that increased cost of milk production required an increase of at least 1 cent a quart in returns to farmers if production was to be maintained so that rationing of milk could be avoided. We presented his recommendation to the O. P. A. Leaders in the dairy industry have been to Washington to plead their case. I have written, telephoned and telegraphed and I have been to Washington and talked to the men who make these policies in our Nation's Capital. Our Congressmen and Senators have been actively and vigorously pressing them for action. But all our appeals were denied.

Now here we are, short of milk. The situation is so serious that our National Government, through the War Food Administration has issued what it calls a milk limitation order. It goes into effect tomorrow morning, in the territories around Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, and Waterbury—our largest centers of population. To all intents and purposes this is milk rationing. Starting tomorrow morning, dealers in these areas may not sell any more fluid milk than the amount they sold in June of this year. In their sales of cream and other dairy products they are limited to 75 percent of the amount they sold in June.

If there is not enough milk to meet the demands of household customers, the dealers will be required to cut down or stop deliveries of milk to restaurants and hotels, to factory lunchrooms—possibly to stores. Hospitals, homes, and schools will, and they must, get first consideration.

One of these days you men and women who work in our war plants may walk up to

the cafeteria counter and find there is no milk. Some of you housewives may find before long that the milkman has left only 4 quarts of milk instead of 5 at the back door, or 2 instead of 3.

I do not say that this milk limitation order is wrong. If we do not have milk enough to go around, we must apportion equitably what we have.

But I do say that the policies of the Federal Food Administration—or rather the lack of any consistent policies—that got us into this fix are wrong. This situation could and should have been avoided.

The fact is, our National Food Administration, since the war began, has never had a consistent and comprehensive policy with respect to food in general and milk in particular. The National Government has never given to the dairy farmer the same economic protection and assurances that it has given to everybody else.

No adequate measures have been developed to assure dairy farmers of a reliable supply of farm labor, machinery, or feedstuffs.

But, more particularly, the pricing policies that have been followed by the National Government have made it impossible for the dairy farmer in Connecticut to cover his costs of milk production.

The answer we are given in Washington is that an increase in the price of milk would violate the President's order to "hold the line." Let us accept this argument. The line must be held at some point, I will grant. I am not against the principle of price control during this war period.

But I am against the selection of a line that must be blindly and grimly held while the supply of vitally needed food—such as milk—is jeopardized. If we keep on with a stabilization program that puts all its emphasis on price and entirely disregards cost of production we will end up with a dry milk bottle and an empty bread basket.

No dairy farmer can raise or buy cows, or plan any of his operations intelligently, unless he can be sure that at least he will get his money back.

After long delay—and only for a temporary period of three months—the National Government has announced a subsidy payment to milk producers. The figure in this State is 50 cents for a hundred pounds of milk, or about 1 cent a quart, to be paid on production in October, November, and December.

This subsidy, it seems to me, is "too little and too late." One cent a quart increase on 3 months' production falls far short of adequate help. Our State war board is to handle the distribution of this money and will expedite it as much as possible. Even so, for this relatively small payment, there is elaborate machinery and an enormous amount of detailed work involved. Subsidies are not as simple as they sound.

Here is the issue, however. Should income incentives for dairy farmers be secured through further subsidies or through price increases? I will give you my own humble personal opinion.

It is my conviction that we ought, at least, to pay our grocery bill as we go along. That conclusion is based on my personal philosophy and it is the way we have lived here in Connecticut. But, if income incentives are to be secured through subsidy payments from the Treasury, instead of by fixing a fair economic price, they should at least meet these conditions:

The subsidies should be adequate to cover the increased costs of milk production.

They should be paid promptly.

There should be definite assurance of continued payment over a sufficiently long period so that producers can make their plans, knowing approximately what income they will have.

It does not appear to me now that these conditions are at all likely to be met.

The importance of this milk question has been impressed upon me ever since last January. I have spent many hours talking with men who know the problem. To my mind it is the No. 1 food problem of Connecticut—and of the Nation.

There is no more important food, from the standpoint of the diet, than milk. It is one of the "basic seven." It is the best possible substitute for such protein foods as meat—and apparently we must accept a diet with less meat and more cereals for the duration of the war. Milk will supplement these cereal foods and supply the minerals, the vitamins, and the animal proteins so much needed by all workers.

Moreover, milk is one of our cheapest foods. We get more food value from a dollar's worth of milk than from nearly any other food that we can buy. The price of milk has lagged far behind as costs of other foods have risen. For the United States, all retail food prices advanced about 40 percent between January 1941 and August 1943—during part of which time we were supposedly "holding the line." If you break that down, you'll find some interesting figures. The cost of cereals and bakery products increased about 14 percent. The cost of all meats increased about 28, fruits and vegetables 82, eggs 72 percent.

Here in Connecticut during this period the price of milk increased only 14 percent. The average of all food prices has increased nearly three times as much as this.

I have had several conferences this week with leaders in the dairy industry and State officials concerned with the milk problem. We came to these conclusions:

First, we must continue to maintain and encourage our production of milk here in Connecticut. To do this, we must secure correction of the basic maladjustment between cost of production and price so that farmers can be encouraged to go ahead and produce to the limit of their capacity.

Our second conclusion was this: We must continue our efforts to get adequate supplies of feed this winter. The Federal Government must make it possible somehow for our dairy farmers to feed their cows.

Our third conclusion was that we must, if possible, avoid any drastic decrease in quantity of milk which will be available to our people. The Government has set 100 percent of June deliveries by dealers as our quota of fluid milk. If we can actually get this amount of milk we will be reasonably well supplied. The State of Connecticut is entitled to this amount, because of the war work we are doing, because of our increased population, and because of the shortages of other foods.

It may be impossible to get this full amount. It very probably will be impossible in the month of November when our production is normally at its lowest point.

If this happens—if the milkman leaves 2 quarts of milk instead of 4 some morning—I earnestly ask that you have patience.

Your State government, as well as the dairy farmer, is working under handicaps. The pricing policy with respect to this food is fixed in Washington. The supply of dairy feed for Connecticut is also fixed in Washington.

Your State government will keep on with this campaign. We will keep on hammering at Washington to increase the returns to dairy farmers and relieve their economic difficulties. We will continue our efforts to get larger supplies of grain. We will go into our neighboring States for such additional milk supplies as we may be able to get to tide us over the critical period that lies just ahead.

For we must have milk.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. At the time when the 31, 32, or 33 Senators met with Judge Vinson to discuss the subsidy matter, what was Judge Vinson's attitude?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. Vinson's attitude was one of extreme cooperativeness. He was very generous in his attempts to understand and appreciate the problem which confronted the people throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I personally came away from the meeting very definitely edified by Judge Vinson's attitude. However, if I were to comment further, I should say that I thought Judge Vinson was laboring under an effort on his part to hold to a policy which disregarded the necessity of giving milk special treatment. It seems to me, for example, that so essential an item and so staple an article of the American diet as milk must be specially treated. It is so valuable, so completely a whole food, that if milk production declines, if cows simply go out of production, and if herds are dissipated, it follows that we will not have the necessary production; and when we are confronted with the shortage brought about by insistence on a policy which disregards the plain needs of the American people with respect to milk, I should say for my part that the failure to insist that milk be given special treatment lies at the root of the entire situation. That is my own comment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was that meeting held before Judge Vinson declared the subsidy on milk, or afterward?

Mr. DANAHER. It was on September 22 that we met with Judge Vinson.

Mr. LANGER. Was that before or after he placed the subsidy on milk?

Mr. DANAHER. It was the day before.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senators present say they were in favor of a subsidy on milk, or were they opposed to it?

Mr. DANAHER. I do not want to speak for them. Please understand that no vote was taken on the matter. The discussion was an informal one. We were endeavoring to arrive at some mutuality of understanding of the problem, and were attempting to have a meeting of the minds of those present. But I think I am justified in saying that the sentiment of the Senators present was that they were overwhelmingly opposed to the subsidy proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think I can add to the comment which has been made as to the impression received by the 31 Senators who met with Judge Vinson. Judge Vinson gave us the impression that a subsidy had been decided upon, and that no matter what arguments might be made, it would be put into effect. I certainly derived the impression that he received his orders from the White House to inaugurate the subsidy program, and that no matter if 96 Senators were against it, he was going through with it just the same. Perhaps 96 Senators are against

it, although I think perhaps 90 would be a more correct statement of the number.

I desire to say, too, that the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Governor of Connecticut have not at all overstated the milk situation as it exists in New England. If the Governor of Connecticut desires to confer with Mr. Byrnes or Mr. Jones or Secretary Wickard or Judge Vinson or any of the others, I hope he obtains an opportunity to confer with them; but I do not think it will do him a particle of good, because I think every one of them is acting under directives from the White House, and that is the only place where anyone can get any change made in the policy. I do not know whether one can get it made there, but if it is not made, there will be trouble in the food situation and the milk situation in the country, and it is not going to be very far off.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield, if I have the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator whether during the discussion he had—I was not present, and I was not invited—it was stated where the money to pay the subsidy would come from.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether that question was discussed. I do not recall whether there was any discussion as to the money.

Mr. LANGER. A subsidy on milk is now being paid. I wish to know where the money with which the subsidy is paid is to come from.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator may recall that last July, Congress passed an appropriation of approximately $350,000,000, as I recall. I suppose that money may last long enough to pay the subsidy until the 1st of January, when the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation expires, under the present law. Money does not seem to bother greatly the advocates of the subsidy program. If they cannot get it in one place, they seem to find it in another, regardless of whether Congress appropriates it.

Mr. LANGER. Let me inquire whether the Senator knows if the money is being obtained from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. I presume it is coming from the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time—perhaps enough to last until January 1.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont. I am not familiar with the milk situation in New England. Let me ask the Senator what is the cause of the milk emergency. Is it due to a drought last summer or to lack of feed? What is the reason back of it?

Mr. AIKEN. It is due to the shortage of feed, the shortage of machinery, the shortage of labor, and a shortage in the price, so that the price does not cover the cost of producing the milk. For instance, the corn-hog ratio upset not only the meat situation with which the Senator is familiar, and the grain situation, but the milk situation as well. Our feed mixers cannot buy corn and pay more than $1.07 a bushel for it, so they buy milling wheat and pay $1.70 for it, to put it into feed for our dairy cows, and it does not seem to make as good feed, either. If they could pay $1.40 for corn for use in mixed feed it probably would be better and cheaper than using wheat.

It is the unwillingness of the administration to grant a price sufficient to cover the cost of producing the milk which is principally responsible for the trouble.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator think that an increased price would remedy the situation?

Mr. AIKEN. It would not completely remedy it, but it would go a long way toward remedying it. The roll-back in butter and meat has created a very bad situation throughout the country. In the State of Connecticut, particularly, the price of dry cows has fallen from 10 cents last April to from 3½ to 6 cents at the present time. In some instances the farmers cannot find a market for such cows, and they must keep them and feed them the feed which should be going into the production of milk. When the roll-back in the price of meat was announced it was stated that the price to consumers, or the retail ceiling price, would be rolled back about 10 percent. I think that has been done. It was also announced that a subsidy would be paid to the packers, to be passed back to the cattle raisers, so that they would not lose money. What has happened is that the retail ceiling price has been rolled back 10 percent, and the price of cattle to the farmer has been rolled back from 20 to 60 percent, depending upon the quality of the cattle. It may not be quite 20 percent on the choicest animals, but they are becoming fewer and fewer on the market. On the dry cows, which constitute a very large percentage of the meat sold, the price has dropped from about 10 cents a pound last April to from 3½ to 6 cents at the present time. I have received complaints from dairymen in Connecticut who cannot find a market for their dry cows, even at 6 cents a pound.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is now in the Chamber. As I recall, he was present at the meeting to which reference has been made. Does the Senator from Vermont recall the Senator from Tennessee learning for the first time that a Government agency was buying up the very cows to which the Senator has referred?

One Senator asked where the money was coming from. Some of us have not yet ascertained where the funds are coming from to purchase cows. I think they are being acquired by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am still wondering.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Farm Security Administration bought about 150,000 of them; but it is my impression that the Farm Security Administration was doing the buying as agent for the Commodity Credit Corporation, or using the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I doubt if the Farm Security Administration was using the funds of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I remember that the Senator from Tennessee was very much interested. He particularly wished to know where the money was coming from that was being used for this purpose. He suggested, correctly, that he was acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and that he had never heard of an appropriation approved by that committee for the purpose for which the money was apparently being used by this Administration. I think that is a correct statement of the Senator's attitude.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, are food subsidies now before the Senate, or is the Bankhead bill before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill before the Senate is Senate bill 1457, the so-called Bankhead bill. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have not yet voted on that amendment, have we?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been voted upon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. He yielded to the Senator from Nebraska, did he not?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to a a question. Who receives the subsidy milk?

Mr. AIKEN. No one has received it as yet, except in three or four city areas where it has been in operation for some time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that it is paid as a roll-back?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it has as yet been paid to any milk producers.

Mr. WHERRY. I was present at the meeting to which reference has been made. I left before it was concluded. At that time Judge Vinson was talking about paying a subsidy to the producer by buying hay. Has that plan been put into effect?

Mr. AIKEN. No; that was thrown out. I understand that that was attempted in the Memphis area, but no one could be found there to handle the hay, and the plan was abandoned. The present intention is to place a Government check in the hands of every milk producer once a month.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the subsidy will not go to the man who produces the milk, will it?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator may recall that the Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry held a hearing about the 1st of June. Officials from the Department of Agriculture appeared before the committee. We asked them at that time, when they were advocating the subsidy on butter and meat, how they were going to handle it. They said they were going to pay the subsidy to processors; that it was mechanically impossible to pay it directly to the producers. There were possibly 600,000 or 700,000 small producers whom they could not subsidize. In this time of manpower shortage, the Department officials could not find help enough to pay it in that way. Now the proposal is made to pay a subsidy on milk, and it is desired to have the A. A. A. committees handle the subsidy and place a Government check in the hands of each of 3,000,000 milk producers every month, although last spring we were told there was not manpower enough to pay a subsidy directly to 600,000 or 700,000 producers.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. One Senator said that 150,000 cows had been bought with Commodity Credit Corporation funds. Does anyone know what was done with those cows?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that they were placed on the farms of those who needed more cows. I understand that there was a considerable demand from the South for more cows. It was probably a justifiable demand. The Farm Security Administration would have to buy the cows which farmers in the North were selling for slaughter, and put them where they could be used for milk production instead of being slaughtered.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. I was present at the informal meeting to which reference has been made. I was uncertain whether Judge Vinson favored a subsidy on the production of milk, or whether he favored a subsidy on hay. The question of hay arose. Am I to understand from the Senator that the producers have received neither the subsidy nor the hay?

Mr. AIKEN. Not as yet. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is correct in stating that Judge Vinson told us that the subsidy would probably take the form of a feed subsidy. Now it is still being called a feed subsidy, but it is a feed subsidy in name only. It is a direct subsidy of from 25 to 50 cents a hundred pounds to the producers of milk. I notice that it is still being referred to as a feed subsidy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Vermont is always so well informed about all matters pertaining to farming that I am sure he wants to keep well informed in this particular instance. I learn from the local newspaper in my home in Kansas that there is being distributed among milk producers a subsidy on milk equivalent to 50 cents a hundred pounds, if my memory serves me correctly. I am not familiar with the mechanics of distribution. I have not heard directly from the milk producers. What I am stating is based upon information in my home newspaper, which is usually accurate. The administration is undertaking to distribute to the milk producers a subsidy based upon the consumption of feed, particularly hay. The subsidy is in proportion to the amount of feed consumed by the stock belonging to each milk producer. I think the distribution is perhaps being made through the A. A. A. committees. I am not certain of that.

Mr. AIKEN. It is.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana in a moment.

There has been no distribution of any money as yet. We are now told that the subsidy is being granted to help compensate the farmer for the increased cost of feed. That is as near as it comes to being a feed subsidy. This is the way it is to be administered: Farmers who sell milk to distributors are asked to present the stubs which accompany the checks which the distributors send to them, showing the number of pounds of milk delivered during a 2-week or 4-week period. Farmers who sell locally perhaps a few quarts a day are asked to make affidavit as to the amount which they have produced. They will go to the local A. A. A. committee and produce their evidence of affidavits. It is not quite clear as yet whether the local committee will have the checks already signed by the Government, which the committee will simply countersign. I think that is the way it is planned.

In other words, all the A. A. A. committees, and the thousands of clerks and secretaries whom they have hired, are to be called into action to pay this milk subsidy to two and a half or three million producers.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Vermont has correctly described the method which is being used.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield to the Senator from Oregon after I first yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont stated that at the time of the roll-back to the consumer on the price of meat, the roll-back was 10 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIS. It was computed that the roll-back to the producer was between 20 percent and 60 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. Between 20 percent and 60 percent, depending on the quality and the grade of the cattle sold.

Mr. WILLIS. Can the Senator enlighten us as to who was the recipient of the subsidy which was paid?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is easier to tell the Senator from Indiana who did not receive the subsidy. That was the man who produced the cattle.

Mr. WILLIS. And at a time when we are interested in bringing about greater production.

Mr. AIKEN. When the O. P. A. fixes the ceiling price on meat that ceiling price becomes the price. For that reason, although the consumer might have been buying at a less price than he is paying today, yet he is paying the ceiling price.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. The word "milk" has been used several times in the discussions. What is the definition of "milk"? As a dairyman, I can tell those who do not know that there is all the difference in the world between milk containing practically no butterfat and milk containing a very rich proportion of buttterfat. Is there any definition of "milk" in passing out the subsidy checks?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know whether or not there is any required butterfat content.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then the best cow in the barn will be the "pump."

Mr. AIKEN. I should not say that the officials will be so unfair as that. They may choose a butterfat content of 3.7 percent and allow for 5 percent, or they may not. They do many things more foolish than that. For example, they placed a ceiling price on the highest grade of McIntosh apples of more than 30 cents a bushel less than the poorest grade of Ben Davis apples. They did not know that Ben Davis apples weigh 48 pounds to the bushel and McIntosh apples weigh only 42 pounds to the bushel.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers of the Public Health Service for temporary promotion in that Service.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of July 1942;

Capt. Clarence E. Olsen, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as the naval member on a military mission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of which Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army, is the head, to rank from the 10th day of November 1943;

Capt. William H. Hamilton, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 7, Atlantic Fleet, and assigned to duty in the United Kingdom, to rank from the 10th day of November 1943; and

Several citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert H. Stevenson to be assistant sanitary engineer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard J. Woodbridge to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notfied forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 15 (legislative day of November 12), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

R. Henry Norweb to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Albert H. Stevenson

To be passed assistant dental surgeon

Howard J. Woodbridge

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain Sheridan W. Bell, of the U. S. S. *Card* of the United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God we lift our human hearts to Thee this day, conscious of the scrutiny of Thy judging spirit. We know that we have failed miserably as we confront Thy standards of generosity, of mercy, of compassion. O God forgive us for our faults and errors. Turn not from us, but as with Thy children in the past, forgive us and establish our feet again upon the way that will lead us out of this wilderness of war and distrust, of envy and greed.

Bless the homes of our Nation where the people are paying the bitter price for this war. Watch over every home, every fighting man. May the spirit of peace prevail. May wars cease and all men come home to loved ones and reestablish their destiny with freedom.

May Thy blessing be with our Congress. Enable the leadership of our Nation to rise to tremendous heights of dignity and responsibility. May measures destined to elevate men to security and peace, flower in these Halls. Bring confidence to a Nation—to a world that is confused and baffled by the conflict of good with evil. In the name of the Great Leader, in Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, November 13, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on November 12, 1943, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On November 12, 1943:

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., November 14, 1943, entitled "Consumers Save Eighty-Nine Billion Dollars Through Price Control, O. P. A. Claim."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram I received from the State Senate Committee in California after their investigation of the Tule Lake section where the Japanese are housed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENICILLIN

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, radio news casters, especially those who have a national audience, ought to scrupulously follow the rule of giving the people accurate information. Mr. Walter Winchell, in his news cast last night, violently offended this rule of accuracy, but not intentionally, I am sure.

In view of the national interest in the subject, a correction is in order. Mr. Winchell in his broadcast last night made the following statement regarding the famous penicillin drug:

To the family in Des Moines, Iowa, which requested penicillin for their boy, I am very sorry but the appeal must be made only to the War Department, which controls the magic drug. The request must come from the family, not an outsider.

The truth is that application should not be made to the Army but to a civilian doctor in Boston, and the application should not be made by the family but by the attending physician of the patient, who is acquainted with the case. Penicillin is a very scarce and precious drug and is made available to civilians only in rare cases—thus far in about 794 cases—and only in cases where the attending physician can convince Dr. Chester Keefer, Evans Memorial Hospital, Boston, that the drug will prove helpful. Obviously, the family would have no conception of the efficacy of this drug. Mr. Winchell was 100 percent in error, and he will, by giving careless misinformation to the public, no doubt, heap upon the busy War Department an additional burden of correspondence, a thing which I know Mr. Winchell did not intend to do.

Pencillin has already saved many lives, including the lives of many men in our armed forces, and it will play an increasingly important part in the coming months. In view of the tremendous public interest in penicillin, I should like to make some further reference to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with further reference to this interesting and important subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJ. JOHN L. JERSTAD

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of the House to an award of a Congressional Medal of Honor to a young air hero, Maj. John L. Jerstad, of Racine, Wis. I rise now to put into the RECORD this morning the citation contained with this medal of honor. It is as follows:

CITATION FOR THE MEDAL OF HONOR

Maj. John L. Jerstad, O-435784, Air Corps, United States Army. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty. On August 1, 1943, he served as pilot of the lead aircraft in his group in a daring low-level attack against the enemy oil refineries and installations at Ploesti, Rumania. Although he had completed more than his share of missions and was no longer connected with this group, so high was his conception of duty that he volunteered to lead the formation in the correct belief that his participation would contribute materially to success in this attack. He led the formation into attack with full realization of the extreme hazards involved and despite withering fire from heavy and light antiaircraft guns. Three miles from the target his plane was hit, badly damaged, and set on fire. Ignoring the fact he was flying over a field suitable for a forced landing, he kept on the course. After the bombs of his aircraft were released on the target, the fire in his ship became so intense as to make further progress impossible, and he crashed into the target area. By his voluntary acceptance of a mis-

sion he knew was extremely hazardous, and his assumption of an intrepid course of action at the risk of life over and above the call of duty, Major Jerstad set an example of heroism which will be an inspiration to the armed forces of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business today and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT MEDICAL CORPS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and include as a part of my remarks a bill I recently introduced to create a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a news article, relating to Capt. Sam Logan, depicting a typical example of Kansas courage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative program and any prior special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE OF CRUDE OIL

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Otto Donnell, of the Ohio Oil Co., to Senator TAFT, on the subject of the price of crude oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, something like 140 names are on the petition to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from consideration of the bill which involves fixing the price of crude oil. The statement I have just been granted permission to place in the RECORD deals with this subject in detail. It comes from a man of reliable information and goes into detail on this entire subject. It would be well worth your while to read it if you care to go thoroughly into the necessity for a raise in the price of crude oil, for the special reason involved in the growing shortage of crude oil.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

PACIFIC COAST JAPANESE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the care, custody, and control of the Pacific coast Japanese, particularly the 15,000 who openly manifest their disloyalty, should have been under the jurisdiction of the United States Army from the beginning. The Army would see to it that they are properly housed, clothed, and fed, and at the same time it would have prevented the disgraceful reign of terror that has existed at Tule Lake, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following telegram and urge its recommendation be carried out:

After a complete investigation and hearing held in the Tule Lake section, the California State Senate Fact Finding Committee on Japanese Resettlement unanimously recommend and urge that Army control be maintained permanently at the Tule Lake Japanese segregation camp. We feel this is imperative for protection of the people of the State of California.

HUGH P. DONNELLY, *Chairman*,
HERBERT W. SLATER.
IRWIN T. QUINN.
GEORGE J. HATFIELD.
JESS R. DORSEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California, has expired.

THE LATE PVT. JOE P. MARTINEZ

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I read in the Well of this House the record of two boys from my own home city who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Today, I want to place in the RECORD the story of a young Spanish-American boy who lives just 18 miles east of my home, who was awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor.

To Pvt. Joe P. Martinez, 23, of Ault, Colo., went the Nation's highest honor—the Congressional Medal of Honor. It was awarded posthumously, for Martinez, a former farm laborer, was killed in leading an American battalion to victory in a charge up the snow-covered mountains of Attu Island.

Martinez was a member of a battalion which had been trying for several days to drive the Japs from a key defensive position on Attu, but the attacks bogged down in the face of heavy machine-gun, rifle, and mortar fire.

"In the face of the severe hostile fire," declared the citation with the Medal of Honor, "Private Martinez arose to his feet and alone resumed his advance. Occasionally he stopped to urge his comrades on and his example inspired the others to follow."

He reached a plateau and cleaned out several Jap fox holes with hand grenades and his automatic rifle. The troops accompanying him drove on, but again the attack bogged down under heavy Jap fire from protected positions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include this entire article which appeared in the Washington Post, November 12, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have two letters—one from a prominent attorney, rancher, and oilman in the vicinity of Amarillo, Tex., in which he says that under date of November 8 he was offered one hundred 6 weeks' old pigs gratis by a farmer who had no feed and wanted to get rid of the pigs.

At Breckenridge, Mich., last week, at the livestock auction, pigs of a similar age sold across the block at 10 cents each for immediate delivery.

From the sheep-growing regions of Colorado and Utah I have letters from men affiliated with the industry there who tell me that their conditions of operation are becoming almost impossible. So we can well wonder where the meat supply required for this Nation and our friends is coming from in the months to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York, last Saturday, I learned that the Democratic leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], was keeping the House in session for the transaction of business that day. So I hurried back to attend the session, because I am always in favor of action. Coming on the floor I made the comment that I noticed that the Republican committee for action was not present. I soon learned that I was in error, that members of that committee were present and that the absentees belonged over on the majority side, and that this action of the Democratic majority leader in calling a Saturday session was just a bluff; that he did not really want to do any business anyway, and as soon as opportunity offered I tried to get a quorum to do business and the gentleman from Massachusetts moved for an adjournment, and he put it through and so we adjourned. The majority apparently does not want remedial legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times written by Hon. Harold G. Aron.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions of the Farm Bureau of Appanoose County.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Turtle Lake Local of the Barron County Wisconsin Farmers' Union with regard to the point values placed upon butter in comparison with oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today may be transferred to tomorrow to follow other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' PENSIONS FROM $40 TO $50 PER MONTH

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution for printing on the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rate of pensions of World War veterans from $40 to $50 and for other purposes (Rept. No. 861), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests: One, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Ernie Pyle to his home newspaper; second, to include in the RECORD an address by the Honorable Huston Thompson at the tomb of Woodrow Wilson on Armistice Day; and, third, to include portions of an article by Judge John J. Parker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial about lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLKIE'S VIEWS ON LABOR

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wendell Willkie on November 13 in addressing the Milwaukee County Republican Party warned them that an anti-labor attitude on the part of the Republican Party would lead to its defeat in 1944. He stated that he would "fight every step of the way against any such foolish course." This significant statement indicates that he fears that the party will be dominated by those who are inimical to labor, otherwise why would he consider it necessary to fight against such leadership?

The Democratic Party has always given evidence of its confidence in the leadership of organized labor. Its attitude is that if the shackles which have hampered labor from obtaining its just rights were removed labor itself could be trusted to work for the best interests of America. The Republican Party, on the other hand, has been suspicious of labor, has protested against labor being given too much power, has felt that labor leadership would, if it could, wreck our economy. It all depends upon whether you believe in democracy or not and whether you trust the common people. Mr. Willkie apparently has reason to believe that the Republican leadership does not have this confidence in the Americans who work for a living.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter I wrote to Judge Vinson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLKIE'S VIEWS ON LABOR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to console the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], who has just spoken, and to remind him that he need not take seriously anything that Wendell Willkie says or does. His recent abuse of the white people of the South and his slurring remarks about the head of one of our Allied Nations was sufficient to finish him.

I am reminded in this connection of a funeral oration an old fellow made over the remains of one of his neighbors. They did not have a preacher, so they called on the justice of the peace to preach the funeral. He walked up to the brink of the grave, pointed down at the coffin, and said, "Brethren, this corpse has been a member of our church for nearly 20 years."

Let me remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Mr. Willkie is not a member of the Democratic Party, and that, politically, he is already dead.

If I were preaching his political funeral I would say, "This corpse has been a member of the Republican Party for nearly 4 years."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 355)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am happy to inform the Congress that on November 9, 1943, representatives of 43 nations and peoples joined with our own Government in signing the accompanying U. N. R. R. A. Agreement, setting up an International Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to give first aid in the liberated areas. This agreement provides only the framework. The implementation is left to the constitutional law-making body of the member states.

The task of the organization will be to assist in furnishing the medicine, food, clothing, and other basic necessities and essential services which are required to restore the strength of the liberated peoples. They have been deliberately stripped by the enemy in order to support the Axis war machine. More than that, the Axis leaders have boasted that as they withdraw, they will leave only devastation—what they have not stolen, they will destroy. As our American soldiers fight their way up the Italian boot, they are discovering at first hand that the barbarism of the Nazis is equal to their boasts. Their only rivals in this respect are the Japanese.

U. N. R. R. A. will be able to make only a beginning in the vast task of aiding the victims of war. The greatest part of the job will have to be done by the liberated peoples themselves. What U. N. R. R. A. can do is to help the liberated peoples to help themselves, so that they may have the strength to undertake the task of rebuilding their destroyed homes, their ruined factories and their plundered farms.

The length of the war may be materially shortened if, as we free each occupied area, the people are enlisted in support of the United Nation's armies.

Already, for example, a new French Army has been created and, as we strike toward Berlin, increasing numbers in Sicily and Italy are falling in step beside the soldiers of the United Nations. Others construct roads and military installations required for our military operations. Millions more are waiting for the

moment when they, too, can strike a blow against the enemy.

They do not want charity. They seek the strength to fight, and to do their part in securing the peace. Aid to the liberated peoples during the war is thus a matter of military necessity as well as of humanity.

U. N. R. R. A. will not, of course, be expected to solve the long-range problems of reconstruction. Other machinery and other measures will be necessary for this purpose. What U. N. R. R. A. can do is to lay the necessary foundation for these later tasks of reconstruction.

The devastation and disorganization caused by the Nazi and Japanese war machines is so great that this world disaster can be met only by the united action of the 44 United Nations and associated nations. Accordingly, under the agreement establishing U. N. R. R. A., it is proposed that each nation will contribute in accordance with its ability. Each will determine for itself the amount and character of the contribution which it can make.

A small fraction of the national income of the contributing member states will, it is hoped, be sufficient to meet the needs. Some of the liberated nations may be able to make payment for the supplies and services rendered. But only by bringing to bear the resources of all the United Nations will we be able to relieve a substantial part of the suffering of the millions who will need help.

The nature and the amount of the contribution to be made by the United States will, in accordance with the terms of the U. N. R. R. A. agreement, be determined by the Congress of the United States under its constitutional procedure.

At this time I recommend to the Congress the enactment of a bill authorizing the appropriation of funds as Congress may from time to time determine to permit the participation by the United States in the work of U. N. R. R. A. I am not now recommending the appropriation of a specific sum. At a later date after the conclusion of the Atlantic City meeting, I shall send to you a further recommendation, informing you of the result of the meeting and requesting the appropriation of specific funds.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 15, 1943.*

ELECTION CONTEST—SEVENTH ILLINOIS DISTRICT: MORELAND VERSUS SCHUETZ

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Elections, No. 3, and ordered printed:

NOVEMBER 15, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, James C. Moreland against Leonard W. Schuetz, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed together with the notice of contest, and the answer thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar (S. 1242) to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2901, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. COLE of New York, KEAN, and CUNNINGHAM objected.

APPOINTMENT OF A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has an amendment to offer which will do away with a great many of the whereases and greatly improve the bill. If that is done, I have no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to hear the amendment which the gentleman has and which he will offer.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], who has handled this joint resolution in the past, has asked me to present for him the amendment which I understand has been previously submitted to the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment would strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the purpose of this joint resolution is to authorize, during the year beginning April 13, 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen and President of the United States but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator and leader in scientific agriculture.

SEC. 2. That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such Committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the Committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.

The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services.)

National farm organization.

The agricultural press.

Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.

The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the Committee. All members of the Committee to serve without compensation. The duties of the Committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and the States of the United States in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, and so forth, information about Jefferson.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the

making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicententary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with that amendment, I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the year of our Lord 1943 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has set aside the year 1943 as a year of celebration of this important event by appropriate ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation; and

Whereas Congress has created the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson; and

Whereas Thomas Jefferson is revered as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, for his services as a citizen of Virginia, as President of the United States, as a man of abiding passion for human liberty and the sacred rights of the common people, and as one who, throughout his entire career, remained preeminently and above all a farmer, devoted to the cultivation of his farms and the improvement of agriculture; and

Whereas he was one of the leading farmers of his time in the United States and was profoundly interested in the sciences related to agriculture and more than any other one person can be regarded as the father and patron of the scientific agricultural developments since his time; and

Whereas he practiced rotations of crops and diversified farming; introduced and improved the breeding of domestic animals and plants; contributed to the improvement of farm implements, such as the plow; encouraged the growing and use of fruits, vegetables, and other domestic products; encouraged research as to methods of control of insect pests; practiced and advocated control of soil erosion, and stood for the conservation of agricultural resources; and

Whereas as the founder of the University of Virginia, he made provision for a professorship of agriculture and helped start a train of events which led to the creation of agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and the research, educational, and other services of the Federal Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas, in his first administration as President of the United States, the national domain was enlarged by the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory, a great farming area which gave us a leading position in the agriculture of the world and enables us to serve as a source of food for our fighting allies; and

Whereas throughout his whole social philosophy runs a theme which recognizes the dignity of the agricultural way of life and a deep appreciation of the satisfactions which accrue, through science, education, and faith, to the farm family and the rural community; and

Whereas he recognized the importance of the perpetuation of a sound agriculture as a paramount factor in the development of the economy and the permanence of our national institutions; and

Whereas, by reason of his contributions to agricultural philosophy, science, education, farm management, and practice, he is recognized as one of the great leaders among the farmers of this country, who are now engaged in a vital part of the war effort; and

Whereas, as a figure, against the background of the soil of the land he loved, he stands as a symbol of its values, democracy and freedom, for the preservation of which the American farmers and all connected with the industry of agriculture are now contributing their maximum effort; and

Whereas it is appropriate that his services to agriculture should be duly recognized and brought to public attention in this anniversary year; and

Whereas many public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families are anxious to participate in activities in recognition of our great debt to Jefferson as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, statesman, and educator and leader in scientific agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there be created, under the auspices of and in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed Chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.

The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

National farm organizations.

The agricultural press.

Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.

The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee are to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the agricultural aspects of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, etc., information about Jefferson and to otherwise cooperate with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, after line 23, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the purpose of this resolution is to authorize, during the year beginning April 13, 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen, and President of the United States, but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator, and leader in scientific agriculture.

"SEC. 2. That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such Committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the Committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

"United States Department of Agriculture.

"The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

"National farm organization.

"The agricultural press.

"Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

"The Office of Education.

"The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the committee. All members of the committee to serve without compensation. The duties of the committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and the States of the United States in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools, and agricultural high schools, etc., information about Jefferson.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the

farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, the title amended, and a motion to reconsider the vote on passage was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill just passed commemorates Thomas Jefferson, an outstanding early American, as one of the founding fathers, recognizing his place in agriculture as one of the several fields of activity in which he predominated. I have always been impressed with Jefferson's versatility, breadth of vision, and his insight into the part that science and art and the development of the human mind play in the greatness of a people. His basic political philosophy led inevitably to his stress on the education of each individual citizen, so much so that common schools and universal public education were a necessity in his political scheme of things.

While we want to remember all very worthy ones who have made their contribution toward establishing or preserving American life, it may be that we are too prone to remember the doers rather than the thinkers. I feel that we should watch with discrimination the things we stress, for before the doer there must be the thinker, before the builder there must be the planner. Thomas Jefferson filled both roles. Great as Jefferson was in the matter of his doing, he was greater in the matter of his thinking.

He certainly should be remembered for what he did, but his more fitting memorials are in the realm of the mind. I would have Jefferson remembered in a variety of ways, of course, because of the variation of his greatness, but I want to remember him for his emphasis upon the development of the human intellect and his freeing of the mind from the thraldom of ignorance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 3377, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been granted on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Veterans' Administration an estimate of the cost of this bill. In order that the House may be advised of that estimate submitted by the Veterans' Administration, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill will come up under a rule tomorrow and be discussed by members of the committee. I do not want him to take those figures as conclusive. The Veterans' Administration usually gives the outside figure whenever asked to make an estimate. I wanted to place that statement in the RECORD so that these figures might not go into the RECORD unchallenged.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. My only reason for doing this is that when the bill was called up on the last call of the Consent Calendar we inquired of the gentleman if he had an estimate of the cost, and he said he did not have it. Then I wrote to the Veterans' Administration, which is the logical place to get it.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning and gave them that information. However, as I said a while ago, it is the custom of an administrative agency to give the outside figure, the ultimate limit of the cost of any measure concerning which they are called upon to make recommendations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. How much time for debate tomorrow on this bill is provided by the rule?

Mr. RANKIN. Two hours.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is an important measure and one which I favor. I hope the time allowed will permit the merits of the bill to be brought out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The estimate referred to follows:

(Estimate of cost on H. R. 3377, 78th Cong., a bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes, as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation October 11, 1943, Rept. No. 747.)

The bill, as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, would provide a rate of $50 per month for veterans eligible to pension for permanent and total disability not shown to be due to service under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, or $60 monthly if the veteran shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and in receipt of pension therefor for a continuous period of 10 years or has reached the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled.

The estimated cost for the first year is $12,768,000. Increases would be provided for approximately 81,000 World War No. 1 veterans and 200 Spanish-American War veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN CERTAIN MONTHLY RATES OF COMPENSATION OR PENSION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3356, to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill also has a rule providing for its consideration and will be called up in the next day or so. As in the case of the bill called just before this one, I have an estimate from the Veterans' Administration as to the cost of this measure, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from New York that I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning asking for a rule on this bill, and gave the information the gentleman is giving the House now. I also call attention to the fact that when the Veterans' Administration is called upon to make an estimate of the cost of a measure, it usually gives the outside figure, so we do not take those figures at face value as being correct as to what the measure would cost.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will recall that years ago when I asked for figures from the Veterans' Administration as to the cost of a bill they were millions of dollars high in their estimate of the cost.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They admitted later that they were wrong in their estimate.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I asked for a rule on this bill along with the gentleman from Mississippi, and it was unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, appeared with me before the Committee on Rules this morning and asked for rules on both these bills, H. R. 3377 and H. R. 3356. As the gentlewoman has said, the estimates that are given as to the outside cost of measures pending before Congress, especially with reference to veterans' legislation, have often proved to

be very, very much exaggerated compared with what the actual costs were when put to the test, so I would not want the statement to go in the RECORD that we concede that this will be the cost of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

The estimate referred to follows:

(Estimate of cost on H. R. 3356, 78th Cong., "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, 73d Cong., as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act," as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation October 11, 1943, Rept. No. 749.)

ESTIMATED COST FIRST YEAR

Section 1, as amended, provides that the monthly amount of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, shall be increased by 15 percent.

It is estimated that this section would provide increases to approximately 329,100 veterans the first year at an additional cost of $22,247,000.

Section 2 provides increases in monthly rates of compensation payable under Public Law No. 484, as amended. It would increase the widow's rate from $30 to $35, and the widow with 1 child, additional amount for the child to be increased from $8 to $10 per month (additional children increased from $4 to $5 per month); no widow but 1 child would be increased from $15 to $18 per month; no widow but 2 children increased from $22 (equally divided) to $27 (equally divided) per month; no widow but 3 children increased from $30 (equally divided) to $36 (equally divided) per month; and the amount for additional children would be increased from $3 to $4 per month for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

It is estimated the widows and children of approximately 33,500 deceased veterans would be entitled to the increased rates the first year at a cost of $2,526,000.

Section 3 provides the increases authorized by this bill shall be effective from the 1st day of the first month following the passage of this act.

Section 4 of this amended bill would extend the benefits of Public Law No. 484, as amended, to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war where death is not service connected but at time of death the veteran had a service-connected disability. Because the rate of deaths from other than service-connected disabilities would probably be small for veterans of this war who have been discharged from service and because in many of the cases that could otherwise qualify, the veteran does not leave an eligible beneficiary, it is thought the cost of this section would be small the first year. Therefore no estimate for the first year is submitted. However, there would be a materially increasing cost dependent upon the number of service-connected disabilities of this war.

The total estimated cost of this bill the first year will approximate $24,773,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2976, to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1336, to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and the reserve components thereof when on active duty, of grades entitling them to transportation of dependents and household effects on change of station (a) when on duty at places designated by the Secretary of the Navy as within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated for military reasons or for the purpose of relieving congestion in the vicinity of naval activities or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available; (b) or upon transfer or assignment of such officers and enlisted men to sea duty, as such duty may be defined by the Secretary of the Navy; (c) or upon transfer or assignment of such officers and enlisted men to duty at places where their dependents for military reasons are not permitted to join them or where Government quarters for their dependents are not available, may, upon application of such personnel or their dependents, be allowed, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, transportation for their dependents and household effects, including packing, crating, and unpacking thereof, from their stations or places of storage in the United States to any other points in the United States, and from such points to new stations in the United States to which such personnel may be subsequently ordered for duty, and at which their dependents are not restricted from joining them or Government quarters for their dependents are available.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Chief of Naval Personnel, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commandant of the Coast Guard, or such subordinates as they may designate, certify that the personnel included in (b) and (c) of section 1 hereof have been transferred to sea duty or to duty at places beyond the continental limits of the United States where their dependents for military reasons are not permitted to join them, the wives of such personnel, or such other responsible persons as may be designated by the officials named above in this section, may execute such certificates as may be required and which are filed with, and relate to, vouchers in connection with the transportation of dependents or household effects: *Provided*, That in lieu of copies of orders of such personnel, the certificate above provided for shall constitute authority for such transportation of dependents, and household effects as may be authorized hereunder and any certificate or certification authorized by this act shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And provided further*, That, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, claims for reimbursement may be submitted by and payments made to personnel concerned or their dependents for any authorized travel performed by dependents at their own expense.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers in cases where such dependents would have been entitled to transportation if the provisions of section 1 hereof had been in effect on the date of payment for otherwise proper payments heretofore made to transportation of dependents, or reimbursement therefor, under orders issued prior to the effective date of this act, to the extent of the commercial cost of transportation of the dependents from the old duty station to the new duty station. Such cost of transportation shall be computed from the last available published rates on the date the orders involved were issued.

SEC. 4. Transportation of household effects of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment, as now or hereafter authorized by law, may, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, be by means of rail, water, or van, without regard to comparative costs.

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective as of December 7, 1941, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the present wars and for 6 months after the termination of such wars, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1354, to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy," approved January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092; 34 U. S. C. 1073-1073e), is amended by inserting therein a new section numbered 4A, reading as follows:

"SEC. 4A. Each civilian member of the teaching staffs who is hereafter retired on or after reaching the age of retirement set forth in section 3 of this act shall be paid a life annuity, terminable on his death, at the rate of the following total annual amount: The average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by such civilian teacher during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service at the option of such teacher, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 35 years, and divided by 70. The retirement annuity payable to each such retired teacher, under any annuity policy provided for by this act, or under the provisions of section 4 of this act, shall be counted as payable on account of the retirement annuity provided in this section 4A, and the Secretary

of the Navy shall pay to each such retired teacher, from such appropriations as may be made for the purpose, such additional sums, if any, as will bring the total annual sum paid to such retired teacher to the total annual amount prescribed in this section 4A: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall operate to reduce the retirement annuity which would have been payable to any such retired teacher if this section had not been enacted: *And provided further*, That no payments under this section shall be made to any member of said staffs who shall be entitled to retirement and retirement benefits under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1920, as amended, and shall elect, or shall have elected, to continue thereunder."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the said act of January 16, 1936, is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" before the word "professors," and by striking out the period after said word "professors," and by adding after said word a comma, followed by the words "and senior professors."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BELLE FOURCHE RIVER COMPACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2580, to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to a compact authorized by the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of South Dakota and Wyoming with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Belle Fourche and Cheyenne Rivers and other streams in which such States are jointly interested," approved February 26, 1927 (44 Stat. 1247), signed by commissioners for the States of South Dakota and Wyoming, on the 18th day of February 1943, and thereafter ratified by the act of the Legislature of South Dakota entitled "An act ratifying and approving a compact between the States of Wyoming and South Dakota for use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River, and declaring an emergency," approved March 4, 1943, and the act of the Legislature of Wyoming entitled "An act to provide for the ratification and approval of the Belle Fourche River compact," approved March 3, 1943, which compact reads as follows:

"BELLE FOURCHE RIVER COMPACT

"The States of South Dakota and Wyoming, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as South Dakota and Wyoming, respectively, or individually as a State, or collectively as the States), have resolved to conclude a compact as authorized under the act of Congress of February 26, 1927 (ch. 216, 44 Stat. 1247), and after negotiations participated in by the following-named State commissioners:

"For South Dakota: M. Q. Sharpe, G. W. Mcrsman, S. G. Mortimer, W. D. Buchholz.

"For Wyoming: L. C. Bishop, Samuel McKean, L. H. Robinson, Mrs. E. E. McKean, and by Howard R. Stinson, appointed as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles, to wit:

"ARTICLE I

"A. The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin (hereinafter referred to as the Basin) for multiple purposes; to provide for an equitable division of such waters; to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to controversies; to promote interstate comity; to recognize that the most efficient utilization of the waters within the Basin is required for the full development of the Basin; and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of floods.

"B. The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Basin constitute the basis for this compact; and none of the States hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Either State and all others using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River under the authority of that State, shall be subject to the terms of this compact.

"ARTICLE II

"As used in this compact—

"A. The term 'Belle Fourche River' shall mean and include the Belle Fourche River and all its tributaries originating in Wyoming.

"B. The term 'Basin' shall mean that area in South Dakota and Wyoming which is naturally drained by the Belle Fourche River, and all its tributaries.

"C. The term 'beneficial use' is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of a drainage basin is depleted when usefully employed by the activities of man, and includes water lost by evaporation, and other natural causes from streams, canals, ditches, irrigated areas, and reservoirs.

"D. Where the name of the State or the term 'State' or 'States' is used, these shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming, or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River under the authority of that State.

"ARTICLE III

"It shall be the duty of the two States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, shall collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of information necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE IV

"Each State shall itself or in conjunction with other responsible agencies cause to be established, maintained, and operated such suitable water gaging stations as it finds necessary to administer this compact.

"ARTICLE V

"A. Wyoming and South Dakota agree that the unappropriated waters of the Belle Fourche River as of the date of this compact shall be allocated to each State as follows:

"Ninety percent to South Dakota, 10 percent to Wyoming: *Provided*, That allocations to Wyoming shall be exclusive of the use of these waters for domestic and stock use, and Wyoming shall be allowed unrestricted use for these purposes, except that no reservoir for such use shall exceed 20 acre-feet in capacity. For storage of its allocated water, Wyoming shall have the privilege of purchasing at cost not to exceed 10 percent of the total storage capacity of any reservoir or reservoirs constructed in Wyoming for irrigation of lands in South Dakota, or may construct reservoirs itself for the purpose of utilizing such water. Either State may temporarily divert, or store for beneficial use, any unused part of the above percentages allotted to the other, but no continuing right shall be established thereby.

"B. Rights to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River, whether based on direct diversion or storage, are hereby recognized as of the date of this compact to the extent these rights are valid under the law of the State in which the use is made, and shall remain unimpaired hereby. These rights, together with the additional allocations made under A of this article, are agreed to be an equitable apportionment between the States of the waters of the basin.

"C. The waters allocated under A of this article and the rights recognized under B of this article are hereinafter referred to collectively as the apportioned water. For the purposes of the administration of this compact and determining the apportioned water at any given date within a given calendar year, there shall be taken the sum of:

"(1) The quantity of water in acre-feet that passed the Wyoming-South Dakota State line during the period from January 1 of that year to that given date.

"(2) The quantity of water in acre-feet in storage on that date in all reservoirs built in Wyoming on the Belle Fourche River subsequent to the date of this compact.

"ARTICLE VI

"Any person, entity, or State shall have the right to acquire necessary property rights in another State, by purchase or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article V and article VII A: *Provided, however*, That the grantees of such rights shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements thereon during the 10 years preceding the use of such lands in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said political subdivision of the State.

"ARTICLE VII

"A. Either State shall have the right, by compliance with the laws of the other State, to file applications for and receive permits to construct or participate in the construction and use of any dam, storage reservoir, or diversion works in such State for the purpose of conserving and regulating the apportioned water of the other State: *Provided*, That such right is subject to the rights of the other State to control, regulate, and use water apportioned to it.

"B. Each claim hereafter initiated for storage or diversion of water in one State for use in another State shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the State in which the water is to be stored or diverted, and a duplicate copy of the application including a map showing the character and location of the proposed facilities and the lands to be irrigated shall be filed in the office of the State engineer of the State in which the water is to be used. If a portion or all the lands proposed to be reclaimed are located in a State other than the one in

which the water is to be stored or diverted, then, before approval of the application shall be granted, said application shall be checked against the records of the appropriate office of the State in which the water is to be used, and a notation shall be placed thereon by the officer in charge of such records to the effect that the land description does not indicate a conflict with existing water rights. All endorsements shall be placed on both the original and duplicate copies of all such maps filed to the end that the records in both States may be complete and identical.

"C. Appropriations may hereafter be adjudicated in the State in which the water is stored or diverted, and where a portion or all of the lands irrigated are in the other State, such adjudications shall be confirmed in the latter State by the proper authority. Each adjudication is to conform with the laws of the State where the water is stored or diverted and shall be recorded in the county and State where the water is used.

"ARTICLE VIII

"In case any reservoir is constructed in Wyoming, to be used principally for irrigation of lands in South Dakota, sufficient water not to exceed 10 cubic feet per second shall be released at all times for stock water use.

"ARTICLE IX

"No reservoir hereafter built solely to utilize the water allocated to Wyoming shall have a capacity in excess of 1,000 acre-feet.

"ARTICLE X

"The provisions of this compact shall remain in full force and effect until amended by action of the legislatures of the States and consented to and approved by the Congress of the United States in the same manner as this compact is required to be ratified to become effective.

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact may be terminated at any time by unanimous consent of the States, and upon such termination, all rights then established hereunder or recognized hereby shall continue to be recognized as valid by the States notwithstanding the termination of the other provisions of the compact.

"ARTICLE XII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent either State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, in any Federal court or the United States Supreme Court for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

"ARTICLE XIII

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"A. To impair or affect any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Belle Fourche River nor its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters;

"B. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by either State or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

"C. To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which these laws would apply without regard to the compact.

"ARTICLE XIV

"This compact shall become operative when approved by the legislature of each of the States, and when consented to by the Congress of the United States by legislation providing, among other things, that:

"A. Any beneficial uses hereafter made by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by this compact, shall be within the allocations hereinabove made for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"B. The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Belle Fourche River and all its tributaries, shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial use of the waters within the basin is of paramount importance to development of the basin, and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial use of the waters shall be made, except upon a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of this compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of this compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purpose.

"C. The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the apportioned waters which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such waters; provided, that such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with this compact at the time of the impairment thereof, and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

"ARTICLE XV

"Should a court of competent jurisdiction hold any part of this compact to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States, all other severable provisions shall continue in full force and effect.

"In witness whereof the commissioners have signed this compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be filed in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the States.

"Done at the city of Cheyenne in the State of Wyoming, this 18th day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1943.

"Commissioners for South Dakota:

"M. Q. SHARPE.
"G. W. MORSMAN.
"S. G. MORTIMER.
"W. D. BUCHHOLZ.

"Commissioners for Wyoming:

"L. C. BISHOP.
"SAMUEL MCKEAN.
"L. H. ROBINSON.
"MRS. E. E. MCKEAN.

"I have participated in the negotiation of this compact and intend to report favorably thereon to the Congress of the United States.

"HOWARD R. STINSON,
"Representative of the United States of America."

SEC. 2. (a) In order that the conditions stated in article XIV of the compact hereby consented to shall be met and that the compact shall be and continue to be operative, the following provisions are enacted:

(1) Any beneficial uses hereafter made by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by such compact, shall be within the allocations made by such compact for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State;

(2) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Belle Fourche River and all its tributaries shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial use of the waters within the basin is of paramount importance to the development of the basin; and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial use of the waters within the basin shall be made except when a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of such compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of such compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purposes;

(3) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the apportioned water which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such water: *Provided*, That such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with such compact at the time of the impairment thereof and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

(b) As used in this section, the following terms: "beneficial use," "basin," and "apportioned water," shall have the same meanings as those ascribed to them in the compact consented to by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed compact provides for the division of the water supply of the Belle Fourche River between the States of Wyoming and South Dakota. The drainage basin of this river comprises an area of 7,350 square miles in northeastern Wyoming and western South Dakota. The main purpose of the compact is to make an equitable division of the waters of this basin for irrigation purposes and to provide the basis for the development of additional water storage in Wyoming. The compact will materially aid the development of the Belle Fourche project in South Dakota, inasmuch as it will remove any question as to the status of project water rights arising out of the absence of water filings in my State for this project. It was originally contemplated to irrigate 76,000 acres on this project, but it has been impossible to provide water for more than 40,000 acres. Under the terms of the compact all valid water rights in Wyoming are recognized and people of Wyoming are authorized to make unrestricted use of the water for stock and domestic use. Up to 10 second-

feet of water in the Belle Fourche below any reservoir to be constructed may be used for stock water in compact. Furthermore, Wyoming is assured the right to store and use up to 10 percent of all the water that falls in Wyoming on this watershed over and above presently appropriated water. This compact was ratified unanimously by the Legislature of Wyoming and with only one dissenting vote in the Legislature of South Dakota. The legislation has been approved by the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and War, and the Federal Power Commission has raised no objection to the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2580 is a bill to protect the interests of the United States Government, the State of Wyoming, and the State of South Dakota. It gives the approval of the Congress to a pact already approved by the State Legislatures of Wyoming and South Dakota for a division of the waters of the Belle Fourche River.

The bill recognizes and confirms existing water appropriations. It establishes permanent stock-water rights for stockmen in Wyoming. It then provides for a division of the unused waters that will permit irrigation of all of the good irrigable lands that can be reached below a feasible dam site in Wyoming and that will provide a supplemental water supply for the existing Belle Fourche project in South Dakota.

The Federal Government has an investment of many millions of dollars in the Belle Fourche project. Additional water is needed to stabilize the development and settlement of the project. The reservoir which now stores water for the project is an off-stream reservoir and the inlet canal cannot carry enough volume to save all the floodwater in times of a high flood. Eventually it is hoped that a storage reservoir can be constructed in Wyoming, farther upstream, that will make possible irrigation of available lands in Wyoming and also provide some supplemental water for the downstream project in South Dakota.

The bill, H. R. 2580, was introduced by my able colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] to give effect to a compact entered into by representatives of the Federal Government and the States of Wyoming and South Dakota. Already, the compact has been approved by the State legislatures unanimously, and the favorable action of the House today will be greatly appreciated by the people and water users in the States concerned.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN VESSELS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3261, to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto," approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law 44, 78th Cong., 57 Stat. 69), is amended to read as follows: "That any vessel formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto, any vessel of 1,000 gross tons (determined in accordance with the provisions of sec. 77 of title 46 of the United States Code) or less, and any vessel employed on the Great Lakes during the year preceding its acquisition by the United States, the title to which has been or may hereafter be acquired by the United States through purchase or requisition, may be returned to private ownership in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 2. Every such vessel shall, upon determination by the department or agency having possession thereof that the vessel is no longer needed or can be spared by such department or agency without detriment to its service, be made available to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator), who shall notify the owner from whom such vessel was purchased or requisitioned that the vessel may be returned to such owner upon repayment to the United States of the compensation paid therefor less such allowances as the Administrator may deem reasonable (1) to cover the cost of such reconditioning as would be necessary to restore the vessel to a condition at least as good as when acquired by the United States (ordinary wear and tear excepted), and (2) to compensate such owner for the use of the vessel by the United States, and upon compliance with such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe. The determination of such allowances by the Administrator shall be final, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

"SEC. 3. If any such owner shall fail, within a reasonable time after notice (which time shall be specified in the notice but may be extended by the Administrator), to make arrangements satisfactory to the Administrator for such return of the vessel or shall expressly waive the right thereto, the Administrator may advertise the vessel for sale upon competitive sealed bids subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe. That the Administrator may reject any bid which does not equal the purchase price or compensation paid or payable by the United States for such vessel less a reasonable allowance to cover the cost of reconditioning as hereinabove defined.

"SEC. 4. The Administrator may withhold from the funds received for the return or sale of any such vessel the expenses incurred by him in such return or sale, and shall pay over the balance of such receipts to the department or agency by which such vessel was made available."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "requisition", insert "except any vessel 17 years of age or older traded in under the provisions of section 510, Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, or any other provision of law."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "would be" and insert in lieu thereof "the Administrator after consultation with the owner deems."

Page 2, line 20, strike out the words "a condition" and insert the words "condition and utility."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "owner", insert the words "to whom compensation has been paid or a tender of compensation has been made."

Page 3, line 10, insert after the word "prescribe" a comma and the words: "including in the case of any vessel used in commercial fisheries or industries related thereto immediately prior to the acquisition of such vessel by the United States, a requirement that the vessel will not be used for a period of 2 years from date of sale, other than in the commercial fisheries or industries related thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2641) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept title to lands and interests in lands near the entrance to the Sequoia National Park, subject to existing easements for public highways and public utilities, within the following described tracts:

Tract A. A portion of tract 37, township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately 2 acres.

Tract B. A portion of the east half of the northeast quarter of section 4, township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately 38 acres.

Tract C. A portion of the south half of tract 37, township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately sixty one-hundredths acre.

The owners of the lands to be conveyed to the United States, before any exchange is effective, shall furnish to the Secretary of the Interior evidence satisfactory to him of title to such lands. Such property shall become a part of the Sequoia National Park upon the acceptance of title thereto by the Secretary, and shall thereafter be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park.

SEC. 2. That in exchange for the conveyance to the United States of tract A, as provided in section 1 of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to patent to the owner of tract A, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary, certain lands of approximately equal value described as follows:

Tract D. A portion of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 16 south, range 29, east, Mount Diablo meridian, Tulare County, Calif., comprising approximately two and fifty one-hundredths acres.

In exchange for the conveyance of the United States of tracts B and C, as provided in section 1 of this act, the Secretary is authorized to patent, in a similar manner, to the owner of tracts B and C certain lands of approximately equal value described as follows:

Tract E. The southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 4, which shall be subject to section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C., sec. 818); the south half of the northeast quarter of section 5; and approximately 68 acres of the north half of the southeast quarter of section 5, which shall not include the surveyed 200-foot strip as shown on map D of exhibit K entitled "Detailed Map of Kaweah Project of the

Southern California Edison Co., Ltd.," and filed in the office of the Federal Power Commission on December 12, 1923; all of said lands in tract E being situated in township 17 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, comprising approximately 188 acres.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or affect in any manner the provisions, or extend the term, of the permit heretofore granted to the Southern California Edison Co., and predecessors thereof for the use of lands in the Sequoia National Park for electric power development purposes, or to relieve the company of any financial or other obligation under said permit, or under agreements or orders relating or supplementary thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF COAL LANDS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3428) to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That each lease shall be for such leasing block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, to be described by the subdivisions of the survey, and no person, association, or corporation, except as hereinafter provided, shall take or hold at any one time leases for more than 2,560 acres in the aggregate, or take or hold any interest as a member of an association or stockholder of a corporation holding a lease under this act if the acreage represented by such indirect interest, or by such indirect interest together with the acreage represented by the direct holding of any lease issued under this act, exceeds 2,560 acres in the aggregate. Any interest held in violation of this act shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that any ownership or interest forbidden in this act which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

"SEC. 7. That, except as herein provided, any person who shall purchase, acquire, or hold any interest in leases issued under this act, either directly or as a stockholder in a corporation or member of an association holding leases or interests in leases of which he has knowledge, which interest so purchased, acquired, or held shall exceed in the aggregate 2,560 acres, or who shall knowingly purchase, acquire, or hold any stock in a corporation or shares in an association which holds any interest in leases issued under this act exceeding 2,560 acres in the aggregate, or who shall knowingly sell or transfer to one disqualified to purchase, or, disqualified to acquire any such interest, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years or a fine not exceeding $1,000, or both: *Provided*, That any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held 2 years after its acquisition and not longer, and in case of minority or other disability such time as the court may decree.

"SEC. 8. That any director, trustee, officer, or agent of any corporation or association holding an interest in such leases who shall, on behalf of such corporation or association, act in the purchase of any interest in any other lease, which together with the other holdings of the corporation or association under this act, exceeds 2,560 acres in the aggregate, or who shall knowingly act on behalf of such corporation or association in the sale or transfer of any such interest in any lease held by such corporation or association to any corporation, association, or individual holding any interest or interests in any other such leases which together with the interest sold or transferred exceeds in the aggregate 2,560 acres, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years or a fine not exceeding $1,000, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT, MIDDLE DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 630) to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective July 1, 1943, so much of the second sentence of section 107 (c) of the Judicial Code, as amended, as precedes the proviso is amended to read as follows: "Terms of the district court for the Nashville division of said district shall be held at Nashville on the fourth Monday in January and the fourth Monday in September; for the Columbia division at Columbia on the first Monday in May and the second Monday in November; and for the northeastern division at Cookeville on the second Monday in June and the first Monday in December."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "July 1, 1943" and insert "January 1, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN AWARDS, FOR WAR MINERALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2616) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a member of our committee better acquainted than I am, I might make this explanation: At the close of the First World War there were many claims on the part of mining men against the Government. An appropriation was made to satisfy those claims. All claims were adjudicated. However, there was not quite enough money in the appropriation to satisfy all of the claims. There were nine claims that were left unpaid because of lack of funds. These nine claims have been adjudicated, and this measure merely provides for an appropriation to take care of the claims that had been adjudicated and found to be correct. It is a very meritorious bill, and I hope that it will pass.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman mean that this bill appropriates the money to pay these claims?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; the bill authorizes an appropriation.

Mr. CASE. It does not contemplate an appropriation?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is just an authorization.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. When the original bill was pending in the House I tried to defeat it, and I did defeat it for a number of years. Eventually, it was brought in under a rule and, on a roll call, it passed. I said then that it would cost the Government over $10,000,000. It has. All of the claimants have been paid except the ones named in the bill. It will take about $50,000 to close the books, and I hope this is the end. These claims never should have been paid in my judgment, but now that everyone has been paid except the few mentioned, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and I shall not object, but I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and to the House that this is the result of a mistake made by the Congress when it passed what is called the O'Connor rule, to take all of the private bills that were objected to, that had been knocked off the Private Calendar, and then put them into a group and bring them in in what is called an omnibus bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. No, this bill was considered individually under a rule.

Mr. RANKIN. That does not make any difference. Under the operation of the O'Connor rule, after we take a lot of bills costing a large amount of money, off the Consent or Private Calendar, then they put them in an omnibus bill and bring them in here, with vicarious strength in various localities, scattered throughout the country, and put them over, so that so far as saving any money is concerned, it has made the Private Consent Calendar nugatory.

Mr. JENSEN. Who can tell me why all these claims were not allowed at once?

Mr. MURDOCK. These claims were adjudicated over a considerable period of time, but it took time, and the money appropriated that was supposed to cover them, but nine of them were not so covered. All of the others have been paid.

If we do not authorize this appropriation which should be made, those nine

which were and are just as valid as any of the others will stand the total loss.

Mr. JENSEN. But it requires an appropriation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; final settlement depends upon an appropriation. I want to say to the gentleman, I know of none of these nine claims, but I was told by colleagues that there are widows who will inherit some of these claims and one at least who now having waited 25 years, is in need of this money. Now if we do not pass this bill and the money is not appropriated, the nine will suffer a total loss instead of being paid proportionately as the others were paid.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely satisfied with this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that all departments of Government concerned have agreed to this and have sanctioned it, even the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 166, to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when one reads the language of the report by the Committee on Indian Affairs this looks like a very innocent resolution; but as you analyze the resolution and also read the report of the Attorney General, a different picture is presented. The court has rendered a favorable decision in this case and the question is now, how much? The Government and the attorneys for the Indians figure it will be around $1,500,000. But before they decide the exact amount in comes a resolution and it means, if this passes, the Court of Claims cannot follow the law; that you cannot follow the provisions of the jurisdictional bill; you cannot allow any offset in favor of the Government. We adopted a policy here a number of years ago granting to the Government the power to offset these claims by deducting from the amount the gratuities or advances that have been made to Indians. That same policy should be followed in this case. Pass this resolution and the Government's hands are tied in this respect. They will get the full amount of the judgment and the Government will receive no credit for the gratuities and advances it has made to these Indians.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to call attention to the fact that the Attorney General has approved this resolution with an amendment. Now, the gentleman is not quite correct, I think, in assuming that there are no gratuities which can be chargeable against those Indians. If this bill is passed the gratuities which might accrue against this claim will be transferred to other claims of these same Indians. I contend that we are not changing the policy and doing away with the matter of counting gratuities in computing such claims.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the letter from the Attorney General, he will find he approves the claims not with an amendment, but with amendments. And one of the amendments that the Attorney General recommends is the one I recommend, and that is, not to take away from the Government the right of offsetting these claims by deducting the amounts of gratuities and advances we have given to these Indians. Now, if the gentleman wants to follow the recommendations of the Attorney General, all well and good, I will not object to the consideration of the bill. But until that part of the bill is eliminated I will not only object to it, but I will demand a roll call before the bill is disposed of.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I presume the gentleman is familiar with the real purpose of this bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. And in favor of it, with the exception of the part I have objected to here.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. And may I state to the gentleman that the purpose of that bill could not be carried out at all if in the final computation in the amount due the Menominee Tribe as the basis for the interlocutory judgment which has now been rendered the Government was to offset its gratuities against the present claim for the very reason there would not be sufficient money available to enable the Government to purchase the land from the State of Wisconsin which it is proposed to purchase with the proceeds of this judgment. All this bill does in that respect is to simply delay the enforcement of the offset of gratuities as against other claims which are pending and which are valid claims against the Government in behalf of the Menominee Tribe of Indians.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Assuming that the Court of Claims does not render a favorable decision in the other cases pending, then is not the Government out on a limb as far as the gratuities and advances are concerned?

Mr. KEEFE. I would say that if the gentleman's supposition were to be 100 percent correct, perhaps that is true. However, I think anybody who is familiar with the litigation pending between the Menominee Tribe and the Government will know that the Government is amply protected and that it stands to lose nothing by reason of the declination to set up offsets in this particular suit. But I would call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: Unless this is done, the opportunity of the Federal Government to acquire these lands for the benefit of the Menominee Tribe, who are wards of the Government, will perhaps be forever lost. We must bear in mind that the acquisition of these lands as part of the timberlands of this tribe is the very thing that has maintained the financial stability of that tribe through their timber operations; and if we do not purchase this land now from the State of Wisconsin, as was originally intended when that reservation was set apart to them, so that this tribe can continue their timber operations, we will have them back on the Government, as wards of the Government, asking for relief in another form. I think we must bear in mind the equities that are involved in this situation in dealing with this problem.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman the financial stability of that tribe of Indians is due to the foresight of Senator La Follette, Sr., who looked after their interests. That is just exactly what other Senators and Representatives did not do in regard to their tribes of Indians. There is no tribe of Indians in the country whose interests have been looked after better than the tribe of Indians involved in this case today.

Mr. KEEFE. In general terms, may I state to the gentleman that I am in agreement with what he says. However, the fact of the matter is that here is an opportunity to carry out the very purpose and policy that has been in vogue all these years through the operation of the Menominee Indian sawmill; and if we do not permit this to go through so that the Government can have sufficient funds out of this judgment to buy this timberland which is a part of the reservation, then we are going to see the plan which Senator La Follette started years ago virtually knocked in the head, and which plan the gentleman this morning is eulogizing. I am interested in it as an economic proposition of justice for this tribe, which tribe, by the way, is not in my district, but with which I am very familiar in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am interested in it from the standpoint of the taxpayers of the United States who have to pay the bill. If you can get from the Attorney General a waiver of his recommendation that he makes in his letter to this committee, the bill can be passed as far as I am concerned. But here is an effort to break down the policy we have been following year after year, since an amendment was added to the deficiency bill by the late Congressman Buchanan, at my request, an opportunity to take away from the Government the right to properly protect itself in these suits. I am not going to be a party to breaking down that policy. Do it for one, and you will be required to do it for others.

Mr. COLE of New York. This resolution contemplates the purchase of certain swamplands from the State of Wisconsin. I understand these identical lands were conveyed by the Federal Government to the State of Wisconsin 75 years ago. I wonder if the gentleman is advised, or any of the other Members interested, as to how much the State of Wisconsin paid to the Federal Government for these same swamplands when they acquired them 75 years ago and for which the State of Wisconsin is now asking $1,500,000 from the Federal Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know anything about what the State of Wisconsin paid for the land, but regardless of what they paid for the land, we should not break down our policy of allowing the Government to charge off money we have already advanced.

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with just exacly what took place under the Swampland Act of 1850, but I understand that it involved all of the swamplands in the entire Northwest and operated as a gift by the United States Government to all the States involved in the Northwest purchase which covered these swamplands.

The question as to whether or not the State paid anything for them at that time I do not know; but I may say that every dollar of funds paid by the United States Government for the purchase of these lands goes, under the law, into the school fund of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. COLE of New York. The State of Wisconsin acquired these lands without any cost. The question that occurs to me now is why they should ask from the Federal Government the price of a million and a half dollars to turn them back to the Federal Government.

Mr. KEEFE. May I state to the gentleman from New York that so far as the State of Wisconsin is concerned it is not asking to sell these lands to the Federal Government; as a matter of fact there is considerable opposition to the sale, because it is felt that the timber on these lands today makes them much more valuable than the price agreement that has been entered into between the Government and the Land Commission of the State of Wisconsin. What we are attempting as an economic proposition is to do for these Indians what the treaty with the United States Government provided, and to keep these Indians self sufficient from an economic basis.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is perfectly true. The Federal Government made a mistake back in 1850. It had made a treaty with the Indians guaranteeing to give them certain territory.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Subsequently under the Swampland Act, it, by mistake, conveyed these same lands to the State of Wisconsin. The thing that disturbs me is why the Government should pay the State of Wisconsin a million and a half dollars solely because of having made a mistake at the time of the original conveyance of the land.

Mr. KEEFE. They are not paying it to the State of Wisconsin, if the gentleman will yield; they are paying it to the Menominee Tribe of Indians as damages to the Indians and the Indians in turn are attempting to use the money to buy this land from the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. That brings me to the proposition that if this money is expended it will not go where it should go or where it should be spent.

Mr. KEEFE. If the money is not used for the purchase of this land the interlocutory judgment, which has been entered, will permit the Government to offset the gratuities of the United States Government against the claim reducing it perhaps by several hundred thousands of dollars. The balance of the money will be paid in cash to the benefit of the Menominee Tribe and will remain to their credit in the funds of that tribe in the Treasury of the United States Government.

Mr. CASE. Then it does not save any money to the United States; it is merely a question of whether or not this money shall be expended from the Treasury for these timber lands or whether it shall be expended to the tribe directly as cash.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the situation as it exists except when the gentleman from Missouri raises the question of the passage of this resolution it simply delays so far as this particular matter is concerned the off-set of gratuities to enable the Menominee Indians to get sufficient money to buy this land, an agreement having been entered into with land commissioners of the State of Wisconsin as to the purchase price.

Mr. MURDOCK. To any objection that this calls for an expenditure of money, I want to point out that the Indians had better be paid in swampland, to become a part of their sustaining reservation, and the State of Wisconsin paid a sum of money somewhat nearly representing the value of the land in question, which money I understand the State of Wisconsin will put into its public-school fund. I can think of no arrangement which would be better than this nor which will better serve the ends of justice.

Let it be understood that if this transaction is not carried out somewhat according to the terms of this bill, this land containing some valuable timber will be sold to private parties who must cross Indian land to reach it. Thus, besides wrongfully depriving the Indians of something which is rightfully theirs, the way will be paved for innumerable suits and difficulties. On the other hand, if this land is definitely made a part of the Indian reservation, the proceeds from the sale of timber will add to the economic foundation of this tribe of Indians and place them beyond the need of calling for funds out of the Public Treasury as needy wards of the Government. I think that the measure as it stands does not infringe upon or radically change the policy which the gentleman from Missouri has so long upheld.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND CHAPTER 7 OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

The Clerk called the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 3408, to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1115; U. S. C., title 18, ch. 7) is hereby amended by inserting after section 168 the following new section:

"SEC. 168A. (a) Whoever shall manufacture, sell, offer, or advertise for sale, or shall cause or procure to be manufactured, sold, offered, or advertised for sale, any token, slug, disk, or other device similar in size and shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, with knowledge or reason to believe that such tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices may be used unlawfully, or fraudulently to procure anything of value, or use or enjoyment of any property or service from any automatic merchandise vending machine, postage-stamp machine, turnstile, fare box, coin-box telephone, parking meter, or other receptacle, depository, or contrivance, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) 'Knowledge or reason to believe,' within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section, may be shown by proof that any law-enforcement officer has, prior to the commission of the offense with which the defendant is charged, informed the defendant that tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices of the kind manufactured, sold, offered, or advertised for sale by him are being used unlawfully or fraudulently to operate certain specified automatic merchandise vending machines, postage-stamp machines, turnstiles, fare boxes, coin-box telephones, parking meters, or other receptacles, depositories, or contrivances, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia in 1787, its members were determined that there should be a uniform system of money throughout the Thirteen Colonies and that the integrity of the money to be established must be adequately protected. Hence section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power "to coin money" and "regulate the value thereof" and "to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States."

Pursuant tc this authority the Congress has passed several laws designed to prevent counterfeiting, including sections 163, 164, 167, 168, 171, and 178 of the United States Criminal Code. Briefly

and collectively these enactments make it a crime to manufacture, sell, pass, use, or issue any devices in lieu of lawful coins of the United States without lawful authority.

Originally, United States coins were used as money only in hand-to-hand transactions. In the past 50 years, however, along with other progress in manufacturing and distribution, a new use for coins in making possible service to the public through mechanical devices for the sale of numerous items of merchandise and service has been developed to large proportions. Coin telephones, fare-collecting devices, parcel-checking facilities, parking meters, and other service mechanisms as well as vending machines for the sale of sanitary drinking cups, soap, towels, postage stamps, candy, nuts, milk, apples, tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, beverages, and other items, are now in daily use by millions of persons and provide means for serving the public conveniently and economically, without which our present-day economy, especially under current war conditions, would be seriously handicapped.

The use of United States coins in these service and merchandising machines is one of the largest single uses for such coins. It is estimated that well over $500,000,000 worth of pennies, nickels, and dimes pass through these mechanisms each year. Treasury Department figures indicate a total of approximately $300,000,000 worth of pennies, nickels, and dimes in the country, including large quantities which repose much of the time in bank vaults and in small private family hoards. This would mean that there is an average of more than one use per year in coin devices for every penny, nickel, and dime in the country.

These devices are, in effect, inanimate tradesmen and render a service that we can ill afford to dispense with. They inform us through printed words the nature and the price of the merchandise they offer for sale; through a glass window they exhibit to us their wares; when we deposit our money, they promptly deliver our purchases; in some cases, they even make change. They expect us to deal as honestly with them as they do with us. Unlike the actual tradesman, however, these inanimate merchants are easily and frequently victimized. The actual tradesman is humane and is possessed of the senses of sight, feeling, and hearing. If a suspiciously spurious coin is proffered him by a customer in exchange for his goods, he employs these senses to determine its authenticity. He looks at its shape and workmanship; he feels to determine its weight, and the nature of its surface; he throws it on the counter and listens for the familiar genuine ring. He not only has the opportunity to make all of these tests but he may also question the customer if he is unsatisfied with the proffered coin. If unconvinced he may demand another coin, and if the same is not forthcoming, he can refuse to deliver the merchandise.

Not so with the inanimate tradesman, however. It was not endowed with the human senses. It cannot see or talk to its customer. It must take the coins that he deposits and deliver its wares without a protest.

So often were vending machines defrauded through the use of slugs, tokens, and spurious coins that the manufacturers urged their engineers to design some kind of protective equipment. After considerable experimentation, an ingenious contrivance was developed known as a slug rejector. Attached and made a part of the machine, it was designed to endow the device with what might be termed the sense of feeling. By means of mechanical and magnetic tests it would cause the machine to reject tokens or slugs which were slightly larger or smaller in either thickness or diameter than United States coins; it would likewise cause the rejection of coins or slugs with holes in the center or those having serrated edges. As time went on these slug rejectors were further improved to such an extent that they would reject coins or slugs made of brass, iron, lead, aluminum, or other certain metals or combinations of metals.

In spite of these protective steps, the manufacturers of fraudulent slugs were equally alert and equally ingenius. To counteract the effect of the slug rejectors they commenced to fabricate their product out of metals and alloys having properties similar to those of lawful minor coins. In this they have been singularly successful and are marketing on a large scale a product that is capable of circumventing the slug rejectors and operating the vending machines in the same manner as coins of the United States.

They advertise these slugs openly in catalogs, and in cheap newspapers and magazines. The ostensible purpose of their product, they say in their advertisements, is for use in gambling machines. However, they invariably hint of their real purpose by adding such phrases as, "these tokens must not be used in cigarette, candy, telephone, stamp, or legal vending machines." It reminds us of the old prohibition days when certain firms would advertise their product by admonishing their customers not to add sugar and allow it to stand as it would then ferment and become intoxicating.

As a matter of fact, very few gambling machines are equipped with slug rejectors. They are always placed in places where they are continually under the watchful eye of the proprietor or one of his employees. They are usually equipped with a glass window which exhibits the last six or eight coins that have been placed in the mechanism. The operator would be clever, indeed, who could manage to get very many slugs into the average gambling machine without having his movements detected by the watchful eye of the attendant.

The ones who suffer most from this illegal racket are the small vending machine operatives whose business is of such a limited scope that they cannot readily absorb their losses. One such, who managed a cigarette vending machine concern in Cincinnati is a typical example. He said:

> Our company took in approximately $600 worth of slugs during the past year (1940). Inasmuch as our net is one penny on every eight packs sold, we had to sell 480,000 packs to make up our loss.

Several States have enacted statutes aimed at this evil but their effectiveness has been minimized owing to the fact that they have been unable to reach the source of supply. Slugs are usually made and sold in some State where such protective legislation does not exist. Enforcement officers must therefore content themselves by prosecuting solely for their "use." Detections are extremely difficult and convictions few.

The existing Federal laws concerning counterfeiting have proved inadequate. On February 18, 1941, the Federal grand jury at St. Paul, Minn., returned indictments against Nate Gellman, Mike Gellman, W. W. Wilcox Manufacturing Co., and James M. Voorhees, its president, on 14 counts for alleged violations of sections 163, 164, 167, and 168 of the Criminal Code. The Gellmans, operating a novelty store, were charged as principals in the indictment, and the W. W. Wilcox Co. and its president, Mr. Voorhees, with aiding and abetting the Gellmans in the alleged violations. The trial of this case without a jury commenced before Hon. Gunnar H. Nordbye, United States district judge, in December 1941. On April 8, 1942, Judge Nordbye rendered his decision, finding the defendants not guilty—*United States* v. *Gellman* (44 F. Supp. 360)—and in part of his opinion stated:

> The difficulty is that this indictment seeks to charge the defendants with an offense under statutes which were enacted over 100 years ago when vending machines probably did not exist. They were never framed to embrace the use of metal tokens as a substitution for money in the limited sense referred to. While the Court is not unmindful that there should be some curb on the fraud that is being perpetrated by the use of these slugs or tokens, relief must be sought from Congress and not from the courts. The State of Minnesota has recently passed an act which prohibits the manufacture, sale, offering for sale, advertising for sale or distribution of tokens, checks, or slugs for use in lieu of lawful coins in vending machines, parking meters, service meters, coin boxes, telephone, or other coin receptacles. No doubt Congress would have authority to extend the statutory prohibitions regarding the use of coins or tokens in the manner referred to herein. A criminal statute must be strictly construed, and to apply these statutes to the factual situation disclosed by this evidence would be entirely unwarranted.

The bill under consideration—H. R. 3408—will supplement existing law by making unlawful the manufacture, sale, offer, or advertisement for sale of tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices similar in size or shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, or causing or procuring any of those things to be done. The offense is made a misdemeanor and the penalty is a fine of not more than $3,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. The act must be done with knowledge or reason to believe that such slugs may be used unlawfully or fraudulently in contrivances designed to receive or be operated by lawful coins.

The Departments of the Treasury and Justice, upon whom will devolve the responsibility of enforcement and prosecution if this bill becomes a law have both signified their approval of its enactment.

There can be no logical argument for the manufacture of slugs or trade checks that are of the same size and design of United States coins. If there is a legitimate use for such items, they can be easily made of a size that will take them out from the prohibitions laid down by this bill.

I earnestly urge your affirmative vote for this measure.

AMENDING THE SABOTAGE LAW (WARTIME)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3442, to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is a minority report on this bill signed by 12 members of the Judiciary Committee. It is obvious that a bill with a minority report is not a proper subject for passage by unanimous consent. I therefore object to its consideration on this calendar.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FACILITATE AND SIMPLIFY COLLECTION PROCEDURE IN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 321, to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can somebody explain this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, heretofore in the granting of leases the applicants have had to file with the office of the Comptroller General a duplicate original or certified copies of each lease or permit, certified copies of statement of agreement to perform, and certain other documents.

There are a large number of leases in which the amounts are very small. The actual cost of detail of drawing up and checking through the two offices sometimes amounts to nearly as much as the lease itself involves. The office of the Comptroller General and the Secretary of the Interior took the matter up with each other and there was an amendment agreed upon and recommended by the Comptroller General, which is included in the Senate bill as it passed, providing that this necessity of not having to file certified copies only applies when the amount of the annual rental is $300 or less. It is just simply to simplify the vast amount of detail work and the vast amount of red-tape expenses, so they limited it to $300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That leases, permits, licenses, contracts, agreements, and other instruments providing for payments to the United States on account of the use of lands or waters under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or on account of the sale of products of such lands or waters, or on account of other transactions incident to the administration of such lands or waters, including contributions by cooperators, but excluding sales of used equipment, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 3743 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (title 41, U. S. C., sec. 20), when the lease or other instruments do not require payment to the Government in excess of $300 in any 1 fiscal year: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe from time to time regulations requiring that originals or copies of any class or group of documents within the foregoing exemption, in the circumstances and upon the conditions designated by him in such regulations, shall be deposited in the General Accounting Office for audit purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SETTLE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 364, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Florida explain this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this particular bill has passed the Senate with amendments to cover certain specific recommendations made. At the present time if there is a surrender of a gas or oil lease, even though you may surrender it on the 10th of January, the legal question has arisen that you may have to pay the rental for the entire year. Under the present construction there is a dispute as to whether or not that construction is correct.

The Congress in 1942 passed an act, which is referred to in the report, for the purpose of working out a compromise. Under the present rule, if you surrender a lease on the 10th of January, in view of the words in one of the other acts referring to annual or yearly rental, they take the position that probably you would have to pay the entire 1943 rental. This bill allows the Secretary of the Interior to settle on a pro rata basis. In other words, if there is reasonable diligence used in surrendering, then, subject to the limitations of the bill, you pay your rental on a pro rata basis when you surrender. If you surrendered in February you would pay only two-twelfths, assuming your lease began January 1.

Mr. JENSEN. This bill only applies to that specific matter?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. It has the unanimous report of the committee, it has already passed the Senate, and it has been approved also by the Budget, and does not apply to anything that might be in litigation or sent to the Department of Justice for suit.

Mr. JENSEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say it has the unanimous approval of the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if it has not become the practice now for the Government, in leasing lands for oil development, to require the rental fee to be paid for 1 year in advance?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am not sure whether that is required to be paid in advance or not, but it is my understanding that it is required to be paid in advance.

Mr. COLE of New York. And that same practice is customary in the entire oil industry. A private owner having land which he leases for development receives for 1 year in advance the delayed rental fee. I am at a loss to see why the United States as landlord should give to its oil tenants a preferential status by permitting them to pay delayed rentals on a monthly basis over a private owner.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. In 1942 the Congress passed an act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make compromise settlements of claims for accrued rental under a lease issued pursuant to the provisions of the act referred to. It was evidently contemplated in the act where it was stated, "On an accrual basis," that they should base it only on the amount that has been used. In other words, if it is surrendered in February they would pay two-twelfths. But a dispute has arisen as to the meaning of this verbiage, so they have felt that to supplement that particular act it is best to authorize it definitely. It is only in those cases where there is due diligence used. There are many instances in which the Federal Government would like for them to surrender and would like to work them out just as soon as they can and get it worked out.

If you require them to pay the full year in advance, the tendency then is to keep it for the entire year and not surrender except on the last day of the year, because they would be paying the rent anyway. It is to the benefit of the Federal Government to have these leases canceled and out of the way in many instances. There is a dispute, however, as to whether this law actually applies, but it is thought that out of an abundance of caution we should pass this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the gentleman mean that where the Government has an oil lease with a private oil company providing for the payment of rental on an annual basis in advance, the Government allows the tenant to remain in possession under that lease for the full year and does not require the terms of the lease to be observed?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No. I mean that unless this particular bill is passed and you do not authorize settlement on a pro rata basis, if a man in July or any month, we may say, determines in his own mind he will surrender,

if he has to pay for the whole year he will not surrender until the end of the year.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course not, because he will have paid the full rental in advance.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. We will assume a particular instance. Along the last of December a man decides to surrender but he does not actually give his notice of surrender until along in February. If he has to pay the full year, if he slipped up a day or two in giving his notice, then he will hold it another year. There are many instances in which the Federal Government is just as anxious to work this out as the operator himself.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does this practice contemplated by the bill conform to the customary standard in connection with the prospecting and development of oil lands in the industry?

Under this bill is the Government giving to its oil tenants any preferred status over an oil tenant who is a private landowner?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not know, but I do know that the Department itself, after considering the bill, made its own objections to the bill and they were written into the bill as amendments. The bill was introduced in the Senate and passed the Senate. The gentleman will notice that the latter part of the bill reads as follows:

The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this act shall extend only to cases in which he finds that the failure of the lessee to file a timely surrender of the lease prior to the accrual of the rental was not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, but it shall not extend to claims or cases which have been referred to the Department of Justice for purposes of suit.

In other words, if the Secretary of the Interior finds that there has been a failure to file a timely surrender, then he will not get it on an accrual basis.

Mr. COLE of New York. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the surrender of any lease issued pursuant to any of the provisions of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following), or any amendment thereof, where the surrender is filed in the General Land Office subsequent to the accrual but prior to the payment of the yearly rental due under the lease, upon payment of the accrued rental on a pro rata monthly basis for the portion of the lease year prior to the filing of the surrender. The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this act shall extend only to cases in which he finds that the failure of the lessee to file a timely surrender of the lease prior to the accrual of the rental was not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, but it shall not extend to claims or cases which have been referred to the Department of Justice for purposes of suit.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROATAN NATIONAL FOREST, N. C.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1315, providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, these lands are located in the same county in which I happen to live. At the time the Croatan National Forest was established certain arrangements were made between the Federal Government and the county governments with reference to moneys to be paid in lieu of taxes. I see no reference to that in this report. In fact, the report is very brief and does not seem to cover the situation very clearly. It seems that this bill came from a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. In view of the lack of definite information on this matter, and pending my receiving an explanation from the departments, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, a full report was made to the Senate and also to the House Committee on Agriculture. The Senate bill was not referred to a subcommittee but was considered by the whole committee. The object of the bill is to transfer about 2,500 acres of land which is now in the Croatan National Forest, located in the State of North Carolina, to the Cherry Point aviation base. It involves only the transfer of this acreage from the Department of Agriculture to the Navy Department, with the proviso in the bill that if the Cherry Point base at any time in the future is not used for naval purposes the land reverts to the Croatan National Forest.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that I have been rather closely connected with the Croatan National Forest from its inception, and also with the marine base, which is established on a part of this land. I understand and recall quite clearly the negotiations between these various departments and the county officials. I cannot quite understand why these gentlemen should keep this to themselves until they bring a bill in here. They are on speaking terms with me and they ought to know, if they do not know, that when they begin to tamper with a national forest which is within 5 miles of my front door I am going to know something about it before it goes through.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I say to the gentleman that we did not know that he is interested. This bill came to the Committee on Agriculture in the regular course. The gentleman has never advised the Committee on Agriculture either orally or in writing that he is interested one way or another in the passage of this measure. I did not know until this moment that there was any objection to it. I thought it was only a formal matter.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that I did not mean to imply that the gentleman knew anything about my interest in it. I do say that both departments affected did know about it, and the officials know about it. The only thing I knew about the bill was when it appeared on the calendar. I certainly could not be expected to read the minds of the departments or the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman knew that the bill had been introduced. It does seem that he would have gotten in touch with the Committee on Agriculture and advised the committee of his interest in this measure.

Mr. BARDEN. By the same token the committee clerk could have called my office. The bill was introduced in the Senate and came over to the House, according to the RECORD.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the way it got to the committee.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not keep up with everything that goes on in the United States Senate. I would be mighty difficult, and I may say the gentleman himself does not know about all the bills that are being considered by all the committees of this House and Senate.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I try to keep up with the bills that affect my district.

Mr. BARDEN. So do I and that is exactly what I am doing now and I do not propose to let this bill pass until I am assured by the proper departments and the county government that all rights of the county are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING THE PERSON WHO SHALL ACT AS PRESIDENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 678, designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a matter of so great importance that it ought not to be taken up by unanimous consent.

In my humble opinion this bill would probably bring a contest in the House and the Senate in case of a close election that would duplicate the Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876.

This bill provides that wherever there is a contest, unless the President is declared elected by the time for him to be inaugurated at the regular time, the Speaker of the House shall become President provided he has been elected Speaker, and if he has not been elected Speaker, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall become President.

There are several complications that I see that might grow out of this proposition. Let us take the question of the election of the Speaker. Suppose the House and the Senate get into a row here in 1945, 1949, or 1953 and the same question arises that arose in 1876. In the Tilden-Hayes contest, the question was over the validity of the election returns from the States of Florida and Louisiana. There were two sets of returns from each State, one of them made by the Democrats and the other one made by the Republicans. The question became very bitter. When they came to open the ballots, if the House opened them, if the Speaker presided he was going to open the returns turned in by the Democrats. The Speaker of the House was a Democrat. The President pro tempore of the Senate was a Republican. He claimed precedence over the Speaker of the House, and said that if he opened those ballots, he would open the Republican ballots. Therefore, if the President pro tempore of the Senate presided, Mr. Hayes would be elected, and if the Speaker of the House presided, and opened the other returns, Mr. Tilden would be elected. In order to iron out the situation, an electoral commission was created to settle the question, and on every single ballot every Democrat on the court voted for the Democratic side, and every Republican on the court voted for the Republican side. That was one contest——

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Suppose both the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should be killed in an accident before taking office. Then there would be a hiatus in the situation which might create a difficult situation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to Republicans being scalawags in those days.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I said Republicans down there in those States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman does not expect that situation to arise again, does he?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me finish this picture. Suppose then you have a contest over the election of Speaker, as we did in 1925, at the opening of the Sixty-eighth Congress. Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans had a majority in the House, and there were 13 Independents, and they held the balance of power. They held the House, you might say, in abeyance for 2 weeks. It took 2 weeks to elect the Speaker of the House of the Sixty-eighth Congress. Suppose we had that same situation, and they were to do as a certain fellow did, who was elected to the Senate of a neighboring State once where his own party had just one majority. He said, "If you do not elect me Speaker, I am going to vote with the other side, and they will agree to elect me Speaker." We might get into that kind of a situation where a few men could control. We might find a candidate for Speaker really running for President via the Speakership route. In that case a majority would elect a Speaker and the big States would control. For instance, New York would have 45 votes and New Mexico 2. But in electing a President directly in the House each State would have 1 vote.

I would much prefer to see you provide either for the Congress to elect the President pro tempore by the regular method or else for the then acting Secretary of State to hold over and act as President until an election is held. I do not believe you will ever get this bill through the Senate. You did not get it through there before, and I am not sure that it would pass the House if it were properly debated under the 5-minute rule.

Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I assure him, in discussing reconstruction days, I know that situation would not arise at this time, but I am speaking of a contest that almost precipitated the Civil War.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And the gentleman recalls that in 1931 we had a very close situation here, because at the time of the election in 1930, or shortly thereafter, there were more Republicans here than there were Democrats, and then on account of deaths the Democrats had a majority and finally elected their Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct. In the election in 1930, when the election returns were counted, I believe the Republicans had either one or two majority, but because of deaths, one of them being the Speaker, Hon. Nicholas Longworth, or resignations, or contests, by the time the House convened in the next December the Democrats had a majority of five or six. At that time I believe the Independents, the Progressives, voted with the Democrats, to make that majority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed and appreciate the gentleman's dissertation on this subject. I call his attention to the fact that the passage of some law to take care of this contingency was contemplated in the twentieth amendment as the gentleman well knows. As the matter stands now, we have a very short time between the meeting of Congress on January 3 and the inauguration day on January 20.

Mr. RANKIN. And let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in that conection that the passage of the twentieth amendment and its after-effect, ought to be a warning to the American people in the future not to hastily change the Constitution of the United States. They went out here and paraded the fact that there were "lame ducks" in Congress, men who were holding office after they had been defeated, and so they killed all of the "lame duck" Congressmen, and created a "lame duck" President for 17 days. So, instead of straightening the Constitution out, they complicated it more, and today we have this situation in which the gentleman from Tennessee is trying to forestall a probable contingency that may not arise for perhaps 10 or 15 or 20 years; and what I am afraid of is that his remedy will be worse than the disease.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that I have thought about this a good deal and the late Mr. William Tyler Page, gave it a great deal of study in his keen intellectual way. I do not visualize any situation that may arise where this procedure would get us into a log jam or into a difficulty. In the first place, if the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should die or for some reason be unable to qualify, the natural person to become President until one has been elected would be the Speaker of the House, because there has been an election and the House is close to the people, closer, I think, than the Senate. May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact, until the succession statute was passed, around 1886, the succession went to the President pro tempore of the Senate and then to the Speaker of the House. I believe this was provided for by the Congress of 1795. In the act of 1886 this was changed and the succession passed to the Secretary of State and on down through the Cabinet. These acts are effective only after a President shall have qualified. The other contingency where we might find ourselves without a President on Inauguration Day is if the electoral college fails to elect a President and none has been elected by January 20, the Speaker of the House and then the President pro tempore of the Senate are by this bill designated to act. But if there is a dispute in the House and the House cannot elect a Speaker, then naturally it will go to the President pro tempore of the Senate. But I do not think there would be a log jam, because of this. In the event the House is called upon to elect a President and the duty automatically devolves upon the Senate to elect a Vice President, if the Senate elects a Vice President before January 20 and the House has not elected a President, the Vice President will be inaugurated and will serve until the President is elected. If by January 20 the House has not elected a Speaker (it could not elect a President until it is organized) and the Senate has not elected a Vice President, then in that event, the President pro tempore of the Senate would, under this bill, act as President. Under our procedure and Constitution I can imagine no situation or condition that may arise where this bill would not assure us of having a President on Inauguration Day. Without this legislation there are two contingencies which are not taken care of. This should and must be remedied. They are remote but they may occur. This almost happened three times in our history. The twentieth amendment adds to the possibility. I think this is the best procedure we can work out. Certainly some system is needed to take care of this contingency, because we would be in a dilemma if we should reach January 20 of an inauguration year without a President having qualified. Then, if we tried to pass a law to name the one who should act as President, there would be no President to sign the act. I do

not know what kind of chaos or what kind of situation might result.

Mr. RANKIN. Congress would have a right to elect a President pro tempore to take the place of the President in case there was no one qualified to occupy that office.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Suppose Congress has not, by January 20, elected a President?

Mr. RANKIN. You can elect a President to take the place of the President or fill the place until the President is declared elected.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But Congress and the House may not have been able to organize by the 20th of January.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you would have no Speaker. I am afraid you are creating confusion in the House and conflict with the Senate in advance if you ever get this bill through, which I do not believe you will.

Take the Andrew Johnson contest, which took place before what the gentleman calls the Act of Presidential Succession, which was passed, I believe, in 1886, or somewhere in the early 1880's. Up to that time there was no provision for the members of the Cabinet to succeed to the Presidency, and under that act it was provided that in case of a vacancy in the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, the Secretary of State should succeed to the Presidency, then the Secretary of the Treasury, then the Secretary of War, and then the Attorney General and then the Postmaster General and then the Secretary of the Navy, then the Secretary of the Interior. That is as far as the rule of Presidential succession goes, because the other Cabinet positions were created after the passage of that act. As I pointed out some time ago, the key word to this succession is St. Wapni.

But let me go back to the Andrew Johnson contest. In that impeachment, if Andrew Johnson had been convicted by the Senate, he would have gone out of office. There was no one eligible to succeed him without an election by the Congress. But the Congress was prepared to elect a President in case there had been a two-thirds vote for sustaining the impeachment of Andrew Johnson.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. And by the way, right at that point, we still have the right, in case of a vacancy, the Congress has the right to elect the President. What I am afraid of here is that you are going to stimulate confusion in advance of this contingency and probably start a row in Congress and maybe a row between the two Houses if this bill is ever passed at all.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There was an act passed prior to 1886, I think the act was passed in 1795, which provided for the succession of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate pro tempore, I do not recall which came first.

Mr. RANKIN. I can tell the gentleman which was going to come first, it was the President pro tempore of the Senate. He was the man slated to take Andrew Johnson's place as President of the United States if Andrew Johnson had been convicted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The reason I think it would not be a good idea for the Secretary of State to hold over an act as President is that his administration might be going out of power and his administration would not have had the approval of the people. Also the Secretaries are not elected officials. So the order we have provided here, I think, would more closely represent their will on the matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well. Now, let me show you another double play the gentleman is likely to hit into. This bill goes to the Senate. I know what the Senate will do. They will turn it upside down and provide for the President pro tempore of the Senate to succeed to the Presidency in advance of the Speaker, or anyone else. Suppose the President pro tempore of the Senate is sick or disqualified, then you will have to go through the formality of ousting him and electing another one, or else you will still have a vacancy in the Presidency. It seems to me we are going a little too fast in the passage of legislation of this kind, and that it is likely to result in confusion in the House sooner or later, and in a conflict with the Senate. I do not feel like taking the responsibility of objecting to this bill if other Members want it passed, but I just wanted to warn you what you are getting into.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In view of the interesting debate we have listened to regarding this bill, it is sufficient evidence to convince anyone that a measure of this importance should not be considered on the Consent Calendar and, therefore, I object.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; I will withhold it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object anyway. I demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I still believe it is of sufficient importance to have the debate again, and I object.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

INCREASE IN RATES OF COMPENSATION TO DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, House Resolution 339 (Rept. No. 863), on the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability, and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3236) to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee to explain the purpose of this bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is correct in asking that there be an explanation of the measure. He is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that committee has unanimously reported this measure. I would like to go back and say that in the Seventy-seventh Congress legislation of this type was passed by the Congress. It was reported favorably by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the Senate, but shortness of time precluded consideration of the matter in that body.

We have at the present time the so-called Home Care Act for dependent children. That act, for the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia, was passed and became law June 22, 1926. A careful study of the provisions of that legislation, as enacted, has indicated to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia and to the Social Security Board of the Federal Government that it is inadequate to meet the needs of the Federal Government from the standpoint of certain standards which have been set up, under which disbursements of money are made.

Many of the States, in view of the Social Security Board's recommendations, have brought into line their own statutes, to comply with the recommendations. We have in the District of Columbia appropriate legislation which has gone into effect, for old-age assistance and aid to the blind, but in connection with aid to dependent children it is felt that the present act is cumbersome and does not easily fit itself into the pattern of what is being done through the Social Security Board. Under the legislation which is proposed we would set up one over-all method to deal with this subject within the Board of Public Welfare. At the present time there are two methods and

it has been found there have been jurisdictional disputes and failure to care for the children in the time limit, which should be required to give that assistance. It is also necessary to set up legislation in a way that we may be eligible for the matching of Federal funds which will aid us in the District of Columbia.

Also, it would permit the inclusion among those eligible to receive a grant of an incapacitated father who lives with his family; also, it would determine eligibility for aid on the basis of residence of the child instead of residence of the parents. It would provide assistance to children of 16 and 17 years of age.

It is believed that it is simply an expeditious way of handling a problem which has become cumbersome because of the inadequacies existing in the District of Columbia since it became law in 1926.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What appropriations would this bill require eventually? Would it increase the appropriation in the Public Health item in any way?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it would not. The funds coming in would simply clear through the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. So it will not require an additional appropriation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No.

Mr. STEFAN. It simply provides a reorganization and simplification of the program of relief generally; is that the idea?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; the gentleman is correct in saying that it improves the manner in which we are now operating the dependent-child-aid program in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand there are some approximately 900 to 1,000 people on direct relief in the District of Columbia. Does the gentleman understand that also?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not sure of the figure. I do know, however, there are a considerable number of people receiving direct relief.

Mr. STEFAN. They are numbered among the unemployables in the District of Columbia. Would they be benefitted by this act in any way?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We believe that legislation previously passed and which has been the law of the District of Columbia sets up the machinery by which we are very easily accommodating ourselves locally to the Federal act in connection with the distribution of funds to the aged and to the blind.

Mr. STEFAN. But the bill under consideration does not call for any additional appropriations?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; the bill deals strictly with the matter of aid to dependent children.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the distinguished chairman of the committee has adequately expressed the opinion of the committee on this measure. There is no controversy about it and I understand it was reported out unanimously.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. He, together with other minority Members, gave consideration to this subject as did the Members of the majority.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the care and assistance of dependent children is hereby declared to be a special matter of public concern and a necessity in promoting the public health and welfare. To provide such care and assistance at public expense, a system of aid to dependent children is hereby established for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The terms "aid" and "assistance" wherever used in this act shall be construed to mean money payments with respect to a dependent child or dependent children. As used in this act, the term "dependent child" shall be construed to mean a child under the age of 18 who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, and who is living with his father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, stepfather, stepmother, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, or aunt in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his or their own home.

SEC. 3. Aid to dependent children shall be granted with respect to a child who has resided in the District of Columbia for 1 year immediately preceding the application, or who was born in the District of Columbia within 1 year immediately preceding the application, one or both of whose parents has resided in the District of Columbia for 1 year immediately preceding the birth.

SEC. 4. The Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia shall administer assistance under this act. It shall prescribe the form and print and supply the blanks for applications, reports, and affidavits, and such other forms as it may deem advisable, and shall make rules and regulations necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of this act and shall make and render any and all reports required by the Social Security Board of the United States Government or otherwise authorized or required by law, and comply with such provisions as the Social Security Board of the United States Government may, from time to time, find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

SEC. 5. The amount of assistance for any child and the manner of providing it shall be determined by the Board of Public Welfare with due regard to the conditions existing in each case, and shall be sufficient when added to all other income and support available to the child, to provide such child with a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health.

SEC. 6. Application for assistance under this act shall be made to the Board of Public Welfare. The application shall be made in the manner and form prescribed by the Board of Public Welfare, and shall contain information as to the age and residence of the child and such other information as may be required by the Board of Public Welfare.

SEC. 7. Upon the receipt of an application for assistance, an investigation and record shall be made of the circumstances in order to determine the dependency of the child and to ascertain the facts supporting the application and such other information as may be required by the Board of Public Welfare.

SEC. 8. Upon completion of such investigation the Board of Public Welfare shall decide whether the child is eligible for assistance under the provisions of this act, and shall determine the amount of such assistance and the date on which assistance shall begin.

SEC. 9. All assistance grants made under this act shall be reconsidered by the Board of Public Welfare as frequently as it may deem necessary. After such further investigations as the Board of Public Welfare may deem necessary, the amount of assistance may be changed, or assistance may be entirely withdrawn if the Board of Public Welfare finds that the child's circumstances have altered sufficiently to warrant such action.

SEC. 10. If an application is not acted upon within a reasonable time of the filing of the application, or is denied in whole or in part, or if any award of assistance is modified or canceled under any provision of this act, the applicant or recipient may appeal for a hearing to the Board of Public Welfare in a manner and form prescribed by the Board.

SEC. 11. All assistance granted under this act shall be deemed to be granted and to be held subject to the provisions of any amending or repealing act that may hereafter be passed, and no person shall have any claim for compensation or otherwise, by reason of a child's assistance being affected in any way by any amending or repealing act.

SEC. 12. The Board of Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate in all necessary respects with the Social Security Board of the United States Government in the administration of this act, and to accept any sums allotted or appropriated by such Board, as are available under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 13. Congress shall appropriate annually and make available to the order of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia such sums as may be needed to pay the share of the District of Columbia for aid to dependent children provided under this act together with a sufficient sum to defray its share of administrative expenses to be incurred in connection therewith, and include such sums in the annual District of Columbia Appropriation Act. Should the sum so appropriated, however, be expended or exhausted during the year for the purposes for which it was appropriated, additional sums shall be appropriated by Congress, as the case demands, to carry out provisions of this act. The balance remaining in the appropriation "Home care for dependent children" as contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943 (Public Law 107, 78th Cong., 1st sess.), as of the effective date of this act is hereby made available to carry out the provisions of this act and shall continue available for such purpose through June 30, 1944.

SEC. 14. All necessary expenses incurred by the District of Columbia in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be paid in the same manner as other expenses of the District of Columbia are paid.

SEC. 15. Any adult person who attempts to obtain, or obtains, or aids or assists any child or other person to obtain, by false representation, fraud, or deceit, any allowance under this act, or who receives for the benefit of any child any allowance knowing it to have been fraudulently obtained, shall upon conviction in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, criminal division, be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 16. This act shall be cited as the "Aid to Dependent Children Act."

SEC. 17. The act entitled "An act to provide home care for dependent children in the

District of Columbia," approved June 22, 1926, and all other provisions of law in conflict with this act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 18. If any provisions of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCE ON DEATH OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN TO WIDOW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the conference report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct" (41 Stat. 367), approved December 17, 1919, as amended and supplemented (42 Stat. 1385; 45 Stat. 249; 55 Stat. 796; 10 U. S. C. 903, 903a), be, and the same is hereby further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "*And, Provided further*, That in the event of the death of any benficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein, such gratuity shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated: *And, Provided further*, That if there be no widow, child, or previously designated dependent relative, the Secretary of War shall cause the amount herein provided to be paid to any grandchild, parent, brother or sister, or grandparent shown to have been dependent upon such officer or enlisted man prior to his death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of War shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *And, Provided further*, That the last foregoing proviso shall be effective as of August 27, 1940."

"SEC. 2. Nothing herein shall be construed to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments made prior to the date of the approval of this act, but no gratuity payment shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

R. R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

There are only two changes in the conference report from the Senate amendment. One of these is merely clarifying and consists of striking out the words "of section 903" which is a reference to the U. S. Code and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thereof." Reference to the statutory citations had already been sufficiently made.

The other change is material and provides for the act to have retroactive effect to August 27, 1940. The effect of the Senate amendment is to include certain persons as beneficiaries entitled to the death gratuity benefit who were not included under the original act. The committee of conference was of the opinion that such inclusion was proper but that if made it should have retroactive effect to the date from which the original act was effective, to wit, August 27, 1940, that being the date upon which dependents of persons in the military service other than the regular Army first became entitled to the death gratuity.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I think for the benefit of the members of the committee the gentleman from Alabama should give a brief explanation of the conference report. This is a very simple bill extending the right of beneficiaries. There is no Member of the House better qualified on this and allied subjects than the gentleman from Alabama. I wish he would make an explanation of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] I may say that when the Senate took up this subject matter, the bill had already passed the House. The original bill was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] who is on the floor. In the Senate the bill was redrawn so as to include additional beneficiaries.

The conference committee felt it was proper to include in the additional beneficiaries a retroactive provision to take care of the case of beneficiaries of men who had died prior to the enactment of this act and subsequent to August 27, 1940, that being the effective date of the act originally extending these benefits to dependents of those persons in the military service other than in the Regular Army. That was about the only change that was made by the conference committee.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein a statement released to the press as of yesterday by the National Stripper Oil Well Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been watching the situation and trying to do everything in my power to secure some aid in the way of an increased price in crude oil for the benefit of the independent oil operators and the stripper oil-well owners, and unless the Congress takes a hand either by legislation or resolution to see that an increase in the price of crude oil is granted, it is going to be a severe blow and shock to both the stripper well owners and the independent operators. It is for that reason that I have signed the discharge petition of the Disney bill, because I personally know that unless some aid is given to the independent operators, they are soon to go out of business.

The independent oil operator has rendered a great service to the oil industry and to this Nation. They have been the trail blazers, the pathfinders, and the frontiersmen in the discovery of oil. Now, with the high cost of living, the high cost of labor and material, and placing the oil business under the Labor Act, it is going to be impossible for them to continue in business unless an increase in price is granted.

They are not the ones who have received the Government contracts for the

manufacture of gas and oils used in our war effort. The major oil companies have a monopoly on these contracts, and the only market for the independent oil companies is the open market, and when the cost of production amounts to more than the market price of the commodity, it is easily seen that this part of the industry will soon fade out of the picture.

A very distinguished citizen of my district, Mr. J. D. Sandefer, Jr., who is president of the Stripper Well Association, has released to the press yesterday morning a statement which shows the necessity for aid to this part of the oil industry, and I am happy to include that statement in my remarks:

It is encouraging to me and to the many other operators of the small oil wells of the Nation that there is a rapidly growing interest on the part of Congressmen in the maintenance of the small, or stripper wells. These wells, 300,000 in number, today produce about 15 percent of the national daily supply of crude oil.

Now, that the shortage of oil is an acknowledged fact, there is greater reason than ever before for making the most of the stripper-well reserves. That can be done only by increasing the price of crude oil.

The administration still has the responsibility of granting such increase. It has refused to grant the increase. Our present appeal is to Congress. In my discussions during this visit to Washington, I find a sympathetic attitude on the part of Congressmen from both the oil-producing and the non-oil-producing States. All have an interest in providing a greater supply for the military program and for essential civilian and industrial uses.

In most of the public utterances on the question of oil supply, great emphasis has heretofore been placed on the need for finding new oil fields. That, of course, is of great importance. It should be remembered, though, that we have a great reserve, already marked out and available, in the form of the stripper wells—approximately three-fourths of all the oil wells in the United States.

There are two alternatives. Under a policy of continuing the present prices, the production of oil from the stripper wells will decline. Already many thousands of them have been abandoned for all time and more are being abandoned every day. The other alternative is to increase the price and make greater use of these small wells. With some margin above day-to-day expenses the operator can apply methods that will increase production.

The choice is that simple. We can add to this 15 percent of national production from stripper wells, or, with no change in price, we can stand by and watch the supply continue to decline and lose valuable reserves forever.

Those responsible for price policy have thought only of the cream—the production from new wells. They ignore the high-cost milk—the stripper-well supply. It is of considerable importance also that the stripper-well portion of the industry represents upward of a fourth of our total proved reserves and affords employment to more than 50,000 persons, with an annual pay roll of $100,000,000.

As a new member of the Petroleum Industry War Council, I attended my first meeting of that group in Chicago November 8 and 9. It is of encouragement to the stripper operators that the council, composed of majors and independents, urged congressional action on oil prices.

The attempt to obtain a correction of price inequity and injustice has been going on for many months. Everyone, seemingly, is convinced of the necessity except the few to whom Congress has delegated authority to take affirmative action. Since that authority came from Congress, it is to Congress that our appeal is now being made. The thousands of stripper-well operators feel a strong sympathy for the millions of consumers of petroleum products. They both suffer from the same cause. One needs the product, the other has the products and is asking for the chance to supply them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Leonard E. Read, given on October 25, at Pittsburgh, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, there was submitted to the Public Printer an address entitled "Reasons for Rationing" and he estimates it will require one and one-third pages at an additional cost of $60. I ask unanimous consent to include this as part of an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notwithstanding the additional expense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, first, that I may revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and second, that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD in an extension of my own remarks three editorials from the Santa Ana Register, the Pacific Rural Post, and the Denver Post. I made this same request last Monday but due to confusion they were not included at that time, and I preferred to have them wait until today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to review somewhat briefly the arguments against the present subsidy program as it is proposed to impose that program upon the producers and the consumers of the United States and as it will be discussed in this chamber the last few days of this week when the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is before us for action.

It has been my contention in the several preceding talks that the subsidy program as now proposed is not wanted by thoughtful producers nor thoughtful processors nor thoughtful consumers. It has been my contention that historically it has been a failure, and that its application today is essentially political.

I gather, if I may say so jokingly, that those who support the present idea of a subsidy are the farmers from Chicago, the farmers from New York City, and the farmers from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. No farmer who lives upon the farm and no consumers who are concerned with the results of such a subsidy program have appeared directly or indirectly in this Hall in support of the present plan of imposing a consumer subsidy upon them, for which the consumer is then to be taxed.

Among the things said to those of us who are trying to set down the practical results of such a program is, "Oh, you simply do not like control." Whether we like control or not has nothing to do with the argument. There has been no statement on this floor, from any who have spoken as I speak, that we should remove the control program. What we want to do is to inject certain features into that program which would put it upon a basis of production, which would inject into it good management, which would return the confidence of the people, and which would, and the only thing which will, prevent inflation.

I regret to see that the gentleman from Texas is not here. One of the most peculiar aspects of the situation to me is the fact that the gentlaman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is now supporting this subsidy program. I am one of the men who in 1936 went out and battled under the gentleman's banner on behalf of the small merchants. I still carry the scars of that battle; yet today we find the gentleman from Texas lined up with a program which would drive the small merchant, the small retailer, the small farmer, and the small producer out of business.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am somewhat surprised to hear the remarks the gentleman has made in regard to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], because, as I understand it, the gentleman from Texas is supposed to be chairman of a committee to aid small businessmen, retail and wholesale, and manufacturers, so that they can stay in business.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct. On the floor of this House on October 15 the gentleman from Texas made an appeal on behalf of small business. I think that is the time he pointed out that there were 10,000 annual failures among small business in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that when the Retail Merchants' Association met not long ago in the city of New York it adopted a strong resolution against consumers' food subsidies?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for that valuable contribution. We have right here in Washington today the most significant evidence of what I am saying. This is the Nagel case, which is now being tried before the emergency

court set up to try protests against O. P. A. regulations. The Nagel case will be significant when history looks back upon this very confusing period.

That case involves the appeal of a small packer, not Swift & Co., which has a representative in the O. P. A., not the Kroger Co., which has a representative in the O. P. A., not of a chain store, nor of big business. This is an appeal of one small packer against regulations which he contends are going to put him out of business. I think it is a very significant thing because the men who wrote these regulations in O. P. A. are not representatives of the small merchants, nor of the farmer, nor of the consumer. We find the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in strange company.

I do not want inflation. The argument is on the prevention of inflation. Those of us who come from rural areas; those of us who had experience with conditions at the time of the last war; those of us who are genuinely in sympathy with producers, and small merchants, and consumers, say that the program will not prevent inflation. One thing that will prevent inflation is production, production, production, and more production. The second thing is good management. The third thing is the restoration of confidence. The fourth thing is a recognition and acceptance of the established marketing methods of the United States.

Well, says the O. P. A., prices to consumers will rise; we must hold the line. Let us see about that. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] made a very eloquent speech upon this floor in which he pointed out that without subsidies, and following the established marketing procedures of generations in the meat industry, the price of meat need not rise to the consumer, while at the same time the producer would receive enough to cover the cost of production.

I have in my hand a cut from a newspaper. It is of a butcher showing hams which he is required to sell at a price less than the cost at which he can buy them, so he has no hams for sale. I do not see how that helps the consumer.

I myself showed sometime ago—and will extend my remarks in the RECORD to include item by item the designated O. P. A. regulation by number, and by designation—that the price of Idaho potatoes under the regulatory methods of the O. P. A. was 7.3 cents a pound to the consumer, and had the ordinary processes of marketing been followed the price to the consumer would have been 5.5 cents a pound. I am unable to see how that helped the consumer.

The step-by-step regulations of the O. P. A. were—

The ceiling price to the farmer for April 1943, U. S. No. 1 Idaho Russet Burbank potatoes, in 100-pound sacks, f. o. b. Idaho, was $2.30 (O. P. A.-M. P. R., April 6, 1943, 1351.1017, amendment 9).

This includes an allowance of 25 cents for grading labor, and sacking. The empty sack costs the farmer 15 cents.

To this 10 cents may be added for quality labeling, "U. S. No. 1 Extra" (1351.1017-a No. 1) making $2.40.

Ten cents may be added for size; 2-inch minimum potatoes (1351.1017-b No. 2), $2.50.

An allowance for risk in transit of 10 cents makes it $2.60 (M. P. R. 271-1351.1002-e December 21, 1942).

Freight, Idaho to New York, is $1.10 plus 3 percent tax, making it $3.73.

The cost to the service wholesaler, that is, the cost on delivery in New York, is therefore $3.73, and this wholesaler may add 21 percent including delivery charges. If he sells cash and carry he may add 9½ percent. The usual addition is 21 percent, making the price $4.51.

The second wholesaler—or jobber—who sells to the retail trade, may also add 21 percent, making the price $5.46. (November 7, 1942, M. P. R. 271, 1351.1003-3, class 3-5).

The retailer may mark up the potatoes, for sale to the consumer, on a varying scale, worked out on a basis of the gross business he does. The average is 33 percent. This makes the price of the 100-pound sack of potatoes to the consumer $7.28. Since they're sold in smaller quantities, let's say simply that the farmer got 2.2 cents a pound, and the consumer paid 7.3 cents a pound.

Now, let's see how it could be done. I have before me a letter from a well-known jobber in New York City. He sets up a comparable schedule, taking the present price to the farmer of $2.30 as a base and figuring the additions as they were figured prior to O. P. A. He says the wholesalers and jobbers would be very willing to sell on this basis.

Price to farmer, $2.30; add freight plus 3 percent, $3.43; add 10 cents for risk, as above, $3.56; wholesaler adds 15 cents, $3.68; jobber adds 15 cents, $3.83; allow the retailer an average mark-up of 33 percent, $5.10.

He has not allowed the quantity and size additions, which we should do in making a fair comparison between the price schedules. For these add 20 cents. Also the jobber's 15 cents does not include the cartage. Perhaps an average of 20 cents would cover that. I am guessing on this average cost, but I make a fair comparable total of $5.50.

The farmer would get his 2.3 cents per pound, as before, but the consumer would pay 5½ cents instead of 7.3 cents.

The O. P. A., established to keep down prices, has in the case shown here raised the price approximately 2 cents a pound to the housewife.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to throw this in at this point. I am informed by members of the trade here in the city that the most reputable produce dealers in this town, some of whom sell goods directly to the White House, are today invoicing the goods at ceiling prices and in addition collecting from the purchaser, the retail groceryman or the consumer, for instance like the White House, an extra amount of money to take care of the additional costs which these people are paying to get the goods to their produce establishments. I think everybody from the White House down, in this city, who is in close contact with the trade knows that the type of operation is being carried on in a big way, with everybody thoroughly understanding it and nobody in the trade kicking about it, and with the consumer taking the rap.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman because that is my idea exactly. The gentleman should have continued and called attention to the situation in sugar in which, thanks to the general food program, we shall have even less sugar production in the United States this year than we had last year which was less than half of the year before.

Place yourself, Mr. Speaker, in the position of a housewife who has been told by the O. P. A. that she should can all the fruit and all the vegetables and everything she can in order to offset the presumed shortage of foodstuffs this winter. She then is told she can have no sugar with which to can them. What do you expect her to think? She knows her fruit and her preserves will spoil. She thinks, and you cannot blame her, that if this is the order of the Food Administration, and she knows there is plenty of sugar, then somebody must want her to buy manufactured jams and fruits, that is, producers' products. She knows something is wrong somewhere. She will put the blame on the first available scapegoat. She has heard, just as you and I have heard, that the O. P. A. is full of young men who know nothing about farms, nor about production. They came to the O. P. A. from canners, packers, and processors, from chain stores, and from classrooms. They are not farmers. They do not know anything of the practical methods of marketing established for more thn 50 years by the trial-and-error method. That method may not appeal to a college professor, but it certainly has someplace in the program of food administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I point out that the people back home are readily realizing that all this pious talk from the O. P. A. about holding down prices is purely a fraud and a deception. They use that as a guide to disrupt the industry.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will prove to the gentleman why that is so, if he will let me interrupt him at that point, because here is citrus, with which I am personally familiar. The citrus industry for a period of several months has been working on a plan with the War Food Adminstration, which agency Congress authorized to make such decisions. The plan involves two things, that the producer shall receive 30 cents a box more than he is presently getting and that the consumer shall pay $2 a box less than the supposed prices, or perhaps $4 or $5 less than the actual prices on the market. The O. P. A. would not accept that plan but insists on imposing subsidies upon the citrus industry, which the citrus industry does not want and did not ask for, and which completely upsets the established methods of exactly 50 years of marketing citrus fruits.

The curious thing is this. In the explanation of the O. P. A. as to why this plan is to be imposed upon the industry, I find this very curious paragraph. I shall not quote it, but the gist of it is that this will save the consumer $40,000,000 as compared to the price the consumer paid last year. I inquired as to how that could be. I was told that the reason is that $40,000,000 more was charged last year between the producer

and the consumer than apparently should have been charged.

I lay that before you, Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly what we have said, that under this plan of subsidies and this plan of food administration, we are giving the handler more than he received in normal times and much more than he expects in wartime.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. He is an able and distinguished member of the House Committee on Agriculture, to which I likewise belong. The gentleman has just discussed part of the matter to which I desire to call his attention. He has explained the obduracy of the O. P. A. toward accepting not only a plan which will accomplish the original objective for which the O. P. A. was created, to wit, holding the cost of living down to the consumer, but a plan which was submitted and discussed not only with the O. P. A. by the Office of Food Administration but with the producers and the distributors, in short, the entire citrus industry. The gentleman recalls that that statement was clearly made in the hearings.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very well.

Mr. KLEBERG. The plan to which the gentleman is referring, which the O. P. A. has sent over and requested a directive on, is one which has not been discussed in any of its minutia or detail with any of the branches of production or distribution or the general constitution of the citrus industry.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLEBERG. The point I am trying to make is that after the disruption of what has been evolved through more than 50 years, yes, through 150 years, in the minds of producers and distributors in this country under the general system of doing business, we are now asked in the midst of the greatest war in history to set that aside and try a plan, a résumé of which the gentleman and I finally got after our best efforts and on which we hoped to give the industry at least some advice. I have a telegram I can give the gentleman which he should place in his statement and have made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, and I know that same situation applies to meat. I skip over various articles, celery, melons, vegetables, and the price of pork chops, which was mentioned in my hearing the other day, the price of feed to the farmer, in which the regulations help neither producer nor consumer, as was brought out by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] recently.

I come now to the price of apples and, thanks to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES], I am able to give you a visual demonstration of the workings of the O. P. A. I hold in my hand two apples from the State of Washington, one very large, the other very small. Both are exactly the same kind of apple, the same species. They are "Delicious," both in name and in taste. Under the regulations of the O. P. A., both of these apples must sell on the market at the same price by the retailer. Will anyone tell me just how that helps the consumer?

I use that visual demonstration, not particularly to advertise the apples of the State of Washington, though I am very glad to do that, but I do it because exactly the same thing is being applied to the citrus industry, but our oranges are not yet ready for the market, so that I am not able to show you examples of those.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I yield gladly.

Mr. HILL. I notice the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] has left the room, but I call the attention of the House to the fact that that same plan is maintained in the price of beef. Men who have specialized in the production of the finest beef in America find themselves squarely up against the O. P. A. regulations, so that very ordinary and common beef will sell for just as high a price as the best.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And does the gentleman from Colorado think that that helps the consumer?

Mr. HILL. It does not help anyone, and puts your market in a chaotic condition until all our feeders that are feeding good beef—we hope it will be good—do not know what they are going to get, or how.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's statement about Washington apples. I might emphasize this, that in the selling of those two apples for the same price, we in turn have been told, as Members of Congress, that it is the outstanding function of the O. P. A., even sanctimoniously, to protect the consumer.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very limited time left, and I am going to try and start upon a discussion which is the result of a question asked me the other day by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked me if it were not so that the subsidy program as we apply it here had been applied in England and in Canada, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] subsequently made the statement that it had so been applied in Germany. I am very glad that they were the ones who brought the question up, and not myself. Certain conditions are involved which are very important. First of all, England is an importing and not a producing country. Second Germany went through very much the same sort of thing that we have been going through until the actual war broke out; then Germany applied a sort of freeze to the entire price structure, wages, handling costs, processing costs, packing costs, retailing costs, down to the consumer. I do not know what the situation is today in Germany. It is probably badly out of balance at the moment, thanks to the operations of the Allied air forces, but that at least was the intention, and changes in the consumer's price were made only after careful analysis of all of the elements involved. If a raise in wages was allowed to an industry, that increase in wages could, if necessary, appear in the consumer's price, but only to the actual extent it reflected itself in the consumer price. Much of it was absorbed in the handling process, and we would have been much better off to adopt that plan, but I have shown you that even today we could still increase the producer's price, without necessarily raising the consumer's price.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have heard so many fine speeches on this subject. What are we going to do about it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Two things are to be done. The question of the gentleman from Massachusetts is good. I said the last time this is not a subject which required a complicated answer because it is a complicated question. It can be cured by a simple answer. First of all, we must quickly and obviously remove the constant interference, the constant confusion and conflict, and that would be done by the passage of the bill (H. R. 2837) introduced and now being held in the Rules Committee, the bill of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Agricultural Committee, which would establish responsibility for a unified program under one head as we had in the last war and as we should have started off with immediately in this war.

Mr. GIFFORD. Who would appoint that man?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to hold that position because he is an official of the Government, a proper official of the Cabinet. I do not think there is any particular argument on that point. He can designate the man or he may take that position himself. I would rather not take up the time to discuss that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would that be our man or the Executive's man?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are living under a system of government which neither I nor the gentleman from Massachusetts can change, and which we do not want to change, in which the legislative department passes the laws and the administrative department executes these laws.

Mr. GIFFORD. Where are we then?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to remind the gentleman that according to one report which I saw, England sold goods which she received from America under lend-lease and made a profit of $20,000,000 and that she is using that $20,000,000 of profit to pay subsidies. There is a vast difference whether a country pays

subsidies from a profit on free goods or by taxpayers' money.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I do not know whether the statement is accurate or not. I do know the report that I hold in my hand says that lend-lease helped Great Britain administer her subsidy program and avoid inflation. I have the record of the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, which shows the friction between the agencies in this country, which is obvious to everyone in the United States, did not exist in England or Canada. The administration was a centralized administration in Great Britain and Canada and not in the United States; that there was a lack of inflationary control in this country which was very important.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has said his solution is to tax the people more than they are being taxed. Now, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] there is another bill introduced by his colleague [Mr. HERTER] which, if this subsidy were to be imposed, should give a benefit to low-income groups through a stamp plan. As it is now the subsidy program helps the man who is making $100-a-week income for the first time in his life, in order to keep from hurting the man who is making $10 a week. It is obviously an unfair program in which the man who has an adequate income is paying somebody to lift the money from the right pocket and put it in the left pocket. There is no reason in the world to pay anybody, or any administrative agency of the Government, for doing that service. That is what the subsidy program is in brief.

I shall leave for another time the description of the exact situation in England, Canada, and Germany, and I will say in conclusion, so that we may at least leave the discussion on a note of humor, that the Office of Price Administration is about to inaugurate an investigation. I have the clipping here, "to conduct a poll of the Nation to get the public's reaction to its rationing regulations."

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. After reading these many speeches of last week, especially the speeches of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and these others, I am worrying about what we are supposed to do about it and what we can do about it. These speeches, to my mind are merely saying that the chauffeur is driving so recklessly. I see no cure for this except to arrest the chauffeur. What is the use of taking the automobile?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is a good point. Of course, the difference is this, as the gentleman knows: Suppose there are five people in the car. Two of them wish to go in one direction, down a known road, and instruct the chauffeur to that effect, and the other three wish to go in another direction, and try out a road which ends in a bog, and give instructions to the chauffeur to turn. It is left to the two somehow to persuade one of the other three to go the same direction they want to go.

The job of this House is to persuade, shall I say, enough Members to go our direction and prevent inflation and really help the consumer.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman was interrupted before he gave the second of the procedures he felt was necessary to effect a cure. I am interested to hear it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There are four or five. The first is to increase production. It was the method in England; it was the method in Canada; it was the method in Germany; it was the method in the United States during the last war. Second, to return confidence; to assure the farmer that he will get the cost of production; to return confidence to the farmer who, in the last war increased production 55 percent in 1 year. This year he has barely increased it over 2 years ago and over last year. I shall give the suggested remedies another day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, tonight a distinguished United States Senator speaks on the Congressional Record on the Air program, which is sponsored in this city by Leo Paulin and which is broadcast by Station WHN in New York. This happens to be the fiftieth consecutive broadcast sponsored in that manner. It has provided Members of both Houses on both sides of the aisle with a splendid opportunity to convey their ideas to the listening public.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some additional remarks along this line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to what has been going on throughout this great country of ours in regard to the operation of the present rules and regulations of the Office of Price Administration. Now that the political air has been calmed and quieted down by talks on both sides, I hope that we can forget the political significations of some of the regulations of the O. P. A. and talk directly to you as to what is going on in the country.

I am proud of the fact that I am one of the boys you cannot take the country out of. It is an impossibility.

The first thing to which I wish to call the attention of the Members is the situation that exists in the capital city of Colorado, Denver. That has a bearing on the O. P. A. price regulations not only in Colorado but throughout the entire United States, and might result in an entire upset of the whole O. P. A. price program. The question is, Has a city the right to levy a tax on the entire citizenry of the incorporated town or city and pay that money to the producers of milk as a direct subsidy to get production? I shall read you what United States District Judge Symes said about this matter, according to an Associated Press report:

DENVER, November 10.—United States District Judge J. Foster Symes today dismissed an injunction suit brought by the Office of Price Administration to prevent collection of a city excise tax of 2 cents a quart above the ceiling price of milk.

The city ordinance is not in direct conflict with O. P. A. regulations, Judge Symes ruled, although he said it was quite apparent the tax would have the effect of a price increase.

The O. P. A. suit against city officials and the milk producers was filed after the city council voted to tax retail milk 2 cents a quart and pass the revenue along to the producers.

The dairymen claimed that they were losing money selling under the ceiling price and that it would be necessary to divert fluid milk usually supplied the Denver vicinity to manufacturers of milk products.

Judge Symes based his ruling upon a clause in the Federal regulations stating that a local tax levied separately and above the ceiling prices is not prohibited.

He compared the city excise tax on milk as similar to the State sales tax on a suit of clothes.

"The Federal Government has the power to say that no tax may be added or imposed above the ceiling price," Symes declared, "but the Administrator has not seen fit to do so."

Clem W. Collins, regional administrator, announced tonight that "either the regional office will appeal to the United States circuit court, or we will take criminal action charging conspiracy."

"The city has a right if they wish to collect a tax and pay it to producers to avert a serious situation threatening Denver," Judge Symes asserted.

Attorney for the O. P. A. argued that the excise tax violated the maximum price ceiling and was a "device to get around regulations."

"If this tax were in direct conflict with Federal regulations," Judge Symes ruled, "the Federal rule would control. This is hardly a price-fixing action, but merely an excise tax imposed on the theory of benefiting the general public."

City Attorney Malcolm Lindsey and Attorney Nelson told the court earlier that the city ordinance was valid under the police power of a home-rule city.

"The State and city have never surrendered their sovereignty to protect the lives of those in the community," Nelson declared.

The O. P. A. admitted that production costs to the dairymen had not been determined because of the "lack of records" kept by the producers.

Truitt stated, however, that a subsidy and a slight increase granted the producers by the O. P. A. guaranteed them a larger income than that they would obtain by selling to the manufacturers.

I thought it would be a good idea for the Members of the House to have the attitude that Judge Symes took toward this particular case.

I call your attention to other matters that are going on in this milk situation facing our people. I notice—and I have no reason to doubt these figures—that the city of San Francisco is 20,000 gallons of milk short daily; the city of San Diego is 18,000 gallons of milk short daily; and the city of Los Angeles is 12,000 gallons of milk short daily. Get those figures in your minds. What do they mean? They simply mean that the men who are producing the fluid milk in that territory are gradually being forced out of business.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that those shortages in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego are in addition to other shortages created and unfilled; that is, the request of the Army for milk for transports.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I wish to compliment the gentleman on bringing to the attention of the House the matter of milk. We are having a great deal of difficulty in getting milk in New Hampshire and other sections of New England. May I ask the gentleman this question?

Does not the gentleman think that if the O. P. A. would readjust its prices, or if we could force it to readjust its price structure as far as milk is concerned, that it would stimulate production and that we would have a great deal more milk?

Mr. HILL. Oh, that is correct. These regulations are the greatest obstacle. The greatest obstacle against production of any kind, whether in milk, shoes, clothing sugar, or any type of production in the price regulations of O. P. A. The first absolute, sensible rule is production. You must have production. I will show you another way that you can get production in milk, because if you can prove this thing is wrong in milk regulating, maybe we can bring some judgment and sane reasoning into the minds of the boys in the O. P. A. who are getting their first-grade education in how to control marketing in a complicated economic system such as ours.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman has referred to the situation that exists in Denver. A similar situation exists in one of the cities in my own State. One city in Oregon found itself without milk completely, as most of the dairies had gone out of business. The city went into the business and bought the dairies itself, and the city is running those dairies now. Is it the gentleman's idea that under the O. P. A. regulations they are running them contrary to law?

Mr. HILL. Oh, according to the Denver decision, they have a right to protect the health and the lives of the citizens of that city.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I have a great deal of correspondence with dairies in my own district in Missouri. Some of them have gone out of business entirely there because, as they say, they are following the example of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, who does not find the operation of a dairy very profitable.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. The farmer has many troubles. He says, for instance, he has to know the botanical name of the crop that he raises, and then he has to know the entomological name of the insects that eat it, and he has to know the chemical name of the poison which will kill the insects, but he says that the worse sort of insects that he has to cope with are the humbugs here in Washington, and that he cannot get rid of them.

Mr. HILL. And I know of no spray material that would kill them off. If I did, I would give the gentleman the remedy. There is another suggestion that has to do with the trouble in the milk-distribution problem, and with that I shall close the milk angle of my remarks. I refer now to the State of Georgia. Some interesting information came to me in respect to that, and I hope that my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is listening, because I discovered by reading the item I have in mind that they are shipping 3.5 plus milk into Atlanta, Ga., from Wisconsin, and getting as high as 47 to 50 cents a gallon.

Also I notice that they are shipping about 3.5 or 3.7 milk from the State of Maryland to Atlanta, and getting close to 50 cents a gallon, and the men who are producing fluid milk for Atlanta, and who live in the Atlanta milkshed, are permitted only 36 cents per gallon for 4.5 milk. You can see what the trouble is, no sound business regulations or men with the proper background of experience to properly direct such a program. The regulations are unworkable, unreasonable, and unnecessary.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Referring again to the Denver decision, I notice that the O. P. A. has appealed that case. Analyzing the situation, it seems to me that the Denver authorities have resorted to a subsidy. Inasmuch as the Administration is now favoring subsidies, I wonder why they are not consistent, and why they fight this subsidy. Could it be because of political reasons in that the Administration does not get credit for the payment thereof and therefore cannot expect it to be a possible vote getter?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman answers his own question. I shall not bring any political argument into my statement because this goes deeper than politics. It is neither Democratic nor Republican. This thing is fundamental, and has a serious effect upon our economic system. I am convinced that if this Congress allows this thing to continue—and that is our responsibility—and this sort of price regulation is to be forced on the producers of the country, we are not only going to wipe out the farming class, but will change our whole economic system, and, I am afraid, the very foundation of our democracy.

The meat-pricing program is another perfect example of price-control bungling.

I refer now to an article which I read this morning in the Washington Post, to the effect that 500 representatives of agriculture, mostly livestock producers, are in the Capital today. I ask you, Why these men are here, in the face of the manpower shortage on the farms? Why are these men forced to come down here to protect their industry? They are afraid of new regulations or new plans that will be forced upon them.

And the press this morning gave some interesting interviews with these men. It says here:

Representatives of all the livestock groups said that should the O. P. A. regulations continue, next year will see the beginning of reduction of herds to the point that it will take many years to build them up again to normalcy.

W. D. Farr, president of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association, said there is now a 15-percent shortage of lambs on feeding ranges. He blamed high feed costs and fixed O. P. A. ceilings for what he called a "chaotic situation" in the industry.

The next article I want to call to your attention is a news release this morning which has been mentioned before, that is, concerning the smallest production of sugar beets since 1928:

SMALLEST BEET PRODUCTION FOR UNITED STATES SINCE 1928

WASHINGTON, November 11.—Decreased sugar-beet acreages indicate a 1943 production of 7,239,000 tons, smallest since 1928, the United States Department of Agriculture reports.

Last year's crop totaled 11,681,000 tons.

The Department said acreage reductions were primarily responsible for the production slump, since the per-acre yield for 1943 is expected to be 12.1 tons, against 12.3 tons last year.

By States, the indicated production and per-acre yield for 1943 includes:

Montana, 649,000 tons and 11-ton yield; Wyoming, 312,000, and 12.5; Colorado, 1,701,000, and 12.6.

With all these scarcities of necessary food products facing the people of this country, can this Congress refuse to bring out a bill that has been lying peacefully in the Rules Committee since last summer? I know we had an argument awhile ago about the program on the floor of this House. There is no excuse in the world for the failure to act on the Fulmer bill which would remedy the

chaotic condition now existing in the various departments attempting to regulate and control our prices. We have too many regulations emanating from various departments, bureaus, and agencies. And few of these agencies have the proper coordination or cooperation with each other in issuing edicts, regulations, and programs affecting an entire industry.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I do.

Mr. BREHM. May I point out one ruling of the O. P. A.: The sugar-beet growers in Ohio came to me and wanted to know if there was not something we could do to permit them to raise more sugar beets. They were denied the right to plant or raise sugar beets. They were paid a subsidy not to raise sugar beets and yet they come along and ration sugar to us. If that makes sense, then I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. HILL. I wanted to talk just a minute about price control. I think one thing we should understand first before we talk about subsidies. We should define what we are talking about. What do you mean, "price control"? Do you mean price control at the producer's end? Do you mean price control between the producer and the distributor; that is, price control for the distributor? Or do you mean price control to the consumer? Let us get that absolutely straight. I want to know what you are talking about. Secondly, when you are talking of subsidies, what are you talking about? Are you talking about subsidies to the consumer who has more money in his pockets than he ever had in the history of the United States, or are you talking about subsidies for the farmers who are now working under more strenuous conditions than they ever worked heretofore, with less help and less machinery? If you are talking about that, that is another thing altogether. I think in the many speeches I have heard on the floor of this House on subsidies, no one explained whether he was talking about producer subsidy which we must have to get production of lead, copper, and zinc, and many other products; or whether he was talking about roll-back of prices to the laboring classes and other classes who are receiving the highest salaries they have ever had in the history of this great Nation of ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, upon one war policy I believe we can all agree—that it is the duty of the Congress, as far as it lies within its power, to prevent, or, failing in that, to reduce to a minimum, monetary losses by American citizens, the consequence of enemy action.

In the hope that those ends may be promoted, I am today introducing a bill which will, if enacted into law, make responsive in the liquidation of such losses all enemy property in our possession, and in addition thereto, provide a means for the swift adjudication in American courts of all of such claims according to Anglo-Saxon justice.

At the close of the First World War the Congress blundered on this issue, and as a result Americans who then suffered losses in lives and property as a consequence of enemy action have not yet been made whole, because, in the passage of the Settlement of the War Claims Act of 1928 we let slip through our fingers German money and property in amounts and of value more than ample to have satisfied all claims in full. We simply fell for false promises and, in blind faith, returned 80 percent of the theretofore seized German property to its original owners. A half billion dollars of worthless German bonds lie in our Treasury as evidence of the fraud which was then perpetrated on us.

We were guided by our hearts, not our heads, in yielding to the fallacious argument that to do otherwise would violate the historic policy of the United States, which, so they said, requires us to hold immune from confiscation enemy private property seized in time of war. It is not at all surprising that then Members of this House, including the present distinguished Secretary of State and a former Vice President of the United States, assailed this and other misleading arguments, and the latter branded the proposed surrender of seized alien properties to their former owners as a "stupendous steal, the greatest in the history of this country."

The whole subject has been recently reviewed in an article in the Bankers Magazine entitled "American Property Claims Against Germany and the Coming Peace Treaty." It was written by Harold G. Aron, an eminent lawyer of New York City, and his associate, Frederick W. Eisner. For its precise statement of the facts which poses the problem and the well-thought-through solution which it suggests, there has been much generous and well-deserved praise in high position, on the bench, and at the bar, including the Federal judiciary. Impressed by this splendid analysis of an intricate legislative problem, I have embodied many of its recommendations in the bill to which I have just referred, confident that in them is to be found the solution which will be deemed the just one as between aggressor and aggrieved.

Its purpose is to prevent a reoccurrence of the stupidities and scandals which grew out of the mishandling of seized enemy property during and after the First World War. Its objective is to protect American citizens and gain for them all attainable compensation for the private losses they have suffered by acts of our enemies.

It will accomplish other things of great importance; speed and justice in adpudicating such claims, by avoiding the trap of another mixed claims commission such as we set up by agreement with Germany in 1922, and it will not let justice be determined or delayed by shadowy concepts of international law, or the civil or commercial code of Germany or the municipal laws of enemy countries.

It will permit injured citizens to prove their own losses in their own way before American courts and not through Government agents before a so-called international tribunal.

But, it will do more than all this, if promptly enacted. It will quickly and completely Americanize the ownership of patents, plants, secret formulas, internationally known trade names and other properties of great value in time to permit us to thoroughly prepare ourselves for the great struggle to break up European cartels, crafty conspiracies against free enterprise that they are, when we enter the commercial struggle for our share of world trade when this war ends.

It will do more; it will hasten the end of the war by breaking the hearts of Nazi and Nipponese bankers and industrialists and moneyed interests, who, relying on a repetition of our ill-conceived performances following World War No. 1, treasure the hope that we will be fools enough to again give them back their properties, to be used again, as after the last war, to build anew their financial, industrial and war machinery to that point where they will be strong enough to again aggress against us.

I hope the bill will have immediate consideration and that none will give ear to the foolish contention that United States property in enemy and enemy occupied countries exceeds in value enemy property in the United States and that, therefore, no action should be taken now, since, so they say, the policy of nonconfiscation is the course of enlightened self-interest. No thought of confiscation exists in the bill I introduce. No question of confiscation is involved. As but a hasty glance at the measure will reveal, the bill requires that defeated enemy governments shall compensate their own nationals for any losses suffered by them as a consequence of the seizure of their property as enemy property by virtue of American legal action.

At the time the nonconfiscation argument was advanced in the Seventy-first Congress, the then Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Garrard B. Winston, was asked by Mr. Garner:

> Is it confiscation of property for us to carry out the provisions of a treaty where the German Government itself obligates itself to pay its citizens on account of our taking this property?

The Under Secretary of the Treasury replied:

> If you take the property of an individual citizen to pay the debts of his government and his government reimburses him for the property taken, there is no inequity.

Again, how can it be said that not to use this enemy property to pay losses of American citizens suffered through enemy action is a sound moral principle? Are we to give back this property and let American citizens go totally uncompensated; or are we to compensate them out of the inexhaustible United States Treasury and make American taxpayers pay the losses caused by enemy governments, while the nationals of those countries get their properties back less only

a custodian's charge of one-half of 1 percent, as they did to the extent of 80 percent when Germany made its former bid for world mastery?

Finally, how can it be reasoned that self-interest should deter us from using funds derived from the sale of enemy property to satisfy claims arising out of losses of American citizens as a consequence of enemy action? American property in Germany has been for all practical purposes, sequestered for 10 years, to the extent that the owner could not get either it or its earnings out of Germany. The seizure became, factually, if not theoretically, actual confiscation the instant war was declared. So convinced of this American owners have become, that careful corporate managements have actually written their plants and properties in enemy and enemy-occupied countries off their books. Victory will change all this.

It is true that our properties there exceed the value of seized enemy property here, but does any one think we are not going to win this war and dictate the peace? Does anyone assume these American properties would be given back to us if the Axis Powers were victorious? What basis, save ludicrous defeatism, is there for fear of Axis reprisals and German confiscation of United States overseas property if we do in fact apply to the liquidation of the losses of our people alien-owned property now in our possession?

No one who knows whereof he speaks would contend but that we have, as held in repeated opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the unquestioned right to dispose of such properties as we please? And this we must do unless we are prepared to sentence thousands of American citizens, victims of Axis aggression, to go uncompensated for losses suffered as a consequence of enemy action. Once we failed miserably to protect our fellows. Are we to repeat again that same folly?

Already the Alien Property Custodian has seized over 150,000 items of foreign-owned property, seizures and freezing orders covering an over-all value of more than $7,000,000,000. The simple question which my bill raises is: Shall all this be returned to their former enemy owners or shall these properties be sold to the highest bidders and the funds thus realized applied to the reduction of the losses sustained by our fellow American citizens as a consequence of enemy action?

In the last analysis, it is Uncle Sam or Uncle Sap. Which shall it be?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there also would be involved the use, for the great public good, of certain patents, chemical formulas, and medical processes in the procedure such as you suggest?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes. I failed to mention that the bill I have drawn provides that whenever the President is of the opinion that a patent should not be sold, it should be retained and licensed to American manufacturers, or, should it be deemed advisable, it might be released to the public domain.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Was not that policy followed very advantageously in the last war?

Mr. GEARHART. In respect to a very, very few items of property seized. In respect to those few the results have been of untold benefit to the American people. The thing I object to is turning back alien enemy property to its former owners, property which represents money invested in the United States, the returns from which largely financed the war for our enemies, the war which we are now fighting, while American citizens who have suffered great damage as a consequence of enemy war action remain uncompensated for their losses, even to this day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to include in my extension of remarks a letter from the War Department and certain other brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD a speech made by the master of the National Grange, Mr. Goss, at Grand Rapids, Mich., before the seventy-seventh annual session of the National Grange. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost $450. I ask permission that it be included notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HISTORY IN THE MAKING—UNCLE SAM ADOPTS A FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to discuss briefly the epochal happenings that have taken place recently with reference to our foreign policy and our participation with the free nations of the world in a program to maintain peace and prevent aggression in the post-war world. It may now be truthfully said that Uncle Sam has indeed adopted a foreign policy. History is being made. In the last month alone events have taken place with which we in America have played a leading part, which may well shape the course of history for a century to come. World happenings are taking place in rapid succession in theaters of action involving all the peoples of the world, which are making necessary the adoption by the United States of a program and world policy by which its action will be governed in the post-war world.

The agreement reached in Moscow and in both Houses of the American Congress has crystallized an American foreign policy more far-reaching than any upon which we have embarked since the Nation was formed over 150 years ago. When the history of this crucial period in world history shall have been written the formulation of this world-wide foreign policy will take its place with such great events in our national history as the Declaration of Independence, the Monroe Doctrine, and the abolition of slavery and the preservation of the Union. The Monroe Doctrine has played an important role as a national policy. It, however, was applicable only to the Western Hemisphere. The foreign policy embodied in the Moscow agreement and the Fulbright and Connally resolutions is world-wide in its application.

The House of Representatives first took up the consideration of this most important problem of our part in world cooperation when it passed the Fulbright resolution. This resolution provided:

> That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

The significance of the adoption by the House of this first official pronouncement of our world-wide policy in the post-war world was not so much that it was adopted by the House but that there were only 29 votes out of 435 in opposition. The action of the House made clear that this Nation not only has made a major contribution in blood and resources to the preservation of world civilization and the winning of the war but that it intends to follow through in the post-war world and by its influence, cooperation, and participation in international machinery make certain so far as it is humanly possible that there shall not be visited upon the world another catastrophe such as this world war which is bringing death and desolation to the world. We in the Congress and the American people whom we represent are determined to leave nothing undone that will insure permanent world peace and outlaw aggression by the gangster nations of the world. We want to make sure our boys shall not have died in vain.

The historic conference at Moscow and the declaration concluded there between the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China make certain that the major members of the United Nations are determined to stand together, not only in winning the war with unconditional surrender of our enemies and complete victory over them and the stamping out of national gangsterism, but also they intend to stand

together in full cooperation in the post-war world to establish and maintain peace and security and prevent aggression in order to insure a better world in which all of the peoples of the world may live together in peace and cooperation and the enjoyment of the blessings and economic resources which a peaceful world provides.

The representatives of the United Nations, in formulating this understanding, said:

JOINT FOUR-NATION DECLARATION

The Governments of the United States of America, United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China, united in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations, to continue hostilities against those Axis Powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender; conscious of their responsibility to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression; recognizing the necessity of insuring a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and of establishing and maintaining international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments; jointly declare—

1. That their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their respective enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security.

2. That those of them at war with a common enemy will act together in all matters relating to the surrender and disarmament of that enemy.

3. That they will take all measures deemed by them to be necessary to provide against any violation of the terms imposed upon the enemy.

4. That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

5. That for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security pending the reestablishment of law and order and the inauguration of a system of general security, they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations.

6. That after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their military forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation.

7. That they will confer and cooperate with one another and with other members of the United Nations to bring about a practicable general agreement with respect to the regulation of armaments in the post-war period.

The Department of State of the United States released the following declarations and statements on the Moscow Conference at the time it released the Moscow Joint Four-Nation Declaration:

ANGLO-SOVIET-AMERICAN COMMUNIQUE ON THE CONFERENCE IN MOSCOW OF THE THREE FOREIGN SECRETARIES

The Conference of Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, Mr. Cordell Hull; of the United Kingdom, Mr. Anthony Eden; and of the Soviet Union, Mr. V. M. Molotov, took place at Moscow from the 19th to 30th of October 1943. There were 12 meetings. In addition to the Foreign Secretaries, the following took part in the conference:

For the United States of America: Mr. W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador of the United States; Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army; Mr. Green H. Hackworth, Mr. James C. Dunn, and experts.

For the United Kingdom: Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, Ambassador; Mr. William Strang; Lt. Gen. Sir Hastings Ismay; and experts.

For the Soviet Union: Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Marshal of the Soviet Union; Mr. A. Y. Vyshinski, Mr. M. M. Litvinov, Deputy People's Commissars for Foreign Affairs; Mr. V. A. Sergeyev, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Trade; Maj. Gen. A. A. Gryzlov, of the General Staff; Mr. G. F. Saskin, Senior Official of People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs; and experts.

The agenda included all questions submitted for discussion by the three Governments. Some of the questions called for final decisions, and these were taken. On other questions, after discussion, decisions of principle were taken. These questions were referred for detailed consideration to commissions specially set up for the purpose, or reserved for treatment through diplomatic channels. Other questions again were disposed of by an exchange of views. The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union have been in close cooperation in all matters concerning the common war effort, but this is the first time that the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments have been able to meet together in conference.

In the first place, there were frank and exhaustive discussions of the measures to be taken to shorten the war against Germany and her satellites in Europe. Advantage was taken of the presence of military advisers representing the respective Chiefs of Staffs in order to discuss definite military operations with regard to which decisions had been taken and which are already being prepared in order to create a basis for the closest military cooperation in the future between the three countries.

Second only to the importance of hastening the end of the war was the recognition by the three Governments that it was essential in their own national interests and in the interest of all peace-loving nations to continue the present close collaboration and cooperation in the conduct of the war into the period following the end of hostilities, and that only in this way could peace be maintained and the political, economic, and social welfare of their peoples fully promoted.

This conviction is expressed in a declaration in which the Chinese Government joined during the conference and which was signed by the three Foreign Secretaries and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow on behalf of their Governments. This declaration, published today, provides for even closer collaboration in the prosecution of the war and in all matters pertaining to the surrender and disarmament of the enemies with which the four countries are respectively at war. It set forth the principles upon which the four Governments agree that a broad system of international cooperation and security should be based. Provision is made for the inclusion of all other peace-loving nations, great and small, in this system.

The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three Governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops. For this purpose the conference decided to establish in London a European Advisory Commission to study these questions and to make joint recommendations to the three Governments.

Provision was made for continuing when necessary the tripartite consultations of representatives of the three Governments in the respective capitals through the existing diplomatic channels.

The conference also agreed to establish an Advisory Council for matters relating to Italy to be composed in the first instance of representatives of their three Governments and of the French Committee of National Liberation. Provision is made for addition to this council of representatives of Greece and Yugoslavia in view of their special interests arising out of aggressions of Fascist Italy upon their territory during the present war. This council will deal with day-to-day questions other than military preparations and will make recommendations designed to coordinate Allied policy with regard to Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries considered it appropriate to reaffirm by a declaration published today the attitude of the Allied Governments in favor of the restoration of democracy in Italy.

The three Foreign Secretaries declared it to be the purpose of their Governments to restore the independence of Austria. At the same time they reminded Austria that in the final settlement account will be taken of efforts that Austria may make toward its own liberation. The declaration on Austria is published today.

The Foreign Secretaries issued at the conference a declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin containing a solemn warning that at the time of granting any armistice to any German Government, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have had any connection with atrocities and executions in countries overrun by German forces will be taken back to the countries in which their abominable crimes were committed to be charged and punished according to the laws of those countries.

In an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding, which characterized all the work of the conference, consideration was also given to other important questions. These included not only questions of a current nature but also questions concerning treatment of Hitlerite Germany and its satellites, economic cooperation, and assurance of general peace.

STATEMENT SIGNED BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, AND PREMIER STALIN REGARDING ATROCITIES

The United Kingdom, the United States, and the Soviet Union have received from many quarters evidence of atrocities, massacres, and cold-blooded mass executions which are being perpetrated by Hitlerite forces in many of the countries they have overrun and from which they are now being steadily expelled. The brutalities of Hitlerite domination are no new thing and all peoples or territories in their grip have suffered from the worst form of government by terror. What is new is that many of these territories are now being redeemed by the advancing armies of the liberating powers and that in their desperation, the recoiling Hitlerite Huns are redoubling their ruthless cruelties. This is now evidenced with particular clearness by monstrous crimes of the Hitlerites on the territory of the Soviet Union which is being liberated from Hitlerites, and on French and Italian territory.

Accordingly, the aforesaid 3 Allied Powers, speaking in the interests of the 33 United Nations, hereby solemnly declare and give full warning of their declaration as follows: At the time of granting of any armistice to any government which may be set up in Germany, those German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party who have been responsible for or have taken a consenting part in the above atrocities, massacres, and executions will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free governments which will be erected therein. Lists will be compiled in all possible detail from all these countries, having regard especially to invaded parts of the Soviet Union, to Poland and Czechoslovakia, to Yugoslavia

and Greece, including Crete and other islands, to Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Italy.

Thus, Germans who take part in wholesale shooting of Polish officers or in the execution of French, Dutch, Belgian, or Norwegian hostages or of Cretan peasants, or who have shared in slaughters inflicted on the people of Poland or in territories of the Soviet Union which are now being swept clear of the enemy, will know they will be brought back to the scene of their crimes and judged on the spot by the peoples whom they have outraged. Let those who have hitherto not imbrued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied Powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.

The above declaration is without prejudice to the case of German criminals, whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the Governments of the Allies.

DECLARATION REGARDING ITALY

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet Union have established that their three Governments are in complete agreement that Allied policy toward Italy must be based upon the fundamental principle that fascism and all its evil influence and configuration shall be completely destroyed and that the Italian people shall be given every opportunity to establish governmental and other institutions based upon democratic principles.

The Foreign Secretaries of the United States and United Kingdom declare that the action of their Governments from the inception of the invasion of Italian territory, insofar as paramount military requirements have permitted has been based upon this policy.

In furtherance of this policy in the future the Foreign Secretaries of the three Governments are agreed that the following measures are important and should be put into effect:

1. It is essential that the Italian Government should be made more democratic by inclusion of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism.

2. Freedom of speech, of religious worship, of political belief, of press, and of public meeting shall be restored in full measure to the Italian people who shall also be entitled to form anti-Fascist political groups.

3. All institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed.

4. All Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from institutions and organizations of a public character.

5. All political prisoners of the Fascist regime shall be released and accorded full amnesty.

6. Democratic organs of local government shall be created.

7. Fascist chiefs and army generals known or suspected to be war criminals shall be arrested and handed over to justice.

In making this declaration the three Foreign Secretaries recognize that so long as active military operations continue in Italy the time at which it is possible to give full effect to the principles stated above will be determined by the Commander in Chief on the basis of instructions received through the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

The three Governments, parties to this declaration, will, at the request of any one of them, consult on this matter. It is further understood that nothing in this resolution is to operate against the right of the Italian people, ultimately to choose their own form of government.

DECLARATION ON AUSTRIA

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination.

They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see reestablished a free and independent Austria and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace.

Austria is reminded, however, that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.

While the conference in Moscow was in progress, the Senate of the United States was engaged in its historic debate on the Connally resolution, which has for its purpose a pronouncement by the Senate as to the foreign policy that should be followed by this Nation in cooperation with the United Nations, now engaged in the throes of World War No. 2. No debate in all our eventful history was of greater significance. At the conclusion of this debate and after the release to the world of the Moscow agreement, the vote was taken on the modified Connally resolution, and only five of the Members of the Senate cast a negative vote.

The text of the Senate resolution as adopted is as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

In this connection it should be remembered that the foreign policy of our country under the Constitution is formulated by the Chief Executive, but any treaties negotiated by the Chief Executive must be submitted to the Senate and approved by two-thirds of its membership present. The overwhelming majority of the membership of the Senate voting its approval of this foreign policy is of utmost significance in connection with such treaties as may follow the cessation of activities and the consummation of international accords putting into operation agreements arrived at between the United Nations. The absence of any political lines of demarkation in the formulation and adoption of this international collaboration in the post-war world is also significant. It definitely established that the maintenance of world peace and the stamping out of international aggression is not a political question.

One of the two great political parties—the Republican—acting through its advisory council, in the recent Mackinac meeting, laid down a definite foreign policy by unanimous agreement, even before the resolutions to which I have referred were adopted. The Mackinac Charter is forthright, clear, and nonpartisan and is in the following words:

MACKINAC CHARTER

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(A) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(B) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(C) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives will be impossible and specific commitments of this council of the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be devolved in the months to come as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(A) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis.

(B) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacturing of the implements of war.

(C) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperation organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization perpetuating existing unity may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for—

1. Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation.

2. Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in

determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things, this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversy, and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the people of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority on behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these ends may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

The agreement between the dominant members of the United Nations on this policy of cooperation to maintain peace and prevent aggression in the post-war world, supported as it is by an overwhelming majority of the American people of all political faiths, gives hopeful assurance that our sacrifice of lives and resources shall not have been in vain and that we may look forward to a more peaceful world in the decades that are to follow. It is also of great military significance. It is of great strategic importance in bringing the conflict now raging on foreign battlefields to a successful and early termination. Nothing of greater importance has occurred in recent months than the assurance given to the world, and particularly our enemies, that we, the United Nations, are standing adamant together with a full determination to fight on, with no separate peace, until full and complete victory shall crown our efforts. The unity of purpose of the major powers of the United Nations, proof of which was heretofore lacking, is a severe blow to the morale of the Nazi forces, not surpassed by a major military victory.

The representatives of the United Nations who filled the important roles in the formulation and adoption of these world policies have performed a service which will enrich the whole world for many generations if the mandates of the policies are observed.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called the attention of the House to a recent trip made by me during the recess of the Congress, through Alaska, as a member of the House Committee on Territories and the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife. I was happy to take advantage of the cessation of work here to make an inspection trip through this important and strategic area. The Alaska Highway extending for 1,630 miles from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, is now being used throughout its entire length for military purposes. The construction of this military road through the uninhabited rough terrain over most of this long distance is a remarkable achievement not only as an engineering project carried forward by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army during war but also as a project planned and programed by the Public Roads Administration. The actual work of construction was carried forward both by the Army engineers and by private contract through civilian workers. On Saturday, November 13, the Northwest Service Command under the charge of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, made a news release making known to the world that this farthest north through-bus service over the entire 1,630 miles of the highway was put into operation last week and Greyhound busses chartered by the American Army began regular service from Dawson Creek to Fairbanks, Alaska. I was privileged during my trip last summer to make the entire journey of approximately 1,000 miles from Whitehorse south to Peace River Bridge near Dawson Creek, and was most favorably impressed by the outstanding accomplishment in road building under adverse conditions as evidenced by the successful opening of the highway through its entire length in such a short space of time. The news release of the Northwest Service Command is an important item of news and I include the report as a part of my remarks. The report is as follows:

WHITEHORSE, YUKON TERRITORY, November 13.—The farthest north through bus service in the world was put in operation this week, when Greyhound busses chartered by the American Army began rolling into Fairbanks on the Alaska Highway.

For the past 3 months the busses have been plying steadily between Dawson Creek, British Columbia, the southern terminus of the famous international road, and Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory. This stretch covers approximately 1,000 miles. Whitehorse is the main base along the highway and the headquarters of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor's Northwest Service Command.

This week the bus service was extended on to Fairbanks, thus lengthening the total trip to 1,630 miles. The journey over the entire highway is not only the world's farthest north bus service but also one of the longest through bus journeys anywhere in North America. Most of it is in the sub-Arctic.

Travel on the Alsaka Highway busses is confined to military personnel, civilian construction workers, and others associated with the war effort. No commercial or tourist traffic is carried. "For the duration of the war," General O'Connor declared, "travel on the highway will be restriced to military requirements. This is by joint agreement of the Governments of the United States and Canada. The road was built for military purposes and will be used accordingly."

The busses traveling on the Alaska Highway are the largest size Greyhounds, the same as those which serve such Canadian and American centers as Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Seattle, Omaha, Chicago, and Atlanta. The busses have been leased from the Greyhound Bus Corporation but are operated by the Northwest Service Command.

Col. Joseph P. Glandon, of Portland, Oreg., is the officer in charge of transportation on the Alaska Highway, and the busses operate directly under his management. This week Glandon, whose headquarters are at Dawson Creek, released figures showing the magnitude of the present bus traffic on the famous international road.

During the month of September 1943 the busses hauled more than 6,500 individual passengers a total of 2,159,622 passenger-miles. This included troops going to duty and on furlough, and civilian workers traveling to and from such vital construction jobs as the airports between Edmonton and Fairbanks and the Canol pipe-line project. The bus line goes through three separate sovereignties—the Province of British Columbia, the Yukon Territory, and the Territory of Alaska.

The drivers of the Alaska Highway busses are men recruited from regular Greyhound runs in western Canada. The bulk of them make their homes in five Canadian cities—Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Vancouver, and Lethbridge. These drivers ride the busses in pairs. There are always two men on each bus. One man drives while the other sleeps or rests. Two sets of hands are essential in the extreme temperatures of the far North—temperatures which often crowd 60° zelow zero—when repairs are necessary or tire blow-outs occur.

Between Dawson Creek and Whitehorse, the busses operate over three separate divisions. The first is from Dawson Creek to Fort Nelson; the second from Fort Nelson to Watson Lake; the third from Watson Lake to Whitehorse. On the new run to Fairbanks being inaugurated this week, the division point midway between Whitehorse and Fairbanks will be the Army airport and highway relay station at Northway, Alaska. Last winter Northway was the coldest point along the 1,630 miles of road, the temperature once dropping to 70° below.

The teams of drivers change at the division points. For example, on a typical recent bus trip to Whitehorse, a bus loaded with Air Corps men on their way to duty was driven as far as Fort Nelson by E. R. Bavin, of Edmonton, and Grant Thompson, of Cranbrook, British Columbia. The bus then was piloted on to Watson Lake by Ray and Fraser Maxwell, brothers, of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. On the final lap to Whitehorse, the drivers were William Cherlenko, of Lethbridge, and Fred Emms, of Calgary.

In addition to the busses leased from the Greyhound lines, the American Army is operating a number of smaller busses on shorter runs between intermediate points on the road. These busses, some of which once served American shipyards, also carry troops and workers around such large posts as Whitehorse and Edmonton.

On the long stretch between Dawson Creek and Whitehorse, the Greyhound busses have been going straight through without any stops other than to take on gasoline or for meals at Army relay stations. In recent weeks the approximately 1,000 miles have been covered in 44 hours elapsed time. The passengers, soldiers and civilians alike, get their meals at the Army relay stations along the road.

Few bus routes contain such a wide variety of scenery. The start of the journey from the Northern Alberta railhead at Dawson Creek, end of steel in the north country, is across the wide Canadian plains. Wheat farms dot the landscape. The bus rolls majestically across the graceful, half-mile-long suspension bridge spanning the Peace River and continues over the prairie.

But gradually the scene grows wilder. The farms fade out. Forests begin to encroach on the fields and pastures. The plains stiffen into high hills. At Fort Nelson, where the road turns sharply westward toward Alaska, the wilderness has become dominant. Between Fort Nelson and Watson Lake the road ascends the Continental Divide. It twists through canyons and steep river valleys. It

follows narrow creeks and deep arroyos. Gaunt peaks guard the horizon.

The bus glides past the historic old Hudson Bay store at Lower Post, stops briefly at the big airport at Watson Lake, and continues across the Yukon uplands in the direction of Whitehorse. This is the land made famous by the gold seekers who struggled into the Klondike in 1898—a land immortalized by Jack London, Robert W. Service, and James Oliver Curwood. Just east of Whitehorse the bus crosses the headwaters of the mighty Yukon River, the first bus service ever to penetrate this wilderness watershed.

Many noted Americans and Canadians have ridden on the Alaska Highway busses on journeys of varying length since they first were put into service.

They include such names as the Governor General of Canada, the Earl of Athlone, and his wife, the Princess Alice; Senator James G. Scrugham, of Nevada; Senator William Langer, of North Dakota; Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Senator C. Douglass Buck, of Delaware; Congressman Homer D. Angell, of Oregon Delegate Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska; Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, of New York City, chairman of the Joint Defense Board; Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Federal Works Administrator; Col. O. M. Bigger, chairman of the Canadian section of the Joint Defense Board; Thomas H. MacDonald, United States Commissioner of Public Roads; Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; a large delegation from the Vancouver, British Columbia, Board of Trade; and Frederic Adrian Delano, former Chairman of the National Resources Board, and one of the best-known railroad experts in North America.

The longest trips made by any of these celebrities were those taken by Congressman ANGELL and Delegate DIMOND, members of the United States House of Representatives. They traveled all the way from Whitehorse to Dawson Creek.

"The use of busses on the Alaska Highway," said General O'Connor this week, "has proven a useful and important innovation. These busses have transported thousands of troops and construction workers on a daily service which has demonstrated the practicability of the Alaska Highway as an artery of travel."

Jean Louis Coudert, Catholic Bishop of the Yukon and Prince Rupert, recently declared that the presence of the busses on the Alaska Highway was a unique sight in the far north. "Strangers cannot realize how remarkable this is," he said. "I now can travel in a comfortable bus to reach parishoners who formerly I had to visit by such primitive and rigorous methods of travel as dogsled, canoe, and on foot. The construction of the Alaska Highway has worked many phenomenal changes in the North."

APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 722 OF INTERNAL REVENUE ACT

Mr. COOPER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3; and agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY.
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: These amendments retain the basic principles of the House provisions with respect to interest on deficiencies and overpayments but make certain technical and substantive changes. They provide that any portion of a deficiency in excess-profits tax which constitutes a deficiency because of a tax deferment under section 710 (a) (5), and any portion of a deficiency in tax under chapter I which is determined by the Commissioner to exceed any refund or credit of excess-profits tax arising from the operation of section 722 shall bear interest. They also make certain technical changes in the House bill so as to provide for the appropriate application of the interest provisions of the bill in case of an overpayment resulting from the application of an unused excess-profits credit carryover or carry-back attributable to an increase in the excess-profits credit due to the operation of section 722 with respect to the taxable year in which the unused excess-profits credit arose. In the case of unused excess-profits credit carry-backs the provisions of the bill and the provisions of section 3771 (e) of the code (relating to the period for interest on carry-backs) are to be applied coordinately. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This section does not appear in the House bill. It extends the time to December 31, 1944, within which pension, stock-bonus, profit-sharing, and annuity plans may be amended to meet the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the code. It also provides that for a plan to comply with the statute any provisions adopted by December 31, 1944, shall be made effective for all purposes as of a date not later than January 1, 1944, or the effective date of the plan in case of a plan becoming effective after January 1, 1944. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment, which did not appear in the House bill, broadens section 124 (f) (3) of the code so as to extend the time within which a corporation may file an application for a certificate of necessity with respect to emergency facilities completed or acquired after June 10, 1940. Under existing law such application must be filed before the expiration of 6 months after the beginning of construction, reconstruction, erection or installation, or the date of acquisition, of such facility, or before December 1, 1940, whichever is the later. The amendment substitutes April 22, 1943, for December 1, 1940. The Senate recedes.

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
Managers on the part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 7 legislative days, on account of official and personal business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very timely and enlightening editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 49 and H. R. 2328, to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code relative to the mailing of certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings, etc.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The meeting of the subcommittee on H. R. 3140 scheduled for Tuesday, November 16, has been postponed, subject to further notice.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

913. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Platte River, Colo., Wyo., and Nebr., with a view to determining whether any modification should be made with respect to flood control on Bear Creek, Colo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 16, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

914. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Seventh Congressional District

of the State of Illinois, James C. Moreland against Leonard W. Schuetz (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Elections No. 3, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 338. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3377, a bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 861). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Second intermediate report of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies. House Resolution 102. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 339. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3356, a bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3670. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. R. 3671. A bill to incorporate the Navy Fathers' Club of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3672. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Thirty-second Division; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3674. A bill for the relief of William E. Widby; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3550. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 32 members and adherents of the New Bedford (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, urging the passage of all bills now before the House to prohibit the advertisement of alcoholic beverages, to ban beer and liquor sales at military and naval centers, to make it unlawful to furnish alcoholic beverages to anyone in uniform, and to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3551. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of John W. Fishback, and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3552. Also, petition of George Wilhelm and 21 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3553. Also, petition of Laura J. Crecelius and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3554. Also, petition of Paul Wendt and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3555. Also, petition of Herman E. Heberer and 115 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3556. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of Eva Brooks and 77 other members of the First Christian Church and Bible School of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3557. Also, petition of Barbara Ault and 29 other residents of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3558. Also, petition of Mary Wilson and 73 other members of the First Christian Church and Bible School of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3559. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from W. S. Lawrence, of Fairfield, Ill., urging that all possible reinforcements be sent to General MacArthur at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1943

(Legislative day of Friday, November 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose hands are all the souls of men, we thank Thee that Thou whose glory flames from the uttermost star dost dwell also in humble and contrite hearts. Our pettiness is shamed in the light of Thy greatness. Even as we come bringing our partisanships and our national loyalties we know in our heart of hearts that we cannot pray unless we say "Our Father." Before the altar of the one God of all mankind we bow, without the masks of our self-seeking, confessing that the walls we have built and the social life we have accepted and defended have betrayed and denied the brotherhood of the race. The bitter fruit that now we taste is of our sowing. The righteous judgments of Thine eternal order sorely chasten us. We have broken Thy law of love and our disobedience has broken us and our world.

In contrition we would dedicate anew this dear land, given us by God, to a purer life, a more unselfish devotion to the ideals which have made it great and the hope of the downtrodden, and to a deeper loyalty to the dreams of the world's Christ for all men. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Reynolds
Ball	Gillette	Robertson
Bankhead	Green	Scrugham
Barbour	Guffey	Shipstead
Barkley	Gurney	Smith
Bilbo	Hatch	Stewart
Brewster	Hawkes	Taft
Bridges	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Holman	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Butler	Kilgore	Tydings
Byrd	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lucas	Van Nuys
Caraway	McClellan	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	O'Daniel	Willis
Eastland	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent from the city on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, not so very long ago there served with us in the Senate a man whom we all greatly loved and admired. We respected his ability and his integrity, and it gives me pleasure now to read a very short editorial concerning his present field of activity. The editorial, which appeared in the Spokane Daily Chronicle on September 24 last, under the headline "Why America is worth dying for," reads:

If you wish to bolster your faith in the glory of the American form of government, just go down to the Federal Building and sit in on a jury trial in district court.

You will find men and women from every walk of life, the lowliest with the distinguished appearing before the court to receive attention. You will find the United States Government, represented by Judge Lewis Schwellenbach, making every reasonable effort to safeguard the rights of defendants who, according to indictments, are seeking to flout the laws of that Government. In one case this week in which a youth was acting as his own attorney, the court made kindly explanation of omissions detrimental to the defendant, and at several points interposed objections in behalf of the lad and sustained them to protect his interests.

There was not the slightest loss of sovereignty by the Government, no hint of compromise with lawlessness. It was obviously a sincere attempt to see that the defendant had a fair trial, which is one of the privileges for which this war is being fought.

Go to the court some day when trials are on and see for yourself. See what it means to have rights, and thank your lucky stars that you are an American.

PLATFORM OF KANSAS FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the platform adopted at the thirty-eighth annual State convention of the Kansas Farmers Union held at Clay Center, Kans., on October 28, 1943, setting forth the national and State program of that organization and appealing to Congress to enact legislation that will benefit agriculture, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the platform of the Kansas Farmers Union was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The nature of the peace which follows World War No. 2 depends on a basic decision in America between the capitalists who demand the right to continue unchecked exploitation of the common people and the Nation's resources under the false slogan of "free enterprise" and the real interests of the common people who make up America and give it strength.

In agriculture, that decision can be made nationally by the adoption of a national land policy. As a basic objective of the National Farmers Union, we urge our officers and legislative representatives to promote a congressional declaration that it is the policy of this Nation to encourage and maintain family-type agriculture and to assure the security of working farm people on the land. That declaration should guide future legislation and all actions of administrative agencies.

1. Food production: The basic duty of farmers of the Nation is all-out food production to supply the needs of our Nation and our allies to win the war. They have undertaken and carried out that duty magnificently, consistently breaking all food production records each year since 1939, with decreasing aid and guaranties from the Nation.

It is the duty of the National Government to give farmers every possible aid in the accomplishment of their assigned task. We deplore the fact that Members of Congress have listened to, and the national administration has appeased, selfish groups which seek power and domination over agricultural agencies and stand ready to wreck farm programs and decrease food production to attain that end. To attain increased food production, both to win the war and to banish want in the peace, the Kansas Farmers Union recommends:

(a) The use of roll-backs and subsidies only to maintain economic stabilization, as outlined in section 3 of these resolutions. In principle we are opposed to solving economic problems with subsidies. We accept them only as an expediency to give farmers justice in a national emergency.

(b) Adequate credit at reasonable interest to finance increased production, including the authorization of not less than $1,000,000,000 in rehabilitation loan funds to Farm Security Administration to bring underfinanced, underequipped, and consequently underemployed farmers into fullest possible production.

(c) Adequate supplies, in terms of machinery and tools to do the production job. We deplore disregard of farmers needs for labor and supplies to achieve greater production, and especially the domination of the War Production Board by minions of industry without sympathy for agriculture or sufficient vision to appreciate the need for food and agricultural production. We demand that real farmers and true farmers cooperatives be given representation on the War Production Board and that an aggressive effort be made to supply agriculture with the equipment it needs.

(d) Adequate labor, through maintenance of present standards of essentiality on the farm and repeal of Public Law No. 45 which immobilized, rather than mobilized, farm labor under the 3,000 extension agents in America. Handling of farm labor should be returned to the agencies which have the know-how to meet farmers' needs, the United States Employment Service and Farm Security Administration.

(e) Maintenance of cooperative farm-credit agencies, developed over a period of 25 years, to meet the needs of working farmers. We oppose the abolition or hindrance of any farm-credit agency to satisfy the greed and avarice of bankers, whose credit system failed and plunged agriculture into its darkest era in the 1920's.

(f) Equitable allocation of feed and supplies. The protein feeds of the Nation today, unrationed, are being almost totally diverted into the hands of exploitive processors. We insist that the War Food Administration take immediate control of feeds so they may be rationed equitably through established channels, including farmer-owned cooperatives, among farmers of the Nation.

2. Taxation: We reiterate our doctrine that taxes should be levied in proportion to ability to pay, and that net income is the best single measure of ability to pay and that a sharply graduated income tax is the most just general tax. We unalterably oppose sales taxes. We demand that income taxes which will confiscate excessive war profits and limit individual incomes in accordance with the President's indivisible seven-point anti-inflation program be adopted.

3. Economic stabilization: We support the Economic Stabilization Act, based on full parity income from products for farmers. As wheat producers, we demand that farmers be assured full parity, not only in the interests of justice to farmers but to assure the tremendously increased planting of wheat needed in 1944. We prefer parity in the market place. We insist that if parity income to farmers for wheat is attained through a subsidy, or parity payments from the Government, that the Nation understand that it is a consumer subsidy to hold down retail prices, and not a farmer subsidy.

We insist that there be parity of sacrifice, and that the provisions of the President's seven-point anti-inflation program which would prohibit war profiteering and limit individual incomes be enacted and enforced now, before a people enraged by the creation of war billionaires in the present national emergency resort to more extreme measures. Farmers are sacrificing. The war contractors now setting aside reserves after taxes which will reach $50,000,000,000 in 1944—more than the national debt before Pearl Harbor—must be required to do the same.

4. National Farmers Union: We approve the collaboration of our officers with labor, religious, welfare, consumer, and other groups to achieve common purposes, and we commend the energy and the vision with which National Farmers Union is being rebuilt and expanded in the Nation as a whole.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

A policy of isolationism has led America from one war to another. America's international policy in the post-war world must be based on collaboration and cooperation with all the world peoples.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Post-war planning in America must be based upon the welfare of people. It should be founded, broadly on:

(a) An economy of abundance.

(b) The achievement of minimum standards of decent living, in terms of housing, health, educational facilities, social security, etc., in every State, county, and parish and township in the Nation, as contrasted to past post-war constructions of monumental public works.

(c) Adequate provision for reestablishment of returning World War veterans in economic security on farms or in the professions of their choice.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

We endorse the R. E. A. program and urge the Federal Government to allocate to its continuation and expansion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. Res. 205. Resolution authorizing an investigation in the State of California of undeveloped projects of a public nature with a view to aiding in a solution of post-war problems (submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on November 12, 1943); without amendment.

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 206. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry

(submitted by Mr. SCRUGHAM on November 12, 1943); without amendment (Rept. No. 536), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORT OF IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE—REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, from the Committee on Immigration, to report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 535) thereon. It is a very important bill, and I hope it may receive early consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Florida will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1534. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to premiums on war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1535. A bill to vest jurisdiction of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma in the case of *Benjamin E. Cook, Administrator of the Estate of Cam C. Boyd, deceased* v. *The United States;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE DISTRIBUTION AND SALE OF MEAT, POULTRY, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing that a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to Federal regulations governing the distribution and sale of meat, poultry, and dairy products, with a view to ascertaining the names and official positions of persons responsible for the chaotic conditions presently existing in the meat, poultry, and dairy industries, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 207) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to Federal regulations governing the distribution and sale of meat, poultry, and dairy products, with a view to ascertaining the names and official positions of persons responsible for the chaotic conditions presently existing in the meat, poultry, and dairy industries, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed ———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REHABILITATION OF AMERICA'S PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CITIZENS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the 25th day of October I asked permission to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. At that time I had also intended to have inserted the response, by Chester C. Haddan, president of the Association of Limb Manufacturers of America. I ask unanimous consent now that in the permanent RECORD Mr. Haddan's address, which was in response to that delivered by our colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], be inserted immediately following the address by our colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant of November 12 entitled "To Streamline Congress," and I also ask that there be printed following this editorial another from the Hartford Times of November 12, entitled "To Study Congress." Both these editorials have reference to Senate concurrent resolution 23, which I submitted, and which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant of November 12, 1943]

TO STREAMLINE CONGRESS

It is earnestly to be hoped that a constructive reorganization of congressional procedure will result from the proposal of Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, and Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, asking for a joint bipartisan committee to "make a full and complete study * * * enabling it (Congress) better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." The impatience of the public with the lawmakers, we suspect, is based not so much on hostility to our representative system as on dissatisfaction with the ineffectiveness of Congress because of its archaic organization. It is within the power of Congress to remedy that situation.

This is by no means a new problem. Woodrow Wilson, in his Constitutional Government, termed the 47 House and 33 Senate standing committees "eighty little legislatures, an odd device of disintegration." It is obvious that committee consideration of legislation is necessary, but the multiplication of committees has resulted in a scattering of responsibility and the advancement of mediocre men to chairmanships. This last condition is aggravated by the seniority rule, which ought to be discarded. It might be well, also, to consider establishing joint committees so far as practicable. For example, the separate hearings by the committees on Military Affairs place a double burden upon witnesses appearing for or against any given measure. Much time is lost. Were the number of committees reduced, it might be possible to secure more adequate staffs for them.

The observation by Richard L. Strout, writing for the Christian Science Monitor on the conditions within Congress is poignant and timely: "Lacking strong leadership Members aline themselves with economic blocs; act as messenger boys for constituents rather than national lawmakers. They are Uncle Sam's bellboys. Reform proposals generally begin with reducing the number of committees. With the number cut to 8 or 10, it would be easy for the chairman to form a legislative cabinet. Actually, a more efficient Congress would strengthen the legislature in its eternal contest with the executive."

———

[From the Hartford Times of November 12, 1943]

TO STUDY CONGRESS

Senator MALONEY and Representative MONRONEY, by introducing identical resolutions in the Senate and House, calling for appointment of a committee to study the operations of Congress and its relationship with other branches of the Government, as well as to make a study of the remuneration of employees of committees and of the relationships between committees, have given the two Houses an opportunity to bring about improvements.

One suspects that without such a study it may in future be difficult for Congress to find suitable employees, and for committees to find acceptable secretaries and other workers. This impression is strengthened by the fact that a study of congressional employment specifically is called for.

As to more important matters, such as the operations of Congress, there is much that can be gained by a thorough study, but whether any real improvement can be brought about is another matter. Congressmen who wield extraordinary power through committees, such as the Dies committee and the House Committee on Insular Affairs, both of which have assumed to veto the employment of decent citizens in various departments of the Government, will be loath to relinquish any of their powers if that should be regarded as necessary.

In recent years there has been plenty of criticism of Congress, which has been put aside for the duration of the war. After the armistice is signed there will be a renewal of the criticism, much of which may be unjustified but which, nevertheless, it is the privilege of the public to make.

Important as it may be to improve the operations of the House and Senate to the end that there may be better government, it is even more important that the relationships between the public and Congress be as well understood as those between Members of the Congress. The Constitution is clear on the duties of the Congress, and whenever there is dispute as to whether the Constitution has been overstepped the courts are available to remove any doubts. The all-important thing, it will seem to some, is to establish public confidence that the Congress truly represents all the people, regardless of

race, creed, economic condition, or political affiliation.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER AT HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Halifax, Nova Scotia, March 21, 1942, in connection with the War-bond drive, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS TO NATIONAL GRANGE BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered November 13, 1943, by Senator Aiken at Grand Rapids, Mich., before the National Grange, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING AND OUR POST-WAR PLANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject Housing and Our Post-war Plans, delivered by him to the Better Housing League of Cincinnati, Ohio, October 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY EMMA GUFFEY MILLER ON 128TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ELIZABETH CADY STANTON

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller in the crypt of the Capitol on the one hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of the birth of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, November 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURRENT FARM PROBLEMS AND TRENDS—ADDRESS BY M. W. THATCHER

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by M. W. Thatcher, general manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, before the Montana Farmers Union Annual Convention, October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL WAR IN YUGOSLAVIA

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two newspaper articles, one by William Philip Simms, published in the Washington Daily News, and the other by Ervin Acel, published in the New York News of October 30, 1943, dealing with the civil war in Yugoslavia, which appear in the Appendix.]

DISTURBANCES IN TULE LAKE RELOCATION CENTER

[Mr. MCFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tule Lake Disturbance," published in the Douglas (Ariz.) Daily Dispatch of November 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy."

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 630) to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3236. An act to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code; and

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 3236. An act to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park; and

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 630) to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, which was, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "July 1, 1943" and insert "January 1, 1944."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, this bill passed the Senate on June 15 last, providing merely for the changing of the date of holding terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee. As passed by the Senate, the bill provided that it should take effect the 1st day of July, 1943. Because we were unable to get the bill through the House before the day of adjournment—in fact, it passed the House only yesterday—it was necessary for the House to amend the bill by changing the date from July 1, 1943, to January 1, 1944. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, on page 2, line 12, after the word "That", to strike out "not less than."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the course of the hearings on the pending bill many very earnest gentlemen appeared as witnesses in behalf of the measure. I caused to be printed in the RECORD a resolution which had been adopted by the Connecticut Editorial Association, when members of the newspaper editors and publishers group who comprise that association met on July 24 of this year. At that time they had before them the original so-called Bankhead bill, a revised version of which, now known as Senate bill 1457, is before the Senate.

At that time it became apparent that members of the Connecticut Association felt that if the United States Government had something to sell and intended to sell it after the manner of some big business corporations, it should be required to pay for the advertising needed to stimulate the sale. Members of the association very properly, it seemed to me, felt that there should be some declaration of principle, some established basis, upon which the Government would operate in this field.

They, of course, thought that the matter could be so handled that advertising would be allotted upon a net paid circulation basis; that it would be placed in the hands of private agencies for distribution among the advertising media to which recourse might be had, after the manner of big business, such as General Motors, to which reference was made many times in the course of the hearings, or any other business, for that matter, which utilizes all known media which are capable of producing results.

They also felt that it was within the bounds of possibility that there could be established some committee or some group who would make certain that the advertising copy would not contain material which could be used to partisan political advantage. In other words, they felt that the funds of all the people, derived from taxation, should not be utilized to gain any political or partisan advantage, and at the same time that all the safeguards commonly followed by business would be available, and all business practices executed in the course of the administration of the program.

When we held hearings on the bill it developed that it did not follow that procedure, that, quite to the contrary, this is a very different measure from what many of those who originally favored the principle expected and hoped it would be.

For one thing, it developed that the Secretary of the Treasury at this minute has all the authority he needs. He has the appropriation. He writes the copy. He distributes his advertising matter where, in his judgment, he can get results.

It developed in the course of the testimony, as the hearings will reveal, that there would be approximately $15,000,000 available under this bill to be divided equally, Mr. President, among some 10,000 weeklies, bi-weeklies, and other publications of the generic description appearing on page 2 of the bill, and published in communities having 10,000 population or less, which would approximate $1,500 a newspaper per annum, to be distributed out of the Treasury without regard for the purchasing power of the community in which the newspaper is circulated, and without regard for the advertising value of the particular medium.

Moreover, the bill is limited solely to newspapers of a character which is described on page 2. There is no provision for advertising in foreign-language newspapers, let us say, or for newspapers having a circulation among colored people, or for newspapers having a circulation among church groups, or labor groups, or any other groups, of that specialty type of circulation through which and to which appeal might very properly be made if in fact the objective of selling bonds was the real purpose of the bill.

In its naked aspect, Mr. President, it came down to this, that the bill would provide for distribution out of the Treasury of the United States approximately $1,500 a newspaper for each of 10,000 newspapers in the United States; the balance of the fund of $15,000,000 to be distributed equitably, whatever that means, among newspapers having circulation in communities in excess of 10,000 population.

It is possible to make the bill accord with principle; it is possible to make the bill speak as all fair-minded proponents of the proposed legislation should desire, and it is possible to denude it of that special-privilege classification into which, under the language in which it has been drawn, it now would fit. It is possible, Mr. President, to amend the bill in very simple fashion to direct that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury utilize the funds that the bill would authorize to be spent to achieve the best possible results in furthering the sale of War bonds, if that is what it is really desired to do.

Mr. President, I had a very great deal of sympathy as I listened to some of the editors and publishers of small-town newspapers telling of the problems confronting them in wartimes. The businessmen of the communities in which they live find themselves constantly with an ever-decreasing stock of goods to sell, and hence there is no longer the need to advertise there once was. The publishers find themselves short of help. They find their newsprint costs rising. They find their labor charges increasing. They find, in other words, that there is not available to them that degree of sponsorship of Government ads to be paid for by private industry, private businesses, that is ready to hand as to the newspapers in the large communities.

Moreover, some of these editors, Mr. President, testified that once a week at least they were compositor, printer, assembler, counter—they did everything that a newspaper publication will require, even to running for ads, and distributing the newspapers, and working long hours for a meager income.

Their situation obviously will engage our attention because of the exceedingly important factor they constitute in the American economy. In respect of the dislocations caused by wartime, of course, they are not alone. With respect of the amount of space they have hitherto given to wartime activities, to news of ration boards, news of the draft law changes, and the like, without charge of any kind, they are performing in their respective communities a similar service to that being rendered by thousands of school teachers who give of their time to the ration boards, to countless citizens on our draft boards who give of their time and yield of their energy in furtherance of the war.

There are sacrifices, Mr. President, by businessmen of high and low degree, and by the citizenry generally. There is no question that in that respect the newspaper publishers who appeared before us have measured up in every single possible aspect to the true test of citizenship in the time of the Nation's crisis. But we must ask ourselves, granting all that, Is this situation of such nature that we should pass a bill for their special benefit to the end that they shall receive $1,500 a newspaper per annum out of the Treasury of the United States? Obviously, Mr. President, it would be unconscionable for us to single out this particular class to be the beneficiaries of the largess of the American people.

Mr. President, if it is our genuine desire to utilize all known media to further the sale of War bonds and to bring in these newspapers, with all other media, fairly to accomplish an acquaintance on the part of the general public with the need for investment in War bonds, we are on very different ground. I very respectfully submit that we can make a step in the right direction, utilizing the structure of this bill, amending it, in other words, to adapt it to the proper purposes.

With those thoughts in mind, Mr. President, I wanted to tell my colleagues who are not on the committee that I listened to every single witness. There was not one whom I did not hear. I gave special attention to the problem in its very direst nature as they described it to us. But there was no evidence to show the extent of the purchasing power of the communities to be served by the newspapers who would be the beneficiaries under the bill. There was no evidence that if we put all the advertising into a given area that it would result in the selling of one additional bond. Quite the contrary, Mr. President. It narrowed down solely and simply to the fact that while a subsidy was being disclaimed, while all those who appeared as witnesses before us were unanimous in declaiming that they wanted no subsidy, the net result of the way the bill is drawn is to result simply in subsidy.

To those Members of the Senate who have not had the advantage of attending the hearings before our committee, I wanted to leave these few preliminary thoughts before we acted on the several committee amendments which are before the Senate. At the proper time I shall move an amendment which I hope, Mr. President, will accomplish the laudable and proper objectives toward which this bill can be directed.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Was there any information presented to the committee to the effect that the provisions of the pending measure would limit the number of newspapers which would be benefited by the measure, or, for example, could there be established in communities which are not now being served, newspapers which might receive a share of the money provided by the bill?

Mr. DANAHER. I will answer the Senator by saying that so far as lines 8, 9, 10, and 11 on page 2 of the bill are concerned, the bill provides that "the advertising space so purchased shall be divided equitably among all newspapers of general circulation which are entered as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879, as amended."

There is nothing in the bill as to whether a newspaper shall be of long standing or newly founded. There is no contemplation, I am sure, under the language of the bill, that a new newspaper could be started and thereafter become the beneficiary of any Government payment.

I will say that were the formula prescribed in the bill to be followed, the largest amount any such newspaper, if it were published in a community of 10,000 persons or less, could receive would be $1,500 a newspaper. It could not get very far on that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if any money is now being paid by any agency of the Government to any advertising agency to advertise the sale of War bonds.

Mr. DANAHER. So far as I know, there is no agency advertising the sale of War bonds except the United States Treasury, and I am informed that the Treasury Department is expending some of its appropriation to further the sale of War bonds through advertising, but that in connection with the advertising for which the Treasury does pay, it is following the usual tenets of advertising practice. The Treasury places its advertising in those newspapers which have an enormous reader appeal, with wide distribution, in an effort to reach the largest number of people with the story of the attractiveness of an investment in a United States Government bond. In other words, I have no doubt that the Treasury is paying, let us say, the New York Times, the Chicago Sun, the Chicago News, and other newspapers of that class. Those are merely samples; I do not know that the Treasury is actually engaging those very newspapers, and I do not know to what extent money in fact is paid to them; but the amount of money spent amounts to as much as several hundred dollars a page.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not find in the report of the hearings on the bill the evidence which I should like to have in answer to my query. Is the Senator positively sure that the Treasury is paying these large newspapers money for large advertisements?

Mr. DANAHER. It was so testified, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. By the Treasury?

Mr. DANAHER. No; not by the Treasury, but by other witnesses; and I will say further to the Senator that the Treasury itself is opposed to the bill, for the Treasury says, "We already have the authority and we already have the appropriation, and we do not want the Congress to tell us how we are going to spend it." In other words, the Treasury says, "We want to be able to develop sales of War bonds in the most practicable, efficient, and productive manner possible." That is the Treasury's position with reference to the bill.

Indeed, that is the position, let me say, of the O. W. I. and other agencies of Government which were contacted, all of which made reports, and the reports of their views appear in the printed hearings, I will say to the Senator, all in opposition to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no authentic information, but I did get the word that the United States Treasury is not paying anyone anything for advertising for the sale of War bonds.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Treasury is not paying anything except for radio advertising.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much radio advertising was paid for last year?

Mr. DANAHER. I think the amount runs to approximately $180,000,000, estimated, of free time for the promotion of War bond sales. I heard that estimate stated yesterday by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I do not know which side has the advantage in this discussion, but I think we should keep the record straight. I believe I heard every word testified before the committee. I do not understand that the Government is paying anything for newspaper advertising of bond issues. Of course, tremendous deductions for the cost of advertisements—I do not know how much they amount to—are made from income, but directly the Government is not paying anything to newspapers for advertising. Other branches of the Government are paying for advertisements, and all those payments go to the large newspapers, as the Senator has stated. I refer to the War Department, the Navy Department, and one or two other agencies of Government. But the benefit goes indirectly to the larger newspapers.

Mr. DANAHER. There was some evidence, as the Senator will recall—and I hope he will refresh my mind if I am in error on this point, but I think I am correct—that the War Department utilized an appropriation of approximately $3,000,000, for War Department advertising, for recruiting notices and the like, and that only 1 percent of it went to newspapers, which would be the beneficiaries under the provisions of the pending bill; is that not so?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct; and the Navy Department also spent a large amount—more than $1,000,000—and did not pay a single cent to the newspapers.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Alabama to say that the United States Treasury was not paying any money to any advertising agency for the sale of War bonds at this time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not to newspapers.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Treasury paying it to anyone?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Treasury paying it to outdoor advertisers?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot say. Frankly, although no evidence was presented, I do not think they are paying anything for outdoor advertising. Of course, they have enormous expense both in the matter of preparation of material for all sorts of suggested advertisements, most of which go into the wastepaper baskets of the newspapers, and for the purchase of mats and things of that sort, and for the employment of personnel; but I do not understand that they were paying anything directly to the newspapers, for newspaper advertising.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if I was in error on that point, I desire to thank the Senator from Alabama for refreshing my recollection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I knew the Senator would want me to say what I did.

Mr. DANAHER. But I think there was some testimony in the record with reference to the large city dailies, which were said to have carried advertising in behalf of the Treasury for the promotion of War-bond sales. However, I shall verify that from the record.

I thank the Senator. However, whether that be the exact fact or not, it in no way militates against the reply I made to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course. I simply wanted to get the matter straight for the record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Reynolds
Ball	Gillette	Robertson
Bankhead	Green	Scrugham
Barbour	Guffey	Shipstead
Barkley	Gurney	Smith
Bilbo	Hatch	Stewart
Brewster	Hawkes	Taft
Bridges	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Holman	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Butler	Kilgore	Tydings
Byrd	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lucas	Van Nuys
Caraway	McClellan	Wagner
Chavez	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	Wherry
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	O'Daniel	Willis
Eastland	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Pepper	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FEDERAL FOOD SUBSIDIES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a telegram from Clark L. Brody, chairman of the Michigan food conference. The telegram speaks for itself. In a word, he is complaining, on behalf of a very general constituency in Michigan, against charging today's grocery bill to posterity and to our returning soldiers.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANSING, MICH., *November 15, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Michigan food conference of farmers, processors, and distributors asks Senate Committee on Agriculture to vote for discontinuance of Federal food subsidies. We believe consumer subsidies for food are not needed and cannot be justified in this period of full employment and high wages. Farmers favor fair prices in market place rather than subsidies and will accept price controls comparable to those for other groups. We believe subsidies are the road to increased Government regulation for producers, processors, and distributors. Our conference includes Michigan's State organizations of farmers, canners, dairy manufacturers, packers, grocers, creameries, feed manufacturers, and poultry industries.

CLARK L. BRODY, *Chairman.*

THE BALANCE OF POWER IN EUROPE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very enlightening article printed in the Nineteenth Century and After, an English publication founded in 1887. The article is by the editor of the publication, Mr. F. A. Voigt. I wish to call attention to what Frank C. Hanighen has said with reference to this editor in an article published in the Progressive of November 8, 1943:

Time was when J. L. Garvin, of the London Observer, offered weekly the most significant indications of the coming currents of British policy. But in recent years keen observers have turned for the low-down to another writer whose views possess authority and have found confirmation in events.

WHY ENGLAND WENT TO WAR

Voigt edits the austere magazine Nineteenth Century and After, a review of impeccable respectability. Sir Arnold Wilson, who voiced well the Neville Chamberlain mind, preceded Voigt as editor. Wickham Stead, formerly editor of the London Times, preceded Wilson. Mr. Voigt himself is well known as the spokesman of Lord Vansittart, who was long Britain's influential permanent Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He expressed Vansittart's views in the years preceding the outbreak of the war, when this man, then known as the brains of the foreign office, clashed with the appeasement policy of Chamberlain.

Voigt plumped for a strong stand against the Axis before, during, and after Munich. He hailed the Anglo-Polish Pact as a cornerstone of British policy, and he called for Winston Churchill to lead the nation. After 1939, Voigt advocated the well-known Vansittart policy of treating Germany rough after the war. In short, Voigt has served as a very reliable weather vane of ruling-class thinking.

His leading article in the current number of his magazine, therefore, assumes special significance today. Voigt never minces words.

I believe that this article is extremely interesting in view of the background of the publication and of Voigt. The article appeared in the September 1943 issue of the Nineteenth Century and After. The article reads as follows:

INTEGRATION OR DISINTEGRATION?

I

It is fashionable to dismiss the balance of power as an obsolete doctrine. It is not a doctrine. It is, for Great Britain and the Empire, the immutable condition of survival. Any power that becomes undisputed master of the European mainland, can become master of the British Isles. This is an old truth, and was familiar to the last generation. The German menace displayed it anew. But now it is being forgotten. If it fades out of the national consciousness, and ceases to inform national policy, then the days of England's greatness will be over.

England has no one permanent foe in Europe, for none of her vital interests conflict with the vital interests of any European power. Her only foe is that power, or that coalition of powers, which may endeavor to dominate Europe. Against that foe she must always be ready, always be strong, and always have allies. As her foe varies, so her allies vary. The foe of yesterday may be the ally of tomorrow and the ally of yesterday the foe of tomorrow.

The power of the British Empire, plus the power of continental allies, will, if the Empire is strong, always balance the power of whatever powers seek domination. And as long as the balance is maintained, there will be peace, for no one power can prevail over the rest of Europe plus the British Empire, as long as the Empire is strong.

This simple mechanism is the balance of power. It exists by virtue of the immutable physical realities. Neither the League of Nations, nor any system of collective security, nor disarmament can change these realities. As soon as the balance of power is challenged, every collective system will collapse and England will, if she is not to perish, make the counterchallenge. She did so in 1939. The mechanism of the balance was released and the League of Nations was at once deprived of whatever reality it had ever possessed on the 1st of September in that year, on the day when Germany attacked Poland and, so releasing the mechanism, began the Second World War. England fought to preserve the balance—for that reason and no other.

The commonly accepted view that Germany made war to dominate the world is, in our opinion, mistaken.

If some person or newspaper should make such a statement in the United States the one responsible would be promptly summoned before the grand jury here in Washington.

She wanted to be a world power, but world power and world domination are not the same thing (England is a world power, but she does not dominate the world). Hitler would have been glad to share the world with the English. They are the only nation for whom he had any deep regard. His book, Mein Kampf, is permeated by this regard, just as it is permeated by Hitler's contempt for his own people, the Germans. His main purpose in going to war was to subjugate the European mainland and then to open up Russia for German colonization. Had England remained neutral, he would have been successful.

But she would then have been at his mercy, or at the mercy of his successor—in any case, at the mercy of the German Nation. Against the new masters of Europe, for they would have had at their disposal resources much vaster than those of the British and American empires combined, they would, having imposed peace on Russia, have made themselves impregnable on land, they would have commanded the narrow seas of the Mediterranean. Nothing could have saved England from destruction—except the good will of the Germans. And on that good will there can be no reliance. Indeed, no nation (the English alone excepted, perhaps) would, if able to grasp so rich a prize, refrain—the richest prize that would ever have fallen to any conqueror.

It was to avert this fate that England went to war in 1939. It is to avert a similar fate in future years that the balance of power must always be maintained. The political complexion of those that threaten the balance is quite irrelevant. Had Germany been the home of enlightenment, progress, and political freedom, had she been a model democracy, and had England been cursed with a political system as abominable as Hitler's, she would nonetheless have been under the absolute necessity of maintaining the balance, for survival must always come first, political complexion second.

If Germany change her political complexion, as well she may at the approach of defeat, that will be no reason for modifying the prospective terms of peace. The nature of the peace must be determined by the enduring realities of the European situation, not by transient phenomena like fascism, national socialism, socialism, or communism. The exorbitant strength of Germany must be reduced and it must be kept reduced. Better a despotically governed Germany that is not too strong than a liberal Germany that is too strong. The peace that will end the Second World War must be such that the balance of power will be restored and will be preserved for generations to come. This must be the primary war aim and peace aim of Great Britain and of the Empire. All other aims are secondary or irrelevant—or, insofar as they obstruct and obscure the primary aim, a deadly menace. Unless the primary aim is achieved, the war may have been won, but the peace will have been lost—that is to say, the Second World War, like the first, will have been won in vain.

II

When Germany has been defeated, she must be integrated in the new European order. There is much discussion as to how she shall become part of that order and be prevented from destroying it for the third time. It seems to us that the discussion proceeds, for the most part, from a mistaken premise. The exorbitant power of Germany must be reduced, it is true. But power is always relative. It is true, that even in absolute terms Germany's power must be reduced. She cannot, for example, be allowed to retain the undivided control of Rhenish-Westphalian industry or to maintain military establishments in the Rhineland. But it is far more important than the weakening of Germany be relative rather than absolute. It is always better to rely on one's own strength than on the weakness of others. The future European order must be based on its own intrinsic strength rather than on the weakness of one of its members. A certain reduction of Germany's exorbitant power having been accomplished, it will be necessary to build up the strength—political and economic, as well as military—that will constitute the new European order. Far more important than the forcible disintegration of Germany is the free integration of Europe as a whole. Far more important than the impoverishment of Germany is the increased prosperity of the other European nations.

It will be found that European integration is, in a last analysis, the concomitant of the balance of power. Without European integration, the balance of power cannot be maintained. Without the balance of power, there can be no integrated Europe. It is a

common error—and one persistently propagated by the Germans—to suppose that the balance of power divides Europe. The opposite is true—it unites Europe against every attempt at domination. The balance is not the cause of war—the failure to maintain it is the cause of war. Europe, balanced and integrated, means an enduring peace and security for all.

The French and the British Empires are complementary. The two stand and fall together. Without the defense of French Indochina there can be no defense of Singapore. The defense of Madagascar belongs to the security of the Indian Ocean. The defense of French north and equatorial Africa belongs to the security of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. In Europe the French alliance is indispensable to the balance of power and to the security of these islands. And without the English alliance, France is lost, for she cannot alone maintain an ascendancy over the Germans. An alliance between her and Russia will give her but a precarious security, for she could never be sure that it would not be superseded by an alliance between Russia and Germany.

It is, therefore, necessary that no political bias, no endeavor to inflict upon the French any particular doctrine be allowed to deflect British foreign policy from the pursuit of one aim with regard to France—a close and enduring entente. No one can tell what political system will prevail in France. But this is her concern, not England's. For England there must be one overriding consideration with regard to France—that she be strong, united, and a loyal ally, whether she be liberal or authoritarian, republican or royalist.

French unity can only come from within, and there is little England can do to help it come except to remain aloof from political dissensions inside France and always to be the true friend of the French people, no matter what their political complexion.

The recovery of France may take a long time. She has prospects of future greatness, but in terms of political and military power she will hardly be what she once was, not for many years to come.

The importance of western Europe, is declining. So is the importance of Germany, beyond even the decline resulting from her defeat. She will have been ravaged far more fearfully by the Second World War than by the first. Her losses are far greater, both in lives and in material, and will take longer to repair. It is hard to imagine that the present generation of Germans, at least, will lightly go to war again with Russia—or with England. And Germany, like France and England, will be a country of the old rather than of the young.

Weakness on the part of the victorious powers will always tempt the Germans, to retrieve their lost fortunes. Any measure of general disarmament will, in effect, rearm the Germans, seeing that armaments are always relative, not absolute. Any system of collective security will, by imposing upon the victorious powers the obligation of quelling aggression all over the world, and so deflecting foreign policy from its legitimate purpose of promoting national interests—afford a patient, vigilant, and resolute Germany the chance of recovering what she has lost. Nevertheless, it seems to us that the German problem is soluble—but only if England has a sound political conception, without which Europe will be lost—and England with Europe. It is a most dangerous error to assume that the German problem exhausts the European problem, and that the European problem will have been solved when Germany has been reduced to permanent impotence. The European problem cannot be solved unless the eastern European problem is solved. What is the European problem? It is the integration of Europe and the reestablishment of what Burke called the common law of Europe, from which the Germans, under Hitler's revolutionary leadership, have broken away. What is the eastern European problem? It is the maintenance of the countries between the Baltic and Aegean as independent communities and their integration as an organic whole. Because those countries were not independent during the period when Germany became a great power, and because, although independent as a result of the First World War, they were not integrated. Europe achieved neither balance nor integration and the European problem remained unsolved.

Europe cannot submit to a general, uniform federation, for a Europe that is not multiform is not Europe at all. Europe demands variety. When differences are deep, they are not solved but intensified by union. A general federation would not put an end to war—it would merely replace war between nations by civil war. It is only when neighboring nations have a certain community of outlook and common vital interests that federation is possible—and by vital we mean essential to life, to sheer existence. The nations between the Baltic and Aegean have this vital interest in common, that they stand and fall together. They are under a double and deadly menace. If they do not find political, economic, and strategic cohesion in a confederacy, they will come under the domination of Germany or of Russia or of both. This will be their doom, for under neither power can there be any question of genuine home rule or even of semi-independence.

Whatever power is master of that region—which has been called the middle zone—

He is referring to the region between the Baltic and the Aegean Seas—

is master of all Europe. That is why this region is the most contested and coveted of all. There is a policy—of which the Times is the chief exponent—which, if it were carried out, would divide Europe into two spheres of interest, the one western and British (or Anglo-American), the other eastern and Russia. This policy is incompatible with the existence of Europe as an organic whole, with integrated and balanced Europe—and also with the security of the British Empire, for today, eastern Europe has come to comprise the industries of central Europe and the eastern Mediterranean. To be master of eastern Europe is, therefore, to be master of all Europe. If England were to abdicate in eastern Europe, she would be abdicating in all Europe. Such a policy would lead to her isolation, it would destroy the British ascendancy in the Near and Middle East, it would, by placing the Balkans and the straits under the domination of one power, bring the British command of the Mediterranean to an end. It would isolate Turkey and eliminate British influence in Iraq and in Iran, and threaten the security of India and of the Persian Gulf. It would compel England to reconsider her attitude toward Germany.

In other words, what he is speaking of and what clearly he is afraid of is that Russia will dominate the area known as the Middle East from the Baltic to the Aegean. He says further:

It would also establish a gigantic rivalry in Europe. The Rhenish-Westphalian industrial area would be in one sphere, the Central-European in another. The Germans would be in between and, however weak they might be, they would hold the balance. Germany, not England, would hold the balance of power, and she would tip it now on one side and now on the other, gathering strength the while, until she could demand her price. And she would, if she were fortunate in her statesmen, either dominate Europe in association with France and the Low Countries, or with Russia. In time she would achieve what she failed to achieve in two world wars, herself become the master power.

None of these eventualities would be compatible with the vital interests—and, therefore, with the survival—of England These interests demand that she hold the balance against any power or coalition of powers that may strive to dominate the European mainland, no matter what the internal politics of that power may be. Beyond this, British foreign policy must always be entirely empirical.

Every military alliance is a provisional measure against a common foe. When that foe has been overthrown, the alliance may continue until the danger that he may rise again has passed. When that danger has gone, the alliance loses its meaning.

The general situation will always be changing with the ever-changing interplay of political and economic forces, with the rise of some nations, the decline of others, and the making and unmaking of other alliances and confederacies. In war, the common purpose—the defeat of the foe—will override every other.

But it does not follow that between allies there will not be profound differences, even at the height of a war. It is better to recognize these differences and overcome them than to ignore them. The power that ignores them and is not vigilant and resolute in safeguarding its vital interests amid the displacements and shiftings of influence and power which war brings about even amongst allies and neutrals, will find itself at an immense, and perhaps a fatal, disadvantage when the war is over. Vital interests have to be defended against all—against enemies by war, and against allies by diplomacy, by firmness, and by close collaboration with others who have the same vital interests

In the First World War there was repeated tension between Great Britain and the United States, both when the United States were neutral and when they were an associated power. Both parties would have suffered lasting injury if both had not been resolute in upholding their interests—the failure of either Government to do so would have been failure in its duty to its own nation, present and future. Nor was the common effort against the common foe impaired. Indeed, weakness, when there is tension with another power, is more likely to produce a rupture in the end than firmness, as the history of appeasement has shown.

There was tension between Great Britain and France, both during the war and after. When in October 1918 the Allies were contemplating operations against Constantinople and the French insisted that the naval command should be in French hands. Mr. Lloyd George wrote to M. Clemenceau.

We have taken by far the larger part of the burden of the war against Turkey in the Dardanelles and in Gallipoli, in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, and in Palestine. The British Government has agreed that the commander in chief of the Allied armies in France should be a French general; it has agreed that the commander in chief of the Allied armies in the Balkans should be a French general. I do not see how I could possibly justify to the people of the British Empire that, at the moment when the final attack upon Turkey was to be delivered, the command of naval forces which are overwhelmingly British, in a theater of war associated with some of the most desperate and heroic fighting by troops from nearly every part of the British Empire, should be handed over to a French admiral as well.[1]

After a stubborn dispute, the French gave way. The reasons why the British Govern-

[1] Sir Frederick Maurice: The Armistice of 1918 (Oxford University Press).

ment showed such firmness were not reasons of prestige and strategy alone—they were also political. To have practiced appeasement toward the United States and France in the last war, would have left Great Britain at an immense disadvantage at the end of the war—and in the peace that followed. Nor would it have been conducive to a better relationship between the three powers later on, but rather the opposite.

The same is true today. A resolute foreign policy, a firmness in upholding national interests against foreign aspirations that are prejudicial to them, even if these aspirations are those of Allied Powers, is as necessary today as it always was and always will be.

III

The United States are, at present, chiefly concerned with the prospects of long-term investment. Their greatest interest is in South America and, after South America, in China. Europe and north Africa come only third. The result, in Europe, may be an Anglo-American economic rivalry. But this does not make conflict inevitable. Great Britain and the United States have a common interest in the economic development of Europe, especially of the region between the Baltic and the Aegean, a region capable of measureless economic development. Politically, American influence in Europe is, at present, more beneficial than British influence, for the Americans are, as far as they are able, endeavoring to support those political forces that tend to promote stability, whereas the British attempt to introduce a kind of revolutionary democracy, irrespective of the consequences and regardless of the precise meaning of the term, and are, thereby, promoting, rather than arresting, instability and disintegration.

The United States appears to be far less interested in France than they used to be, or indeed in western Europe. Their interest is in Europe as a whole and more in eastern and southeastern Europe than heretofore. Broadly speaking, therefore, while indifferent to the balance of power (and hostile to the sound of the term rather than to the reality that underlies it, a reality that is imperfectly understood across the Atlantic), they are, in effect, working for the integration of Europe.

It is impossible to anticipate how strong Russia will be when the war is over. However great her losses have been—and they have been prodigious, through hunger at home as well as through death, wounds, and destruction in battle—she has immense recuperative power. The prospect is that she will play a much larger part in the affairs of the world after the war than she did before.

Her aims in Europe are made clear by her declared policies and her propaganda and by the support she gives to various armed Partisan movements, and to political parties that are Communist in all but name. The Comintern, which was officially disbanded a short while ago, is now a permanent congress, representing the Communist and pro-Russian movements of all countries, but following a national rather than a social program. In Germany, Russia, in her propaganda supports a prospective Conservative, rather than a prospective Socialist opposition, and is evidently preparing for a special arrangement with the Germany that will emerge from the war. Broadly speaking, Russia is promoting the disintegration of all Europe and, in particular, of the region between the Baltic and the Aegean. She has declared the future annexation of the eastern half of Poland and has carried out a clandestine occupation of that half by means of secret emissaries. By the activities of the Polish Workers Party (which is directed from Russia) in western Poland and by her attempts to stir up premature insurrection, it is evident that she means to make western Poland a Russian dependency. By thwarting every attempt at collaboration between Poland and Czechoslovakia and by promoting the disintegration of Yugoslavia in particular and of the Balkans in general, she has isolated Czechoslovakia (she now proposes to complete this isolation by inviting the Czechoslovak Government to make its headquarters in Moscow). Russia is determined to control the industries of central and southeastern Europe, especially those of Bohemia. Control of the latter would enable her to transfer the movable plant to the Urals and to direct Czech skilled labor, of which she will be in great need, to the Russian interior. She is also promoting the disintegration of Rumania, with a view, no doubt, to controlling the delta of the Danube and the oil fields. She is determined to secure direct, unimpeded access to the Mediterranean and perhaps even to the Adriatic.

The situation in Iran is obscure, but the chronic unrest that prevails there would seem to suggest a parallel to the Balkans. It may be that Russia is endeavoring to promote the isolation of Turkey, also, and is preparing to create a Russian sphere of influence extending to the Persian Gulf. Broadly speaking, Russia sees the opportunity of acquiring, as the result of the Second World War, more than all she has coveted along her western and southwestern borders throughout the whole of her history.

If she succeeds she will, in time, be master of Europe, perhaps in association with Germany. Master also, it may be, of a region extending from the eastern Mediterranean to India.

But her difficulties may be far greater than they seem. The countries between the Baltic and the Aegean have a total population of more than a hundred million. They are acutely aware of the Russian danger and the brief experience some of them had of the Russian occupation in 1939, leaves them in no doubt as to what annexation by Russia would mean in practice. Even the Czechs, whose attitude has always been favorable to Russia, are profoundly disquieted. If the Germans had not made themselves so hated by their barbarities, and if they could hold out any prospect of genuine independence to the countries of eastern and southeastern Europe, they could count on allies who would, together, be very powerful.

It is a weakness of Germany today that her political system is excessively rigid. If, as defeat approaches, she is able to change that system and to rid herself of Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebbels, and become liberal, she may yet gain a considerable access of strength. She herself is certainly more preoccupied with her eastern front than with any other, and is carrying out a strategic withdrawal on a big scale with the evident purpose of shortening that front and of rendering it impregnable. Even if she were in a mood to capitulate to the western allies, it is hardly conceivable that she would capitulate to Russia unless she were so completely broken and demoralized as to be resigned to any fate, however catastrophic. On the other hand, it is likely that, if the war drags on, she will endeavor to negotiate a separate peace on terms not unfavorable to Russia.

But even in possession of so vast an area as the "middle zone," Russia would not find security. The Balkan nations, especially the Serbs, would resist Russia no less than German domination. Balkan unrest would be perpetuated. Europe would not find peace.

Russian aspirations contain the stuff of all Anglo-Russian tension for the last 100 years. They would, if realized, overthrow the balance of power. They would, in the end, compel Great Britain, whether she liked it or not, to modify her attitude towards Germany. Is an Anglo-Russian conflict therefore inevitable? It is not, though it will certainly come if the issue is not faced, if the English press continues to conceal it (whereas the American and the neutral press expounds it freely and at length) and if the conduct of British foreign policy, by its compliance and its ingrained habit of appeasement lead, or rather mislead, Russia into the belief that Great Britain and the Empire are much weaker than they are in reality and much more accommodating than they are likely to remain.

British interests in eastern and southeastern Europe can be defined by the one word—integration. The countries between the Baltic and the Aegean dispose of immense actual and potential resources. Germany has carried out a great industrial concentration in Bohemia, Silesia, Austria, and the outlying regions, so as to keep her industrial production as far away as possible from Allied airdromes. The middle zone has, what it had not after the last war, the making of a vast industrial as well as agrarian community. The population, although divided in several obdurate ways, has certain deeper affinities and is being drawn together by the common danger. The desire for some form of confederacy is deepening and widening, especially amongst the younger generation. In those countries which are in themselves divided—in Poland, for example, where there is division between Poles and Ukranians; in Czechoslovakia, between Czechs and Slovaks; in Yugoslavia, between Serbs and Croats—there is a desire for a wider allegiance that will transcend the internal antagonisms.

Given a few years of peace, the middle zone could establish itself as a political, military, and economic unit on a confederate basis. It would, with the rising birth rate that is common to eastern and southeastern Europe, have an expanding population. It would also have an expanding production and an ever higher standard of living. It would be a market for British and American exports and a field for British and American investment. If the middle zone attains a certain cohesion, it will, as a power, be at least equal to Germany and, in time, superior. Its existence will give Russia absolute security along her western border, and, therefore, in Asia, for if Russia need fear no attack in Europe she will be strong enough to overcome any foe in Asia. Whereas for England, the command of the Mediterranean and, therefore, the freedom of the Balkans from foreign domination is a vital interest; to Russia, these are but secondary interests, if they are interests at all in any ultimate sense.

The middle zone of independent confederated powers is much more likely to open than to close Europe and Russia to one another, whereas a Russian domination would bring the zone, and one of the great industrial centers of Europe, into Russia's closed economic and closed political system. It would bring upon Europe deep division, economic ruin, and political disaster, from which Great Britain could not escape. And the gainer, in the end, would not even be Russia, but Germany.

The confederacy of the middle zone must be built up from within. It cannot be imposed from outside. But if to promote it were an object of British—and perhaps American—foreign policy, the impulse to build it up from within would be powerfully augmented. The reconstruction of Europe and every attempt at organic integration, is paralyzed in advance if Great Britain has no foreign policy. As her armed might grows, her political influence declines, and while she is winning the war, she has begun to lose the peace. Russia has a policy, and a clear one. The United States have a policy. England has none, although she has all that is needed, far more so than either Russia or the United States, to have a foreign policy.

She is stronger than she has ever been before, she is near Europe and can, by virtue of her strategic situation, gain equal access to almost all Europe, and she is, alone of European great powers, feared by none because all know that she does not strive for domination, and that as long as she holds the balance the peace of Europe and the independence of all European nations is guaranteed.

A British foreign policy that will promote the union of the countries between the Baltic and the Aegean is necessary to the solution of the whole European problem. Without it, England cannot win the peace as well as the war. It affords the only hope that the progressive disintegration of Europe may be arrested, that there will be a long period of peace, and stability, and that the Second World War will be the last. It is the only hope that civilization, as Europe understands that term, will survive.

THE EDITOR.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the article was written by an editor who is extremely close to the Foreign Office, and likewise extremely close to the ruling classes in Europe, it is certainly something that we should bear in mind when the representatives of this country go to the peace table.

AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO MARINE SGT. JOHN BASILONE

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, we are all aware of the numerous acts of heroism performed by many of the fine men and women in our armed forces, and I recognize the difficulty of singling out any one instance of particular heroism for special comment. However, as a Representative of the people of the great State of New Jersey, I feel it is my duty to call the attention of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives to a recent article which appeared in the magazine section of the Washington Post of November 7. The article reviews an act of such extraordinary heroism and accomplishment, by Marine Sgt. John Basilone, a veteran of Guadalcanal and a resident of my State of New Jersey that it justified the President of the United States in awarding to him the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In reading this story of how Marine Sgt. John Basilone, with only a handful of men, kept a regiment of nearly 3,000 Japs from breaking through Lunga Ridge, and annihilated the entire regiment, my mind reverts to the time in the First World War when the same spirit of patriotism and devotion to duty brought a determined and united French people to the point, in the Battle of Verdun, where they said, "They shall not pass," and the Germans did not pass. In this case, Sgt. John Basilone and his handful of men determined the Japs should not pass, and they did not pass.

I recommend the reading of this story by every Member of Congress and all of the American people, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL FOR EXTRAORDINARY HEROISM—THE JAPS WERE DRIVING DOWN ON GUADALCANAL'S HENDERSON FIELD, AND IN THEIR WAY WAS ONLY MARINE SGT. JOHN BASILONE WITH A HANDFUL OF MEN

The scene is a narrow pass between two hills. It is called Lunga Ridge, Guadalcanal.

John Basilone, 26-year old sergeant in the marines, and a small contingent of his men lie quietly in a shallow trench, guarding the pass. Suddenly the flash from an advanced post comes over Basilone's field telephone.

"Large Jap force approaching your position. You are outnumbered a hundred to one, at least. But hold."

John's position is one-half mile from Henderson Field, the American air base on Guadalcanal. John knows that this field controls 1,000 miles of the air over the southern Pacific battle front.

All Sergeant Basilone has to stop the Japs with are four heavy machine guns and a little rifle protection.

Now he hears the Japs cutting the barbed wire in the woods, 75 yards across the field that lies in front of their gun positions.

"Stick around, fellers," John says. And a couple of them laugh, softly, nervously.

A carpet of moonlight spreads across the field and by this light John sees a black form come out of the trees at the far end. Another follows it. Then more and more. These forms throw themselves flat on the ground, start to wriggle slowly toward the marines. A whole wave of Japs are coming, a few feet apart, through the jungle.

The Japs are cutting barbed wire strung across the field. Some of them crawl under it. Now the slithering forms are closer—50 yards, 40 yards, 30 yards.

"Let them have it," John says in a low voice.

The guns open up, bullets jump across the field at the Japs. John sees Japs half rising when they are hit, and falling back to the ground. Others twist on the ground, arms and legs flailing.

THE JAPS TRY HEAVIER GUNS

Their mortar shells begin to lob onto the field from behind the trees. The shells are short of the mark. They can't get the range, and their guns soon slow up.

Now for the first time John notices that heavy artillery fire is coming up from the marine batteries in back of him. Shells are going over into the rear of the Japs at the other end of the breach. In the distance John can hear the baroom, baroom of other attacks.

The Japs begin to come on again. This time they come from the sides of the field to the left and right. The marines shift their guns around in the holes to meet them. The Japs begin to throw grenades from their positions, and John feels the ground shake.

Suddenly over on his right there's a loud explosion and the guns there stop firing. In a few seconds a marine crawls across to John. It is private La Pointe.

"Both guns are dead, Sergeant," La Pointe reports.

John raises himself up on one knee, puts his arms around the hot gun Bullard has been firing.

"Powell, Garland," he orders, "we're going over there with La Pointe."

John picks up the machine gun, carries it in his arms across to the other gun position. In a moment it has been set up and Powell is behind it, his hand on the trigger, blasting. The hole has been hit—and hit hard. All but two of the men are badly wounded.

John crawls to the first of the two damaged guns. It is beyond repair. He goes to the second, a few yards away.

A Jap in the woods gets their range with a submachine gun. John, crouching low, examines the second gun as the bullets splash around him.

The moon has been blotted out by clouds. It is pitch black. John has to work with his hands, using only his sense of touch. In 30 seconds he has taken the gun apart. The training he received in marine school taught him to take guns apart blindfolded—it's paying off heavily now.

Like a surgeon in an emergency operation, he deftly locates the trouble.

"The head spacing is out of line," he yells to Powell above the roar of guns.

"Tough," Powell yells back. "That gun's a dead pigeon."

But John is already working on the breech. Powell knows that any marine in the foxholes that night would try to fix the gun, no matter how slim the chance of success might be. But he knows, too, that John has the skill that might make the repair of the gun just barely possible.

Powell gives his gun another burst. Japs are coming out of the field on the right, charging for all they're worth. Powell hears John say something. Then he hears a machine gun on his right began to shoot. John has put the gun back into action.

Powell wants to holler his admiration for the job his sergeant has done, but all he can say is, "John! Attaboy, John!"

The Japs are surprised by the two guns firing from the position they thought they'd knocked out. They disperse, drop back into the wood.

John reaches for a machine-gun belt. There are only a few left out of the explosion that hit the hole.

John knows the Japs are reorganizing in the wood and that the next attack will be heavier, all out. The marines have three guns to meet it, but the ammunition dump is 100 yards away at Henderson Field—100 yards on the winding path through the wood in back. "I'm going back for a little powder," he says to Powell.

He crawls to the path, gets up and begins to run. He is weak and stiff in the legs. Running, he must remember the bends in the dark path so that he won't plunge headlong into the brush.

In a few moments his muscles limber up. But the path seems endless. A grenade explodes behind him, tearing the night to ribbons. Fragments sing by his head. He isn't touched.

Another grenade bursts, closed behind him, but he is still unhurt. The bullets of snipers, firing at him by ear, sing by. It seems impossible he can still be uninjured, but he is.

Then he comes to the end of the path. Half the journey is done—the easiest half.

He goes into the ammunition dump. The sight of it standing there reassures him; there has been no Jap break-through at any point. He pulls cartridge belts out of a box, throws them across both shoulders. Then he picks up the box and the belts left in it, starts back along the path.

The cartridge belts hang down from his shoulders, bang on his legs. He stops, pulls the belts up. He can hear heavy firing all around him. He starts again, bending low under the box he is carrying.

Burdened as he is, the path seems even longer than before. In the jungles around him the Jap snipers are still trying for him. Bullets scream past his head, plunk into trees. Not a one touches him. Then he's back. He's made it, somehow.

When he reaches the ridge there isn't a sound of a gun. He veers off to his left, sees the men at the gun there and drops 6 belts, 1,500 rounds. That should hold them for a while.

Crouching, he starts for the guns on the right. A Jap sniper cuts loose. John dives to the ground and hauls himself and the

cartridge belts along painfully. He makes it. He drops seven belts and directs Powell to load the gun on his left. On his belly John craws to the other gun, tells Garland to cover him while he loads the gun he repaired.

The Japs have nearly perfect range now, are driving bullets desperately close. John opens the tripod, flattens the big gun on the earth's surface. Lying flat, aiming the gun, his helmet slips down over his eyes. He rips the helmet off. Bareheaded, with his chin almost on the ground, John squeezes the trigger in short bursts as the Japs charge. The gun is hot. The belt of ammunition is running out. John yells to Garland to reload that gun and rolls over to the left to the fully loaded gun waiting for him there. John lines his sights and starts shooting again.

The earth begins to shake again from the Jap mortar fire. John's bullets sing across the field.

The Japs are lumped together where they fall. But the attackers are determined. They use piled-up bodies as a wall, and submachine gunners have gained close positions, using these bodies for protection. John shifts his gun a few feet and gets a new angle on them. Bodies had been blocking his range.

Firing one gun till a belt is empty, rolling over and firing the second gun that's been reloaded for him, then repeating the maneuver, John keeps up a rattle of deadly accurate fire. The Japs cannot advance.

The dawn breaks at last. Tiredly John looks behind him and sees the welcome sight—reinforcements coming along the path from Henderson Field. John turns to his gun again, peppering the last of the Jap attack. He knows they have won now. Soon there is no longer any sound from the Jap side.

John hears his name. Lieutenant Colonel Puller, John's commanding officer, stands nearby with his hand outstretched. John shakes hands with him.

"I hear you came back for ammunition," Lieutenant Colonel Puller remarks. "Good work."

The marines are setting up new guns, getting ready for the next attack. Powell, La Pointe, and a few others who have been with John are able to make their way back through the woods, back to Henderson Field.

John sticks on at his post until 6 o'clock the next afternoon, till the last Jap has tried and failed to break through Lunga Ridge.

A regiment of Japs, over 2,900 men, has been annihilated. And America has a new hero.

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BOND SALES BY NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1457) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, on page 2, line 12.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder if we can not get action on that amendment, and make a little progress with the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the second amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "expended", it is proposed to insert "for the purchase of such advertising space", so as to read:

Provided, That one-half of the total amount made available during each fiscal year pursuant to this act shall be expended for the purchase of such advertising space in daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, and communities of 10,000 population or less, and one-half of such amount shall be expended for the purchase of such advertising space in daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, and communities of more than 10,000 population.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, in section 3, page 3, line 9, to insert after the period "In the distribution of such advertisements, the same space shall be offered to all newspapers to be paid for at the prevailing published rate for the respective newspapers", so as to make the paragraph read:

SEC. 3. (a) In order to secure the best financial results for the United States consistent with such program, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in cooperation with recognized existing nonprofit national newspaper publishers' associations to be designated by him (including one such association representing principally daily newspapers and one representing principally weekly newspapers), prepare newspaper advertisements and fairly distribute such advertisements to all newspapers in accordance with section 1 of this act. In the distribution of such advertisements, the same space shall be offered to all newspapers to be paid for at the prevailing published rate for the respective newspapers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama explain to us what is meant by this committee amendment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to do so. It was included so as to make certain, so far as possible, that there could be no discrimination in the distribution of advertisements. The Senator will note that the amendment provides for the same space in all newspapers, to be paid for at the prevailing published rate of each newspaper. Of course, the advertising rates of the newspapers vary in accordance with the volume of circulation, and the rates are established and accepted by the advertising agencies and the advertisers, if they are satisfactory, and they are promulgated and supplied to the advertising trade. So we figured that under this amendment the Treasury Department, even if it desired, could not give a newspaper an advertisement which would be better than those given to other newspapers, and could not give one less. They would have to give them all the same amount, according to their advertising rate.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Assume that a page in the New York Times would cost $700. Would it be the Senator's thought that, under this amendment, the Treasury would go to a newspaper with a circulation of 2,000, say, and get 14 advertisements at $50 apiece?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whether they would get that many advertisements, or how they would work it out, but during the fiscal year they would be obliged to take advertising which would bring to each newspaper the same amount of money, based upon its published rates.

Mr. DANAHER. There was some testimony in the hearings, as the Senator will recall, that it would cost the Treasury $484,000 for each insertion of a like advertisement in all newspapers, dailies, and weeklies alike. Is it the Senator's understanding that by the language proposed to be inserted, each time the Treasury placed an advertisement it would cost $484,000 right across, to all the newspapers, to handle the advertising?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The rate of pay for the advertising shall be based upon the same amount of space, so that if an advertisement is placed in the New York Times, and it is given, say, 6 inches, or whatever it may be, and a weekly newspaper is given 6 inches, then the difference in the pay to the newspapers would be graduated and fixed by the advertising rates of each of those two newspapers.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's explanation then would hold true whether the newspaper had a circulation of 1,500 or 2,000,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, we would not find such an absurd situation as that accepted by the advertisers, and the advertising agents who handle business for the advertisers.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not think I understand the Senator's last comment. If the same space is to be offered to all newspapers, then clearly the same space would be offered to a paper with a circulation of 2,000 as to a newspaper with a circulation of 2,000,000. Is not that so?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, but doubtless the rates would be in the same proportion.

Mr. DANAHER. I am not talking about the rates.

Mr. BANKKHEAD. In the case of the newspaper with a circulation of 2,000 it would be paid 1 percent, or 10 percent, or whatever was worked out, the same percentage as that paid to the large newspaper.

Mr. DANAHER. And that is independent of the advertising power of the paper or the purchasing power of the community in which it circulates. Is not that so?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator knows as well as I do, as he is well informed on any subject I have heard raised, that the advertising rates take into consideration all those factors. When the rates are established and announced advertisers may advertise or they may not. In fixing the rates newspapers naturally fix rates which will not drive advertising away from them. They fix their rates in line and in accord with the established practices and customs in the newspaper field.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it not a fact, then, that if newspapers fixed their rates, as the Senator explains it, in accordance with the advertising power of the newspapers and the purchasing power of the communities which the newspapers can offer to sell to their advertisers, clearly commercial advertisers advertise in those communities and in those newspapers where they can get the best results, but we, on the contrary, would bind the Treasury and say, "Irrespective of whether you get good results or not, or whether you can ever sell a War bond or not, you are to advertise in this, that, or the other newspaper." Is not that so?

Mr. BANKHEAD. They would advertise and pay in accordance with the underlying principle of what good an advertiser gets by using a particular newspaper. That is a proposition which, as I have stated, is established by certain well-known rules in the newspaper profession.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, that is a good medium for getting funds from the Treasury to those newspapers, I agree, but whether or not it is a good way to promote the sale of War bonds is open to some question, as I think the Senator will agree.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not agree at all with the Senator's idea that advertisements should be placed in all large metropolitan newspapers on the theory that they have a greater circulation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Could the amendment be so interpreted as to mean that if the Secretary of the Treasury should offer to purchase a full page in the New York Times or any other metropolitan daily newspaper that he would have to offer to purchase the same amount of space in every local and county weekly newspaper throughout the United States?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that if on any day in the week or month he bought a full page in the New York Times he would have to buy a full page in the Hickman County Gazette?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or some other newspaper of similar circulation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know that he would have to do it the same day, but during the period involved or during the year.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator a further question. Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury in an effort to appeal to a certain community to purchase bonds, for instance a community such as Detroit, where large war plants are located, felt that it might be desirable to appeal to the employees of such war plants because of their peculiar situation to purchase bonds out of their wages, he would have to offer the same advertisement to every other newspaper in the United States, although there might not be a war plant within a hundred miles of many newspapers

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; he would not have to do it the same day, but the same amount of space during the period involved would have to be offered to other newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am trying to find out how the language is to be interpreted, because it is very broadly written. Someone must interpret it. Does the language mean that if the Secretary of the Treasury offered to pay whatever the cost is, $300 or $400, for a full page in a San Francisco or Los Angeles newspaper which might appeal to a particular condition existing in those communities, he would have to offer to buy that much space in a newspaper in some remote community where the same conditions did not exist?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, it is supposed that he would use good judgment.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; he must do it. It is not like a private advertiser picking out the newspapers he thinks it is worth advertising in. The language here is compulsory on the Secretary of the Treasury to offer the same space to all newspapers regardless of their size and location. I am wondering whether any prudent businessman would be required to do that in his own advertising? We are dealing here with the public money. We are saying to the Secretary of the Treasury, "You have got to do this. You have got to give just as much space in the rural communities of Arizona as you do in New York City or in Chicago."

Mr. BANKHEAD. The rate of pay would be reduced in proportion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, of course, the rate of pay would be reduced, but I am talking about the wisdom of requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to take as much space in a newspaper in the neighborhood of the Grand Canyon as he would in that other grand canyon known as Fifth Avenue, New York. I simply want to find out how the language is likely to be interpreted. The language of the bill is rather broad.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Secretary would be required, as I see it, to reduce the space in the large newspapers in proportion. Let me make this statement: The amendment was prepared in cooperation with officials of the National Editorial Association and the legislative draftsmen of the Senate, and I participated, with a view of placing the best and most effective provision in the bill in order to prevent discrimination and to bring about automatically the same treatment, so far as compensation is concerned, to every newspaper in the country. If anyone can improve the language so as to make administration of the measure automatically fair, I shall welcome it. I think the language provides for fair administration of the measure. Those of us who participated in the preparation of the language agreed that it does.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the bill is passed, of course it should be in the most practical and helpful form. It is for that reason I propose an amendment to the amendment. I call attention, as I did yesterday, to the fact that the pending amendment requires that the space shall be paid for "at the prevailing published rate for the respective newspapers." I point out that the published rate in uniform newspaper practice is subject to a 15 percent advertising agency discount if the advertising is placed through an agency. I also point out that "the prevailing published rate" of all newspapers is made in contemplation of the 15-percent discount on what is called national advertising.

I now suggest again, as I did yesterday, that if this advertising should be placed directly by the Government, instead of going through advertising agencies, the Government should have the same discount privilege as an advertising agency. I do not think that would be the case if the language stands requiring that the space "be paid for at the prevailing published rate." Merely to meet this point, I move to amend the pending amendment by striking out the period at the end of the committee amendment on page 3, line 12, and inserting a comma and the following: "with the same discounts, if any, available to the Government as are available to advertising agencies."

I am sure that this is purely a matter of practical routine, and that the Senator from Alabama would have no objection to it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have conferred with the Senator from Michigan about that matter. I recognize his superior information as a newspaperman, and I have no objection to his amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator who is sponsoring the bill that there are approximately 800 newspapers in the State of California, and I know something about their pulling power and location. I should say in a general way that if the Treasury Department were to place 800 advertisements of the same size in those 800 different newspapers, the benefit to the Government in the sale of bonds would be very fairly proportioned to the amount that each one of the newspapers would charge for the advertisement. It is true that some of the larger newspapers would charge 10, 20, yes even 100 times as much as some of the very smallest newspapers, but I know of no fairer rule by which to apportion the benefits to the Treasury than that which natural business practices have established, and that is the amount paid for the advertisement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what we have tried to do, and that is what the newspapermen have cooperated in effectuating.

Mr. DOWNEY. I believe the Senator has accomplished it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the amendment to the committee amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from

Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 9.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit action to be taken on the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment? I am sure there will be no disagreement with respect to it.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the pending committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 3, line 10. As the language is now couched, it may be uncertain whether someone might interpret it to mean that every time the Treasury would offer an advertisement to one newspaper it must offer the same identical advertisement to all other newspapers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is space, not content.

Mr. BARKLEY. I offer an amendment, on page 3, in line 10, of the committee amendment, after the word "same", to insert the words "aggregate amount of", so that over a period of a year the advertising could be distributed so as to make it an aggregate amount equal to, but not all at the same time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think really that ought to be done. It may be done under the bill, but I am glad to accept the amendment. That is the spirit of the program.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from Kentucky a moment ago to indicate his belief that the word "space" appearing in the pending amendment related to a page. I understood him to indicate that if a page of advertising was given to the New York Times a page of advertising matter would have to be given to some of the small newspapers throughout the country. Of course, in a page in the New York Times there would be many more square inches than in three or four pages of the small newspaper. I wondered whether the language referred to pages or square inches of advertising matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I used the words "page in the New York Times" simply as an illustration. The word "space" in the committee amendment is not interchangeable with the word "page."

Mr. WHITE. I thought the Senator indicated that to be his belief.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I was simply using the word "page" as an illustration; that if the Treasury offered a page advertisement to the New York Times it would have to offer a page to all other newspapers. They might take a quarter of a page, or only a column, whatever it would be. Whatever the Treasury did in regard to any one newspaper it would have to do as to all other newspapers.

Mr. WHITE. What I had in mind was that space would be sold by the square inch and not by the page.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that is true, but it is conceivable that for some reasons the Treasury might decide that it ought to place a whole page advertisement in some newspapers. My amendment, however, would make it possible to stagger the advertisements over a period, so that the aggregate amount would be the same.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the chief advantage of the Senator's amendment—and I think the amendment is a very important one if the bill is to be passed—is that it would renew an element of commercial discretion in the method in which the space should be used. That would be absent without the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, which I offer, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Five million dollars of the sum hereby appropriated for expenditure by newspapers of communities of more than 10,000 population shall be expended for distributing of advertising, information, sales arguments, and appeals relating to and promoting or encouraging the sale of bonds, notes, and other obligations of the United States over radio stations in the United States and not less than half of said sum shall be expended with radio stations of 250 watts or less and which had less than $50,000 of time sales in 1942.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as was stated yesterday by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], if we are to pass the pending bil for the benefit of newspapers, it should also be passed for the benefit of the small radio stations. Yesterday, I made inquiry of the Federal Communications Commission, and I discovered that in America there are 911 radio stations, of which 604 are affiliated with the networks, and 307 are not affiliated with them. Four hundred and forty-eight of those stations have less than 250 watts power. According to the last survey made by the Federal Communications Commission, which was for the last fiscal year, 301, or roughly one-third, of the radio stations in the United States were losing money or were operating on a narrow margin, barely able to pay their expenses. Two hundred and twenty-seven of the 301 which were losing money were of 250 watt power or less. Forty-one of them were from 250 watts to 1,000 watts in power. Mr. President, only 40 of the 301 which have been losing money had time sales of $50,000 or more.

Mr. President, the North Dakota Press Association is very vitally interested in this matter, as was shown by its telegram which I had inserted in the RECORD yesterday. Mr. Ed Franta, who is secretary of that association, not only telegraphed to me, but has previously written to me. The facts are that in North Dakota over a score of the smaller newspapers have already gone out of business. Almost entirely, as was so ably stated earlier today by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], because of the fact that the merchants have nothing to advertise, the small newspapers have in many instances had very little business. More than a score of the other newspapers in North Dakota have been absorbed by some of the larger newspapers. Therefore, Mr. President, the amendment I have offered provides that $5,000,000 shall be taken out of the authorization, from the sum allocated to the larger daily newspapers. The amendment provides that $5,000,000 shall be taken from the $15,000,000, which would still leave $10,000,000 for the larger daily newspapers, and the small weekly newspapers would still have their $15,000,000.

I agree with what so many Senators who spoke yesterday said, that if we are to take care of the small newspapers we should also take care of the small radio stations. If we do not, I believe we shall be in the position indicated by an article which appeared the other day in the Washington Post, apropos of the Bankhead bill to place Government advertising in daily and weekly newspapers. The article was written by Drew Pearson. My judgment is that the most hated man in America today is former Congressman Fred Vinson, who, Drew Pearson added, is hated by "bankers, cattlemen, oilmen, farmers, railroad labor, and John L. Lewis."

Mr. President, that is a large segment of the American people.

In this position of being a hated man, Mr. Vinson succeeds the late General "Iron Pants" Johnson, Leon Henderson, and Secretary Ickes, to name only a few of the long parade of Roosevelt lovers and haters.

Mr. Pearson says Mr. Vinson comes from a Kentucky district where they still carry long guns. Mr. Pearson says Mr. Vinson came to Congress years ago with high ambitions. His main ambition was to become a tax expert. I do not need to bore the Senate with quotations about "the power to tax is the power to destroy"; but underlying that ambition is a deeper desire, a desire to secure unlimited power without electoral responsibility.

So now we have Mr. Vinson as the Price and Wage Stabilizer, and he admits freely to arousing the enmity of

the farmer, the worker, the oil, the banking, the mining, and the cattle interests of the Nation.

Yet, if any Member of the Senate were to arouse the hatred of so many groups, he could not possibly return to the Senate. To arouse the hatred of any of those groups would be to be charged with destroying the war effort, to be charged with striking at the unity of the people.

Mr. Pearson's article about Mr. Vinson did not mention his alter ego, Edward Pritchard, the son of "Big Pritch," Mr. Vinson's college roommate. "Young Pritch," who is Mr. Vinson's alter ego, made a pilgrimage to Princeton University, thence to Harvard to sit at the feet of Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter, thence to several other Government offices, and, eventually, to rejoin his father's friend when he, Mr. Vinson, became the Price and Wage Stabilizer.

There have been other alter egos in this Government: Mr. Ben Cohen, now with Judge Byrnes; Mr. Ginsberg, with Mr. Henderson; Mr. Abe Fortas, with Mr. Ickes.

Mr. Vinson does not deny that his alter ego "Young Pritch" hopes some day to become Governor of their native State of Kentucky, nor does he deny that "Young Pritch" mimics Mine Leader Lewis for the amusement of the White House intimates. Nor is any denial made that "Young Pritch thinks 'em up" and Judge Vinson "throws 'em."

The Army says "Young Pritch" cannot stand up, so they have discharged him, back to civil life and back to his old job with Judge Vinson.

Mr. Drew Pearson, who unconsciously reveals power-hungry men in this Government, said last Sunday night that the railroad men would get a "40-hour week and vacation pay." Mr. Pearson added that in the beginning of the war effort the leaders of the railroad workers, having their own set of laws—legislation covering more than half a century of dealings with their employers and the Government—did not ask for the 40-hour week, and therefore their men were working 48 or 52 hours a week without overtime.

Personally, I do not know whether that is true, but the point is that the whole effort, first the President's, second Mr. Vinson's, is for the purpose of destroying freely elected representative leaders of the rail workers, and substituting in their place men who think they can lead the rank and file back into Mr. Roosevelt's camp in the forthcoming election.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], speaking at Grand Rapids, Mich., said, in warning the farm Grange of the forthcoming election, "Both major parties have been perilously close to moral bankruptcy" during recent years. He warned them to beware of "opponents of progress" seeking election next year. Again I quote the junior Senator from Vermont:

> There are those who believe that every man who is poor is responsible for his own misfortune.

The railroad workers, the mine workers, the farmers, and the cattlemen are a fiercely independent people.

There is a way, a political way, via the ballot box, for these independents to function. Perhaps we have reached a place in the road for nonpartisan action.

Certainly when a man can wield the power Mr. Vinson wields, aided and abetted by his alter ego, Mr. Pritchard, who was never elected even dog catcher, the time is here to put against Vinson the power of the people.

It is all very well for Mr. Vinson to say, "Hold the line against inflation," and to admit only a slight increase in the cost of living, when we all know that that is not true, and that the cost of living, at least in New England, has gone up nearly 100 percent.

Mr. President, I say that the answer to Mr. Vinson and to men like him—men who manufacture disunity—is a return to unity, to free political action—if necessary, to a people's nonpartisan organization. Nowhere can we get this message more clearly before the American people than through the free and independent press, in which the small weekly newspapers must be represented, and through small radio stations. The record shows that 301 of them—nearly a third of them—are losing money, or on the verge of just being able to exist. I submit that with all the large corporations contributing money, and saving it through the income-tax laws, by selecting large newspapers and giving them the advertising, all of which is possible under the present tax laws, that if such a large amount of money is to be spent, the Congress ought to make some provision for the small weekly newspapers and the small radio stations.

I hope my amendment may be adopted, because if we are to take care of one group of patriotic citizens, it is just as reasonable to take care of the other.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has very good reason for offering his amendment; but I should like to point out that it is the beginning of what I suggested yesterday would happen. If we are to do something for newspapers, it is quite logical that we do the same thing for radio stations, and particularly small radio stations, as well as for outdoor advertising organizations, magazines, and other advertising media. While I point out that the amendment is quite proper, and just as fair as is the bill itself, it is too important to be acted upon without an opportunity for Senators to know what it is all about. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Caraway
Andrews	Bridges	Chavez
Austin	Brooks	Clark, Idaho
Ball	Buck	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Burton	Connally
Barbour	Bushfield	Danaher
Barkley	Butler	Davis
Bilbo	Byrd	Downey
Eastland	McClellan	Taft
Ellender	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Ferguson	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
George	Maloney	Tobey
Gerry	Maybank	Truman
Gillette	Mead	Tunnell
Green	Moore	Tydings
Guffey	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Gurney	Overton	Van Nuys
Hatch	Pepper	Wallgren
Hawkes	Radcliffe	Walsh
Hayden	Reed	Wheeler
Hill	Reynolds	Wherry
Holman	Robertson	White
Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham	Wiley
Kilgore	Shipstead	Willis
Langer	Smith	Wilson
Lucas	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I do not know how he would vote if present. Therefore I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. REVERCOMB's name was called). I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] who has been called from the city by most urgent circumstances.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent from the city on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—21

Aiken	Kilgore	Robertson
Ball	Langer	Shipstead
Chavez	Maloney	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Danaher	Overton	Wallgren
Hatch	Pepper	Wheeler
Holman	Reynolds	Wilson

NAYS—54

Andrews	Ellender	O'Daniel
Austin	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Bankhead	George	Reed
Barbour	Gerry	Scrugham
Barkley	Gillette	Smith
Bilbo	Green	Stewart
Brewster	Guffey	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Gurney	Tobey
Buck	Hawkes	Truman
Burton	Hayden	Tunnell
Bushfield	Hill	Tydings
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Byrd	Lucas	Van Nuys
Caraway	McClellan	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Wherry
Connally	McKellar	White
Downey	Maybank	Wiley
Eastland	Mead	Willis

NOT VOTING—21

Bailey	Johnson, Calif.	Murray
Bone	La Follette	Nye
Bridges	Lodge	O'Mahoney
Capper	McCarran	Revercomb
Chandler	McNary	Russell
Davis	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Glass	Murdock	Wagner

So Mr. LANGER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a few minutes since, in colloquy with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] there was reference as to whether or not the hearings disclosed a record of payments to the New York Times or any other of the large city dailies for Treasury Department War-bond advertising. My memory played a trick on me in that respect. I desire to tell the Senator from Nebraska that I have checked the record and there is not that evidence. In the record what we were talking about was a hypothetical case which referred entirely to large commercial advertisers conducting the same type of campaign.

Let me state further that I have checked with the Treasury Department itself in the meantime by telephone, and have been told that the Treasury has not paid one cent to any medium of any kind for War-bond advertising promotion. I was referred further to the Treasury statement as submitted by Secretary Morgenthau and as it appears on page 132 of the hearings, from which I read:

> I am opposed to the enactment of this bill, primarily because it might jeopardize the continued success of the Government's vital War-loan program under my direction. However, the broad regulatory powers over the press which the bill would confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury are foreign in nature to the functions of that office, and I would not care to assume the exercise of such powers.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I wondered if my colleague found out from the Treasury Department that, as a result of not spending a penny for advertising, there was any difficulty in meeting the bond requirements?

Mr. DANAHER. I did not make inquiry in that particular, but the record shows definitely to the contrary. I know very well that the record demonstrated that the drive had gone over the top in every respect.

Mr. MALONEY. To make the record more complete, is it not a fact that the quota of the last bond drive was exceeded by several billion dollars?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly, by hundreds of millions of dollars, and my recollection is as much as $3,000,000,000. I think that will probably coincide with the Senator's recollection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it not also true that the bond sales amounted to only 82 percent of the quota in the case of the E bonds, the ones known as personal investment bonds for individuals?

Mr. DANAHER. On the E bonds that is my understanding.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And 38 States failed to make their quota on the E bonds. I did not want any misunderstanding about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. If I understood correctly, the Senator from Alabama said that the personal investment bonds, bonds to be invested in by individuals, had not reached the quota. My information is that in the last drive the quota was $5,000,000,000 and that the sales exceeded $5,300,000,000, representing the investment by individuals.

Mr. DANAHER. I think that is so, but the Senator from Alabama referred to Series E bonds?

Mr. TAFT. I could not understand what the Senator from Alabama said.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A recent release by the Treasury Department shows that there was a quota of $3,000,000,000 on the E bonds, that only 82 percent of that quota was sold, and that 38 States failed to meet their quotas. I have the list of States, if the Senator desires to look at it.

Mr. TAFT. But the E bonds are not the only bonds offered individuals for investment. There are F bonds and G bonds offered to individuals, and if the individuals happen to prefer G bonds to E, that does not affect the question of the sale of the entire quota.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, while I was at it, I asked the Treasury also to give me a picture of the situation with reference to the cost of bond-sale advertising by corporations. The fact is that corporations which contribute advertising to the United States Treasury and do not run their own names on the "ads" are permitted to deduct the cost of the advertising up to 5 percent of the net income of the donor. The "ad" is regarded as a contribution to the Treasury. So far as corporations or other business advertisers who use their own names in advertising War-bond sales are concerned, the Treasury takes as a criterion the reasonableness of the charge. While the word "reasonable" has not been construed as a matter of regulation, it has been ruled that any expenditure for advertising of that nature which approximates what the Treasury calls tax avoidance will be regarded as reasonable up to that point. When the Treasury, on the facts of a given case, finds that such advertising expense is unreasonable and constitutes tax avoidance, all charges for advertising above that limit are disallowed. It depends on the facts of each case. Inasmuch as we have heard so very much about that situation, I wanted the RECORD to show the facts.

The Senator from Alabama and I had some discussion in committee about a further proposed amendment, and the Senator submitted to me language of a proposed draft which will meet my purpose. On page 3, in line 9, after the word "act", I move that there be inserted the language which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, after the word "act", it is proposed to insert the following:

> The leader of the majority party in the Senate and the leader of the majority party in the House may jointly designate a person, and the leader of the principal minority party in the Senate and the leader of the principal minority party in the House may jointly designate a person, to cooperate with the Secretary of the Treasury in reviewing all advertisements before being approved for tendering to newspapers. Such persons so selected shall be paid a reasonable salary as a part of the costs of conducting the sales of Government securities. No material shall be used in any advertisements if objected to in writing by either of these persons.

Mr. DANAHER. The amendment speaks for itself, and I agree with the Senator from Alabama in the language which he has adapted to the end desired. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this amendment was rejected by the committee on the ground that it is unconstitutional, that the amendment is an attempt to have Congress appoint a man to a position over which the Congress has no control. I agree with the view expressed in the committee, and I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had risen to say practically what the Senator from Ohio has stated. In the first place, I do not think Congress has any power to designate an executive officer to help carry out the administration of an act which is charged to the executive departments. Aside from that, I am quite satisfied that neither the majority nor the minority leader of either House wants any such responsibility.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I should like to submit an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment is now pending.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, during the hearings on the bill, while we

were considering the subject of adopting an amendment which would completely eliminate the thought of partisanship in the use of the fund to be provided, the thought of any political purpose, an objective which I have expressed on all occasions, the Senator from Connecticut suggested that the majority leaders and the minority leaders be requested or authorized—I do not remember the exact language—to review all the material submitted, and to eliminate anything which would have the implication of politics or partisanship of any sort. I promptly answered that that would be an intolerable burden, that it would be totally impossible for the leaders to perform such a duty. However, I followed the matter up the next day substantially as the Senator from Connecticut has stated, and submitted to him an amendment carrying out his thought. But instead of placing the burden upon the leaders themselves, the amendment would authorize the leaders to select someone to represent the parties, so that there would be no possibility of partisanship, permitting the leaders, as stated in the amendment, to reject any material which had in it the implication of politics. I have been exceedingly anxious, all the way through, to have everyone understand that no politics, no partisanship of any sort, was contemplated under the program, but it has been hard to make all Senators to understand my objective.

Objection now comes from the other side of the Chamber to the adoption of the amendment. I did not insist on it in the committee. The Senator from Ohio has correctly stated that the amendment was rejected in the committee on the ground that it improperly would delegate executive power, and I did not press the amendment, as members of the committee know, and I shall not press it in the Senate. I presented it in good faith, as every Senator knows, in an attempt to carry out the general program, to guarantee, so far as is humanly possible, that there should not be the implication or the charge or suspicion that the program might be used for political purposes. I have not made much impression in that regard on most of my colleagues on the Republican side, which I regret.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama was entitled to state what he has said. He cooperated in every respect, in accordance with the discussion and colloquy which ensued between him and me when the point was raised in the committee. I thank the Senator for the statement he has made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "1944" and insert in lieu thereof "1945"; and on page 2, line 3, after the figures "$30,000,000", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "and during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, a fractional portion of such amount based upon the number of months remaining in such fiscal year" and a comma.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the amendment seems somewhat complicated, but it is really a simple amendment. As I stated yesterday, I am opposed to the principle of the bill, and I am still opposed to the bill, but in the event it shall pass, I think it should contain this amendment, which I offer in an attempt to conserve from twelve to fifteen million dollars.

The language of the bill as it is written provides an appropriation of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. Five months of that year have already elapsed, and my amendment would merely provide, in case the bill should become law, that only a proportional amount of the appropriation for the first year should be available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware seems to have offered two amendments. Is the Senator willing to have both acted on together?

Mr. BUCK. I sent merely one amendment to the desk or meant to send only one to the desk.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "1944" and insert in lieu thereof "1945". and on the same page, line 3, after the figures "$30,000,000", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "and during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, a fractional portion of such amount based upon the number of months remaining in such fiscal year", and a comma.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. Half of the fiscal year is gone. I assume what the Senator proposes to do could be done anyway, but I have no objection whatever to the amendment. I think the Senator is mistaken, however, with respect to 1945. It should be 1944.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President, it should be the fiscal year ending 1945.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the amendment provide for the last half of the present fiscal year?

Mr. BUCK. Assuming that the bill should become law January 1, next, then instead of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 there would only be twelve and a half million or fifteen million dollars to be used.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would be 1944. The Senator provides for 1945.

Mr. BUCK. No, I think not. I ask that the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "1944" and to insert in lieu thereof "1945."

Mr. BARKLEY. The two parts of the amendment are linked together, Mr. President. What the Senator from Delaware is attempting to do is to provide that for the fiscal year ending 1945 from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 shall be available, and that for the rest of the present fiscal year only a portion of that amount shall be available. I think the two parts of the amendment must go together.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the clerk did not read all of my amendment. He read simply the first part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the second part.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the figures "$30,000,000", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "and during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, a fractional portion of such amount based upon the number of months remaining in such fiscal year," and a comma.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I did not hear clearly that portion of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware on page 2, line 2, and on page 2, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I have another amendment which provides that the money shall be spent to advertise War bonds. There is no mention in the bill of War bonds. The bill refers to bonds, notes, and other obligations of the Government. I am quite certain that the proponents of the bill did not intend that advertisements of Government notes and bills should be placed in small newspapers published in communities of 10,000 or less. I am sure they do not believe that such Government securities can be sold in large amounts in such communities. It would be foolish to place such advertisements in small community newspapers, because such securities bear no more than three-quarters to seven-eights percent interest. They are purchased only by the banks. Even the banks in such communities would not want them because those small banks also have savings accounts on which they are still paying from 2 to 2½ percent interest, and they must invest their money at a higher rate. Therefore it seems to me that the bill should specify particularly the kind of bonds it is intended that the advertisements should promote. When we speak of War bonds, we mean series E, F, or G, which have been specially provided for investment by individuals. I offer the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the words "sale of", it is proposed to insert the word "War", and in the same line to strike out the words "notes, and other obligations."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] on page 2, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, line 16, after the word "cities", to insert the word "townships", and in line 20, after the word "cities", to insert the word "townships." In some parts of Pennsylvania we have township government. I wonder if there would be objection to the insertion of the word "townships."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection. The Senator refers to areas outside cities of 10,000 population or less.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask a question about that. The language is, "newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, and communities of 10,000 population or less." There are no census figures on communities. A census is taken of population of incorporated cities, and towns, and of counties, but I do not know of any designation of a community, what a community is, or how one would arrive at the population of a community.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think there is a special point in that statement. We considered that matter. The Census Bureau counts a community as a place. The only object of the bill is to include any place where a newspaper is published where the population is less than 10,000. If the Senator from Kentucky thinks the word "communities" should be deleted, if he thinks it confuses the issue——

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am simply trying to find out what it means.

Mr BANKHEAD. It simply makes the description as broad and comprehensive as it can be made to cover all newspapers which are properly qualified under the postal laws and have a general circulation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not offer any amendment to that language.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We considered that matter. The language as it is now can do no harm.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose it would be interpreted to mean small newspapers published in cities of less than 10,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The matter was discussed and considered. It was brought to our attention that in two places at least newspapers were located just on the outside of the corporate limits of towns. We thought the word "communities" would doubtless cover the situation so that newspapers so situated would not be excluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume then the language would be interpreted so that no newspaper published in a city or a village which the census figures show to have a population of more than 10,000 would be covered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] on page 2, lines 16 and 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,500,000."

On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000,000."

On page 2, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "not less than one-half of."

On page 2, beginning with line 17, it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "and one-half of such amount shall be expended for the purchase of such advertising space in daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, and communities of more than 10,000 population."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to make a word of explanation. The amendment I offer is the amendment which is printed and lying on the desks of Senators which was proposed to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who decided, however, not to offer the amendment. I am now offering it exactly as it was printed, and as it now lies on the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment would be to confine the expenditure of money authorized under the bill to newspapers published in cities and towns having a population of less than 10,000 persons.

Mr. President, I myself am a publisher. I have been embarrassed by the bill, and perhaps somewhat by the amendment. Practically all, if not all, of the large newspapers of the country are against the bill. The newspapers of the class of my newspaper—the medium-sized country and city daily newspapers—are rather generally opposed to the bill.

On my part, I recognize the validity of the bill insofar as it applies to the weekly newspapers, the semiweeklies, and the dailies in the very small towns—towns having a population of less than 10,000 persons. I think there is much to be said for them. A burden has been laid upon them; and the amendment would confine the expenditure of any part of the money to advertisements in newspapers published in cities of less than 10,000 persons, and incidentally would reduce the amount of the proposed appropriation by one-half.

The bill without the amendment would carry a sum of between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000, half of which would be spent for advertisements in newspapers in cities of less than 10,000 population.

The bill as amended by the pending proposal would eliminate entirely the expenditure of any amount of money for advertisements in newspapers in cities of above 10,000 population; and, really, all those newspapers are opposed to the bill.

So I think the amendment would make a much better bill of the pending measure. It would divide the cost. It would put the expenditure in the places where it is needed, if it is needed anywhere. It would go to the newspapers which would derive the most benefit for it, and none of the money would be spent for the larger newspapers.

Furthermore, Mr. President, by the amendment, I would be taking my own newspaper out of the class of newspapers which could possibly benefit from the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The justification for the bill, I should say, is based upon the theory that it would help the Treasury in the sale of bonds. I do not suppose the Senate would pass a bill granting largess of this sort, if it can be called that, simply because anyone wants it, and if the advertisements authorized under the bill would result in the sale of bonds as effectively by placing advertisements in the larger newspapers, as well as in the smaller ones, from the standpoint of public service, I do not see any reason to object to that course. I do not see why we should say that because a certain group of newspapers does not want it, therefore, we should not use their space.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the theories of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, so that I may have an opportunity to say something in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, the fact is that in large part the bill has been pressed on the Congress by the associations representing the weekly newspapers of the country, including some of the smaller dailies. It is urged in behalf of the bill—and with some validity, I think—that the circulation of those newspapers reaches the class of persons who are not being reached by the publicity, whether paid or otherwise, in the larger newspapers, and that by putting the advertisements in the smaller newspapers published in the smaller cities the desired results will be accomplished for the Treasury Department.

I do not regard the bill as a subsidy to any class of newspapers. I did not intend to say anything which would leave that impression. If we are to spend any money for the purpose contemplated, I think by all means the expenditure of the money should be confined to newspapers published in towns of less than 10,000 population.

I yield now to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say in connection with the statement of the able majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that the Treasury Department is of course opposed to the bill, and I hope all Members of the Senate realize that.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I am of the opinion that the amendment, although I have not

had time to analyze it, would eliminate the participation in the advertising program of all community newspapers published in large cities. Religious newspapers, racial newspapers, and newspapers of that type would likewise be penalized if they were published in a city the population of which is in excess of 10,000.

Mr. REED. Yes; that would be the effect.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, Mr. President, I think that would weaken the bill, if the bill is, as the Senator from Kentucky has said, for the purpose of selling bonds. We are circumscribing it more and more all the time, it seems to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have from the Senator from Kansas or from the Senator from Alabama information which may have some bearing upon the amount which should be carried in the bill, regardless of whether cities of more than 10,000 population are to participate. It has been stated by a Member of the Senate that a compulsory expenditure of not less than $25,000,000 would result in the expenditure of an average of approximately $2,500 a year to each newspaper in the United States. I should like to know whether that is true.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, that is not true. It may average that. I do not know; I do not have the figure for that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how many newspapers there are. It would be an easy matter to divide the number of newspapers into $25,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; but the money is not to be distributed on that basis. It is to be distributed on the basis of the different amounts given to various newspapers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it would be necessary to strike an average. The average would be approximately $2,500.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, if one desires to obtain an average, that is all right; but the amount going to each newspaper should be determined.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I gave the Senator from New York the wrong answer. I did not write the bill; I have had nothing to do with its handling in the committee. I am familiar with it only in a general way, and I said to the Senator from New York that it would exclude certain publications from participation. The correct answer to the Senator from New York would be that they are not considered anyway. On page 2, beginning in line 8, the bill reads:

> The advertising space so purchased shall be divided equitably among all newspapers of general circulation.

I think the term "of general circulation" would exclude the publications mentioned by the Senator from New York, anyway.

Mr. MEAD. No, Mr. President; I think not. Let us consider, for instance, the colored newspapers. They are of general circulation. I do not think there is any limited circulation so far as they are concerned. I think they are in general circulation, for anyone to read and subscribe to, because they are entered with the post office under the second-class mailing privilege.

I think the amendment might be further studied; because I can see that the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas and I are at odds as to the proper interpretation of it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should say to the Senator from New York that the term "of general circulation" probably has been interpreted legally, but I do not happen to be familiar with what the interpretation is. I do know that in newspapers and among newspapermen—and I happen to be one—when we speak of a newspaper of general circulation, we mean just general circulation, not confined to a church, a society, or a lodge, or to any particular group, sect, or class of persons.

Mr. MEAD. But there are exceptions in all fields—for instance, in the case of a racial newspaper or a religious newspaper which is either restricted to a community or to a parish, or is of general circulation. Let us consider, for instance, the Christian Science Monitor. It is of general circulation.

Mr. REED. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MEAD. And there are a number of racial newspapers which are of general circulation.

So in my judgment there is a possibility of eliminating many such newspapers simply because they are published in a community the population of which is in excess of 10,000 persons.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I may suggest to the Senator from New York that probably the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] could answer that question better than I can. He is the author of the bill and has managed it in committee and throughout its progress up to this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Take two examples. Take the Christian Advocate, which is a Protestant newspaper, and the Catholic World, which is a Catholic publication. They are not limited in circulation to any community. They go all over the United States. The fact that they may be religious papers does not deprive them of their general character as being of general circulation. I think there is danger, as the Senator from New York has said, that they may be eliminated. Anyone can buy them and read them. They may be purchased at newsstands. Their circulation is not at all limited to the denominations for which they speak.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it seems to me that the pending amendment would prevent them from participating in the funds authorized in the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question with reference to the amendment. The amendment would limit the amount of money to be spent, and also limit the class of newspapers with which it may be spent. That is true, is it not?

Mr. REED. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. As I understand, it would exclude the newspaper which the Senator from Kansas owns.

Mr. REED. It would.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator state that this would not be a subsidy to the newspapers, but rather the employment of money for the promotion of the sale of bonds?

Mr. REED. I am glad to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not think this is a subsidy to the newspapers. I think the Government will get value received. I think the Treasury can promote the sale of bonds in this way.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas if there has been any lack of response in the purchase of bonds when they have been offered.

Mr. REED. With respect to the class E bonds; yes.

Mr. MOORE. Would a business house expend money for the sale of products which are already selling without advertising?

Mr. REED. I do not accept that statement of the Senator from Oklahoma that these products are selling without advertising. They have been greatly advertised, mainly through the larger newspapers. The strongest point urged in favor of the bill is that the sale has not extended in proper proportions to the people in the smaller communities of the country.

Mr. MOORE. Have not the bonds usually been bought both from the standpoint of investment and from the standpoint of the patriotic duty to buy bonds?

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Oklahoma knows—or he ought to know—that the weakness of these bond sales has been, generally speaking, that the bonds have not been purchased by the individual purchasers to the degree which it was hoped would be the case. That is the situation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, who was first on his feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to ask a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to present my position with regard to the proposed amendment.

I yield to no one in sympathetic understanding of the problems of the small newspaperman. I spent all my youthful years in a print shop maintained by my father. I know the problems of the small newspaperman. I know what he is up against. I am exceedingly sympathetic toward the position in which he finds himself.

However, I cannot break away from the fact that the fiscal agent of the Government, the Secretary of the Treasury, has definitely and positively stated in writing that he is opposed to the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is the first time I have ever heard of the Senator from South Dakota paying any attention to any recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury. [Laughter.] The Senator from South Dakota has managed to get along consistently by not paying attention to the Secretary of the Treasury, and I do not know why any exception should be made in this case.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. After all, no matter whether I approve or disapprove of the Secretary of the Treasury, he will remain in office for another year and a half.

Mr. REED. Unfortunately that is the case. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSHFIELD. And he will have control of the bond campaigns during the next 18 months.

Mr. REED. Undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yesterday I offered for the RECORD a statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to it. The Secretary says:

> I am opposed to the enactment of this bill, primarily because it might jeopardize the continued success of the Government's vital war-loan program under my direction. Moreover, the broad regulatory powers over the press which the bill would confer upon the Secretary of the Treasury are foreign in nature to the functions of that office, and I would not care to assume the exercise of such powers.
>
> The war-loan campaign has been a voluntary, united effort of the whole American people. The Second War Loan drive, concluded early this month was, as you know, an overwhelming success. The total goal of $13,000,000,000 was exceeded by $5,000,000,000.
>
> An army of volunteers labored devotedly to realize that success. Workers, advertisers, advertising media, retailers, theaters, and others contributed wholeheartedly to this vital cause. Newspapers, both country papers and the great metropolitan dailies, gave invaluable support in the handling of news and features and in the promotion of sponsored advertising.

There is a good deal more to the statement.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Kansas to the fact that the loan drives during the next 18 months must be under the direction of this official. He has proved that his method of handling the sale of bonds is a tremendous success. The newspapers have done their full share. They are entitled to full credit; but I am wondering how the Senator can justify the expenditure of $15,000,000 to do something which has already been done successfully.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I fear that the Senator from South Dakota was not listening attentively to me. If he will listen attentively for about 2 minutes more, he will be enlightened so far as it is possible for the Senator from Kansas to enlighten him.

Mr. President, I approach a vote on this bill with a good deal of hesitation and some reluctance. I am not quarreling with the amount of money carried in the bill. Whether this amendment is voted in or out, I believe that the Government will get value received for whatever money it may expend under the terms of the bill.

I have also deplored, as every other informed citizen must deplore, the failure of citizens generally to invest in War bonds in the proportion which they reasonably and fairly could have been expected to do. My reluctance in voting for the bill arises from none of these considerations. It arises from the fact that I am a member of the newspaper profession. I own a newspaper. As a member of the newspaper profession, I am jealous of the reputation of the profession, and I am quite reluctant to have the newspapers accept payment from political governments—and our Government is always a political government, no matter which party is in power—even though the newspapers render a service and give value received.

I have told this to my newspaper friends who have urged me to vote for the bill, as well as to my newspaper friends who are opposed to the bill. I fear that the fine edge of respect for the opinion of the newspapers of the United States which we collectively call the press might be dulled a trifle under any system of accepting pay from the Government, even for space for advertising purposes.

It is that latter consideration, and that alone, which influences my judgment on the bill. So far as the amount of money is concerned, it is insignificant compared with the hundreds of billions of dollars we are spending. So far as the value of the service is concerned, I think the Government will get value received. I think there is a validity behind the bill, a validity which I respect. Whether my amendment goes in or goes out, I expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas illustrates very clearly the motive which he seems to think should influence the passage of the bill; that is, some newspapers want it, and others do not. In my opinion that makes it a subsidy, and that is why I am opposed to it.

I listened to a considerable part of the testimony regarding the need of advertising War bonds in newspapers. I can say that those who testified made no case whatever for such need. There is no occasion for more advertisements of this nature than we have had. If anything, War bonds have been overadvertised. In my opinion the failure to sell to individuals in the early drives was because all of the emphasis was put on advertising. We cannot turn on the radio without hearing advertisement of this character. We do not listen any more or read anything that pertains to War-bond advertisements. They pass us right by because there is so much of it. The Government has had the benefit of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of advertising, and the Government officials did not realize until the last drive that if they want to sell bonds to individuals it can be done only by a house-to-house canvass, and a direct personal appeal to people to buy bonds. Every salesman will confirm that statement.

In order to sell anything that costs real money, there must be a background of advertising, an underlying layer of advertising, to create a favorable impression. But in order to actually sell anything which costs a hundred dollars, whether it be an automobile, a vacuum cleaner, or anything else, it is necessary to make personal, direct solicitation. In the beginning of War-bond drives, the Treasury fell down on solicitation. They thought they could sell bonds merely by advertising, by moving-picture stars giving interviews in the newspapers, and appearing in the public square. It was found that that method did not succeed. The bonds were sold to banks, but not to individuals. Finally, in the drive which took place before the last one, the Treasury set up a personal organization which they improved, and during the last drive they improved it further. During the next drive it will be perfected still further. But there is no real need for advertising. I venture to say that we will not sell a hundred bonds by putting any more advertisements in the newspapers than there are today.

It all comes down to one question: Do we think that in the general distribution of Government advertising small newspapers have been so discriminated against that we ought to give them a subsidy from the Government Treasury? That is the only question. I do not like to vote against the small newspapers. They represent a very great power and a good influence. I think it would be to their own benefit not to be given a subsidy. I believe it is most unfortunate that they should have organized and demanded that Congress appropriate $30,000,000 in order that the Government may advertise in those particular papers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have listened to some of the hundreds of announcements over the radio to which the Senator from Ohio has referred. They have become so thick and so numerous that sometimes I wonder if they do not defeat their own purpose. Does the Senator know whether the radio stations are paid anything for the time taken up in such advertising?

Mr. TAFT. Yesterday I put into the RECORD a statement, which I did not verify, issued by O. W. I., to the effect that since the war started the radio stations have contributed without charge more than a hundred million dollars' worth of time computed on the basis on which they sell time. I do not know how true that is, and I have not verified it, but that was the statement. It is said that most of the radio advertising is contributed. Occasionally sponsors contribute a part of their time to the advertising of bonds.

Mr. AIKEN. Another form of advertising is through the medium of the moving pictures. As the Senator knows, one cannot go to a moving-picture show without seeing Federal advertising on the screen. Does the Senator know whether that advertising is paid for in any way?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. I understand that most of it is contributed. If the Senator is asking about the Government, the Government does not pay one cent for such advertising. If it undertook to pay for all the advertising it has received in connection with War bonds, war information, and the O. W. I.,

it would cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars a year. But here it is proposed that we take one small group—and there is some ground for the contention, I agree, that they have been discriminated against—and give them a subsidy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In answer to the Senator from Vermont, let me say that earlier in the day the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] after talking with a representative of the Treasury Department on the subject, stated for the RECORD that no amount of money had been paid by the Treasury for advertising sales of bonds, either in newspapers, over the radio, or in moving pictures.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I was about to say that if the movies and the radios had been paid for advertising conducted through them, the smaller newspapers, and the larger newspapers, too, should be paid also for the advertisements which they have carried for the sale of Government bonds.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been stated, and it is undoubtedly true, that almost all the conversation we hear over the radio in behalf of the selling of bonds is on the time of the sponsor who has employed the time to advertise some commercial product over the radio. Between those programs there may be a half a minute or a minute during which someone volunteers his own voice in behalf of bond sales, but it has not been paid for by the Government.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. There was a short colloquy a few minutes ago between the majority leader and the Senator sponsoring the bill, with reference to the number of newspapers which might participate in the program should the bill become a law.

I requested from the Library of Congress a report on the number of newspapers there are of the different varieties. I was furnished with two very brief memoranda which I request to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of the discussion.

There being no objection, the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of newspapers—Report dated Jan. 31, 1942

Dailies	2,131
Evening	1,666
Morning	458
All day	7
Foreign	157
Sunday	571
Triweekly	43
Semiweekly	408
Weekly	11,474
Fortnightly	11
Semimonthly	19
Monthly	10
Bimonthly	2
Miscellaneous	2
Total	14,100

Number of newspapers—Report dated Jan. 31, 1943

Dailies	2,043
Evening	1,605
Morning	433
All day	5
Foreign	132
Sunday	525
Triweekly	35
Semiweekly	356
Weekly	10,967
Fortnightly	12
Semimonthly	19
Monthly	19
Bimonthly	3
Miscellaneous	2
Total	13,456

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the memoranda show that, in round numbers, there are approximately 14,000 newspapers, and if we divide $30,000,000 among the 14,000 newspapers, it demonstrates, as the Senator from Kentucky remarked a while ago, that each paper would receive approximately between $2,000 and $2,500. We do not know exactly how the money will be divided. The general division provided by the bill requires that half of the $30,000,000 must go to newspapers published in cities of 10,000 population or more, and the remaining half to the newspapers published in cities of 10,000 population and less. On that basis I assume it is the purpose of those who sponsor the proposed legislation to see that the same plan shall be followed in dividing the half of the $30,000,000 which goes to newspapers in the lower brackets; that is, in towns of 10,000 or less. If that is true, then it is safe to assume that each individual newspaper in the lower half would receive its share of the $15,000,000, or from $2,000 to $2,500.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY What do the Senator's figures show as to the number of newspapers in the upper category which are published in cities or towns of more than 10,000 population?

Mr. BUTLER. There are between ten and eleven thousand in the class of weekly newspapers, and there are 2,131 daily newspapers. That leaves the remainder; that is, the difference between 2,131 and 14,100, in the other group.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the 10,000 or 11,000 newspapers in the smaller group sharing one-half of the $30,000,000 should each receive an average of from $2,000 to $2,500, the remainder when distributed among approximately 2,000 daily newspapers would, of course, give to each of those newspapers anywhere from $7,500 to $10,000. Yet, at the same time, I do not like to be picking flaws, but I should like to have the author of the bill recall the fact that in one place in the bill the Secretary of the Treasury is required to offer the same space to all newspapers without regard to whether they are published in cities or in communities. There is, apparently, an inconsistency there which will make administration difficult.

Mr. BUTLER. Providing that such shall share alike, in other words, the two provisions are contradictory on their face.

The amendment before the Senate at the moment is that, I think, proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] which would reduce by one-half the appropriation that is proposed for the operations of this bill.

It is perfectly natural that we should make application to our own State as to just how this measure would work. In Nebraska there are approximately 300 newspapers, and less than one-tenth of that number are published in cities of 10,000 or over; in fact, I think, the number would be a half, perhaps, of one-tenth, showing that nearly all, or the great majority, of those newspapers are in the group the Senator from Kansas proposes the bill should provide for by eliminating the provision for advertising in newspapers in communities of more than 10,000 population.

I agree with the Senator from Kansas that dailies published in towns of 10,000 or more are not requesting this legislation. I should also like to point out the fact that the publishers in the lower group, for whom he is now providing by his amendment, are also divided in their opinion. In this connection, I should like to read a letter into the RECORD at this place, prefacing the letter with this remark: I have heard perhaps from 20 or possibly 30 newspapers in Nebraska. That number is about one-tenth of the total number that have expressed themselves either for or against the proposed legislation, and the number is about equally divided between those who favor and those who do not favor the proposed legislation. To indicate the attitude of at least a good share of those in the class of weekly newspapers, I read a letter which came entirely unsolicited, as did all the comment, whether it was pro or con, on the legislation. The letter, written under the date of November 5, comes from the gentleman who publishes the Burt County Plain Dealer at Tekamah, Nebr., and is addressed to me.

Just to let you know that I am one publisher of a country weekly newspaper who approves your reported stand against paid War bond advertising for newspapers.

I may say, by the way, that the fact was published when the committee reported the bill that I was in the group of five who voted not to report it to the Senate. The letter continues:

I doubt if there are many publishers who have had to face more vexing problems during the past year than I have, but I want no thought of a Federal Government check to cast a shadow over the patriotism or independence of the Burt County Plain Dealer.

I can't always go along with you in your votes, but we are much in agreement on matters of individual independence, and I thought maybe the sentiments of the humble publisher of Tekamah would not be unwelcome in the above matter.

As a postscript he adds:

P. S.—Am enclosing a copy (separate cover) of this week's issue. Nothing in it of special interest, but it will give you a general idea of conditions in this territory.

Before reading the second letter from this publisher, I may say that his eight-page paper which came to me had at least one or two columns of material all originating from different Government bureaus which was published free of any charge, showing that a large percentage of this publisher's newspaper is given over to matters which are handled free so far as he is concerned.

On receipt of the letter, I asked him if I might use it in case I cared to do so, and, under date of November 11, a few days ago, I received this reply addressed to me:

Since my recent brief letter apparently found an appreciated place in your busy life, you are welcome to use my correspondence and copies of the Plain Dealer as you wish, although I have no personal desire for special publicity in the matter.

Incidentally, my brother, right-hand man and a full partner in our business, is with the United States combat engineers who made the fight at Attu. I have five minor children in school and I have learned a lot about the problems of keeping a newspaper operating in these troublesome times.

However, I certainly cannot subscribe to any theory and contradiction of democracy—a fool's paradise, where individuals would prosper while their Nation grows poorer by leaps and bounds under the heavy burdens of a world war.

The problems of the newspaper publisher are those of every good American and I am thinking of the future in hoping that the newspaper publishing industry will continue to survive without adding to the necessary and already burdensome obligations of the National Treasury.

The letter is signed by the gentleman who wrote the first letter, Mr. M. D. Hemphill, publisher of the Burt County Plain Dealer, at Tekamah, Nebr., who, I think, leaves a thought that is well worth the consideration of those who are proposing to appropriate additional sums from money that comes only from the sale of bonds. I am satisfied that the publishers of newspapers in Nebraska will go along with those of us who think it is unwise to add to the public debt today, even though the claims might have merit in connection with the sale of advertising.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I recognize the validity of the criticism made of the amendment which I just offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. It is true that in cities larger than 10,000, in fact, practically in all cities of any size, there are local newspapers issued weekly, sometimes semiweekly, and there are papers printed by a church or a society which are entitled to the same consideration as the same class of papers printed in towns of 10,000 or less.

So, Mr. President, after a brief conference on the floor with Senators who are interested, in order to remove that discrimination between the same class of newspapers, even though printed in the cities, I want to offer certain words in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on page 2, beginning in line 17. I shall read it, and then I will send it to the desk to be stated. This is the provision I would insert:

Provided further, That weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, townships, and communities of 10,000 population or more shall be entitled to all the rights provided for herein for weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, townships, and communities of 10,000 population or less.

That takes care of the situation as presented by the Senator from New York, which I think has much merit.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the difference between a weekly newspaper and a weekly magazine? How does the Senator distinguish between the two?

Mr. REED. I think that is a very hard distinction to draw, except that one is printed on soft paper and the other on hard paper, and one purports to print general news and the other is not a newspaper. The Senator from Michigan knows as well as anyone what a newspaper is; he, as well as anyone, can make the distinction between a newspaper and a magazine, and he ought not to lean upon the Senator from Kansas to make the distinction.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I find it difficult to interpret the language of the bill on that point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator, as I understand, does not include the daily colored newspapers of general circulation?

Mr. REED. Colored or otherwise.

Mr. TAFT. It only relates to those that come out every other day.

Mr. REED. Or weekly.

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand the Senator maintains that the amendment is for the purpose of making the bill one that will sell bonds?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. In a large community where the daily newspapers are filled with advertising I cannot understand how it will be possible to sell any more bonds by putting an ad in the little newspapers which come out once or twice a week in the same place where the large papers circulate.

Mr. REED. The large newspapers are already subsidized to a certain extent by the corporate and commercial advertisers who are allowed to take credit on their income taxes, particularly their excess-profits taxes, for what they expend for advertising. This is confined entirely to the large newspapers.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator is so interested in selling bonds that he is trying to correct what he thinks an inequality in the distribution of advertising under the present Treasury system?

Mr. REED. Every once in a while the Senator has peculiar ideas, and that is one of them. He misunderstands the Senator from Kansas. The intention and intent of the Senator from Kansas is to further the selling of bonds.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the pending question is in reality on four amendments. However, the first two are closely related and the last two are more closely related. I ask for a division of the question so that the first two may be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless the Senate agrees, each amendment will be voted on separately.

Mr. GILLETTE. It is immaterial to me. I ask for a division of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if I caught the statement of the Senator from Iowa clearly, it was that the first amendment the Senator from Kansas offered was a separate amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. The modification the Senator just offered?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. No; I refer to the amendment itself. The first two parts relate to the amount of money to be made available; the last two relate to the distribution.

Mr. REED. Up to today I had expected the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to offer the amendment. He had it prepared, and it was printed. I merely accepted the responsibility, and assumed the burden of offering it when the Senator from Minnesota decided not to do so. I have no objection to separating the two parts of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the Senate will consider the amendments separately. The question is on the first amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. VANDENBERG. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That means that we are now voting solely on the question whether the appropriation shall be cut in half. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the first item, $25,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the only question on which we are now to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the question before the Senate.

The question is on the first amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the second amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the third amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "not less than one-half of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the

Senate to the fact that the words "not less than" have already been stricken out by the Senate, so that the vote will be on striking out the words "one-half of." [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide.

Mr. REED. Let us have a division.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A point of order. Let us have an understanding of the effect of the amendment. I ask that the clerk may read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the words "one-half of."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is this a part of the Ball amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands. It is the third amendment.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Chair and the Senate would desire a clearer understanding of the amendment. Striking out these words is merely a formal matter. The same subject matter is carried out in the amendment as offered. In other words, if the amendment should be agreed to as I offer it, this language should come out.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Should this amendment not be voted on at the same time with the remainder of the amendment? Otherwise it does not make any sense.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator from Ohio in that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that both amendments be considered at the same time.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered as one.

Mr. TRUMAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us see if we understand the situation. If the amendment shall be agreed to, the language in line 12 will read:

Provided, That the total amount made available during each fiscal year pursuant to this act shall be expended for the purchase of such advertising space in daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, and communities of 10,000 population or less.

Is that what it means?

Mr. REED. That is correct; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All those in favor of the amendment will rise and remain standing until counted.

Mr. WHERRY. What amendment is this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the third amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the last amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning in line 17, it is proposed to strike out the comma and the words "and one-half of such amount shall be expended for the purchase of such advertising space in daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, and communities of more than 10,000 population," and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the words *"Provided further*, That weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, townships, and communities of 10,000 population or more shall be entitled to all the rights provided for herein for weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, townships, and communities of 10,000 population or less."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to some rather peculiar phrasing in the bill. I refer to the first page, line 10, where the Secretary of the Treasury is not merely authorized, but is directed, to purchase and pay for advertising the sale of bonds. I do not recall any authorization bill ever directing any officer of the Government to do anything. If it has any validity at all, it contemplates that the Secretary of the Treasury now has funds in his hands which he can utilize for this purpose. He may have such funds, for all I know, but this directs him to purchase, and therefore, as soon as the bill shall be enacted into law it will become his mandatory duty to proceed to purchase advertising space for the sale of bonds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure the Senator is entirely correct, but I had supposed the Senator from Alabama would strike out the words "and directed."

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator knows I would not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That question was debated here yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make a point of order against the words "and directed", because the Secretary could do that only when he had the money, and no money has been appropriated for this purpose. It is a very remarkable provision. I make a point of order, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield. I was about to make the point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that the provision is subject to a point of order. It can be reached in either one of two ways.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERTON. It can be reached in one of two ways, either by a point of order, or, if the point of order is not sustained, it can be reached through a motion to strike out the words "and directed."

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am asking the Senator to yield in order that I may discuss the point of order. Of course, an appropriation which was not authorized would be subject to a point of order, but the bill does not provide for an appropriation. This is an authorization, that is, it is an authorization to the Secretary of the Treasury to do certain things. Whether he has the funds available I do not know, but an appropriation is required to enable him to do them. That would not necessarily make the point of order lie against a direction placed in a substantive piece of legislation which either authorizes or directs him to do certain things. Therefore simply for the RECORD, with respect to the parliamentary situation, I say that I doubt whether the words are subject to a point of order, because it is not an appropriation which would be subject to a point of order such as if money were being directly appropriated which had not been previously authorized.

I called attention this morning to the word "directed" as being unusual in a bill of this sort; but that is one thing, and a point of order is another.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from Tennessee is making the point of order on the ground that we cannot direct the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase advertising until an appropriation has actually been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have rules with respect to the appropriation of money. There is an appropriation committee of the Senate which provides for appropriating money. The provision in question invades and violates that rule. The Secretary is directed to purchase advertising space without regard to appropriation. I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The Chair is of the opinion that the matter can be settled by amendment. Therefore, the Chair rules that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that on page 1, line 10, after the word "authorized," the words "and directed" be stricken.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. BANKHEAD addressed the Chair.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have the floor and I have not yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I ask the Senator from Maine if he wishes to ask me a question?

Mr. WHITE. No, Mr. President; I do not. I wish to read a letter into the RECORD.

Mr. OVERTON. I make the motion, Mr. President, because in my legislative experience of 12 years in the Congress I do not recall a provision of this kind being inserted in a bill when no appropriation had been made. I think besides that it is not very wise and sound legislation to direct the Secretary of the Treasury, and make it mandatory upon him, to purchase advertising space in newspapers. Let us suppose there is an issue of bonds for sale, and the sale is progressing splendidly, that there is no necessity at all for any advertisement; then is the money to be spent anyway? Is the Secretary compelled to do it although he does not need any advertising of the bonds? If so, the bill certainly degenerates into a mere subsidy of the press.

Mr. President, I do not think we ought to require the Secretary of the Treasury to do a useless and vain thing. If anything is to be done, he may be authorized to do it, and then that would leave some discretion within the Secretary of the Treasury as to whether he shall advertise the sale of bonds or not.

I submit, therefore, Mr. President, that my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it appropriate for me to read a letter which has just recently come to my desk. It is from the secretary to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WHITE: I have a telegram from Senator NYE, who is in Chicago, which reads as follows:

"Please request Senator WHITE to make this announcement in the Senate for me:

"'Because he has an interest in ownership of a newspaper, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has refrained from any activity on the pending advertising bill, and desires in his absence that I announce that were he present he should have to ask that he be excused from voting on the question.'"

Mr. President, I presume that announcement applies not only on the vote on the final bill, but on amendments which are offered to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it has been repeatedly stated before the Senate and in the Banking and Currency Committee that the Secretary of the Treasury is opposed to this program. I was so advised before the bill was introduced. So the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, as he well knows, under the facts and circumstances means the total defeat of the purposes of the bill. I assume the Senator knows, as most of us know, that the Secretary, without direction, will not administer this bill. There is no dispute about that. That is the reason the language was placed in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I have asked the Senator to yield to me to answer his last statement that there can be no dispute about whether the Secretary will administer the bill. I differ with the Senator as to what the attitude of the Secretary would be. I know the Secretary considers the measure to be unsound. But if he is authorized by an act of Congress to make these advertisements, and a bond issue is made, and he is trying to sell the bonds, and desires to insert advertisements for that purpose, he will hardly ignore the request of the Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there will be no request by Congress if the language in question is stricken.

Mr. OVERTON. The Secretary will be authorized to do it, which is equivalent. The authorization will be supported by an appropriation which will be made.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I was advised by the Treasury Department, before the bill was introduced, that they had authority to do the very thing proposed by the bill to be done, but, being opposed to it, they would not do it. That is the reason the language is used in the bill.

Mr. President, a vote in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is the equivalent of a vote to defeat the bill. I think no one can dispute that. The adoption of the amendment would emasculate the program of the bill. In the bill there is a section which specifically authorizes the Congress to appropriate money if additional money is needed, which, of course may be needed at any time. So I submit that a vote for the Senator's amendment is in effect a vote against the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Let us assume that there is a bond issue of $5,000,000,000, and that within the course of 2 weeks the $5,000,000,000 issue is oversubscribed. Does the Senator wish the Secretary of the Treasury immediately, as soon as a bond issue of $5,000,000,000 is put out, or one of four billion or three billion dollars, to rush to the newspapers and spend $30,000,000 totally unnecessarily?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In my opinion, Mr. President, one need we have is for a continuous program. As a result of these periodical campaigns the enthusiasm subsides. I think it would be better if selling of bonds was going on all the time. That statement is suggested by the remark made by the Senator from Louisiana. Of course a limit on what the Secretary may spend is contained in the bill, and the Senator's amendment proposes to cut the limit by one-half. That results in a saving to the Government of 50 percent of the amount proposed in the bill. Certain Senators are especially disturbed every time an appropriation is suggested, but I note that some Senators in that group are not voting for an amendment which would cut half of the amount out of the bill. I want it well understood with regard to the effect of the amendment, that the words "and directed" were deliberately put into the bill because it was recognized that a mere authorization, which the Secretary now has, if specifically put into the bill would not accomplish anything.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we leave the words "and directed" in the bill, they will be an instruction not only to the Secretary of the Treasury but to the Appropriations Committee. We are endeavoring to say to the Appropriations Committee, "You must appropriate not less than $12,500,000." It seems to me that if we wanted at sometime to tell the Secretary of the Treasury he must spend a certain amount, the place to put that is in an appropriation bill. The pending bill is an authorization bill, and if the bill is passed, and then later comes to the attention of the Appropriations Committee when it is considering an appropriation bill, the committee can place in the appropriations bill an item of $12,500,000 or $10,000,000 or $5,000,000, and can say regarding it that it shall be spent before a certain date. I think the committee can then issue an instruction to the Secretary of the Treasury, but I do not think we today should attempt to bind the Appropriations Committee to a minimum amount which must be appropriated under any circumstances.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the words "and directed" are deleted and that the Appropriations Committee in considering the item puts in those words as a direction for the expenditure of the money, would that not be subject to a point of order on the ground that the original act authorized it but did not direct it?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think so. I do not know of any acts which require but do not direct. I do not remember any since I have been in the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator suggests that the Appropriations Committee put it in when the item comes before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. And I think as a practical matter it could be put in previously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER'S name was called). I announce the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. He is absent on business of the Senate. I am not advised how he would vote on the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). As I announced on the previous vote, I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent from the city on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has been called from the city by most urgent circumstances.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—34

Andrews	Ferguson	Robertson
Austin	Gerry	Shipstead
Ball	Green	Taft
Barbour	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hawkes	Truman
Buck	Holman	Tydings
Burton	Maloney	Wallgren
Bushfield	McKellar	Walsh
Butler	Moore	Wherry
Byrd	O'Daniel	White
Danaher	Overton	
Ellender	Reynolds	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Hayden	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hill	Smith
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bilbo	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Langer	Tobey
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	McClellan	Van Nuys
Downey	McFarland	Wagner
Eastland	Mead	Wiley
George	Pepper	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	Wilson
Guffey	Reed	

NOT VOTING—24

Bailey	Glass	Murdock
Bone	Hatch	Murray
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Nye
Bridges	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Capper	Lodge	Revercomb
Chandler	McCarran	Russell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler

So Mr. OVERTON's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I rise to state the reasons why I am opposed to this bill. I think it is merely the camel's nose under the tent for a federally subsidized press. I have the greatest respect for the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and I dislike to be on the opposite side from him; but I think if we pass a bill such as this we shall have exactly the same conditions nationally that we have in the States with respect to State advertising, which is issued solely for the purpose of buying votes. I do not care which party is in power, it is a bad thing to use Federal money for advertising for the purpose of subsidizing the press. I think this is the camel's nose under the tent, which in the end will mean more expenditures for more advertising. Therefore I cannot support the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in the Banking and Currency Committee I voted against the bill. I offered in the committee the amendment which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] offered in the Senate, and which was adopted.

I think this debate has made it clear that this is not a bill primarily to sell War bonds, but a bill to help weekly newspapers which have been hard hit by the war. Newspaper publishers themselves came before the committee. I think they have convinced themselves that a Government program of paid advertising would help to sell bonds.

The reason why Members of the Senate are supporting this bill is that they wish to help publishers of weekly newspapers in their States. I do not blame them. But let me tell the Senate, Mr. President, that if we pass this bill to bail out this particular group of businessmen who have been hard hit by the war, it will be only the beginning. In the very early months of this war the automobile dealers were knocked completely out of business. We did not bail them out. The dealers in electrical supplies, refrigerators, and washing machines are out of business today. We did not bail them out. More than 450,000 retail grocers and butchers in this country are in effect carrying out the Government's rationing program. If any Senator has been in a grocery store or a butcher shop he knows that handling ration coupons has made it tremendously more difficult for grocers to stay in business. If we are to start compensating every individual who contributes in any way to the war effort, we ought to compensate the grocers for handling ration stamps.

In the hearings on this bill Mr. Rich, of Michigan, cited at length the experience of Canada. I wish to read a paragraph from Marketing, published in Canada, which he quoted. The article appeared on April 17, 1943. This is the paragraph which he quoted:

> Originally designed to handle war-finance advertising exclusively, these organizations (papers, agencies, etc.) soon demonstrated to ministers, deputy ministers, and officials the efficiency of expertly planned advertising in speeding up public understanding and acceptance of all Government policies and proposals. In a very real sense, Canadian publishers and advertising men have shown the Government the superiority of paid advertising compared with free publicity. • • • The result has been that numerous Government departments have become national advertisers to a very considerable extent and are likely to continue and increase the use of advertising.

The testimony before the committee of Doyle L. Buckles, field manager of the Alabama Press Association, who told how the bill originated at a meeting of such managers in Cleveland 2 years ago, clearly shows that the bill to have the Federal Government buy advertising for War bonds is only the first step; that eventually there will be pressure for the Government to buy advertising to publish O. P. A. orders, O. D. T. orders, and so forth. The $12,500,000 to $15,000,000 provided in the bill would not be a drop in the bucket compared with what that kind of a program would eventually cost.

In one of his quotations from a Canadian official, Mr. Buckles quoted him as saying:

> The British Government is the largest single advertiser in the English press.

Mr. President, do we want the Government of the United States to become the largest single advertiser in the American press? Does any Member of the Senate think that we should much longer have a free and independent press if that should happen? I care not what is the experience in Canada or Britain. I do know something about American newspapers and newspapermen, and the newspaper business. The testimony before the committee showed that the amount expected to be received by 10,000 weeklies, $1,000 worth of advertising a year—and they will still get it, under the amendment of the Senator from Kansas—averages 6.7 percent of their gross income from all sources. Does any Senator with any business experience think that a businessman will not pay some attention to the opinions and views of a single customer who contributes nearly 7 percent of his gross revenue?

If the bill is passed, and if an appropriation is made, it will be only the beginning of a long series of bills to get this group, that group, and the other group, on the Federal gravy train. "Everyone else is getting it, so why should we not get it?"

Senators who vote for this bill cannot in good conscience oppose at least an equal appropriation for advertising on the radio, on billboards, and in subway cars. If advertising by the Government is good business in the newspapers, then it is good business on the radio, which has certainly contributed plenty of free time to this program.

I wish to close by reading from a letter which I received yesterday from L. A. Clark, publisher of the Pontiac Daily Leader, in Pontiac, Ill.:

> We are publishers of a small rural daily having a paid circulation of 4,700, but we are very much opposed to the Bankhead advertising bill.
>
> • • • • •
>
> We are ashamed when our local acquaintances say, "Well, I see the Government is going to add the newspapers to the 'hand-out'

class." Our reply to this is that we think it is a scheme to buy up newspaper support for someone, but that we have been busy writing letters to our Senators and Representatives to vote against this bill. The common reply from our friends is a compliment for our stand.

We have been able to sell more War bond advertising than this bill would ever provide and, if passed, the bill would kill all appeal we could make to sell this advertising to local sponsors. For the Third War Loan we sold over $500 worth of this advertising in our small paper and a very large part of it was voluntary by the people, without a cent of cost to the Government.

Why not add magazines, radio, and billboard advertising to the bill? Try to buy up everybody with a "hand-out."

If this bill passes we believe War bond advertising nationally will drop near 75 percent.

An impression has been created here that the sponsored advertisements for War bonds printed in newspapers are published free by the newspapers. That is not true. The newspaper is paid its regular advertising rate for such advertisements. They are sold on the basis of having the merchants sponsor them. That is nothing new in the newspaper field. The newspapers have been doing that for a hundred years. Every Christmas, every Thanksgiving, and every July Fourth they sell sponsored advertisements. Most of them are pleased to do it now as a contribution to the war effort.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the bill will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I had thought I would not participate in any way in this debate. Inasmuch as I am a member of the profession which will be directly benefited if the bill is passed, I shall request the consent of the Senate to be permitted to withhold my vote. I shall do so because I am under conflicting impulses, owing to unjust as well as just criticism which has been lodged against this measure.

I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to my colleagues in the Senate, my colleagues in a broader sphere of activity. I do this because some unkind words have been uttered on the floor of the Senate about the newspaper publishers of America, and more particularly concerning the small city and country newspapermen.

Mr. President, the small newspaper publisher is a robust, self-reliant, patriotic citizen. He wants no hand-out, no favoritism, no special consideration. He fights subsidies; he fights wasteful Government expenditures. Senators who are friends of the newspapermen if convinced in their innermost minds that the bill provides for a subsidy for the newspapers, or that it is not good business for the Government, should vote against the bill.

I repeat, the newspaperman wants no subsidy; he wants no waste. Above all they want nothing that infringes upon the freedom of the press. The small newspaperman feels a pride in his vocation because its security stems from the constitutional safeguard of that freedom of the press. He examines his conscience daily or weekly, or semiweekly, as his business may require him, to see if the utterances printed in his newspaper are in accord with the highest principles of Government, and for the welfare of our country. He stands vigilantly on guard against subversive activities and against corruption in high places.

Again I adjure all Senators who think this measure will in any way depreciate the freedom of the press, or will cast reflection upon the honor or freedom of the man who edits or publishes a newspaper, they should vote against the bill. By that decision, however, they will express the unholy belief that the newspaper editors' opinions are controlled by its advertising revenues. This I stoutly deny.

I wish to speak briefly in defense of this large and honorable profession, the profession to which I owe my livelihood, and in which I began as a boy, standing on the bound copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and picking type from the type case. Perhaps that is the only foundation I have ever had for being in this body today, but it certainly served a good purpose to bring me down to this hour and to this place, through the profession in which I have labored for more than twoscore years.

Mr. President, yesterday my pride in my profession was hurt to hear it said upon this floor that the voice of the newspapermen is the "only venal voice" which has been raised in our coordinated war effort at this time of our Nation's emergency. Mr. President, I say emphatically to my fellow Senators that this is not a venal effort. The newspapermen are trying to do the job for their country as patriotically as is any other group of its citizens. It was said that all other citizens participate in the war effort and give their services for the war. There is no group of people who do that more loyally, more freely, or more effectively than do the newspaper publishers. Whenever the Rotary Club, the Kiwanis Club, the American Legion, or any similar organization sponsors a drive for the war effort, for the Red Cross, or for any of the various activities in behalf of our Government during this time of emergency, the first thing they do is to form a committee. On the majority of such committees, one will find an active, potent force in the newspapermen. The first subcommittee which the chairman of the drive sets up, is a publicity committee, and usually a newspaperman is appointed on the publicity committee because it is known that he best can serve in that capacity. After he has helped map out the plan, and helped set up the program of activity and probably made an initial subscription, and after the other members of the committee have gone to the peaceful quiet of their homes, he goes back to his newspaper office and writes the editorials and the news campaign which make the publicity and the attendant drive successful. He digs down into the vast pile of literature, mats, and illustrations which a benevolent Government has prepared at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and has sent to him free of charge to publish in his newspaper. He finds that only about 1 percent is useful and the remainder is waste. After hours of diligent work he adapts the material to suit the community in which he lives. Quite often because of the shortage of paper, he rations the paid advertising already sent in, in order to provide space for the Government's need. He works tirelessly to publish effectively the things which will best promote the activity at hand.

Mr. President, the small newspaper publisher does not ask for pay to do that. If you were to try to pay him for it, you would have to make an appropriation many score times greater than is provided in this bill. He will continue to do all this and he will do it throughout this war and throughout the period after the war, and he contributes it now and will continue to contribute it as his free service and his patriotic duty to the country, regardless of whether this bill passes or fails. He will continue to do it as long as he lives, as the greatest reward comes from the satisfaction of serving.

But there comes a time when the Government says in effect, "We also want you to publish some newspaper display advertisements. We need these page or half-page ads to promote bond sales"—which have been successful, and a part of the success is due to the advertisements which have been published and sponsored by the merchants and industries of the communities. The Government suggests that the merchants and industrialists sponsor and pay for these advertisements.

Now this presents a difficult problem to the newspaper publisher. If he should donate this space, he will be giving away his stock in trade, the thing he has spent his capital to build up, the thing for which he pays the help in his office, and the thing which comprises his goodwill. He is jealous of the worth of this commodity and must maintain its standard of value. The Government asks no other group to contribute free its stock in trade. So he responds to the Government's call that he go out and solicit sponsors for these advertisements. The Government is asking him, figuratively speaking, to take a tin cup and collect from the citizens of the community for that which he believes the Government itself should pay.

All this bill proposes is that the Government assume the comparatively minor expense of the advertising which it is now asking publishers and retail merchants to contribute.

The newspaper publisher wants to be loyal, so he takes that figurative tin cup with the emblem of the American eagle on it, and goes to the doors of the establishments of the businessmen. He encounters a group of men who have appealed to Washington in vain for relief from the aggravations of Government; from excessive taxation; from unnecessary questionnaires; from the irritations of the O. P. A.; and from all the other complexities which this war has brought

upon them. He goes to a merchant, who himself is aggrieved and disturbed by his Government's activities, a merchant whose wail of distress has not been heard in Washington, either at the Capitol or at the White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, but has been lost in the maze of the huge buildings lining the thoroughfare between these points. That is the group of people to whom the small-town publisher goes and asks that they pay for something for which a misguided agency of the Government has refused to provide. With nerves worn and frazzled by the dislocations of war, the businessman is apt to tell the solicitor, "Oh, yes, you are doing this again, are you not? This is just to fatten the racket that you are carrying on in this community. I will give you a $5 contribution, but it will come out of my appropriation for newspaper advertising. You do not need to think you are going to get it from me twice." Sometimes, I am afraid, the merchant concludes that his contribution to bond advertising ends his responsibility to purchase bonds.

All this is the experience of many a small-town newspaperman in soliciting what the Government itself should pay for in the same frank and businesslike method in which they purchase the other requirements of war. That is the cause that is being offered to the Senate today.

It has been said here by one of my colleagues, "All communities are covered by this character of advertising through the large newspapers and the radio." I challenge that statement. If the Senator should ride out into the country and into the small towns he would find a scarcity of newspapers in these days; and if he should go into a small town or country home and find a large newspaper, he would learn how quickly it would be cast aside when a familiar thud on the front porch announces the arrival of the small-town newspaper. The whole family gather around the table in the living room and read the local events which interest the people of the community, the things which touch their home life. They read about the babies born in the community, about the children graduating from Sunday school and high school, about the marriages; they read with pride the things the small newspaper says about its town—our town; about the successes of its boys and girls—our boys and girls, and all of its illustrious citizens. They read, with a smile, the softening things which are said to cover the faults of the erring, and with pardoning indulgence the glowing tribute which has been paid as the final earthly recommendation for the admission of a deceased politician—our statesman—into the realms of eternal bliss.

Yes, Mr. President, the small-town newspaper rests unquestioned on the table of the living room. Its pages are not filled with scandals from Boston to Hollywood and the Bahamas, but it has a wholesome tone that all can appreciate. It is not called before the Post Office Department to answer charges of purveying obscene literature, of printing salacious pictures on its pages. It is there to give the people of the community the local news which they want to know. They are more interested in knowing that last night the town council passed an order repairing the street-flooding broken sewer pipe at the corner of First and Main than they are in reading what happened in Moscow. They are more interested in knowing that a good mayor has, with patience and kindness, suspended the sentence of a drunken-driving deserving Democrat or a ribald Republican than they are in reading in the big newspapers that the jury acquitted the alleged murderer of Sir John Doaks in Nausea. They may read the evergrowing list of names of those boys in their community who have answered their country's call. Perhaps they may read a published letter written by a neighbor's boy over in Guadalcanal telling about the hardships there, about malaria, about the danger-infested jungles, and also saying that perhaps he will never come back home again. Then one can almost hear John say, "Mary, I think maybe we ought to take that $500 out of the bank and buy bonds, because it may help our neighbor boy save his life and bring him back to us again." For such is the response to the appeal of the small-town newspaper.

Senators, we are spending millions of dollars to educate people of other nations about the virtues and ideals of America; we spend millions of dollars to send propaganda all over the world; we send beautifully illustrated magazines, telling how we will bring the "four freedoms" to all the people of the world, and carrying along with them pictures, implying that, in freeing them from want, we are going to put a turkey on every dinner table in the world. Would it not be better if we should bring to the hearthplace of every home something of the voice of America, some of the things we are fighting for, and of our obligation to support our Government? For, Senators, patriotism does not spring full flowered from inheritance,; patriotism has to be nurtured and developed in every generation, and there is no means by which patriotism can be built up in America better than by the message conveyed to the hearthsides of our homes through the small country newspapers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I did not, by any means, say that the large newspapers reach everybody in the country. I said there was plenty of advertising. The small newspapers as well as the large newspapers carry some sponsored advertising. There is not a man, woman, or child in the United States who does not listen to War-bond advertising over the radio every day. I do not want to be misunderstood that I made any statement that the large newspaper advertising reaches all the people in the small communities. I said that today the general advertising program reaches everyone, and no more advertising is needed than is being provided today.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall be glad to take the Senator's statement, but I do not care to go into the difference between the merits of advertising in the small newspapers which are read in small communities, and the large newspapers.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I want to say that I appreciate very much what the Senator is saying, and I think he spoke justly and truly when he drew a picture of the country newspapers when they are asked to take these advertisements quite freely as parting with their substance, for all they have to sell is their space. I never believed there is any subsidy involved, and I do not now. I thank the Senator for his effort, but I object to one of his remarks. In drawing an illustration he used the words "ribald Republicans." I suggest that, in view of the recent election, he substituted the words "robust Republicans." [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. I accept the Senator's correction.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I believe there is much merit in the pending measure, but since in my opinion it is contrary to public policy for any Senator to vote on any measure from the enactment of which he would be a direct beneficiary, I ask that I be permitted to refrain from voting on this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an editorial reprinted from Editor and Publisher for November 6, 1943, entitled "No Subsidy Is Involved."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO SUBSIDY IS INVOLVED

The Bankhead bill has been reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Banking and Currency, by a vote of 11 to 5. The bill directs the purchase of newspaper advertising space, in dailies, weeklies, semiweeklies, and triweeklies, for the sale of bonds, notes, and other obligations of the United States. Not less than $25,000,000 nor more than $30,000,000 per fiscal year is appropriated, with the stipulation that half the amount be spent in papers published in communities of 10,000 or less.

This action of the committee and the prospect of favorable votes in both Houses of Congress has aroused again the sentiment among a few metropolitan newspapers that the legislation opens the way to large expenditures by the Government, with the threat to freedom of the press through what some papers have termed "pap" and others "subsidy." Editor and Publisher has refuted these arguments again and again, but in view of the bill's present status and our past connection with advocacy of advertising by government, it seems appropriate to review the whole story briefly.

In the issue of January 3, 1942, Editor and Publisher printed the first editorial urging the use of paid space, rather than donated space, for the sale of war securities. We pointed out that newspaper space was the publisher's stock in trade, comparable on that basis with the arms and ammunition it was buying from their producers for cash.

Subsequent issues carried further editorials and comments from the newspaper field which generally supported our initial proposal. These continued through February and March and into April, when the St. Louis Post-Dispatch attacked the idea as a bid for

a Government hand-out to the press and as a road to subsidy by the Government. At this juncture the American Society of Newspaper Editors met in New York, and Mr. Ralph Coghlan, editor of the editorial page of the Post-Dispatch, and the editor of Editor and Publisher were invited to present their views to the A. S. N. E. resolutions committee. The result of their debate was a resolution reading as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That the American Society of Newspaper Editors is unalterably opposed to any governmental policy which may be construed or has resemblance to a wartime subsidy of the American press, since such a policy might gravely endanger the news and editorial integrity of newspapers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the patriotic services of the American press never have been and must never be evaluated in terms of dollars; therefore, from the standpoint of editors, we deplore any apparent solicitation or action which may be construed as an effort to bring pressure upon the Government to buy advertising space in the newspapers of the Nation."

That resolution failed of passage, being snowed under a flood of substitute motions—all of which rejected the idea of a press subsidy. The question was submitted to a mail vote.

Meanwhile, the bureau of advertising of the A. N. P. A., meeting the following week, accepted the above resolution that the A. S. N. E. had rejected, with this addition to the last sentence: "As distinguished from honorable and orderly presentation to government of the advantages of advertising."

Disregarding this advice from the newspaper advertising experts, the A. S. N. E. resolutions committee submitted this resolution to the entire membership for referendum:

"*Be it resolved*, That it is a principle of journalism that newspapers seek no favors or subsidiaries from government."

That was adopted, of course, by a vote of 169 to 14. The newspapers were then squarely on record, by the voice of their two representative associations, as against subsidy. In the process, they had given no guidance either to Congress or the Treasury as to how their space might be usefully employed for the sale of war securities. Editor and Publisher kept the fight up along its original lines. Several State newspaper associations took it up also.

During most of 1942, the Treasury promoted the sale of War bonds with no central effort, but with 1943 swinging the war effort into full speed, it became evident that more vigorous promotion methods were needed. Secretary Morgenthau then called to his aid several distinguished newspaper advertising men, to whom he made it clear that the Treasury Department did not wish to buy space on its own account, but would welcome the contribution of space by private advertisers.

This method was followed during the Second and Third War bond drives, both of which were oversold—on the whole, but not everywhere to individual buyers on the desired scale. It has been evident from the start that the purchase of War bonds by individuals was one of the major guards against inflation.

Between the Second and the Third War bond drives, Senator BANKHEAD introduced his bill, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to use the authority to buy advertising he already possessed and setting up specific funds for the purchase of newspaper space.

Testimony before the committee was given by representatives of both large and small newspapers, the A. N. P. A. being represented by a letter from President Linwood I. Noyes, which again warned against the dangers of subsidy. The committee, after weighing the evidence, voted to report the bill favorably. Among those so voting (by proxy) was the venerable and incorruptible Senator CARTER GLASS, publisher of the Lynchburg (Va.) News and Advance, who has had a long lifetime of both journalism and politics. If subsidy were even a remote peril attached to Government advertising, we are certain that Senator GLASS would have been found on the other side.

Two major points suggest themselves here.

One is how to resolve the doubts on subsidy.

The other is the comparative efficiency of official advertising and the kind that the Treasury has been willing to use up to now.

Government has used newspaper advertising in recent years for Army and Navy recruiting. The copy was good and the effort was successful. At no point during either campaign was it suggested that the Government was attempting to subsidize the selected lists of newspapers in which it bought space. The advertising produced an unexpected number of recruits at small cost.

When the Treasury invested $672,000 in magazine space to advertise savings bonds and sold the bonds to the tune of many millions without one inch of sponsored space—was there any thought that the magazines were being subsidized? The question answers itself. Why then the reluctance to apply this proved, successful, process to the infinitely greater task of today? Great Britain and Canada have regularly advertised their Victory loans in newspapers and magazines—and not once has any newspaper or member of Parliament raised the ridiculous subsidy argument.

To say that advertising sold to the Government on the regular card rate basis involves a subsidy from the Government to the press is too silly for discussion. To suggest that newspaper policy is for sale at the rate of about $1,000 per newspaper per year is to put an appraisal on the press, which, if seriously entertained, would mean that newspapers are already too far gone for salvation.

Newspapers that won't be subsidized can't be subsidized.

Now for the question of efficiency. The Allied Newspaper Council reported last week that a total of 118,000,000 lines of advertising had been printed in newspapers for promotion of the Third War Loan, plus 61,000,000 lines of news. Let's forget the news lineage. The bulk of the 118,000,000 lines of advertising undoubtedly appeared in large city newspapers, at an average agate line rate of, conservatively, 20 cents. In other words, more than $20,000,000 was solicited by newspapers from local and national advertisers to do less than one-fourth of the Treasury's projected job for 1943. At that rate, the Treasury's present advertising scheme calls for 2.5 units of advertising to every 1 provided in the Bankhead bill. If the latter's calculations are sound, the Treasury is wasting advertising effort—and newsprint—by its unwillingness to sponsor officially signed advertising.

Another point—while the Treasury declares that sales of Third War Loan bonds to individuals exceeded its $5,000,000,000 quota by $377,000,000, it is known to Editor and Publisher that this ratio does not hold for every part of the country. In some sections of New York City, in fact, the sale of bonds to individuals ran more than 30 percent behind the local quotas. Insufficient newspaper advertising in these areas and lack of strong local organization for individual sales are the only plausible explanations for this condition.

Still another point—it is naive to think that the taxpayers, in the last analysis, did not pay for the huge advertising pressure that has been put behind the war loan drives to date. Space so contributed is deductible from the operating expenses of advertisers, for tax purposes. So it may be that the Treasury lost a bit financially, as well as forfeiting control over the kind of copy that was used to support its program. The Treasury would have specific control over the quality and placement of copy that it published over the signature of the United States of America, under the Bankhead bill or any amended version of it that may pass Congress and the President.

Let us all quit thinking of Government advertising in terms of subsidy, or as a replacement for temporarily lost commercial copy. It cannot be either. When Government buys advertising for the sale of bonds, or for any other purpose, all hands will have to think of it as a straight commercial transaction, with Government the customer in the same sense that R. H. Macy & Co., General Motors, or American Airlines is a customer of the press. Uncle Sam would buy newspaper advertising space and service—nothing more and nothing less. Put the placement in the hands of able advertising people, shut the politicians out, pay the newspaper the value of its space, and all the bogeys that are feared today will vanish.

Moreover, waste will be eliminated. The appeal to the people will be direct and overpowering, with the advertising signed by and bearing the direct authority of the United States of America. Private funds now otherwise used will be available for the purchase of War bonds and the payment of legitimate income taxes. Lastly—a straightforward approach is always the best.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am among those Senators who thoroughly enjoyed the well-deserved tribute to the newspaper profession paid by the Senator from Indiana, but I cannot see what connection it has with the subsidy proposal. I am coming more and more to the conclusion, Mr. President, in connection with subsidies, that the great question, as has always been the case, is where the subsidy goes. I hope no one will get the false impression from the beautiful, glowing, and very proper and deserved tribute of the Senator from Indiana that it has anything to do with the bill and the subject we have been discussing in the Senate for a couple of days; and I hope that no one will worry too much about the poor newspaperman with a tin cup to whom the Senator referred. It is a proper "cup" and it is the same one he uses on the Fourth of July, on Armistice Day, and during the holiday season. Most of us have had a chance to participate in worth-while advertising by way of that type of solicitation, and we will do it again. It is the newspaperman's own idea and invention. He is going to continue to practice it, and, therefore, it is quite unfair, unintentionally unfair, of course, to use it in this instance.

If there ever was a subsidy this is it. I do not think anyone here is mistaken about it; I do not think that up to now anyone here has been much disturbed about the Treasury Department meeting the demand of the War bond drives. I do not think anyone here doubts for a moment that we will ever fall one dollar short of any bond quota, with or without this kind of advertisement.

I want to say again, as I attempted to, perhaps too feebly, yesterday, that this, in my judgment, is a dangerous step, and I reiterate, if I may, that we cannot do this to the newspapers or for the newspapers and reject like proposals in connection with other worth-while advertising facilities or media. It just cannot,

in fairness, be done. I know there are some Senators who believe we can open the gate in this instance and close it when something else comes along. All kinds of pressure, pressure on conscience, pressure on sympathy, political pressure, or other kinds, will be then exerted, and if we take this step—and I am beginning to fear we will—it will be a step we will long regret.

I hope the bill will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MALONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] which I transfer to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and will vote. I vote "yea." I am advised that if present the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER'S name was called). I repeat the announcement as to the necessary absence of my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I add that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." As I intend to vote the same way, I am therefore permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIS (when his name was called). Inasmuch as I believe there is much of merit in the pending measure, but since in my opinion it is contrary to public policy for any Senator to vote on any measure from the enactment of which he would be a direct beneficiary, I ask that I be permitted to refrain from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHEELER. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] if present, would vote "yea." He is paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has been called from the city by most urgent circumstances.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent from the city on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?

The question being put, the Senate decided in the affirmative.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Gillette	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hayden	Smith
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Kilgore	Tobey
Caraway	Langer	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lucas	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	Wiley
Downey	Mead	Wilson
Eastland	Pepper	
George	Radcliffe	

NAYS—35

Austin	Gerry	Robertson
Ball	Green	Shipstead
Barbour	Gurney	Taft
Brooks	Hatch	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Hawkes	Truman
Burton	Holman	Tunnell
Bushfield	McKellar	Tydings
Butler	Maloney	Walsh
Byrd	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ellender	Overton	White
Ferguson	Reynolds	

NOT VOTING—21

Bailey	Johnson, Calif.	Murray
Bone	La Follette	Nye
Brewster	Lodge	O'Mahoney
Capper	McCarran	Revercomb
Chandler	McNary	Russell
Davis	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Glass	Murdock	Willis

So the bill (S. 1457) was passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in response to a request which has been made of me I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on Senate bill 1457, the bill, as amended, be printed in full. A great many changes have been made in the bill, and that is the only way to make the text of the bill immediately available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill, as amended, will be printed in the RECORD immediately following the vote.

Senate bill 1457, as amended, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide for the more effective use of idle currency in aid of the stabilization program and the war effort, and in order to improve the credit structure by relieving the Federal Reserve banks and the various other members of the banking system of the United States of the necessity of purchasing additional vast amounts of United States bonds and other obligations, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase and pay for during each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, not less than $12,500,000 nor more than $15,000,000 and during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, a fractional portion of such amount based upon the number of months remaining in such fiscal year, of advertising space in newspapers published in the United States for the purpose of advertising the sale of War bonds of the United States, and for the publication in such newspapers as a part of such advertising, information, sales arguments, and appeals relating to, and promoting or encouraging, such sales. The advertising space so purchased shall be divided equitably among all newspapers of general circulation which are entered as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879, as amended: *Provided*, That the total amount made available during each fiscal year pursuant to this act shall be expended for the purchase of such advertising space in daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, townships, towns, villages, and communities of 10,000 population or less: *Provided further*, That weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, townships, and communities of 10,000 population or more shall be entitled to all the rights provided for herein for weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers published in cities, towns, villages, townships, and communities of 10,000 population or less.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe such regulations consistent with the provisions of this act as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to secure the best financial results for the United States consistent with such program, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in cooperation with recognized existing nonprofit national newspaper publishers' associations to be designated by him (including one such association representing principally daily newspapers and one representing principally weekly newspapers), prepare newspaper advertisements and fairly distribute such advertisements to all newspapers in accordance with section 1 of this act. In the distribution of such advertisements, the same aggregate amount of space shall be offered to all newspapers to be paid for at the prevailing pub-

lished rate for the respective newspapers, with the same discounts, if any, available to the Government as are available to advertising agencies.

(b) In the administration of this act there shall be no interference in any manner with the independence or freedom of any newspaper or its responsibility in serving its readers.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. The authority conferred by this act shall terminate 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is necessarily absent. I ask unanimous consent that a statement he has prepared regarding his position on the bill just passed be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN REGARDING HIS POSITION ON SENATE BILL 1457

I have arranged to be paired in favor of this bill.

The conclusion that I should take this position was reached after a close study of the bill, of the hearings, and of the committee's report, and after consultation with the newspaper editors of my own State, the men whose businesses will be most directly affected by this legislation.

In behalf of this bill, it may be said that the newspaper advertising which this legislation authorizes undoubtedly will contribute materially to increased sales of War bonds.

If money is to be spent for the promotion of War bond sales, I know of no better way to spend it than by buying newspaper advertising space. But we must remember that the advertising which a newspaper sells constitutes its stock in trade, just as the end product of any factory manufacturing war materials constitutes its stock in trade.

The primary load in the drive for War bond sales is being carried by the newspapers of the country today. Those papers are entitled to be paid for their white space just as an airplane manufacturer is entitled to be paid for the planes he produces.

I am not entirely satisfied with the fact that the bill provides no effective control over the text of advertising copy to be purchased under its provisions, and leaves the way clear for use of such copy as a possible medium for advancement of political purposes. I realize, however, that it would be a very difficult job to write into the bill provision for an effective control which would completely negative this objection. Furthermore, assurance has been given by those who will administer the bill that in the administration of it no political purpose will be served. I prefer to accept this assurance, and rely upon it, rather than oppose a bill which is praiseworthy in its major objective, fair in principle, and which is desired by a very substantial majority of those who will be affected by it.

For some time I had doubts whether this bill contained adequate safeguards against the possibilities that the money which it provides might be used as a lever to sway the newspapers of this country, or some of them, from the straight line to which they must know if a free press as we know it is to be preserved. Recognition of this threat is implicit in the language of subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the bill, which purports to meet the threat by providing that "In the administration of this act there shall be no interference in any manner with the independence or freedom of any newspaper or its responsibility in serving its readers." It should be noted that this provision is not merely directory, but is a mandatory prohibition against using these funds in derogation of a free press.

Consultation with my friends, the editors of newspapers published in my State, has substantially cleared my mind on this point. These men, though consulted separately, took an almost unanimous view: that no newspaper worthy of the name would be in any danger of being corrupted or controlled by an advertiser, and that the proportion which this proposed Government advertising will constitute of the total advertising sales of any particular newspaper will not be large enough to be a serious corrupting influence even if we were to concede—as I refuse to do—that the press of this country is susceptible to such corruption.

Though necessarily absent from the Senate on official business, I did not feel that I could in conscience shirk the responsibility of taking a clear position on this legislation, and of effectuating my decision by arranging a pair with a Senator who holds the opposite view, so that my vote may in effect count toward the final result of the Senate's consideration of this measure.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, when the so-called Bankhead bill, just passed, was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, a number of letters were presented to the committee which were not inserted in the RECORD at the time. Only those letters with respect to which requests for insertion in the RECORD were made were printed in the committee hearings. The American Newspaper Publishers' Association submitted a letter without request that it be printed in the hearings. Subsequently the association asked that its letter be placed in the RECORD. The committee hearings had been concluded, so the committee was unable to do so. I now ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, October 16, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: Announcement has been made that hearings are to be held soon by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate of which you are chairman, regarding bill S. 1073, introduced by Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, on May 4, 1943, to provide that at least half of a fund of $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 be expended for Government advertising in weekly, semiweekly, triweekly, and monthly newspapers in small towns and rural areas regardless of markets and other factors that normally control decisions in buying advertising. The one-half remainder would be available for advertising in daily newspapers.

The board of directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association has given consideration to this subject and our position was made plain in the address of the president of the association to the annual convention last April, the president at that time being Walter M. Dear, copublisher of the Jersey City (N. J.) Jersey Journal. There was no dissent voiced on the floor of the convention to the statement by Mr. Dear and none has come from our membership since then. I quote the remarks of Mr. Dear made on April 28, a few days prior to the introduction of bill S. 1073:

"By resolution last year, the A. N. P. A. went on record as opposed to intimidation or undue pressure to switch, split, or extend an advertising schedule when the set-up of a marketing campaign had been completed. Recent disregard of this resolution has resulted adversely to the newspapers, both in commercial and governmental advertising. In the case of the limited Treasury advertising campaign for sale of bonds last December the hue and cry, not only from radio stations, but also from newspapers not on the list, resulted in the abandonment of a repetition or expansion of a newspaper advertising campaign for the second war loan drive now current.

"Another phase of this problem has developed through the announcement of a bill to be introduced in the Congress. Briefly it is proposed that an appropriation of 25 to 30 million dollars shall be voted by Congress for advertising in newspapers of Treasury bond sales, the appropriation to be equally divided between daily and weekly newspapers. This provision smacks of subsidy.

"Some newspaper groups have publicly acclaimed approval of the idea and through overenthusiasm or because of economic pressure have expressed advocacy on the ground that such expenditure, particularly in the case of the small newspapers, would serve as a stopgap for the economic depression which endangers the continuation of such publications. While we have the deepest sympathy for any of our fellow publishers who may find the going difficult, and realize the value and importance of the weekly press, we cannot subscribe to the wisdom of accepting a subsidy. Such a program would prove disastrous. Under such circumstances, no longer could the American newspaper maintain its claim of a free and independent press.

"We readily admit that the basic principle of advertising is just as applicable and will be equally as effective for the Government as experience has proven it to be. However, Government advertising must be safeguarded from political influence and directed by independent advertising experts who have demonstrated their ability and the confidence in which they are held by the newspapers. This confidence has been built up by the honorable and businesslike handling of the trust imposed in the expenditure of private funds. There would be no reason to believe that these gentlemen would be any less scrupulous in the proper handling of Government moneys.

"This may sound Utopian, but in our judgment it is the only fundamentally sound basis on which Government advertising can operate. Apparently before such an advertising campaign can be undertaken with any degree of dignity and general acceptance, newspapers must learn to regard Government advertising as falling in the same category as a commercial advertising campaign by adhering to the resolution adopted last year. Unfortunately, such a realistic approach does not seem imminent."

After the announcement that hearings are to be held soon, this matter was again considered by the board of directors of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and we reaffirm our attitude as expressed in the above-quoted remark of Mr. Dear.

Sincerely yours,

LINWOOD I. NOYES,
President.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably from that

committee, without amendment, Senate Resolution 206, and ask for its immediate consideration. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] on November 12, 1943, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which favorably reported it earlier today. The resolution came from the Committee on the Judiciary with a unanimous report. The resolution deals with the investigation of the alcohol beverage industry of the United States. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is present, and if any Senator desires to ask any questions he will be glad to answer.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, when was the resolution reported by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution was ordered reported yesterday, and was reported to the Senate earlier today.

Mr. WHITE. Has it been placed on the calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. It has not been placed on the calendar. I have conferred with members on the Republican side who are on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as well as members on the Democratic side, and they are all in favor of the appropriation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have made some inquiry from minority Members concerning the resolution. I suppose in ordinary course the resolution should go over and take its place on the calendar. I understand the action of the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. It is my understanding the Committee on the Judiciary voted unanimously in favor of the proposed investigation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if either the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Indiana are in position to say that an emergency exists with respect to the matter dealt with by the resolution, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I will ask the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] to answer that question.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, there is an emergency existing which requires the adoption of the resolution today. The committee is wholeheartedly in favor of entering upon the investigation. The investigation cannot be begun until considerable research is made among the records in the departments in Washington and in other cities by expert investigators. It is the desire of the subcommittee to have the investigators go to work as soon as possible, in fact tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I am entirely satisfied with the explanation made by the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 206) authorizing the investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 206) authorizing an investigation of the alcoholic beverage industry (submitted by Mr. SCRUGHAM on November 12, 1943) was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the business practices and operations of the alcoholic beverage industry in all its phases, including any matters relating to the production, importation, distribution, purchase, or sale of whisky, gin, rum, brandy, or other distilled spirits, or wine or malt beverages. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Robert Kendall McConnaughey, of Ohio, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, vice Edmund Burke, Jr., resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. With the exception of the nomination of Elizabeth B. Scott to be postmaster at Arthur, N. Dak., which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has asked to go over, I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations, with the exception noted, are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynde D. McCormick to be Rear Admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence E. Olsen to be rear admiral, while serving as the United States naval member on a military mission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of which Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army, is the head.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Hamilton to be commodore, while serving as commander, Fleet Airway Wing Seven, Atlantic Fleet, and assigned to duty in the United Kingdom.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that presently I shall move to adjourn until Thursday. I have heretofore announced that at 12:30 on that day there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses. The Senate will convene and Senators will proceed to the House Chamber at that time.

It had been expected that the soldiers' vote bill would be taken up on that day. The chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Election, Mr. GREEN, advises me that inasmuch as the bill had to be reprinted it will not be available until tomorrow, and he will not ask that the bill be taken up on Thursday. We will determine on Thursday whether it will be advisable to take it up on Friday. If not it will go over until Monday.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, do I understand that the bill will not be taken up before Friday in any event?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. And circumstances will determine whether the bill will then go over until Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

As in legislative session, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 16 (legislative day of November 12), 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

Philip H. Best
John G. Crawford
Mayo L. Emory
William C. Jenkins, Jr.
Harry J. Schweigert

To be temporary surgeon

Frederick J. Krueger

To be temporary sanitary engineer

Gordon E. McCallum

To be temporary senior surgeons

William Hendon Gordon
Leonard A. Scheele
Robert H. Flinn
Frederick W. Kratz

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Lynde D. McCormick to be rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from July 15, 1942.

Clarence E. Olsen to be rear admiral in the Navy, while serving as the United States naval member on a military mission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of which Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army, is the head, to rank from November 10, 1943.

William H. Hamilton to be commodore in the Navy, while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 7, Atlantic Fleet, and assigned to duty in the United Kingdom, to rank from November 10, 1943.

APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clarence C. Moore, Jr.
Robert M. Jenkins
William H. Frey

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Anne S. Drake, Cummington.
Bertha T. Conners, East Templeton.
Rosanna T. Ruel, Granby.
Marjorie C. Purdy, Marshfield Hills.
Margaret R. Brewster, Randolph.
Jennie A. Consoni, Sagamore.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie A. Hanson, Aneta.

OHIO

Walter E. Cole, Andover.
Eugene D. Morris, Clarksburg.
Sarah Griffith, Pedro.
Janet M. Wilson, Ridgeway.
Tressie U. Kerr, Sullivan.

TENNESSEE

Maben B. Curry, Henry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou blessed and ever-living Lord, let Thy spirit steal into every heart that the humblest duty may be glorified. As we wait in Thy presence these sacred moments, hearken, our Father, unto us. Grant that this day we may resolve not to live for our own aims and advancement, but to bear loss willingly and labor zealously that our people may see the way that leads to a just and a contented national life.

Grant us a fuller measure of awareness that position may not revolve about self. Give us Thy counsel when in need and remind us of the great obligation we owe our country. To this end we pray for the fellowship of a single purpose and for a spirit to share our common tasks. O Knight of God, with Thine undaunted heart, challenge us to walk about Zion that we may tell it to the generations to come: This God is our God and will be our guide even unto death. O let not the deathless liberties of our free institutions lose their power and meaning in the dusty deadness of selfishness. Do Thou put Thy spirit into all breasts that our citizens may be drawn to the altar of reconsecration; then the breaking light will soon open on the dawn and glory be unto Thine excellent name, O Master, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) entitled "An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made."

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation, the Clerk of the House be authorized to include therein an amendment striking out the preamble.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

JOINT MEETING OF HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the membership I wish to announce that the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, will address a joint meeting of the Senate and the House on Thursday next, November 18, 1943, at 12:30 o'clock p. m.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on Thursday next, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jams we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on Thursday next the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open, and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 355), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 30 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $40,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Daily News by Raymond Clapper under date of November 15, 1943, entitled "Food Subsidies."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Boston Globe on our foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow afternoon, November 17, after the legislative business of the day and the other special orders already entered, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from J. C. Capt, Director of the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Earl S. Peirce, Acting Administrator, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

NEW DEAL BUREAUCRATIC DEMAGOGS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for his very unique talk made last night at the invitation of Fulton Lewis, Jr., over radio station WOL.

Any man who can make such a plea for that vanishing race of New Deal bureaucratic demagogs and stretch his imagination so far as to infer that he is discussing subsidies is, indeed, a supermaster in the technique of camouflage, and in this respect his talk was indeed unique.

To dodge the issue and resort to personalities not only denotes weakness but downright feebleness.

ANSWERING FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if anyone will read the text of Fulton Lewis' radio address complained of he will find he did attack me personally and by name, and, in my opinion, when radio commentators on commercial programs attack anyone personally it is only right that that party get time to reply. The radio company could not give me this time and I filed a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission. I was talking to his manager about the text of Mr. Lewis' speech in which he attacked me and informed him that I expected to have the Federal Communications Commission pass on the question as to whether or not I would be entitled to answer Mr. Lewis on his program. His manager said he would give me the time on Mr. Lewis' program which was what I wanted. I accepted without any reservations or restrictions. I did not presume I would be under obligations to Mr. Lewis by so doing since I was foregoing and giving up a valuable privilege by withdrawing my complaint before the Federal Communications Commission and it is true that to accept the time was the better way to handle it. I am afraid the gentleman who just spoke did not hear the speech, therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and insert this radio address of mine in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if this is the tirade——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentlemen when they do things like that they will get the House into a lot of trouble. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I regret exceedingly to have to object to the gentleman's speaking but I will have to if they will not let me put my own address in the RECORD.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I did not object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to assure the gentleman from Texas that we want his speech in the RECORD because it was nothing but a political speech.

The SPEAKER. Objection was heard to the gentleman from Texas publishing the speech.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have not objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] did.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentlemen who are complaining, I ask unanimous consent that the address I made be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman to insert the speech at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, then I ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the radio speech of the gentleman from Texas. I loved it. Why, the country now realizes that the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, and the Republican minority are of some weight and importance in this House of a Democratic majority. It is the most helpful speech to the Republicans we have heard for a long time. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas who has filled the RECORD lately so voluminously on the beauties of subsidies that he may begin to revise his own arguments pretty soon. His own Texas people testified yesterday against subsidies, and rightly named them as blackmail and bribery. Seemingly he should heed the voice of Texas. Is he so determined to salvage the administration that he cannot hear a message from his own beloved Texas? Does not the gentleman realize he is really building up our gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, for greater things?

I personally thank him, and the more he talks subsidies after that manner the better we like it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to thank my distinguished friend from Texas for doing me the honor of mentioning me in his broadcast last night. Now, simply for the RECORD, and in order he may at least have and state the truth hereafter, I wish to say that I never had a luncheon with members of the Committee on Banking and Currency; I never asked any member of that committee to change his position.

Any commentator or columnist who says otherwise is not telling the truth.

I believe—and only to keep the RECORD straight—this statement should be made at this time.

MUTUAL'S RADIO PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, some radio history was made last night over the Mutual Broadcasting System, although unfortunately all of it was not good. I think the gentleman from Texas was precisely correct in requesting the Mutual Broadcasting System and Fulton Lewis to grant him permission to speak, as his name had been used on the radio and his statements had been criticized. I congratulate him on his persistency in getting that permission. I congratulate the Mutual Broadcasting System and Fulton Lewis on doing the fair thing and giving him the opportunity. It was exactly the kind of fairness we would expect from Fulton Lewis, as he is generally recognized as the fairest and most accurate news commentator in America.

I think when private citizens or public officials are attacked or criticized on the air they should have the right of rejoinder. I believe that the chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee is intending to write such a provision into the new radio code.

It is extremely unfortunate, however, that the gentleman from Texas should pervert this opportunity by making a political tirade out of his talk instead of answering Mr. Fulton Lewis as he was advertised to do. However, that should not invalidate the principle that private citizens and public officials should have the right on the air to answer columnists and commentators who attack them in person. Unless some such opportunity is provided freedom of speech on the air becomes a farce instead of a fact.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, whenever anyone attacks the Republican Party, as did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], it must be borne in mind that he is attacking the majority of the American people. Our leader, that ardent patriot, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., has led the fight against inflationary steps. May I remind the House that for more than 10 years the voice of JOE MARTIN has been raised against the vast delegation of power to the Executive. For 10 years and more his voice has been raised against huge appropriation bills and other measures that create inflation, while all through that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been ardently working for those things that would bring inflation.

ASHAMED OF THEIR WORK

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I were given time on the radio every time Walter Winchell went after me, you would not hear much else.

Last night over the radio the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] told the housewives of America that if, when they went to market, they were required to pay 10 cents more for a pound of ham the Republicans and the Republican leader, JOE MARTIN, would be to blame for the addition to the cost of living.

Throughout his talk, which was remarkable for its inaccuracies and erroneous conclusions, the gentleman sought to divert attention from the mess into which the New Deal, of which he is an ardent supporter, has plunged us.

He ignored the fact that the skyrocketing of the cost of living, the apparent scarcity of the necessities of life, the high and burdensome taxation under which the people are laboring, are all the result of deliberate New Deal planning. "We planned it that way," said the President.

The gentleman from Texas overlooked the fact that, if now we are in a desperate situation requiring extreme remedies, our condition is the result of the New Deal policy which he has so ardently supported for the past 10 years. For 10 years and more the gentleman and his party have been in undisputed control of both branches of Congress, of the executive department, and for the last 2 or 3 years in control of the Supreme Court.

Today his party has a working majority in both the Senate and the House and his confession that chaos and bankruptcy exist, that bribery through subsidies should be practiced, is proof—if proof were needed—of the fallacy of the New Deal policy, the incompetency of New Deal leadership, in which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is a spokesman and a director.

The gentleman views the structure which he and his party have erected, admits that it is a monstrosity, and attempts to shift responsibility to the Republicans, who bitterly, consistently, and persistently opposed its erection.

MILK SHORTAGE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the subsidy program of the Roosevelt administration has been used so far to cover up the complete failure of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration to increase our food production.

The milk situation is so desperate at this time that unless corn is immediately released to New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New England within 6 weeks we face the loss of 35 percent of our dairy cattle.

Feed is now being put out with 1 percent corn, 90-percent dust, 2- or 3-percent wheat, oats, and barley. The cow is not being deceived even if the people are. Pretty soon the people will feel the shortage of milk resulting from the subsidy and the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I made before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Charles B. Donaldson at Salisbury, Md., on the 11th.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech that I shall make over a broadcasting system tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ETHEL COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Ethel Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ethel Cohen, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $750 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by her on April 23, 1939, because of negligence of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAFAYETTE GIBSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1442) for the relief of Lafayette Gibson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lafayette Gibson, 451 Oakley Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of $850. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lafayette Gibson against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on December 6, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving on North Fourth Street, Columbus, Ohio, was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 399) for the relief of John Sims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Sims, Mobile, Ala., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said John Sims on September 26, 1942, when he was struck while walking on a sidewalk bordering upon Highway No. 45, near Toulminville, Ala., by a truck of the Work Projects Administration, assigned to project WP-6756.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,100", and on page 2, line 2, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said cla .. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER A. GAWALIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1594) for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter A. Gawalis the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries as a result of a collision between the automobile in which he was riding and an Army truck on Highway No. 25, in Linden, N. J., on February 4, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1737) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Saunders Memorial Hospital, Florence, S. C., the sum of $37,550. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of losses sustained by such hospital as the result of the failure of the United States Army Engineer Corps to carry out the terms of a lease of such hospital to the United States, for the duration of the present war, and 6 months thereafter.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "out", insert the word "of"; in line 10, after the word "of", strike out the article "a" and insert the words "an option to"; and in line 10, after the word "lease", strike out the word "of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$37,550" and insert "$25,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. I. WOOTEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1760) for the relief of S. I. Wooten.

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ESTATE OF RALPH ALTON GREENLEAF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf, Wakefield, Mass., personally, the sum of $5,000 and to Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf, Wakefield, Mass., administratrix of the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf on account of personal injuries sustained by Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf, the death of her husband, Ralph Alton Greenleaf, resulting from personal injuries, and damage in the amount of $400 to personal property owned by Ralph Alton Greenleaf, caused by a collision of the automobile of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, in which they were riding, with a United States Army truck on Main Street, Wakefield, Mass., on April 20, 1942:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,754."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in the amount of $400 to personal property owned by Ralph Alton Greenleaf" and insert in lieu thereof "to automobile and funeral expenses."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: : *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NADINE GORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2385) for the relief of Nadine Gorman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to Nadine Gorman, of Omaha, Nebr., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries and property damage sustained by her when an automobile in the service of the Works Progress Administration ran into her automobile in Omaha, Nebr., on February 2, 1939: *Provided*, That the above sum shall be accepted in full release of the judgment held against Arthur L. Dunn.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,500."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "her claim" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "for damages."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM S. STEED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2691, for the relief of Tom S. Steed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Tom S. Steed, a former employee of the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Winnsboro, Tex., for disability alleged to have resulted from an injury sustained by him on April 19, 1937, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to consider and determine the merits of his claim under the remaining provisions of said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARVO KARI, LEMPI K. HOLM, AND BURT JOHNSTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2792, for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Arvo Kari, of Westport, Wash., the sum of $2,754.20; (2) to Lempi K. Holm, of Westport, Wash., the sum of $1,500; and (3) to Burt Johnston, of Westport, Wash., the sum of $9,910, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for the loss of real and personal property owned by them which was destroyed by fire on February 19, 1942, as a result of the negligence of United States Army personnel: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$9,910" and insert "$9,047."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JENNIE I. WESTON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3153, for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard A. Weston, Newark, Ohio, administrator of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased, or his successor in trust, the sum of $29,360.15. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States on account of the death of the said Jennie I. Weston and damage to real and personal property owned by her caused by a United States Army bomber on September 8, 1942, when it crashed into her dwelling.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Richard A. Weston, Newark, Ohio", and insert the word "the."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "or his successor in trust" and strike out "$29,360.15" and insert "$19,915."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "of such estate."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "dwelling" and insert "dwellings."

Page 2, line 3, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. CLYDE MARQUIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3194, for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

W. I. DOOLY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 759, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly,

of Conasauga, Polk County, Tenn., for compensation for the value of his undivided one-half interest in tract No. 766d, containing 124$^{3}/_{100}$ acres, in Fannin County, Ga., which was included with other lands acquired by the United States pursuant to condemnation proceedings instituted March 21, 1936 (case No. 1928 at law), in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta division, and in which final judgment was rendered on October 5, 1936.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDDIE PERCLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 770, for the relief of Eddie Percle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Eddie Percle, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his wife, Mrs. Octavie Landry Percle, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on June 27, 1940, near Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish, La.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAFTON BOAT WORKS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 862, for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Grafton Boat Works, of Grafton, Ill., the sum of $240, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for storing a boat belonging to the National Youth Administration during the period from December 1, 1940, to April 1, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILFORD TRUST CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 950, for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, of Milford, Del., as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased, the sum of $4,155, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for damage to a farm building and certain machinery and equipment therein, owned by such estate, which resulted when a United States Army airplane crashed into such building on July 18, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERVIN S. FINLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1246, for the relief of Ervin S. Finley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ervin S. Finley, of Sumter, S. C., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a Government-owned truck operated by a civilian employee of the Army Air Corps at Shaw Field, S. C., on September 15, 1942, and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1309, for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Pan American Airways, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, for $2,681.82 as the value of two dry-ice boxes belonging to it which were stored in Honolulu, T. H., and which were received from storage by a representative of the United States Army and placed on board the United States Army transport *Royal T. Frank* in the mistaken belief that they were boxes belonging to the United States Navy which the Navy had agreed to lend to the Army, and which two boxes belonging to Pan American Airways, Inc., were lost when that vessel was destroyed by enemy submarine action, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $2,681.82. There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,681.82, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE MANGRUM ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2005, for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Christine Mangrum, of Fairview, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, and to Luster Mangrum, of Fairview, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained, and to Nathan Mangrum, of Fairview, Tenn., the sum of $800, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property loss sustained, when the truck in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Lea Avenue and Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn., on August 5, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$800" and insert in lieu thereof "$50."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1332, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money, which sums represent the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by the claimants as a result of war conditions:

Theodore C. Achilles, $5,837.50; Henry E. Stebbins, $411; Henry M. Wolcott, $104; William Nicholas Carroll, $1,707; George K. Donald, $3,593.50; James G. Carter, $12,000; Myles Standish, $900; Sam E. Woods, $650; Edmund A. Guillon, $860; Harold D. Clum, $7,090.15; John H. Lord, $9,200; Landreth Harrison, $1,170.25; Isabel Pinard, $623; Jule B. Smith, $1,086.42; C. C. M. Pedersen, $325; Thormod O. Klath, $275; John K. Davis, $699.33; Stanley G. Slavens, $355; Donald W. Lamm, $270; Frank S. Williams, $125; Arthur B. Emmons III, $139; John K. Caldwell, $792; Gordon L. Burke, $460; Samuel J. Fletcher, $933.25; William E. Yuni, $100; M. R. Rutherford, $230; David C. Berger, $220; John B. Sawyer, $343; Owen L. Dawson, $343; U. Alexis Johnson, $398.50; J. Dixon Edwards, $50; J. Hall Paxton, $100; Quincy F. Roberts, $952; Kenneth J. Yearns, $280; Nathalie D. Boyd, $1,000; Walter W. Hoffman, $1,726.56; Frederic C. Fornes, Jr., $3,801.50; John H. Bruins, $1,938.45; Addison E. Southard, $8,015; Clarence E. Gauss, $447; Kingsley W. Hamilton, $325; Sidney H. Browne, $470; Charles S. Reed II, $400; Edward M. Ingle, $730; Thomas S. Estes, $1,309.50; Harlan B. Clark, $1,550; Martin J. Hillenbrand, $862.50; Kenneth S. Patton, $5,660; Perry Willis, $796; Robert L. Buell, $620; V. Lansing Collins, $955; Paul Paddock, $1,063; Courtland E. Christiani, $1,203; George A. Armstrong, $534.60; Duwayne G. Clark, $7,311.53; E. Talbot Smith, $2,780; Temple Wanamaker, Jr., $130.33; James E. Brown, Jr., $5,214.49; Cavendish W. Cannon, $3,204; Homer S. Fox, $4,560.08; Thomas McEnelly, $331; Mrs. Anne Gault Antoniades, $100; Gladys Wells, $1,112.63; M. William Blake, $207.37; Nathaniel Lancaster, $1,555.16; Norris B. Chipman, $7,740; Harold Pease, $583.99; John M. McSweeney, $268; W. Garland Richardson, $4,229.02; James W. Riddleberger, $1,060.02; Carl E. Christopherson, $1,189.31; Albert W. Chapman, $1,419.98; Ann Hillery, $759.87; Joseph W. Ballantine, $425; Augustus Chase, $580.77; Alfred G. Richter, Jr., $544.68; Wallace W. Stuart, $1,163.34; Jefferson Patterson, $5,377.50; Frederick A. Kuhn, $1,397.46; Ida Mae Orr, $690.57; Lucille C. Strong, $571.50.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GERALD G. WOODS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1008, for the relief of Gerald G. Woods.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gerald G. Woods, of Portsmouth, N. H., the sum of $71.90, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for expenditures made by him as commander of flotilla No. 301, United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, for rations for members of such auxiliary engaged in operating a Coast Guard patrol boat: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL MARGOLIN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1169, for the relief of Samuel Margolin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Margolin, of Auburn, Maine, the sum of $1,427.50, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage and personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him as a result of a collision of the truck which he was driving with a War Department sedan on Main Street, Lewiston, Maine, on January 10, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,427.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,727.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS COURCIL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 248, for the relief of Louis Courcil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis Courcil, the sum of $5,000. The payment to the said Louis Courcil shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital, medical, and other expenses, and for damages sustained on account of the injuries received by the said Louis Courcil, which resulted when an Army vehicle, serial No. 20203845, Service Company, One Hundred and Fifth Infantry, United States Army, left the lane of travel and progressed diagonally to the north curb lane on Foothill Boulevard, near Fontana, in the county of San Bernardino, State of California, and crashed into the automobile in which said Louis Courcil was seated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the figures "$5,000", strike out the period and "The payment to the said Louis Courcil shall be."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "for", insert "personal injuries,".

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", strike out the bill down to ": *Provided*", in line 5, page 2. Insert in lieu thereof, "sustained as a result of an Army truck crashing into the automobile in which he was seated, on Foothill Boulevard, near Fontana, Calif., on January 21, 1942."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL J. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1220, for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor, of East St. Louis, Ill., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for personal injury, medical and hospital bills, cost of artificial limb, and property loss sustained by the minor as the result of an automobile accident involving a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 66, at the intersection of Chapman Street, Edwardsville, Ill., after dark, on December 7, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000; to pay the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor, the sum of $3,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "medical and hospital bills, cost of artificial limb, and property loss."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, and the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor."

MRS. DONALD B. JOHNSTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1934, for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Donald

B. Johnston, of 300 Southeast First Avenue, Miami, Fla., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Donald B. Johnston, who was killed by the collision of a United States Army plane with an Eastern Air Lines plane piloted by him at the Thirty-sixth Street Airport, at Miami, Fla., on September 22, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL BARRERE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1984, for the relief of Paul Barrere.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Barrere, New Orleans, La., the sum of $7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of a personal injury sustained on June 10, 1940, when he was thrown out of a truck while an inmate of the United States Public Health Hospital at Fort Worth, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2075, for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States Navy Yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERTA RAMSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2236, for the relief of Roberta Ramsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roberta Ramsey, De Funiak Springs, Fla., the sum of $92.40. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Roberta Ramsey against the United States for damage to her automobile which was struck on January 15, 1942, by a United States Army truck while such automobile was parked in an authorized parking space in De Funiak Springs, Fla.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "here" and insert her".

Page 2, at the end of line 1, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2315, for the relief of Ethel Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ethel Phillips, of Elmira, N. Y., the sum of $90.40, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the cost of repairing an automobile owned by her which was damaged on January 18, 1943, when struck by a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "$90.40", insert "and to pay the sum of $23.25 to Mary Hurley, of Elmira, N. Y."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "her claim" and insert "their claims."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "an automobile" and insert "automobiles."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "her" and insert "them", and strike out "was" and insert "were."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley."

MRS. PRISCILLA B. McCARTHY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2440, for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy, of Louisville, Ky., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, resulting in permanent disfigurement, sustained by her in an accident which occurred when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a truck in the service of the National Youth Administration, driven by an employee of the National Youth Administration, on official Government business, near Bloomfield, Ky., on July 17, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. C. W. SELBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3039, for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. C. W. Selby, Chester, Md., the sum of $30. Such sum represents the loss sustained by the said Mrs.

C. W. Selby, as the result of the cashing of a money order for $30, which had been issued to her, by a person having the same initials and last name and with the same address as the person for whom the money order was intended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, SUMMERVILLE CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CHATTOOGA COUNTY, GA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3062, for the relief of the Board of Trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Claims. Does that have to be made before the bill is considered or after?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to do that now.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

HAMP GOSSETT CASTLE ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3136, for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hamp Gossett Castle, of Mount Sylvan, Tex., the sum of $2,500; to Lois Juanita Gimble, of Lindale, Tex., the sum of $2,000; to Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, of Lindale, Tex., the sum of $4,000; and to Roy Martin Lyons, of Lindale, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and hospital and medical expenses incident thereto, sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck about 8 miles east of Tyler, Tex., on the Tyler-Kilgore Highway, on August 30, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. McGREGOR:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,500."

On page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,500."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$2,000."

On page 1, line 10, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM SWAN AND AILY SWAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1133, for the relief of Sam Swan and Aily Swan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sam Swan and Aily Swan, of Williamson, W. Va., the sum of $3,600. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Sam Swan and Aily Swan against the United States on account of damage to their home, owned jointly by them, caused by an explosion on October 13, 1941, in a stone quarry where blasting operations were being conducted by the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,600" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA CHARACK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2469, for the relief of Anna Charack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna Charack, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on August 2, 1942, near Portland, Oreg., when the car in which she was traveling was struck by a United States Navy bus.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, after the word "bus" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO GULLO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2999, for the relief of Leo Gullo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leo Gullo, route 1, box 204, Shreveport, La., the sum of $8,336.02, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property destroyed and damaged when a United States Army airplane (B–26 A No. 41–745) crashed into his dwelling near Lucas, La., on August 26, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,336.02" and insert "$7,302."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARA E. CLARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3000, for the relief of Clara E. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Clara E. Clark, of Adrian, Mich., in compensation for injuries sustained on January 22, 1943, in the city of Adrian, Mich., on account of a fall in the Federal post-office building, at Adrian, Mich., caused by the slippery and dangerous condition of the floor in said post-office building on account of water, snow, and other dangerous conditions permitted therein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions adopted by the Petroleum Industry War Council at a meeting held in Chicago on the 9th day of November 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN CERTAIN MONTHLY RATES OF COMPENSATION OR PENSION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 339 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation appeared before the Committee on Rules with the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and asked for a rule in regard to this measure. I doubt that there is much controversy about the rule, and I have no request for time on this side of the aisle.

This bill provides for increasing the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pensions payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and to veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and for increasing the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and including widows and childrin of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act.

I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] use his time now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation with a unanimous report. The chairman of that committee the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday, which voted unanimously to grant a rule to bring up the bill today. All the bill does is increase the compensation of disabled veterans and their widows by 15 percent, due to the increase in the cost of living. It is only doing the fair thing for disabled war veterans and their dependents. The bill is short and contains the exact amount of the increase, in case any Member desires to study it. It has been endorsed by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veteran organizations.

FARM SUBSIDIES AND BUREAUCRATIC REGIMENTATION

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a short time to speak out of order because I shall not be here next Thursday when the rule will come up on the subsidy bill. I would very much like to discuss the subsidy bill under the rule, but I will be unavoidably absent from the Congress on that day, so I propose to make a few comments at the present time, expressing my views in opposition to farm subsidies or doles.

Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic floor leader, was quoted recently in the public press as follows:

A practical solution of the food-subsidy issue would be to take it to the polls next November and let the Nation decide it.

The farmers in New York State decided that issue on election day 2 weeks ago.

Apparently the White House, the "palace guard"—including the crackpot radicals, who are determined to regiment and socialize industry and agriculture, under the camouflage of winning the war—have not heard of the election returns from the farm districts of up-State New York and Kentucky. The National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Dairymen's League, as well as practically all farm organizations, are united in opposing Government food subsidies, political hand-outs, or bribes. The American farmers do not want cockeyed bureaucrats and collectivists regimenting their daily lives and controlling their liberties and personal acts. The farmers in up-State New York rolled up a Republican majority of 650,000 votes, which is unprecedented during the past 20 years.

The dairymen, the poultrymen, the apple growers and onion and vegetable producers in my congressional district are in a state of political rebellion against the stupidity and blunders of the Office of Price Administration, particularly the O. P. A. ceiling price of $1.07 a bushel on corn, and against the proposed food subsidies and price roll-backs. There is already a critical shortage of feed for poultry and dairy cows in the East due to the bungling of the O. P. A. and New Deal bureaucratic agencies. The farmers are tired of being kicked around and do not want to be liquidated or socialized by New Deal bureaucrats and radical crackpots. They regard the milk subsidies as bread-line payments and resent the stigma attached to it and believe that the subsidies, if any, should go to the consumers, who are the only beneficiaries.

The New Deal claims that the wage earners and consumers have so much money that they are fearful of inflation, yet profess that it will be a serious hardship for them to pay 1 cent more for a quart of milk. The consumer would far rather pay 1 cent more for a quart of milk than find their families without any milk due to a serious shortage, which is rapidly developing, as a result of O. P. A. blunders and regimentation. A continuation of the New Deal economic farm fallacies will endanger the health of 40,000,000 people living in 13 Northeastern States by seriously reducing the production of milk and eggs. The handling of the farm problem has been the greatest blunder and most colossal failure of all New Deal experiments as a result of which eastern farmers will have to lessen production or go out of business.

Subsidies inevitably mean more taxes, more debts, and more bureaucrats. Every farmer knows that the subsidy payments must come from tax dollars and out of the pockets of the American people, wage earners and consumers, including the farmers themselves or by further borrowing which would be an inflationary measure. Any subsidy paid by the Federal Government is and must be inflationary. I represent one of the greatest dairy districts in America, including Delaware County, but the political revolt extends beyond the dairymen to the poultry and egg producers and vegetable and fruit growers, and to all farmers.

A few weeks ago, on election day, the farmers made known their views in no uncertain terms, and if the same conditions continue until November 1944 the farm vote will be unanimous against New Deal regimentation, subsidies, and socialization.

Mr. Speaker, what the farmers resent above all is governmental regimentation, and further control by bureaucratic agencies here in Washington interfering with their daily lives and personal liberties. That was the issue in the recent election, not only on the farms but among the small businessmen, the small professional men, the home owners, and the entire middle class. It did not make a bit of difference whether they were Republicans or Democrats. In my assembly district in Orange County only one Democratic supervisor was elected, and he was elected on the Republican ticket. It was a clean anti-New Deal sweep, because voters, whether they were Republicans or Democrats, resented bureaucratic regimentation and dictatorship from Washington. They did not want to be liquidated by arrogant, radical, or communistic New Deal bureaucrats, so they decided, regardless of party

affiliation, to vote the straight Republican ticket from Lieutenant Governor right down through to the lowest office. The net result was that in up-State New York there was a 650,000 Republican majority, something unheard of in recent years. Local and county Democratic candidates were wiped out by an avalanche of votes cast by an aroused electorate who resented the socialistic, bureaucratic regimentation from Washington, not the farmers alone but the home owners, the small professional men, small businessmen, and storekeepers. They combined, regardless of politics, to oust and liquidate New Dealers before they were liquidated themselves.

Farmers are vigorously opposed to further regimentation by way of subsidies or political handouts, but so are most American taxpayers. Once the camel gets his nose under the tent and inhales the fragrance of subsidies it would cost the taxpayers several billion dollars a year.

I hope the Members of the Congress, regardless of party, will meet the issue fairly, head-on, without evasion, and vote the subsidies down, and not compromise in any way, as there is no basis for compromise. Either you are for subsidies or you are against them. Either you are for these farm subsidies, gratuities, and political bribes or you are not. That is a clear-cut issue. I hope it will be met squarely on that issue, whether you want more governmental and bureaucratic regimentation through subsidies or whether you want to put a stop to further regimentation, subsidies, and bureaucratic control. The issue does not affect farmers alone, it affects all the American people.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3356, with Mr. THOMAS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 1 hour, and, under the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc. That the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 15 percent.

SEC. 2. That the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children under authority of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, shall be as follows: Widow but no child, $35; widow and one child, $45 (with $5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $18; no widow but two children $27 (equally divided); no widow but three children $36 (equally divided) with $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

SEC. 3. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

SEC. 4. The benefits of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1943, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law, subject to the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public, No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That the definition of "widow" shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

This measure provides for a 15-percent increase for the service-connected disabled veterans of the World War. The measure also provides an increase in the rate of compensation for the widows and orphans of veterans of the World War, that is, the veterans who had service-connected disabilities.

I know it will be contended that these increases should not be allowed at this time when we are straining every effort to raise funds for war purposes, but I cannot forget that these veterans and their dependents are war victims, victims of World War No. 1 and of World War No. 2.

We are not doing any more for them than we did for the Federal employees. We are not doing any more for them than has been done for the coal miners and the people employed on war projects throughout the country. The truth is that this increase does not absorb the increase in the cost of living. The cost of living has gone up on an average of 26 percent. Therefore I submit that raising this compensation 15 percent on an average is not a raid on the Treasury, especially at this time, when these disabled men are unable to secure employment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. While expressing general sympathy for the measure, I ask the gentleman by what yardstick the 15 percent was arrived at.

Mr. RANKIN. That question was threshed out by the veterans' organizations. We held this measure back for almost a year. Representatives of the recognized veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart—came before the committee and urged its passage. Therefore, we have reported it to the House for your consideration. It will be followed by another measure in a day or two, providing for increased compensation for the non-service-connected totally disabled veterans of the World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. Yesterday, Monday, the question was raised about this additional compensation for these totally and permanently disabled veterans, and I found that Members of the House were astonished to know how the years have passed since World War No. 1. There are today 59,982 veterans of World War No. 1 between the ages of 60 and 64 years; between the ages of 65 and 74 years, inclusive, there are 32,157; above the age of 75, there are 33,381 veterans of World War No. 1. I give you these figures in order to answer those statements, in the RECORD a day or two ago, with reference to the other bill, a companion bill to this one, which I understand the Committee on Rules has reported and will be taken up tomorrow.

A question will probably be raised as to the cost of this measure. At the very outset the cost is estimated to be, the ultimate limit, $24,773,000 a year. I know that is a considerable sum of money, although it sounds infinitesimal when we come to talk of the billions we are spending for other purposes.

There are a great many of these disabled men and a great many of these dependents who are unable to make a living at any kind of employment, who are dependent upon this compensation for their very existence. For that reason we have reported this bill out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation unanimously in order not only to take care of this situation now, but to let our men who are in the service on every battle front in the world know that when they come back home disabled they are not going to have to seek the shelter of a jail or a poorhouse to find a place to sleep, and that their dependents will not be compelled to beg their bread from door to door.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine service that he has rendered to the veterans of the World War No. 1, and also which he is now rendering to the veterans of World War No. 2. Quite recently increases were granted to civilian employees of the Federal Government, and many of those receiving those increases are able-bodied and strong; they are stalwart citizens,

while the veterans of World War No. 1 in many instances are greatly disabled. This same situation will soon be greatly augmented with respect to those who serve in World War No. 2. The casualty lists are growing daily.

Some of our comrades have not had any good jobs since they returned from World War No. 1, and they are left in a frightful situation.

Mr. RANKIN. And because of their disabilities they could not get employment in those war industries.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true. I want to say to the gentleman, in order to get into these war industries and to get into the factories, practically all of those veterans are required to submit to a strict medical examination before they are taken into that employment, and these veterans who are suffering disabilities by reason of service in World War No. 1 have been unable to secure employment by reason of that fact. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the fine service he has rendered to our veterans. It is my hope this measure will be passed by a unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his kind remarks. I want to say to the House that this is one committee in which there has been no politics. We have not played politics with human misery; we have not played politics with the disabled veterans; we have not played politics with the welfare of their dependents. But we have tried to do the very best we could for them, bearing in mind our obligations to the American people and our duty to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to voice the sentiment of my colleague from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] when he referred to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] as a great friend of the veterans. I think the gentleman from Mississippi has done more for the welfare of veterans and their dependents than any other man that I know of.

In referring to the probable cost entailed in this bill, the gentleman indicated it would be something like $24,700,000. The gentleman from Indiana referred to increases for civilian Federal employees, and I understand that amounted to something like $500,000,000 a year, did it not?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure as to those figures

Mr. STEFAN. I am told it is more than $600,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. More than $600,000,000 a year.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think we are doing anything but what is absolutely just for veterans and their dependents in this bill. Can the gentleman tell me how this will affect a widow of an officer who died during World War No. 1? As I understand, she is receiving a fixed amount of $25 a month now, is she not? Would she be benefited by this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; her compensation would be raised to $35 a month. If she has one child it will be raised to $45, with $5 for each additional child. And where there is no widow but one child, it will be $18 a month; no widow, with two children, it will be $27 a month equally divided; no widow, with three children, it will be $36 a month equally divided, with $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. How will this affect the dependents of Spanish-American War veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. This does not touch Spanish-American War veterans. That is handled by the Pensions Committee.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand there is a bill, however, to give them some relief.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there is a bill which has been reported out by that committee that gives them a similar increase, or probably more.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Mississippi not only for his work in connection with this bill but for his work generally in connection with legislation for the benefit of veterans. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think, and I am sure that he does, that he voices the sentiments of this House and also of the country in general, that after this war we are not going to repeat the negligent treatment we accorded to soldiers after the last war, and that we are determined we are going to recognize the service they have given to their country.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that after the last war it was agreed that the servicemen should have been paid $60 a month to give them something like parity with pay received by men employed in every other vocation in America during that war. After the war we undertook to adjust that compensation. Enemies of that legislation called it a "bonus." It never was a bonus. We were merely adjusting that compensation. It took 17 years of bitter struggle to finally get that adjusted-compensation paid. The veterans took so much abuse that it hurt them in many ways, especially politically. For instance, the average State in this Union has never even elected a veteran of World War No. 1 as its chief executive, and it is the only war through which America ever passed that we went 25 years without electing anyone who was in service during that war as President of the United States.

So when the soldiers' pay bill came before the House a year ago I had served notice 6 months in advance that I was going to try to take care of the soldiers' pay while the war was going on and that I proposed to raise that base pay to $50 a month.

When the bill came before the House I offered that amendment and secured its passage, raising the base pay to $50 a month. We called the roll and it was carried by more than 10 to 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The bill went to conference and they knocked my amendment out. They came back and said, "You will have to take the small amount of raise provided, or vote down any raise at all." I happen to know the rules of the House. I knew that a motion to recommit would take precedence over any other motion. So I offered a motion to recommit, instructing the House conferees to stand by that $50 amendment. That motion carried by 332 to 31, a little more than 10 to 1. Then the conferees raised it to $46. They were still going to chisel the servicemen out of $4 a month. But, when they did, the bill first had to go back to the Senate where it came from. I went over there and talked it over with Senator LA FOLLETTE and he agreed to offer the same motion there. The motion carried in the Senate, to instruct the Senate conferees to agree to that amendment. The vote was 58 to 20.

So in that way we raised the base pay to $50 a month and adjusted, to that extent, the pay of the men in the service in this country, which should have been done in the First World War.

When this war is over it is my hope to give those men full pay for 6 months, or 9 months, or even 1 year after the war is over while they are settling back into their usual vocations, in order that we may not have to go through with that adjusted-compensation fight for another 15 or 20 years after this war closes.

We have had every kind of bill before our committee, and we have now, for increased pay for these disabled veterans and their dependents, but after going over it thoroughly with the veterans' organizations the committee decided that this bill would be as far as we would be justified in going at this time.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman has practically answered my question in the last sentence of his remarks. This bill only applies where service connection is shown?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. BREHM. Could it be possible to amend this bill to include total permanently disabled veterans which are not service connected?

Mr. RANKIN. That is provided for in H. R. 3377. It has already been reported by the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, and a rule has been granted by the Rules Committee.

Mr. BREHM. So that takes care of that.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this bill predicated upon any other consideration than the increased cost of living that is current in the country today?

Mr. RANKIN. A great many Members have felt for some time that these dependents of the service-connected deceased veterans were not adequately cared for.

Mr. COLE of New York. Even under normal conditions?

Mr. RANKIN. Even under normal conditions.

Mr. COLE of New York. So then, the justification for this bill is not limited solely to the increased cost of living?

Mr. RANKIN. No, not solely.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the reason why the committee did not make the provisions of this bill temporary in their character, to last only during the war or for a short time thereafter, but made it permanent?

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct. Of course, Congress can change the law at any time.

Let me say to the Members of this Congress that I am grateful for what the Members on both sides have said about my being a friend of the veterans. Every Member of this Congress is a friend of the veterans of all wars. There are no enemies of veterans in Congress. No matter what party they represent, no matter what State they are from, they are all friends of the veterans. It is a question as to what is the best thing to do, and what we can do in order to meet the situation.

Now, on this question of the increased cost of living, some people are afraid that this will cause inflation. Now, do not get excited on the radio, or in the press, or on the floor of the House; inflation is already here. If any of you have a doubt about it I will cite you the record. Prices are governed in a free economy by the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

In 1917, we had in circulation $40.23 per capita. In 1920, at the very peak of high prices, we had $53.21 per capita in circulation; on the 31st day of September of this year, 1943, we had $137.58 per capita in circulation, or more than three times what we had in 1917 and considerably more than twice what we had in 1920.

Oh, some may say that the population has increased. That is true. Had it stood still the per capita circulation would have been a great deal more. But let us read the figures as to what we had in circulation. Back in 1917, we had $4,172,945,914 in circulation; in 1920 we had $5,698,214,612 in circulation; today we have $18,844,446,730 in circulation; in other words, we have gone from $4,172,000,000 in 1917, to $5,698,000,000 in 1920, and to $18,844,000,000 at the present time. So this rise in the cost of living is simply an economic response to the volume of the currency in circulation multiplied by the rapidity of that circulation.

Let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] that it will be just about as impossible to deflate this currency back to what it was even before this war started and reduce commodity prices back to those levels as it would be, to use a Biblical expression, to "bind the sweet influence of Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion."

You never could pay the national debt, you could not pay interest on it if you reduced the currency back to what it was before this war began.

So these veterans moving along with the natural tide of events are being victimized because the small amounts of their fixed incomes, and for that reason I and the other members of the committee acceded to the wishes of the veterans' organizations and brought this bill to the floor of the House. I trust it will be passed without opposition.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman point out the discrimination which has been practiced against the employment of disabled veterans in view of the unemployment compensation laws of the country?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; where those laws are in existence a man is required to stand an examination, and in a great many cases they are turned down because they have some disability.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And they are refused employment because it increases the insurance premiums necessary to be carried by the employers.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is the case all over the country. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] called that very forcibly to my attention the other day with reference to cases in Missouri and other States. These men, because of physical disabilities, are not only unable to get employment in the various munition plants and other war activities, but as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has said, in those States where they have compensation insurance laws or employer liability laws they turn these men down because they cannot stand the physical examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add to the gentleman's statement regarding the employability of veterans or rather their not employing them under civil service: The Civil Service Commission gives a veteran preference disability rating and then because he is disabled they will not employ him. So the veteran is penalized there because he has a disability. It is a very unjust situation.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' laws we have passed during the years since the World War are complicated; it has been a piecemeal business. Veterans can apply sometimes under one law, sometimes under another, and secure more compensation under one law than under another. I hope some time we shall have legislation that will clarify this situation so it will be simpler for the veterans. Rating schedules should be improved and increased. I am very much troubled as I go through the hospitals today to find that many of the veterans do not know their rights regarding compensation. I trust that the Veterans' Administration will insist upon representatives going through the hospitals, seeing the men at their beds, telling them their rights to compensation and insurance. I do not believe there is a human being in the country today that does not want the veterans of this war and all our wars adequately cared for. There is not a home that will not be touched in some way by this war—I hope lightly; I hope the veteran soldier of that home will not be injured, disabled, or lose his life—but every family will be touched in some way. It is only just that this Congress seek means to take care of them. It is our privilege and our sacred trust. Fighting in this war is the most horrible that has ever been known. There have been many cases of very weakening disease. Take malaria that is so prevalent in the South Pacific. It is very difficult sometimes to prove service connection in such cases. Take the enormous number of nervous cases that will come out of this war. In many instances it is going to be very difficult for them and their widows to prove that they have any service connection at all.

I want to give you some of the rates, in fact, all of them, because I shall ask unanimous consent to put them in the RECORD, that will be granted in increases to the veterans and their dependents.

Section 1 provides that the monthly amount of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, shall be increased by 15 percent. I have been asked the number that will be affected under this section. It is estimated this section will provide increases to approximately 329,100 veterans the first year at an additional cost of $22,247,000. No one in the country will begrudge that payment, I am sure.

On July 13, 1943, the Congress granted the following increases to the widows where the veterans died of a service-connected disability:

Increase service-connected disability compensation, Public, 144, 78th Cong., July 13, 1943

Widow, but no child	$50
Widow with 1 child (with $13 for each additional child) (subject to apportionment regulations)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (equally divided) (with $10 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided)	38

Section 2 provides increases in monthly rates of compensation payable under Public Law numbered 484, as amended. It would increase the widow's rate from $30 to $35, and the widow with one child, additional amount for the child to be increased from $8 to $10 per month. Additional children would be increased from $4 to $5 per month. No widow, but one child, would be increased from $15 to $18 per month. No widow but

two children increased from $22—equally divided—to $27—equally divided—per month. No widow, but three children, increased from $30—equally divided—to $36—equally divided—per month, and the amount for additional children would be increased from $3 to $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

I will give you now the number and the cost. It is estimated that widows and children of approximately 33,500 deceased veterans would be entitled to the increased rates the first year at a total cost of $2,526,000.

I may say that under this law dependency must be proved. If the widow's income exceeds $1,000 she does not get it and the child does not get it. In the case of a widow with a child or children whose income exceeds $2,500 she will not receive anything. There is a limitation there that at times may prove a difficult one, but it is there to keep the cost down.

Section 3 provides the increases authorized by this bill shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

Section 4 of the amended bill would extend the benefits of Public Law No. 484, as amended, to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war where death is not service connected but at time of death the veteran had a service-connected disability. Because the rate of deaths from other than service-connected disabilities would probably be small for veterans of this war who have been discharged from service, and because in many of the cases that could otherwise qualify, the veteran does not leave an eligible beneficiary, it is thought the cost of this section would be small the first year. Therefore, no estimate for the first year is submitted; however, there would be a materially increasing cost dependent upon the number of service-connected disabilities of this war.

The total estimated cost of this bill the first year will be approximately $24,773,000.

When we think of the huge amounts that are being paid to so many different groups, this amount of money seems a mere bagatelle. However, it will bring a certain amount of comfort to the veterans and to their families. We are facing this very day unemployment in our own country in certain areas. The munition factories are closing down. I understand 45,000 in one war industry alone will go out within the next month. We are going to have a very great rehabilitation problem and reemployment problem to face. That makes this bill, in my opinion, even more necessary.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to congratulate the gentle lady upon the fine statement she has made and also to make this further observation. An increase was granted not so long ago by this House to the civilian Federal employees, and the aggregate amount of that increase was something over $500,000,000 annually. Many of those people are able-bodied citizens capable of working in any capacity. But the veterans of World War No. 1 have had trouble in securing employment by reason of their disabilities. In many of the plants doctors conduct a very rigid physical examination before they are able to secure employment, and many of those who came from World War No. 1 have been unable to secure any employment in the factories and plants throughout this country by reason of the disabilities they suffered. I think this legislation will be very helpful in that respect, and it will be helpful also to widows and the children of those veterans. I hope this measure will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely true. Thursday, I saw a man at the Army hospital at Atlantic City from England, who had not been home in 2 years. He was wounded in Sicily. Naturally, he wants a transfer nearer home. As you all know, the readjustment after this terrible experience back into civilian life is something that has to be taken into consideration. I remember when reporting to President Calvin Coolidge regarding care of the veterans he always said to me: "I suppose none of us knows the strain that the veterans undergo during war." This is a much longer war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not want to let the remark of the gentleman from Indiana pass, because he said the Federal employees had received an increase in pay. In regard to all of them except postal employees, they received no increase except for increased hours.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true, but it means more money coming into their pockets, and it means a great deal in a very difficult time so far as food and various other things are concerned.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. Does this bill apply or have any provision for non-service-connected cases?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It does for the widows and children of veterans who have a non-service-connected disability but who do not die of it, but not for the men. There is in another bill that will come up later on.

Mr. GREEN. The widows and children of the non-service-connected veterans will participate?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That schedule is in here, and I will put it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, we were in a world crisis in 1917–18. We now are in the greatest crisis this Nation and the world has ever known.

The United States Government taught our young men and women the art of killing, how to wage war successfully, through the necessity of self-preservation for the democratic form of government.

Inasmuch as our armed forces led us out of chaos in the last war, they will lead us out in this war.

This Nation now has an honorable obligation to the men and women who offered their flesh, blood, and life, and to their widows and children, so that the Star-Spangled Banner shall ever wave "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave," and so that light, liberty, and justice shall endure throughout the world.

Part of the obligation we owe World War No. 1 veterans and World War No. 2 veterans is that we pass this bill (H. R. 3356), so I humbly plead with you to remember and repay, by voting "yea."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, one of the Members was speaking a few moments ago about the employment of veterans who have been disabled in the war. You recall that during the Seventy-sixth Congress, in which I served, a man who had lost his leg and was a member of the World War Ampo organization in New York could not find employment in the Government Printing Office because of his disability. We tried, but they felt that the man was not suitable for employment there. I said at that time that if a man was not suitable for employment in the Government service, in his country's service, certainly private industry could say with equal face that he was not entitled to consideration by them.

This is a good bill, to increase the compensation by 15 percent. My associations and contacts with the veterans' organizations have, of course, been to a great extent with the disabled veterans. They have been unable to find employment in the new industries because they have been unable to perform the kind of work that goes with the skilled work in war industry. They must, of course, remain on their present white-collar jobs, or whatever they may be doing, at the same rate of pay they were receiving before the war. The cost of living has hit them tremendously. I know that if we pass this 15-percent increase it will be a well-deserved tribute to our disabled men of America.

I spent the summer of this year as a patient at Halloran General Hospital, where our wounded soldiers from overseas are being treated. They will be happy to know that we in Congress are going all out for our disabled veterans. They will be happy to know that Congress is united in action by all our Members to do the right thing by the men

who have suffered and bled that our Nation might live.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of answering a question the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] wishes to ask.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The question I wish to ask is whether or not the gentleman thinks the passage of this bill would create a precedent for the increase of payments to annuitants under the Federal civil-service retirement law or the social-security law or the Railroad Retirement Act?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so, for the reason that those retirement benefits are in the form of insurance benefits for which the beneficiaries paid when they were in the employment of the Government or the enterprises for which they worked. Therefore, they are receiving just what their contracts call for. This is a different proposition. These are victims, you might say, of the wars through which we have passed and in which these disabled men and the husbands and fathers of these dependents fought. We owe them an obligation to see that they are properly cared for. Therefore, I do not think this would be any precedent at all for increasing the pay of people who are on Federal retirement or any other retirement for which they paid during the days of their employment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad to hear the gentleman's assurance on that point.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. We hope that this bill will apply to World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 cases.

Mr. RANKIN. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice the language of the bill applies to service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, and so forth. What is the reason for not including the special awards and allowances?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that those awards were fixed not on the basis so much of the disability as of attempting to allay the spread of disease, for instance, tuberculosis. The gentleman will find that men who have arrested tuberculosis have been allotted $50 a month, I believe it is. That was arbitrary, it is true, but it was thought at that time that that would be better than running the risk of their spreading tuberculosis by not having any compensation at all to take care of them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the case of insurance, the insurance is a business proposition and the man pays for it himself.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If a man had $10,000 of insurance, his widow gets $57.50 a month for 20 years. Of course, we could not afford to increase that.

Mr. CASE. The cases I have in mind are cases where the merits of the case were such that prior to the enactment of the law which made the particular case eligible a special act was passed. Subsequently the basic law was changed, in some instances so that those individuals would be eligible under the general law. However, by reason of the fact that the special act was passed for them, the Veterans' Administration rules that that is controlling, and even though now they would be eligible and get more under the general law, they are held to the special law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Of course, they made a mistake then, according to the gentleman's statement, of having a special law passed.

In that connection, I take this occasion to point out that this committee has never passed a private pension law. I hope that in the years to come it will not adopt that policy. However, we have provided a law that is liberal, so that everyone who comes under the provisions of that law will be treated equitably. When you begin to pass private pension bills you very often have to correct somebody's military service record that is in question. You can remember back in the old days when Grover Cleveland wielded his pen so effectively in vetoing bills of that character, and a great amount of political repercussion grew out of it. So, when this committee was organized under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. Royal Johnson, he took the position that by all means we should avoid a mix-up of that kind.

We adopted the rules of the committee and the committee adhered to them during the 8 years that he was chairman, and the committee has adhered to that rule during the 13 years that I have been chairman. So this applies not to these special awards, but to the ones that come under the general rules of the legislative act.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to have the chairman's explanation in the RECORD, because it will afford me opportunity to give careful explanation to the people who have written me about it.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope from now on that the Congress will frown on passing private pension bills, but will pass a law to cover the men in the service so that everyone who measures up to the standard fixed may be taken care of on an equal basis.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I understood the gentleman to say that the estimated cost of this would be about $24,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the estimate of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LUDLOW. My understanding is that the cost of a modern battleship, with all of its features, is around a little more than $100,000,000, so that the entire cost of doing justice to these disabled veterans, would be less than one-fourth of the cost of one battleship. Is that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. It is, and I say to the gentleman that a short time ago Congress passed a bill remitting about $5,000,000,000 in income taxes that had already accrued, and if that money were applied to this purpose, it would take care of these veterans for a long time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the gentleman have any figures generally as to how many disabled veterans of this war would be included under these benefits?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not believe that I have the number here. Yes, my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] calls attention to the fact that it would cover 329,100.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From the present war?

Mr. RANKIN. That is World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. Of course you cannot tell how many casualties we will have in this war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean up to date. I was trying to get some idea if the gentleman had any.

Mr. RANKIN. I have it here in the report. For World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, the number to date is 329,100.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And there is no break-down as to what the number would be of World War No. 2.

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. This bill in no way touches veterans of the Spanish-American War?

Mr. RANKIN. No; that comes from another committee.

Mr. ANGELL. What is the status of legislation giving relief to those veterans of the Spanish-American War?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand a similar bill has been reported by that committee.

Mr. ANGELL. I hope it will receive early consideration. The Congress has been guilty of failure to appreciate the outstanding service of these veterans of 1898 in failing to make adequate provision for them.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending bill. It provides an increase of approximately 15 percent to veterans and their dependents. We must provide adequately for the men who are fighting to protect America and we want them to know that the folks back home will not permit their dependents to be in need while they are at the front.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time and ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to yield some of her time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3356 provides for a 15-percent increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disabilities and to widows and children of veterans as well as their dependent parents. There are four sections of this bill. Section 1 increases by 15 percent the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable for wartime service-connected disabilities of veterans of World War No. 1, as well as for veterans of World War No. 2, who saw service on and after September 15, 1940, which, as I understand it, is the effective date of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would rather finish my statement before yielding. Section 2 increases the rate of compensation of widows and children and dependent parents compensation. Under existing law a widow with no child receives $30 per month. Under the provisions of the bill under consideration, a widow with no child would receive $35 per month. Under existing law, a widow with one child would receive $38 per month and $4 for each additional child. Under the present bill, a widow with one child would receive $45 per month, with $5 for each additional child. Under the present law, no widow but one child would receive $15 per month, and under the present bill $18 a month. Under existing law, with no widow but two children they would receive $22 per month, and under the proposed bill $27 per month. Under present law, no widow, but three children would receive $30 per month, with $3 for each additional child, and under the present bill $36 a month and $4 for each additional child.

Section 3 of this bill provides that these increases shall become effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of the act.

Section 4 of this bill provides that the benefits provided for herein are extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war.

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the only possible objection that could be raised to this bill would be one of economy. No one in this House is more economy-minded than I am, where it is right to be economy-minded. But when we consider the veterans of this and other wars, as well as their dependents, their widows and their children, we cannot be economy-minded, taking into consideration the cost of living as it is today. That is not the right attitude to have toward those who have given their lives and their blood for us. This bill will correct some of the inequalities that now exist.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman heard one word mentioned about economy in this bill? I have not heard it anywhere.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I say that is the only objection that could possibly be raised to it. No; I have not heard that mentioned.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am very much concerned and I am in sympathy with the purposes of the act and in that it is going to do something for soldiers and their dependents. I am also interested in the parent who is dependent on the soldier's income.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This bill takes care of dependents.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not seem to find it in H. R. 3356.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You will find it in the report on page 2.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is not a word about it in the bill. You take care of the wives, children, and widows, but you say nothing here about the parent who is dependent upon the support of the son.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand it, that is taken care of. This is an amendment to another public law. Is that right, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi?

The question of the gentleman from New York is that he finds nothing in the bill to include dependent parents.

Mr. RANKIN. No, that is not in the bill; that is non-service-connected cases.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But it is mentioned in the report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, in service-connected cases there would be an increase in everything, including widows and dependent parents?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but not in non-service-connected cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But not in service-connected cases?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the leaders of our present war, as well as generals and admirals in the past, have depended largely upon morale. To me, this bill under consideration is a very good bill and a very strong bill for the present morale of our fighting men. Let us look at Mrs. Johnson whose husband is serving in the Army. She writes her husband a letter and says, "I just came back from across the street where Mrs. Smith lives, whose husband was killed at Guadalcanal a few months ago. I find Mrs. Smith over there with two children. She receives around $35 or $40 a month from the Government. She is unable to work. She cannot live on the amount she is getting with present prices. Something will have to be done for her." That boy out in the service receives that letter and he gets to thinking, "Would my wife be in the same condition if I were killed today or tomorrow or sometime in the future?" He talks to his buddy. It goes all through the armed forces. Nothing could do more, in my opinion, to shatter the morale of our fighting men than a letter of that kind.

The passage of this bill raises the amount so that so many of that kind of letters cannot be written. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the chairman of our committee, for whom I have so much respect and regard, talked about inflation. He said inflation is here now. With that I agree, but not entirely.

Inflation is certainly here for those with fixed incomes whose income has not increased since Pearl Harbor in proportion to the increase in the cost of living and consumer goods. But inflation certainly is not here for those whose income or wages or whatever they receive has increased in proportion with or greater than the cost of living or the cost of consumer goods. But for the people to be affected by this bill, H. R. 3356, the income of those individuals has not increased since Pearl Harbor, whereas the cost of consumer goods and the cost of living has increased tremendously. Therefore, inflation is a very vital factor to the ones to be benefited by this bill and the passage of it will help to do away with some of the present existing inequalities.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These people then, unless we do increase their compensation, are victims of inflation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Absolutely, just as aged people who are receiving the same pension today which they received 1, 2, and 3 years ago, without increase. They are subject to the increased cost of living, but their income has not increased.

Mr. RANKIN. Just as the farmers, whose prices for raw materials have not been increased.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Exactly, where we are keeping some commodities below parity under an act of Congress or by the Office of Price Administration at this time.

Another point I wish to emphasize in conclusion in regard to the favorable passage of this bill was brought out very clearly to me by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] when he rose previously. He recalled to my mind that this House has already passed a 15-percent increase for all Federal employees under civil service.

Certainly we can do as much for the veterans of the last war and the veterans of this war as well as for his widow and children.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, just so there shall be no misunderstanding, I want to touch upon one matter in this

bill that has not been thoroughly discussed, so there will be no repetition on the part of those speaking on behalf of the bill.

Section 2, as you may or may not know or understand, does not provide for allowances to widows and children of men who have died of service-connected disabilities. This is simply an allowance to those widows and orphans of men, who were receiving some service-connected disability allowance, but whose death was not the result of that service-connected disability.

There has been some question raised in times past, as to the reason for such an allowance. There has never been any question about the allowance to widows and children of service-connected cases, but the reason is simply this: It is a matter of justice, not charity, to those widows and children in providing them an allowance which the man himself could not give them. Because of his receiving service-connected disability allowance he was unable to procure insurance with which to protect his widow and children. The minute he went to an insurance company and made application for a policy, he had to disclose, as he was required to do, the fact that he had a service-connected disability. Almost immediately and without exception, it barred him from obtaining for his wife and family that much needed protection in case of his death.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is that soldier barred from every company, regardless of whether he pays an increased premium or not?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not every company.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But if he gets insurance he has to pay a higher premium than he otherwise would pay?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If he is able to obtain insurance at all, it is at an increased premium. Sometimes he cannot get any whatsoever.

Of course, we all had $10,000 insurance 25 years ago, but we were not all wise enough or financially able to hold onto it. Then after we had allowed some of it to lapse we were not able to comply with the veterans' insurance regulations with reference to the payment of back premiums and thus we deprived our widows and children of that much needed protection.

I am reminded at this time there was one of our Presidents who said that war veterans have a greater claim upon us than any other class of our citizens. I am quite sure that if there is any defect in this bill at all, the defect is on the side of not giving these widows and children a larger increase than this bill provides.

After having swallowed so many camels we certainly should not strain at a gnat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the committee on reporting out H. R. 3356. This is one bill that certainly should pass this House by a unanimous vote. It is a bill that is giving aid to a certain group of individuals, veterans, who have been the victims of innocent circumstances during this inflationary period. I trust it will pass this House by unanimous vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I too, want to express my appreciation to the committee for bringing out this piece of legislation. I am glad it comes from the committee which was presided over by my predecessor, Mr. Royal C. Johnson of South Dakota, who was succeeded by an equally able man, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I feel that if there is any weakness in this bill, it is on the side of providing too meager an assistance, and that we have failed, perhaps, to provide as adequately as this country might well afford, for the disabled veterans, and the widows and orphans.

However, I shall support the legislation in its present form. It is manifestly a step toward justice and fair play. I urge that every Member of the House support H. R. 3356. It deserves your unanimous vote.

There may be some, Mr. Chairman, who would argue for economy in opposition to this highly merited increase in pensions for disabled veterans. I yield to no Member of the House in my desire and my effort to curtail wasteful Government spending and to put an end to the reckless extravagance which has both marked and marred the present administration as the most profligate and unecopomic in the American history. However, the place to start such economies is obviously not with the men who have lost their health or become crippled in mind or body while fighting the Nation's wars. To these heroes we can never extend our full debt of gratitude, we can never fully repay them for their sacrifices. What we do today in the passage of this bill is but a very small token payment, Mr. Speaker, on the great debt which this Republic owes the disabled veterans of the United States.

In this era of billion dollar boondoggling and global gifts of taxpayers' funds the comparatively trifling annual cost of these additional pension payments is indeed inconsequential. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] so aptly said a few moments ago, we have swallowed so many camels the past few years that this is no time to strain at a gnat. Let us pass this legislation today by a unanimous vote despite the widely rumored report that it is being done over the protest of the executive department. In the total cost of war the cost of dealing justly if not generously with those who have made the sacrifice of life or limb is but a fractional factor. Let us hope that we can learn to live at peace in this world but in the meantime the costs of providing this Republic with an adequate defense system and of dealing justly with our veterans is something which we cannot and must not evade and on which we cannot use the paring knife of economy too deeply without injury to our country and injustice to those who have fought to keep it safe and great.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion during this debate regarding the increased cost of living and inflation. I should like to call the attention of the House to this particular fact: These disabled veterans are not members of a union that will fight for increased compensation; they must rely upon such organizations as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Congress of the United States. It is our duty, therefore, to see that these veterans are taken care of. During the hearings before our committee on this bill, H. R. 3356, it was brought out that the average wage being paid to employees in manufacturing plants in this country when the original adjusted-compensation law was passed was $1,100 per year. At the present time the average wage in industry is more than $2,000 per year, but the compensation for these disabled veterans has remained stationary.

This country of ours will remain great just as long as the people and the Congress pay proper tribute and honor to our heroes, and these boys are certainly the heroes of this country. The minute we refuse to recognize that fact, then this Nation of ours will start on its decline. I sincerely trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill, H. R. 3356, will pass unanimously today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it was originally my intention to explain the bill, but that has been done very well. Then it was my intention to explain the difficulties many of these veterans and their loved ones have had by reason of the increased cost of living; that has been well done also. Then it was my intention to rise and compliment the able chairman and the rest of the members of the committee on reporting out this bill; and that has been done in fine words also. Then I finally revised my own mental remarks to say that I will express to the House the hope that this bill would pass unanimously; and that has been done by the preceding speaker. But I do want to say that this is a good bill; it is a bill that is needed and needed at once. I want to compliment the chairman of the committee on the hard work he has been doing on this veterans' committee. He is conscientious; he studies legislation; he realizes the problems of the veterans and their

dependents and he is doing a good job. I want to compliment him on getting this bill out and I hope we will show our real interest by voting for it unanimously. I hope there is not a vote against it. Living costs are going up—let us act promptly and favorably on this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment this committee and the members thereof on this splendid piece of legislation. I used to be a member of this committee. I shall support this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

PROTECTION, NOT PROMISES, FOR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure to extend congratulations to Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, not only for this bill which he has fathered making provision for the veterans and their dependents, both of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, but for his untiring and highly intelligent effort at all times in behalf of every measure of legislation having for its purpose protection and benefit to the men who have served our country in the hour of trial.

His is a unique distinction, the father and defender of essential legislation in protection of servicemen of all wars. The bill under consideration, H. R. 3356, provides for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended:

Be it enacted, etc., That the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, are hereby increased by 15 percent.

SEC. 2. That the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children under authority of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, shall be as follows: Widow but no child, $35; widow and one child, $45 (with $5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $18; no widow but two children, $27 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $36 (equally divided), with $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

SEC. 3. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

SEC. 4. The benefits of public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1943, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law, subject to the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public, No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That the definition of "widow" shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

The American people and the American Government have always been prolific in promises to the veterans but sterile in fulfillment. I can recall World War No. 1 and the promises made to the men entering the armed service and the protection likewise promised to their dependents. I can well recall the return of the veterans at the termination of the war in 1918. I can recall the streets crowded with these men who had served with distinction and honor in the period of the First World War seeking in vain opportunity for employment. I recall in 1922, more than 3 years after the war had ended, on assuming the office of mayor of Boston, finding the soldiers' relief rolls of the city reaching the staggering figure of $200,000 for the year as against the normal expenditure of $40,000 a year. I was not so greatly disturbed about the amount of money expended for soldiers' relief as I was by the fact that in the acceptance of the relief the men were forfeiting their self-respect and their self-reliance so essential to the perpetuation of good American citizenship. Wheels of industry were moving slowly, if at all, and it was essential that something be done to relieve the situation. As mayor I made it my business to provide public work, namely, the Dorchester Rapid Transit System, costing $11,000,000, the Governor Square Rapid Transit System, costing five and one-half million dollars, and the East Boston development at a cost of an additional one million and a half. It seems rather difficult to believe, nevertheless true, that many men who entered the service left good positions, but with the assurance from their employers on their return the old job would be open for them, and found on their return their positions filled by less patriotic Americans, and no job open for them, despite the fact that many had families dependent upon them. In the public-works program as inaugurated by me in 1922, I made a provision that only veterans could be employed with a result that it was possible to absorb in gainful employment and at a high wage more than 8,500 men who had served the country in its hour of need and who through their employment found it possible to preserve their self-respect and self-reliance.

I had occasion to be present at Washington at the time of what was familiarly known as the bonus march and the impression made upon me will last as long as life itself. I saw men wheeled along in hand carts with both legs gone and I saw blind men led along by their buddies and I read with horror, shortly thereafter, of the tragedy at Anacostia.

The men who marched to Washington seeking a fulfillment of the pledge of adjusted compensation were men who had been maimed in the service of their country in the hour of trial, they sought only that which the Government had promised them and to which they were clearly entitled. They found it difficult to secure quarters with their meager store of money in Washington so they encamped on the dump at Anacostia and since they were abiding by the laws and violating none they refused to leave when ordered. Then came the order issued by the then President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, for the armed forces to drive them out—with the result that many were killed and wounded, but they assembled later on that fateful day on the steps of the Capitol. They assembled without indulging in speeches denouncing the Government for the killed and wounded of many of their comrades but they assembled and joined in the singing of "My Country 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty" an exhibition of patriotism and devotion never excelled in the history of the world. The killing and the maiming of these men and the suffering of the soldiers and their dependents would have been unnecessary provided legislation had been enacted rather than promised for their protection. We are engaged today in the enactment of legislation, not in the promising of legislation and it is to be hoped that no man who deems himself worthy of the title American citizen will be found voting against the pending measure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3356. I want to compliment at this time the Veterans' Committee and its able chairman in the production of this bill for our consideration. Frequently we have occasion to make adjustments such as this. At the time these pensions were granted, they were granted in the opinion of those who passed on it, on the basis of the need of the soldiers of that day. Due to the fact that the purchasing power of the dollar rises and falls from year to year and from generation to generation, what was just at one time becomes unjust a few years later. This is an attempt to rectify the deceased purchasing power of the dollar.

I hope at some future time that the pensions settled upon our veterans will be settled in such a way that they will maintain a closer relationship to the purchasing power of the dollar, the pension to be adjusted from time to time and at stated intervals, in order to maintain a standard of living from year to year on the same basis as at the time of its original passage. Even as we strike an average from Dow Jones on stocks and bonds I think we can strike an average on the cost of living. I hope some day to see these pensions adjusted on the basis of recurring adjustments, according to the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, although I am not on the Veteran Affairs Committee of the House, I do have a

great interest in matters pertaining to all veterans but especially of the First and Second World Wars. One of the several reasons for my interest in them is that because of the climate and health inducements of Arizona more ex-servicemen are in my State than Arizona furnished originally to the former wars. I have learned from many of them recently that the increased cost of living is pressing hard upon them at this time. I think Congress should provide greater benefits for all, or at least for those toward whom the Government's obligation is greatest.

If we had been better able to hold the line and minimize the increased cost of living to a greater extent than we have been able to do, such legislation as this would not be so urgent. It was one time thought that a 15-percent increase in compensation to Government employees would more than cover the increased cost of living to them. We have so provided it, or attempted to provide it, in legislation. Laboring men have told me that the Little Steel formula, which is based on a 15-percent increase, is now obsolete. I want to fight inflation but recognize in my family bills each month that the cost of living has gone up and that we must take such into account in dealing with the Nation's defenders and their dependents.

I am greatly alarmed and distressed at the prospect that, in spite of all our efforts to hold back the rising tide of inflation, it will bring suffering to the millions who are not drawing war wages or obtaining war profits and who must live on fixed incomes diminishing in purchasing power. As a part of that group to be protected, exservicemen and their dependents are our first direct responsibility. I favor the passage of this bill.,

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 15 percent.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "veterans", insert "of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on and after September 16, 1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children under authority of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, shall be as follows: Widow but no child, $35; widow and one child, $45 (with $5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, $18; no widow but two children, $27 (equally divided); no widow but three children, $36 (equally divided), with $4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

SEC. 3. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the 1st day of the first month following the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 14, insert the following: "SEC. 4. The benefits of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1943, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law, subject to the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public, No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That the definition of 'widow' shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. O'NEAL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pensions payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disabilities and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 339, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 150, noes 0.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 0, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—343

Abernethy	Fenton	Larcade
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	Lea
Allen, La.	Fish	LeCompte
Andersen, H. Carl	Fisher	LeFevre
Anderson, Calif.	Fitzpatrick	Lemke
Anderson, N. Mex.	Flannagan	Lesinski
Andresen, August H.	Folger	Lewis, Ohio
Andrews	Fulbright	Luce
Angell	Fuller	Ludlow
Arends	Furlong	Lynch
Arnold	Gale	McCord
Auchincloss	Gallagher	McCormack
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	McCowen
Barden	Gathings	McGehee
Barrett	Gavagan	McGranery
Barry	Gavin	McGregor
Bates, Ky.	Gearhart	McKenzie
Beall	Gibson	McMillan
Beckworth	Gifford	McMurray
Bender	Gilchrist	McWilliams
Bennett, Mich.	Gillette	Maas
Bennett, Mo.	Goodwin	Magnuson
Bishop	Gordon	Mahon
Blackney	Gorski	Maloney
Bloom	Graham	Manasco
Bolton	Granger	Mansfield, Mont.
Bradley, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield, Tex.
Brehm	Green	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Mason
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	May
Bryson	Gross	Michener
Buffett	Gwynne	Miller, Conn.
Burch, Va.	Hagen	Miller, Mo.
Burchill, N. Y.	Hale	Miller, Nebr.
Burdick	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Pa.
Burgin	Halleck	Mills
Bushey	Hancock	Monkiewicz
Butler	Hare	Morrison, N. C.
Byrne	Harris, Ark.	Mruk
Camp	Hartley	Mundt
Canfield	Hays	Murdock
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Murphy
Cannon, Mo.	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Capozzoli	Heidinger	Murray, Wis.
Carlson, Kans.	Herter	Newsome
Carson, Ohio	Hess	Norman
Carter	Hill	Norrell
Case	Hinshaw	O'Brien, Ill.
Chiperfield	Hobbs	O'Brien, Mich.
Church	Hoch	O'Brien, N. Y.
Clark	Hoeven	O'Connor
Clason	Hoffman	O'Hara
Clevenger	Holifield	O'Konski
Cochran	Holmes, Mass.	O'Neal
Cole, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	O'Toole
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Outland
Colmer	Horan	Pace
Compton	Howell	Patman
Cooley	Hull	Patton
Cooper	Jarman	Peterson, Fla.
Courtney	Jenkins	Peterson, Ga.
Cox	Jennings	Pfeifer
Crawford	Jensen	Philbin
Crosser	Johnson, Calvin D.	Phillips
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Pittenger
Curley	Johnson, Luther A.	Ploeser
Curtis	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Plumley
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Day	Johnson, Ward	Poulson
Delaney	Jonkman	Powers
Dickstein	Kean	Pracht
Dilweg	Kearney	Price
Dingell	Keefe	Ramey
Disney	Kelley	Ramspeck
Ditter	Kennedy	Randolph
Domengeaux	Keogh	Rankin
Dondero	Kerr	Reed, Ill.
Doughton	Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.
Dworshak	Kilday	Rees, Kans.
Eaton	King	Richards
Eberharter	Kinzer	Rivers
Elliott	Kirwan	Rizley
Ellis	Klein	Robertson
Ellison, Md.	Knutson	Robinson, Utah
Ellsworth	Kunkel	Robsion, Ky.
Elmer	LaFollette	Rockwell
Elston, Ohio	Lambertson	Rodgers, Pa.
Engel, Mich.	Landis	Rogers, Mass.
Fay	Lane	Rohrbough
Feighan	Lanham	Rolph
Fellows		Rowan
		Russell
		Sadowski

Satterfield	Stevenson	Ward
Sauthoff	Stewart	Wasielewski
Schiffler	Stockman	Weaver
Schuetz	Sullivan	Weichel, Ohio
Schwabe	Sumner, Ill.	Weiss
Scott	Sumners, Tex.	Welch
Scrivner	Sundstrom	West
Sheppard	Taber	Wheat
Simpson, Ill.	Talbot	White
Simpson, Pa.	Talle	Whitten
Slaughter	Tarver	Whittington
Smith, Ohio	Thomas, N. J.	Wickersham
Smith, W. Va.	Thomas, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Smith, Wis.	Thomason	Willey
Snyder	Tibbott	Wilson
Sparkman	Tolan	Winter
Spence	Towe	Wolcott
Springer	Troutman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stanley	Vinson, Ga.	Wolverton, N. J.
Starnes, Ala.	Vorys, Ohio	Woodrum, Va.
Steagall	Vursell	Worley
Stearns, N. H.	Wadsworth	Wright
Stefan	Walter	Zimmerman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—88

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Monroney
Bates, Mass.	Gillie	Morrison, La.
Bell	Gore	Mott
Bland	Gossett	Myers
Bonner	Grant, Ind.	Norton
Boren	Hall,	O'Leary
Boykin	Leonard W.	Priest
Bradley, Mich.	Harless, Ariz.	Rabaut
Brooks	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Rogers, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Hart	Rowe
Celler	Hendricks	Sabath
Chapman	Izac	Sasscer
Chenoweth	Jackson	Scanlon
Coffee	Jeffrey	Shafer
Costello	Johnson,	Sheridan
Cravens	Anton J.	Short
Cullen	Johnson,	Sikes
Davis	J. Leroy	Smith, Maine
Dawson	Jones	Smith, Va.
Dewey	Judd	Somers, N. Y.
Dies	Kee	Taylor
Dirksen	Kefauver	Treadway
Douglas	Kleberg	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	Lewis, Colo.	Voorhis, Calif.
Durham	McLean	Wene
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Whelchel, Ga.
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Winstead
Forand	Martin, Iowa	Woodruff, Mich.
Ford	Merritt	
Fulmer	Merrow	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Short.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Jeffrey.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Anton J. Johnson.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Marcantonio.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WINSTEAD, is unavoidably absent, being away on a mission for the War Department. He desired to be paired for this bill, but since there is nobody to be paired with, as everybody is for it, I want him recorded as being in favor of the measure.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 356), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Hon. Frank Murphy, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth; and further to extend my own remarks and include therein a speech made on this occasion by my friend the President of the Philippine Commonwealth, Hon. Manuel Quezon. In both instances these speeches reflect my sentiments, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Basil J. Vlavianos entitled "The Greek United Front." The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is presently serving our country in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the simple purpose of announcing to the House that the conferees have reached a complete agreement on the bill, S. 763, relating to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, as an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. We hope to have the report and the statement ready by tomorrow, if possible. If not, on tomorrow I shall ask permission to have until midnight tomorrow for the filing of the report, and try to take the matter up the next day. I will, of course, arrange with the floor leader and the Speaker before doing anything at all about it. I have already spoken to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky is of such importance that I believe it should be brought up as soon as possible after it is filed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Montpelier Argus with reference to a unique association formed in Vermont entitled "Freeman's Association."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include brief editorials with each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from today's Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have received from the State medicine committee of the Buchanan County Medical Society, St. Joseph, Mo., informing me that on November 3, 1943, at its regular meeting the society unanimously voted and went on record as opposed to the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills (S. 1161 and H. R. 2861) and setting out their reasons therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein copies of four letters addressed to the citizens of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press and also three telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a résumé of veterans' laws in effect in the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two speeches I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include two articles from the Chicago Sun, and a communication from Mr. Darden, of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on star route legislation and include certain extracts from a book, entitled "People in Bondage."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ernie Pyle concerning efforts of the Mexican people in behalf of prisoners in the hands of the Japanese.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I was downtown on official business and came into the Chamber just at the conclusion of the roll call on the bill increasing the veterans' compensation, just passed. If present I would have voted for the bill.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today I be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the board of assessors of the town of Framingham, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday of next week, at the conclusion of legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE] for 15 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is not to add materially to the splendid arguments in opposition to the proposed subsidies outlined by the administration, for these have been presented in a scientific manner a number of times on the floor of the House by my able colleagues. I wish to present some of my own views and to give the Congress the prevailing sentiment expressed by the average small farmer in Missouri.

It is recalled by most of us that this body went on record by a nearly two-thirds vote last summer in opposition to subsidies, that just before we went home for the summer recess we extended the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until January, and that subsidies have been in effect and we are at this time paying out of the Treasury money that is being raised through the sale of War bonds.

We will be called upon day after tomorrow to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the administration would have us continue the subsidies. Have we thought just how well they have worked? The only way we have to judge subsidies is by theoretically supposing that they were in operation or by actually witnessing their results. How have they been working? It was my pleasure last evening to be present at the hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture where farmers and packers from all over the Nation were called in to give their story. I listened to a packer testify that he received from the Government subsidy money—I believe he said $1.10 per hundredweight—on live beef. He was required by the Government to sign an affidavit that he has passed on to the producer the entire amount of this subsidy. Now, the price on live cattle to the producer has fallen more than $3 or $4 per hundredweight within the last few months, yet the consumer testifies there has been no reduction in the price of meat—the finished product. The chairman of the committee, Senator SMITH, asked the audience if anybody in the crowded committee room—and it was full of farmers from all over the United States—had received any of the subsidy money. No one raised his hand. The question was asked the packer, What became of the subsidy money? He said he signed a sworn statement to the effect that he passed it on to the producer but that if the producer did not receive it, it must have been lost in the confusion. This is a concrete demonstration, Mr. Speaker, of the results of our trial-and-error methods in this country, and of the record of subsidies thus far.

Among the farmers testifying before the committee, one was a constituent of mine, an actual dirt farmer, who lives in my district. I ask unanimous consent to read to you in his own words his testimony given last night before the Senate committee, as follows:

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, that statement is as follows:

I am Theodore Anderson, of Montreal, Mo., a farmer and feeder of cattle and hogs. I am president of the American Pork Producers Association and president of the Missouri Live Stock Association. I have spent my entire life on the farm, and I normally feed 1,000 to 1,200 hogs per year. Due to continual confusion and uncertainty, I have on my farm at this time fewer hogs than at any

time in several years, and frankly, I do not know just what I am going to do the next 12 months.

The producers of hogs are proud and happy to produce so vital a food product for our armed forces, our allies, and our civilian population, and we feel that our production record is above criticism. Due to our greatly increased production of hogs, there has never been an actual shortage of pork and any indicated shortage has been due to bungling, bureaucratic mismanagement. Alternate shortages and gluts have been due to Government failure to recognize the necessity of a seasonal variation in hog prices. Hog producers want to continue their production, but it will be impossible unless a straightforward, practical program can be adopted.

We as farmers and hog producers are unalterably opposed to subsidies being used in place of a fair market price, because we believe that it is inflationary and impractical.

We farmers cannot understand why it isn't inflationary for the Government to borrow money to pay a part of the grocery bill for consumers who are enjoying the present unprecedented wage scale. Surely this is true, for every Government radio broadcast tells us how many billion dangerous inflationary dollars they have. If we allow the Government to subsidize the consumers now, what can we expect when less favorable incomes prevail? Do we want to postpone a part of their grocery bill for the boys to pay in taxation after they return from the war?

A consuming public that has money enough to pay almost any price to a black market or ridiculously high prices for articles not under price control certainly has enough money to pay their grocery bill today. The benefit of subsidies has apparently not been reflected to consumers, and certainly they have not been reflected to producers.

We believe that subsidies are employed by O. P. A. primarily to deprive hog men of the management of their own business and place us under Government controls which are likely to continue not only during, but after, the war.

These Government controls which accompany subsidies are destroying confidence of swine growers and is reducing production and unnecessarily prolonging the war. We hog men are opposed to live ceilings because they give the Washington bureaucrats and dictators the control of the entire swine industry and regiment the swine producers in an un-American manner. Ceilings will require allocation among producers and among packers.

Realizing the need for some control of prices, we believe that the proposed meat-management plan as developed by the livestock and meat industry to be the most effective plan that has been proposed.

The farmers feel that live hog ceilings are discouraging and are destroying the standard successful methods of production and system of marketing to the detriment of both producers and consumers. Live hog ceilings ignore quality, make no seasonal variation in production costs for hogs and break down production and availability of pork products throughout the year. Live hog ceilings are destroying our open competitive markets, are creating black markets, are causing unsatisfactory and unnecessary confusion in the movement of live hogs to processors.

As has been said, give the farmer a decent price for his products in the market place and there will be no necessity for subsidies. He is opposed to accepting a Government dole and forever forcing him to remain an object of charity.

Subsidy will discourage the production of food. Let the income of those who till the soil be brought in line with national income.

During the past few weeks and months I have listened carefully to arguments given by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and other advocates of the subsidy program of the administration, and it seems to me that many of these arguments are based on fallacies. It is said that for a few dollars spent for subsidies, the American people would be saved many, many times that amount in consumer costs. I wonder if that is true? It sounds very fine indeed. It is about as attractive as the argument presented in a chain letter which I received several years ago from a friend with the request that I write five similar letters to that many friends of mine and remit a dime to the sender. It all sounded very fine and I anticipated that I would receive many dimes from suckers on down the line, with the possibility, as I remember, of getting back over $1,000 in dimes. These letters went all over the country and Americans, many of them intelligent businessmen, fell for this proposition because it offered something for nothing. Is it not true in this case of subsidies, we are again falling for a proposition that offers us something for nothing and which is doomed to failure because of the hidden or little noticed fallacy in the argument propounded?

It is also said that in processing, the larger the price received by the producer, the greater the cost to the consumer—that the cost is pyramided thus—that if eggs bringing 50 cents per dozen to the producer, after going through the dehydrating process selling for $1, would represent a 100-percent processing cost, that eggs selling for 60 cents per dozen with a 100-percent processing cost, would result in 60 cents to the processor instead of 50 cents. Now any child of high-school age has no trouble in detecting the fallacy in this case. Of course, it can cost no more to process 60-cent eggs than it does 50-cent eggs—there is no pyramiding in this instance.

There are certain fundamentals which Americans must adhere to and put into practice if we are to avoid the pitfalls that will result from centralization in the Federal Government, usurpation of legislative and judicial prerogatives by the Executive, resulting in directives being issued by hordes of bureaucrats. Another gentleman from Texas, Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS, has called attention to the fact that we Americans, regardless of our politics, must adopt a basic philosophy of taking care of our problems locally if possible and not passing on economic, social, and political problems in ever-increasing numbers to the National Government.

During the 1920's most of us were trying to live off of returns from investments. Our neighbors were buying stocks and bonds and we were trying to do as little work and extending our efforts as little as possible. Most of us wanted to be parasites and let the other fellow make our living. We went on a spree, had a good time, but pay day came with the result many of us who could least afford it lost our life's savings. Great suffering and sacrifice took place and it seems that we should have learned the lesson that we could not get something for nothing. But during the 1930's and so far during the 1940's under the New Deal administration, we have been doing the same thing under another name and in a different way. We have practiced the doctrine of scarcity and have tried pump priming, have tried to borrow our way to prosperity and have spent more year after year than we have taken in. Some of our crackpot economists have told us that it makes no difference how much our national debt increases, how high it soars, so long as we keep up our national income, that we need have no fear about private enterprise or our system of competition, that our capitalistic system cannot be destroyed. We cannot kill it, they say, and so we have been passing on to future generations the payment of the bills it is our duty and right to assume as we go along. The spree which we enjoyed during the 1920's is nothing compared with the grand orgy of indulgence that is taking place on a much larger scale during the past few years.

One striking difference is that it was private initiative that was on the spree before, now it is the administration. Before, it was corporate enterprise extending itself too far; now it is our duly elected Executive and his many appointees who are sanctioning the far-reaching economic experiments. Those of us who are still sober realize that pay day will again come in one form or another, and that the solution is for us to adopt a basic philosophy on the part of the individual citizen of giving value received for that which he gets and not be continually striving to get something for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of my district are utterly opposed to subsidies even though it might appear on the surface that they will benefit from certain of them. The arguments used in debating subsidies are all in favor of the consumer, chiefly in the large cities where the electoral vote is greatest. However, I would like to make the observation right here, judging from the recent indications at the polls, that the consumers are no longer being fooled by the promise of immediate benefits. They have felt the pinch of taxes in recent months and are becoming aware of the fact that the day of reckoning is not far off.

Listen to another dirt farmer, Mr. John Brandt, of Benton County, Mo., who has farmed all his life and who is president of his county farm association:

I just want to express my opinion in regard to the recent urge on Congress by the administration.

Obviously referring to President Roosevelt's recent message.

I think this is something that should never be done, because if labor cannot pay for its food and clothing now, with such sky-high wages, when will they ever be able to pay for their food? When the deflation comes after the war? It all looks to me like plain politics to please organized labor and make them vote solidly for the New Deal next year—all at the expense of the bankrupt Federal Treasury.

The farmers would much prefer not to get subsidy payments from the bankrupt Treasury, but would much rather have farm produce prices in line with labor and the products the farmer has to buy and let labor and

ot'ers pay for their food now when they are able to do so. Where will Uncle Sam get the money to put everybody on relief or W. P. A. when the war is over?

Again, may we hear the words of the manager of a grain, feed, and millers' association, Mr. A. H. Mainershagen, as follows:

I know you are getting a lot of letters in reference to voting for the above-mentioned bill which eliminates the paying of subsidies on farm products. The majority of farmers and grain men would like to go back to the old way of doing business and not being paid subsidies for everything they raise. If all grains would be allowed to advance in comparison to the present wages that the Government is paying, subsidies would probably not be thought of. It is not good common sense to have to pay people to raise more produce. If the cost of administering the expenses of paying these subsidies would be considered, we would probably find that the administration expense connected with subsidies would be greater than the subsidy paid. It would mean additional help, more Government in business, and this is just the thing we want to get away from. I don't think it would stop inflation which has been pointed out by the economists. I feel that the Government is causing inflation by paying the unreasonable wages they pay at the munition plants. This is causing a hardship on all industry.

I hope that you will go down the line with the majority of the voters in your district and vote for House bill No. 3458.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman on the splendid statement that he is making. I was talking this morning with the State secretary of agriculture of the State of South Dakota, Mr. Everson. He told me that he was present at the meeting at the Senate hearing this morning on the matter of subsidies. He said that he was amazed at the unanimity of the protest of producers of the country against the Roosevelt subsidy program; that the farmers wanted the country to distinctly understand, if there are to be subsidies, they are to be consumer subsidies and not producer subsidies; that they are not asking the taxpayers to assume the cost of food subsidies in this country.

Mr. SCHWABE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there have been instances in the case of certain critical war materials such as copper, where the benefits of a subsidy were advantageous in the present emergency to overcome the inequities of the low- and high-cost mines. But farm subsidies are not so simple. First of all, the farmer is not a bookkeeper and does not have the time and money to employ the kind of help needed to cope with the governmental regulations, nor the gas to be traveling back and forth to Government agencies for explanation. He must be on the job from dawn to dark and the constant annoyances of bureaucratic decrees after his day's work are entirely beyond his ken or inclination. The New Deal economists who have gained their knowledge of farming from books and statistical charts with their usual inaccuracies, have no conception of the problems of the average farmer of 180 acres. He has learned his job the hard way, through practical experience, and he speaks an entirely different language than the New Deal economic advisers.

It seems the administration does not take into account the wishes, desires, or advice of those who by experience, ability, and training are best qualified to make regulations of a particular business or industry. I remember last summer, one day one of our Congressmen from the State of Iowa, called at the office of the O. P. A. to see if he could not get some encouragement on the farm machinery outlook. Without adequate machinery, the Iowa corn crop was jeopardized. This particular Congressman was told not to worry because O. P. A. had just received word that a bountiful supply of hand hoes would be available in time for cultivation of the Iowa corn crop. One can but wonder as to the background and experience of this particular bureaucrat. He must have been one of those New York or Chicago, or 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue farmers.

Repeatedly the New Deal has attempted to regiment and regulate the farmer. During peace times, we have practiced the doctrine of scarcity and experienced the coming and going of the N. R. A., and now during time of war, comes the most grandiose of all schemes thus far advanced, to put everybody—producers, processors, and consumers—directly or indirectly, on the Government pay roll. The administration would have it appear to each of these three groups that he is being especially and particularly favored, whereas, as a matter of actual fact, the simple truth is, the Treasury of the United States, that great American Santa Claus, good old Uncle Sam, in reality our boys, who we hope will be returned some day, our children and our grandchildren, are the ones who will be holding the sack.

I had the privilege on September 2 of attending a meeting in Kansas City, Mo., of the Livestock Producers' Association of America, where some 2,000 farmers from all over the West were assembled. About a score of Congressmen and Governors were on the platform. Next to me sat Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, who received a number of telegrams during the day from Washington. One of them which was from Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, was read to the audience; it high lighted the entire meeting in that it led those in attendance to believe that the Administration contemplated no ceilings on livestock. The livestock producers present that day felt this to be quite a note of encouragement and expressed their joy with enthusiasm. However, only 9 days thereafter, September 11, an order was dated from the O. P. A., announcing ceilings on live pork. Surely this order was in the making at least 9 days, and later on in the month of September, we learned that ceilings on live cattle also were contemplated. This is a practical example of how one agency, in this case the Food Administrator, said one thing while another, the O. P. A., actually had the authority and said another. Since then Mr. Jones has testified before various congressional committees, but what confidence can we place in his words when he has no authority. The Pulmer bill would provide for a Federal Food Administrator with power over all agencies having to do with food and would go a long way toward correcting the existing evils.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In connection with what the gentleman has just stated regarding the statements made at the meeting and subsequent announcement of policy, has the gentleman read a transcript of the meat hearings in which representatives of the O. P. A. said that the plan would not be put into effect until they had consulted with the industry, while at the same time the plan was being signed in downtown Washington?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes; I have read those hearings. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Those who oppose subsidies, conscientiously do so for two reasons. First, subsidies are economically unsound. Second, they tend toward paternalism. Any farmer or other producer, any processor or thoughtful consumer, realizes it is easier and less costly, to let the consumer pay his food bill, even at a slightly increased price, than to raise the money through taxation to pay consumer subsidies. A cent per pound or per dozen or per bushel more to the producer may mean the bulk of his profit; it may represent 20, 30, or 40 percent profit to him, while to the consumer it is only another cent. Then, too, there is a lot of lost motion and friction and administrative cost necessitating increased hordes of employees on the public pay roll to administer the subsidies. Mortgaging our future and pledging the earnings of future generations, involving the payment of interest, is a factor not to be overlooked. For example, if we borrow $5,000,000,000 a year and pay it back, say, in 20 years, the interest alone would amount to as much as the principal.

Now, our consumers, according to the statement by the administration, have a greater income today per capita than ever before in our history and are plenty capable of paying their food bill. Any high-school boy or girl knows it is better business to pay for a necessity now if able to do so, rather than defer an obligation to a later date. Any businessman, any banker, will tell you not to borrow money or create an interest-bearing obligation unless absolutely necessary. How different the attitude of our New Deal administration. Where this philosophy will lead to, no one knows. We can say, however, quite positively, that to take advantage of the people in a time of war and to thrust down the throats of our Congress such an economically unsound proposal under the guise of war necessity, and to undertake to sell the people the idea of subsidies as a war measure to hold the line and avoid inflation unfits the present administration for the responsibility that is

theirs, and they should be relieved of their trust.

The second fundamental reason we oppose a system of subsidies is that they tend toward paternalism; the scheme is contrary to traditional American principles of free enterprise and our system of open competition. We have progressed for a long while operating under the fundamental laws of supply and demand, and we should go slowly and proceed with utmost caution in interfering with the best system we have ever known.

From the viewpoint of the producer, processor, and consumer, and looking at the matter objectively, as an American citizen who wishes a free country with the opportunity and the incentive for our children to produce and to advance, we cannot but oppose subsidies. Our dream is still that of Thomas Jefferson's who thought of utopia as a prosperous community of farmers, an America of free and independent people. Our farmers want to be relieved of the shackles of governmental control; they want a free and independent agriculture again, at least the cost of production, and encouragement that they will receive a fair price, so that they will have enough incentive to induce them to produce bountifully.

When will our people cease to fall for such seemingly attractive schemes? When will they quit trying to lift themselves by their own bootstraps? People would have fallen for such arguments as the administration now advances a few years ago, but now they have lost faith and confidence in our administration's leaders, with all their bureaus and handing out of directives. And so we find our citizens skeptical and very cautious this time. They are indeed slow to fall for seemingly foolproof schemes such as this subsidy proposal. There is one encouraging sign, they still have confidence in their Congress. Let us represent them truly. The only excuse for our being here is that all of the people cannot come to Washington. They are opposed to subsidies and may we not let them down; may we demonstrate by our votes that we are worthy of their confidence.

Fortunately, the farmer's contact with the laws of nature has endowed him with a sense of the true value of things and he is not so easily confused with words and formal declarations of the New Deal strategists who never for a minute overlook the political implications of a seeming gratuity to the voting consumer. He applies the principles of a problem of a wider scope to the homely principles of his early, sound moral training and the laws of supply and demand, and when they do not measure up to these fundamentals that have been tested and not found wanting, he soon rejects them as false and realizes their ultimate end will mean retracing when the going will not be so good. He is suspicious of anything that is handed him for nothing. He has long since learned that this is a cold, calculating world, and that everything given has its price, even though it may not show at the moment. They have seen all the ducking, dodging, juggling acts of the New Deal before and are fully conscious of how they will end, in greater bureaucratic control and an even more serious raid of the Treasury which will have to be paid in the future by our servicemen who are giving their all for the freedom of the world, while here at home freedom is gradually being sucked in by a great octopus of socialistic, governmental exploitation.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman is quite an expert on matters of interest to agriculture, and it is obvious that he has made a profound study of this particular question of subsidies. I think I should rise to congratulate the gentleman upon the work that he is doing for the farmers of our State of Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has made a very fine statement on subsidies and I want to ask the gentleman if it is not his belief that without the subsidy program, that is, if we had a satisfactory handling of the Food Administration, without the subsidy program which is about to be imposed on the country, the consumer would not actually be better off.

Mr. SCHWABE. It certainly appears that way to me. At least our national debt would be less and I doubt if the consumer would notice any appreciable increase in commodity prices traceable to there being no subsidy program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Forgetting the question of subsidies at the moment, does the gentleman believe in price control during the war?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes, to a certain extent. For example, I believe in control of the demand by consumers of meat. This is done by the use of the red ration stamps. This would help solve the problems of livestock producers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the law of supply and demand during war is usually disturbed by reason of the unusual demands for war purposes; that is so, is it not?

Mr. SCHWABE. Oh, surely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, in the case where, and I am only trying to get information and I would like to get the gentleman's view, in the case where the demand for these food commodities or products is much larger than the supply under existing conditions, what would happen to the price level if there was not some control?

Mr. SCHWABE. It is simply a difference in the way we would like to go about it. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts is sincere and, of course, the Members of the minority are also sincere. We all want to produce more. That is our objective. It is simply that we disagree as to the way we should go about accomplishing our objective. If prices rise and at the same time production increases we need have no great fear of inflation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In connection with the observation that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] made, as long ago as 1940, in November, a bill was introduced from the minority side which would have fixed and stabilized the prices of wages and things. But the majority side would not listen to any fixing of wages at that time. They said they did not want Congress to pass on it. They were going to leave it to the President. Ever since that time the President has hiked wages, but all the time he has wanted to hold the prices of farm products down. Of course, you cannot stabilize one without stabilizing the other and make it work anyway.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I call attention of the leader of the majority side that there has been no request I know of on this side of the House for the removal of price control. Suggestion has been made in very great sincerity, but the majority side just completely ignored it, that we should have started and should now return to the program which was in effect in World War No. 1, which was inaugurated and put into effect at that time by the same party to which the majority leader belonged, which was an efficient program. I am sure the majority leader does not stand on this floor to defend inefficiency, to defend duplication, to defend the cutting down of production, and to defend mismanagement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman defend the prices that existed in World War No. 1?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel, what the farmers want to begin with, the farmers of the Nation do not object to fair ceilings placed upon their products so long as that ceiling is not placed so low that it will interfere with the production of food that is necessary for the boys on the fronts.

Mr. SCHWABE. I believe that is in accordance with the war needs. The farmer must have sufficient price incentive to encourage adequate production of food, a vital war necessity.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That especially applies, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri, in regard to butterfats.

Mr. SCHWABE. I think that is correct.

Mr. LANDIS. I might cite, just to give an example of what kind of price control we are up against, the case of the California pea grower who did not get enough because the ceiling was not high enough to pay for the labor to pick the peas.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will you also include several thousand acres of carrots which, thanks to the Food Administration, rotted in the ground in California. I am sure the majority leader is not defending that type of food administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman accept the position of the gentleman who has just spoken in his defense of prices during World War No. 1?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Prices or administration?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman heard the question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I heard the question. But the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is speaking of the administration. You have diverted the question to prices. That was not under discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made an observation referring to the prices during World War No. 1. I am asking the question now if the gentleman approves of World War No. 1 prices at the present time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very willing to discuss prices with the majority leader. I ask that they be placed on a comparable basis. That is not being done by the majority side.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has not answered the question. He brought up the prices during World War No. 1. I ask the gentleman, he having indicated or offered that as an illustration of what would be a proper condition to exist now, I ask the gentleman if he approves of World War No. 1 prices at the present time. The gentleman has not answered the question yet.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who has the floor, and what the question is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everybody understands who has the floor except the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think what the gentleman from Missouri is trying to point out is that he is not complaining about having price control. What he is objecting to is the unfairness with which it is being put into operation. That is so evident in so many ways, that we are supposed to have price control and we are supposed to have equal distribution of food. Neither one of those things is being put into operation by the present manipulations of the O. P. A. The reasons that they are not are many, and if they were put into operation it would not be possible for the man with the price to go downtown and buy himself a gallon of cream and make all the butter he wants, without any points; and yet if his wife goes to the store she has to pay 5 points for a little cottage cheese that is made out of skimmed milk. In other words, there is nobody that has stood up against the old grindstone. They are afraid to put a ceiling on beef cattle.

It is just like the situation in India. There it is supposed to be a sacred animal; but they can put a ceiling on hogs and they will shove it right down their throats without a word on their part.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One thing that some of us at this time object to is this proposition of rolling back prices in order to buy the labor vote. We do not like that. We say you should allow labor to go along with the rest of us, with this agreement—I will not call it a conspiracy, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] last night referred to the Republican program—I will not call it a conspiracy. It is just sort of a hard and fast agreement whereby the administration raises the wages of the factory workers in return for the endorsement which the administration recently had of the C. I. O. leadership. It is just what we think looks like a raw deal.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] we did a pretty good job of winning World War No. 1. The point is that we did win and now it is up to us to adopt measures that will win this one. We are all out for production which is all important today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks today and those that I will make today, and to extend my remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question that I have to ask?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, let me get started first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article in reply to what the gentleman is about to say.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of World War No. 1, was brought up and the question of prices in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. I want to mention one commodity and compare the prices paid now as compared with the prices paid then. That one commodity goes into the cost of living of every family. That commodity is sugar. We are taking into consideration the amount of sugar consumed in this country in 1942, compared with during the World War. We paid $2,871,000,000 less for sugar in 1942 than we would have paid for the same quantity in World War No. 1. During the two years 1942 and 1943, presuming the consumption of sugar will continue during the last three months, as during the first three quarters, our savings on sugar alone, compared with the last World War will be $5,871,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment please.

The amount of subsidy the President asked for, that he wanted to be used, was $800,000,000; that is for all food programs. That would be $6.06 per capita. The savings on sugar alone compared with the last war are $21.75 per capita; so the question of subsidy looks as though it might be favorable to the consumer.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish on sugar.

In June, 1920, there was a recorded price on sugar by the Department of Agriculture for a family of 3 of $69.33 per year compared with $17.67 in 1942 and 1943. A family of 5 in June, 1920, paid $115.55 but in 1942–43 only $29.43; in other words we could save nearly $6,000,000,000 in 2 years on one item, just sugar alone.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like subsidies; I do not like the word "subsidy," and people are being told it is an obnoxious word, an offensive word; but I am convinced there is no alternative for keeping down the cost of living and encouraging production except through the use of subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made what appears to be a fair statement in respect to sugar. Will the gentleman explain——

Mr. PATMAN. Just ask the question, if you please.

Mr. KEEFE. But I have got to lay a premise in order to give the gentleman an understanding as to what I am going to ask.

Mr. PATMAN. I have the understanding; go ahead.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman explain the effect of subsidies on the price of sugar as between the price of sugar in World War No. 1 and the price of sugar today? That is the information we should like to have.

Mr. PATMAN. There are two factors which enter into it—subsidies and price control.

Mr. KEEFE. I want the gentleman to make a general statement on the part subsidies played.

Mr. PATMAN. Just give me a chance and I will.

We import four-fifths of our sugar; I believe that is conceded. Our beet- and cane-sugar producers cannot compete with this imported sugar that is produced by cheap labor down here in the

islands, and we have to pay our domestic growers a little extra bonus, or a subsidy, we will call it, of about a cent a pound. That is on just about one-fifth of the sugar that is consumed in America. That saves us a cent a pound on the other four-fifths. Just common arithmetic will show anyone that that is a big saving, a big saving. Now, if we do what you gentlemen in the minority are advocating—raise the price so as to take care of domestic sugar—we would have to raise the price to the sugar growers on the islands—people who do not need it. They are already making enormous profits. Most of those sugar plantations are owned by New York banks, by the New York "farmers." So, by advocating that we raise the price on the domestic sugar, we will at the same time have to raise the price on the imported sugar. So there is where a subsidy is directly to the benefit of the American consumer of sugar, and that is the only way on earth you can do it. If anyone can tell me any other way, I shall be happy to yield.

The other factor is price control. I do not like price control either; it is regimentation, certainly it is; but in war time we have got to accept some things we do not like, something bad oftentimes to keep from having to take something worse. Often in times of peace conditions and situations arise where these things will occur, but everyone, I presume, who has studied the question is in favor of price control. I cannot conceive of a person's saying that we should not have price control. If we have price control we are going to have a lot of regulations and rules that we do not understand, and a lot of things will be done that we do not like, and a lot of things are going to be done that should not be done, and a lot of mistakes are going to be made, because we are dealing with millions and millions of commodities and articles; that is why. We must expect these things to be done, and, by reason of that subsidy, by reason of that price control, the consumers of America on sugar alone, just that one item, will save over five and one-half billions of dollars in two years' time.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Would the gentleman in his extension of remarks, put in a comparison of prices in 1918, during the second year of World War No. 1, with current prices? I notice the gentleman used the year 1920.

Mr. PATMAN. I would be delighted to do that; it will appear in the RECORD tomorrow.

SUGAR PRICE NOW AND DURING WORLD WAR NO. 1

History is the best teacher of what has happened to this country through uncontrolled prices and what may happen again if the Congress does not provide subsidies to restrain increases in the cost of living. During and following World War No. 1 prices were not controlled and as a consequence they got far out of bounds. The American people were compelled to pay through the nose, and business institutions by the score went bankrupt. Surpluses of thousands of retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers were sacrificed in an endeavor to shoulder the storm following the collapse of commodity prices.

I do not believe any Member of Congress will want to assume the responsibility for a similar occurrence in this war if he realizes what consumers had to pay and business had to suffer—losses of hundreds of millions because there was no control over the rapidly advancing market prices. Families had to pay unconscionable prices which cost them, conservatively figured, $6,820,000,000 over present prices for food alone, and about $9,792,000,000 taking cost of living into consideration in 1943. Prices were in a chaotic condition. Manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers were completely at sea to control the situation.

Sugar, for illustration, during and immediately following World War No. 1, would jump as much as $5 a bag of 100 pounds in a week or two, rising from less than $7 a bag to $28 at the refinery. The retail price of sugar leaped from around 8 cents a pound in 1918 to as much as 35 cents in 1920, almost four and a half times the 1918 prices.

To provide a background of sugar prices, the consumption in 1942 was 4,561,251 tons of 2,240 pounds, or a total of 10,217,202,240 pounds. The national average retail price in 1942 and 1943, according to the Department of Labor, was stablized at 6.8 cents a pound.

This price compares with 9.7 cents national average in 1918; 11.3 in 1919; 19.4 in 1920. The high average price for any month in 1920 recorded by the Department of Labor was 26.7 a pound in June. The Department's records show that sugar sold for 34.6 cents in Los Angeles in July 1920 while Mr. Gerrit Vander Hooning, fromer president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, informed me he sold it in his store in Grand Rapids, Mich., at 35 cents. Other authority has told me this price prevailed in other States.

If the American housewives are called upon again, without subsidies as a check on rising prices, or without controlled prices, to pay such high prices for sugar alone as 35 cents a pound it will cost them $3,576,020,784. In place of that, however, they have paid during 1942 and in 1943 an average of only 6.8 cents a pound, which would mean a cost of $704,985,954.56, in comparison with 1920.

NEARLY SIX BILLIONS SAVED 1942–43

In other words, with unrestrained pricing and no stabilization in the first war, the people of this country would have paid out in 1942, $2,871,034,830 more for sugar and at the same rate this year based on the 35 cents a pound. In the past 2 years, therefore, the lower prices to consumers will be $5,871,034,830 on sugar alone because of price stabilization.

On sugar alone in 1942 it would have cost consumers three and a half times the $800,000,000 President Roosevelt is asking in the way of subsidies to place prices of food on a stable basis to avoid price inflation of 1920. With 1943 closing there will be even a greater saving than the $2,871,034,830 for the reason that more sugar will be consumed as the War Food Administration has released more on a rationing basis than prevailed in 1942.

In the face of these facts and figures, what will the Congress do? Tell the American people to pay $704,985,954.56 for sugar with a subsidy of $800,000,000, or more than $2,871,034,830.

COST OF SUBSIDY COMPARED WITH INCREASED PRICE

This $800,000,000 subsidy proposal represents an average cost of $6.06 per capita based on 132,000,000 population whereas the additional cost for sugar alone at 1920 prices of 35 cents a pound means a per capita cost of $21.75 in comparison, or $15.69 more per capita without price regulation should prices again skyrocket as they did from 1918 to 1920, as seems reasonable to expect in view of past experiences without regulation.

Can the country afford that kind of a drain on the pocket of the American people, especially the lower income groups who usually have the largest families and can least afford to pay this higher cost?

SUBSIDIES OR INFLATION

To demonstrate more concretely the difference between regulated prices which subsidies are intended to control and to avoid inflationary prices—which are sure to follow if conditions of the last war reappear as seems almost certain—here are some convincing facts. This table shows the per capita consumption of sugar in pounds; the average price as supplied by the Department of Labor; the per capita yearly cost from 1918 to 1920; the highest official reported cost in 1920 reported by the Department of Labor; the highest price of sugar recorded in grocery stores in some cities, compared with the stable prices which have prevailed throughout 1942–43.

Year	Per capita consumption	Cost per pound	Yearly cost per capita	Cost per pound 1942–43	Yearly cost per capita	Per capita saving
1918	73.36	$0.097	$7.12	$0.068	$4.99	$2.13
1919	85.43	.113	9.65	.068	5.81	3.84
1920 [1]	86.56	.194	16.79	.068	5.89	10.90
1920 [2]	86.56	.267	23.11	.068	5.89	17.22
1920 [3]	86.56	.35	30.30	.068	5.89	24.41

[1] Highest average price in 1920 reported by Department of Labor.
[2] Highest price reported in June 1920 by Department of Labor.
[3] Highest price reached in some cities by Department of Labor and other authorities.

To illustrate in another way the cost of sugar to families based on the varying prices which prevailed in the last war and how they compare in 1942 and 1943 with stabilized prices, I have here a table which discloses the cost to families of two to five. Those having larger families would be in proportion. Briefly stated, however, these facts stand out:

FAMILY PRICE COMPARED

A family of three in 1918 paid $21.36 for sugar compared with $14.97 in 1942–43, while a family of five paid out $35.60 in the same year against $24.95 in 1942–43.

A family of three in 1919 paid $28.95 compared with $17.43 in 1942–43, while a family of five paid $83.95 in 1919, as compared with $29.05 in 1942–43.

A family of three in 1920, at the highest average price reported by the Department of Labor, paid $50.37 for sugar, compared with $17.67 in 1942–43, while a family of five paid $83.95 compared with $29.45.

A family of three in June 1920, the highest recorded price for sugar by the Department of Labor, paid $69.33, compared with $17.67 in 1942–43, while a family of five paid $115.55, compared with $29.45 in 1942–43.

A family of three in 1920 paid, at the highest retail price reported in some cities, $90.90, compared with $17.67 in 1942–43, while a family of five paid $151.50, compared with $29.45 in 1942–43.

In 1942–43 the price of sugar remained constant at 0.068 cents a pound whereas from 1918 to 1920 the price of sugar advanced rapidly from 0.097 average in 1918 to as high as 35 cents in June 1920. The comparative cost of families of two to five between 1918–20 and 1942–43 is as follows:

Year	Family of 2		Family of 3	
	1918–20	1942–43	1918–20	1942–43
1918	$14.24	$9.98	$21.36	$14.97
1919	19.30	11.62	28.95	17.43
1920 [1]	33.58	11.78	50.37	17.67
1920 [2]	46.22	11.78	69.33	17.67
1920 [3]	60.60	11.78	90.90	17.67

Year	Family of 4		Family of 5	
	1918–20	1942–43	1919–20	1942–43
1918	$28.48	$19.96	$35.60	$24.95
1919	38.60	23.24	48.25	29.05
1920 [1]	67.16	25.56	83.95	29.45
1920 [2]	92.44	25.56	115.55	29.45
1920 [3]	121.20	23.56	151.50	29.45

[1] Highest average price in 1920 by Department of Labor.
[2] Highest price reported in June 1920 by Department of Labor.
[3] Highest price reported by Department of Labor in some cities and other authorities.

NEARLY $3,000,000,000 A YEAR SAVING ON SUGAR ALONE

It should be understood the $2,871,034,630 representing increased cost is for sugar alone. There are many other food products involved which enter into the cost of living. All of them were relatively higher during the first war and immediately thereafter than they are today.

Sugar represents but 1 percent of the average food outlay per capita—Department of Labor. The comparison of the food-cost index from 1918 to 1920, compared with 1941 to 1943 is as follows:

1918	134.4
1919	149.8
1920	168.8
1941	105.5
1942	123.9
1943 (9 months)	138.1

The total outlay for food in 1942, based on Department of Commerce figures, was $27,600,000,000, or 21.8 percent lower than in 1919. On the basis of food costs, therefore, in 1942 there has been a saving in price on the part of consumers due to stabilization of $6,018,000,000.

In 1943, based on estimates of the Department of Commerce, food will cost $31,000,000,000, predicated on 9 months' calculations. Compare the cost of food in 1920 with 1943, the increased cost is 22 percent more in 1920, hence a saving to the public, if 1920 prices were paid, of $6,820,000,000 because of stabilization.

COST OF LIVING PRICES

The comparison of the cost-of-living index, including all commodities entering into such cost, show the following comparison:

1918	107.5
1919	123.8
1920	143.0
1941	105.2
1942	116.5
1943	123.3

In 1942 the total expenditure for cost-of-living goods by the consumers of this country was $54,400,000,000. On the basis of comparative figures in the index in 1919 with 1942, costs were 6.27 percent lower in 1942. The consumers paid, therefore, $3,410,880,000 less for their cost of living in 1942.

In 1943 the expenditure for cost of living goods totaled $61,200,000,000 at 16 percent less than in 1920. This represents a lower cost by $9,792,000,000 for consumers.

These facts prove the danger of uncontrolled pricing and what stabilization means to the consumers of this country. It is not alone these added living costs which we must consider but their effect on constant demands for increased wages. We are at present witnessing this demand on the part of labor, and, as Major Bowes, of radio amateurs says, "around and around she goes; where she'll stop nobody knows." This vicious spiraling must be stopped at all costs, and since the $800,000,000 is but $6.06 per man, woman, and child, we can justify an action that will defeat the proposal for a subsidy in the eyes of the 132,000,000 people?

LOWER INCOME GROUPS SUFFER MOST

The greatest burden will fall on the lower income groups, the class of people who have the largest families. Here in a nutshell is what it means to them:

First. The $2,871,034,830 lower price on sugar alone means a saving of $21.75 per capita, $65.25 per family of three, $108.75 per family of five—based on 1943 cost as compared with the price of 35 cents in 1920.

Second. The saving in food of all kinds in 1943 of $9,936,000,000 represents a per capita saving of $75.23, $225.69 per family of three, $376.15 per family of five based on estimated sales of $31,000,000,000 by the United States Department of Commerce.

Third. The saving on $61,200,000,000 estimated by the United States Department of Commerce as total cost-of-living expenditure for 1943 of $9,792,000,000 would make the per capita $74.18, $222.54 for a family of three, $370.90 for a family of five.

Fourth. The cost per capita of $800,000,000 subsidy requested by the President would represent $6.06 per capita, $18.18 per family of three, $30.30 per family of five.

What the inventory losses were in the first war to measure what they could be if subsidies and price regulation are not provided to ward off another collapse of the commodity markets cannot be estimated. We do know, however, that they were in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Sugar, as previously indicated was sold by refiners at $28 a 100-pound bag to wholesalers in June of 1920 then dropped suddenly to about $7 per bag. We know too, that the retail price dropped from 35 cents a pound in June 1920 to 10½ cents in December 1920, an average of 8 cents in 1921, causing additional losses to retailers with surplus stocks.

SMALL BUSINESS HURT BY DEFLATION FOLLOWING INFLATION

Wholesalers, other processors, and distributors all had unusually large stocks on hand as a rule. Inventory losses ranged from a few thousand dollars, according to the size of the business, to $200,000 for wholesale grocers. I know of one manufacturer who uses much sugar in his product who had his large warehouse full with barrels of sugar packed 5 high, each containing about 350 pounds, whose loss was over $1,000,000. With 4,200 wholesale grocers alone it will be appreciated that at but $20,000 average this loss totaled $84,000,000, conservatively figured. And this does not take into consideration the many thousands of bakeries, processors, and so forth, who use much sugar in their operations.

Generally speaking, for all business, there is an accurate measuring rod to show how business failures and liabilities increased immediately following the periods of 1918–20 and 1921–23 when the commodity markets slumped so terrifically due to declines in prices of all commodities without any price control.

The total number of failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet in 1918, 1919, and 1920 was 25,314. The failures beginning with 1921, when prices started slumping the latter half of that year and ending with 1923, were 62,046. Thus we have an increase of 140 percent in the number of failures, two-thirds of which were undoubtedly due to losses suffered through shrinking commodity values.

Even more pronounced is the extent of the increase in liabilities beginning with 1921 and including 1923, which were 300 percent more than the 3 previous years of 1918 to 1920, inclusive. The losses in this latter period were $571,434,000, compared with $1,790,683,000 in the 3 years following the heavy price declines, or an increase of $1,219,399,000.

There is no way of telling how much more wages will go up unless prices are stabilized. It must be obvious that they will be considerable if wages are to increase with each general increase in prices in order to meet the added cost of living. Some 60,000,000 workers are said to be employed and each dollar-a-week raise in wages would add $3,120,000,000 a year to the pay roll.

In addition, the Government is the heaviest purchaser and would have to meet these increases. Every 1 percent increase in cost of goods of whatever nature would add 1 billion to each 100 billion spent for the war effort.

SUMMARY

Summarized, Mr. Speaker, here is the condition which confronts Congress without regulation of prices through the assistance of subsidies in certain directions to hold down the cost of living, and, of course, wages at the same time:

A. Sugar has been selling at the rate of $2,871,000,000 lower price in 1942 and 1943 than the highest retail prices prevailing in 1920. In 2 years it has cost consumers $5,742,000,000 less because of price stabilization.

B. If the people paid for food at the prices then prevailing in 1919 and 1920, it would have cost $6,016,800,000 more in 1942 and $9,792,000,000 in 1943, a total of $15,808,800,000 for 2 years.

C. Cost of living in 1919 represented an increase of $3,410,880,000 over 1942, while in 1943 on an estimated basis of total expenditure, the lower price would be $9,792,000,000, making a total of $13,202,880,000 for the 2 years if 1919 and 1920 prices prevailed during 1942 and 1943.

D. The increased failures in business caused an increase in the liabilities of $1,219,399,000.

E. Each 1 percent increase in the cost of food over 1943 prices will add $310,000,000 to the people of this country.

F. Every time the cost of living goes up 1 percent, the American people will have to pay $610,000,000.

G. On each $100,000,000,000 expended by the Government for war needs and other requirements it will have to pay out $1,000,000,000 more.

The 132,000,000 people are this Government. Is it not good business, therefore, to subsidize, to stabilize prices by voting a subsidy of $800,000,000 at a cost per capita of only $6.06; $12.12 for a family of 2; $18.18 for a family of 3; $24.24 for a family of 4; and $30.30 for a family of 5, rather than submit to a probable cost based on 1920 prices of $100.22 per capita; $200.44 for a family of 2; $300.66 for a family of 3; $400.88 for a family of 4, and $501 for a family of 5.

This does not take into consideration any increased cost to the Government for what it buys or anything else, or any wage increase.

That is our problem, Mr. Speaker. Which is the obvious way we should vote on the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to its continuation and the $800,000,000 subsidy issue?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I should like to have information as to whether the bill that is about to come from the gentleman's committee would prohibit the subsidizing of sugarbeets.

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly would; it certainly would. It would prevent the subsidizing of sugarbeets. And there is where you gentlemen on the Republican side put yourselves in a very inconsistent position, if you will pardon me. I like every one of you men personally, but as a party you have your contentions, and we have ours, and, of course, we will fight it out; but I think you are making a great mistake. You are placing yourselves in the position where you are against all subsidies, except you have an exception in there as big as a mule; it is as big as a mule, and these exceptions will run not only to tens of millions of dollars a year but to a hundred million.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman indicated that all members of his party were for this program that the gentleman has outlined, but does the gentleman speak authoritatively for all the others? Does the gentleman speak authoritatively for all the members of the Texas delegation and all these other Democrats?

Mr. PATMAN. No, not any more than the gentleman speaks for all the Oklahoma Members.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman said all of the party.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman belong to that group that is fighting subsidies?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes, and I am going to continue to fight them. I wondered if the gentleman's statement was quite accurate when he said the gentleman's own party was for the subsidy program.

Mr. PATMAN. I said it was a party question.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question.

Mr. LANDIS. Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies on oil?

WILL YIELD TO ANYONE WHO CAN OFFER A PLAN EXCEPT SUBSIDIES TO HOLD DOWN COST OF LIVING AND ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. I am in favor of subsidies on anything that will encourage production without increasing the cost of living. You see, we have to have some kind of standard or guide to go by. I ask the gentleman now, and I ask any person present here, if he can name any way on earth that you can hold down the cost of living and encourage production without the use of a subsidy? I yield to any person who says he has a plan.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman have a plan?

Mr. LANDIS. Just an example.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman have a plan that will hold down the cost of living and encourage production without using a subsidy?

Mr. LANDIS. I will give you an example in the canned-goods industry.

Mr. PATMAN. What is that example?

Mr. LANDIS. In the canned-goods industry we have in the last year paid out eight-tenths of a cent per can and we have decreased production in canned goods over 30 percent. I contend if we were to give the canning industry 1 cent per can increase, we would increase production and give the consumer the canned goods and more canned goods at the same price or probably a cheaper price.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that he is just as wrong as he can be. I am glad he brought up canned goods. You know, canned goods are put up all over the United States. Generally, the price paid for canned goods was satisfactory and the canners could make good money. They did not need any increased price at all. The farmers were getting a good price for their production. But in certain high-priced areas, like Baltimore or Cleveland where the cost of production was so much higher, these canners were being squeezed out, they were being put out of business. Now, which is better, raise all prices up to where these few fellows could stay in business or give those few canners a subsidy? We gave them a subsidy and we are saving many dollars for every $1 we paid out in subsidies. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. LANDIS. You could do the same thing with an increase of 1 cent a can.

Mr. PATMAN. Why increase it all over the Nation just to take care of a few hardship cases? I do not care how much you hate the word "subsidy" or anything else, it does not make sense to increase the price all over the Nation to take care of a few hardship cases in various places.

COPPER

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that on copper a subsidy was paid to the high-cost producers? The price of copper was not raised all over the United States, but went to the high-cost producers?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Copper is a valuable product. We had to have copper; we needed it; it is a critical material, and we had to get all the copper production we could. About three of the big copper companies, all of them, were producing all the copper. They were getting 12 cents a pound, and they were making big money. They did not need an increase, and they did not ask for it. How would you get an increase in copper production to bring in these high-cost mines where it would cost 20, 25, or 35 cents a pound to bring them in? Would you increase all prices up to them? That does not make sense. No. Just give the high-cost mines the extra price, which we did, and for every dollar we paid out that way we saved $28. That is not only good sense, it is good business.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. Is it not also true that if we had used the other method and raised this price, you would not increase the production of those efficient, effective, low-cost mines one pound of copper? In other words, they are now running at capacity?

Mr. PATMAN. Why, certainly they are.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield to permit an observation?

Mr. PATMAN. No. As much as I like the gentleman, I cannot yield for that purpose. I want him to get his own time.

Mr. GAVIN. Let me ask the gentleman then a question. Subsidies require money. Where are you going to get the money other than through taxes? You are looking now for $12,000,000,000 in new money that you cannot find. The subsidy program may make another two, three, four, or five billion dollars before we get through. You are talking about the dangerous money, the inflationary trend with $52,000,000,000 of loose money lying around. All you are doing with subsidies is passing that tax burden on to the boys who are over there fighting for us at $50 per month. Therefore, I think the bill should be paid now and not pass this on to be paid at some later date.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing up the most popular question that is usually brought up on that. I want to thank him for it. I am really indebted to him for it because it gives me an opportunity to completely answer him right here.

What is the answer? Take the copper that the gentleman mentioned. Well, we had to borrow that money. We had to borrow about $30,000,000 to pay the subsidy on these high-cost mines. That went into the public debt and the boys coming back here after they win the war will have to pay that $30,000,000. I know that, I concede it.

What would have been the alternative? If we had not done that, we would have had to borrow a billion dollars which the boys, after saving the country on the battle fronts of the world, would have had to pay after they come back here. Would the gentleman prefer that they pay a billion dollars or just $30,000,000?

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman is reciting a lot of confusing figures about which there might be a lot of argument.

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment. I am not yielding for a speech.

I assure the gentleman that the figures I am citing are correct ones, and no informed person disputes them. I can cite figures on other things that would be just as astounding as that. So the fact is that sometimes we have to take something bad to keep from taking something worse. It is better to have a $30,000,000 debt passed on to them than to have a billion-dollar debt.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unless we had price control, prices would now be two to two and one-half times what they are. These very soldiers they are thinking about, and properly so, when they return, we are thinking about now in connection with their wives, their mothers, and their dependents. The purchasing value of the allotments these soldiers are making and that the folks at home are receiving would be considerably less without a price-control system than it is now under the price-control program, with all the defects that exist.

Mr. GAVIN and Mr. BUFFETT rose.

WILL HARM SERVICEMEN'S FAMILIES

Mr. PATMAN. I will not yield to anybody until I comment on that statement.

That brings up this question: We raised the allowances and allotments to the dependents of the servicemen a few days ago, and that was the right thing to do. We should have raised them. Now we come along here and propose a bill which destroys price control over the cost of living to the extent that the cost of living will go way up, and you then have taken away from them twice as much as you gave them in that increase. That is what you are doing, that is what you are proposing. What about the other people who do not come in on the increase in wages and salaries, like the preachers, the firemen in the cities, and the policemen and the teachers and the bookkeepers and the typists and the other people, including farmers, representing a large part of the middle class of our country, who have no increase in wages or prices? If you succeed in breaking this price line, you destroy the value of their wages and their salaries.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is the only Member of the House who has addressed the Speaker before he began to interrupt the gentleman in the Well of the House, so the Speaker trusts that the gentleman from Texas will yield to him.

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has mentioned subsidies on copper. The subsidies on copper were paid only to those producers who could not produce at that level.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BUFFETT. In other words, the subsidy on copper was paid only to the people who needed it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, who needed it. I thoroughly agree with it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Why does not the gentleman agree with the same principle as to subsidies on food, paid only to the lower-class people who need it?

Mr. PATMAN. They need it to get production. That is what they want. They cannot produce at the prices they would get unless you give them a subsidy. It is the same way on canned goods, the same way on everything. The gentleman's question answers itself. Therefore, I presume the gentleman is not going to vote with the solid Republican minority on that.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is an adept at twisting my question around. If that is true, where are the producers that favor the subsidy proposal?

Mr. PATMAN. They are everywhere. There are a lot of producers that favor it, a lot of them. It is not just these Washington and New York farmers that are speaking the sentiments of the real farmers of the country. Some real farmers doubtless do oppose subsidies. We have a lot of Wall Street farmers down here, and they are telling us how bad subsidies are. They are taking them all the time and have been taking them as long as we have had a Government, but you know subsidies are bad only for the farmers; they are good for the railroads; they are good for air mail; they are good for the merchant marine; they are good for inland waterways; they are good to help industries through the protective tariffs; and they are good for the magazines and newspapers up to an amount of $100,000,000 a year; but they are terrible for the farmer. Is not that awful?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I get it, what the gentleman wants to do is to take this dollar which the housewife or anyone else has to purchase food, run it through the Washington bureaucrats, who shave it 10 cents or 20 or 30, whatever it may be, and then give it back to them.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman makes a point there. Who is a Washington bureaucrat?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has worked hand in hand with them for so long he ought to know better than I do.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman's question has provoked my curiosity. I will endeaver in my feeble way to answer it the best I can.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Brother Ickes is one of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman asked me who they were. I was going to name some of them—and this man Fortas.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman now to give me just a little time to expand on it. Who are these bureaucrats?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman asking me?

BUREAUCRATS

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am asking myself. I am letting the gentleman go right now, for the present. Let us take the W. P. B. Who are the people in charge in W. P. B.? I never heard of Mr. Donald Nelson being accused of being a Democrat. Maybe he is. But he is a mighty fine man, a good man, and he will emerge after this war as one of the greatest men in the war. I do not care if he happens to be a member of the other party. And who are the people in the bottleneck positions down there, heads of these boards and bureaus, that you call bureaucrats? Most of them are Republicans. Why? It is perfectly natural. It was accidental; what I mean, they were not doing it on purpose, it was the logical thing. You have got to have people down there who know all about copper, who know all about steel and aluminum and brass and all these different things. Where are you going to get them? The little business fellow does not have the time to give up his business and come to Washington and look after it. Only the big fellow, the dollar-a-year man, who has somebody right beside him who

can take his place, can run off down to Washington and stay here all the time, and kind of look after his own business at the same time, too.

So it was just a natural course to be taken, that the big fellows would drift into this. I asked down there why they did not get rid of these steel fellows, and everybody knows they are there. I asked one of the officials why they did not get rid of them. He said, "We have to have somebody here who knows all about steel, and if we would get rid of these we would have to get somebody else, and it would be about the same." And so that is the way it is, and that is why you have so many Republicans in that situation. Many more than 50 percent of those who hold key positions in W. P. B. and O. P. A. are Republicans. Now if the Republicans can make and do so much better job, I wonder why they do not do it.

CROP OF WAR MILLIONAIRES

By the way, we have one piece of legislation which can be said to be strictly Republican legislation in this Congress, and that is the tax measure. That is a perfect piece of Republican legislation, because the Republicans framed it. And they have a right to do that. They said they were going to put over that tax bill, that Ruml plan, that made the first crop of war millionaires, or if they were already millionaires, they were determined to make them bigger. But they were only 75-percent millionaires when they came out, but they have a group now of 75-percent millionaires, and they wrote that bill. That is simply the kind of legislation we can expect, and anyone who had anything to do with writing that tax bill has no right to criticize the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the bungling bureaucrats, or anybody else.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I was quite interested in the figures that the gentleman quoted concerning the savings, as I understood it, of some $6,000,000,000 in sugar alone. If my figures are correct, and there are 130,000,000 people in the Nation, then a savings of $6,000,000,000 would be about $47 per person, or about 2½ tons of sugar to a family of 5.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I would rather not have the gentleman take up my time by going into figures. I shall put the exact figures into the RECORD, and I shall be glad to do it, on a per capita basis and the total tonnage, not only for this year, but for last year and other years.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. And that is the figure of 2¼ tons per family of five?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I am not taking any horseback opinion on that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Regardless of the fact that it happened that I personally voted against the Ruml plan, nevertheless, I was laboring under the delusion that the Democrats were in control of the House and are in control of the House now, and when it passed that bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; but you see if one group votes solidly it has a very powerful effect, and you gentlemen get together, and there are always some Democrats that like to go along with the Republicans, and they voted for it, and in that way you have a group, and that is true in voting on the Ruml plan in both the House and the Senate. That is what happens when you have a solid bloc of votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. But notwithstanding the statement just made, that does not eliminate any minority responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. They have the responsibility. They got together and framed it. If they had voted their individual opinions, there would be no such responsibility, but when you frame up and say, "I am going to vote with the Republican Party" regardless of merit that is where the responsibility falls.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I read the gentleman's remarks made over the radio last night, in which he told of a conspiracy between the Republicans to destroy the economy of this country and cause an increase in the cost of living and thus bring about inflation.

Mr. PATMAN. I feel complimented that the gentleman took the time to read it.

Mr. KEEFE. I did, and it is very interesting and there will be comments upon it later, as one might perceive from the wires received last night from the people of this country. What I am interested in knowing is this. The gentleman is aware, of course, through reports in newspapers that there has been a request for an increase in the price of coal to about 60 cents a ton to the consumer. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, not only in the price of coal but in other things.

Mr. KEEFE. I am referring to the coal. Does the gentleman contend that that prospective increase in the price of coal to the consumers is the result of a conspiracy on the part of the Republicans, or is it due to the bungling of the labor situation in this case, and the handling of the whole labor problem which has resulted in a wage increase that necessitates an increase in the price of coal.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer the gentleman. You see, oftentimes we cannot see the forest for the trees and we cannot see the good things we are doing because of picking out some little, insignificant something. I will admit that is a violation of the stabilization agreement, and I hate to see it very much. There are a lot of things that happen that I do not like. But should I do like that selective service board in Minnesota the other day, just throw up my hands and say, "Let the country go to the dogs. Let the country go," because something happened which I did not like? Patriotic citizens do not do that. I am not attacking that particular selective service board. All those boards that I know are composed of good fellows. But they acted ill-advisedly there. They should have given the matter more consideration. What you mentioned there was brought about by 1 percent of the workers of this country. The coal miners have about 500,000 members, which represents 1 percent of the workers of the country. Let us assume they did wrong, which they did, and I denounce them for it. I denounced them in the speech that the gentleman read. Should we, because these little, irritating and annoying things, and things that we do not like happen, representing only a very little pinprick compared to the whole picture, just throw up our hands and say, "Just let the country go. We don't care"? I hope the gentleman is too big to do that. Knowing him as I do, and knowing the power of his logic and reasoning and consideration of these things, I do not believe he is going to let those little things throw him off.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Unfortunately, of course, I do not have the floor.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question. I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman I repeat the question that I asked before and the gentleman in his usual suave manner has not answered it at all. Does the gentleman contend that the proposed increase in the cost of coal which is an element of inflation is due to a conspiracy on the part of the Republican Members of this Congress, as you charged in your speech last night?

Mr. PATMAN. With reference to that particular thing, the Republicans were not responsible for it as such. But, in comparison with the harm you are about to do, this will sink into insignificance.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman concede that that harm, if it is a harm, which causes an increase in the cost of living so far as the price of coal is concerned, is a thing which the Republican Party has nothing to do with.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say to the gentleman that he is too big to talk about little things like that. When we have a national debt of over $100,000,000,000 and 9,000,000 men under arms, with more than 2,000,000 on 55 battle fronts of the world, giving their lives to save this country, is the gentleman going to waste time talking about little things like that? I know there is a principle involved, but at the same time it is little, looking over the whole picture, and I think the gentleman in bringing it up really does the country a little disservice. I hope he will pardon me for saying that. Because it provokes other people to bring up little ticky things and minor matters and just makes them get furious and froth and foam at the mouth and cuss out the Government and everybody connected with it because some little thing happens like that. What is 60 cents on a ton of coal compared with the 9,000,000 boys in the war and the national debt of over $100,000,000,000?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question only to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand, then, with reference to the last statement which the gentleman just made, "What does 60 cents a ton on the price of coal mean to the people in the face of 9,000,000 men in the service and the great national debt," does he apply that same philosophy to increases on the prices of all commodities that may take place from time to time?

Mr. PATMAN. No; that is just one item.

Mr. KEEFE. I am going to ask the gentleman to answer that question. You did not answer my question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is trying to raise the prices on millions of commodities, and this only involves one commodity.

Mr. KEEFE. No; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is not attempting to raise the prices of millions of commodities.

Mr. PATMAN. I will answer it to my own satisfaction. I have answered it to my own satisfaction. I am not going to yield to the gentleman any more except for a question.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not answered the question to anybody else's satisfaction.

Mr. PATMAN. With regard to the question of fuel, that brings up a good question. I am glad the gentleman mentioned fuel.

You know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] mentioned a while ago—I do not see him. I wish he were here—he mentioned about how bad subsidies are. Oftentimes things come up like that. Mr. GIFFORD comes from New England, one of the finest sections of this country——

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment, please.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. PATMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for 3 more minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rule that where there are other special orders following, I do object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Boston Post recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the problem of an adequate supply of food in this country is assuming most serious proportions. We have reached a place where Congress as well as the administration must take a practical and realistic view of the food situation. We must deal with it as a part of the national program. The supply of food in this country has become a part of the international picture. We have got to realize that food is a necessary war material. Food is not only a war necessity but will also play a significant part in the writing of a peace and post-war program.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation had an all-time high production of food crops in 1942. The record of production during the past 3 years is not a thing that just happened. A kindly Providence provided rain and sunshine, but the farmers of this country did their part, and more, to produce the bountiful crops we have had in recent years. They have worked from daylight until dark, in sunshine and rain, for 70 to 80 hours a week when necessary, and the women and children have worked with them in order that crops may be produced and a supply of food provided for our civilian uses and our armed forces.

The demand for food production of this country has been tremendous. Until the last year or two there has been a carry-over or surplus of some kinds of food, but, Mr. Speaker, we are facing the year 1944 with a sharp decline in food supplies and with practically no surpluses on hand. For example, we have an under-supply of feed at the present time which in turn is bound to produce a smaller supply of beef, pork, and other meat products. Hogs and cattle right now are going to the packers unfinished, which means that an additional supply of millions of pounds of beef will not be produced. The present outlook for the dairy business is that the amount of milk and other products will not be increased in the immediate future. In fact, the milk situation can become critical in the next few months.

I want to call your attention further to the manner in which the administration has attempted to handle that problem. A few months ago administration officials decided the price of meat was too high. No showing was made that the grower of livestock was receiving exorbitant prices for his labor or production. He was not even consulted. In June a roll-back of 10 percent on the retail price of meat was ordered. The payment of a subsidy was ordered to take its place. What happened? The meat packer and processor received a subsidy of $1.10 per hundred on livestock purchased for slaughter and at the same time cattle sold on the market at a reduction of from $1 to $2 per hundred. The producer, of course, did not get any subsidy; he got the roll-back in the price of his livestock of from $1 to $2 per hundred. About $4,000,000 has already been paid to processors and packers. Such action certainly did not contribute to the increase in the supply of food.

Since that time further and different rules have been promulgated whereby an attempt is made to put ceilings on live cattle, which has further confused, confounded, and complicated the situation. These rules and regulations have been worked out by individuals who have had no practical experience in the production of food, especially livestock, and who would not seek the advice of those who have had such experience. It is my opinion, from my own experience, and from the study I have made of this situation that unless this matter is corrected promptly we are going to have a dire shortage of meat within the next few months. The irony of this situation is that although we have millions of cattle in this country, there will be a shortage of beef for the reason that there is no incentive for the producer to deliver a finished product in the market.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this as one example of the short-sightedness and mismanagement in dealing with the food problem. Mr. Speaker, it should be brought to the attention of the people of this country that those who produce the food are not getting rich. They are not even receiving parity for their products, when the cost of labor is taken into consideration. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, although we are eating about 30 percent better than before the war started we are paying the lowest share of our income for food in our history. It is only 21 percent and believed to be the lowest of any nation in the world, and let me emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, that only one-half of the 21 percent really goes to the farmer. In other words, about 11 cents of the consumer's dollar reaches the man who really produces the food.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. I just wonder if he has gone into the fact of whether or not the subsidies that are being paid in the meat industry have increased production of meat on the market.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] has raised the question. He has always taken a deep interest in matters of interest to the farmers of this country. The payment of meat subsidies to the packers and processors has not increased production of meat on the market. The very unfortunate thing about it is this, that because of the confusion, misunderstanding, and uncertainty of the situation, livestock men are putting their cattle on the market now and have been for the past several weeks, without their being finished, and many of them are doing it at considerable financial loss. We are not getting the production of meat that we should have and we are going to find meat production lower in the near future.

Mr. WINTER. And you cannot correct that with subsidies?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You cannot correct that by subsidies. Certainly not. The livestock men are not asking for subsidies. Neither are they asking for exorbitant prices for their products.

Mr. SCHWABE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri who has just made a very informative address.

Mr. SCHWABE. These subsidies have been paid for several months, which are said to be for the producers of livestock. Can the gentleman name any benefit that the producers, the farmers have derived from this system of subsidies? Can the gentleman name a single farmer who can say that he has received any subsidy himself?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think it is generally understood, generally agreed, that the farmer did not get any subsidy. It went to the processor, to the meat packer. The farmer did get the rollback, however.

Of course, it was suggested by those who handled the thing that this benefit would be passed on to the farmers. But immediately, because of the uncertainty of the thing, the market went down. As I said a moment ago, it went down from a dollar to $2 per hundred pounds, and the farmer did not receive any subsidy, but took a loss of from $1 to $2 per hundred on his cattle.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] last night on the radio made this statement:

> So, I say first to you housewives if the price of ham goes up 10 cents a pound, thank the Republicans and their radio spokesman.

Then, within a hundred words, he said:

> So, I say to you farmers, if you bring your hogs to market and get only 8 cents a pound, blame all the Republicans.

He blames the Republicans if the price to the farmers goes down; he blames the Republicans if the price of ham to the housewife goes up.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just how are the Republicans to blame for any cause or for any situation which arises within or without O. P. A. when the majority party, the Democratic Party, of which the gentleman is a member, has had absolute control of both branches of Congress and of the Executive office for the last 10 years?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, I did not hear the address.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am quoting from a copy of his address.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not hear the speech of the gentleman blaming the Republicans for this situation the gentleman from Michigan has just described, but I am surprised and chagrined that he would use his radio time to blame this thing on the Republican Party; I think it is unfortunate, if such is the case.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure there must be an answer. I do not have time to yield at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order; the gentleman from Texas has not addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is: The gentleman from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As soon as I have completed my statement I shall be pleased indeed to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not now. Let me complete my statement.

It might be well to call your attention to some figures that are practical and rather significant. The wholesale ceiling price on beef is 22 cents per pound. You know what it costs in Washington if you can get it. Eggs on the market sold by the farmers in my community last week brought 42 cents per dozen. In Washington they are 70 cents. Of course, the consumer paid more, but that money did not go to the farmer. It went for handling charges, transportation charges, and other expenses. Mr. Speaker, the problem of food supply in this country transcends the question of how much the farmer is to get for his work, although that is extremely important. The big problem is how the greatest producing Nation in the world may increase the production of all kinds of food in order, so far as possible, to meet the greatest demand ever known in history. We must face the reality more than ever that food is an essential war weapon, and that food will be one of the outstanding factors when it comes to the writing of the peace among the nations of the world. I call your attention right now, for example, to the lend-lease commitments we have made during the past few months whereby we have agreed to increase our supplies of food to the Allies. I would further call your attention to the request of the President that we share our food with the starving people of the occupied countries across the seas. The amount for foodstuffs to be sent to Europe in the next 6 months is estimated at 7,300,000 metric tons.

Mr. Speaker, we had just about the same acreage of production we had 25 years ago. It is interesting to observe, too, that our wheat and other grain production in 1917 and 1918 was almost as high as in 1942 and 1943. The demand for food was not as great as it is at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are there any other special orders?

Mr. PITTENGER. I intend to ask for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In just a moment; I will as soon as I complete my statement.

Mr. Speaker, there has been too much bungling, confusion, and misunderstanding with regard to the food problem in this Nation. There has been too much theory and not enough realistic, practical, common sense used in dealing with this question. The big question today is how we may increase the food supply of this country. Of course, nobody advocates the payment of premiums or exorbitant prices for doing the job.

Mr. Speaker, we are short of food. We are doing little or nothing to encourage and increase its production. The whole problem must be clarified and worked out on a practical basis whereby we may be able to secure a maximum supply of food at fair and reasonable costs. The farmers and producers of this country must be given to understand, as never before, that they have a most important part not only in the winning of the war, but in winning the peace that is to follow. They must be given a clear understanding that they shall have a reasonable award for their efforts, and have definite assurance they will not be further confused by unnecessary bungling and red tape and regulations. They must use every effort to produce and provide more and more food.

Mr. Speaker, the payment of subsidies will not do the job. Subsidies will aggravate the trouble we are seeking to remedy. Subsidies are inflationary. Subsidies will be passed on to those who are fighting our battles as well as to our children. Subsidies, if continued, will lead to economic chaos. When this war is brought to a successful conclusion, subsidies will have to be withdrawn. Then farmers will have to receive the cost of production or go into bankruptcy. Subsidies are unnecessary at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, first, the whole problem of food, its production, distribution, and controls should be placed in the hands of a war food administrator. The administrator should have final determination on all questions involving the problem. He should have the support of an advisory board composed of men who have had practical experience in dealing with the various phases of the question.

Second. Give the farmer prices that will encourage maximum production. Let him be assured he will have fair and adequate pay for his products on the basis of what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy.

Third. Producers must be assured they shall have an adequate supply of machinery and equipment. In the distribution of manpower assure the farmers of this country agriculture will be regarded as a part of the war industry.

Fourth. Let the public recognize that it is not just a question of helping the farmer. The question we face is how to get the food we must have, and what at this late hour can be done to improve the situation. Cheaper prices on a product—beef, for instance—does not do any good, if you cannot get the beef.

Fifth. Let the people realize our food supplies are dwindling rapidly, and adopt our program accordingly.

Sixth. Stop experimenting by allowing theorists and bureaucratic administrators to bungle and confuse the situation. Administer our food program with the least controls possible. Put emphasis on the fact that the more food we produce the less control will be necessary.

Seventh. Shape our food program on the basis of making the best possible use of our productive ability. It is a food and nutrition program we need along with a farm program.

Eighth. The farmers of the Nation must be given to understand as never before, they have the cooperation and understanding of other groups engaged in the war effort—as well as the administration itself—in producing the maximum supply of food necessary for the winning of the war and for the winning of an early peace.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas for his question.

Mr. PATMAN. Will not the gentleman from Michigan read more of the talk that was made last night? For by doing so he will discover that the only alternative to increased prices without subsidies is lowering the price of the farmer. He was reading the other alternative; he did not read the explanation above it, I will say to the gentleman. I hope he reads it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield again to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Texas I will say that I sent down this morning and had a complete transcript made of his radio address and I had intended to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. I have a copy of it here if the gentleman would like it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman got it in before I did.

Mr. PATMAN. I have it here in my hand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But last night the gentleman said that unless we had subsidies the price to the farmer for his hogs was going down and the price of ham to the housewife was going up. If that be true, in between there must be some racketeering or profiteering, and the whole procedure of processing, transporting, and selling is in the hands of the new dealers and the O. P. A.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, who is ever watchful to see that the rights of the citizens of this country are carefully guarded and protected.

Mr. MUNDT. It is my pleasure to have office next to the gentleman from Kansas. I know from personal observation that he is one of the most careful students of the House and one of its hardest workers. I see a light in his office late into the night. I appreciate the time and attention he has devoted to this question. But I have asked him to yield for the purpose of asking whether he does not feel that the first thing to do to get production of food products in this country is to provide for a single Government food administrator?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank my friend from South Dakota. I pointed that out in my statement, and I appreciate the fact that the distinguished gentleman agrees with me on this matter.

Mr. MUNDT. I might point out that on June 24, 5 months ago, the House Committee on Agriculture reported out the Fulmer bill to provide for a single Government food administrator. For 5 long months we have waited for action; 5 months of confusion, contradictions, claptrap. The time has come now for the majority leader and the majority in Congress to give this body an opportunity to vote for a wartime administrator of food.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a distinguished and active member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have advices from my district, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas, that the hog floor has been punctured to the extent of 90 cents a hundred. Practically all last week the hog floor of $13.60 has been $12.70 without any support from the Government. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week they could sell no hogs because they were unable to take care of them at the killing centers. Does not the gentleman think that disaster is already upon the hog producer right here at the height of the movement of fall hogs?

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio it is very unfortunate that those representatives of the administration who prepared a recent order fixing prices on live animals have not had any experience at all in dealing with livestock. Not only that, but admitted at a hearing before the gentleman's great Agricultural Committee that they did not even consult with representatives of the livestock industry before they prepared and issued orders to make these adjustments in prices on cattle and other live animals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has made a very constructive speech in connection with this food problem. It has been the practice when Members of Congress criticize the innumerable bureaus, administrations, departments, and agencies of the Government in connection with the domestic problems which this country is facing due to the World War to claim that they were retarding the war effort. Of course, I do not agree with that contention or that position. I feel that when we have a bureau, administrator, stabilizer, or any other man placed in a responsible position in this Government to see that our domestic economy is carried on as it properly should be, constructive criticism is the only safeguard that the American people have in that respect.

During the past few weeks I have been a severe critic of the Office of Price Administration and I take back not a single thing that I have said about the numerous mistakes that agency has made. In connection with our problem of mining coal I feel that the coal miners were in the middle, subject to politics, and that they were entitled to a wage increase. I feel that the American people would also think the same if they were properly informed. I have observed the attitude of the numerous overlapping departments and bureaus of this Government in connection with the application of the railway employes for a wage increase. It is my opinion, after a study of that subject, that that increase is justified and I want to speak today in reference to that matter.

A very serious mistake has been made by this administration in the handling of that problem. In order not to be misunderstood may I say that I have consistently supported the administration in its war effort. I have voted for every appropriation for the War Department, for the Navy Department and for the air forces and I give to those agencies of this Government the high honor of having done the greatest job that has ever been done in human history. Second to that, I say that labor and management in industry have produced the airplanes, the tanks, the guns, and the ammunition which has made it possible for our war agencies to operate. I am sorry to say that the various bureaus and domestic agencies created by this administration have failed at every turn of the road.

They have failed to appreciate the problems of the railroad workers, they have failed to appreciate the fact that there ought to be an increase in the wages of the railway employees.

May I say on this question of subsidies which has been discussed here today that roll-backs and subsidies are the greatest fakes that has ever been proposed to the American people. The monumental mistake that the administration made when it froze wages was not to freeze the prices of the products that the people buy. It has made other monumental mistakes also. It has employed men to occupy responsible positions in these different governmental agencies who were thoroughly incompetent and unable to understand the problems of the law of supply

and demand and every other economic problem presented to them.

I do not here make a blanket indictment of a lot of able men who are doing the best they can only to find that their efforts and their policies in connection with any constructive work in these different agencies are ignored or set aside or not followed. The American people will not stand for this sort of program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota will admit that personally I have practically no railroad labor or coal-mine labor whatsoever in my district.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think that is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. On the other hand, the gentleman and I will both admit that there are two groups of people who, like the farmer, in respect to certain commodities did not have their recompense placed up to where it should have been in line with other industries and that is what has caused the major portion of the trouble up to date.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Those people have the final word and the final say in the formulation of the rules and regulations and addenda and appendices that have been issued to the extent of over 3,000 since the O. P. A. has been in existence. If the gentleman will direct his criticism to that group down there the criticism will be well founded, and we may properly exclude from criticism the great number of fine men in these agencies who are diligently trying to do a good job, but find themselves thwarted by a little group who sit in these positions of economists and lawyers and who have the final interpretation of the actions of these fine men.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. As I pointed out a while ago, I have no desire in this criticism I am making to include a lot of fine, conscientious, able men who are in Government service and who are trying to do a good job. I am directing my comment to the bureaucrats and to that element who have tried for week after week to prevent what I think is a justifiable increase in the wages of the coal miners, and, to bring it down to date, to that group and to those men, those individuals, those bureaus, and those commissions who are now denying to the railroad employees, who have done a masterful job in the field of railway transportation, a small increase, to which in my opinion they are justly entitled.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion, there is no Member of the House who is more fair to the various groups in America, regardless of whether or not they are represented in his district, than the gentleman who is now addressing the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank my colleague for that comment; but, to get back to the subject, I want to talk this afternoon about the increase in wages for the railway employees. The railway transportation industry in this country is most vital to our war effort. Railway management and railway employees have worked overtime day after day in an effort to cope with the war needs, and they have done a fine job. In my opinion, the administration has taken the wrong road in its efforts to circumvent an increase in pay for this great body of loyal Americans in this country.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is referring to the turn-down by Judge Vinson?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Whom does Judge Vinson represent?

Mr. PITTENGER. You answer me. I would like to know.

Mr. CURTIS. He does not represent the Congress, does he?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is the trouble. We have created these different war agencies and then autocratic men are appointed and they proceed to make their own laws—they call them regulations—and to make their own decisions, in entire disregard of the wishes of the Congress.

Some time ago I introduced a bill which I wish the Members of this Congress would have an opportunity to read, providing that the Senate and the House pass a concurrent resolution or a joint resolution so that a committee of the House of Representatives and a committee of the Senate should sit in with every bureaucrat, every administrator, every stabilizer, every agency of this Government, and see how they propose to spend the money and what they propose to do, and then tell them how they think Congress will react and respond, and then report to Congress so that Congress can be advised and can act intelligently on these numerous requests for money, most of which is wasted by our domestic theorists, economists, and what not.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the record should be kept clear, however, that in most of these acts, such as the Price Control Act, the Congress delegated the power, not to the bureau, but to the Executive.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. The so-called bureaucrats are the agents of the Executive. The Congress is not responsible for their acts.

Mr. PITTENGER. Too many people do not think this problem through. We have in our Government three branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. It is the duty of the Congress to pass laws. No Congress in history has ever responded in a world emergency like this Congress and the preceding Congress in voting wartime powers to the Executive. The administration features of our legislation rest upon the administrators and the bureaus and the bureaucrats appointed by the executive department of the Government. Of necessity Congress cannot watch the details of that administration. That depends upon the selection of men of experience, men of intelligence, men who know the problems and who know how to work them out successfully. The gentleman's comment is very much in point in connection with this discussion as to the increase in wages for the railway employees. All of these remarks are in point also.

The wage and labor policies of the national administration have finally reached the absolute zero of justice or reason. The erratic conduct of incompetent and inexperienced administrators has become a commonplace of too many agencies of the Federal Government; the bungling of those charged with control over labor relations has always been most conspicuous in the general chaos of the Washington bureaucracy. But in the stupid and dangerous mishandling of the railway labor situation, I believe the administration has topped all its previous records of confusion and folly. In my judgment, unless there is an immediate and direct reversal of recent railway wage policies, the Congress must itself take action.

No man needs to stand here in this House and defend the railway workers of the United States. Each of us here knows the splendid record of that great body of men. The Nation knows that under handicaps greater than ever before experienced, the railway industry has transported our soldiers and our war materials in a way that is far above praise. Words are not needed when the mountains of munitions and the millions of soldiers and sailors arrive at our seaports safely and on schedule to testify to the contribution of our matchless transportation industry. And the people of the United States know well that the pillar upon which that industry rests is the skill, the devotion, and the loyalty of the one and a half million men and women enrolled in the railway service.

But the record of these railroad workers goes far beyond the period of this war emergency. In every year of peace this Nation has been dependent upon the railway industry. The fact that we are thus dependent upon the industry and its employees has put in their hands a great economic power—a power beside which that of the coal miners, or of any of our extractive or manufacturing workers seems relatively slight. I wish I could say that the agencies of the Federal Government have been as careful, as scrupulous, and as completely responsible in the exercise of their wide powers as these railway men have always been in their conduct. Every official in this Government could well afford to study the record of the great railway labor unions over the past 50 years, and especially over the past two decades. That record is a lesson in calm, sane leadership—a lesson in the careful exercise of great responsibilities.

That record justifies these railway workers and their unions, now, in expecting that they will receive at least elemental justice and fair dealing from their National Government. If any body of our citizens has earned the right to a square deal these railway men have earned that right. But today they have been so grossly abused, so grievously discriminated against, that they have been driven to make the most serious protest within their power.

When these conservative labor groups, led by the most cautious and reliable of American union officials, can decide that they have no recourse excepting to issue a call for a strike vote of their membership, then I say someone somewhere has been guilty of a blunder of the first magnitude.

What has happened? Some one of these scintillating superscientists whose unfettered imaginations incubate so many sweeping governmental orders, has decided that the well-tested methods of handling railway labor disputes should be discarded. The Railway Labor Act, passed by the Congress upon the joint request of labor and managements in 1926, has functioned well through prosperity and depression, in peace and in war. The processes of collective bargaining have carried on smoothly, under that act, through many crises that have brought disorder and havoc to other industries. For more than 18 months of war, now, that Railway Labor Act has been the reliance of the employers and the employees, and the greatest assurance of the Nation, that labor relations on the railroads would stay on an even keel. The railway workers themselves have remained patient under circumstances much harder to endure than those which have brought repeated disruption of more than one vital war-production industry.

But the national administration, unsatisfied with the widespread discord created by the general folly of its labor program, must rip up this law, must override its procedures, and must place in the hands of one man the supreme power to dictate the wages of a million and a half wage earners in this most essential industry. I say that apart from all questions of the specific merits of the railway workers' case, in this controversy, there can be no doubt that the administration has blundered fatally and beyond repair in trying to scrap the most effective labor law ever enacted by the Federal Government. There may be defects in the Railway Labor Act, but I believe I can safely say that none of the men now charged with dictatorial control of the labor policy of the Federal Government is capable of improving upon that law. Certainly no one among them has the brains, or the experience, or the capacity to stand up and say, "The Railway Labor Act is out; hereafter I am the law!"

Perhaps someone who had not kept in touch with the railway situation might think that some great mistake has been made, under the Railway Labor Act, which necessitated drastic Executive action. Had the railway managements and the unions joined together to put into effect extravagant wages that would force rate increases? Had the unions somehow arranged to raid the railway treasury, and get away with exorbitant demands? Were the unions asking for such impossible working conditions as to threaten the actual interruption of transportation? Only some such threatening catastrophe could justify the violence of the attack made upon the railway workers.

But there was no such danger, no such collusive action, no threat of disrupted traffic or increased railway rates.

After 9 months of orderly and lawful handling of an ordinary wage request, an emergency board set up under the Railway Labor Act had decided that the nonoperating employees of the railways should be given an increase of 8 cents in their rates of pay, "to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war." The board which made that decision was composed of trained and experienced men, who were well qualified to decide. The evidence upon which they made their decision was voluminous and comprehensive—it covered every conceivable phase of the reasons for and against the wage increase. The hearings which preceded the final report of the emergency board lasted for many weeks. The report was a model of well-reasoned, conservative judgment—too conservative, perhaps, in having done much less than justice to the railway employees.

The report and recommendation of that board should have been accepted as the basis of Federal governmental policy. Instead, the "Dictator" of Economic Stabilization on the last day open for his action, interposed a flat veto on the proposed wage increase, and suggested that the emergency board reconvene to bring out such a report as he would propose. The chairman of the board quite properly, it seems to me, refused to stultify the law and the action of his board. Thereafter the Economic Stabilizer remained inactive, allowing the railway-wage situation to grow steadily more critical, until October 16. On that date, an Executive order created a new board, called a special emergency board, for which there was no warrant in the law nor in the past practices of the industry. The special board was given special instructions. It was to bring in such a report as would satisfy the "buddha of the bureaucrats"—although why the administration should have gone to the trouble of creating a new board simply to hallow the preconceptions of the Economic Stabilizer, I cannot understand.

Now we have read the report of that special board, the board apparently to end all other boards. This time, Director Vinson did not wait a month to pass on the board's report; his approval came so fast that his own press bureau must have been racing with the board to see which might get to the reporters first. It is inconceivable that the Director gave to the new report that careful consideration which would have surveyed all its effects, before his stamp of approval was given. It seems incontestable that the board's report was known to the Director, as thoroughly as the Director's orders were known to the board. The pernicious character of the report of that special board makes it look like the combined effort of all the would-be union breakers in the national administration.

The special board robs employee Peter to pay employee Paul, and takes about $19,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the employees reduced, which had already been granted to them by the railroads' signed agreement. The Sharfman board, in recommending 8 cents an hour increase, figured the cost at $204,000,000 per year and held that this was not inflationary and was well within the ability of the railroads to pay without increasing costs of the services that railroads render to the country.

The special board recommends that the agreement made between the railroads and the labor organizations for 8 cents an hour with a minimum of 54 cents an hour in the industry be amended, thereby reducing large groups of skilled workers 4, 3, 2, and 1 cent per hour from the 8 cents already agreed to, and that an additional 2 cents and 1 cent per hour would be paid to a large group of lower-paid workers. Here no minimum is provided for and the lowest-paid workers would actually receive less than the 54-cent minimum agreed to by the railroads and the labor organizations. For instance, a man getting 40 cents per hour would get 50 cents per hour under the special board's award, but would receive 54 cents an hour under the agreement signed by the railroads and the labor organizations.

I certainly would not say, Mr. Speaker, that the lower-paid groups should not get 10 cents an hour and more—their wages are far substandard—and I know that the railway unions asked for a minimum of 70 cents per hour which seems not exorbitant when the steel industry minimum is at 78 cent per hour. But I do protest against the twofold evil of the new report. The American railways and the American people are dependent upon the work of the foremen and the skilled mechanics in the shops, bridge and building departments and the skilled clerical workers of the railways, as well as these lower-paid employees. Those skilled employees, as well as the lower-paid workers, are paid wages from 30 to 75 cents below what similar men are getting in other industries. Many of these foremen and mechanics and skilled accounting employees have left the railroad service for outside employment, where wages are so much higher and where overtime compensation is much more just. The decision of the special board, if the railway unions and the Government were to accept it, would accelerate the already highly dangerous shift of skilled men from our vital transportation industry.

More insidious than that, Mr. Speaker, is what seems to be the fundamental purpose of this new report. What it would do, and what it seems to have been

intended to do, is to drive a wedge between the higher skilled and the semi-skilled, lower-paid groups of employees. It is beautifully designed to cause turmoil among the railway labor unions, to disrupt the orderly and united handling of labor problems which has done so much for the railway industry and the Nation. That decision seeks to set the unions of less skilled against the unions of higher skilled men; it seeks to enter into every union and cause discord between the better paid and lower paid in every department. Its effect, if not its purpose, would be to divide the railway employees, in order that the supreme dictator of our economic universe might the better rule them all. It would have been an entirely different situation if these lower-paid employees had been granted higher rates—but not at the expense of their fellow workers.

What kind of a stabilization plan is this? According to the Special Emergency Board's report the lowest-paid employees are being paid substandard wages. Why not then correct these substandard wages without creating greater inequities among the other employees involved? This kind of inept bungling creates more strife and turmoil and tends to destroy collective bargaining on a fair and equitable basis. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all the time.

The railway unions have served notice upon the administration that they are not to be victimized by this elaborate scheme. I congratulate these unions, not only on their own wisdom in the protection of the rights of the railway workers, but also in having served far more wisely than do our almighty administrators, the true welfare of the people of the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent at the time the vote was taken on the bill (H. R. 3356) to increase compensation or pensions payable to veterans of the World War. Had I been present, I would have voted for the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for 20 minutes.

TAXES AND THE SALE OF BONDS TO FINANCE THE WAR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are operating under an annual budget of $104,000,000,000—$97,000,000,000 of which is for the war. Under the tentative agreement advanced at the beginning of this war, and under the theory agreed upon by all economists, we ought to meet these obligations half from loans, and half from Government revenues. In other words, under the schedule, we ought to raise this year, in order to meet our Budget of $104,000,000,000, $52,000,000,000 in revenue and $52,000,000,000 in loans.

As a matter of fact, we are raising at this time under present revenue laws $38,000,000,000. The Ways and Means Committee next Monday will bring a bill to the floor which is calculated to produce an additional $2,000,000,000. The Treasury indicated a need of $12,000,000,000 or at least a minimum of $9,000,000,000, but the bill proposed will produce only $2,000,000,000 additional. In other words, with the passage of this bill, the annual revenues under present conditions will amount to about $40,000,000,000 a year. That means we are falling $12,000,000,000 short of what we ought to raise by revenue. Accordingly in order to meet the Budget we will have to increase our loans to $64,000,000,000.

That is a titanic task, but one easily disposed of with proper management. It is true there has been a slowing down of momentum in the sale of bonds, and some States made their quota with difficulty in the last drive. But there are vast reservoirs of capital yet untouched, and the American people are ready and anxious to buy if we can get the message over to them. It is evident that delay in completing quotas was largely the result of confusion and misunderstanding and lack of an adequate medium of salesmanship. This can be remedied and the campaign for sale of bonds organized and expedited by a simple program of appeal and education. The medium for such a program is naturally the medium utilized in every sales campaign in the country—commercial and otherwise—the newspapers. The next sales campaign, the January drive for the fourth loan is rapidly approaching, and the fifth loan campaign in June follows closely.

We should plan at once for a business-like newspaper campaign to inform the public and secure cooperation. At this stage of the war, bonds must be sold largely through newspaper advertising, the great avenue to the public interest and favor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is an expert on this question of taxation. Will the gentleman before he finishes give us his own opinion as to how much we can raise by taxation and by borrowing, and whether there is a limit.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no ascertainable limit. Bank deposits today are the highest in the banking annals of the Nation. The capacity of the investing public is far in excess of the needs of the Government—even in time of war. In addition to capital already in reserve, the national income is annually adding somewhere between $142,000,000,000 and $147,000,000,000 to the resources of the Nation. The value of all services and commodities available for distribution aggregate only about $80,000,000,000, leaving somewhere between sixty and seventy billion surplus funds to run riot. The more of this surplus we can neutralize in Government bonds the less danger of waste and inflation. Under the circumstances, the sale of $64,000,000,000 worth of bonds in this country is a small matter, if we adopt the proper medium of salesmanship—if we can get the message over to the people.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated that budgetary estimates amount to $104,000,000,000. Ninety-seven billion dollars of that is for war purposes. That $97,000,000,000 of budgetary estimates is based on the War and Navy estimates at the time they were sent up. An examination of those estimates indicates that they involve an estimate of the cost of tanks, guns, ships, and everything else. Does the gentleman have any idea how much under those estimates the cost will be, through the medium of renegotiation? How much will the Government pay out of the total expenditure of $97,000,000,000, when all of those contracts for that expenditure have been renegotiated?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have saved in actual figures up to July, something in excess of $4,000,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. In renegotiation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. Approximately half of that was in cash recovered and half in readjustments. Of course, as time proceeds, the amount saved by renegotiation declines, for the reason that in the beginning when contracts for the manufacture of munitions were first negotiated it was a new and untried field. Little, if any, of it had ever been manufactured before. About all we had were the blueprints, and they were largely estimates. In short, neither Government nor industry had any very definite idea as to either's methods of costs. The principal miscalculation was failure to take into consideration methods of mass production which had been developed since the last war. When actual fabrication began, much was turned out in mass production, which in former years had been laboriously machined by hand. The result was a speed and economy of production which completely scrapped original estimates and contracts. But today all such schedules and contracts have now been readjusted and rewritten. Costs are now accurately standardized, and excess profits largely reduced or eliminated. Profits from renegotiation are correspondingly small, although in the aggregate the savings through renegotiation are still a source of material savings. No manufacturer is making the profits made in previous wars. No multimillionaires are being created overnight. And if by chance more than a very reasonable profit remains after renegotiation, the tax collector gets any excess on the income-tax returns.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have any preliminary figures as to the probable amount that will be saved out of the budgetary estimate of $97,000,000,000 expenditure for war as the result of renegotiation as applied to those expenditures to be made in the present fiscal year to which this appropriation applies?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With the data at hand it is possible to estimate, but it is only an estimate. On the basis of the past 6 months it is to be expected that we will make material savings, but not at the rate of renegotiation of the early contracts.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman this further question? In the recent military deficiency bill which the House just passed there were apparently reductions in the budgetary estimates contained in that proposed bill of approximately $950,000,000. Is the gentleman of the opinion that further savings can be effected through wiser, if I may so express it, expenditure of funds appropriated to the Army and Navy?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not through "wiser expenditure" because the care with which this money has been expended up to this time is one of the exceptional features of this war. With the information available at the time the money could not have been more judiciously expended. There has been less unforeseen waste in this war than in any previous American war. But conditions and needs on the fronts change constantly. It is impossible to accurately foretell at the time estimates are made—many months in advance and far removed from the scene of action—just what expenditures will be required. For example, we were under the impression in the early days of the war that we would require large quotas of the smaller-sized tanks. It later developed that such tanks were wholly inadequate and we discontinued manufacturing that type.

Even in so small a matter as barbed wire estimates were widely at variance with actual needs. Estimates for barbed wire were based on the assumption that we would need huge quantities of wire in no man's land and on the front whereas the amount of barbed wire actually required is negligible. In every drive we develop new weapons and old weapons become obsolete. It is impossible to foretell in detail what the needs will be, it is possible that these unpredictable changes on the front can save some money out of the $97,000,000,000. Perhaps $6,000,000,000, more or less. But that is contingent. In the meantime the Budget must be met and $64,000,000,000 in bonds must be sold to meet it. Up to this time our method of reaching the public through the press has been largely through voluntary contributions of time and space on the part of the newspapers.

We expect them to give their time and go out into their trade territory and solicit the merchants and other businessmen to make up a page for which each merchant would pay a small part and the paper makes up the deficit. It has been an imposition, not only upon newspapers but an imposition upon the merchants, and the papers find it is becoming increasingly difficult to carry out such programs. The bill (H. R. 2684) now pending in the House provides a businesslike way in which to organize the bond campaigns and pay those newspapers a reasonable amount of their actual costs, and put the bond issue before the Nation simultaneously and in an orthodox, methodical manner, calculated to get results.

While it is a secondary consideration, we must appreciate the difficulties under which the newspapers labor—especially the weeklies. The metropolitan press is not so adversely affected as it is the beneficiary of the so-called institutional advertising by firms which have nothing to sell but advertise heavily to maintain goodwill and keep their names before the public. But such advertising is limited to papers published in cities with a population of 25,000 or over and does not reach the newspapers in the rest of the country comprising 52 percent of the population of the Nation. It is this 52 percent our bond campaigns must reach, and we must reach it through the country press.

War conditions handicap the country press more drastically than most any other industry. Patronage is steadily declining as the shelves of the merchants become bare. Costs of production mount steadily. Both labor and paper are harder to get.

Notwithstanding the adverse conditions under which they operate, the Government for some strange reason which has never been explained, expects them to contribute their only commodity free gratis while it pays for every other commodity and service at highest prices. In addition the Government floods the newspaper offices with heavy releases on every conceivable subject from ration regulations to appeals for increased production crowding out revenue-producing matter with no thought of compensation.

But the prime purpose of the bill is not the relief of the hard-pressed country press—as important as that problem is just at this time. The real objective of the bill is to sell $64,000,000,000 worth of bonds in the most practical and economical way possible; to introduce elementary business methods in Government financing. It is estimated that under the provisions of this bill we can finance the needs of the Government at an average cost of fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount realized. And handle the issue in record time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very much interested in the gentleman's bill and have studied it with some care. I agree with him that the newspapers of America have done a perfectly grand job thus far in helping publicize, not only the bond drives, but various other patriotic drives that have been necessitated by the war. I was wondering if the gentleman has made any calculations as to what, in terms of actual dollars and cents, this bill would mean to the average small publisher of a newspaper? Does the gentleman have that broken down?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is calculated to involve average payments of something like eight or nine hundred dollars a year to the small weekly. Of course the actual amount would depend on circulation and prevailing rates in the area.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Some months ago, the Navy Department purchased space from the newspapers for cash, to conduct an enlistment campaign throughout six or seven States. I would like to ask the gentleman, Is it not true that the Treasury Department is authorized now to buy space in weekly newspapers, if they so desire?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Through the War or Navy Departments as the gentleman has indicated. The buying of space by the Government is not a new proposition. The War Department is buying space, and as the gentleman says, the Navy Department has been advertising through the newspapers. Both the English and Canadian Governments advertise in newspapers. In this respect the bill is not a departure. It is merely an authorization and a standardization of methods and practices in common and universal use by business everywhere. It is the most practical and economical method of providing funds with which to meet our war budget.

The bill meets with the approval of the newspapers. In a plebiscite taken of the newspapers recently, 2,545 newspapers favored the bill and only 115 opposed it.

It meets with the approval of the merchants and businessmen of the country who have been solicited each bond drive to contribute to the signature pages which the Government asked the editors to underwrite. Such a plan is not only an imposition on the editor who must pass the tin cup each time to the same merchants up and down Main Street, but it is unfair to these businessmen who are asked to bear the cost of adertising the drive each time while the rest of the country is unsolicited.

In my opinion the bill also meets with the approval of a majority of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the gentleman aware that a similar bill, with certain amendments, passed the Senate a few moments ago by a vote of 35 to 27?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the information. I knew the bill was under consideration in the Senate, but did not know a vote was to be taken today. The vote justifies the expectations of the friends of the bill and is a tribute to Senator BANKHEAD, who originated the bill and has advocated it with such ability. It is another of many contributions by the distinguished Senator from Alabama to the practical solution of difficult national problems.

Mr. CURTIS. It has certain restrictions. I do not know how the bill compares with the bill which the gentleman has introduced.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The two bills were originally identical. No doubt Senator BANKHEAD'S bill has been improved during its consideration in the committee and in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the fears which has been expressed concerning the bill is that it might lead to an opportunity for certain governmental agencies or parties to play favorites. I know the gentleman has been concerned about eliminating that from his legislation. I wonder if he can delineate for the House those safeguards which are in the bill to protect each and all among the publishers against any possibility of favoritism in the dissemination of this advertising.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman has brought up that point. Any such apprehension is without foundation. The payments are distributed equally to all the newspapers of the same class. Regardless of their political affiliations or editorial policy all newspapers of the class admissible to the mails as second-class matter receive the same amount of space and could not possibly be subject to caprice, prejudice, or political pressure.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Under this bill would the Government pay the regular rate charged by the particular newspaper?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Naturally space, requisitions, rates, and conditions would be largely standardized to conform to local requirements, circulation, and established rates within the trade area.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is the answer to one of the pressing questions of the day. Vast sums of money must be raised both during the remainder of the war and in the first days following the armistice. Let us get the job done in the quickest, fairest, most businesslike, most economical, most practicable way possible.

The Senate has passed the bill by a substantial majority. A majority of the House favor the bill. It is to be hoped that the committee will start hearings and report it out in time to permit enactment before the holidays.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. PRIEST, for 1 week, on account of serious illness of his father.

To Mr. HINSHAW, for November 17, on account of official business.

To Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. JENKINS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will begin public hearings on Friday, November 19, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

915. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the sixth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 358), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 355. Resolution providing additional funds for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 356. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3477, a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisals of its assets, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 866). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2832. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3611. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 869). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3675. A bill to amend section 112 of chapter 2 of title 38 of the United States Code (Judicial Code, sec. 51); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3676. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3677. A bill to aid in the stabilization of the economic structure of the United States after the present war by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the gradual reduction of the workweek to 30 hours; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the annual Army-Navy football game for 1943 be played at Philadelphia for the benefit of the United Service Organizations, Inc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 357. Resolution to create a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate the liquor distilling and wholesale liquor industries in the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3679. A bill for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3680. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Minta P. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3681. A bill granting a pension to Margaret Haskin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3560. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Ray W. Denning and 40 other citizens of Dowagiac, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3561. Also, petition of 350 citizens of Spencer, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absen-

teeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3562. Also, petition of 199 citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3563. Also, petition of Rev. W. A. Vanzant and 40 citizens of Clifton, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3564. Also, petition of Rev. J. H. Whedbee and 97 citizens of Girdletree, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

3565. Also, petition of Della Noe and 100 citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3566. Also, petition of Bessie M. Guerhart and 133 citizens of Gilboa, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3567. Also, petition of Georgia Craig and 97 citizens of Atwood, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3568. Also, petition of Rev. P. R. Hayden and 43 other citizens of Houlton, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3569. Also, petition of 127 members of the First Avenue Presbyterian Church of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3570. Also, petition of 61 members of the First Baptist Church of Puyallup, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3571. Also, petition of M. V. Van Dyke and 354 other citizens of Nashville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3572. Also petition of Rev. Harvey R. Nelson and 67 members of the Arvada Baptist Church, Arvada, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3573. Also, petition of Mildred Browning and 50 citizens of Hyde Park, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3574. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Arthur Phelps and 20 other citizens of Pueblo, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3575. Also, petition of Dr. Howard P. Powell and 113 other citizens of Charlotte, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3576. Also, petition of Anna K. Sanders and 49 other citizens of McLuoth, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3577. Also, petition of 92 members of the First Methodist Church of Canon City, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3578. Also, petition of 51 members of the First Baptist Church of Erie, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3579. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Willard D. Hayes and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3580. Also, petition of Lee Cafferata, and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3581. Also, petition of Albert Klemm, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3582. Also, petition of Henry Dawson, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3583. Also, petition of M. Johns, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3584. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Ophelia McElroy and members of a class of women in the Sunday School of the First Christian Church of Wellsburg, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3585. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry ministers of McConnelsville, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until demobilization is completed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3586. Also, petition of sundry ministers of Christian Churches of Caldwell, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until demobilization is completed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3587. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. H. R. Martin and 17 other members of the Loyal Women's Bible Class of the First Christian Church of Dallas, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3588. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of the resolutions committee of the Nebraska Live Stock Feeders Association, Iowa Beef Producers Association, Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and Kansas Live Stock Association, declaring unalterable opposition to the continuation of the price roll-back subsidy and livestock ceiling price program, and asking that consumers of the Nation be advised that only by supporting food producers in their efforts to eliminate this unsound, economic policy which is throttling production can their hope for adequate future food supplies be insured; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our life and our salvation, we praise Thee that through the ages no loftier ideal has ever been given the children of men than that exemplified by the Galilean Teacher. His star is in the firmament of humanity's hopes to which the nations look with trembling appeal. Grant that in Him our thoughts and deeds may meet, cleansing us from the dross of passion and selfish interest.

Almighty God, strong men are needed, youth is falling. Help us to go forward to do our whole duty, trusting that the

human heart will make grateful response. In a world so rich and abundant, pity the man and state that see with limited vision, banishing the tremendous power of faith. It is by faith that we cultivate virtue and conquer sinful tendencies; by faith we teach ourselves to tolerate annoyances and bear the ills of life, yielding to the ever-guiding Will. It stands for the invisible realities of the universe, reminding us that thought and conscience are the eternal verities which cannot die. We bless Thee for the moral and spiritual gifts with which Thou hast endowed us and pray Thee to help us to cultivate them with precious eagerness. In the name of Him who is the inspiration of all good workmen. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1457. An act to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 630 An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain very important and enlightening correspondence between the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ickes, and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. JARMAN. From the Committee on Printing, I present the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the address delivered in the House of Representatives by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, on Thursday, November 4, 1943, relative to governmental expenditures, during the fiscal years 1939 to 1944, for war activities; interest on the public debt; other activities, nonwar items; be printed with an illustration as a House document.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Gladly.

Mr. TABER. Is it customary to print such things as this?

Mr. JARMAN. I think so, but the gentleman is the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations, and he is probably more familiar with the custom in respect to these matters than I am.

Mr. TABER. I never have heard of it before. It may be the proper thing to do, but I never heard of its being done before.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I think we ought to be very careful about such matters. If we set a precedent by printing at Government expense as a public document a Member's speech, to be sent out at public expense, where politics might be involved, we may get into trouble. The moment we do it in one case, we will be asked to do it in other cases. I am not going to object, but if we print one speech made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, at public expense, then the next thing that will follow naturally will be a speech by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and we will have started a political campaign at public expense. I hope the majority leadership will take notice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to shut the gentleman off, but he would appreciate it very much if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] would withdraw this resolution for the present.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to withdraw the resolution.

EXTENDING TIME TO MAKE APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 722, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
WESLEY E. DISNEY,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENEMY-OWNED PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, according to unofficial reports that have reached my desk, the Alien Property Custodian has seized or frozen alien-enemy-owned assets and properties now within the United States of a value of almost $8,000,000,000.

The Japanese and German owners of that magnificent estate are either in the armed forces fighting against us or otherwise working for the success of the arms of the Axis Powers.

If we follow the precedent of the last war, we will, with an "excuse, please," hand all of this back to its former owners, less an insignificant charge of one-half of 1 percent for custodian services.

Since this property belongs to our enemies who are intent upon our destruction, should it not be immediately sold to the highest bidder and the funds thus realized devoted to the protection rather than the destruction of these United States?

I commend to the favorable consideration of the House my bill, H. R. 3672.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the day's business today and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article on the subject of wheat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to print therewith a radio address delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on Monday night.

The SPEAKER. That has already been printed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It has not been printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Consent has been given, and the Chair would not like to entertain a request to reprint it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to reprint it. With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, we were expecting to get that radio address today. I had it yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has asked unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But he did not print it.

The SPEAKER. That is in the hands of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will object to other requests.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a portion of a radio speech by Mayor LaGuardia, in connection with subsidi

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. More than 2 years ago, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] withheld his remarks from the RECORD, when I took part in that discussion. I want to know now how long he can withhold the printing of this address.

The SPEAKER. The matter is in the hands of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, I ask unanimous consent that upon the close of legislative business and other special orders today I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At which time I will deliver that address.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following any other special orders today, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no obection.

(Mr. WASIELEWSKI, by unanimous consent, was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there obection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been accorded the privilege of addressing the House today for 30 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that that permission be vacated and that instead I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday, November 30.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short patriotic poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after the disposition of the legislative program of the day and other special orders that may have been entered I may address the House for 15 minutes on the subject: The Gettysburg Address 80 Years After.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Treasury's proposed tax bill, the Bureau of the Budget has estimated the expenditures of the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1944 at $106,000,000,000.

I estimated them at $90,000,000,000, basing my statement on the expenditures to date.

The expenditures for the first 4 months of the fiscal year ending October 31, were $29,720,000,000, or at the rate of $89,000,000,000 for the year.

Month by month the records back up the statement I made to the Ways and Means Committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous requests to make: First, that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., on November 16, 1943, on the Lea bill, H. R. 3420; and second, that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider the Commodity Credit Corporation bill banning the use of food subsidies. I hope the measure becomes law. I favor this legislation. From hundreds of personal contacts throughout New Hampshire I find that the people in my State definitely do not wish a food subsidy program. The commissioners of agriculture in New England in making recommendations to the Governors of New England have voiced opposition to a subsidy in any form.

Food subsidies will augment the public debt, they are inflationary, they will result in increasing bureaucratic control, and they will put the Government into the business of paying the grocery bill of the Nation. In my opinion subsidies will decrease production instead of increasing it. I voted against the use of subsidies when the question was up several months ago and my position remains unchanged. We need an adjustment in prices of certain commodities to care for increased production costs. Such procedure is infinitely preferable to subsidizing. It is time that we get away from the idea that it is possible to solve the food problems by drawing checks on the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a patriotic poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I recently delivered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The gentleman may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, but not "at this point" when there is a legislative program.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

HON. ABE FORTAS

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a letter from which I will quote one sentence. The first sentence reads:

I have submitted my resignation as Under Secretary of the Interior, and I report to the Navy for active duty tomorrow morning.

This letter is dated November 15, 1943.

I should like to suggest that there are Members of this House who owe this great American an apology for the words that have been spoken on this floor about him. The Honorable Abe Fortas, of Tennessee, is today a seaman in the United States Navy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter I received from the Honorable Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times of November 13 last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from this morning's Washington Post by Ernest Lindley entitled "The Republican Party."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

INCREASING RATE OF PENSION OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 338 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and pending that I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution making in order consideration of a bill which will raise the pensions of World War veterans in certain cases from $40 to $50 per month and to $60 in other cases.

I do not understand there is any opposition to the consideration of this rule, I do not understand that there is any opposition to the enactment of the legislation, therefore I shall not take any time to discuss the matter. I hope it will not be necessary to have the extended debate of 2 hours on this bill and I also hope that it will not be necessary to have a record vote on a bill that we are all in favor of.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Mississippi in the hope it will not be necessary to use an extensive amount of time for the consideration of this measure. As a matter of fact it was reported to the Rules Committee that the bill came from the Committee on World War Veterans with a unanimous report. Beyond that it largely follows the pattern of the bill which was under consideration yesterday, supplementing that bill, which was adopted by a unanimous vote.

We should not be unmindful of the fact that the Veterans' Administration estimates that the enactment of this legislation at the outset will cost the Government around $24,000,000 a year. Those are matters which we must constantly keep in mind in connection with all public expenditures. But the vote of yesterday and the action of the House is clear evidence of the fact that the Congress of the United States is going to see to it that the veteran and his dependents, disabled veterans particularly, are adequately cared for by the Government.

It has been suggested that this legislation is in a measure designed to meet the increased living costs current today. However, as I understand the proposal, it is beyond that an approach to the precedent established by our Government in its treatment of the veterans of the Spanish-American War. The amount of increase provided in this legislation approximates the amount paid to the veterans of the Spanish-American War but with certain additional limitations and restrictions which are not present in the treatment of those veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Indiana has referred to the cost of this bill as being $24,000,000 a year, but I think he has it confused with the bill that was passed on yesterday. The estimate of the cost on this bill is $12,768,000.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to accept that correction. I had the information as it was conveyed to the Rules Committee when both of these bills were before the committee simultaneously.

Mr. RANKIN. There was some confusion; this bill will cost only about half as much as the other one.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will note also there is a limitation of income. If a single man has an income of over a thousand dollars a year, he does not get it, or if he is married and has children, and has an income of $2,500, he does not get it. Also he must be totally and permanently disabled. There are many other restrictions. The amounts are much lower than for the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. HALLECK. Those are the limitations and restrictions to which I referred in my statement, but which I did not detail specifically.

It has been suggested, and I am confident it is true, that the committee reporting this bill acts in a nonpartisan way and that the consideration of this bill has been nonpartisan. Therefore, I would not want to inject a partisan note at this stage of the proceeding. I do want to express the hope, though, that this legislation will not be vetoed as certain similar legislation, although not exactly like this but following the pattern, has been vetoed in the past.

I am hopeful that the recent expressions of solicitude from the other end of the Avenue for the veteran and his dependents may indicate Executive approval of this legislation upon its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there will be a record vote upon this bill. Unfortunately, I have to be away this afternoon and if there is a record vote I will not be present. I am leaving this afternoon to attend a meeting of the national executive committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis tomorrow morning, at their request.

I am in favor of this legislation. It is nothing more or less than a square deal to the veterans who are now receiving pensions. This is a pension measure for the benefit of the men who are receiving disability compensation at the present time and whose disabilities were not incurred in the World War. Similar to the Spanish-American War pension, an increase from $40 to $50 is made necessary by the increase in the cost of living. This is just a simple matter of

justice and provides a fair deal to these old veterans who are now incapacitated, and have been for the past 10 years. Had I been here on the roll call, I would have voted in favor of the legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, probably all the Members of the House are in favor of the pending bill, but it will not do the veterans very much good to give them an increase if the cost of living goes up.

Monday night the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] among other things said:

> So, I say, first, to you housewives, if the price of ham goes up 10 cents a pound, thank the Republicans and their radio spokesman.

Just a little later he said:

> So, I say to you farmers, if you bring your hogs to market and get only 8 cents a pound, blame all the Republicans.

As long as that spread between the hog pen and the frying pan is going to take place unless we follow the gentleman from Texas and his political theories, it might be well to inquire what causes it. And it might be well to remember that the majority party with its O. P. A. and all of its other governmental agencies and regulations has absolute control over that spread.

Yesterday I was on the floor and ready to offer the complete speech made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] but he said he intended to put it in the RECORD himself so I yielded and did not make the request. At that same time or a little later in the day the gentleman from Texas suggested that I should read all of his speech, so in my extension of remarks today I am going to put all of his speech in so that it can be read in connection with the remarks made yesterday and those I am making today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already held that the gentleman cannot do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the Chair hold that in extending my remarks when I refer to his speech I cannot put the rest of it in and comment on it?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair has held.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That amounts to censorship of a speech made by a Member.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan understands the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Chair will bear with me a moment, yesterday when some Member was speaking I asked him to yield and he yielded and I quoted these same two sentences. Then the gentleman from Texas objected and in substance said that I was not correctly quoting his thought. So at this time when I have repeated those sentences, I asked permission to put it all in.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has held that the gentleman cannot do that.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3377) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3377, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph I (f), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read:

"I (f) The amount of pension payable under terms of part III shall be $50 monthly, except that where such veterans shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reach the age of 65 years, the amount of pension shall be $60 monthly: *Provided*, That——."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides an increase in compensation for the totally and permanently disabled non-service-connected veterans of the World War from $40 to $50 a month. If they have been held to be totally and permanently disabled for 10 years, or have reached the age of 65 years and are totally and permanently disabled, they are given the same compensation now provided for Spanish-American War veterans, or $60 a month.

In 1929 I attempted to extend the presumptive period for disabled World War veterans to January 1, 1930, for the reason that there were thousands of those veterans who were suffering from service-connected disabilities who had either not been able to prove their disabilities in time, did not know how to make the proof in time, had not discovered their trouble in time, or had refrained from making application until it was too late.

We passed that bill in the House by a majority of 326 to 49. I said the other day that the widows' and orphans' bill was passed by that number, but I believe this was the vote by which we passed what was called the Rankin bill at that time. The chairman was opposed to it and asked that its name be changed and that it be called the Rankin bill from that time on.

The bill passed the Senate by 11 to 1, or 66 to 6. It was vetoed by President Hoover, with the promise that they would pass a disability allowance bill. The veto was sustained, and then the disability allowance bill was passed providing these men with $40 a month. That was reduced to $30 a month under the economy bill, but has been raised back to $40.

By passing this measure we raise those men to $50 a month, and at the same time take care more liberally of those men who have been totally and permanently disabled for 10 years and also the men who are totally and permanently disabled and have reached the age of 65 years.

We are trying as best we can to take care of the disabled veterans without "wrecking" the Federal Treasury.

It may be a matter of surprise to the Members of the House to know that the number of men who were in World War No. 1 who have now passed the age of 75 amounts to 33,381. There are 32,157 men who were in that war, who have passed the age of 65 years, and have not yet reached the age of 75, making a total of 65,538, according to the figures that I have compiled.

According to the figures compiled by the Veterans' Administration there would be 81,000 World War veterans and 200 Spanish-American war veterans covered by this bill. The cost will be, according to the Bureau's estimate for the first year $12,768,000.

Let me say to the House again that this bill is recommended by the nationally recognized veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart. So far as I know, there is no opposition to it. What we are trying to do is to deal justly with these men, and at the same time look after the Federal Treasury.

DANGEROUS LEGISLATION

Let me say right here that I am opposed to any policy that would use the World War veterans, or any other veterans, as a smoke screen to disrupt the laws of this country or wreck American institutions. There is now pending befor the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, of which I am a member, a bill which falls within that classification. In my opinion, it is one of the most dangerous measures so far as the welfare and safety of our American institutions are concerned that has ever been proposed to the Congress of the United States. It was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] and in the Senate by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. It would violate the Constitution of the United States, as well as the constitutions of the various States, override State laws, and probably disrupt the election machinery of every State in the Union, and throw election contests into the Federal courts and the State court in every State from

Maine to Texas. This dangerous piece of legislation is proposed, ostensibly, to let the men in our armed forces vote by absentee ballots.

Centuries ago when the shores of our Mother Country were being lighted with the flame of human torture, a woman was being burned at the stake for her religious convictions. She cried out in all the agony of her anguished soul, "Oh, religion, what crimes are committed in thy name!" When I see the things that some people are trying to do, ostensibly for the men in the service, and that the service men would repudiate with contempt, if they understood the situation, I am prone to say, "Oh, patriotism, what crimes are committed in thy name!"

If that bill were submitted to the men in our armed forces from every State in the Union, I am sure a vast majority of them would say, "For God's sake, do not pass a measure of that kind. We are not fighting to destroy the American Government or to destroy the Constitution; we are not fighting to destroy our State governments, but we are fighting to preserve them."

This bill would set up a Federal Elections Commission here in Washington, and I want to show you some of its powers. It would wipe out State laws and State qualifications for the electors, in violation of one of the very first provisions of the Constitution. Article I, section 2, was one of the very first provisions put into that instrument by our forefathers, under George Washington, in 1787, which provides:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

It would wipe out that provision, which has remained in the Constitution for 130 years, and was rewritten into the seventeenth amendment, providing for the election of United States Senators, without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," not a single change of any kind. The sponsors of that bill would wipe out that salutary provision of the Constitution in their wild desire to concentrate into the hands of the Federal Government all power over all elections, whether in Texas, Ohio, Mississippi, Michigan, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, or any other State. They would wipe out those provisions of the Constitution while our men on every battle front in the world are fighting to preserve that Constitution as well as the rights of the States. In addition to that, it would lodge in that Commission some of the most dangerous powers that I have ever seen proposed in the Congress of the United States since I have been a Member of this august body, one of which would enable them to frighten every little election holder from one end of the country to the other by threatening them with prosecution in the Federal courts and subjecting them to the dictates of this superpolitical bureaucracy set up in Washington to control the election, under the plea that it is providing the men in our armed forces the privilege of voting by absentee ballot; when, as a matter of fact, that has already been done by the States themselves—which have the sole power to do so under the Constitution.

That bill sets out a special ballot to be voted. That ballot violates the law of practically every State in the Union and the constitution of most of the States.

If an election official counted that ballot in many States he would be subject to prosecution in the State courts, and if convicted, might be sentenced to the penitentiary. If he failed to count them he would be subject, under this bill, to indictment in a Federal court, and if convicted, he might be sentenced to pay a fine of $5,000 or to serve 5 years in the Federal penitentiary, or both. That punishment might be imposed on every little election holder from Mississippi to Maine, from Alabama to Michigan, or from coast to coast in every State in the Union.

The O. P. A., that super agency, against whose operations so many people are now protesting, sued a man in Georgia recently for violating one of its edicts. And where do you suppose they filed the suit? It was filed in Massachusetts. Think of suing a small-business man in Georgia and taking him to Massachusetts to try his case. It might break him to go there and pay the costs of his litigation. Suppose a man in Massachusetts violates the law and they try him in Texas? We have recently seen a large number of persons indicted for conspiracy. They were all indicted here in Washington and brought here, some of them 3,000 miles from their homes, to be tried.

Under this law they could charge election holders in Massachusetts, election holders in Texas, election holders in Ohio, election holders in Mississippi, California, and Pennsylvania, with conspiracy, because they all read the same literature. Suppose they all read the speeches of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], replied to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], or the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. They might indict them all for conspiracy to throw the election—500 or 5,000 or 10,000 of them. They might indict them all and drag them all to Washington to stand trial for conspiracy, to be tried by a jury, handpicked, you might say from the pay roll of the Federal Government, many of whom have been selected or whose appointments have been recommended by a judge of the Supreme Court, who will probably be the fifth man on this Commission; because the new bill they offer now provides that four of them shall be appointed by the President, and the other one shall come from the Supreme Court to be selected by the Chief Justice. Let us see what those penalties are. Here is what the bill says:

> Whoever willfully and without justification—

They are to be the judges of the willfulness or justification—

> deprives any voter of any right or privilege under this bill—

They are to be the judges of that also—

> or interferes or attempts to interfere with the right of any person to vote, or to vote as he may choose—

Under the provisions of this title anybody can make the accusation; you understand—

> or willfully refuses or fails to count any ballot validly cast under the provisions of this title—

They are to decide the validity. If they do count them in your State, they may be prosecuted in the State courts; and if they do not count them, they may be prosecuted in the Federal courts by this Commission—

> Whoever does or attempts to do any fraudulent act in connection with the casting of ballots under this title shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

You could not get election holders at the average precinct in the average State to go out and help hold an election and act as officials in the various precincts with a club like that held over them.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman think that if this restriction is placed on Federal elections it would practically destroy the holding of elections?

Mr. RANKIN. I fear it might. That is the point I am making. It would destroy the States' control of elections, wipe out the independence of our elections, and destroy the States' election machinery. What we are trying to do, and what these veterans want, above all things, is to maintain the institutions we have told them they are fighting for. And that is what we are driving at. This bill also attempts an amendment to a bill passed a year ago that is going to be contested in every State in the Union probably, or a majority of them, and in all probability will be held unconstitutional. Then the bill would be a nullity and the men in the service deprived of the right to vote, that we are trying to provide them under joint resolution numbered 190, which leaves the election machinery in the hands of the various States.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does the gentleman have available the number of States whose laws already permit the soldier or the one in service to vote?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; 46 of them, they tell us.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I know that Missouri has such a law.

Mr. RANKIN. Forty-six have made such provisions, which leaves only two. Those two States are Kentucky and Delaware. I am reliably informed that Kentucky will hold a session of the legislature in January and Delaware will probably do the same thing.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That would make the State laws of the entire Nation such as to permit the men in service to vote?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; with aid of House Joint Resolution 190, which we are offering as a substitute for that unconstitutional measure. House Joint Resolution 190 reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States, the enactment of appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war.

Then follows an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] to this joint resolution, which I introduced, and we have accepted Mr. VURSELL'S amendment. It reads as follows:

And in order to afford ample opportunity for members of the armed forces to vote for Federal, State, and local officials, and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, it is recommended that each State cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy an adequate number of postal cards for use by such absentee voters in the armed forces in making application for absentee ballots, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such postal cards to be delivered to members of the armed forces, located within or without the United States, as expeditiously as possible, in order to enable such members of the armed forces to secure, execute, and return said ballots in ample time to be recorded for such election.

The next section reads as follows:

SEC. 2. It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war. Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including postal cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

By passing this joint resolution we would retain the election machinery in the hands of the States and give them the assistance of the War Department and the Navy Department, and also free air-mail service, in order that those ballots might go to those boys and come back as quickly as possible, and not be disrupting the election machinery of the various States or throwing us into a disastrous contest in the House next year.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. These returns must be made, however, on the date of election. In this resolution there is no extension of the period beyond the date of election for them to be counted?

Mr. RANKIN. That question was raised at our last meeting, and I understand that there will be an amendment offered to this joint resolution for an extension of time. But I doubt if it will be necessary, because by starting now, we can get these ballots to the men and get them back in ample time for the election.

Mr. DEWEY. It would seem to me that it would not be justified to extend the time, for the simple reason that no one knows how long one can maintain the judges and clerks of election, to see that there is proper accountability of the absentee votes.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, but that question was raised at our last meeting of the committee.

These postal cards have already been printed. There are 10,000,000 of them ready to send out. What we are providing in this joint resolution is that these postal cards may be used to aid the men in the armed forces to apply for ballots. Where they do not apply, these ballots—and this has been the case where I live—have been sent out by the election holders themselves, or by the local officials.

Who are most interested in having the soldiers from your State vote? The people who live in your State, of course, the fathers, the mothers, the wives, and brothers of these men; and, incidentally, the men who are running for office in the State or district. So they will be diligent in getting these ballots out to these men, but they will go to the men themselves and not have to be passed around through the Secretary of State and then around through a Federal election commission. So the passage of this House Joint Resolution 190 with this Vursell amendment and the amendment that I read, which were recommended by the War Department, will throw every safeguard around these ballots and at the same time accomplish the purposes alleged to be attempted by this monstrosity of 21 pages that might wreck the election machinery of every State in the Union.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. In the event that we enacted legislation here that might be in conflict with the election laws of the respective State, this general election might become a highly controversial issue. Did we not have such a controversy in the Hayes-Tilden case to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. RANKIN. In the Tilden-Hayes contest in 1876 they had such a contest with reference to Louisiana and Florida. They had a Republican Senate and a Democratic House, and the controversy arose as to who would have precedence as Presiding Officer at the joint session. There were two sets of returns from both Florida and Louisiana. If the Speaker of the House presided and opened the ballots he was going to open the returns that favored Tilden, the Democrat. If the President pro tempore of the Senate opened the ballots he would open the set of returns that favored the Republican, Mr. Hayes. The country got almost to the boiling point and in order to prevent a probable return of civil conflict, the sad and bitter experience of which we had just had a few years before, men in the two Houses got together and provided for the Electoral Commission; and even then on every vote taken by that Commission every Democratic member of the commission voted for Mr. Tilden and every Republican voted for Mr. Hayes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Just to make this clear, in the event the plan the gentleman from Mississippi proposes should be adopted, the Government would forward postal cards to all the men in service permitting them the opportunity to request a ballot from their respective States so that all men in the service could participate in the general election.

Mr. RANKIN. Those postal cards have already gone, but to make assurance double sure, additional ones could be sent.

Mr. GAVIN. Then the postal lards would come back to the respective States, the ballots would be forwarded to the men, and they would vote in the regular manner.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. They could vote not only for Federal officers, but for State, municipal, and local candidates in which they would be very much interested. All names would be on the ballot and the men in the service would know who they are voting for.

Mr. RANKIN. And if my proposal is defeated and you have this Federal Commission set up it would control one ballot, the Federal ballot, and the State authorities would control the State ballots. Then you would have to send two sets of ballots. To say the least of it you would have confusion confounded. I say that servicemen do not want any such mix-up in the election machinery of this Nation and for that reason I have taken the time to bring this matter to the attention of the Membership of the House to let you know what this measure would do. You have had enough confusion trying to enforce the election laws of the various States, but heretofore you have concentrated only on the Southern States; now you are involving every State in the Union.

Mr. GAVIN. In the Senate bill what kind of ballot do they propose?

Mr. RANKIN. One of these "Aurelio" ballots.

Mr. GAVIN. It just permits them to vote for the President and Vice President, Senator and Representative?

Mr. RANKIN. They permit them to vote a straight party ballot. It violates the law of some States. If such a ballot were returned in my State, and the judges of election counted it, they would be violating the State law and if this proposed bill should pass and they refused to count it they would be violating Federal law and be subject to punishment in a Federal court to the extent of a $5,000 fine or 5 years in prison or both.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman from Mississippi is making a very able presentation of this matter, in my judgment. I wish the gentleman would explain to the House that it is simply a gesture of a ballot which would be a great disappointment to a great many of the men who would receive it and that this ballot does not have the name of a single candidate on it, not even for President of the United States or for Member of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is now speaking about the ballot they propose?

Mr. VURSELL. I am speaking about the bobtailed ballot that is provided under the Lucas bill.

Mr. RANKIN. The ballot is printed in the bill, and, as I said, it violates the laws of many States. I think it violates the laws of practically all the States and the constitutions of most of them. Here it is. You write the name of the party in. Now, the boys from my State would not know what to do with a ballot like that—and from many other States, also—because under our State laws we do not even print a party name on the ballot; you have to go down the ballot and pick out the candidates; and if you have not enough intelligence or have not paid enough attention to the election to know who those candidates are, that is your misfortune.

In New York it is different. They have these ballots, and all these fellows had to do in this recent Aurelio election was to mark "Democratic" or "Republican," and in either case they would automatically vote for Aurelio. By that sort of a ticket they elected a man to the Supreme Court for 14 years who, according to the press and the other information we get down here, was hand-picked for nomination by an underworld racketeer who had been prosecuted in the courts of New York. To impose that kind of a ballot on the people of this country and on the soldiers who are fighting to maintain American institutions, and to set up this super-bureaucracy, and to hold over every election holder this tremendous threat of prosecution in the Federal courts, would probably do this country an irreparable injury, and the service men do not want it.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. This ballot provides only for the Republican and Democratic parties. How about the Progressive party and other political parties?

Mr. RANKIN. They leave a place in there for them to write in any other prejudices they may have in the shape of a party.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Under this proposition and under this bill that the gentleman has been discussing, would that preclude the States that already have absentee election laws from furnishing the soldiers the other set of ballots?

Mr. RANKIN. They have some kind of a half-hammered arrangement in there that the States might furnish them and if they voted the State ballot they would have to comply with this law.

Mr. RIZLEY. In my State, for instance, we have an absentee election law, and we have the names on there of all the Congressmen and the State officials.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. If a soldier got one of those ballots, then received one of these blank ballots and voted twice, would he be subject to prosecution?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; probably for both, and in addition to that he might be court-martialed, I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. May I inquire as to whether the gentleman has considered this additional branch of the problem? As to how the candidates for office are going to get their arguments and their issues before the men abroad regardless of the kind of ballot they have.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know how that is going to be done. Probably the O. W. I. will look after that for you.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time to discuss this subject because it is one of the grave problems that confront us at this time. The Senate committee has reported this monstrosity. The House committee is against it by 2 to 1. We are for House Joint Resolution 190 that does not tie on to any unconstitutional law and therefore will not vitiate the election. It leaves the elections in the hands of the States. All it does, so far as the Army and Navy are concerned, is to call on them to expedite the delivery and return of these ballots, distribute them, and get them collected and send them back with as little delay as possible.

We provide free air-mail service for all these ballots and for all communications in connection therewith in order that the ballots may go to these men in the service without interference by any Federal bureaucracy and then to be sent back to their homes, their home counties, their home communities and counted the same as other ballots. In other words, we are doing what we took the oath of office to do: We are upholding the Constitution of the United States for which these boys are fighting. I have put in many years on veterans' legislation and, if you will remember, as I said yesterday, it was my amendment that raised the base pay of men in this war to $50 a month. The servicemen throughout this country who know me, know that if I did not think the enactment of this Lucas-Worley bill would do them more harm than good and their country more harm than good, I would not be opposing it. If we had nothing to offer in its place, we would be at a disadvantage, but we do have this House Joint Resolution 190 that will do exactly what ought to be done under the circumstances.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Under the bill reported by the Senate committee as a disguise for a soldiers' vote bill, does not that also provide for all these Communists in the National Maritime Union to vote who have never voted before in their lives in all probability?

Mr. RANKIN. That bill and the Worley bill both provide for all members in the Maritime Union to vote but does not provide for the men who are working in a defense plant 3,000 miles away from home to vote. Those men in the Maritime Union from our viewpoint are on the same footing as other men who are working in war industries. What we are trying to do is to take care of the men in uniform and to get these ballots to them in a legitimate way, and get them back so that they may be counted by their own election officials.

Let us save American institutions at home, while our brave men are defending them abroad.

Now, getting back to the bill before the House——

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's remarks on this very important matter, but I do want to ask the gentleman a question in connection with H. R. 3377 which we are currently considering. Does this bill take care of or provide in any way for veterans of this World War who have service-connected disabilities?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. For total or permanent disability?

Mr. RANKIN. Non-service-connected disabilities?

Mr. RIZLEY. I mean non-service-connected disabilities. It covers the veterans of the present war?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, it covers the veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. In order to relieve any doubt on that point, an amendment will be offered to make it clear.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to get clear in my mind the companionship between H. R. 3356, which we passed yesterday, and H. R. 3377 which we are now considering.

Mr. RANKIN. H. R. 3356 applies to veterans with service-connected disabilities and to the widows and orphans of those veterans. This applies to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

Mr. McGREGOR. They really are companion bills and cover all veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to commend the gentleman and the gentleman's committee for his action in this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 3377 is a bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes. It is my belief that this measure should apply to veterans of World War No. 2.

Mr. Chairman, many of these totally and permanently disabled cases should have been given service-connection, but for one reason or other they have not been given it, perhaps because they were late in filing their claims or did not file their claims properly in the beginning, or the doctors have died who could have given evidence, or the records were lost during World War No. 1.

I bring this matter before the House because it is our bounden duty, as I see it, to make sure that the Veterans' Administration and the Army and Navy are doing everything possible to bring information to the men in the hospitals that they may file their claims for compensation promptly.

It has been the policy thus far in the War Department and the Navy Department not to allow the service men's organizations to go into the hospitals to help the men with their claims, as they did after and during World War No. 1. That should be changed, in my opinion. Only yesterday I heard of a veteran who returned home from a hospital with a gunshot wound in his stomach, but who was apparently normal. Nothing was done about telling him about his opportunity for rehabilitation or for compensation. That is obviously wrong.

Another case came to my attention yesterday, that of a man who was burned. He had an occupation that required the use of his hands, but they are so stiff from the burns that he can probably never use them again in his former work unless physiotherapy can help him in some way or more skin grafting can be done.

These men should be told at once of every opportunity they have for at least a measure of compensation. You cannot compensate these men for what they have given for us, but you can see that they avail them of every benefit possible. The Congress has passed a great deal of legislation but it does not help the disabled veteran unless he applies for it.

World War veterans now receive pension of $40 per month for permanent and total—non-service-connected—disability under the regulation which would be amended. The law requires not only that they must be permanently and totally disabled but they must have served for 90 days or more during the World War, or if less than 90 days, discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, and the pension is not payable to an unmarried veteran whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a married veteran, or veteran with minor children whose annual income exceeds $2,500. Many of these veterans have families, and being unable to earn support because of the permanent and total disability, must rely on the pension of $40 per month, which, it is obvious, is most inadequate.

I hope that sometime the veterans' laws will be equalized so that World War veterans will receive the same amount of pension as do the Spanish-American War veterans, who do not have the restrictions that have been placed upon the World War veterans.

This bill for World War veterans would increase the rate of $40 per month to $50 per month.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The question of equalizing veterans' compensation came up in the early days of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Every time it arose, the question of equalizing them with Civil War veterans came up. At that time the Civil War veterans were very old and were receiving the highest compensation ever paid, on an average, to any soldiers in the world. The average member of the committee did not want to pull down those pensions, but if we had raised the World War veterans up to them we would have brought about such a protest that we probably would not have gotten the legislation through. For that reason, the majority members of the committee agreed just to go along and let the veterans' legislation proposition stand as it is now, with this committee handling legislation relative to the veterans of World War No. 1 and now World War No. 2, the Committee on Pensions handling the Spanish-American War veterans' legislation and the Committee on Invalid Pensions handling legislation with reference to the Civil War veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Mississippi was on the committee when it started in 1924 and I went on the committee in 1925. Of course, very few of the Civil War veterans are alive today. I think the time is coming when we must equalize those rates and give more to the World War veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. A great many dependents of Civil War veterans are still living and are still on the pension rolls.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. They are paid all out of proportion to what is being paid to the dependents of World War veterans.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the gentlewoman already discussed the situation with reference to the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall take that up in a moment.

In addition, the bill would take cognizance of the long periods of permanent and total disability and advanced age of World War veterans who are permanently and totally disabled by granting a pension of $60 per month, if the veteran shall have been rated permanent and total and is in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years—that seems only fair, because if he has held that rating for 10 years he will always be dependent and helpless—or if he has reached the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled.

I may say at this point that many of these veterans are dying. The death rate for the 65-year-old veterans and even for those younger is very rapid. It is on the increase. So in estimating the total cost of this bill, I think the Veterans' Administration has put more than the outside cost on it. Of course, the veteran must be 65 years old, must be totally and permanently disabled, and also must meet the limitation regarding an income of $1,000 if single and $2,500 if married and with dependents.

Now I am coming to the Spanish-American War service pension.

Under the existing service pension laws, all veterans of the Spanish-American War receive at least $60 per month if permanently and totally disabled, and they need not be permanently and totally disabled if age 65. In other words, the rate of $60 per month is granted Spanish-American War veterans upon attaining the age of 65 without reference to any degree of disability. Veterans of the Spanish-American War may receive $100 per month if in need of regular aid and attendance. It should also be borne in mind that Spanish-American War veterans may receive $20 to $50 per month for one-tenth to three-quarters disability, or $30 for age 62 with reference to disability where they do not qualify for these higher rates, whereas World War No. 1 veterans have only one rate of service pension, and that is the rate for permanent and total disability. Furthermore, there are rates from $12 to $50 per month for Spanish-American War veterans with less than 90 days' service but who had service of 70 days or more, whereas the service pension of World War veterans for permanent and total disability requires 90 days' service.

You see, the requirements and limitations are very much greater for World War veterans than are the requirements for the Spanish-American War pensions.

The Committee on Pensions has reported out the bill H. R. 2350, which would increase the rate of $60 per month to $75 per month, thus granting Spanish-American War veterans $75 per month for permanent and total disability, or upon reaching age 65, without reference to the degree of disability. It should be borne in mind that H. R. 3377, pertaining to World War No. 1 veterans, does not grant an age pension without reference to the degree of disability but requires permanent and total disability to be eligible for any pension whatsoever under the bill.

In my opinion, World War No. 2 veterans should be given at once the right to come under the provisions of this bill, because while the World War No. 2 veterans cannot be rated permanently and

totally disabled for 10 years because that time has not elapsed, I think there may be a few veterans who came under the specialized group in the War Department who may have reached the age of 65 years and be permanently and totally disabled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I am giving the figures so that the Members may be fully informed upon the subject.

I am going to give you an estimate by the Veterans' Administration of the cost, which I have said before I think is high and beyond any possible outside cost. This is the estimate of the cost that has been given me by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill, as reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, would provide a rate of $50 per month for veterans eligible to pension for permanent and total disability not shown to be due to service under part III of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or $60 monthly if the veteran shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and in receipt of pension therefor for a continuous period of 10 years or has reached the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled.

The estimated cost for the first year is $12,763,000. Increases would be provided for approximately 81,000 World War No. 1 veterans and 200 Spanish-American War veterans.

I think there is not a dissenting voice in the Congress regarding this legislation, because, after all, it is an extremely moderate request for the veterans. I doubt if there is a single objection all over the United States to this measure. The Congress and the citizens of the United States realize our responsibility and our debt to the service men and women.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield myself an additional minute.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentlewoman tell us the status of the legislation in respect to widows of Spanish War veterans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will quote sections 2 and 3 of H. R. 2350, the bill the Pension Committee reported out, which provides service pensions to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents on a basis more comparable to service pensions in Civil War cases, which are as follows:

Section 2 of the bill would change the marriage delimiting date governing service pension to widows and remarried widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. The delimiting marriage date for service pension to widows of Civil War veterans is June 27, 1905, approximately 40 years after the termination of that war. The date proposed by section 2 is approximately the same length of time after the close of the Spanish-American War. The inequalities and injustices resulting from the existing limitation by denying pension to widows married to the Spanish-American War veteran as early as 1922 and who lived with and cared for the veteran during his lifetime are accentuated by the high cost of living and advanced age precluding employment.

Section 3 of the bill would provide a reasonable increase of widows' service pension from $30 to $40 per month upon attainment of age 65, and grant $50 per month to the widow who was the wife of the veteran during his war service. The latter provision is identical with that provided for Civil War widows and is in accord with the sound principle that preference should be given that class of widows. The increase to $40 at age 65 will establish a rate comparable to that granted Civil War widows at age 70. This increase at age 65 is believed justified in the light of living costs, unemployability, and general need of this group.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege on yesterday to support H. R. 3356, a bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to the Veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, and for other purposes. As a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I rise now in support of H. R. 3377.

As has already been pointed out by the distinguished and able chairman of my committee, this measure proposes to increase the rate of compensation or pension from $40 per month to $50 per month for the permanently and totally disabled non-service-connected Veteran of World War No. 1; and when such veteran shall have been rated totally and permanently disabled and in receipt of pension for a period of 10 continuous years, or has reached the age of 65, the amount of pension shall be $60 per month.

The Veterans' Administration has informed me that approximately 81,000 veterans will be benefited by this measure. Who, Mr. Chairman, are these men? They are those who have lost their health, who are broken in body and some in spirit, unable to pursue a substantial, gainful occupation and, therefore, unable to provide even the reasonable necessities of life for themselves and their dependents. The opportunity for the disabled veteran, even on part-time and temporary work, to supplement his income is very rare. According to Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, these disabled patriots frequently "buck up against the unemployment-compensation provisions relating to employers who do not want them on their pay rolls because it increases their insurance rates."

Many of these men have worthy claims for service-connected disability compensation except that the necessary proof of service incurrence may have been lost, destroyed, or otherwise unprocurable.

It is of more than passing interest that this Congress—to meet in part the increased cost of living—voted for and enacted into law large increases in dependency benefits for the dependents of servicemen in the present war. These benefits are substantially larger than is here proposed for the benefit of the disabled veterans. This Congress also—to meet in part the increased cost of living—voted for and enacted into law an average monthly income increase to the average Government employee of about 22 percent. Unionized labor—to meet in part the increased cost of living—adopted a formula to secure an increase in the monthly income of its members without violating the President's hold-the-line order by increasing the hours of labor from 40 to 48 hours per week and fixing time and a half for all time over 40 hours, which, in fact, provides an actual increase of 30 percent in income without any increase in the hourly rates of pay. It is also significant that in many instances there were large increases in the hourly wage rates. Many income increases in other fields—to meet in part the increased cost of living—could be cited. So certainly we should not at this time quibble about the nominal increase proposed for the totally and permanently disabled veterans who fought our battles in the years 1917 and 1918. He and his dependents, too, are struggling under the burdensome increased cost of food, clothing, rents, medicines, and other essentials of life.

The estimated cost of this bill for the first year is only about $12,700,000—less than 10 cents per annum per capita—a very modest sum when compared to current appropriations. It is my information that Canada pays her totally and permanently disabled veterans $100 per month, plus $25 per month for the first dependent, plus $15 per month for the second dependent, plus $12 per month for the third dependent, plus $10 per month for each additional dependent. May I, therefore, emphasize that the cost of this bill is very modest and even then leaves us far below the standards of similar appropriations made by the Dominion of Canada.

This measure meets with the terms of a long-time mandate of the American Legion. Its passage is also urged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. I regard it a privilege to support the measure. I hope and urge that it will pass the House without a dissenting vote.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 3377, now under consideration by the Committee of the Whole House is

a companion bill to H. R. 3356 which was unanimously passed by the House yesterday.

Yesterday's bill, H. R. 3356, was for the purpose of increasing service-connected disability rates of compensation on pensions payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. H. R. 3377, under consideration today, aims to increase the rate of pensions to World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specific cases, and for other purposes. I believe that every true American who realizes the mammoth sacrifice made by the veterans who are offering their lives to preserve liberty and freedom, will agree that the passage of this legislation is nothing more than a just and equitable recognition. It will enable them and their dependents, in a small degree, to enjoy more the fruits of their victory. Representatives of veterans organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart, have all endorsed this legislation.

We realize that this will cost a considerable amount of money, although the sum would sound infinitesimal when we consider the billions that we are spending and will spend for other purposes. There are and will be a great number of veterans, disabled veterans, and dependents who are unable to make a living at any kind of employment, who will be dependent on Federal compensation for their very existence.

America must not again allow or tolerate the conditions that held forth after World War No. 1, when our returning heroes were unable to find employment and for years after November 11, 1918, were compelled to seek relief and financial aid from either relatives or their local community.

I do not believe there is a person in our country today who does want the veterans of this war or the last war adequately cared for. Almost every home in our land has a boy or girl away in the armed service of our Government. It is our privilege and our sacred trust to see that in future years these heroes shall not be compelled to suffer privation or want by reason of conditions beyond their control.

The chairman and members of the Committee on Veterans' Legislation and also this Congress is to be congratulated on its unselfish and whole-hearted understanding of the veterans' problems both present and future. I hope and trust that H. R. 3377 will pass unanimously as did H. R. 3356 on yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, when the roll call was taken yesterday on H. R. 3356, I, in company with the mayor of the city of Gary, Ind., was in one of the downtown departments on official business, and therefore unable to cast my vote for the bill. I was in favor of the bill, but I missed the roll call. Had I been present I would have voted for the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as one who has sincere appreciation of, and respect for, those who have served in the armed forces in time of war and as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, it affords me genuine satisfaction to speak and vote for H. R. 3377.

H. R. 3377 provides for an increase in pensions payable to veterans of World War No. 1 who had honorable service for not less than 90 days and who have become totally and permanently disabled, regardless of the origin of their disabilities, other than for misconduct. It would increase all such persons on the rolls from $40 to $50 per month, and where they have been in receipt of this particular type of pension for 10 consecutive years or reach the age of 65 years, they would receive $60 per month.

Approximately 85,000 such veterans are now on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration who would benefit from this increase and as the years go by, it may be the only pension roll open and available to aging and disabled World War No. 1 veterans who are unable to establish proof of service-connection for their disabilities after so many years have elapsed.

There may be some who contend this type of pension to be a mere service pension for which the Government has no obligation. On the other hand, the Government has rewarded veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1 with a more generous service pension basis, and not requiring permanent and total disability as a prerequisite. However, the point which appeals to me as the basis for justice in this particular pension entitlement, is the fact that many of these so-called non-service-connected disabilities actually had their origin during the veterans' service, but due to difficulties in keeping up service records in zones of combat or theaters of operations, the veteran has been unable to prove service-connection years after the war.

It would be far better to pay a few questionable service pensions under such general legislation, if such should happen, than to deny worthy cases because of lost service records or failure to note the illnesses or injuries which afflicted the veteran during his actual service. And in the final analysis, it is only those veterans and dependents of veterans who can no longer sustain themselves who must seek refuge and relief on this particular roll.

I think we are all agreed the cost of living has increased sharply in recent years and is still climbing. Most groups of workers in the Nation, including public employees, have been granted wage increases to offset, in some measure, this increased cost of living. But here is a group of permanently and totally disabled veterans—men who have served honorably in the armed forces in time of war—compelled to struggle for existence on a mere pittance of $40 per month. Bear in mind, most of these men have dependents and they are unable to supplement this meager income. If they should be able to obtain and work at employment which earns $1,000 per year for a single man or $2,500 per year for a married man, they are removed from the pension rolls.

It is true the Seventy-seventh Congress granted an increase from $30 to $40 per month for these men, but in all fairness, we recognize the increase was woefully inadequate to meet the trials of today. Surely no one will contend that $50, or even $60 per month, today, for a family would encourage wasteful or profligate spending.

Every Member of this House should vote for H. R. 3377 and in a small measure, not only in the interest of justice and equity but to show their appreciation for those who serve us in time of war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, under existing law a veteran of World War No. 1, with a permanent and total disability rating, not shown to be due to service, is entitled to a pension of $40 a month. Under the provisions of the bill, H. R. 3377, now before us, this would be increased to $50 a month, except that where such veterans shall have been rated permanent and total and are in receipt of a pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or shall have reached the age of 65 years, then the amount of the pension will be $60.

Veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection now receive a pension of $60 a month for total disability, or if they have reached the age of 65 years.

This bill does not place the veterans of World War No. 1 on a parity with the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, or the Philippine Insurrection, but it does bring them nearer to the amount received by the veterans of those other wars. Your committee does not believe the Spanish-American War veterans are receiving too much, but rather that the World War veterans are receiving too little under present living conditions. No pension is payable to a single veteran whose annual income exceeds $1,000. That is, no pension is payable to such a veteran under the provisions of the bill before us, nor is a pension payable to a married veteran whose income exceeds $2,500 per year. It is to be noted that after reaching the age of 65 years, or with a rating of permanent disability the veteran is not in position to earn any appreciable amount of income. His cost of living has risen the same as has others. It is our duty to see that these veterans are cared for now just as much as it was our duty to care for them while they were in uniform.

This bill before us, as has been stated by someone who preceded me, as estimated by the Bureau of Veterans' Administration, will cost the Government approximately $12,768,000 per year at the outside estimate. It will affect about 81,000 veterans of World War No. 1, and approximately 200 Spanish-American War veterans, who also served in World War No. 1. I favor the passage of this bill.

Mr: RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. If these men were hospitalized, it would cost the Government at least $120 per month for each one of them, would it not?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That much or more, on the average.

Mr. RANKIN. So that paying this compensation enables these men to stay home with their families.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And in the long run it will save the Government money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. This bill provides for increasing the pension of World War veterans who are totally and permanently disabled, but no specific reference is made to the veterans of World War No. 2. What is the contention of the committee that reported this bill in regard to these veterans?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand the committee's view on this, this bill (H. R. 3377) does not cover the veterans of World War No. 2. We took care of them yesterday in H. R. 3356, which dealt with service-connected men and their widows and children. The bill today treats only with non-service-connected permanently and totally disabled cases.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Surely the gentleman is aware of the fact we have had veterans of World War No. 2 who have been given medical discharges without having service-connected disabilities? Does not the gentleman think some provision should be made to take care of these cases?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes, if those men are not included under compensation laws already on the statute books, and taken care of by the Veterans' Administration. Is the gentleman referring, for instance, to a case where a man got into the service and had a disability and they did not find it out and he was later discharged and he is a permanently disabled case, but is not recognized for compensation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not necessarily. I have in mind particularly a veteran of this war in my own State who went through the experience of Pearl Harbor and was given a medical discharge, but was actually denied hospitalization because his case was not service-connected. I believe that veterans in that category should be given some consideration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the gentleman. My understanding of this bill is that it does not cover that type of case.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to make a point I have made repeatedly on the floor. Veterans are not properly informed in the hospitals regarding their claims or disabilities. The hospitals do not have the Veterans' Administration contact men stationed there, and the veterans' organizations are not allowed to go through the hospital, as formerly, to help the men with their claims. I am speaking now of the Army and Navy hospitals as well. I think if those veterans were told their rights, many of those cases would be service-connected, and the men could be rehabilitated. We have passed all the necessary legislation, but this is a matter of very faulty administration. I think it is a great tragedy today and is inexcusable.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentlewoman believe, then, that if the case cited by the gentleman from Idaho had been properly handled and brought before the Veterans' Administration, that particular case would have been taken care of?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is not necessary in this bill to include the veterans of World War No. 2, because this is non-service-connected legislation, and such legislation would be premature at this time. Is that the position of the gentlewoman?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and they must have permanent and total rating 10 years or be 65 years of age. The provision as to being 65 years of age would cover very few of World War No. 2 veterans. However, I think they should be included in this bill at this time, I will say to the gentleman, in order to be ready for any eventuality.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Only those soldiers are being discharged in advance of peace who have disabilities, and it is supposed to be service-connected if they are in the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, of course; some are discharged without any service-connected disability.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does not this legislation go back to the so-called National Economy Act, which cut off a lot of pensions that were not service-connected at a time when there was no longer any possibility of digging up proof that they were service-connected?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Exactly. We are trying to make up for some of the inequities caused by the Economy Act, and the reduction of pensions by the Chief Executive under it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. With reference to whether or not this legislation applies to veterans of World War No. 2, it is my information that we have a general statute which extends the privileges, benefits, pensions, and all other matters which are extended to veterans of World War No. 1 to those of World War No. 2. Do we not have such a general statute?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand our committee has already brought that out and it has passed the House. I would further explain in answer to the gentleman's question, the bill which passed the House yesterday, H. R. 3356, specifies World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. This bill before us here does not so designate.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In view of that general statute, the fact they were specifically specified as veterans of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 would be regarded merely as surplusage, would it not?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think so. But the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the chairman of our committee, was asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] awhile ago if it covered veterans of World War No. 2 and he replied it did. I went over in the gentleman's presence and asked him and he said he was mistaken on that, it does not cover World War No. 2. I am taking the interpretation and opinion of the chairman of our committee, who, I think, knows more about it than anyone.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In further support of this measure, was it not brought out during the hearings, in Canada veterans of this character were paid $100 a month and an additional amount for each dependent?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I so understand.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Therefore, the amount which this bill proposes for our World War veterans is still far under the amount paid by the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And it certainly is not excessive for what the men have endured.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not the gentleman believe this entire matter may be clarified by specifically providing that veterans of this war should be included in this legislation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do, and I would have no objection to the gentleman offering such an amendment if he cares to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] upon the splendid argument he made with reference to the legislation which is now pending, which will simplify the question of our soldiers voting in the future. He has ever been alert in his activities for the veterans of all wars, and I want to commend him upon that splendid resolution which is now pending in the House. We must make it possible for all of our soldiers to vote during this period of war. This

method for voting must be made as simple as possible.

With respect to the pending bill, H. R. 3373, with which I am in full accord and which I will support, I wish to call attention to the Members of the House that this measure is brought very largely to bridge the gap which was caused by the passage of the so-called economy law which, at that time, repealed the Disabled Veterans' Act. It was under the Disabled Veterans' Act by which non-service-connected cases, those who were suffering permanent and total disability, were entitled to receive some benefit from their Government. This measure merely replaces the former Disabled Veterans' Act which was repealed by the passage of the Economy Act and to take care of that particular class of cases.

As all of us remember, and we can reflect upon the situation that exists with reference to the veterans of World War No. 1. This particular piece of legislation applies to the veterans of World War No. 1. I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the ages of some of the veterans of World War No. 1 at the present moment.

The average age of the veterans who participated in World War No. 1 is now 49 years, plus. There are among the veterans of those who served in World War No. 1, 59,982 who are now between the ages of 60 and 64 years. I might also state that there are 32,157 of those veterans who are now between the ages of 65 and 74 years. There are 33,381 veterans of World War No. 1, who are now over 75 years of age.

My mind recurs to the time when the veterans came back from World War No. 1. Many of them had good jobs before they entered the service. When they came back their jobs had been taken by someone else. Many of those veterans were never able to get another good job after they came back home, because they had suffered disabilities. By reason of the fact that they had suffered disabilities, the factories and the mills did not take those disabled men into their employment. All of us remember that within more recent years there have been very rigid physical examinations required, which have been conducted by the plants and factories and mills throughout this country, in order to ascertain the physical condition of the men who were coming into that plant as employees. They were guarding, of course, against the question of insurance. Under the present condition, with these rigid examinations existing, many of these veterans who have suffered disabilities were unable and are unable to secure employment in those plants. That is a very serious handicap. Many of those men cannot establish service connection. With 25 years having elapsed since the close of World War No. 1, it is now almost impossible for those veterans to establish service-connected disabilities.

I wish to refer briefly, for the moment, to the question of the establishment of service connection at this late date following World War No. 1. It is almost impossible at this time for the veterans to establish service connection. The men with whom they served have gone to various parts of the country where they have established themselves and they cannot now be located. Doctors who had examined them and who had full information regarding their physical condition, have died or have gone to parts unknown. The veterans are facing an impossible condition with reference to securing evidence to establish service connection. The door is practically closed to the veterans insofar as making proof of service-connected disability.

This bill bridges over that gap, because it takes care of those who have not heretofore proven service connection, who cannot now prove service connection, but who are permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill seeks to increase the rate in permanent and total disability cases from $40 per month to $50 per month. This slight increase is believed to be entirely equitable. The bill goes further because it provides in those cases in which a permanent and total disability has continued for a period of 10 years, or the person reaches the age of 65 years, then the amount of the pension shall be $60 monthly.

We owe a duty to our veterans. They have suffered greatly for our country. They now suffer disabilities which prevent them from holding worth-while jobs. Their disabilities, suffered while fighting for their country, are their present handicap.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded as we consider this measure, and I was so reminded a little while ago when my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] was speaking on this bill, that after the passage of the economy bill several years ago, I learned that many veterans of World War No. 1 were forced to leave the veterans' hospitals. Some of those veterans had been in those hospitals for a period of years. They came to the hospitals with their own clothing but their clothing had been taken from them and discarded. Some of those men when they were forced to leave the hospitals, and I speak especially of the veterans' hospital at Dayton, Ohio, left without clothing; some of them left in their underwear. The passage of that economy bill separated those veterans from any assistance from their Government; yet many of those veterans were permanently and totally disabled. They had not been able to establish service connection as the cause of their disability. This particular piece of legislation which we now consider will assist those men in this period of their lives. Some of them are 60, 65, and 70 years of age. They are largely unable to secure employment. Many of them have families, and they are raising children. This measure will be very helpful to those men in their distressed situation. May I compliment the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is chairman, for bringing about this piece of legislation. And also I desire to compliment this committee for bringing before the House the companion bill passed on yesterday, H. R. 3356. These two measures will be very helpful to the veterans. The bill passed on yesterday, H. R. 3356; will aid both the veterans of World War No. 1 and the veterans of World War No. 2, including the widows, orphans, and the children. This measure will bridge the gap in the non-service-connected cases where the men are suffering permanent and total disability. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this measure will pass without a dissenting vote and that this obligation of the Government to these permanently and totally disabled veterans of World War No. 1 will not be longer deferred; that they will not be longer prevented from receiving that to which they are so justly entitled.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as supporting and voting for H. R. 3377.

I believe it is only our duty to take care of the men and women who gave their all in defense of our country during World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, though they had no visible service-connected disability wounds, their bodies and minds suffered nevertheless.

Thousands of these members of the armed forces became disabled and unable to obtain work due to wear and tear on their bodies while in service, they need food, clothing, and shelter the same as those who were wounded.

This bill takes care of them whenever they become disabled, and the $50 or $60 per month will mean the happy sustenance of body and mind of our veterans when they most need it.

It will mean justice given by the great democracy of which we are so proud to be part.

For the above reasons I plead for the unanimous consent of this body of Congress, for the passage of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentlewoman from Massachusetts further requests for time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure this resolution will receive the same unanimous vote given H. R. 3356 on yesterday.

As a new member of the Committee on Veterans' Legislation, may I take this opportunity to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and the entire

committee for the careful and harmonious consideration given these and other veterans' matters, and their sincere concern for the veterans of both World Wars.

Lest there be any doubt in the mind of any Member of the House, from 20 years' experience in veterans' affairs I can assure you that if and when the Veterans' Administration rates a veteran as totally and permanently disabled there can be no doubt about his condition.

All of you, as I was, must have been surprised to learn how many thousand veterans of the First World War are beyond the age of 60, as just shown us by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

The youth in today's armed forces are not worrying much about their old age, but this action should serve to set their minds at ease as to what awaits them if and when they become aged and infirm.

To save them future difficulties, these young men should carefully record names and home addresses of their associates, of medical men, and nurses who care for them, and they should not let false pride deter them from reporting for medical care if needed, no matter how slight the need. That record may some day save their rights to compensation.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to suggest favorable action on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph I (f), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read:

"I (f) The amount of pension payable under the terms of part III shall be $50 monthly: *Provided*, That—."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendment:

I (f) The amount of pension payable under terms of part III shall be $50 monthly, except that where such veterans shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reach the age of 65 years, the amount of pension shall be $60 monthly: *Provided*, That—."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: On page 2, line 2, after the period, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"The provisions of this act shall apply to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take the 5 minutes. This matter has already been discussed with members of the committee, and I understand they are in favor of this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. THOMASON having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3377, pursuant to House Resolution 338, reported the bill back to the House with two amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 89, noes 0.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 353, nays 0, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—353

Abernethy	Busbey	Dingell
Allen, La.	Butler	Disney
Andersen, H Carl.	Byrne	Domengeaux
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Dondero
Anderson, N. Mex.	Canfield	Doughton
Andresen, August H.	Cannon, Fla.	Drewry
Andrews	Cannon, Mo.	Dworshak
Angell	Capozzoli	Eaton
Arends	Carlson, Kans.	Eberharter
Arnold	Carson, Ohio	Elliott
Auchincloss	Carter	Ellis
Baldwin, N. Y.	Case	Ellison, Md.
Barden	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Barrett	Church	Elmer
Barry	Clark	Elston, Ohio
Bates, Ky.	Clason	Engel, Mich.
Beall	Clevenger	Fay
Beckworth	Cochran	Feighan
Bell	Coffee	Fellows
Bender	Cole, Mo.	Fenton
Bennett, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.	Fernandez
Bennett, Mo.	Colmer	Fisher
Bishop	Compton	Fitzpatrick
Blackney	Cooley	Flannagan
Bolton	Cooper	Folger
Boren	Courtney	Fulbright
Bradley, Pa.	Cox	Fuller
Brehm	Crawford	Furlong
Brown, Ga.	Crosser	Gale
Brown, Ohio	Cunningham	Gallagher
Bryson	Curley	Gamble
Buffett	Curtis	Gathings
Burch, Va.	D'Alesandro	Gavin
Burchill, N. Y.	Dawson	Gearhart
Burdick	Day	Gerlach
Burgin	Delaney	Gibson
	Dewey	Gifford
	Dickstein	Gilchrist
	Dilweg	Gillette
Goodwin	Lemke	Robertson
Gordon	Lesinski	Robinson, Utah
Gorski	Lewis, Ohio	Robsion, Ky.
Gossett	Luce	Rockwell
Graham	Ludlow	Rodgers, Pa.
Granger	Lynch	Rogers, Mass.
Grant, Ala.	McCormack	Rohrbough
Green	McCowen	Rolph
Gregory	McGehee	Rowan
Griffiths	McGranery	Rowe
Gross	McGregor	Russell
Gwynne	McKenzie	Sadowski
Hagen	McLean	Sasscer
Hale	McMillan	Satterfield
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McMurray	Sauthoff
Hall, Leonard W.	McWilliams	Schiffler
Halleck	Mans	Schuetz
Hare	Madden	Schwabe
Harless, Ariz.	Magnuson	Scott
Harris, Ark.	Mahon	Scrivner
Harris, Va.	Maloney	Sheppard
Hart	Manasco	Sheridan
Hartley	Mansfield, Mont.	Simpson, Ill.
Hays	Mansfield, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Heffernan	Marcantonio	Slaughter
Heidinger	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Ohio
Herter	Mason	Smith, W. Va.
Hess	May	Smith, Wis.
Hill	Merrow	Snyder
Hobbs	Michener	Sparkman
Hoch	Miller, Conn.	Spence
Hoeven	Miller, Mo.	Springer
Hoffman	Miller, Nebr.	Stanley
Holifield	Miller, Pa.	Starnes, Ala.
Holmes, Mass.	Mills	Steagall
Holmes, Wash.	Monkiewicz	Stearns, N. H.
Hope	Monroney	Stefan
Horan	Morrison, N. C.	Stevenson
Howell	Mruk	Stewart
Hull	Mundt	Stockman
Jarman	Murray, Tenn.	Sullivan
Jenkins	Murray, Wis.	Sumner, Ill.
Jennings	Myers	Sundstrom
Jensen	Newsome	Taber
Johnson, Anton J.	Norman	Talbot
Johnson, Calvin D.	Norrell	Talle
Johnson, Ind.	Norton	Tarver
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomason
Johnson, Okla.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tibbott
Johnson, Ward	O'Connor	Tolan
Jonkman	O'Hara	Towe
Judd	O'Konski	Treadway
Kean	O'Neal	Troutman
Kearney	O'Toole	Vincent, Ky.
Keefe	Outland	Vinson, Ga.
Kefauver	Pace	Vorys, Ohio
Kennedy	Patman	Wadsworth
Keogh	Patton	Walter
Kerr	Peterson, Fla.	Ward
Kilburn	Pfeifer	Wasielewski
Kilday	Philbin	Weaver
King	Phillips	Weichel, Ohio
Kinzer	Pittenger	Weiss
Kirwan	Ploeser	Welch
Klein	Plumley	Wene
Knutson	Poage	Wheat
Kunkel	Poulson	White
LaFollette	Powers	Whitten
Lambertson	Pracht	Whittington
Landis	Ramey	Wickersham
Lane	Ramspeck	Wigglesworth
Lanham	Randolph	Willey
Lea	Rankin	Wilson
LeCompte	Reece, Tenn.	Winter
LeFevre	Reed, Ill.	Wolcott
	Reed, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Rees, Kans.	Wolverton, N. J.
	Richards	Woodruff, Mich.
	Rivers	Worley
	Rizley	Wright
		Zimmerman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—78

Allen, Ill.	Ditter	Jeffrey
Baldwin, Md.	Douglas	Johnson, J. Leroy
Bates, Mass.	Durham	Jones
Bland	Engle, Calif.	Kee
Bloom	Fish	Kelley
Bonner	Fogarty	Kleberg
Boykin	Forand	Larcade
Bradley, Mich.	Ford	Lewis, Colo.
Brooks	Fulmer	McCord
Buckley	Gavagan	Martin, Iowa
Bulwinkle	Gillie	Merritt
Celler	Gore	Morrison, La.
Chapman	Grant, Ind.	Mott
Chenoweth	Hancock	Murdock
Costello	Harness, Ind.	Murphy
Cravens	Hébert	O'Leary
Cullen	Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.
Davis	Hinshaw	Price
Dies	Izac	Priest
Dirksen	Jackson	

Rabaut	Smith, Maine	Vursell
Rogers, Calif.	Smith, Va.	West
Sabath	Somers, N. Y.	Whelchel, Ga.
Scanlon	Sumners, Tex.	Winstead
Shafer	Taylor	Woodrum, Va.
Short	Thomas, Tex.	
Sikes	Voorhis, Calif.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Short.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Schafer.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Celler with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Jeffrey.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Elliston.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes."

On motion of Mr. RANKIN, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON S. 763

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee of conference may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill S. 763.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain letters and copies of letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain articles therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner entitled "Abolish the War Relocation Authority."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address entitled "Free Enterprise in American History," delivered by Preston Hotchkis, president of the California State Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WARD JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a 5-minute radio address made by Zach Lamar Cobb on the question of whether or not subsidies are necessary to combat inflation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WARD JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to me by Mr. Isaac Crawford Sutton, former administrator for the State of Pennsylvania for the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by myself at the dedication of the Salisbury-Wicomico County (Md.) Airport, November 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Texas Private Flyers' Association regarding the Lea bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 25 minutes.

STATE DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION APPROVE HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 50 TO WELCOME THE PEOPLE OF ITALY TO THE FAMILY OF LIBERATED NATIONS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, wars are not won entirely by bullets and cold steel. The right sort of propaganda, in which the rule of kindness is a predominant element, may be a great factor in winning wars. The sort of propaganda to which I refer as the right sort is the sort that has its well-springs in the warmth of our humanitarianism, in our honesty of purpose, and our sincere earnestness to serve mankind.

With that thought in mind, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 50, which is now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and which proposes that this Congress, acting in behalf of its principal, the people of America, shall extend hands across the sea to the people of Italy and welcome them to the family of liberated nations.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States democratically elected by the people, is in a position to convey to the people of Italy, the victims of fascist rule, and to downtrodden oppressed peoples everywhere, our Nation's sympathy and friendship for them: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people who elected it, welcomes the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. We congratulate them on the overthrow of the horrors and slavery of fascism. We sympathize with them in the struggle that is before them in reclaiming their country from the Nazi invader and in reconstructing their nation. In the cosmic evolution that is going on the might of America is pledged to support by all reasonable and constitutional means the freedom, peace, and security of all right-thinking and right-doing men. We hail the overthrow of fascism in Italy as the dawn of freedom for all of the Axis-ridden countries and as pointing the way to the final consummation of a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

STATE DEPARTMENT AND O. W. I. APPROVE

I am proud to be able to announce that this resolution has the approval of the State Department, which has as its main responsibilities the conduct of our foreign relations, and the Office of War Information, which has exclusive charge of our propaganda efforts in foreign countries.

Under date of October 8, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, wrote to me as follows:

I have your letter of October 1, 1943, addressed to Secretary Hull, enclosing a copy of a resolution which you submitted to the House September 21, welcoming the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. The resolution has been carefully read and I find no conflict with the foreign policy of this Government. It embodies the spirit of the Atlantic Charter with respect to the people of defeated countries, and also reflects, I am convinced, the attitude of the great majority of American citizens toward the unfortunate Italian people.

Mr. Stettinius adds that he heartily concurs in the sense of the resolution, to

which he refers as "your generous message."

The Office of War Information, after giving the resolution the most careful consideration, finds it to be in harmony with the foreign policy of our Government, with the Atlantic Charter, and with the Moscow agreement.

The Office of War Information would like to have this resolution for psychological warfare purposes. It believes that the resolution, if adopted by Congress, would be valuable in winning friendship and support for the cause of the United Nations. Already it has been broadcast to the people of Italy in the Italian language and to other European peoples in other languages as a straw showing the temper of the wind over here.

This resolution was originally introduced in the House on September 21 and I am pleased to say that the reaction to it, as it has come to me, has been universally favorable. The least enthusiastic comment I have heard in regard to it is that its adoption cannot possibly do any harm. My comment on that comment is that I do not consider mere innocuousness a recommendation, and that if this resolution would be simply an empty gesture let us forget it.

But I shall try to show why in my opinion the adoption of the resolution would not be at all idle or meaningless and why, on the contrary, it might be expected to bring positive results of high importance to America and the United Nations. My faith in the resolution is tied in with immutable principles of human nature which are as applicable to nations as to individuals. Good will is one of the very greatest assets any individual can possess in this world, and so it is with nations. When all is said and done, public opinion still is, and ever will be, the most potent force operating on this earth, and I believe this resolution would be of immense value in attracting favorable public opinion to America and the countries with which we are allied in this global war to rescue oppressed peoples and to insure the future security of civilization.

TWO WEAPONS WE CAN USE

I would like to stress what I conceive to be the usefulness of the resolution for propaganda purposes. We of the United Nations have two powerful weapons which we can use in winning this war:

First. The weapon of military might.

Second. The weapon of propaganda.

We are making effective use of the former weapon—the weapon of military might. The products of our war factories are on every front. Our men are giving a splendid accounting of themselves in every theater of war. Every day demonstrates in a thousand forms their steadfastness, courage, and heroism.

Of the latter weapon—the weapon of propaganda—we are making no adequate use at all, compared with the possibilities such a weapon really affords. The weapon of military might is limited by manpower, natural resources, and technological equipment. The weapon of propaganda is limited only by the validity of our cause and the range of our ingenuity. We are fighting the enemy with only one barrel when we make such restricted use of our propaganda opportunities.

When I speak of propaganda, I do not mean a propaganda of falsehood and deceit. I mean a propaganda of truth; I mean a propaganda of helpfulness; I mean a propaganda leading in the path which I hope all nations will finally follow, in the direction of a new world order that will recognize the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of America that our propaganda is a truthful propaganda. We may eliminate certain facts and play up other facts, but while enemy nations are showing no regard whatever for the truth, our policy, generally adhered to, is to put out only the truth, which helps to maintain the high character and respect in which America is held in the public esteem of the world.

CRYING NEED OF OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

The Office of War Information has a crying need for effective propaganda material to be used in cultivating an atmosphere of friendliness and good will among the subjugated peoples whose support we of the United Nations so much need in helping them to throw off the yokes of their tyrannical rulers. All available material of this nature is very welcome to the Office of War Information. In the Appropriations Committee room recently Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, gave our deficiencies subcommittee definite detailed information concerning the operations of the propaganda arm of our Government. He presented to us many samples of a great variety of leaflets which are being distributed by the millions—6,000,000 a week, to be exact—over enemy territory. Many of these are dropped from airplanes; some are actually shot in shells from guns. That these leaflets have had a tremendous softening effect is shown by the fact that many Italians and Nazis captured in north Africa and Sicily had copies of the leaflets on their person and admitted that they had been influenced by them to surrender.

We have the unsolicited word of a captured Italian general who threw up his hands and said:

I could do nothing to maintain the morale of my men when they were plastered with hundreds of your leaflets every day.

What made the leaflets so effective, he admitted, was that his men believed them.

PROPAGANDA'S PART IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

History records that propaganda had a vastly important part in winning the final victory for the Allied cause in the First World War. Eloquent testimony to this effect was given by General Ludendorff, who had this to say on the collapse of the German Army in 1918:

The Army was drenched with enemy propaganda publications. Their great danger to us was clearly recognized. The supreme command offered rewards for such as were handed over to us, but we could not prevent them from poisoning the hearts of our soldiers.

I am thinking how particularly helpful House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 might be in Italy if Congress puts its imprimatur on it and the Office of War Information scatters it all over the Italian Peninsula from the present combat line to Brenner Pass.

A message of this kind coming from America certainly would give hope and encouragement to the people of northern Italy and would have a revivifying and stimulating effect in strengthening their determination to drive every German out of their country, and that surely would be helpful to the United Nations war effort.

Coming from the Congress of the United States of America, the mightiest and most resourceful Nation on earth, whose only motive is to help mankind in opening the way to a better world, would not this resolution be a welcome message to the beleaguered Italians and inspire them to greater deeds?

"MORONIC OLD KING" BROADCAST

One thing this resolution would do, in my opinion, would be to wipe out, substantially at least, the damage that was unintentionally and unfortunately done by the "moronic old King" broadcast. While in the text before you there is no reference, direct or indirect, to that broadcast, the friendship that is radiated in the resolution for the real people of Italy would go far toward removing any evil effects that may have resulted from the broadcast. The people of Italy revere their King, and, in the interest of international cooperation as well as respect for Italian opinion, we could well approve this simple expedient of removing any unintentional reflection on the reigning head of the House of Savoy.

I am thinking, too, of the probable effect of this resolution, not only among the people of Italy and other peoples still groaning under the lashes of tyrants but also among the people at home. We have in America a large element that stems back into Italy. When we consider all of those that spring from Italian stock, and their friends, the number probably runs into millions. These are good, honest, hard-working, God-fearing citizens. Many of them during our war with Italy had their emotions torn between loyalty to America and the ties of family ancestry, which pressed and strained against their hearts. The adoption of the resolution I have introduced would bring comfort and solace to them and would contribute to a very considerable degree to our home morale.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

One other point I would like to mention and then I am through with this sketchy presentation. I am sure that it is most pleasing to our entire Nation to witness the renaissance of interest by the Congress of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. The people are hoping, almost praying, I think, that what Congress has done is only the beginning, and that it will continue to assert its responsibilities in that field in which

American destiny is so historically and vitally interwoven. The people of America are looking to their representatives to speak for them in matters of important foreign relations. The masterful leadership of Chairman BLOOM and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in reporting out and securing the passage of the Fulbright resolution was acclaimed from ocean to ocean. That resolution expressed the sentiment of America springing right up from the grass roots, and Congress is being honored no end for the statesmanship which gave expression to the popular mind. I believe that the adoption of my resolution would be similarly acclaimed, not that it is as important from the policy standpoint as the Fulbright resolution, but because it would be accepted as an honest, sincere statement by Congress along righteous lines. It would be notice to everybody, everywhere, that while we have put into the field the mightiest military force the world has ever known, we, as a nation, are not unmindful of the finer things of life, all of which, I think, will help to build up our cause in the public opinion of the world, which I am sure is very proper, very worth while.

Important as I believe this resolution to be for psychological warfare purposes, that is not my only reason for urging its favorable consideration. I am for its adoption because I believe it is the right thing to do in the fulfillment of America's obligation of leadership in these tragic and epochal times. We are in the midst of the greatest war of all history, and the world is being drenched in blood. It has been said that "a little touch of kindness makes the whole world kin." I will be hoping that the "little touch of kindness" which we will perform if we adopt this resolution, expressing in simple language our genuine friendship for the liberated people of Italy and the other unfortunate peoples who are still enduring Axis subjugation, will be helpful in creating a union of sympathy and effort so strong that it will shorten the conflict, save many lives, and in the final outcome contribute to the establishment of a new and better order that will compensate for the agonies through which the world is now passing and justify the supreme sacrifice of our precious dead.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES P. McGRANERY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] will assume new duties as assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Those of us who have been privileged to serve with Mr. McGRANERY and have been associated with him professionally and socially for many years regret the fact that he is leaving this body where his industry and ability contributed so much to our country during these most trying times. However, we feel that his strength of character, his ability, and his ardor will mean a great deal to the executive branch of our Government. I know he will be successful in his new undertaking and that his accomplishments will reflect more honor on an already distinguished career. I personally wish him Godspeed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of the House regrets very much the voluntary actions of our distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] in resigning from this body. With him into his new field of public activity go the best wishes of each and every Member of this body without regard to party.

It was my pleasure to be very closely associated with the gentleman from Pennsylvania during his period of service in this body. He is a man of strong character, of fine, manly feelings and intense friendships, whose loyalty to his party is appreciated and respected by everyone, but whose loyalty to the House without regard to party is just as strong.

A man of unusual capacity and of sound judgment, he was quickly recognized by the leadership of the House immediately after his election to this body and his rise in this body has been very rapid. After only a short period of service he was elected in the Democratic caucus as a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means, which, as we know, is the legislative committee dealing with taxation and tariff questions, and whose Democratic members in addition constitute the Democratic Committee on Committees.

As the days, weeks, and months have gone by, his prestige and his influence in this body increased. His leaving meets with keen regret on the part of his colleagues. We appreciate the fact that he feels he can render valuable service in this crisis to the executive branch of the Government, and we all know that he can and will do so.

During his period of service one of the most trying periods in the history of our country has taken place. In this period he has played his part in a courageous manner. He has always spoken and voted in support of those measures the passage of which, as we now look back, was absolutely essential for the defense and the best interests of our country.

I know I speak the sentiments of my colleagues when I say we are very sorry to see him leave us, but we all extend to him our warm, sincere, and friendly best wishes for the successful career that we know he will enjoy in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to join in honoring our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]. Today marks the formal close of his present congressional career, as he is assuming office as administrative assistant to the Attorney General. We who know him wish him well. He has, however, been appraised by those who perhaps know him better, namely, his neighbors of Philadelphia, and I deem it most appropriate to include in these remarks an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Record of September 30, 1943. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I be permitted to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

M'GRANERY—RIGHT MAN IN THE RIGHT POST

Attorney General Francis Biddle is to be given a strong right arm—Congressman JAMES P. McGRANERY, a fellow Philadelphian.

McGRANERY'S impending appointment as the Assistant to the Attorney General is splendid news.

President Roosevelt could hardly have made a better choice.

Aside from the candidate's merits, the appointment is welcome also as an answer to criticism that the President has displayed an increasing disposition to name conservatives to high posts.

A realistic liberal, Representative McGRANERY is one of the most potent New Deal leaders in the House.

While little given to oratory, McGRANERY, a member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, has demonstrated a tremendous capacity for thorough, constructive, legislative work.

He might have been tailored for the high Justice Department post—or it for him.

He will be the administrative officer in charge of agencies and bureaus employing 45,000 persons, among them the F. B. I., Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the War Frauds Division.

His experience in Congress since 1936 will stand him in good stead as chief liaison officer of the Department with the legislative bodies and other governmental departments and agencies. In his office proposed legislation will be examined, bills affecting the Department prepared. He will be the officer dealing with the Federal courts throughout the country, with all United States attorneys and marshals.

With McGRANERY'S appointment, Philadelphia lawyers (with a bow across the page to our own Philadelphia lawyer) are honored to the extent that attorneys of this city, for the first time in history, occupy the posts of Attorney General and the Assistant.

The high esteem in which McGRANERY is held by the administration and his fellow legislators in Congress has a counterpart, previous in point of time, in Philadelphia.

He was born here, enlisted here in the Army Air Service, and established a fine record as a pilot in the First World War. He worked here as an electrotyper, still carries his union card. He studied law at Temple, started practice here in 1924, was chairman of the registration commission.

Congressman McGRANERY is the right man for the high post to which he has been named.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, probably little can be added to the very splendid remarks of the chairman of the Democratic Pennsylvania delegation and the majority leader of the House, but as a native Philadelphian and as a neighbor of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] as one whose congressional district borders on the district which JIM McGRANERY has represented, I feel that I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without adding my words of praise for the splendid work he has done while he has been in Congress.

I have known Jim for many, many years, long before we came to Congress. He has been my warm personal friend. We are both graduates of the same university and I hold him in high esteem. I wish to say to the Members of this House that Philadelphians of all political faiths have a high regard for JIM McGRANERY. He is one of Philadelphia's noblest sons, sent forth into the arena of public life with an inspiration to devote himself with all the powers of his mind and heart and intellect to the service of his feliowman and he has earned himself a high place in the admiration and affection, in the esteem and regard of all who know him. Philadelphia is proud of Jim, proud of his accomplishments, proud of the great contribution which he has made to his country while a Member of the Congress, and all Philadelphians wish him success, happiness and contentment in his new duties as Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to what has been said here in the last few minutes. With my good friend from Philadelphia, Mr. MYERS, I pay tribute to JIM McGRANERY, not as a neighbor or a resident of any particular State but as a fellow American.

JIM McGRANERY and I came to the House at the same time from different parts of the country. He has been a source of inspiration to me. We have worked together on many problems for our party and for the country.

All I can say to you, JIM McGRANERY, is that in your leaving the House we are sending to the Department of Justice not only an able lawyer but a man who has served with distinction in this House and who knows the problems of the country. You are going to be a credit to that Department and a credit to the President of the United States.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as one who represents a district in the western part of the State from which our distinguished colleague [Mr. McGRANERY] comes, I cannot let the occasion pass without adding a few comments of my own regarding that distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McGRANERY has endeared himself to the people whom he represents in the city of Philadelphia. He has represented them truly and according to their wishes. He has been recognized in this House as a man of exceptional ability and talent, and possessing a very fine and winning personality which has endeared him to all of us.

Further, Mr. Speaker, he has now been recognized by one of the executive departments of our Government as a man possessing an unusual ability. They now call upon him to give them some of that ability which he has so ably displayed in this House. I therefore feel that the House should perhaps not regret his passing but feel that he will enter a wider field of endeavor and perhaps do more credit to his country than he has been able to do in the past. We all wish him well in his new sphere.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress 7 years ago, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JIM McGRANERY, was one of the first Members I became acquainted with. I learned to have a great admiration for him. I think he has one of the finest minds, one of the finest hearts, one of the finest characters of any man I have ever met in public life. I regret more than I can say to see men like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] leave this body. There was never a time in the history of this country when we needed such fine upstanding Americans as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] more than today. I wish to say, however, that the loss to the House will be the gain to the Department of Justice.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on another occasion I intend to address the House at length on the achievements of the sons of Pennsylvania. They have had a glorious record in the history of this country, and in restricting my remarks at this time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY] I feel that it will be recognized that the House has been honored by his integrity, his ability, his honesty, and his industry and character. I am sure that he will grace the position he will hold from tomorrow on with that other distinguished Pennsylvanian, the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who is about to be recognized by the Speaker under special order, will yield to me, I rise to express appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the others who have special orders, for permitting this eulogy to be paid to our distinguished colleague [Mr. McGRANERY]. I consider that a very gracious act on their part, and I want the RECORD to carry the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and others, have graciously stepped aside.

Mr. KEEFE. And I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I was honored and delighted, so far as I am concerned, to step aside and waive a portion of my time to permit the expressions of eulogy which have been paid to our colleague [Mr. McGRANERY].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter published in the New York Times today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for 30 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the Nation on the time of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., night before last, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made a violent political speech. This speech thoroughly disclosed the sinister political character of his arguments in favor of subsidies. In effect he charged that the members of the Republican Party were in a conspiracy to raise the cost of living to the consumer. In order that there may be no mistake, and so that I may not misquote the gentleman, I read from the transcript of the speech:

> If the bill, as proposed by the Republicans, is adopted, there is only one other alternative to letting food costs go up, and that is to let farm prices go down. I say to you farmers, if you bring your hogs to market and get only 8 cents a pound, blame the Republicans; if you bring your beef cattle to the auction pen and get only 9 cents for good steers, blame the Republicans; if milk goes down 50 cents a hundredweight or more, if your vegetable crops, your wheat, and other commodities are reduced in price, you can blame the Republican Party, which would, as I have said, gamble with the Nation's welfare in a reckless, shameful conspiracy to rise to power from the confusion and anarchy which would attend the abandonment of stabilization. Out of the chaos which follows inflation, these conspirators hope for the dissatisfaction which may lead to the election of a Republican President in 1944. For this purpose the Republican conspirators are willing to throw to the wolves of inflation the farmers of America, the laboring people of America, and the soldiers of America, along with their wives, their mothers, and their children, who must live upon a few dollars a month, while food prices and wages will soar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is here on the floor and as one member of the Republican Party, I want to denounce this speech in the strongest language that the rules of the House will permit. As one member of the Republican Party and on my responsibility as a Member of this great body, I say to the gentleman from Texas that I know of no such conspiracy. I have never

heard of such a conspiracy until he uttered those words, and such a contention on the part of the gentleman from Texas is, in my opinion, like most of his other arguments in favor of subsidies, taken from the thin air and made out of whole cloth. I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas whether or not he is of the opinion now as he sits in this Chamber, that a responsible group of a considerable number of Democrats on his side of the House are in opposition to the position which he takes on the subject of subsidies. Does the gentleman from Texas care to answer?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman want me to reply? I have 30 minutes after he and the gentleman from Michigan complete their addresses to the House, and I shall be very glad to reply at that time.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman care to reply now?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I will reply in my own time in my own way. The gentleman might cut me off.

Mr. KEEFE. I will not cut the gentleman off. But I will say, I just asked the gentleman that question out in the lobby a few moments ago, and the gentleman very frankly admitted in my presence and in the presence of several other Members of Congress that he was very well aware of the fact that he was in the minority in this body in his contention, and that a large number of Democrats on his side were not following him in his argument.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield now. I do not care to yield now. I gave the gentleman an opportunity. So I ask the gentleman this question: When you made the statement over the air the other night and denounced the Republicans of this country in the unbridled language which you used, why did you not include as members of that conspiracy the members of your own party that control the committee that reported this bill to the Congress? Why did you not denounce the gentleman who is a member of your party and who is the chairman of the committee that reported the bill that you denounced, and which you say results from a Republican conspiracy? Why did you not, in fairness and justice, include in your denouncement your fellow Democrats who denounce your position and have done so repeatedly, and who will vote for the Steagall bill? The unfairness of the attack made upon the Republicans of this country is too apparent for further comment, and the sinister political implications that are to be found in the constant arguments of the gentleman from Texas are too clear to need further exposition or explanation from me. I might just as well charge here, in the Well of the House, that the gentleman from Texas is engaged in a conspiracy to wreck and ruin the financial structure of our Nation. I make no such charge. The gentleman from Texas is entitled to hold and maintain and express his considered opinion on this subject or any other subject, and I will afford him every opportunity to give expression to his opinions, and defend his right to so express his opinion.

In my judgment, however, it ill becomes a Member of Congress, whether on the floor of this House or speaking over the radio to the Nation, to broadcast wholesale the charge that the Republicans of the Seventy-eighth Congress without exception are engaged in a conspiracy to take bread out of the mouths of the mothers and fathers and dependents of servicemen. I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the record will disclose that the sons of Republican Members of Congress are fighting on the battle fronts of this war alongside of the sons of Democratic Members of this House. I think it ill becomes anyone under those circumstances to preach in one breath the necessity for unity in the public interest and in the next breath make a statement to a Nation-wide audience that can have no purpose or effect except to spread disunity and dissension.

Mr. Speaker, we are advised that a wage increase has been granted to the United Mine Workers and that a contract entered into between the Government, as operator of the mines, and the employees, has been approved by the War Labor Board and the President. Immediately the Office of Price Administration at the insistence of Mr. Ickes, has suggested an increase of approximately 60 cents a ton to the consumers of anthracite coal and a variable increase in the price of bituminous coal. The newspapers quote Mr. Ickes as saying that the proposed increases to the consumer are not high enough.

As an illustration of the loose and unbridled character of the argument of the gentleman from Texas, may I direct your attention to a discussion which appears on page 9616 of the RECORD of yesterday, November 16. The gentleman who is now addressing you asked the gentleman from Texas this question during the progress of the discussion on the floor, when the gentleman from Texas was speaking:

> Does the gentleman contend that that prospective increase in the price of coal to the consumers is the result of a conspiracy on the part of the Republicans, or is it due to the bungling of the labor situation in this case and the handling of the whole labor problem, which has resulted in a wage increase that necessitates an increase in the price of coal?

The gentleman evaded an answer to this question, and those of you who were here or have read the RECORD will remember the long statement which he made, in which he said, in part, and I quote:

> You see, oftentimes we cannot see the forest for the trees and we cannot see the good things we are doing because of picking out some little, insignificant something. I will admit that is a violation of the stabilization agreement, and I hate to see it very much. There are a lot of things that happen that I do not like.

I again pressed the gentleman by repeating the question:

> Does the gentleman contend that the proposed increase in the cost of coal which is an element of inflation is due to a conspiracy on the part of the Republican Members of this Congress, as you charged in your speech last night?

The gentleman from Texas answered, and I quote:

> With reference to that particular thing, the Republicans were not responsible for it as such. But, in comparison with the harm that you are about to do, this will sink into insignificance.

Further on in his statement, the gentleman from Texas said:

> What is 60 cents a ton on coal compared with 9,000,000 boys in the war and a national debt of over $100,000,000,000?

There you have a typical example of the loose and flimsy character of most of the argument of the gentleman from Texas. He charged in the speech to a Nation-wide audience that the Republicans were in a conspiracy to raise the cost of living to the consumer. Then when his attention is directed to a specific case, involving a very substantial increase in the cost of living to the consumer, arising from the proposed increase in the price of coal, an article that is necessary for every home and every manufacturing plant in the country, the gentleman is forced to admit and concede, very grudgingly, that this increased cost to the consumer is in no way the result of any action on the part of the Republican minority in the Congress.

He attempts to belittle the proposed additional cost to the people of the country in the price of coal, and treats it as insignificant. If a 60-cent-per-ton increase in the price of anthracite coal is to be considered insignificant, I ask the gentleman from Texas, why is it then that he has spent hour after hour here on the floor of this House, crying out against the terribel dangers of inflation that might be involved in an increase of seven-eighths of one cent on a can of peaches or peas?

Well, what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. But it does not appear that in the argument on this subject of inflation that old adage holds true. The gentleman takes every argument he can lay his hands on to sustain his nebulous position.

After reading some of these speeches I am afraid that some of the figures used therein may be subject to a different interpretation than that placed upon them by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. The gentleman if he is fair will find—and I know that he means to be fair—that a large portion of the threatened increase in the cost of living to the consumer has arisen because of the failure of this administration to deal realistically with this subject of price control. Perhaps nothing further is necessary to be said upon the subject. I think Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., so effectively answered the gentleman from Texas last night that any further comment from me would be like an anticlimax. The attempt of the gentleman from Texas to make a political issue out of this grave economic question accompanied by his intolerant accusations against all

people who disagree with him has nullified in the minds of thinking people the effectiveness of his entire argument.

I say to the gentleman from Texas that the people back home who find it increasingly difficult to secure the necessities of life regardless of price take little stock in many of the arguments presented by the gentleman in his frenzied efforts to block the passage of the Steagall bill. What do I mean by that statement? Let us look at a few facts that I will now call to your attention. Let us for a moment examine the situation which exists in the cities of Fond du Lac and Oshkosh, Wis., 2 fine cities within my congressional district. Many cities of similar size not only in Wisconsin but in other parts of the country are similarly and likewise affected. These 2 cities of Fond du Lac and Oshkosh are located in the very heart of the great milk-producing area of this country. The people in these 2 cities are faced with a shortage of fluid milk. Think of it! Fond du Lac County, Wis., is not only one of the great milk-producing counties of this Nation, but Winnebago County, which is my home county, which lies next to it, also is one of the great milk-producing counties of the entire Nation and yet the people who live in the cities of Fond du Lac and Oshkosh, within these counties, cities of over 25,000 population, are faced with a threatened shortage of fluid milk. What has happened to bring about this threatened shortage? Let us think about it just a little bit in terms of realism.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Not right there.

Each city has its local distribution agencies. The milk supplied to these distribution agencies comes from farms and is delivered to the plants where it is processed and bottled for distribution to the consuming public. Many of these plants have been in existence for over 50 years, and regular channels have been established in the flow of milk from the farm into these distribution agencies. You must bear in mind that these distribution agencies or outlets do not own the cows from which the milk comes. A lot of people here in Washington do not seem to understand the simple fact that these distribution agencies must purchase this milk from farmers in a highly competitive market. The farmer very naturally will dispose of his milk to the agency offering the highest price.

What has happened? The O. P. A. has fixed the price of milk to the consumer in these communities. The retail price of milk that the distributors sell to the ultimate consumer determines the price that the distributor can pay to the farmer for his milk. That is clear, is it not? Under the O. P. A. price ceiling all retail milk in the cities of Oshkosh and Fond du Lac, Wis., in the heart of the milk-producing area of this Nation, are subject to a price ceiling which permits the payment of only 77 cents a pound for butterfat. These distributors that supply these communities therefore are prohibited from paying the farmer that produces the milk more than 77 cents a pound on a butterfat-content basis.

We now find that a new wrinkle has worked itself into this situation: The big distributors of fluid milk, the big monopolistic influences, the great big boys that you fellows on the right said you were going to drive out of the temple, these money changers, these monopolists that we heard talked about in 1932, 1933, and 1934, that you were not going to permit to survive, that you were going to drive out of existence, well, they seem not only to be thriving but they are expanding at a most alarming rate and multiplying their operations so that you can hardly count them. And what are they doing? They are the aggregations of wealth and capital. They are coming up into my district and all over the State of Wisconsin and they are buying little cheese factories and little creameries and paying the owners of these factories, in some cases, double a fair price for them. Why? I know of one factory that was purchased that was not worth to exceed $25,000, yet they paid $50,000 for it without batting an eye. Why, if you please? I will tell you why, and you ought to begin to think about this. The men who are crying out for milk and food, the people who are interested in getting food scattered on an equitable basis throughout this country should consider this. You will not be able to laugh it off with a lot of cries about conspiracy and Republicans. Oh, no; here is what they are doing. We find that the big distributors of fluid milk are picking up cheese factories and creameries strategically located in the milk-producing area, factories and creameries that used to produce cheese and butter; and these big monopolistic influences are now converting those factories into centers for the preparation and shipment of fluid milk, putting the cheese maker and the butter maker out of business. Is it not clear, therefore, that if these people can pay the farmer more for his milk than the local distributor is permitted to pay under O. P. A. ceilings the big boy will siphon off the flow of milk into his factories and the local distributor will be sitting with his plant and no milk to process?

What happens? We find that in the city of Fond du Lac yesterday the great Borden plant in that town was paying the farmers in that community for their milk on a butterfat base 89 cents a pound. John Jones, living here, takes his milk to the local distributor, getting 77 cents a pound, compelled by O. P. A. price ceiling. Bill Smith, next door, sells his milk to the monopoly, getting 89 cents a pound for the butterfat. What would you do if you were a farmer? Why, you would take your milk to the factory where you could get 89 cents a pound, of course.

What do they do with it? Is it not clear that these big companies are threatening to drain off the local milk supply of local distributors and that this attractive price would naturally cause the farmer who produces the milk to send his product to the factory that would pay this 12 cents per pound premium? You may well ask why it is that Borden and Kraft can pay 89 cents a pound for butterfat while the local distributors are held to a price of 77 cents. Oh, that is where this glorious O. P. A. and all the rest of these outfits that are dealing with this food distribution system come into play. That is where this outfit the gentleman from Texas is defending all the time comes into the picture. Let me see if I can make that plain. The answer should be perfectly obvious.

The big boys ship this milk into the various milkshed areas scattered throughout the country where the price of milk is controlled by milk marketing agreements and not by price ceilings of O. P. A. They can take this same milk out of my county or out of Fond du Lac County and ship it to Chicago, to Philadelphia, to Boston, perhaps even to Washington or to Atlanta, Ga., and get a price for that milk under the milk marketing agreement prices that will enable them to pay 89 cents a pound for butterfat as against the inflexible price put upon the local distributor by O. P. A. of 77 cents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, yesterday the gentleman from Michigan rather set a precedent in this regard. He said no one should take extra time if there were others who had special orders. If he wants to set a precedent, I invite this to his attention, but I shall not object myself. I shall be very glad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin because I want to answer him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding of the rule was, and if I am not correct I trust the Speaker will inform the House, that when there were other special orders, to save embarrassment to those who were to follow—I follow in this case and I shall not object on that account—the Chair ordinarily would not recognize a request for additional time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair always states that there are other special orders to follow, and then asks if there is objection. Both gentlemen who have time following the gentleman now addressing the House are on the floor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact several pertinent questions have been asked by the gentleman from Wisconsin of the gentleman from Texas, in all fairness I believe the House should hear the gentleman from Texas as soon as possible. I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I also want to call attention to the fact that these large operators, in addition to their ability to ship this fluid milk around the country to whichever market will gain them the best price, are also equipped, because of the large character of their business, to take and convert any excess

fluid milk that comes into their possession into manufactured products, ceilings on which permit payment to the farmers of a much higher price than the local distributors can pay for fluid milk under local O. P. A. ceiling regulations. The local distributors in the cities of Fond du Lac and Oshkosh, and I refer to those two because I am very familiar with the situation there, are faced with the threat of being driven out of business, and the citizens are faced with a definite shortage of fluid milk. They have petitioned the O. P. A. at Chicago for a review of their price structure in order that they might be able to compete in some measure with the great corporate interests, and be able to pay their farmers a price that will secure a supply of fluid milk for local consumption.

One petition was filed on August 12, 1943. Even though the situation locally was extremely critical, nothing has been heard from it since that time. Day before yesterday the petitioners of Fond du Lac were advised by the O. P. A. in Chicago that that office did not have jurisdiction, that the matter would have to be referred by the Chicago office with their recommendation to the Washington office of O. P. A. It now appears that their petition will have to be passed upon by the gentleman in charge of price fixing and in charge of dairy and poultry products down here in the office of O. P. A. I called the gentleman this morning, I think he is a fine gentleman from all I understand because he comes from down deep in Texas, and he advised me that he did not understand much about the situation because he had only been on the job about 2 weeks but that he would get busy and try to locate this petition and see if some action could not be taken on it.

He further advised me that even if his office did approve a flexible change in the local price structure of milk to enable these distributors to compete and stop this milk from going away from the communities there, and assure a supply of milk to the local citizens, it still could not be effective until it was approved by the War Food Administration. Then, after the War Food Administration had passed upon it, if we were successful in getting their approval, it would finally have to be submitted to Judge Vinson for his approval—this in the face of a critical emergency demanding at least 1 cent a quart increase in the price of milk to allow milk to flow in natural distribution channels to these people and to allow the distributors to remain in business. The businessmen and farmers must adopt the cumbersome ramifications of Government control and must explore all these bypasses that have charge of the milk distribution business. I assure you that it requires the application of constant pressure as a last step to enable these people to save their businesses and to assure the citizens of those communities an adequate supply of fluid milk.

I feel reasonably certain that, faced with the alternative of no milk or a small increase in the price accompanied by an assured supply, the citizens of Fond du Lac and Oshkosh will find no difficulty in registering their position.

May I say to the gentleman from Texas while we are on the subject, in his reply to me, does he consider the proposed increase of 1 cent a quart in the supply of milk in this particular area, and which is limited to this area alone, to be puny and insignificant, as he described the proposed increase in the price of coal? If he does not contend that the proposed increase in the price of coal is inflationary, I would like to have the gentleman explain how he figures that a proposed increase in the milk price to the consumer in those two communities could be considered inflationary. I am not contending that the price of 89 cents to the farmer is too high. I am not asking that this price be reduced. We are asking that the producers for the local markets be granted a price that will enable local distributors to meet this competition and assure to local people an adequate supply of fluid milk.

The whole supply and distribution of fluid milk is so involved with O. P. A. regulations, milk-marketing agreements, O. D. T. orders, and restraints and restrictions of all kinds, that the people in a great milk-producing area are threatened with disaster as far as their supply of fluid milk is concerned. It is sincerely to be hoped that the O. P. A., the War Food Administration, and the office of Judge Vinson will immediately explore this critical situation and give effective relief before it is too late.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman was talking about the diversion of this milk from the home market. Can the gentleman give us some idea of how the amount of milk distributed in the home market in Oshkosh or Fond du Lac compares with the amount distributed in 1940? Is diversion the only significant factor in the local shortage or is increased consumption one of the major causes?

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman understood the milk distribution situation, he would know that this milk of which I am speaking, which for over 50 years has flowed into these communities from surrounding farms to supply the local citizenry with fluid milk, would never go away to Philadelphia, or Baltimore, or Atlantic City, or Atlanta, Ga., were it not for the regulations which permit these monopolists to get such a high price for it in those far-off communities that they can afford to pay the farmers around Oshkosh and Fond du Lac more than they are permitted to be paid under the local O. P. A. price regulation. I may say further to the gentleman that increased demand is to be noted in the large cities referred to. It no doubt arises from the unusual concentration of war workers in these areas. I may say further, however, that Fond du Lac and Oshkosh are also crowded with war workers and these men and women are certainly entitled to an adequate supply of fluid milk. The reason they are threatened with restriction grows out of the unreasonable price differential heretofore referred to. We are simply asking that the local distributors be given a price increase sufficient to permit them to compete.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent that on Friday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FATHER FRANCIS J. HAAS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] each have special orders, but if there be no objection on their part, I shall put the gentlewoman's request. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at St. Andrew's Cathedral, in the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., a signal honor will be conferred on a man who has spent many years of his very active life here at the Nation's Capital.

As one who has had the privilege of knowing Monsignor Francis J. Haas, and his great contribution to humanity, I offer my public tribute to him today in anticipation of his consecration as bishop of Grand Rapids—a great American, a great churchman, a great scholar, a great teacher and one of the greatest champions of his fellow man. Bishop Haas will bring to his new responsibilities not only an unusual knowledge of church affairs, but added to that a comprehensive understanding of government in its relation to humanity.

He was born in Racine, Wis., educated at St. Francis Seminary, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., where he served as director of the national school of social service and later became dean of that school, which post he held until the present time.

Realizing that government was closely connected with human problems, Father Haas became greatly interested in serving the state as well as the church. In the depression of 10 years ago, he became actively interested in the recovery program and served on the advisory board of the National Recovery Administration. He was one of the original members of the National Labor Relations Board and served as a special conciliator for the Department of Labor since 1935, in which capacity he has participated in the settlement of more than 1,500 strikes. His tolerant, human attitude to the problems not only of labor, but of industry, endeared him to all with whom he came in contact during his many years of public service. His most recent public service was his appointment by the President as chairman of the President's Fair Employment Practices Commission which he resigned upon his appointment as Bishop of Grand Rapids by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

No words of mine can describe Monsignor Haas' great service as well as an

excerpt from the President's letter to him on accepting his resignation as chairman of the F. E. P. C. I quote:

> In all the posts of responsibility in which you have served your Government, you have shown a humanity and skill which both church and country greatly need in these difficult days.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much for yielding to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And, Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey that it is always a great pleasure to yield to her.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 15 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] if he intends to have printed in the RECORD tonight, so that it will be available tomorrow, the remarks that he made on Monday night over the radio, and which I was prevented from inserting in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman ask me a question and does he want me to answer it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not have asked the question if I did not want the gentleman to answer it.

Mr. PATMAN. I will state to the gentleman for his benefit and information that the speech referred to was turned over to the Government Printing Office, but not in time for insertion in the RECORD which appeared this morning, but I feel reasonably certain that it will be put in tonight, and I assure the gentleman I am just as anxious to have it appear in the RECORD as he seems to be able to read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I assure the gentleman that as a piece of fiction, as fallacious reasoning, it is a masterpiece, and I recommend it to everyone interested in nonfactual assertions, in illogical conclusions. I now apologize to the gentleman from Texas because I objected yesterday when he asked for an extension of time on a special order. It has been my understanding, and, indeed, I have definite recollection of a statement made by the then Presiding Officer that when a request is made for an extension of time by one having a special order, and other special orders are to follow, that the Chair would not recognize the gentleman speaking for a request of that kind, the point being that a refusal to put the request saves embarrassment to subsequent speakers. For instance, if one has a special order following mine, say that I have 10 minutes, and I then ask for 10 minutes more at the expiration of the first 10 minutes and others have orders to follow, naturally they do not want to object, and at the same time they do wish that I would quit., There was some foundation, at least I thought there was, for my statement yesterday of the understanding which I had of the proper procedure. If Members will look at page 9480 of the RECORD of Saturday, November 13, they will find where the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] asked for permission to speak for an additional 10 minutes. I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] was in the chair. In any event the Speaker pro tempore said:

> It is not customary for a Member to double his time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman put in the concluding remarks?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now. The gentleman was granted the time. The ruling, as I understand it, is made to save embarrassment to those who have subsequent special orders. I only make this statement because I feel now that in view of the ruling today that I owe the gentleman from Texas an apology, which I hereby make, and which he may extend at large in his own remarks, if he wishes, for the objection made by me yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended today to refer at length to the address of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] which was prevented from being inserted in the RECORD. But the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has quoted so extensively from it and answered it so completely that it seems to me further comment on that talk is unnecessary, except to call attention to one thing which the gentleman said, and which I put into the RECORD yesterday twice, and again today, which was this, that the gentleman from Texas made this statement:

> So, I say first to you housewives, if the price of ham goes up 10 cents a pound, thank the Republicans and their radio spokesmen, and so I say to you farmers, if you bring your hogs to market and only get 8 cents a pound, blame the Republicans.

Then when I made that statement from the floor of the House the gentleman from Texas—and it is on page 9619—made this statement:

> Will not the gentleman from Michigan read more of the talk that was made on last night? If by doing so he will discover that the only alternative to increased prices, without subsidies is lowering the price of the farmer. He was reading the other alternative. He did not read the explanation above it. I hope he reads it.

I will say to the gentleman that I did read it. I read it again after I returned to my office, and I could not get rid of the thought that having control of the Government, having control of the legislative branch, the judicial branch, the executive branch, I could not get rid of the thought that if there was something wrong somewhere, if somebody was racketeering, if someone was profiting, there was no one to blame except those who were in control—this administration.

That was the only point I was trying to make. If the price of meat from the hogpen to the frying pan goes up, as he said, too much, if 10 cents a pound is added; if the price to the farmer for the hog goes down, who is to blame except the gentlemen who are regulating prices, the O. P. A., and the champion of the O. P. A., the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]? It was to again bring that thought to the minds of the Members that today I repeated the statement; and then having had unanimous consent to speak out of order, having had unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and having been told yesterday by the gentleman from Texas that I did not give the correct impression to the Members of the House, when I quoted him, it was only then that I asked permission in my extension of remarks which I have been authorized to make, to include all of the gentleman's statement. Then the ruling was against me. Here is what occurred:

I said that last Monday night the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] among other things said, and so on, and I quoted him.

Then I said this:

> At that same time or a little later in the day the gentleman from Texas suggested I should read all of his speech, so in my extension of remarks today I am going to put all of his speech in so that it can be read in connection with the remarks I made yesterday and those I am making today.

I did not want anyone to believe for one moment I was misquoting the gentleman. I did not want anyone to believe, if I could avoid it, that my conclusion of the effect of his remarks was erroneous, so in fairness to everyone I just asked here, as anyone might do, that I might put in all that the gentleman said, so that everyone would know just what he did say and whether or not I was wrong in my conclusion.

> So in my extension of remarks today I am going to put in all of his speech so that it can be read in connection with the remarks I made yesterday and those I made today.
>
> The SPEAKER. The Chair has already held that the gentleman cannot do that.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.
>
> The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the Chair hold that in extending my remarks, when I refer to his speech, I cannot put the rest of it in and comment on it?
>
> The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair had held.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN. That amounts to censorship of speech by a Member.
>
> The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan understands the situation.

As I understand the rule, and I am only referring to this because I am trying, not to complete, but to add to my knowledge of the rules and my parliamentary education, I have always understood that when the accuracy of the conclusions of a man were challenged as to an utterance, he had the right to put in the whole statement. Who was right? Who was wrong? The answer can be found only in the record of what was said. Unless that is permitted, how can the truth be learned? Otherwise how can there be freedom of speech; how can there be freedom of expression unless remarks made on the floor under permission to revise and extend may be revised to include relevant material parts of the same talk which was being discussed. I am not asking these questions by way of criticism, because I had a remedy. I could have appealed from the ruling of the Chair. I did not do that. And I am only again repeating it so that

the Members of the House may understand the situation so they can be advised in the future as to what they may or may not say.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make this statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is not taken out of my time, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. No; it is not. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I regret that I was not advised, because I join with all the other Members of the House, in the greatest admiration for the present occupant of the Chair, and I say that sincerely. I only want to call attention to the fact that sometimes here on the floor even pertinent and relevant matters by way of explanation, at least once, were not permitted to go into the RECORD. I shall not, as I might, attempt to put anything more from the gentleman's radio talk in the RECORD in the revision which I have permission to make now than I have already said.

From a political standpoint, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for the speech he made the other night—purely from a political standpoint, because he has driven the Republicans together. He has made some of those who did not realize the situation understand just what we are up against. The membership will recall that more than a year ago, some 30-odd people were indicted for sedition. You will recall that in a publication entitled "The New Republic," some 96 Members of the House and Senate were charged with being subversive and with subversive activities, practically of being guilty of sedition. Not so very much attention was paid to that, and that viewpoint was repudiated by the people at the next election, overwhelmingly so. Yet there were those who thought that they might escape the same kind of smear if they just went along and kept still. I know Republicans who have never said a word against this administration from the floor; who have never criticized anything that has been done, and yet those Republicans must realize now since Monday night, when the spokesman, we might say, of the subsidy plan, the spokesman in this instance of the administration, charged all Republicans—all Republicans—with being in a conspiracy to lower prices to the producer and raise prices to the consumer. A conspiracy is the criminal planning and action of a group. That is what that charge means. The gentleman charged Republicans with being in a conspiracy, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, to increase the cost of living to the wives of our sons who are fighting in this war. A charge so foul, so false, it needs no denial.

I want to close with this admonition. Do not think for one moment, if you sit on this side of the aisle, that you will escape the smear carried on by the administration, by its agents, by its Communist allies, by its internationalist allies. Do not think that by keeping still and being good boys and good girls that you are going to escape it. To the gentleman from Texas I say there is just one thing for Republicans and Democrats who believe in our form of government to do, and that is to unite, shoulder to shoulder. Meet the remakers of America every day, when they advance one of the fallacious schemes, all tending to destroy constitutional government. Meet them shoulder to shoulder and let them know from the well of the House that we recognize what they are trying to do, and that we do not propose to be divided on our own side in our opposition to them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SUBSIDIES AND REPUBLICANS' INFLATION POLICY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts in connection therewith, and pertinent thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] said the Democrats have been in power 10 years and therefore we should be responsible for everything; and the Democrats should be responsible for everything in connection with the policies of the Government. But I think he should take into consideration that the Democrats found the Government and the country in very bad condition when they took it over in 1933. All the banks were closed. Not a bank in America was open. Bread lines were miles long. Homesteads were being foreclosed all over the Nation. There were from nine to twelve million people without jobs. The party in power had done absolutely nothing to try to remedy the situation. We have had so far to go since the Democrats took over.

Now, in connection with this radio speech—and I want to say now that if anything should happen that I am deprived of the privilege of the floor for the purpose of finishing this address—I am not anticipating it myself, but I know that sometimes people have differences of opinion and may use tactics to stop me—tomorrow I presume the Commodity Credit Corporation extension will be up for consideration, and at that time I understand we will have 8 hours' debate. We are supposed to have 4 hours on our side. So if we do not have the time we want today, we will certainly have it tomorrow or the next day.

With reference to that speech that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], kindly referred to, I desire to invite his attention to something that he did not read.

You know that Raymond Clapper was voted by his colleagues in the Washington press gallery as the fairest and best-informed columnist writing about national affairs. Mr. Clapper says somethings here that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] denies a part of; and I want to be perfectly fair and state that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] denies a part of it, but I am only doing it in connection with other remarks that I want to make.

Mr. Clapper said:

> The trouble is that large groups want to get rid of all Government controls. They want the lid off prices. They are fighting to end subsidies. But powerful political pressure has been created on Congress. The Republicans have joined in. Several Republicans on the Banking and Currency Committee were understood to have favored continuing subsidies but after having lunch with JOE MARTIN, they unanimously went against the administration. Take off price control, let everybody collect all the traffic will bear. That is the game about to be put over in Washington.

That is a quotation from Mr. Clapper. That is corroborated, all except the luncheon part of it. I am not going to have anything to do with that because the gentleman from Massachusetts says that he did not.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield gladly to the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to tell the gentleman, if he wants to be thoroughly accurate, that no effort was made by me to influence the vote of any member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I concede that, knowing the gentleman as I do; but did he make any appeal to the members as Republicans to all stick together?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Never a word.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman did not ask them to stick together?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Not at all.

Mr. PATMAN. There was no such suggestion or intimation?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Not at all.

Mr. PATMAN. In caucus, conference, private conversation, or otherwise?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Not at all, because I knew when that bill came up the sentiment would be overwhelming and there was no reason to speak about it.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman wields a very powerful influence even without the power of suggestion being used.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman's compliment to the Republicans being able to visualize things.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; it is certainly strange in view of my knowledge of this particular case, because I can visualize it. I think others in our committee will testify that that is the only time the Republicans ever voted together solidly; and that is what they did this time; and that was a very strange thing indeed. We all of course have differences of opinion, but the Republicans never all vote together in a block; a few Republicans vote with the Democrats and a few Democrats vote with the Republicans, but this time it was a solid Republican vote. You know that was an unusual, an

amazing thing in view of the fact that the power of suggestion was never used at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did the committee never vote solidly before?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it has voted solidly, but not on controversial questions. I do not believe Republicans have voted solidly, totally 100 percent on controversial questions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many Democrats voted for this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I think 4 did out of the 14.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many votes did they cast against the bill when it was brought out?

Mr. PATMAN. The issue was not on bringing the bill out, I may say to the gentleman, because the Commodity Credit Corporation extension is something that practically everyone favors and they are not going to vote against the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation because something happens to be in the bill that they do not like.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When the roll is called on this bill next Monday or Tuesday, how many Democrats does the gentleman believe will be for the legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know, and I doubt if the gentleman knows that. Much as he knows about the membership on his side of the aisle, I doubt if he is prepared to say exactly how many will vote for this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I should like to ask one more question of the gentleman. Do I understand that this measure has been made a party vote by the Democrats?

Mr. PATMAN. By the Democrats?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. No; the Republicans made it a party vote by all voting together; not only on this but on other issues involving price control and inflation; they all voted together.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I deny that. I think I know the Republican attitude fully as much as does the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I asked the gentleman about the Democrats.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no right to speak for the Democrats; I do not know how they will all vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman attempted to do it the other night.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I was speaking for myself.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then the gentleman has no right——

Mr. PATMAN. And the gentleman did not want time to reply to me; and I do not blame him at all, because he has got a good man to reply, and that is Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., who is the gentleman's spokesman. He did not need to ask to reply.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman admits he did not have any right to speak for the Democratic Party and I say he has no right to speak for the Republicans. He speaks, then, only for himself.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not speaking for the Republicans, but I want to say in commendation of the gentleman that in speaking for the Republicans he does a mighty fine job of it and he holds them together mighty well. He is to be commended for it. He held them together in this case whether it was by power of suggestion or otherwise. They stayed with him and did exactly what he wanted done.

I know there is a lot wrong with our country. There are lots of things wrong with it, but there are more things right about it. If Hitler and Tojo were sitting in these galleries day after day and they would hear our Commander in Chief abused, everything on earth said about him, everything said about the different agencies that were set up to regulate price control, keep down inflation, and everything else, and nothing ever said in commendation, just abuse, accused of everything, and they accuse our Commander in Chief of everything, although you never hear of Tojo and Hitler being abused very much, they probably would be very much pleased with what is going on. I do not say everyone is unpatriotic because he does not agree with me on political matters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield. I have yielded to the minority leader. I have been generous in the granting of time to the minority leader, and I would like to go ahead with my own speech.

Mr. Speaker, we should have more unity in this country, we should have more cooperation, and that radio speech Monday night was made deliberately based upon what I believed the facts to be to justify it. Many of you are lawyers. You know what it takes to prove conspiracy. It is one of the easiest known crimes in the statute books to prove. You can prove it by circumstantial evidence and evidence of acts that are committed can be used as evidence in the proof of the conspiracy.

Let me see what the evidence is in this case. Let us go back to the original O. P. A. Act. Then the Republicans were not so strong for the original act. Many of them voted against it. That was to fix the price line. The standard, the guide, was the average of prices as between October 1 and October 15, 1941. That did not work. We made an awful mistake by not going the whole way then, but we made a worse mistake by not doing it when we declared war on December 8, 1941. If we are going to talk about mistakes, we made a worse mistake when we failed to help China 5 or 6 years ago and when we failed to deny Japan the munitions of war that were sent to her; so we have made lots of mistakes. There is no use of talking about mistakes. Let us see where we are going from here.

After we made that mistake, then we came back and said, "We have got to have a different line to fix prices and wages on." The Congress passed the law, and I believe the distinguished minority leader voted for it, the act of October 2, 1942, which not only authorized but directed the President of the United States to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries and things that go into the cost of living as of September 15, 1942. This Congress, with the votes of the Members of the minority side, directed the President of the United States to hold that line. That is one time that the Congress issued a directive to the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman stated I voted for this original legislation and I admit that is the official record. The other day in a public meeting someone asked me a question from the audience if I was not ashamed of that vote. I replied, "No, I still think the vote was a good one, but I am ashamed of the administration of the law."

CHALLENGE

Mr. PATMAN. All right. The gentleman admits he voted for it. What part of the administration is the gentleman ashamed of? The President is trying to do what you told him to do. You said in that law that you authorized the President, not only that, but you directed him, to hold the line. The President has been trying to do it. It has been broken some, I admit. But by your vote you directed him to hold that line, and I challenge any Member of this House right now to get up and offer any plan or any suggestion or any proposal that will permit the President of the United States to hold that line as we directed him to do and not increase the cost of living and encourage production, without the use of subsidies. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows——

Mr. PATMAN. Answer the question. Does the gentleman have a plan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am going to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; the gentleman is not interrogating me.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has it held down the cost of living this last year?

Mr. PATMAN. There have been breaks in the line.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of how much?

Mr. PATMAN. There was the case of the coal miners the other day, the coal miners, 500,000, representing 1 percent of the working population of America. Are you going to let the country go to the dogs because you are mad about that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman challenged anyone here.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I challenge anyone to give us a plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then let me do it.

Mr. PATMAN. Any plan that will hold the line like we directed the President of the United States to do and encourage production without increasing the cost of

living, and do that except through the use of subsidies. Name your plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Go back to November 1940 and dig out of the pigeonhole where your new dealers shoved it the bill I offered to stabilize prices and wages.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To stabilize the price of wages as well as the price of merchandise. Your party would not do it because you had a bargain with the labor unions to get their votes.

Mr. PATMAN. Your answer is "I told you so."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, but you do not know enough to recognize it.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; but I am telling you that nearly all of the Republicans voted for that directive that directed the President of the United States to hold the line as of September 15, 1942. Now, your are condemning him because he has held the line.

Again I challenge any Member of this body to get up—and I will yield to him—who will offer any plan that will keep down the cost of living, encourage production, and not increase prices, without the use of subsidies. Can you name it? Of course you cannot.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman. Does he have a plan?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would not want the gentleman to yield sufficient time for me to answer on that particular question, but if the gentleman and the rest of the House will listen attentively during the debates on this bill——

Mr. PATMAN. I am not yielding for a speech, much as I like the gentleman. I do not want to take the time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman does not want the question answered; all right, but we will answer it in spite of him.

REPUBLICANS FOR INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. The President has said to the Congress, "If I am not doing the right thing, if subsidies should not be used, give me a plan." We have offered no plan. All we have offered is blowing the lid off of prices, wages, and salaries, and having runaway inflation. I say to you and to the distinguished minority leader, with all due respect, his votes, and almost solid votes, are convincing that they are in favor of inflation, that they want inflation. The votes indicate that. So after telling the President to hold the line, they give him no cooperation. Not only that, the O. P. A., the only agency that could hold the line, they want to cut down the appropriations for them to where they could not possibly do the job. They would not give them the money to do the job.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment.

Then the O. W. I., that is another vote. They were doing an excellent job teaching the people the evils of ruinous inflation and how to avoid it. This House with the solid vote of the Republicans—it could not have been put over otherwise—voted to cut out that part of O. W. I. That was an inflationary vote, that was a vote to promote inflation in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When I first came to Congress or, at least, some years afterward, I recall that the gentleman was quite an advocate of paying the bonus with inflationary money.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman asking a question? I am not yielding except for a question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What I should like to ask is, When did the gentleman join the anti-inflationary forces?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. You were opposed to putting out $2,000,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of paying it in inflationary money.

Mr. PATMAN. No; not printing press money, but now you are putting out printing press money by the billions of dollars a month, and the gentleman says not a word; he is not alarmed now. When it was desired to pay a just and honest debt to 3,500,000 men who bared their breasts to the enemy's bullets, and many of them shed their blood upon foreign soil; when it was desired to pay an honest and just and true debt to them with honest money, the gentleman said "No", that would ruin the country, $2,000,000,000. But now you put out billions of dollars a month, and there is no fear of inflation whatsoever. I cannot understand the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield so I may answer him?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly; I will be glad to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his transformation; his change of views.

Mr. PATMAN. Transformation? I have always been against inflation. I have always fought inflation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman made a statement that is incorrect. I was not against the soldier bonus bill. I voted for the Vinson bill, the bill of your great friend, Judge Vinson, who wanted to pay the bonus with honest money. The gentleman wanted to pay with inflationary money.

I should like to ask one more question.

Mr. PATMAN. With all due respect to the gentleman, he would like to divert my attention from what I wanted to say.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman in favor of an increase in the price of oil?

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman would like to divert my attention. Yes, I would like to see the price of oil increased.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would that be inflationary?

Mr. PATMAN. Not by itself; no. But I am not willing to break up price control to do it. I am not willing to do it by law, neither am I willing to fix the price of any other commodity by law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How are your oil producers going to get it, then?

TO RAISE PRICES BY LAW INFLATIONARY

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is trying to get me off on an argument about oil. Let me take my own time and use it in my own way. If the gentleman wants to ask me a question pertaining to what I am talking about, it will be all right.

The oil producers in this country will be better off and the country will be better off with that increase, but I am not willing to break up price control by passing a law to raise the wages of railroad workers, to raise the price of oil, to raise the price of milk, to make every price a political issue. It will result in a ruinous type of runaway inflation, and you all know it. That corroborates any statement that is made that the Republican Party has become an inflationary party, and we have the proof to back it up. Nothing is being done by them to stop the runaway inflation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. PATMAN. On that point, yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusettts. The gentleman said the Republican Party has become the inflationary party.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I admit that since last November 2 it has been the inflationary party. It is growing.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman wants to be facetious, but I think when the people find out the value of subsidies in holding down the cost of living and when they find out that the gentleman's party is trying to increase the cost of living on them to the point that it will practically crush out the middle class in our country, I think the people might have a different view. I believe they will. I do not believe the people of this country want to force an increase in the cost of living, and I have challenged the Members of this House to give me any other plan. They will not do it, they cannot do it. There is no alternative except subsidies, if you are going to keep down the cost of living, if you are going to increase production.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield right now, if the gentleman will pardon me. I want to get just a little bit onto what the gentleman said. I have not got to it yet.

Mr. KEEFE. I was in hopes the gentleman would.

REPUBLICAN CROP OF MILLIONAIRES IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. PATMAN. So the question of conspiracy is proven by the votes, voting together. Yes; a few Democrats voted with you, but it could not be put over unless you gentlemen voted solidly, and by voting solidly you can carry most any issue you want, and I again invite attention to the Ruml plan. For some reason, members of the Republican Party wanted to give the millionaires who made millions of dollars of profit out of the cost of this war, wanted to give back to them

some of their tax money. I cannot understand why, but you voted almost solidly to do it, with the Ruml plan, so as to make a new crop of war millionaires, although we have always said, and said in the last war, that if we ever had another war, we would not have any more war millionaires made out of it. You did vote that way.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

VOTE TO GIVE TAX MONEY BACK BUT REFUSE TO VOTE MORE TAXES

Mr. PATMAN. Not now. You did vote to make more millionaires by the Ruml plan. That is inflationary, and now you come along and you are against raising more taxes. The Treasury is trying to put over some taxes that will pay the war debt, as we go along, and we should do it, but you gentlemen in a bloc are opposing it, so when you are trying to give money back and you are refusing to pay taxes to pay the cost of the war, what other conclusion can you come to except that you are an inflationary party in favor of runaway inflation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. It might be pertinent to call attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that the day after the spokesman of the National Manufacturers' Association appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, 10 Republican members made a statement identically along the lines that he urged.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. Now, about taxes. This is a serious matter; it is not a facetious matter. Taxes must be raised. Talk about inflation. We are right on the edge of runaway inflation. If we do not do something to siphon off the excess purchasing of this money, we will have runaway inflation. We are not doing a thing about it. In the first place, if you pay a dollar now, that is equivalent to saving two or three dollars in the future, because if you have to borrow that dollar, and you pay interest on the dollar, the interest on a long-time bond, the history is that by the time you pay back the dollar on that bond, you will have to pay two or three times the amount of it in interest, in addition to the $1 that was borrowed. So that for every dollar we pay now, we save these returning soldier boys, if you please, the obligation of not only paying the $1, but of paying two or three times the amount of it in interest. Furthermore, whenever you siphon off this excess purchasing power, you are making inflation less likely. That is the reason that England and Canada do not have such difficult price-control problems. We are trying to eat our cake and keep it, too. We are letting our people keep their money, and going into the market in competition with one another, and bidding up the scarce and limited supply of goods and services. At the same time we want price control. They are almost inconsistent. England and Canada are paying more than half the cost of this war as they go. We are paying barely one-third, and since the Republicans voted together and forced that 75-percent Ruml plan, if you will take the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, and determine the taxes paid by the American people and compare them with the taxes paid by Canada and England, you will discover that the taxpayers in Canada and in England are paying 300 percent more for the 2 years combined. So how can you keep from calling your party an inflation party, if you are giving millions of dollars back to war contractors and making millionaires and forcing and compelling a group of millionaires in World War No. 2 and then refusing to levy taxes and siphon off this purchasing power, so as to pay a part of this war debt.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. You are talking about millionaires, and talking about subsidies. I can recall when we had planned scarcities.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question. I am not yielding for a speech.

Mr. GAVIN. I am not trying to make a speech, but merely to ask a question.

Mr. PATMAN. You are; I beg your pardon.

Mr. GAVIN. I am asking you, can you reconcile yourself to your planned security program when we were paying subsidies to the Nation's farmers for plowing under cotton or for not planting it? Do you want that kind of subsidy? We are paying taxes for that today.

Mr. PATMAN. I can answer that if you will give me time. I have a good answer for that.

Mr. GAVIN. You always have. You know all the questions and all the answers.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know all the questions and all the answers, but that is perfectly all right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas may be extended 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has not expired. He had ceased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

WHY SUBSIDIES PAID TO FARMERS

Mr. PATMAN. I will try to answer the gentlemen one at a time. I want to answer them all. I will do my best to do it. I am not sure that I can, but I will do my best. I think I have a good answer to his question. He is talking about subsidies to farmers. Do you know why a subsidy is paid to farmers? I will tell you.

Mr. GAVIN. Not to the farmers, but on cotton.

Mr. PATMAN. Cotton? He is a farmer, too. All right. The first general law that was passed by the American Congress in 1789—remember this, it is a part of history—was a tariff law, a subsidy law. Law No. 2 was to give owners of vessels an extra amount in cases where people in America used those vessels, subsidizing the merchant marine. The tariff is as old as the Government itself and is a subsidy that has cost the American consumers up to $4,000,000,000 a year. The farmer was at a great disadvantage. The farmer had to buy in a protected market and had to sell in the open markets of the entire world. The American Congress, 10 years ago, 144 years after the founding of this Republic, decided the farmers had been discriminated against. They decided they were discriminated against and they set aside money to remove part of that discrimination. In other words, a compensating offset for disadvantages forced upon them by laws of the American Congress. And Congress itself ever sets aside a part of the tariff duties that are collected every year in order to pay it to the farmers in the form of a subsidy.

Mr. GAVIN. That was a Democratic Congress, but you have a Republican Congress now.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, Republican Congresses have for over 100 years enforced a tariff, and, of course, they never refused to take it.

Mr. GAVIN. We did quite well by ourselves, too.

Mr. PATMAN. If the farmers get the benefit of it, or the poor, low-income consumers get the benefit of it, that is the only time that a subsidy becomes obnoxious.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say to the gentleman that I am not certain how I am going to vote on the subsidy. I would like to call attention to this one thing. At the time when we passed the law which authorized subsidies, if you want to call them that, to cotton growers, cotton was selling at 4½ cents and 5 cents a pound, and the processors' tax we passed, which was declared unconstitutional afterward, took the place of a domestic tariff for the benefit of producer and consumer alike. And it was knocked out.

IS A SUBSIDY A BRIBE?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I think that is a fair statement of the situation. Anyway, the point was to give farmers a compensating offset for disadvantages forced upon them by a law passed by the American Congress. It was a good law, and no one should oppose it. Of course, now some of the farmers are being misled; I mean some of the farm leaders are trying to mislead the farmers into believing they should not take a subsidy, it is a form of bribery. That is so ridiculous; whoever heard of that? I have never heard of anyone receiving a tariff benefit say it was a bribe. When we overrode the President's veto and forced low interest rates to the farmers, that was a direct subsidy. Nobody said that was bribery. When we gave the merchant marine and the inland waterways and the railroads all these huge, enormous subsidies, that was not bribery.

When we allow newspapers and magazines of this country benefits to the amount of $100,000,000 a year in low postage rates, that is not a subsidy. It is only if you are going to help the farmers and the low-income people who would be squeezed out by the high cost of living that the word "subsidy" becomes obnoxious.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes. I want to ask him a couple of questions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. PATMAN. I want to answer the gentleman right now and then I will yield to him. He said I made a political speech.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield just before he goes into that?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me make one point before I yield, and then I will be glad to yield.

The gentleman says I made a political speech on the radio. Well, if it was a political speech, it was because the speeches before me were political, by Fulton Lewis, who has become the spokesman for the Republican Party. How could I answer him without making a political speech? I have no apologies to offer for attempting, in my humble, feeble way, to answer him the very best way I could.

Now I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe in a protective tariff?

Mr. PATMAN. Now, that is evidence of what you fellows want to do. I know that is your policy. You cannot face this subsidy issue on the facts.

Mr. KEEFE. And you will not answer a question, either.

UNLEARN BEFORE YOU CAN TEACH

Mr. PATMAN. You cannot face this subsidy issue on the facts. You just want to confuse the people and get them off on something else, by talking about a 60-cents-a-ton increase in the price of coal and about bureaucrats and protective tariff. I do not blame you for doing that, because you cannot face the issue. That is why. If those Members of Congress had not committed themselves against subsidies, we would not have any trouble, but they were led to believe that subsidies were bad and a lot of them committed themselves against subsidies, and whenever a fellow does that, you have got to unlearn him before you can teach him anything, and that is an awfully hard job to do.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to discuss anything but subsidies, the O. P. A., and the administration. I do not care to take up the protective tariff, and I am not yielding for that purpose, I will state to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will not yield on that question.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not on that question.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield on another question?

Mr. PATMAN. About what I am talking about; yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman consider that the importation of sugar from Cuba at a price based upon the low wages paid, as he said yesterday, in that area, which exceeds the payment of a subsidy to the farmers, who produce sugar beets—does the gentleman consider that to be any different than the imposition of a protective tariff?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. That is the finest example that he cannot answer to save his life. He is supporting a bill here that will force us to pay the same price for foreign sugar——

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, answer the question.

Mr. PATMAN. I am answering it.

Mr. KEEFE. You have not answered a question. Not one today.

Mr. PATMAN. I will answer it in my own way.

Mr. KEEFE. You just ramble on and ramble on.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the best example of a case that the gentleman cannot possibly answer to save his life. You see the Republicans had to get together and conspire to force up the high cost of living and are going to destroy the sugar subsidy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I cannot yield in the middle of a statement. The gentleman cannot expect me to.

They are going to force up the price of sugar that is grown in foreign countries. In other words, our imports of sugar now are four-fifths of our consumption. This is a good example. Only one-fifth of the sugar we consume is produced here. Four-fifths of the sugar that is used in this country comes from those immense plantations which are owned mostly by New York banks, and they use the cheapest kind of peon labor in the production and marketing of their products. Here in America we do not have that situation and we have got to pay a little subsidy of a cent a pound.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the same as the protective tariff, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not yielding, Mr. Speaker. I hope the gentleman will respect the rules of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. My goodness!

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment. Yet the gentleman and his party would force us not only to pay that 1 cent a pound on the one-fifth of the sugar that is produced here in America but he would force us to pay it on the four-fifths that is owned by the big banks in New York. That is what he and the other Republicans want to do; in other words he would force the cost of living on sugar up much more than it is today along with other items.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Texas is making a very fine statement on the condition of the Nation.

Mr. PATMAN. I yielded for a question; I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that the Nation is not in very good condition. Will the gentleman tell us whose party has been in power for the last 10 years?

NO ONE ASKING FOR THE REPEAL OF THE NEW DEAL LAWS

Mr. PATMAN. We have a good party in power; it has done some mighty constructive things. I have not heard the gentleman suggest the repeal of any law that has been passed. Some of the gentlemen on that side of the aisle have been trying to block the enforcement of some of them but they have not introduced any bills asking for the repeal of any major laws that have been enacted in the last 10 years. If it were so bad it looks like you would be offering some bills to repeal those laws.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWABE. The gentleman was talking about a conspiracy of the Republican voters in this House; does he not include the Republican voters of New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky in the conspiracy?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not consider that much of a contribution to this particular argument.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has always been against monopolies. Why does he think he has a monopoly on all knowledge?

Mr. PATMAN. I am against monopoly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman claims to know everything. Why does the gentleman say the gentleman from Missouri knows nothing?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is helping the sugar monopoly that is the worst monopoly in the world. The gentleman wants to force us to take money out of the taxpayers' pockets and give it to the great sugar monopoly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The boys on that side are doing that. Why does the gentleman claim to have a monopoly of all knowledge and object to a question asked by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not; I do not claim a monopoly of knowledge on any subject. There are 8,000,000 articles and commodities on which prices are to be fixed, and I do not claim to know enough to fix the prices intelligently on a half dozen of them.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I would not care to yield any more right now. So the point is that we have got to have price control whether we like it or not. We would have run-away inflation without it. None of you have the courage of your convictions to offer to repeal price control. I never heard of it. Why do you not try to repeal it? Why try to break up the enforcement of the law by refusing to give the administrators of the law the money they need to enforce it? We have got to have it and you know it. We directed the President

of the United States to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, and you know it cannot possibly be done 100 percent; that is not possible. It is like relief; you cannot satisfactorily administer it. You know that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I just have not time, I may say to my friend from Ohio, to yield right now, but since the gentleman insists so vigorously I will yield to him briefly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the President had held the line on prices would subsidies be necessary at this time?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely necessary; yes, sir. You cannot hold the line without them, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If he had held the line——

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman has any plan I will yield to him to tell what it is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If he had held the line——

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, well, the gentleman has neither a plan nor a question.

The gentleman knows that the line cannot be held 100 percent; he knows that perfectly well, just as well as he knows that relief cannot be administered 100 percent. It is like justice. The inscription over the entrance to the Supreme Court does not read: "Exact justice under law," it reads "Equal justice under law." As long as you have equal justice under the law nobody can complain. Under any law there may be exceptional cases, but we should not try to condemn the Government because of that fact.

FAILING ON DOMESTIC FRONT

The general rule is all right. This war is going along all right. Where we are failing is on the domestic front by not properly dealing with and combating inflation. We can lose the war right here at home if we lose the war against inflation. Our sons can go to the 55 battle fronts of the world and spill their blood and save their country in time of war, yet right here in America in this Congress we can do as much to lose the war upon the battlefields by losing the war against inflation, and I want to appeal to you gentlemen to study this question and not work together just because you want to act as a party. Put your country first and let us save the country here on the home front as well as on the foreign front.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman I am not going to make a statement, I am going to ask him a question.

Mr. PATMAN. That is fine.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has indicated he is very much concerned about the disintegration of O. P. A. May I ask the gentleman if he ever offered any amendment to any of these bills to concentrate the control of prices and the production, processing, and distribution of food in the War Food Administration to the prejudice of the Price Control Administration?

Mr. PATMAN. I certainly did and at that time I thought it was the very thing to do, but if you will analyze it as I did you will find you cannot stop inflation unless you have one person to do it. If you leave it to the Transportation Division to fix prices on transportation, to the Rubber Director to fix it on rubber, to Mr. Ickes to fix it on oil and to the Food Administrator to fix it on dairy production, you will not have any control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up too much time. I just wanted a minute to finish a thought, but I will withdraw the request.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 17, 1943.

His Excellency, EDWARD MARTIN,
Governor of Pennsylvania,
Harrisburg, Pa.

SIR: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States in the Second District of Pennsylvania, to become effective midnight, November 17, 1943.

Very truly yours,
JAMES P. MCGRANERY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCANLON (at the request of Mr. WEISS), for an indefinite period, on account of injuries sustained in an automobile accident on November 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was called out of the Chamber this afternoon while the bill H. R. 3377 was before the House, and failed to record my vote in favor of this measure. I do favor this bill, H. R. 3377, as I indicated on yesterday in speaking of another bill, H. R. 3356, providing for increased payment to meet in part the rising cost of living for ex-service men. This increased cost cannot be denied and our obligation is positive. I am particularly favorable to the part of the bill considered today which rates total and permanent disability for those who have been rated as permanently disabled for a continuous period of 10 years or have reached age of 65, and raises their pay to $60 per month. This step is a little late, but better late than not at all.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, although I was unable to be present to record my vote on the bill, H. R. 3377, which was passed unanimously by the House today, I wish it to be noted that I am in favor of it, and would have voted for it if I had been able to be present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article and the report of a Senate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGRANERY] and his resignation as a Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the National Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Daily Calumet of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to him by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, together with enclosures in the letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Boston Post of last Sunday, written by Henry Gillen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the RECORD show that I was at the doctor's at the time the bill H. R. 3377 was under consideration in the House today. Had I been present, I would have been pleased to vote affirmatively on the passage of the bill.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1457. An act to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; and

S. J. Res. 59. A resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim armed services honor day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a .m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will begin public hearings on Friday, November 19, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

916. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its sixth consecutive annual report entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

917. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Violet Lena Pruett from the group of 237 cases involving suspension of deportation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

918. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision No. 1 of the estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for the office of the Secretary, requesting an increase of $1 per year employee; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

919. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 157 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

920. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 10, 1943. submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Bennetts Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 24, 1942; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 3682. A bill to rescind Limitation Order L-208 of the War Production Board, relating to the operation and maintenance of gold mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 3683. A bill to maintain on active duty, during the present war, officers of the Army of the United States who reach retirement age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3684. A bill providing for the issuance of appropriate insignia to rejected or deferred registrants for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting by members of the armed services of the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3685. A bill for the relief of H. Ward Eaton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMURRAY:

H. R. 3686. A bill to provide for the bestowal of the Silver Star decoration upon Carl W. Heiden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3589. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Peter Van Eyck, legislative committee, Ottawa County (Mich.) Farmers Union, Holland, Mich., opposing House bill 3477; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3590. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of Vera Corlew and others, with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3591. Also, petition of Maude P. Boynton and others, with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3592. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Boyce Eastin and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3593. Also, petition of Louis W. Fischer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3594. Also, petition of Ted Jones and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3595. Also, petition of R. C. Beck and 17 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3596. Also, petition of the Painters' Local, No. 137, and signed by 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3597. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of James S. Bghanna and other citizens of Bethany, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3598. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Erwin Hilke and 38 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3599. Also, petition of Frank Badstebner and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3600. Also, petition of Charles O. Eck and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3601. Also, petition of Harold M. Becker and 40 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3602. Also, petition of Milton J. Kiefer and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3603. Also, petition of August R. Effen and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting

against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3604. Also, petition of Henry W. Katz and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3605. Also, petition of Ralph Alsmeyer and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3606. Also, petition of James Cade and 39 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3607. Also, petition of Eugene H. Rush and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3608. Also, petition of N. W. Fitzgerald and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3609. Also, petition of Daniel J. Gleason and 39 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3610. By Mr. WARD JOHNSON: Petitions signed by 104 members of the First Christian Church of Long Beach, Calif., of which Dr. Homer A. Strong is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3611. Also, petition signed by Rev. Charles E. Venable, pastor of the Christian Church of Compton, Calif., and 139 members of the congregation, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3612. Also, petition signed by 176 members of the Methodist Church of Compton, Calif., of which Reverend Hooper is the pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3613. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Milford, Ind., and vicinity, favoring the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3614. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Nassau and Suffolk Counties, Long Island, N. Y., urging Federal prohibition of vivisection practices; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3615. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the Koolaupoko Lions Club, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to amendment of the Nationality Act of 1940, by removal of limitation as to ancestry; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all men, at noontide, amidst the clamor of busy cares, we seek a quiet cloister of the soul where spirit with spirit may meet. In this anguished day of the world's passion and pain we would purge and purify our own hearts as we face the high demands of the public good committed to our keeping. In righteous wrath we have lifted a sword bathed in heaven and have pledged our all to the destruction of a hideous system which conscripts the soul of the individual as a slave of the state, which pollutes the intellectual and moral springs from which it bids its young to drink and which seeks to poison the springs of our own democracy.

Fix our eyes this day not on what we vow before Thee to tear down but what, in Thy name and for the sake of all Thy children, we pledge to build up. Forgive us that it has taken the lurid glare of a global war, with its terror and horror, for us to recognize that all peoples must work out the common concerns of the world together or else go down together into the red burial of a final suicidal holocaust. O Thou strong Father of the nations, draw all Thy great family together with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace and justice, with equal worth and freedom to all, may come at last to a cleansed earth—the home of a holy brotherhood of peoples. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, November 16, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; and

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Samuel Margolin, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 248. An act for the relief of Louis Courcil;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 1133. An act for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 1984. An act for the relief of Paul Barrere;

H. R. 2005. An act for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2469. An act for the relief of Anna Charack;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Clara E. Clark;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3356. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law, 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act; and

H. R. 3377. An act to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim armed services honor day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

REASON FOR ABSENCE OF SENATOR REVERCOMB ON VOTES ON BANKHEAD BILL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, on two or three occasions while Senate bill 1457, the so-called Bankhead newspaper advertising bill, was before the Senate, on roll calls and yea-and-nay votes I announced the absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The Senator is so constant in his attendance and so faithful in his work, that I feel that I ought to add that he was absent because of a death in his family. It is that circumstance to which I had reference when I previously announced his necessary absence.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, following the passage the other day of the bill extending the terms of the President and the Vice President of the Philippines, President Quezon has written a letter stating, in general, his position in the matter, and Vice President Sergio Osmeña has broadcast a short message to the Filipino people as to his position in the matter, both in approval of the bill. I ask that these two communications be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and message were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1943.

The Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The joint resolution to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands which was unanimously passed by the Senate and by a big majority in the House has touched me deeply and has been a source of pride and gratification. I take it as a public recognition on the part of the representatives of the American people of my service to my country and to the United States in this hour so tragic for both peoples, and of my continued usefulness in the military struggle which lies before us.

Very sincerely yours,

MANUEL L. QUEZON.

VICE PRESIDENT SERGIO OSMEÑA'S MESSAGE TO ALL FILIPINOS IN THE PHILIPPINES AND ABROAD

My countrymen, a joint resolution was passed by Congress continuing President Quezon in office for the duration of the war. Under this resolution which has been approved by the President of the United States, my right to succeed to the presidency on November 15, 1943, has been postponed until constitutional processes shall have been restored in the Philippines.

Congress acted on this matter upon the request of the Philippine Government in exile and this action of the Philippine Government was taken on my own initiative. I owe it to my people who gave me their confidence in the last elections to state the reasons for my action.

If we were in normal times, my duty would be clear and simple: I would have to assume the presidency on the 15th of this month as a matter of right. But these are not normal times. Our country not only is at war, but also is occupied by the enemy.

Under these circumstances, our principal concern and primary consideration is to win the war, liberate our people from the invaders, and establish the independence of our country. The question naturally arises: What is the best thing to do in order to help accomplish these aims?

It is unnecessary for me to remind you that President Quezon was the head of our Government at the time of the outbreak of the war and that it was his lot to lead our people by the side of the United States. Faithfully and courageously, he has complied with his duty even with his health greatly impaired. His voice continues to encourage our people to resist the enemy and to keep faith with the United States. It was he who signed for us the declaration of the United Nations. Due to his efforts the Philippines has been given a seat in the Pacific War Council.

Moreover, those responsible for the prosecution of the war on the part of the United States have expressed to me their concern over the possible effect of the change of leadership at this time. They said that the enemy would take advantage of President Quezon's retirement from active leadership by telling the Filipinos that President Quezon had withdrawn from the fight and that he was no longer interested in this war. They added that the morale of the Filipinos still fighting the enemy in the mountains of Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao and receiving inspiration from him might weaken if President Quezon retired. Furthermore, they told me that in their opinion, based on recent information from the front, the unity of our people in general would be better maintained and secured with the retention of President Quezon in office since that would mean that both of us would continue working together.

The Presidential succession therefore ceased to be a domestic matter involving only our own interests and desires. Related, as it was, to the war, it became a matter that concerned not ourselves alone but also the United States.

With the redemption of our country uppermost in my mind and with the conviction that this objective cannot be achieved without the full support, much less without the leadership, of the United States, I prepared the letter which the Philippine Government approved and sent to Congress. In that letter, the matter of the Presidential succession was placed before Congress with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional Government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency.

Congress, after thorough consideration, passed the joint resolution providing for the continuance in office of President Quezon for the duration of the war. This resolution expresses the considered judgment of the American people. I accept it without reserve and I urge every Filipino, whether in the homeland, in continental United States, in Hawaii, or anywhere else, to accept this congressional action which is intended to safeguard the best interests of the two peoples.

As for me, I consider it my inescapable duty to continue giving to President Quezon's leadership my utmost support and cooperation so that the Commonwealth Government now in Washington may render the greatest service to the Philippines and the Filipinos. It is my desire to assist the Commonwealth Government in its endeavor to make every Filipino, wherever he may be, feel that he is close to his Government which is always solicitous of his interest and welfare.

Fellow countrymen, these are critical days for individuals as well as nations. Our sense of responsibility as a people and the strength of our national solidarity have once more been tested. We have again proved our unity. With this action, we have shown the world that when the freedom of our country and the validity of our commitments are at stake, there are no differences among us and selfish considerations carry no weight in our decisions.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 157 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

VIOLET LENA PRUETT (NEE LEFLER)

A letter from the Attorney General referring to his letter of May 1, 1943, and specifically to the case of Violet Lena Pruett (nee Lefler), and stating that new and additional evidence is now before the Attorney General which warrants reconsideration of the entire proceedings and requesting that the case in question be withdrawn from among those now before Congress; to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the office of the Secretary of Commerce for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Price Administration for the period ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

REPORTS ON THE ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of the sixth consecutive annual report, entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States," containing detailed financial and operating information on the Nation's major privately-owned electric utilities for the calendar year 1942, together with composite financial and operating statements of the companies for the years 1937–42, summarized in a special report of the

Commission entitled "The Financial Record of the Electric Utility Industry, 1937-42" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — FEDERAL OWNERSHIP OF REAL ESTATE (S. DOC. NO. 130)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee relating to Federal ownership of real estate, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I have submitted a report on the Federal ownership of real estate and ask that it be printed as a Senate document and also printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL LAND AND PROPERTY

TOTAL FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF LAND

Federal ownership of real estate in the United States will comprise over one-fifth of the entire land area of the country, if pending condemnations, purchases, and prospective acquisitions are consummated. This total of 384,519,556 acres is indicated by the following tabulation:

TABLE I.—*Total acreage of land owned by the Federal Government (including public domain, past acquisitions, and prospective acquisitions)*

	Acres
Total land owned by United States June 30, 1940 [1]	368,816,289
Acquired July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941 [2]	2,458,302
Acquired July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942 [2]	1,813,825
Acquired July 1, 1942, to Jan. 30, 1943 [2]	2,546,050
Pending condemnation [3]	6,291,269
Pending direct purchase [2]	424,798
Prospective acquisitions:	
War Department [3]	1,150,000
Navy Department [3]	100,000
Total	383,600,533

[1] Federal Works Agency computation.
[2] Department of Justice computation.
[3] Excludes estimated transfers.

This total of 383,600,533 acres owned or to be acquired by the Federal Government is equal in size to the combined area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Ohio, Alabama, Kentucky, and Indiana. It represents 20 percent of the entire area of the United States.

Of the total land acquired by the Federal Government up to June 30, 1940, 334,987,000 acres were in the public domain and 33,829,000 acres were acquired by purchase, condemnation proceedings, etc.

From July 1, 1940, to January 30, 1943, land acquisitions totaling 14,884,244 acres have been acquired or are in the process of condemnation or purchase. This represents a total of 23,256 square miles, a land area nearly equaling that of West Virginia.

LAND ACQUISITION BY AGENCY

By making use of all available data a complete survey of land acquisition by department and agency may be arrived at. The following tabulation may lack absolute completeness, as a comparison with table I will illustrate, but in general it may be stated that the figures shown below are the nearest approach to a complete record as is existent.

TABLE II.—*Land acquisition, by agency, to Jan. 30, 1943*

Establishment	Acres acquired prior to June 30, 1940 [1]	Acres acquired July 1, 1940–Jan. 30, 1943 [2]	Total acres acquired to Jan. 30, 1943	Cost of acreage acquired prior to June 30, 1940 [1]	Cost of acreage acquired, July 1, 1940–Jan. 30, 1943 [2]	Total cost of acreage acquired to Jan. 30, 1943
Department of Agriculture	158,956,034	3,796,574	162,752,608	$101,738,904	$14,278,198	$116,017,102
Department of Commerce	32,201	236	32,437	2,639,823	128,212	2,768,035
Department of the Interior	204,676,431	409,408	205,085,839	104,849,944	3,853,588	108,703,532
Department of Justice	25,575	180	25,756	1,998,610	24,660	2,023,270
Navy Department	499,961	98,527	598,488	25,674,927	17,646,734	43,321,661
Post Office Department	1,806	----------	1,806	139,988,647	----------	139,988,647
Department of State	35,432	17,522	52,954	553,917	31,882	585,799
Treasury Department	30,114	----------	30,114	4,874,830	----------	4,874,830
War Department	3,847,004	2,469,516	6,316,520	119,804,306	156,069,773	275,874,079
National Capital Housing Authority	150	----------	150	1,081,400	----------	1,081,400
Architect of the Capitol	206	----------	206	17,269,166	----------	17,269,166
Federal Communications Commission	61	477	538	1,451	59,470	60,921
Federal Reserve Board	5	----------	5	737,180	----------	737,180
Federal Security Agency	15,028	----------	15,028	3,999,840	----------	3,999,840
Federal Works Agency	3,980	20,237	24,217	83,140,441	2,005,240	85,145,681
Government Printing Office	5	----------	5	5,658,736	----------	5,658,736
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	1	----------	1	1,141,500	----------	1,141,500
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	39	200	239	20,000	500	20,500
Red Cross	4	----------	4	357,634	----------	357,634
Smithsonian Institution	199	----------	199	276,561	----------	276,561
Soldiers' Home	500	----------	500	326,193	----------	326,193
Tennessee Valley Authority	626,504	----------	626,504	61,168,451	----------	61,168,451
U. S. Maritime Commission	897	73	970	2,302,703	2,566,000	4,868,703
Veterans' Administration	64,151	2,340	66,491	11,919,067	147,140	12,066,207
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	----------	46	46	----------	425,842	425,842
National Housing Agency	----------	2,485	2,485	----------	1,114,677	1,114,677
District of Columbia	----------	356	356	----------	24,735	24,735
Total	368,816,289	6,818,177	375,634,466	[3] 691,524,231	198,376,651	889,900,882

[1] Federal Works Agency computations.
[2] Department of Justice computations.
[3] Does not include cost of public domain.

As of January 30, 1943, of the total land acquired by the Federal Government at least 205,085,839 acres have been acquired by the Department of the Interior. Some 162,752,608 acres have been acquired by the Department of Agriculture. These two Departments, as of January 30, controlled over 95 percent of all land owned by the Federal Government. Much of this land is in the public domain.

The War Department as of the above date controlled 6,316,520 acres. This amount will have been considerably augmented when present pending acquisition, including transfers, totaling 16,769,185 acres are cleared. At such time the War Department will then have acquired 23,085,705 acres, including transfers. The Navy Department has acquired 598,488 acres with a similar 799,198 acres pending acquisition. This will total 1,397,686 acres. The Tennessee Valley Authority, fifth largest Government landholder, has acquired 626,504 acres with none pending.

The cost of land acquired by the Federal Government as of January 30, 1943, was $889,900,882. This cost does not include the purchase of 334,987,431 acres of public domain, comprising five-sixths of all federally owned land. Nor does it include 8,762 parcels of land procured (such as city lots) which, from July 1, 1940, to January 30, 1943, cost $144,952,877, for a total land cost of $1,034,853,759 to January 30, 1943. (For a complete study of the parcel acquisitions in the Federal Government from June 30, 1940, to January 30, 1943, see appendix, table A.)

LAND ACQUISITION BY STATES

The table below indicates the Federal ownership of land in the various States as of June 30, 1940, as compiled by the Federal Works Agency. No more recent figures are at present available with the exception of the compilations found in the section entitled "Public Land Withdrawn in Connection With the National Emergency."

As of June 30, 1940, as noted below, more than 25 percent of the total federally owned land is in 11 Western States. Most of this was in the public domain. However, even at that time 33,829,000 acres acquired by purchase or condemnation were owned by the Federal Government. This total has been increased by 6,818,177 acres as of January 30, 1943, as indicated in table II.

TABLE III.—*Record of Federal real estate, by States*[1] *(as of June 30, 1940)*

State	Number of projects	Number of counties	Number of— Counties having Federal projects	Number of— Cities having Federal projects	Acreage of Federal real estate— Public domain	Acreage of Federal real estate— Otherwise acquired (purchase, condemnation, donation, etc.) Rural	Otherwise acquired Urban	Acreage of Federal real estate— Total	Acreage of State— Total	Acreage of State— Federal	Cost of Federal real estate— Land	Improvements	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
										Percent			
Alabama	370	67	66	73	44,516	884,253	1,771	930,540	32,818,560	2.84	$29,590,781	$142,168,947	$171,759,728
Arizona	189	14	14	16	30,585,679	356,432	46	30,942,157	72,838,400	42.48	1,476,241	131,387,502	132,863,743
Arkansas	227	75	72	59	1,123,215	1,390,690	1,231	2,515,136	33,616,000	7.48	6,248,533	32,109,381	38,357,914
California	800	58	58	150	39,946,071	1,004,885	8,538	40,959,494	99,617,280	41.12	28,342,167	319,956,791	348,298,958
Colorado	326	63	62	55	22,073,138	744,574	76	22,817,788	66,341,120	34.39	5,308,187	65,352,680	70,660,867
Connecticut	138	8	8	48		429	205	734	3,084,800	.02	3,524,035	18,127,635	21,651,670
Delaware	70	3	3	14		27,137	9	27,146	1,257,600	2.16	3,620,136	15,158,466	18,778,602
District of Columbia	972			1			11,146	11,146	44,320	25.15	101,461,058	436,784,457	538,245,515
Florida	315	67	66	55	216,609	1,556,135	1,549	1,774,293	35,111,040	5.05	6,123,571	67,888,603	74,012,174
Georgia	317	159	121	95		1,160,350	537	1,160,887	37,584,000	3.09	12,947,934	64,075,274	77,023,208
Idaho	299	44	44	46	31,307,132	1,099,084	822	32,407,038	53,346,560	60.75	4,130,881	56,327,525	60,458,406
Illinois	415	102	97	181		288,406	3,395	291,801	35,867,520	.81	22,694,632	191,140,873	213,835,505
Indiana	229	92	88	108		62,901	355	63,256	23,068,800	.27	5,190,977	39,465,424	44,656,401
Iowa	189	99	90	103		58,121	848	58,969	35,575,040	.17	4,321,557	29,772,352	34,093,909
Kansas	143	105	71	70	25,618	69,046	98	94,762	52,335,360	.18	1,740,674	40,468,927	42,209,601
Kentucky	226	120	95	75		583,545	1,118	584,663	25,715,840	2.27	10,149,324	55,957,078	66,106,402
Louisiana	227	64	56	52	14,566	1,037,738	473	1,052,777	29,061,760	3.62	13,860,495	115,643,948	129,504,443
Maine	220	16	16	66		98,432	1,062	99,494	19,132,800	.52	2,624,853	34,136,019	36,760,872
Maryland	143	24	22	30		124,107	711	124,818	6,362,240	1.96	13,349,269	135,578,180	148,927,449
Massachusetts	281	14	14	108		13,106	2,513	15,619	5,144,960	.03	31,190,233	135,859,379	167,049,612
Michigan	470	83	81	115	122,185	2,169,728	774	2,292,687	36,787,200	.62	13,985,698	68,447,626	82,433,324
Minnesota	246	87	70	79	1,431,377	1,670,143	1,985	3,103,505	51,749,120	6.00	9,975,193	43,901,154	53,876,347
Mississippi	321	82	79	76	9,671	1,234,250	904	1,244,825	29,671,680	4.20	8,906,477	29,373,802	38,280,279
Missouri	289	114	96	93		1,351,233	385	1,351,618	43,985,280	3.07	19,539,941	63,914,048	83,453,980
Montana	381	56	56	35	24,927,361	1,760,697	53	26,688,111	93,523,840	28.54	7,040,929	119,395,653	126,436,582
Nebraska	148	93	68	48	259,216	197,827	182	457,225	49,157,120	.93	2,782,747	22,178,813	24,961,560
Nevada	158	17	17	13	54,960,302	119,685	28	55,080,015	70,285,440	78.37	948,179	72,998,687	73,946,866
New Hampshire	56	10	10	27		668,233	69	668,302	5,779,840	11.56	6,111,857	5,941,514	12,053,371
New Jersey	270	21	20	100		26,693	604	27,297	4,808,960	.57	11,237,652	84,003,663	95,241,315
New Mexico	231	31	31	17	24,970,692	1,388,399	35	26,359,126	78,401,920	33.62	3,191,170	53,493,280	56,684,450
New York	638	62	61	198		87,240	5,435	92,675	30,498,560	.30	80,110,844	302,549,301	382,660,145
North Carolina	275	100	89	89		1,469,302	366	1,469,668	31,193,600	4.71	19,380,121	62,919,283	82,299,404
North Dakota	179	53	48	30	194,564	769,119	304	963,987	44,917,120	2.15	4,287,716	9,202,109	13,489,825
Ohio	393	88	88	160		91,463	1,199	92,662	26,073,600	.36	18,206,648	109,971,645	128,178,293
Oklahoma	239	77	73	69	171,240	245,850	136	417,226	44,424,960	.94	4,661,057	32,086,011	36,747,068
Oregon	384	36	36	44	26,629,080	795,965	168	27,425,213	61,188,480	44.82	7,649,130	113,811,909	121,461,039
Pennsylvania	429	67	63	208		520,075	2,406	522,481	28,692,480	1.82	27,790,998	153,833,611	181,624,609
Rhode Island	69	5	5	16		10,639	56	10,095	682,880	1.48	2,245,034	18,324,540	20,569,574
South Carolina	177	46	44	46		719,069	98	719,167	19,516,800	3.68	6,835,336	37,214,166	44,049,502
South Dakota	127	69	53	29	1,762,786	545,728	20	2,308,534	49,195,520	4.69	3,127,759	18,710,580	21,838,339
Tennessee	468	95	92	120		1,095,131	2,814	1,097,945	26,679,680	4.12	43,838,607	164,245,991	208,084,598
Texas	514	254	167	171		910,416	3,495	913,911	167,934,720	.54	15,528,953	116,292,830	131,821,783
Utah	249	29	29	30	35,565,121	200,123	120	35,765,364	52,597,760	68.00	2,443,281	33,808,811	36,252,092
Vermont	73	14	12	28		168,671	33	168,704	5,839,360	2.89	2,245,826	7,673,317	9,919,143
Virginia	366	100	85	72		1,612,365	2,762	1,615,127	25,767,680	6.27	34,770,505	209,180,370	243,950,875
Washington	418	39	39	67	10,413,076	669,324	3,469	11,085,869	42,775,040	25.92	8,627,433	163,999,367	172,626,800
West Virginia	152	55	45	63		905,223	556	905,779	15,374,080	5.89	7,337,234	63,159,033	70,496,267
Wisconsin	320	71	67	105	14,960	1,479,518	2,581	1,497,059	35,363,840	4.23	9,060,711	46,775,683	55,836,394
Wyoming	202	23	23	35	28,219,256	319,226	1,112	28,539,594	62,430,720	45.71	1,761,657	55,005,491	56,767,148
Total	14,338	3,071			334,987,431	33,760,106	68,752	368,816,289	1,903,221,280	19.38	[2]691,524,231	[2]4,409,771,729	[2]5,101,295,960

[1] Federal Works Agency computations.

[2] Does not include cost of public domain.

LAND ACQUISITION BY FUNCTION

The following computations, compiled by the Federal Works Agency, show that as of June 30, 1940, most of the Federal land was in use for forest conservation, grazing, control of public lands, and national parks. Comparatively high costs are noted for that land in use for postal services, flood control, national defense, land reclamation, and forest conservation. These costs, it must be borne in mind, include the purchase of land and consequent improvements, but do not include the original cost of public domain.

TABLE IV.—*Land acquisition by function as of June 30, 1940*[1]

Agency	Use of real estate	Cost	Acres
1. Forest Service	Conservation of forests	$330,890,702	154,817,243
2. Grazing Service	Grazing	4,078,970	138,712,582
3. General Land Office	Control of public lands		44,667,839
4. National Park Service	Conservation of scenic resources	134,718,301	14,087,831
5. Fish and Wildlife Service	Conservation of fish and bird life	31,899,652	4,243,466
6. Soil Conservation Service	Conservation of soil	54,704,419	3,443,211
7. Quartermaster Corps	National defense	693,366,895	2,116,862
8. Corps of Engineers	Flood control and water commerce	624,980,993	1,730,142
9. Bureau of Reclamation	Land reclamation	477,405,271	1,650,582
10. Indian Affairs	Care of Indians	27,160,137	1,288,177
11. Tennessee Valley Authority	River control and power development	309,197,640	626,504
12. Farm Security Administration	Rural resettlement	115,426,851	568,107
13. Yards and Docks	National defense	513,741,255	499,961
14. Animal Industry	Experiments and tests	2,001,761	105,909
15. Veterans' Administration	Care of veterans	207,483,758	64,151
16. Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico	River control	11,600,667	35,432
17. Civil Aeronautics Board	Air commerce	7,135,613	31,117
18. Coast Guard	Protection of water commerce	43,209,026	29,962
19. Prisons	Care of prisoners	41,070,901	25,516
20. Public Health Service	Protection of public health	45,569,115	14,925
21. National Capital Parks	Conservation of scenic resources	63,442,721	12,679
22. Mines	Experiments and tests	3,312,878	12,410
23. Plant Industry	do	3,938,276	10,536
24. Office of the Secretary of Agriculture	do	9,993,564	10,223

[1] Federal Works Agency computations.

TABLE IV.—*Land acquisition by function as of June 30, 1940*—Continued

Agency	Use of real estate	Cost	Acres
25. Post Office	Postal Service	$638, 816, 802	1, 806
26. Surplus property (Public Building)	Surplus property	20, 169, 995	1, 369
27. Public Works Administration:	Prison	1, 429, 128	970
28. U. S. Housing Authority	Housing	126, 292, 091	933
29. U. S. Maritime Commission	Water commerce	51, 015, 926	897
30. St. Elizabeths Hospital	Care of the insane	9, 630, 220	820
31. Dairy Industry	Experiments and tests	117, 125	640
32. Public Buildings Administration	Miscellaneous buildings	298, 355, 636	567
33. Inland Waterways Corporation	Water commerce	2, 382, 365	535
34. U. S. Soldiers' Home	Care of veterans	5, 801, 178	503
35. Standards	Experiments and tests	4, 297, 719	254
36. Architect of the Capitol	Enactment of legislation	94, 244, 335	206
37. Smithsonian Institution	Education and recreation	9, 043, 741	199
38. Coast and Geodetic Survey	Surveys and maps	35, 600	178
39. Alley Dwelling Authority	Housing	3, 723, 884	159
40. Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering	Experiments and tests	8, 678, 862	179
41. Mint	Production of money	9, 792, 660	124
42. Weather Bureau	Weather forecasts	927, 197	117
43. Public Roads Administration	Highway commerce	2, 615, 796	111
44. Columbia Institution for the Deaf	Care of the deaf	846, 500	103
45. Federal Communications Commission	Communication by wire and air	65, 780	61
46. Immigration and Naturalization	Care of aliens	8, 568, 502	60
47. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	Experiments and tests	7, 870, 000	39
48. Geological Survey	Surveys and maps	171, 065	25
49. U. S. Housing Corporation	Housing		24
50. Customs	Collection of revenue	121, 277	12
51. Engraving and Printing	Production of money	8, 988, 692	12
52. Freedmen's Hospital	Care of the sick	1, 975, 162	11
53. Federal Reserve Board	Administration of Federal affairs	4, 539, 041	5
54. Entomology and Plant Quarantine	Experiments and tests	614, 992	6
55. Government Printing Office	Printed matter	11, 948, 736	5
56. Procurement	Administration of Federal affairs	653, 843	4
57. Red Cross	Care of the distressed	2, 527, 668	4
58. Home Owners' Loan Corporation	Administration of Federal affairs	2, 700, 878	1
59. Boundary Commission, United States and Canada	Boundary markers	104, 198	
Total		5, 101, 295, 960	308, 816, 289

LAND ACQUISITION AND PROPOSED PURCHASE BY AGENCY

Considerable land is in the process of condemnation with some pending direct purchase. As of January 31, 1943, the total amounts follow:

TABLE V.—*Total acres pending condemnation and direct purchase as of Jan. 31, 1943* [1]

Department or agency	Acres pending condemnation	Acres pending direct purchase	Total acres
Department of Agriculture	200, 728. 62	327, 804. 30	528, 532. 92
District of Columbia	35. 11		35. 11
National Housing Agency	23, 897. 65		23, 897. 65
Department of the Interior	118, 239. 78	39, 486. 00	157, 725. 78
U. S. Maritime Commission	932. 41	2. 67	935. 08
Navy Department	787, 609. 61	11, 588. 98	799, 198. 59
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5, 659. 56		5, 659. 56
Department of State	282. 39	4. 67	287. 06
Treasury Department	33. 09		33. 09
War Department	16, 203, 041. 38	566, 143. 73	16, 769, 185. 11
War Shipping Board	126. 00		126. 00
Department of Justice		85. 00	85. 00
Veterans' Administration		557. 61	557. 61
Department of Commerce	13. 29	34. 74	48. 03
Federal Works Agency	19, 638. 813	764. 61	20, 403. 423
Total	17, 360, 237. 703	946, 472. 31	18, 306, 710. 013

[1] Based on Department of Justice computations.

Of these 18,000,000 acres approximately 10,500,000 acres have been in the public domain. Almost all of this land is desired by the War Department, with the Navy Department and a few other agencies seeking a minor portion.

Somewhat similar material has been compiled by the Bureau of the Budget. Including both present acquisitions and proposed purchases, the tabulation indicates that the War Department expects to acquire by far the most land, with the Navy Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation following in the order named.

TABLE VI.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations), by agency, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944* [1]

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Department or establishment	Purchases Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943		Proposed purchases July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost
Department of Agriculture:						
Farm Security Administration	97, 284	$316, 000	39, 025	$313, 000	4, 000	$80, 000
Forest Service	309, 205	1, 367, 000	143, 447	504, 000	88, 683	295, 000
Bureau of Plant Industry	27	6, 000				
Special research fund	1, 521	10, 000				
Soil Conservation Service, submarginal agricultural lands	277, 297	1, 185, 000				
Total, Department of Agriculture	685, 334	2, 884, 000	182, 472	817, 000	92, 683	375, 000
Department of Commerce: Civil Aeronautics Administration	10	(2)	45	5, 000		

[1] Bureau of the Budget computation.
[2] Less than $500.

TABLE VI.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations), by agency, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944*—Con.

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Department or establishment	Purchases Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943		Proposed purchases July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost
Department of the Interior:						
Bonneville Power Administration	490	$110,000	56	$34,000	63	$12,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs:						
Tribal funds	63,960	354,000	9,145	95,000	103,569	506,000
Other	50,406	393,000	16,037	129,000	35,951	271,000
Bureau of Reclamation	24,358	677,000	31,825	1,243,000	33,137	1,091,000
Bureau of Mines	4,011	5,000	6,193	25,000	61	31,000
National Park Service	3,801	169,000	4,392	261,000		
Fish and Wildlife Service	22,338	183,000	33,007	93,000	37,033	186,000
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration	406	7,000				
Total, Department of the Interior	169,770	1,898,000	100,655	1,880,000	209,814	2,097,000
Department of Justice: Bureau of Prisons	80	1,000				
Navy Department:						
Bureau of Yards and Docks	592,756	[3] 63,883,000	296,230	[3] 25,130,000		
Coast Guard	62	[3] 2,554,000	80	3,000		
Total, Navy Department	592,818	66,437,000	296,310	25,133,000		
Department of State: International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico	1,228	29,000			74	5,000
War Department: Real Estate Branch for War Department	3,064,663	164,618,000	767,972	41,844,000	323,220	43,567,000
District of Columbia	7	98,000	16	144,000		
The Alley Dwelling Authority	473	713,000				
Federal Communications Commission	140	14,000	[4] 30	[4] 6,000		
Federal Works Agency:						
Office of Administrator	621	754,000				
Public Roads Administration	624	3,593,000				
Total, Federal Works Agency	1,245	4,347,000				
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	76	759,000	1,161	998,000	287	346,000
National Housing Agency: Federal Public Housing Authority	25,860	11,154,000	5,486	2,443,000	[5] 6,948	[5] 3,282,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:						
Defense Plant Corporation	73,921	[3] 49,063,000	7,701	[3] 13,516,000		
Metals Reserve Company	243	7,000				
RFC Mortgage Company	1	209,000				
Total, Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries	74,165	49,279,000	7,701	13,516,000		
Tennessee Valley Authority	[1] 34,993	15,207,000	90,148	4,916,000	90,544	3,722,000
U.S. Maritime Commission	1,507	5,665,000	[6] 1,189	948,000		
U.S. Veterans' Administration			557	116,000		
War Shipping Administration	290	4,325,000	17	103,000		
Total	4,752,659	327,428,000	1,453,759	92,869,000	723,570	53,394,000

[1] Includes improvements in cases where land improvements were purchased as a unit.
[4] This purchase depends on authority now pending in Congress.
[5] Estimates are only to Dec. 31, 1943.
[6] Includes 827 acres the cost of which is undeterminable at this time due to incomplete detailed reports.

LAND ACQUISITION AND PROPOSED PURCHASE BY STATES

According to Bureau of the Budget figures, much of this acquisition has been and will be found in the States of Texas, California, South Dakota, Florida, Oklahoma, Idaho, Tennessee, New Mexico, Colorado, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Oregon. The list follows:

TABLE VII.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations), by State, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944* [1]

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Location	Purchases Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943		Proposed purchases July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost
Alabama	73,147	$4,796,000	[2] 10,354	$548,000	6,702	$153,000
Arizona	57,338	483,000	10,102	104,000	9,559	144,000
Arkansas	118,952	4,517,000	48,386	847,000	19,100	355,000
California	489,588	33,980,000	[2] 34,197	9,666,000	17,673	979,000
Colorado	130,316	3,449,000	4,412	255,000	14,514	318,000
Connecticut	2,084	7,269,000	153	141,000	90	61,000
Delaware	2,731	343,000	260	80,000	80	32,000
District of Columbia	182	1,888,000	64	406,000	49	216,000
Florida	279,283	8,056,000	20,071	286,000	9,181	29,000
Georgia	154,112	7,934,000	27,857	108,000	7,144	28,000
Idaho	91,027	510,000	175,009	128,000	10,095	159,000
Illinois	41,682	11,725,000	2,151	1,519,000	1,346	98,000
Indiana	111,286	12,140,000	8,393	699,000	5,654	74,000
Iowa	12,588	1,125,000	1,784	190,000	1,200	58,000
Kansas	102,866	7,453,000	5,053	348,000	457	41,000
Kentucky	56,002	5,234,000	46,950	2,201,000	36,466	1,722,000
Louisiana	169,752	4,334,000	66,367	520,000	3,260	174,000
Maine	7,652	1,535,000	2,571	540,000	72	17,000
Maryland	16,095	5,289,000	3,193	2,336,000	450	203,000
Massachusetts	10,936	5,291,000	3,346	1,009,000	2,182	39,000
Michigan	39,599	6,249,000	10,951	3,001,000	16,495	122,000
Minnesota	26,725	254,000	13,991	539,000	38,641	585,000
Mississippi	171,268	5,521,000	25,638	594,000	5,196	95,000
Missouri	85,470	4,091,000	23,630	664,000	22,484	497,000
Montana	75,732	821,000	20,215	165,000	6,412	95,000
Nebraska	93,067	5,470,000	193	121,000	120	8,000
Nevada	32,044	684,000	7,279	187,000	3,838	196,000
New Hampshire	2,569	901,000	2,157	189,000	40	12,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE VII.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations), by State, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944*—Con.

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Location	Purchases Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943		Proposed purchases July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost
New Jersey	20,811	$10,950,000	245	$1,528,000	120	$120,000
New Mexico	134,042	792,000	5,254	95,000	10,224	47,000
New York	22,447	40,170,000	3,577	3,264,000	4,638	997,000
North Carolina	169,598	5,074,000	46,903	1,903,000	42,042	1,269,000
North Dakota	38,597	213,000	22,431	140,000	12,018	93,000
Ohio	41,043	8,424,000	25,450	2,789,000	38,246	3,049,000
Oklahoma	226,445	4,609,000	68,986	1,694,000	28,788	927,000
Oregon	165,498	8,824,000	1,595	362,000	6,563	245,000
Pennsylvania	28,863	13,113,000	16,255	5,343,000	12,180	2,525,000
Rhode Island	3,780	1,231,000	1,673	1,056,000	40	16,000
South Carolina	30,278	2,229,000	2,241	46,000	745	92,000
South Dakota	289,096	2,730,000	3,035	31,000	12,934	138,000
Tennessee	256,314	22,485,000	132,160	7,390,000	62,187	2,853,000
Texas	550,483	23,113,000	[2] 50,777	1,586,000	14,328	226,000
Utah	85,781	2,728,000	8,918	88,000	9,550	125,000
Vermont	782	18,000	257	11,000	1,642	44,000
Virginia	33,800	12,109,000	74,745	7,454,000	10,246	253,000
Washington	59,527	11,682,000	7,752	1,018,000	12,722	485,000
West Virginia	2,014	334,000	1,127	2,350,000	7,981	2,419,000
Wisconsin	51,894	3,138,000	6,081	651,000	5,275	49,000
Wyoming	66,713	458,000	6,741	90,000	50,156	249,000
Alaska	38	9,000				
Hawaii	30	6,000	4,085	1,467,000		
Puerto Rico	20,566	1,506,000	1,195	122,000		
Samoa	33	53,000				
Virgin Islands	93	88,000				
Location undeterminable			387,600	25,000,000	142,345	30,663,000
Total	4,752,659	327,428,000	[1] 1,453,759	92,869,000	723,570	53,394,000

[1] Bureau of the Budget computations.

[2] Includes proposed purchases by the U. S. Maritime Commission of 150 acres in Alabama, 400 acres in California, and 277 acres in Texas, for which it is not considered practicable to make an estimate of cost at this time.

LAND ACQUISITION AND PROPOSED PURCHASE, BY FUNCTION

From a recent survey by the Bureau of the Budget, it is apparent that three-quarters of all land purchases from January 1 to December 31, 1942, has been for war purposes. Most of the remainder is for submarginal agricultural lands, forest lands, rivers, harbors, and flood control. Ostensibly, in the period between January 1 and June 30, 1943, war activities will approximate half of the land purchase and rivers, harbors, and flood control about a quarter. During the present fiscal year between July 1, 1943, and June 30, 1944, substantial land acquisitions are envisioned for rivers and harbors and control of floods while the war program and Indian lands acquisition will be much lower. Following is a table of land acquisitions—purchased and pending—by function:

TABLE VIII.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations), by function, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944* [1]

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Purposes	Purchases, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943		Proposed purchases, July 1 1943, to June 30, 1944	
	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost	Acres	Cost
Incident to administrative functions	7,277	$424,000	8,435	$431,000	5,756	$243,000
Wildlife refuges	22,338	183,000	33,007	93,000	37,033	186,000
National parks, parkways, etc	3,884	1,026,000	5,569	1,403,000	287	346,000
Submarginal agricultural lands	305,773	1,367,000				
War housing	26,333	11,867,000	5,486	2,443,000	6,948	3,282,000
Indian lands	114,366	747,000	25,182	224,000	139,520	777,000
Resettlement farms and suburban communities	1,308	61,000	275	3,000	2,800	40,000
Forest lands, forestation, etc	309,205	1,367,000	143,447	804,000	88,683	205,000
Dam sites and reservoirs for power and flood-control projects	127,306	14,907,000	84,719	4,466,000	77,832	3,190,000
Substations and rights-of-way for transmission lines	7,124	254,000	3,875	205,000	7,080	332,000
Reclamation projects	91,858	730,000	70,575	1,553,000	34,337	1,131,000
War activities	3,543,905	285,559,000	[2] 692,817	64,700,000	142,345	30,663,000
Rivers and harbors and flood control	191,982	8,916,000	380,372	16,844,000	180,949	12,909,000
Total	4,752,659	327,428,000	1,453,759	92,869,000	723,570	53,394,000

[1] Bureau of the Budget computations.

[2] Includes 827 acres the cost of which is undeterminable at this time due to incomplete detailed reports.

LAND IN USE FOR WAR PURPOSES

The total land in use for war purposes as of March 30, 1943, is 43,181,183 acres. Almost all of this is being used by the War Department, as the following table makes clear:

TABLE IX.—*Summary statement of land in use for war purposes as of Mar. 30, 1943* [1]

Agency	Title or possession acquired by Justice					Withdrawn from public domain and transferred by Interior	Special-use permits issued by Interior	Transferred by Agriculture	Total	
	Completed (since July 1, 1938)		Pending for final settlement							
			Private land		Public domain					
	(1)		(2)		(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
	Acres	*Parcels* [2]	*Acres*	*Parcels*					*Acres*	*Parcels*
Commerce Department						26,167			26,167.00	
Federal Public Housing	2,484.63	386	27,191.97	6,063					29,676.60	6,449
Federal Works Agency	20,375.41	1,064	19,718.52	2,131					40,093.93	3,195
Maritime Commission	73.02	100	932.41	563					1,005.43	663
Navy Department	114,188.54	819	768,349.42	880	27,304			39,530.00	949,371.96	1,699
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	46.03	26	9,237.55	370		8,244			17,527.58	396
War Department	2,967,650.87	6,090	6,234,863.03	2,376	10,480,588	3,720,712	17,313,483	1,381,178.82	42,098,475.72	8,465
War Relocation Authority						18,865			18,865.00	
Grand total	3,104,818.50	8,485	7,060,292.90	12,383	[3] 10,507,892	[3] 3,773,988	17,313,483	1,420,708.82	43,181,183.22	20,868

[1] Department of Justice computations.

[2] The item, "Parcels," represents those small areas described only as city lots or a certain number of square feet on which the actual acreage is unknown.

[3] The total of columns 3 and 4 (14,281,880 acres) represents the entire area withdrawn from the public domain for war purposes, while column 3 (10,507,892 acres) represents only that portion of the land withdrawn on which the Department of Justice has instituted condemnation proceedings for the elimination of outstanding private interests.

NOTE.—This does not include 582,342 acres withdrawn from the public domain for the use of the Department of the Interior in connection with the production of platinum, copper, helium, magnesite, etc.

Land acquired or in use for war purposes from July 1, 1938, to March 30, 1943, inclusive of areas of public lands the use of which is permitted, by order of the Secretary of the Interior (in the total amount of 17,313,483 acres) is 43,181,183.22 acres, or 67,470 square miles.

Continental United States consists of 2,977,128 square miles, not including water area. The area acquired or in use for war-training purposes is therefore 2.26 percent of the total area. To visualize more clearly the extent of this area, it comprises the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and one-half of Maine. (Department of Justice computation).

From the previous table it will be seen that 98 percent, or 42,098,475 acres of the total land acquired for war purposes has been purchased by the War Department and almost all of the remainder, or 949,371 acres, has been acquired by the Navy Department.

Of the total acquisitions for war purposes somewhat over 3,000,000 acres have had title pass to the Government; somewhat over 7,000,000 acres of private land are pending settlement. The rest is in the public domain or has been transferred or had special-use permits issued for its acquisition from other departments of the Government.

In addition a total of 20,868 parcels of land—such as city lots, buildings, etc.—have been acquired or are pending acquisition.

PUBLIC LAND WITHDRAWN IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL EMERGENCY

As of March 5, 1943, a total of 14,864,222 acres of land has been withdrawn from the public domain for war purposes. Of this, 13,364,222 acres are of published public record. Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Utah, New Mexico, and California comprise the States and Territory from which most of this land has been taken.

The following tables make this clear:

TABLE X.—*Recapitulation, by States, of acreage of public lands withdrawn in connection with the national emergency*[1] *as of Mar. 5, 1943*

	Total area in acres within withdrawal boundaries
Arizona:	
War Department	2,109,057
Defense Plant Corporation	898
Interior Department	5,120
Total	2,115,075
California:	
War Department	950,079
Navy Department	4,635
Commerce Department	60
Defense Plant Corporation	7,346
Interior Department	7,280
Total	969,400
Colorado:	
War Department	262
Interior Department	115,011
Total	115,273
Florida:	
War Department	2,340
Navy Department	(2)
Total	2,340
Idaho:	
War Department	22,885
Interior Department	(2)
Total	22,885
Mississippi: War Department	40
Montana: War Department	11,284
New Mexico:	
War Department	1,284,660
Interior Department	20
Total	1,284,680
Oklahoma: War Department	10
Nevada:	
War Department	4,037,654
Navy Department	20
Commerce Department	42
Interior Department	387,036
Total	4,424,752
Oregon:	
War Department	151,713
Commerce Department	60
Total	151,773
South Dakota: War Department	11,177
Utah:	
War Department	1,994,445
War Relocation Authority	18,865
Commerce Department	418
Interior Department	6,793
Total	2,020,521
Washington:	
War Department	109,125
Navy Department	513
Total	109,638
Wisconsin: War Department	40
Wyoming:	
War Department	1,240
Interior Department	61,082
Total	62,322
Alaska:	
War Department	2,015,289
Navy Department	22,136
Commerce Department	25,587
Total	2,063,012
Grand total	13,364,222
Unpublished acres withdrawn	1,500,000
Grand total	14,864,222

[1] Department of Justice computation. See the following table:

Connecticut, square miles (land areas)	4,899
Delaware, square miles (land areas)	1,973
Maryland, square miles (land areas)	9,887
Massachusetts, square miles (land areas)	7,907
New Hampshire, square miles (land areas)	9,024
New Jersey, square miles (land areas)	7,532
Rhode Island, square miles (land areas)	1,053
Vermont, square miles (land areas)	9,273
One-half of Maine, square miles (land areas)	15,520
Total	67,073

[2] Indeterminate.

The War Department is responsible for most of this use, there being just six departments and agencies to which transfers of land in the public domain have been made.

TABLE X (continued).—*Recapitulation by agency area of public lands withdrawn in connection with the national emergency*[1] *as of Mar. 5, 1943*

Agency:	*Total area in acres within withdrawal boundaries*
War Department	12,701,300
Navy Department	27,304
Defense Plant Corporation	8,244
War Relocation Authority	18,865
Commerce Department	26,167
Interior Department	582,342
Unpublished acres withdrawn	1,500,000
Grand total	14,864,222

[1] Department of Justice computation.

WAR DEPARTMENT LAND ACQUISITIONS

Since July 1, 1938, according to Department of Justice computations, the War Department has purchased, secured through donation, exchange, or condemnation a total of 2,847,650.87 acres of land. Translated into comprehensible figures, this amounts to an area over four times the size of Rhode Island. In addition to this, the total acreage acquisition pending under present condemnation or direct purchase proceedings amounts to 16,835,451.03 acres. Consequently, when this land is added to that previously secured the War Department will find itself with 19,683,101.90 acres on its hands. This encompasses an area larger than New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Jersey combined. This total, it must be borne in mind, includes large areas transferred to the War Department from the public domain.

Not included in this is a total of 6,090 "parcels" of land—so designated because they include small items, such as city lots. The actual acreage of these plots is not given. A total of 2,376 such parcels are pending, bringing the number of parcels acquired or pending to 8,466.

The following table indicates the ever-increasing amount of land acquired by the War Department in the last 5 years:

TABLE XI.—*Land acquired or pending by the War Department, 1939–43*[1]

Fiscal year	Acres	Cost of acres	Parcels	Cost of parcels	Cost of acres and parcels
1939	187,966.82	$4,730,046.31	311	$647,677.70	$5,377,724.01
1940	190,168.60	5,870,703.95	151	433,534.56	6,304,238.51
1941	582,173.06	31,308,265.30	293	2,151,761.00	33,460,026.30
1942	931,256.83	48,429,598.80	2,912	109,939,347.46	158,368,946.26
1943[2]	956,085.56	76,331,908.66	2,273	9,410,333.57	85,742,242.23
Total	2,847,650.87	166,670,523.02	5,940	122,582,654.29	289,253,177.31
Pending and purchased Jan. 30 to Mar. 30, 1943	16,835,451.03	(3)	2,526	(3)	(3)
Grand total	19,683,101.90		8,466		

[1] Department of Justice computations. [2] As of Jan. 30, 1943. [3] Not available.

From this it will be seen that from about 187,000 acres closed in fiscal year 1939 the land acquisitions by the War Department have increased fivefold until in 7 months of the fiscal year 1943 the total rose to 956,000 acres. In 1939 the total cost was $5,377,724. This rose to $158,368,946 in 1942 and attained in the first 7 months of fiscal year 1943 a comparable total of $85,742,242.

Although estimates of future expenditures are at best but conjectures, the estimates for future acquisitions—that is, those matters pending condemnation or direct purchase—run into large figures. An estimate based on recent average costs indicates that future acquisitions, already proposed, will cost over one-half billion dollars.

Figures supplied by the War Department itself are for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and the first 6 months of fiscal year 1943. Variations from Department of Justice figures (see appendix, table B) may be accounted for in some manner by difference in date of compilations in regard to approving purchases. These indicate that of about 18,845,230 acres of land authorized in this period, 17,308,636 acres have been acquired or are pending possession.

TABLE XII.—*Acquisitions of land* [1]

Acres authorized	18,845,230.44
Acres optioned, 1941–43	2,041,519.90
Acres condemned (declaration of taking)	2,223,415.48
Acres condemned (War Powers Act)	1,391,694.60
Acres transferred or donated	10,918,532.78
Granted by right of entry	733,473.67
Total acreage	17,308,636.43

[1] War Department compilations. Includes pending projects, partial possession projects, total possession projects, completed projects.

As of October 1943, the emergency construction, real-estate acquisitions, and maintenance program of the Army of the United States represented an outlay of about $11,000,000,000. Since June 1940, nearly 15,000 separate construction projects have been undertaken of which over 13,500 are now in use. Real estate, purchased or leased for war purposes, has cost about $370,000,000. Posts, camps, and stations occupy an area of 14,500 square miles—equivalent to the combined areas of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. Floor space in buildings constructed since June 1940 totals 1,800,000,000 square feet.

NAVY DEPARTMENT LAND ACQUISITIONS

Land purchased by the Navy Department, according to figures submitted by the Navy Department, totals 908,573 acres during the period July 1, 1940, and April 30, 1943. The actual total cost of these purchases cannot be estimated, because 9,241 of the 19,104 tracts are as yet open, full payment not having been completed. However, the total cost of this acquisition to date is $115,719,655.82.

The Federal Works Agency reports the Navy Department as having a total acreage as of June 30, 1940, of 499,961 acres, costing $513,741,255. Consequently, the total acreage, with improvements, owned by the Navy Department is 1,408,534, and has cost to date $629,460,910.

In addition to the above, the Navy Department stated that it has leased 3,073,969 acres since July 1, 1942, at a cost of $727,594.55, plus damages paid amounting to $182,839.79. Space rented in buildings amounts to 4,639,901 square feet, for a cost of $5,576,647.39. Quarters rented on a per-person basis amount to $1,004,839.12.

OTHER LAND ACQUISITIONS

According to figures submitted to the committee, the Federal Works Agency has purchased 27,064.33 acres, at a cost of $7,128,587, in the period from January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942. The majority of this land was purchased for "war public works" projects, although some was purchased for access roads and flight strips. There were 61 of these purchases, 10 being specifically labeled as building sites.

Acquisition of land by the National Housing Administration between February 24, 1943, and March 1, 1943, indicates a total of 36,743 acres, at an estimated cost of $12,535,278.

BUILDING SITES ACQUIRED AND PROPOSED, BY STATES

Large purchases and pending acquisitions for building sites are found principally in West Virginia, although the largest costs have been or will be divided among Illinois, Massachusetts, Florida, and the District of Columbia.

TABLE XIII.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations) for building sites, by States, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943* [1]

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Location	Purchases Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943	
	Square feet	Cost	Square feet	Cost
Alabama	42,261,200	$278,000		
Arkansas	147,233	143,000		
California	16,170,114	988,000		
Colorado	1,742,400	19,000		
Connecticut	3,466,069	190,000	675,180	$66,000
District of Columbia	553,220	1,079,000	63,283	126,000
Florida			1,182,560	5,000
Illinois	10,993,531	2,988,000		
Indiana	6,610,230	87,000		
Kentucky	4,967,582	57,000		
Maine			370,260	1,000
Maryland	6,887,707	236,000		
Massachusetts	12,459,752	187,000	1,534,063	125,000
Michigan	1,596,675	62,000	261,360	5,000
Mississippi	6,572,333	47,000		
Missouri	174,240	108,000		
Montana	26,000	5,000		
New Jersey	2,128,472	691,000	875,368	7,000
New Mexico	187,308	1,000		
New York	7,031,417	948,000		
North Carolina	53,300	275,000	97,061	25,000
Ohio	4,519,624	32,000		
Oregon			20,909	(2)
Pennsylvania	626,803	213,000		
South Carolina			200,000	5,000
Texas	11,664,061	192,000	126,324	(2)
Vermont			27,442	15,000
Virginia	4,323,578	341,000	87,120	16,000
Washington			601,781	43,000
West Virginia	289,497,582	713,000		
Wisconsin	6,805,379	486,000	100,000	3,000
Wyoming			48,787	8,000
Total	441,465,810	10,366,000	6,271,518	450,000

[1] Bureau of the Budget computations.

[2] Less than $500.

BUILDING SITES ACQUIRED AND PROPOSED BY AGENCY

In this respect, as might be expected, the War Department is by far the largest dealer in real estate, with the Federal Works Agency and the Navy Department procuring most of the remainder:

TABLE XIV.—*Report of land purchases and proposed purchases (including condemnations) for building sites, by agency, Jan. 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943* [1]

[Based on reports submitted by agencies concerned]

Department or establishment	Purchases, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1942		Proposed purchases, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1943	
	Square feet	Cost	Square feet	Cost
Department of Agriculture: Forest Service	26,000	$5,000		
Department of Commerce: National Bureau of Standards	3,510	1,000		
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Mines			440,827	$48,000
Department of Justice: Immigration and Naturalization Service	217,800	5,000		
Navy Department: Coast Guard	3,591,093	551,000	4,767,408	276,000
War Department: Real Estate Branch	429,659,231	6,085,000		
District of Columbia	419,822	208,000	63,283	126,000
Federal Works Agency: Public Buildings Administration	7,357,558	2,782,000		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,154	98,000		
Metals Reserve Company	157,140	425,000		
RFC Mortgage Company	25,502	206,000		
Total, Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiaries	190,796	729,000		
Total	441,465,810	10,366,000	6,271,518	450,000

[1] Bureau of the Budget computations.

HOTELS PURCHASED

The War and Navy Departments have purchased 14 hotels at an estimated cost of about $15,000,000 during the present emergency. The War Department has purchased 12 of these, containing 6,943 rooms, at a purchase price (or an appraised price) of $13,000,000 for 10 of these. Following is the list:

TABLE XV.—*Hotels purchased by War Department*

	Rooms	Purchase or appraised price [1]
Stevens, Chicago	3,300	$5,528,101
Miami-Biltmore, Miami Beach	400	895,000
Nautilus, Miami Beach	200	600,000
Don-Ce-Sar, St. Petersburg	263	449,000
El Mirado, Palm Springs, Calif.	150	425,000
Greenbrier, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va	700	2,300,000
Forest Hills, Augusta, Ga	300	[2] 400,000
Eastman, Hot Springs	500	510,000
Chicago Beach, Chicago, Ill	600	[3] 900,000
Shark River, Neptune, N. J	47	30,510
Vista-del-Aroyo, Pasadena, Calif	409	([4])
Casa Loma, Coral Gables, Fla	74	([4])
Total	6,943	[4] 13,028,611

[1] Appraised value.
[2] Filed condemnation and occupancy proceedings. Deposit $450,000 with declaration of taking.
[3] Negotiation being made for lease.
[4] Does not include last 2 items.

The Stevens Hotel in Chicago was purchased by the War Department in December 1942 for $5,528,101. At that time the committee protested against the unnecessary cost to the Government of the purchase. Later, in September 1943, the hotel was sold for $5,251,000. The committee believe that purchases of hotels should not be countenanced until all other methods of acquisition of property are exhausted, since such purchases may frequently be financially unsound as well as dangerous to the economic stability of the communities involved.

The Navy Department has purchased two hotels: The Norconian, Norco, Calif, $850,000, and the Chamberlin, Old Point Comfort, Va., $500,000, for a total of $1,350,000.

In addition, the Federal Public Housing Agency has acquired fee simple title to one hotel, the Three Toms Tavern, Thomasville, Ga., at a price of $75,000. The hotel has accommodations for 130 guests and will be expanded to accommodate 250. The original cost was $284,000; Government appraisals averaged $166,000.

HOTELS AND COTTAGES LEASED

The War Department has been paying $11,249,011 annual rental for 545 hotels and cottages containing over 43,088 rooms with a capacity for over 128,917 men. The following table indicates these acquisitions by cities:

TABLE XVI.—*Hotels leased by War Department*

Place	Number hotels	Number rooms	Capacity	Annual rent	Appraised value
Atlantic City	47	10,689	31,285	$4,125,692	$36,407,950
St. Petersburg	85	6,236	15,413	891,604	7,042,480
Daytona Beach	47	2,092	5,320	311,620	3,111,200
Miami Beach	347	23,460	74,976	5,743,495	49,149,509
Camden, S. C	1			33,600	([1])
Seattle, Wash	3	[2] 424	[2] 654		
Grand Rapids	2				
Wildwood, N. J	1			6,500	
Boston	1				
Des Moines	3	684	2,143	135,000	1,043,600
Bradley Beach	1				
Portland, Maine	1				
Harrisburg	1				
Tocoa, Ga	1			1,500	([1])
Chicago	1				
Soda Springs, Calif	1		114	([3])	
Oakland, Calif	1	410	877	([3])	
Kansas City, Mo	1	75	205	([3])	
	545	44,070	130,987	11,249,011	

[1] Withheld. [2] For 2 hotels only. [3] Condemnation proceedings.

The Navy Department has leased an estimated total of 42 hotels at an approximate rental of $2,560,324.33. This does not include 69 hotels leased by the Coast Guard for $477,378 annual rental.

Three hotels have been leased between February 24, 1942, and May 1, 1943, by the Federal Public Housing Authority. One of these has since been canceled. Annual rentals total $13,500.

NEED FOR CENTRALIZED CONTROL

The Comptroller General of the United States, recognizing the anomalous situation which now exists regarding information on Federal land acquisition, recently indicated in a letter to the President of the Senate that no uniform method of acquisition, disposal, and recording of Federal real-estate holdings is now extant. The sixty-odd Federal establishments are all on a parity as to administrative control and responsibility, each functioning in its own separate sphere, yet none equipped to assemble and correlate the information on new land and property requirements, surplus property disposition, future utilization, and the custody of the greatly expanded Federal holdings.

Specifically, the Comptroller General states:

"There is at the present time no satisfactory uniform control, administrative or otherwise, over the performance of the operational steps in the acquisition and disposition of real property for the uses and purposes of the United States and its various agencies, nor has any satisfactory procedure been established for the compilation of records whereby adequate administrative control could be effected.

"While various attempts have been made in the direction of establishing logical acquisition and planning measures, and of effecting more adequate accounting control, there is still no central depository or record from which the factual situation as to real property holdings can be reflected so that new acquisition and disposition requirements can be met to the best advantage of the Government." [1]

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in preparing this present report has been reminded only too forcibly as to the truth of this statement inasmuch as it was impossible to ascertain the extent of present Federal land

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89, pt. 6, p. 8485.

holdings except by going directly to the individual agencies. In addition, no information on future programs for land acquisition is generally available, as attested by the statement of the Assistant Attorney General of the Lands Division, Department of Justice, who, at a hearing before the committee, indicated that data respecting proposed land purchases may be secured only through the records of the agencies involved.

It is the opinion of the Comptroller General that there should be established in the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior the necessary facilities providing for the acquisition, abstracting, titling, recording, and disposition of federally owned and controlled lands since much of the machinery and personnel needed for this centralization is already a part of the General Land Office. In the interest of both efficiency and economy, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures believes that such a central unit should be established in whatever agency of the Government the Congress may decide.

THE RELATION OF FEDERAL OWNERSHIP OF LAND TO STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION

Because of the recent large-scale acquisition of real estate by the Federal Government, its bearing on State and local taxation has received widespread recognition. Obviously, directly as the Federal Government acquires more real estate, the amount of taxable property in the various States diminishes and the burden on the taxpayer in the particular locale becomes greater.

The President of the United States in 1935 established the Committee of the National Emergency Council to study the relationship of Federal ownership of real estate on State and local taxation. The committee made its report (H. Doc. No. 111, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) in January 1939, covering data to June 30, 1937. A further study, with revisions, was completed in May 1943 (H. Doc. No. 216, 78th Cong., 1st sess.). Partial reproduction of the findings of this Committee, together with additional material, will be found in appendix table C. The following discussion is based in large measure on the findings of the Federal Real Estate Board and the Committee of the National Emergency Council but in no way necessarily represents the opinions of those groups. All references are to appendix table C unless otherwise noted.

Total acreage of Federal real estate as of June 30, 1937, was 394,657,721 acres. Of this amount about 50,592,542 acres actually are under Indian ownership and should be deducted from the total. Thus a summary of Federal real estate and Indian holdings during the past 6 years includes the following:

TABLE XVII.—*Growth of nontaxable property*

Year	Federal ownership	Indian ownership	Total
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*
June 30, 1937	344,065,179	50,592,542	394,657,721
June 30, 1940	368,816,289	[1] 50,592,542	419,408,831
June 30, 1943 [2]	384,519,556	50,592,542	[2] 435,112,098

[1] Based on June 30, 1937, figures.
[2] Includes acquisitions pending.

In 6 years the land area under Federal ownership has increased 11 percent. Land under Federal ownership is now 20.2 percent of total continental United States, not including the 2.6 percent of the land under Indian control.[3] The total cost of improvements on Federal real estate runs to over 91 percent of the total, or $5,625,000,000 of $6,184,000,000, the remainder representing initial acquisition cost. The estimated assessed value of this property, with no uniformity throughout the States, runs to roughly $3,282,914,494 or half of this cost with a fair market value of $4,696,061,638 or three-quarters the cost.

The estimated tax levy on Federal real estate, based on local 1937 rates, would have been about $91,000,000, of which over 50 percent would have been allocated to the District of Columbia, New York, California, Arizona, Montana, Massachusetts, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Illinois.

Federal aid to States for the 10-year period between 1928 and 1937 totaled about $8,500,000,000, of which not quite three billion was for aid other than that provided by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Civil Works Administration, and the Works Progress Administration, which may be construed as temporary emergency measures.

Included in this aid, according to the committee, were the following projects:

Agriculture: Experiment stations, extension work, forest funds, and highways.

Interior: Colleges, Mineral Leasing Act, special funds, vocational education, education, reclamation.

Labor: Employment service.

Navy: State marine schools.

Treasury: Education of blind.

War: National Guard.

Independent Offices: Federal water power, homes for soldiers and sailors, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Civil Works Administration, Works Progress Administration, Public Works Administration, Social Security Act, and Tennessee Valley Authority.

The annual aid rendered to States excluding emergency aid (Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Civil Works Administration, and Works Progress Administration), increased considerably during the period. From 1928 to 1930 the average annual aid was about $146,000,000. From 1931 to 1933 this average increased to $238,000,000 and from 1934 to 1937 the average aid doubled to $484,000,000. In addition to this the average annual aid for 1934–37 for Works Progress Administration, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and Civil Works Administration was $1,705,155,000.

1. Federal aid in relation to fair market value of Federally owned property

As seen in appendix table C, for the years 1928–37 and including emergency aid, it will be found that 12 States received aid amounting to no more than 10 percent of the fair market value; that 5 States received from 10 to 20 percent of the fair market value; that 10 received from 20 to 30 percent of the fair market value; that 6 received from 30 to 40 percent of the fair market value; that 9 received from 40 to 50 percent of the fair market value; that 5 States received from 50 to 60 percent; that 1 State received from 60 to 70 percent and that 1 State received more than that. States receiving the most aid in relation to fair market value of Federal real estate are as follows: Indiana, 75.7 percent; Wisconsin, 60.1 percent; Missisippi, 57.6 percent; Ohio, 57.2 percent; Missouri, 55.7 percent. The District of Columbia received only 1.5 percent of the fair market value in Federal aid. States with low percentages of aid in relation to fair market values are Nevada, 2.2 percent; Arizona, 2.7 percent; Montana, 5.0 percent; Idaho, 5.7 percent.

For the same period, and excluding Federal emergency aid, appendix table C shows that 15 States received aid amounting to no more than 5 percent; 9 States from 5 to 10 percent; 9 States from 10 to 15 percent; 10 States from 15 to 20 percent; 3 States from 20 to 25 percent; and 3 States from 25 to 30 percent. States receiving the most Federal aid in relation to the fair market value are Mississippi with 26.5 percent; Iowa with 26.3 percent; Indiana with 26 percent; Arkansas with 21.5 percent; Missouri with 20.5 percent. The District of Columbia showed a relationship of 1.1 percent of Federal aid. States receiving almost as low a percentage of Federal aid are Arizona with 1.5 percent; Nevada with 1.7 percent; Washington with 2.7 percent; and Montana with 2.7 percent.

2. Federal aid in relation to population

Including emergency aid, appendix table C shows that the average annual assistance to States paid by the Federal Government for the years 1928–37 was $857,985,000. The per capita aid annually ranges from Virginia's low of $3.99 to Nevada's high of $34.23. States receiving unusually high per capita aid are Nevada, $34.23; the District of Columbia, $22.48; Wyoming, $22.21; New Mexico, $14.91; Montana, $16.56; Arizona, $13.82; South Dakota, $13.71; Idaho, $12.41; North Dakota, $12.52; Utah, $11.79; Colorado, $11.51. Most of these States, it will be observed, contain large tracts of public domain and are sparsely populated. Those States receiving the least Federal aid, when emergency aid is included, are North Carolina, $3.77; Virginia, $3.99; Kentucky, $4.52; Tennessee, $4.59; and Georgia, $4.84. Four States received on an average of from $3.99 to $4.99 annually per capita; 20 States from $5 to $6.99; 13 from $7 to $9.99; 7 from $11 to $14.99; 2 from $16 to $17.99; and 3 over $20.

Excluding emergency aid, appendix table C shows that the average annual aid to States paid by the Federal Government for the years 1928–37 was $289,600,000, or almost $3,000,000,000 in the 10-year period. The District of Columbia received an average of $16.22 per capita annually. States receiving highest per capita aid are as follows: Nevada, $25.81; Wyoming, $15.64; Nebraska, $15.29; Montana, $8.94; New Mexico, $8.29. Those States receiving the lowest per capita aid are as follows: New Jersey, $1.25; Pennsylvania, $1.40; New York, $1.64; Massachusetts, $1.71; West Virginia, $1.70. Thirty States received less than $3; nine received from $3 to $4.99; seven received from $5 to $8.99; and three received from $15 to $16.99.

3. Federal aid in relation to economic ability of States

Table D [4] in the appendix shows the index of State economic ability [5] to revenue load, Federal aid, and public debt. With the United States as a whole accepted on an index basis of 100, the following States might be States to receive the most aid: Nevada, 225; Wyoming, 217; Nebraska, 214; New Mexico, 206; South Carolina, 204; Oklahoma, 198; Colorado, 195; Mississippi, 197; Utah, 191; South Dakota, 187; Arizona, 178; District of Columbia, 172; Montana, 173.

Those States receiving the least aid proportionably to their economic ability are New Jersey, 63; Connecticut, 68; New York, 70; Michigan, 73; Maryland, 76; Virginia, 80; Illinois, 81; Maine, 84; Ohio, 85; Wisconsin, 86; Rhode Island, 88; Massachusetts, 88.

Dr. Wylie Kilpatrick, under whose supervision the original of appendix table D was compiled, states:

"No fair interpretation of the Federal-aid system would conclude that assistance is intentionally distributed to favor or to discriminate against either the rich or poor States. Rather the conclusion is warranted that the system is haphazard in operation so that distributive justice is achieved by accident or is missed in the same way. For example, the State with the highest economic ability, Ne-

[3] Since the 1937 figures included this Indian land as part of that belonging to the United States, in the following discussion it will be understood to be included. As it is tax-free, it will not greatly distort the figures.

[4] Appendix D is compiled from a report by Dr. Wylie Kilpatrick for the Bureau of the Census in Financing Federal, State, and Local Governments 1941, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Special Study No. 20, finial, September 1942.

[5] Economic ability is computed on a basis of economic income, output of industries, and retail sales on a per capita basis and then averaged.

vada, also has the highest index of Federal aid. This combination is perhaps the fortuitous result of many Federal aids working blindly together.

"Similar incongruities mark Federal and State aid to local governments. Indexes of high ability and low Federal aid may be accompanied, as in New York and Ohio, by large State aid to localities, constituting a normal series of indexes. The three factors of ability, Federal aid, and State aid are often combined diversely without logic."

Table E in the appendix reveals the following. The New England States are very high in economic ability, moderate in their revenue load, low in Federal aid received, and low in debt load. The Middle Atlantic States are very high in economic ability, have the highest national revenue load per capita, receive the least Federal support, and have by far the largest debt. The East North Central States are very high in economic ability, have a low revenue load, low aid, and a low debt. The West North Central States are below average in economic ability, have a moderately low revenue load, a high amount of aid, and a very low debt. The South Atlantic States have a very low economic ability, a moderately low tax load, an above average amount of Federal aid, and an average debt. The East South Central States, lowest in economic ability, have a low tax load, a high amount of aid, and a below average debt load. The West South Central States, low in economic ability, and moderately low in tax load, are high in Federal aid, and slightly above average in debt load. The Mountain States have an average economic ability, a moderately low revenue load, by far the largest amount of aid, and a low debt. The Pacific States have the highest economic ability, a moderate revenue load, a high index of Federal aid, and a slightly above-average debt.

CONCLUSIONS

The committee has watched with apprehension the alarming increase in land acquisition in the last few years. While the committee recognizes that much of this acquisition has been for purposes connected with the national emergency, it nevertheless finds that excessive amounts of land have been purchased by the Government since 1938.

The committee further finds that there has been a growing concern in many States which have experienced the loss of large amounts of taxable property to the Federal Government. Naturally, as the Government acquires more and more property, the tax load on the local taxpayers directly increases. This anomalous situation is further complicated by the fear, expressed in many States, of the post-war effect that the probable dumping of large tracts and parcels will have on local real-estate values.

Consequently the committee expects that Federal agencies contemplating Federal acquisitions should curtail such plans as far as possible. Such acquisition should be effected only after the possibility of using available Federal holdings is exhausted and after the long-range effect on States and municipalities concerned with such acquisitions has been studied.

The committee further finds that no uniform procedure for land and parcel valuation is now in practice. Consequently a wide disparity in appraisal values and purchase prices are possible under such a decentralized method.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends—

1. That the Government agencies begin immediately to liquidate surplus holdings in land and real estate which are not needed for Federal activities.

2. That consideration be given to the feasibility of assigning the operational functions of appraising, acquiring, abstracting, recording, and disposing of all real estate owned and controlled by the Federal Government to a central unit in an already existing Government agency in order to reduce inequity, lack of uniformity, duplication, and waste of funds in connection with Government acquisitions and disposition of real property.

3. That this unit shall be a part of already existing Government machinery.

[Due to the illness of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., he was unable to join in the presentation of this report, therefore it does not necessarily represent his views.]

THE HARD COAL SITUATION IN MASSACHUSETTS—PETITIONS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Special Committee to Investigate Fuel Oils and Solid Fuels a telegram and a letter in the nature of petitions, which I have received from citizens of Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter in the nature of petitions were referred to the Special Committee to Investigate Fuel Oils and Solid Fuels and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *November 17, 1943.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building:

Hard coal situation in Somerville very acute. Even coal yards in our city of 103,000 population without any hard coal. Your assistance requested to remedy this grave condition.

HAROLD A. PALMER,
Acting Mayor, Somerville, Mass.

THE MEAD CORPORATION,
WHEELWRIGHT DIVISION,
Leominster, Mass., November 13, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: Is there not something you can do about this hard coal situation in New England? It is desperate.

New England is 550,000 tons poorer off this year than at the same time last year, and the shipments are running behind 20,000 to 25,000 tons a week as compared with last year.

In the town of Lancaster, the Lancaster Fuel Co. have just told me that 260 of their customers have no coal at all and 200 have only 25 percent of what they should have. The fuel company has no coal on hand and does not know when it will get any. The situation must be the same in Clinton.

Everybody in this office who burns coal is shy of what they ought to have.

I am chairman of the rationing board in Lancaster and urged a great many people to change to coal last year and now where are they?

Very truly yours,
GEORGE W. WHEELWRIGHT.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN LEBANON

Mr. WALSH also presented a telegram from the president of the Mount Lebanon Society, Fall River, Mass., relating to the form of government in Lebanon, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALL RIVER, MASS., *November 18, 1943.*

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

Text of appeal to President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull. The Mount Lebanon Society and auxiliary, an organization founded in Fall River in 1911 by American citizens of Lebanese extraction to help Lebanon achieve its independence, views with great concern the present developments threatening the structure of that independence now achieved. As American citizens we pray our Government at this stage of world turmoil to use its weighty influence to help stabilize conditions in the republic of Lebanon on the basis of the Atlantic Charter and support Lebanon in its right to the enjoyment of its independence.

We respectfully submit that no consideration of expediency at this stage of world affairs should be permitted to introduce any basic change in the present republican independent form of government in Lebanon, to the end that its inhabitants after the war and during the peace negotiations be allowed to decide their own destiny in an atmosphere of security and by the exercise of their full freedom of choice and free from fear of threat or coercion from whatever source it emanates.

This course appears to us the most conducive to further stability. It is based on the consideration of elementary justice, which we are confident that our Government in its capacity of the leader of democracy in this great struggle, will not hesitate to see applied to the case of our native land, the republic of Lebanon.

MOUNT LEBANON SOCIETY,
FARRIS NASSIF, Jr., *President.*

PERSECUTION OF THE ARMENIANS

Mr. WALSH also presented a telegram embodying a resolution adopted by a meeting of citizens of Armenian extraction at Cambridge, Mass., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *November 18, 1943.*

The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALSH: In a mass meeting of the Cambridge citizens of Armenian extraction held in the recreation hall at Porter Square, Cambridge, on the 14th of November 1943, I have the honor to send you the enclosed resolution which was unanimously voted examining the reliable reports from Turkey. We find that the Turkish Government is taking advantage of the war and relentlessly continuing a renewed policy of extermination of the remnants of Armenians who had escaped the diabolic orgy planned during the First World War. This policy is carried out under the mild sounding term of wealth tax. Men unable to meet this impossible tax are deprived of all their belongings and sent to hard-labor camps at distant corners of the country where they are practically condemned to death and their families are left at home to perish from starvation. We respectfully call your attention to this sad situation and request you to use your good offices with our State Department to ameliorate the plight of Armenians whose only crime is their faith in Christianity and their devotion to the principles of democracy. We assert our own faith in our American institutions and in the American way of life. We hope that the noble ideas of war will not be denied to the long suffering Armenian people. Resolution adopted November 14, 1943, by those of Armenian extraction at the recreation hall, Porter Square, Cambridge, Mass.

Most sincerely yours,
PAUL K. NAHABEDIAN.

ROLL-BACK OF PRICES AND OPERATIONS OF THE O. P. A.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in full and appropriately referred a letter from the Bridgeport Central Labor Union with attached resolutions.

There being no objection, the letter, with the attached resolutions, was referred to the Committee on Banking and

Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGEPORT CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Bridgeport, Conn., November 16, 1943.
United States Senator JOHN DANAHER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed resolutions were adopted by all American Federation of Labor locals in Connecticut in conjunction with C. I. O. and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen at a conference called by the State O. P. A., Wednesday, October 20, 1943.

These resolutions were also endorsed at recent meeting of Bridgeport Central Labor Union.

The purpose of this meeting giving information relative to black market, rolling back of prices, and how to cooperate with the O. P. A.

PETER BENARD, *President.*
WILLIAM J. BRENNAN,
Secretary.

NO. 1. CEILING PRICES

Top legal prices protect the individual and the country at war. It is the obligation of each individual shopper to know top legal prices. The official O. P. A. ceiling price lists should be hung up in every kitchen, and labor organizations will undertake to distribute price lists to all of their members and families. Before doing the daily marketing, every housewife should prepare a shopping list and budget her ration points and note the top legal prices for the items she intends to buy. We urge that checking of prices be made a daily shopping habit! We also urge that apparent violations be taken up at once with the storekeeper and if correction is not made, with the price panel of the local war price and rationing board.

Shutting off the outlet to the black market is the responsibility of every consumer. Organized labor recognizes this responsibility and will do its part. But it also recognizes that it is not the exclusive responsibility of labor, but that of every single consumer in the State and Nation.

NO. 2. LOCAL WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARDS

Local war price and rationing boards in each community are made up of volunteers—fellow citizens who are doing a wartime job. They are impartially serving the needs of all people. They are not a group set apart from the rest of the community and must be truly representative of all segments of community life. Local boards require the service of volunteers. Labor members on local boards are not enough. Labor and members of the families of labor recognize the need for additional volunteers' help and urge all persons connected with labor to contribute their services to this essential wartime community activity.

NO. 3. GRADE LABELING

Organized labor recognizes that the lack of definite, understandable labeling of grades is a weakness in the protection of the consumer against abuses of the price-control program. Labor condemns the Taft amendment on grade labeling—an amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act—and vigorously supports a change of the act to provide for the labeling of consumer goods, not only for the protection of the consumer, but to relieve pressure on the price-control structure.

NO. 4. LIVESTOCK CEILINGS

Organized labor points out that unless ceilings are placed upon all meat on the hoof, there can be no effective control of meat prices to the consumer. Labor recognizes the need for control of feed prices as a means of controlling the price of livestock ready for slaughter. It, therefore, urges the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration and any other agency connected with this phase of the price-control program to cooperate with the Office of Price Administration in accomplishing this result.

NO. 5. ROLL-BACKS AND SUBSIDIES

Organized labor urges immediate accomplishment of a roll-back of prices to the level of September 15, 1942, in accordance with the President's hold-the-line order. It recognizes that this result can only be accomplished with the full cooperation of the farmers of this country. This roll-back can be accomplished by the use of subsidies or production bonuses, and labor urges Congress to authorize immediately the use of such payments to farmers to effect the roll-back in prices. The war economy of this country is more important than the special interests of a particular group.

NO. 6. MORE MILK AT LOWER PRICES THROUGH GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY

(Introduced by Teamsters Joint Council No. 64, A. F. of L.)

Whereas farmers have fought for some time to obtain higher prices for their milk, contending that farm labor and feed costs had risen; and

Whereas the failure of milk production to keep pace with milk consumption is attributed to the fact that the farmers have not received the prices they have demanded; and

Whereas it became evident some time ago that there were two alternatives in respect to granting farmers higher prices (1) to pass the increase on to consumers and (2) to subsidize the farmers out of Government funds and thus leave the price to consumers unchanged; and

Whereas certain farm and big business interests object to Government subsidies without proper justification and the use of their influence upon Congress in efforts to restrict or abolish subsidies; and

Whereas the course they follow would increase inflationary trends and impose greater burdens upon labor whose wage increases are limited by law to 15 percent above January 1941 wage rates; and

Whereas Government subsidy is a sound method to roll back prices to September 15, 1942 level, as promised labor by national administration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference go on record in favor of an appropriate increase in farm milk prices through Government subsidy in order to encourage greater milk production; and be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen from this State be informed of the sense of this resolution and urged to vote in favor of appropriations necessary to roll back consumer prices to the afore-mentioned date.

NO. 7. LOCAL COMMITTEE ON PRICE CONTROL AND RATIONING

Organized labor urges the immediate formation of small working committees in the locals of all unions. The function of these committees will be to originate and follow through on definite action by the members of the locals in support of the price control and rationing programs. Some proper activities of these committees will be to see that members have accurate information on legal ceiling prices—to urge them to check prices when they are buying—to urge them to bring apparent violations to the attention of retailers—and to make reports to local board price panels of cases where retailers refuse to make corrections when the overcharges are called to their attention. These committees can initiate programs to provide information on rationing and price control especially among women members, and the wives of other members, who do the bulk of shopping for the family. The Labor Advisory Committee, representing the locals throughout the State, meets regularly with the State O. P. A. office to work out definite ways in which organized labor can contribute to the success of the price control and rationing programs, and the local committees can be the means for translating these into direct action by local members.

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL CO-OPERATION

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Henry H. Hunt, director of the Connecticut Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation, a resolution which was adopted by that commission. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD, and thereafter be referred to the Committee on Finance for consideration in connection with the subject of renegotiation of contracts.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the retroactive recapture of profits on renegotiation of war contracts by the Federal Government has subjected various States to the risk of serious loss of State tax revenues through the necessity of refunding State taxes already collected and in some instances already distributed to and expended by local governmental subdivisions, and has imposed on the States other administrative and budgetary problems; and

Whereas certain factors are taken into consideration in the renegotiation of war contracts, which factors are not ordinarily, and should not be, given effect in computing State corporate taxes; and

Whereas the States do not participate in the renegotiation of war contracts, which is confined to the exclusive jurisdiction of the appropriate departments of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the financial program of the State of Connecticut is subjected to risk of serious loss of State revenue through the retroactive recapture of profits from the renegotiation of war contracts by the Federal Government, which is unwarranted interference with the State's budgetary and fiscal policies; and

Whereas certain States have passed legislation declaring it the policy of such States to refuse to refund any income taxes already paid, because of renegotiation between the Federal Government and taxpayers in which said States did not participate on the ground that such refunds would upset the State's tax and budgetary system, and that other States are likely to enact similar legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation respectfully recommends to the Congress of the United States and to the appropriate departments of the Federal Government the adoption of a method of renegotiation of war contracts which will relieve the States of the problems referred to herein and obviate the refunding of State taxes already collected; and be it further

Resolved, That this commission strongly urges, for the purpose of providing a uniform and equitable method of accomplishing the foregoing purposes, that every contractor be allowed on renegotiation credit for State taxes computed in accordance with the applicable State laws without adjustment for excessive profits recaptured after corporate taxes have already been paid to the State and this commission further urges that a uniform policy be adopted by the respective renegotiation agencies giving effect to renegotiation after Federal taxes; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the commission transmit a copy of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives in the Con-

gress from the State of Connecticut with a request that they take appropriate action to secure the cooperation of their colleagues in the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to implement the proposals herein, and that the chairman transmit copies of this resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives in Congress, the Council of State Governments, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Treasury, chairman of the Truman committee, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Finance, with the request that such legislation and administrative procedure be adopted to accomplish the purpose herein set forth.

RESOLUTION BY CONVENTION OF RURAL COOPERATIVES AT ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the convention of the Rural Electric Cooperatives of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, held at St. Paul, Minn., on November 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
St. Paul, Minn., November 16, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the convention of Rural Electric Cooperatives of District 6, held at Hotel Lowry, St. Paul, Minn., on November 11, 1943:

"*Resolved*, That we, the duly elected delegates of the Rural Electric Cooperatives of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, in annual convention at St. Paul, Minn., this 11th day of November 1943, urgently request that the Senators and Members of Congress of region 6 take the lead in sponsoring the appropriation of at least $750,000 to be made available immediately to the Rural Electrification Administration as a special administrative fund for the purpose of assisting the Rural Electric Cooperatives of America in completing surveys and engineering studies for shelf of projects to blueprint stage to be ready for immediate construction after the war, or as materials are available before the end of the war.

"Preliminary figures indicate that there are still 7,000,000 farms, farm establishments, and nonfarm rural homes without electricity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators and Members of Congress of each of the three States and that a copy also be sent to the Governors of these States, and to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of R. E. A."

May we urge your cooperation in the above matters, and may we offer any assistance you may see fit to direct to us for your guidance.

Yours very truly,
H. EDMUNDS,
Director, District 6,
National R. E. C. A.

RESOLUTION BY COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS—PROPOSED OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL MOBILIZATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted October 6, 1943, by the American Institute of Consulting Engineers on the so-called Kilgore bill, relating to the establishment of an office of scientific and technical mobilization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there have been brought to the attention of the American Institute of Consulting Engineers the so-called Kilgore bill, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, S. 702 and its counterpart, the so-called Patman bill, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, H. R. 2100; and

Whereas the bills propose to establish for time of war and of peace an office of scientific and technical mobilization which is given powers in the fields of science, research and engineering that are specific authorizations for the application of principles and dictatorial methods bearing resemblance to those used by governments in fascism and national socialism; and

Whereas the effects of the establishment of such an office would be to disrupt the present highly successful methods of scientific and technical research, which have been so extraordinarily successful in our present age; and

Whereas the highly centralized control will deaden private and individual initiative upon which great progress in science and in industry in our country has been based: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

1. That the American Institute of Consulting Engineers, through the council in which is vested the government of the institute, hereby records its opposition to the passage of these bills or either one of them, or of any bills granting similar powers,

2. That all members of the institute be advised to communicate promptly with their Representatives in Congress and Senators, recording opposition to these bills, and

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of the Senate and of the House.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS,
R. E. BAKENHUS, *President*,
PHILIP W. HENRY, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTIONS BY CONVENTION OF THE SOUTHERN TENANT FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by the Southern Farmers Tenant Union dealing with various farm problems.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 5: REPRESENTATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOR ON REGIONAL MANAGEMENT LABOR COMMITTEES

Whereas there has been established management-labor committees under the War Manpower Commission in the various regions for the purpose of developing policies and programs affecting all types of labor; and

Whereas these committees are now composed of representatives of employers and organized industrial workers and no representation has been given organized agricultural workers though these committees do concern themselves with the problems of all types of labor, including agricultural workers; and

Whereas the various Southern States contain the Nation's largest supply of labor which is not fully utilized in the war effort: Be it

Resolved, That this tenth annual convention of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union assembled in Memphis, Tenn., and representing farm workers residing in the States of Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Florida urges the War Manpower Commission to give representation to agricultural workers in these States by appointing representatives on the regional management-labor committees; further it is

Ordered, That copies of this resolution be sent to Chairman Paul V. McNutt of the War Manpower Commission, officers of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

RESOLUTION 6: PUBLIC LAW 45

Whereas the Congress of the United States in April of 1943 adopted a law and appropriated $26,000,000 for the purpose of supplying farm labor needs on the Nation's farms; and

Whereas under provisions of this the Agricultural Extension Service which is an educational institution has been given authority to determine areas of recruitment within the various States and to recruit workers for farm work; and

Whereas the Food Administration is prohibited by a provision in this law from furnishing transportation to farm workers who are unemployed in the 3,000 agricultural counties of the Nation unless the county agent in each county certifies that each individual worker is available for farm work elsewhere; and

Whereas this law and other measures taken by agencies such as the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service have frozen thousands of experienced farm workers in Southern States in the counties in which they live; and

Whereas with few exceptions the only farm labor supplied the Nation's farms has been that of foreign workers imported into the United States and inexperienced men, women, and children from cities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention petitions the Congress of the United States to enact a law and appropriate funds for recruiting and transporting farm workers during 1944 on the following basis:

1. That one agency of Government preferably the War Food Administration be given full authority to recruit and transport farm workers from any area of the United States where workers are available for employment and to any area where they are needed.

2. That no foreign workers be imported into the United States or war prisoners used until all American workers are fully employed in the war effort.

3. That authority given the county agents to determine the availability of farm workers for transportation to another area in 1943 be removed from provisions of the 1944 law. That the various agricultural extension services restrict their activities to education of farmers.

4. That there be set up by the agency responsible for recruiting and transporting farm workers a representative committee composed of employing farmers, farm workers, and the public to determine policies, areas of recruitment, housing and wage standards for farm workers. That such a committee be authorized to hold hearings in each region or crop division of the United States to determine wages and other conditions of employment on farms for the region or crop.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas the crops in the Mid-South were seriously affected by drought; and

Whereas all crops have now been harvested in this area and there is nothing for farm workers on cotton plantations to do through the winter months and their labor will be unused while workers are needed in other areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call on the Congress of the United States and officials of the War Manpower Commission and the War Food Administration to devise some plan whereby these workers may be used in the war effort.

RESOLUTION 8: WAR PRISONERS

Whereas there are thousands of war prisoners in the country who may be used on farms and in food processing plants: Be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record urging the Government not to use these enemies of our country on farms and in food processing plants producing food for war use.

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the executive council presented a report on the rural South after the war: Be it

Resolved, That the convention adopts this program as the official program of the union for the rural South after the war and that this program be subject to editing by the executive council for the purpose of clearing up any statement which may be misconstrued.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 537); and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 538).

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING (REPT. NO. 539)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a preliminary report from the Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning relating specifically to the disposal of surplus plants and material, the cancelation and adjustment of war contracts, and industrial demobilization and reconversion. I ask that the report be published.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Elaine Beadling, of Coraopolis, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa., in place of Dennis A. Phelan, resigned.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1536. A bill to authorize emergency relief and rehabilitation of farm lands in Lucas County, Ohio, from damage resulting from the extraordinary floods of July and October 1943; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1537. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herbert M Greene; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. TOBEY):

S 1538. A bill to enlarge the jurisdiction of United States district courts in suits against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate 1539, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORITY FOR MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS TO CARRY CIVIL WAR BATTLE STREAMERS

Mr. TYDINGS. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the War Department to permit Civil War battle streamers to be carried with regimental flags. It has always been the policy to exclude streamers which were carried by Confederate regiments, the traditions of which have been inherited down to the present day. I refer, as an example, to a specific regiment, an Alabama organization, which was in existence long before the Civil War, and has continued since, and which fought during the World War as a part of the Rainbow Division. I think it appropriate that now, for purposes of carrying on the traditions of this regiment, the sons of those who fought on the southern side in the Civil War, in memory of the battles in which their fathers fought, at least should have the right to carry these streamers as a matter of maintaining military morale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1539) to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TYDINGS. I also ask unanimous consent that the record of the Alabama regiment to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY

Magnolia Cadets, Canebrake Rifle Guards, Cahaba River Rifles, Alabama Zouaves, Hardee Light Infantry, Montgomery Tru Blues—these were among the companies, some organized as early as 1836, from which was formed the Fourth Alabama Infantry, Confederate States of America, the predecessor of the present One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry.

Immediately after its organization, the Fourth Alabama proceeded by way of Dalton, Ga., to Lynchburg, Va., where it was mustered into the service of the Confederate States of America on May 7, 1861. From there it moved to Harpers Ferry, and shortly thereafter it became a part of General Lee's brigade and participated in the First Battle of Manassas.

In the spring of 1862 the Fourth Alabama took part in the Battle of Seven Pines, sustaining heavy losses. As one of the regiments in Jackson's corps, it fought at the First Battle of Cold Harbor, Malvern Hills, the Second Battle of Manassas, and Antietam. The regiment then became a part of General Law's brigade, composed entirely of Alabama troops, and took active part in the Battle of Fredericksburg and Suffolk, which opened the way for Lee's invasion of the North. Passing on into Pennsylvania, it suffered severely in the repulse at Gettysburg.

In the fall of 1863 the Fourth Alabama moved south with Longstreet's corps and engaged in the battle for Chickamauga. Rejoining the Army of Northern Virginia in 1864, it again became involved in the hardest kind of fighting, as the names Wilderness, Spotsylvania, and Second Cold Harbor testify. After these battles came a long trench warfare period behind the defenses of Petersburg. Then came Appomattox and the surrender, bringing the Alabama regiment's brilliant Civil War record to a close.

While this regiment is credited with only 17 campaigns, and only 17 stones are shown on the regimental crest in commemoration of its participation in the War between the States, it will be noted from the following list that a good many skirmishes were engaged in which were counted as a part of the main effort rather than as a campaign for which the regiment claims battle honors.

Ethams Landing, Beans Station, Gaines Farm, Malvern Hill, Hagle River, Va.; Spotsylvania, Va. (five times); Sharpsburg, Md.; Crutchfields Farm, Va.; Hanover, Va.; Suffolk, Va.; Charles City, Va.; Chickamauga, Ga. (twice); Wills Island, Va.; Hog Mountain, Williamsburg, Va.; Petersburg, Va.; Deep Bottom, Va.; Fort Gibson, Va.; London, Ky.; Knoxville Heights, Tenn.; Seven Pines, Dandridge Pike, Tenn.; Dandridge, Tenn.; Wilderness, Va. (three times); Manassas, Va. (three times); South Mountain, Md.; Fredericksburg, Va.; Fort Huger, Va.; Gettysburg, Pa.; Falling Water, Houlet House, Thornton River, Va.; Ruggles Mill, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Raccoon Valley, Tenn.; Campbell Station, Va.; Cold Harbor, Va.; Manassas Gap, Va.; Fort Harrison, Va.; Darby Town, Va.; Knoxville, Tenn.

At the close of the War between the States, the regiment was mustered out of the Confederate States Army and again became State militia, in independent companies, the organization of which was completed by 1872. The Fourth Alabama units served as militia until 1911, when the Fourth Infantry, National Guard, was organized from the units.

This National Guard outfit saw no active service until June 1916, when it was ordered into Federal service during the Mexican border disturbances and sent to Nogales, Ariz. On the border, it drilled, hiked, patrolled, and performed guard duty. Returning from Nogales on March 22, 1917, it was retained in service for detail guarding bridges and other railroad property until it was returned again to Montgomery on August 14, 1917.

On the eve of the War between the States, the Fourth Alabama was created by Special Order No. 167, A. G. O., Alabama. It is, therefore, a coincidence that on the eve of the World War the regiment should be redesignated the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry.

As part of the Forty-second (Rainbow) Division, the regiment was sent to Camp Mills, N. Y., on August 28, 1917, where it was made ready for service with the American Ex-

peditionary Forces. Arriving at Liverpool, England, November 19, 1917, it was sent to France, where it arrived on November 28.

The World War service of the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry was with the Eighty-fourth Brigade, commanded by Brig. Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Its war record assures its place among the great fighting regiments of the American Army. The participation of the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh in the World War follows:

Lorraine sector (defensive), February 21 to March 21, 1918.

Baccarat sector, subsector Vacqueville (defensive), March 31 to June 18, 1918.

Champagne-Marne (defensive), July 15–18, 1918.

Somme-Suippes sector (defensive), July 3–18, 1918.

Aisne-Marne (offensive), July 26 to August 2, 1918.

La Croix Rouge Farm (offensive), July 26–27, 1918.

Ourcq River, Sergy, Hill 212 (offensive), July 27 to August 2, 1918.

St. Mihiel (offensive), September 12–16, 1918.

Essey sector (defensive), September 16–27, 1918.

Meuse-Argonne (offensive), October 5 to November 9, 1918.

Kreimhilde Settung, Hill 288, Cote de Chatillon (offensive), October 11–21, 1918.

Heights of the Meuse and advance to Sedan (offensive), November 2–9, 1918.

The battle streamers authorized the regiment are:

World War—Lorraine, Champagne-Marne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne. Other battle honors include the award of the French Croix-de-Guerre with palm to Company F for distinguished gallantry in action.

Following the armistice, the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry entered the American Army of Occupation and arrived in Germany on November 16, 1918, 5 days after the end of the war, and remained in that country until ordered to return home. Arriving at New York City, April 25, 1919, then proceeding to Montgomery, Ala., its muster-out was completed by May 19, 1919.

Two months later, in July, 1919, the regiment was again reorganized as the Fourth Infantry, National Guard, and served as such until December 1921, at which time it was redesignated the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry, Alabama National Guard. Regimental headquarters received Federal recognition on April 10, 1922.

Serving as National Guard troops in Alabama, the regiment has been called into the service of the State on many occasions for emergency duty during floods, storms, riots, and civil disturbances, proving that it is capable of serving well in peacetime as well as in war.

It was in the one hundred and fourth year of its existence, on November 25, 1940, that the regiment was again ordered into Federal service as a part of the Army of the United States by Presidential order dated at the White House, Washington, D. C., November 16, 1940. By the latter part of December 1940 it was stationed at Camp Blanding, Fla., its present station, to begin a year of intensive training.

There are few regiments in either the Regular Army or National Guard which can boast of a battle record as distinguished as the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh's. In both the Civil and World Wars, its service was marked by participation in the great pitched battles which stand forth on the pages of the military history of the Nation. The motto of the One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Infantry is Signa Inferemus—We shall drive forward. The words look to the future, and the past performances of the battle-proven regiment proclaim them full of meaning.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 248. An act for the relief of Louis Courcil;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 1133. An act for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 1984. An act for the relief of Paul Barrere;

H. R. 2005. An act for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2236. An act for the relief of Roberta Ramsey;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2469. An act for the relief of Anna Charack;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2792. An act for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston;

H. R. 2989. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3000. An act for the relief of Clara E. Clark;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons; and

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3356. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act; and

S. 3377. An act to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month, to $60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1944—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3593) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"Sac and Fox Indians, Oklahoma (tribal funds): The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay Frank O. Jones $36.32 from funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Sac and Fox Indians of Oklahoma, for services performed while a member of the Sac and Fox, Oklahoma, tribal council."

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"CHICKASAW NATION OF INDIANS, OKLAHOMA (TRIBAL FUNDS)

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay to attorneys of record for said Chickasaw Nation of Indians, employed under the authority of the act approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat., p. 537); for necessary expenses in connection with the investigation of records and preparation, institution and prosecution of suits of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians against the United States under the above-mentioned act of June 7, 1924, the sum of $1,000."

At the proper place in the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. — Nothing contained in this act or in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1943, shall be construed to prevent or to interfere with the instruction, education, training, transportation, or service of class IV–E conscientious objectors within or outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, when such instruction, education, training, transportation, or service is conducted and paid for by a religious or philanthropic agency for the purpose of carrying out relief operations, or to prevent persons paid from appropriations made by the said acts from incidentally facilitating the said instruction, education, training, transportation, and relief services."

RELIEF OF STATES FOR LOSS OF REVENUE ARISING FROM NONTAXATION OF INDIAN LANDS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Whereas the investigations and reports authorized and contemplated under Senate Resolution 282 and Senate Resolution 432 of the Seventy-first Congress were never finally completed; and

Whereas the recommendations of the United States Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs were to the effect that the studies of the relation of the States, wherein exempt Indian properties were of sufficient consideration to seriously affect the State's taxing power, and that of its political subdivisions to the United States, be further studied, in order to determine the rights and equities of such States, with reference to said exempt Indian lands and other property; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Oklahoma Tax Commission* v. *United States*, in an opinion dated June 14, 1943 (319 U. S. —), stated:

"Congress has passed laws under which Indians have become full fledged citizens of the State of Oklahoma. Oklahoma supplies for them and their children schools, roads, courts, police protection, and all the other benefits of an ordered society. Citizens of Oklahoma must pay for these benefits. If some pay less, others must pay more. Since Oklahoma has become a State, it has been authoritatively stated that tax losses, resulting from tax immunity of Indians, have totaled more than $125,000,000, a sum only slightly less than the bonded indebtedness of the State."

In another recent decision of the Supreme Court, it was stated that the new policy of Congress was to tighten the guardianship and restrictions against the taxation of Indian properties, and that where such exemptions or immunities impinged upon the rights and powers of local governments, that the remedy was with Congress, and not in the courts. (See *Creek County* v. *Seber*, 318 U. S., 705, 87 L. ed., 807); Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate of the United States, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a further investigation of the relationship between the Federal Government and the governments of the several States and political subdivisions thereof, in which are located Indian reservations and restricted Indian lands, whether unallotted, allotted, tribal lands, or restricted lands belonging to individual Indians, which are now, or which have in the past been exempt from State taxation, and in which oil and gas or other minerals produced therefrom, are likewise exempt from State taxation; with a view to developing a plan by which, if, in the judgment of the Congress, the facts justify, the United States may make a fair and equitable reimbursement or compensation to the said States, commensurate with the detriment sustained by each such State, or its political subdivision.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the said Committee on Indian Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places, during the sessions and recesses of the Senate of the present Congress, until final report is submitted.

This resolution shall be deemed a continuation of the authorizations and purposes provided for in Senate Resolution 282 and in Senate Resolution 432 of the Seventy-first Congress, and consistent with the report of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of April 1932, submitted to the chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, pursuant to said Resolution 282.

SAMUEL MARGOLIN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Samuel Margolin, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,427.50" and insert "$1,727.50."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment. I may say that I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Claims with respect to this matter, and he has no objection to the action I propose.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation, which were to strike out the preamble; to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the purpose of this resolution is to authorize, during the year beginning April 13, 1943, which marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the creation of the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee which, together with public and private institutions in the service of agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the State colleges of agriculture and organizations composed of farmers and their families, is hereby authorized to hold, conduct, and participate in ceremonies and activities throughout the Nation not only to revere Thomas Jefferson as a patriotic statesman and philosopher, as author of the Declaration of Independence, as a private citizen and President of the United States but also in recognition of our great debt to him as a farmer, agricultural philosopher, inventive genius, educator, and leader in scientific agriculture.

SEC. 2. That there be created the National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby appointed Chairman of and is hereby authorized to organize such Committee. The President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint as members of the Committee five Members of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to appoint in his discretion an appropriate number of members of the Committee representing the following agricultural organizations:

United States Department of Agriculture.

The land-grant colleges (including the colleges of agriculture, the agricultural experiment stations, and the agricultural extension services).

National farm organizations.

The agricultural press.

Scientific and learned societies dealing with agriculture.

The Office of Education.

The Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to appoint a secretary for the Committee. All members of the Committee are to serve without compensation. The duties of the Committee shall be to assist in bringing to the attention of the people of the United States the great services rendered by Jefferson to agriculture and to encourage and promote appropriate and timely activities in connection with the various agricultural organizations mentioned above and of the States of the United States, in the various agricultural meetings to be held during the current year, to encourage appropriate programs dealing with Jefferson and agriculture in the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, to encourage widespread dissemination through the press, the radio, farmers' meetings, the rural schools and agricultural high schools, etc., information about Jefferson.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the making of any appropriation to carry out its purpose.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF RAY ATHERTON TO BE AMBASSADOR TO CANADA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Foreign Relations the nomination of Mr. Ray Atherton, of Illinois, who is now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Canada, to be Ambassador to Canada. This does not change the situation except that it raises Mr. Atherton from the rank of Minister to that of Ambassador. I should like to have unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination as in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ray Atherton to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that the real effect of this is merely to change the rank of Mr. Atherton from that of Minister to that of Ambassador.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. There are certain reasons why speed in the confirmation is very desirable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination as in executive session? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING FROM FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States comes to the Senate, we may have at least 24 hours before we vote on it so that I may become familiar with the report.

DANGER OF POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent editorial from The State, published in Columbia, S. C., entitled "The Poll Tax Again."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLL TAX AGAIN

Some of The State's readers may have wondered why recently it had been commenting again from time to time on the anti-poll-tax bill which seemed to be sleeping peacefully in

the Senate Judiciary Committee. The reason was—as stated here once before—that we had information that the committee had held it about as long as it thought it could; that pretty soon it would be reported out to the floor. Also, the revival of anti-poll-tax propaganda was a sign that something was cooking.

Now the report is out with a 12 to 6 favorable tag, and Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, has promised "free and unlimited coinage of words" in the staging of another successful filibuster. It will be recalled that he and other southern Senators turned the trick in the closing days of the Seventy-seventh Congress. But the time element in the present situation is quite different. And time is a big item in filibuster.

The point between the House bill, which is the one just reported out by the Judiciary Committee, and the O'Mahoney bill, still in committee, is that the former takes an unconstitutional method of trying to remove the poll tax as a requisite for voting, while the O'Mahoney measure proposes a constitutional amendment, which is a longer, but the right way for the matter to be determined.

We don't think the poll tax, in itself, amounts to a hill of beans in the voting in South Carolina. But its removal—if it is to be removed—should be either by State action or through constitutional amendment, the only lawful means.

The danger in passage of the present House bill is more in what it might lead to than in the removal of the poll tax. If Congress can regulate our voting requisites, when the Constitution definitely places that authority in the State, what else could Congress do under the same procedure?

ISSUES INVOLVED IN POLL-TAX BILL—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Poll Tax Bill," by an eminent American writer, Mark Sullivan, and published in the Washington Post of November 17, 1943. This covers the matter very fully. In due time I propose to speak on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL-TAX BILL

(By Mark Sullivan)

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

The present status in the Senate of the proposal to outlaw the poll tax as a qualification for voting is this: The bill to abolish it by act of Congress was reported this week by the Senate Judiciary Committee to the Senate floor and can be called up at any time. Proponents of the measure say they will call it up soon. When called up it will lead to earnest debate. The issue affects the American structure of government more profoundly than any other proposal before this or any recent Congress. There is no call upon the American public more urgent than that this issue be understood, at a time when action upon it is imminent.

The poll tax, as a qualification for voting, is an exercise of the functions of State governments. So is every other qualification for voting, everywhere. Qualifications requiring that the voter must have lived in the State a certain length of time, that he must be a citizen, that if of alien birth he must have been naturalized a certain length of time, that he must be able to read and write—all these and every other one of the various qualifications in different States—all are prescribed by State governments. None are prescribed by the Federal Government at Washington. Fixing qualifications for voting is an exclusive function of the States. It is the most fundamental of their functions—for it is an attribute of their very existence as units of government.

The present proposal would take part of this function away from the States. It would forbid any State to require payment of a poll tax as a requirement for voting in any election to choose Federal officials (President, Vice President, Members of Congress).

If Congress should take this step, if it should enact the poll-tax bill, it would by that act establish a principle and a precedent. The principle and precedent would be that Congress has a right to determine voting qualifications, that Congress can override qualifications fixed by States. By that principle and precedent, if now established, Congress could change any voting qualification in any State. It could forbid any of the familiar qualifications now widely practiced, having to do with length of residence and the like. It would go further than merely forbid qualifications set up by the States—it could set up and enforce new qualifications of its own.

The proposal soon to be debated by the Senate is of concern not merely to the small number of States, eight which still have the poll-tax requirement. It is of concern to every State, to every citizen. It is of the deepest possible concern to persons who have at heart the preservation of the American structure of Government.

This proposal to take from the States part of a function now exercised exclusively by them, comes at a time when there is already serious anxiety about the extent to which the Federal Government, during the past few years, has intruded upon functions of the States. The extent of the Federal absorption of functions of Government can be suggested by two figures. In the State of Ohio, all the functions of government exercised by the States are carried on by 22,000 State employees. But in the same State the number of Federal employees—exercising Federal functions of government and deriving their authority from Washington—is 90,000.

The issue here set forth is so fundamental that no other aspect of the poll-tax measure is comparable. That the poll tax is undesirable is now generally conceded. Formerly practiced in many States, it is being gradually wiped out by the States themselves. It was wiped out by Florida in 1937, by Pennsylvania in 1933, by Louisiana in 1932, by Massachusetts in 1892, in two of the States still retaining it, Tennessee and Arkansas, active movements to repeal it are under way.

To help eliminate rancor from the coming debate, one point should be understood. Because there are large Negro populations in the eight States, all Southern, which still have the poll tax, it is frequently charged that the poll tax discriminates against Negroes. This impression is widespread and has been cultivated. The impression is utterly wrong. The poll tax applies to whites exactly the same as to Negroes. There are in some Southern States devices, especially as respects primary elections, which do discriminate against Negroes. But the poll tax makes no such discrimination. Argument against it can fairly be based on many grounds—but not on the grounds of discrimination between whites and Negroes. In the coming debate, there is no more occasion to use the word Negro than to use the word Swede, or Italian, or Greek.

EXCHANGE AND TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR (S. DOC. NO. 129)

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its general public interest, and because the offices of so many Senators have asked for it, I ask unanimous consent that the material appearing on page 9492 of the RECORD of November 15, starting with my remarks and ending with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] on page 9496 be made a Senate document. This matter contains the material which gives information concerning American prisoners held in other countries at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE WORLD WE WANT—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The World We Want" delivered by the Vice President before the New York Herald Tribune Forum in New York City on November 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARITIME FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARBOUR

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on November 17 by him before the United States Maritime American Legion Post, No. 47, under the auspices of the Maritime Commission, in the Department of Commerce Auditorium, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIGION AND WORLD DISCRIMINATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Religion and World Discrimination" delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah before the Institute for Religious Studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York City, November 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADVERTISING OF WAR BOND PROGRAMS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON NEWS AND ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Advertising Has Paid Its Way" published in the Washington News of November 16, 1943, and an address entitled "The Relation of Advertising to the War Program" delivered by Senator TRUMAN on November 11 at Chicago, Ill., before the annual meeting of the Central Council of American Association of Advertising Agencies, which appear in the Appendix.]

COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE WAR CONTRACTS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release issued by the Office of War Information with reference to reports made by the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration on the subject of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee war contracts, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DOMESTIC AIR PATTERN FOR TOMORROW — ADDRESS BY HARLLEE BRANCH

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Domestic Air Pattern for Tomorrow" delivered by Harllee Branch, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, before the First National Clinic of Domestic Aviation Planning at Oklahoma City, Okla., on November 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY GOVERNOR GRISWOLD OF NEBRASKA

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Twenty Million," discussing the farm program, written by Hon. Dwight

Griswold, Governor of Nebraska, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOODROW WILSON'S LAST WARNINGS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a comment by David Lawrence in the United States News of the issue of November 19, 1943, and the Armistice Day, 1923, radio address by President Woodrow Wilson, and an article entitled "The Road Away From Revolution," contributed by President Wilson to the Atlantic Monthly of August 1923, which appear in the Appendix.]

HARRY SLATTERY, R. E. A. ADMINISTRATOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE EMPORIA GAZETTE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Fight on Slattery," by William Allen White, published in the Emporia Gazette of October 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT FROM NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram, dated November 16, 1943, addressed to President Roosevelt by the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING THE SOLDIER VOTE—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Counting the Soldier Vote—Senator AUSTIN Wants Republican Tellers Agreeable to Party," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of November 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Should Alaska Wait," published in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News of October 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, with the understanding that the bill will not be taken up today, and not until the next session of the Senate, whether tomorrow or Monday, which will be determined when we return from the Hall of the House of Representatives, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 540, Senate bill 1285, to amend the soldiers' voting law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, my attention was distracted, and I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said that I should like to have unanimous consent that Senate bill 1285 be made the unfinished business, with the understanding that the bill would not be taken up today, but go over until tomorrow, to be taken up tomorrow if there should be a session, or, if not, on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Reserving the right to object, I should like to request that if the bill shall be taken up it will definitely not be proceeded with until Monday. I have not had opportunity to read the bill. There are some amendments which I should certainly like to prepare carefully and suggest, and I express the hope that the Senator may be willing to say that the bill will not actually be taken up until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to confer with the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], before making such an agreement. Personally, I have no objection to the bill going over until Monday, and I think I can say to the Senator from Ohio that even if it were taken up tomorrow it probably would not be voted on until Monday. However, I should like to have it made the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Kentucky say not only "probably" but that it will not be voted on before Monday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is quite probable that it will not be voted on before Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, what is the request made by the Senator?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be in order so that I will not again have to repeat the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the unanimous-consent request that the so-called soldiers' voting bill be made the unfinished business, with the understanding that it will not be taken up today; that it will not be taken up until the next session of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee which had that bill under consideration, but was ill at the time, and have not had an opportunity completely to study the bill. I should like to have the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that can be arranged, but I should like to have it made the unfinished business. When the Senate returns from the Hall of the House of Representatives, I think we can arrange the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I have the right to move that the Senate consider the bill, so it may be made the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. I make the point of order that the call of the calendar is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. During the morning hour on any day other than Monday it is in order to move to consider any bill on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, advises me that he has no objection to letting the bill go over until Monday. With that understanding I make my request for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator made a motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I renew my request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, with the understanding that it not be taken up until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio object?

Mr. TAFT. No; I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert new matter.

JOINT MEETING OF MEMBERS OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE HULL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is now time for the Senate to proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until it returns from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate stood in recess.

(The Senate being in recess, its Members proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives in order to listen to the address delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.)

At 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Vice President.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 359)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement with reference to the bill (S. 514), for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, which, after having passed both Houses, was returned by the President of the United States without his approval. I make this statement with a view to asking the Senate to override the veto of the President. It is a claims bill, and on such a bill I do not think such an attempt has often been made in the Senate; indeed, I do not know whether it has ever been made, but the facts in this case are so clear, and it is so evident that the President acted upon a recommendation of the Treasury Department, that I feel sure that not only will the Senate override the veto, but I am quite confident that if the Pres-

ident had had the actual facts before him he would not have vetoed the bill.

In Memphis, Tenn., there lived a lady who had a considerable amount of real estate which she had inherited, as she thought, from her father and her sister. Her name was Mrs. Kate Hamilton. I knew her very well indeed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to excuse me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say to the Senator that none of us over here, who want to hear him, can hear a word he has been saying.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very sorry. I thought I had a fairly good carrying voice. I shall not take more than a few moments, and I hope Senators will listen to me because I am asking them to do a rather unusual thing.

Mrs. Hamilton lived in Memphis, and died on December 1, 1930, possessed of a very considerable amount of real estate which she had inherited from her father and from her sister who was a nun in the Catholic Church, and who had lived in Texas. She died in Texas.

Mrs. Hamilton never knew of a sale being made by her sister. She thought she had inherited all the property through the father, and, her sister dying, she supposed she had inherited it from her sister also. Mrs. Hamilton had one daughter—an adopted daughter, by the way—who inherited her entire estate. The adopted daughter became the administrator of the estate, and received the entire property, and paid an inheritance tax in excess of $14,000 at the time of the settlement of the estate.

There is a provision in the Federal law, as I recall, which requires that application for the refund of tax money so paid be made within 3 years. The time had nearly expired. I think it would have expired in 3 months, or about that time. I ask the Senator from Louisiana if that is not correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. About 3 months before the time would have expired, a remarkable situation developed. The Order of the Sacred Heart, of the Catholic Church, through its attorney, presented a will of the sister in Texas—Mother Mary, as she was called—who died many years ago leaving a will in Texas, which was proved in Texas, but which had never been established in Memphis, and the family knew nothing in the world about it. If the administratrix had filed a claim at that time for a refund of one-half the tax, it would have had an effect on the law suit. A great deal of property was involved, and the administratrix was advised by her lawyer that her claim was perfect notwithstanding the will.

Litigation started in 1934, and continued for several years. The case was first tried in the chancery court, which is the tribunal in Tennessee where such actions are initiated. The case was tried before that court, and Mrs. Karsch, the adopted daughter and administratrix, won before the chancelor. The decision was appealed to the court of appeals by the attorneys for the Order of the Sacred Heart. The court of appeals decided again in favor of the administratrix. That made two decisions in her favor. Thereupon, in accordance with the provisions of our law, the losing side filed a petition in the Supreme Court, set up all the facts, and asked for a writ of certiorari and supersedeas, which petition being granted, the case went to the Supreme Court.

Mrs. Hamilton, the decedent, died on December 1, 1930, and the administratrix paid the tax in 1931 and 1933, as I recall the date. I shall have to ask the Senator from Louisiana in order to be absolutely certain of the dates. He is chairman of the Committee on Claims, from which the bill was reported.

The case was not finally decided by the Supreme Court until 1939, when a decision in favor of the Order of the Sacred Heart was handed down. Mrs. Karsch had paid out $7,025.60 in taxes on a part of the estate which was not at all taxable, because under the law the half of the estate going to the sister, or to the devisee under the sister's will, which was the Order of the Sacred Heart, was not taxable.

The measure which has been vetoed was a simple bill introduced by me after the case was decided. It was introduced and was referred to the Committee on Claims, which unanimously reported it. It seemed to be a matter of right. The Government had received $7,025.60 to which it was not entitled. It was perfectly clear that it was not entitled to the money. The payment was made under a misapprehension of fact, and it seems to me that for the Government to undertake to take advantage of a technical statute of limitations and deprive this administratrix of the $7,000 which she had unwittingly paid under the circumstances I have stated cannot be defended. It seems so clear that it is a matter of right and justice that the Government should return the money that I am asking that the Senate override the veto.

I am quite confident that if the President had had these facts before him he would not have vetoed the bill. I want to be perfectly frank with Senators; I never dreamed that a bill such as this would be vetoed; of course, I never discussed the bill with the President, and did not have an opportunity to do so. Yet the bill has been vetoed, and I am asking for an overriding of the veto, since the Senate was the body in which the bill originated. It will take a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, and the question must be decided by a yea-and-nay vote. I am asking my colleagues to do justice to this good woman, who paid out this money under a misapprehension of the law. I am asking my colleagues to restore to Mrs. Karsch, the administratrix, $7,025.60 which was erroneously paid.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the veto based solely on the statute of limitations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; solely on the statute of limitations.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It is rather difficult to get a clear understanding of a matter when one has heard it brought up in just this way. As I understood what the Senator stated, the amount carried in the bill is the amount of a tax which was illegally assessed and illegally collected upon a portion of an estate which had passed to a religious or charitable institution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Which was not taxable.

Mr. WHITE. So that it was not legally taxable?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Really, the only question presented to us is whether we approve of the pleading of the statute of limitations by the Federal Government against a claimant under these circumstances.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Treasury Department sent in a recommendation that the bill be vetoed on that ground, and evidently the President based his veto on the recommendation of the Treasury Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield; but permit me to say that I hope Senators will remain for a few moments, so that we can take a vote on the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have an answer to the question as to whether or not, when the tax was paid, it was considered by all parties to be a legal tax, and one that should have been paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly the fact. No one ever dreamed there was an outstanding will which made any other disposition of the property. Mrs. Karsch thought she had inherited the property.

Mr. FERGUSON. During the entire time while the statute of limitations was running was there any claim that the payment was illegal?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the litigation in fact make it an illegal tax because of the turn the litigation took and the decision in the litigation?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that it was impossible to tell anything about whether the tax was legal or not legal until the litigation was finally ended. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. It must be said that the 3 years had not quite expired when the will turned up, but if the claim had been made at that time it would have greatly injured the chances of the administratrix, as the Senator, who is an excellent lawyer, must know. He knows it would never have done for the administratrix to take a position of that sort, or she would have been very greatly handicapped in the lawsuit then pending.

Mr. FERGUSON. Merely filing the will was not the true test; it was the determination of the litigation?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was the determination of the litigation. The case was

twice decided in favor of the administratrix, but the last decision was against her.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I can tell the Senator from Michigan the facts in the matter. I handled the claim in the Committee on Claims. In short, the facts are these: Mrs. Hamilton died in December, 1930. Mrs. Karsch, her adopted daughter, was her only heir. Mrs. Karsch was appointed administratrix of the estate. She assumed control of this property. She thought it was hers. It had belonged to Mrs. Hamilton since back in the nineties. In December 1931, or a year later, Mrs. Karsch paid the inheritance tax of a little more than $14,000. She managed the property.

Then in July or August 1934, a religious institution in the State of Texas, which is exempt from the payment of inheritance tax, filed suit under an old will. The will was probated. The will was that of Sister Mary Agnes McGivney, a sister of Mrs. Hamilton, who died in 1890. She willed this property to a religious institution. The will was probated in Texas in 1890. It was not probated in the State of Tennessee. Suit was filed under that will in July or August 1934. The 3-year statute of limitations on which the veto is based would expire in December 1934, or 4 months after suit was filed. Litigation was started, and that litigation was not determined until 1939. There was no claim for refund of the inheritance tax until that suit had been determined.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That suit determined the fact that no inheritance tax was in fact due?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Because the property went to the religious institution?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And by virtue of that fact there was no tax due?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the property had gone as originally it was thought it went, then the tax was due?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, that is true, Mr. President.

Mr. EASTLAND. The suit was not determined until 5 years after the statute of limitations had expired with respect to claim for refund. The point in the veto was that Mrs. Karsch should have filed a claim for refund of the tax before the 3-year period of the statute of limitations had expired. But she had no claim then. She had no claim until the suit had been determined, which was in 1939.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator tell me whether since the veto message was received this subject matter has had further consideration in the Committee on Claims?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, it has.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say that the Committee on Claims gave consideration to the original bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee. We have pending before our committee quite a number of claims for refunds of taxes, and the President in the past has always vetoed such claim bills; but when this claim came before the committee we gave it due consideration and felt that it deserved to be excepted from the general rule.

It will be noted that the President's veto message is the stereotyped form of veto message. It is a similar type of message, except as it relates to the facts, to those which have heretofore been sent to the Congress in connection with claims for refunds of taxes.

Mr. President, what caused the committee, after a consideration of the veto message, to take up this matter was the equity that existed in this case. Here was the claimant who was called upon to pay inheritance tax to the Federal Government as well as to the State of Tennessee within 1 year after the death of Mrs. Hamilton. She followed the law in that respect. It was not until July of 1934, only 4 months before the 3-year statute of limitation expired, that suit was filed under the old will.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. For the information of the Senate in considering this claim I should like to have the Senator explain from what ancestor this property originally came.

Mr. ELLENDER. From what ancestor?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes. I understood the name of the mother of the administratrix was Mrs. Hamilton.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; Mrs. Hamilton. She had no children, but she had this adopted daughter, Mrs. Karsch.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer the question if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mrs. Hamilton was a daughter of a school teacher whose name was Eugene McGivney, who over 100 years ago taught school for many years in the then little town of Memphis. He bought a schoolhouse lot outside the city limits, which is now in the heart of the city, and that in itself shows what progress has been made in the growth of the city. The increase in the value of that schoolhouse lot was what caused the property which was given to Mrs. Hamilton to be of such value.

Her maiden name was Kate McGivney. She and her sister inherited the property from their father, and she thought that her sister died without will, and that she owned all the property.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Under the probate proceeding in Tennessee who received this property?

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the probate proceedings?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understood the Senator to say that the estate was probated first in Tennessee, and that someone received the property. Who was it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mrs. Karsch received the property.

Mr. ELLENDER. The adopted daughter.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mrs. Karsch?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, who was the adopted daughter of Mrs. Hamilton.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The property came then from Mrs. Hamilton to Mrs. Karsch?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Did not the probate proceedings in Tennessee show that Mrs. Hamilton had the sister in Texas?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. She had been dead many years, and had left a will in Texas of which Mrs. Hamilton had never heard. No one in Memphis had ever heard of it until it turned up in the year 1934, to the surprise of everyone.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Did Mrs. Hamilton die intestate?

Mr. McKELLAR. She died intestate, yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. And no reference was made to the deceased sister in the petition for probate?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated, the suit under the old will was filed in July of 1934, only 4 months before the 3-year period in which to file claim for refund of the tax expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Who does the administratrix under the law of Tennessee in effect represent? Was this real estate?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was. She was the administratrix of the estate, and she thought she inherited the real estate from the mother who had adopted her.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that is the fact which made it inconsistent to file suit and ask for the refund. She would have then been admitting that the institution was entitled to the property, and not the administratrix?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what her lawyers thought; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, Mr. President, that is correct. Then, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, two courts decided in favor of Mrs. Karsch, and it was only on an appeal by writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court that the Supreme Court considered the case.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was not even an appeal. It was a petition for certiorari.

Mr. FERGUSON. So we have the situation, then, of an administratrix, in effect, representing two interests: those of the real owner of the property and those of herself, she thinking she was the real owner.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And for that reason she did not file the claim within the statutory period.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct about it.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the basis of the present claim for a refund is that the Government has been unjustly enriched; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from Tennessee. I understood him to say that the amount of tax paid was $14,000, and that the claim is for $7,000. Where is the other $7,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Fourteen thousand dollars was paid, but she paid the tax on the whole estate, not merely on the half of the estate she eventually received. It was held that the sister's legatee, the Order of the Sacred Heart of the Catholic Church, was entitled to one-half the property on which the administratrix had paid $7,000.

Mr. TUNNELL. Fourteen thousand dollars was the total tax? Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; only half of which was really due by Mrs. Karsch.

Mr. McKELLAR. The other half was due, if by anyone, by the Order of the Sacred Heart; but it was never paid by them.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand. I was on the Claims Committee, and the case seemed to me to be one in which the money should be refunded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and I understand the report is unanimous.

Mr. TUNNELL. It is.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether my understanding is correct. I understand there is a unanimous report from the committee, filed after the committee had considered the matter a second time, that the course we are now pursuing should be adopted; that is, they recommended that the veto be overridden.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Tennessee made a request that the bill be taken up for reconsideration?

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought I had made such a request. If I did not, I ask unanimous consent that it be taken up now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course that will not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it not displace the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 514) entitled "An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

On this question the yeas and nays are required by the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the yeas and nays are required, I think a quorum should be present. I make the point of the absence of a quorum, so that all Members of the Senate may be present and may vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Robertson
Andrews	Green	Scrugham
Bailey	Guffey	Shipstead
Ball	Gurney	Smith
Barbour	Hatch	Stewart
Barkley	Hawkes	Taft
Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Co.	Tobey
Buck	Kilgore	Truman
Burton	Langer	Tunnell
Bushfield	Lodge	Tydings
Butler	Lucas	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Van Nuys
Caraway	McFarland	Wagner
Chandler	McKellar	Wallgren
Chavez	Maybank	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wherry
Connally	Moore	White
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wiley
Downey	Overton	Willis
Eastland	Pepper	Wilson
Ellender	Radcliffe	
Ferguson	Revercomb	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objection of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Question has been raised as to whether there might have been an offset to which the Government was entitled, or whether the Government collected all the tax it was entitled to from the other end of the estate, which is not involved here—the Order of the Sacred Heart. Does the Senator have any knowledge of that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. The Government has collected from the estate everything it is entitled to, and, in addition, a sum slightly in excess of $7,000, which is the amount proposed to be refunded by the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—65

Aiken	Connally	Maybank
Andrews	Downey	Mead
Bailey	Eastland	Moore
Ball	Ellender	O'Daniel
Barbour	Ferguson	Overton
Barkley	George	Pepper
Bilbo	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hatch	Revercomb
Brooks	Hayden	Robertson
Buck	Holman	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tunnell

Tydings	Wallgren	Wiley
Vandenberg	Walsh	Willis
Van Nuys	Wherry	Wilson
Wagner	White	

NAYS—4

Danaher	Guffey	Hawkes
Green		

NOT VOTING—27

Austin	Glass	Murray
Bankhead	Hill	Nye
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Brewster	La Follette	Reed
Byrd	McCarran	Reynolds
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Russell
Davis	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	Millikin	Tobey
Gillette	Murdock	Wheeler

So, on reconsideration, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill was passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, before we become too far removed from the subject matter of our latest official action, I wish to make a brief statement.

I talked with various members of the committee from which the bill came which later resulted in the veto and the action which the Senate has just taken to override the veto. I did not wish to obtrude my particular argument upon my colleagues, but I desire the RECORD to contain a statement of the reasons for my voting as I did.

I find myself in this position: I feel that when there is a statute of limitations, it should be a statute of repose. There should be an end to the business of citizens dealing with the Government, and vice versa. If in a given instance we are to reopen a case on the motion of one who will benefit thereby, it should be open equally for the Government, in turn, to press its claim, if any there be, for an additional levy or tax, as the case might disclose. Therefore, when we find ourselves in the predicament presented by this bill, it seems to me to point to the need for general legislation to take care of hardship cases of a special class, rather than to have the Senate decide ex parte perhaps a thousand cases a year.

Every Senator has had numerous claims presented to him—perhaps a dozen or 15 a year—all of them more or less cogent, and some of them very appealing, pointing out the injustice which has resulted from the operation of the fixed rule of law which is to be found in our statute of limitations. Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that taking individual action on separate cases, with an ex parte presentation on the floor of the Senate, is not the way to reach the problem.

INVESTIGATION OF UNDEVELOPED RESOURCES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 205, which is on the calendar. The resolution was approved by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It provides for the appointment of a subcommittee to investigate, only in the State of California, water, irrigation, and other projects, and calls for no appropriation of money.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the Senator at any time discussed the resolution with the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. DOWNEY. I have not discussed this particular resolution with him. Several months ago I did discuss with the senior Senator from California the fact that I was expecting to go to California on an investigation. I cannot conceive that he would have the slightest interest or concern in it.

Mr. WHITE. So far as the Senator knows, the senior Senator from California has no objection?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct; and I am very positive that he could have no possible concern with it or objection to it.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California a question. While the resolution carries no appropriation, is it contemplated that an appropriation will be requested later?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; no appropriation will be requested. The resolution contains this sentence:

> The expenses of the committee or subcommittee under this resolution shall not be paid out of or create a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate.

I can assure our distinguished majority leader that there will be no request for money later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 205) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on November 12, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation in the State of California with respect to (1) the undeveloped irrigation, reclamation, water, power, and all other projects of a public nature with a view to determining the number of workers that might be required in the construction of such projects, the cost involved, and the best manner of financing them, (2) the total amount of unemployment that may be created in the State of California by the termination of the war, and (3) the extent to which the construction of public projects may relieve such unemployment in comparison with the operations of private business and enterprise, and to consider any and all methods that may be deemed advisable in solving post-war problems in the State of California. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and to invite representatives of farm, labor, public, civic, commercial, and other groups in the State of California to participate in and to assist in such investigation. The expenses of the committee or subcommittee under this resolution shall not be paid out of or create a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate.

DRAFT DEFERMENT OF SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is not often that I am affected by articles which appear in the newspapers; but in view of some statements which have been made about the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself in the column entitled "The Federal Diary" in the Washington Post of today, I desire to read a portion of the article and make a brief comment.

The article states, in part:

> The Senate now has a Draft Deferment Committee, but it doesn't function. Senators LODGE and MAYBANK are members and they joined in writing a bill that set up the committees for the Senate, as well as the executive and judicial agencies. The Senate committee doesn't meet, nor has it set up standards under which Senate employees can get deferred. This has led other Senators to accuse LODGE and MAYBANK of violating their own law by their failure to function.

Mr. President, one of the things I cherish in the short time I have been in Washington is the association with my fellow Members in this body. They have been very kind to me, and no Senator has requested anything.

The President of the Senate appointed me as a member of the committee. The Senator from Massachusetts and I were appointed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to prepare the legislation after we learned in the Appropriations Committee that there were hundreds of young men employed by the Federal Government apparently hiding out in the bureaus in Washington because they were employed by the Federal Government. The bill became a law. As a member of the committee, of which the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman, I have attended every meeting which has been called. It is true that we have set up no standards to defer, in general, the employees of the Senate or departments, but we are ready to hear any individual case which may be brought to our attention. Only last week one individual case was brought to our attention—that of a man doing valuable work who was selected for limited service. Upon the basis of an affidavit and a letter from General Ulio and because of his physical disability, we requested his deferment.

At the same time, Mr. President, two or three pages of names of men were brought to us with the request that we ask that they not be reclassified in I-A. This was refused. My attitude with reference to the employees of the Senate, or the employees of the Government, is that they should be treated just the same as the employees of individuals. Under certain circumstances they are entitled to the same deferments to which private employees are entitled. But certainly, Mr. President, no Government employee is entitled to any preference over any nongovernmental employee in any State of the Union.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the bill which we were fortunate in having unanimously passed by the Senate has perhaps put into the service of their country some of those in the Government departments in Washington, to whom reference has been made in reports and otherwise, who have been in the service of the Government at the taxpayers' expense.

However, I wish there to be no misunderstanding in connection with many faithful Government employees. As I said some time ago when I introduced in this body records bearing upon the subject, there are many, many Government employees deserving commendation. But, Mr. President, in fairness at last many of those, as shown by the reports, who deserve little consideration are on their way to where the other boys in this country are gladly serving.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—ELAINE BEADLING

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, earlier in the day the nomination of Elaine Beadling to be collector of customs, collection district No. 12, was favorably reported from the Committee on Finance. The Treasury Department has indicated a necessity for the immediate consideration of the nomination. Inasmuch as the Department has so expressed itself, I understand that the Senator from Maine has said that he will lodge no objection to immediate action on the nomination.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that the situation is an emergency one. It is my understanding that the collector has died or retired.

Mr. GEORGE. No; he has resigned.

Mr. WHITE. I suppose that in a district of such great importance it is highly necessary that there should be a collector of customs, and I have no objection to the present consideration of the nomination.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elaine Beadling to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER AT ARTHUR, N. DAK.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth B. Scott to be postmaster at Arthur, N. Dak., which had previously been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Kendall McConnaughey to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 18, 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert Kendall McConnaughey to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Elaine Beadling to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Julia S. Wheeler, Ormond Beach.

MISSISSIPPI

Ruby M. Summers, Saucier.

NORTH DAKOTA

Elizabeth B. Scott, Arthur.

OKLAHOMA

Ralph D. Kester, Enid.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us that Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee, then shall the earth yield her increase and God, even our own God, shall bless us, God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.

Now let us all join in the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to call.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

The joint meeting of the two Houses was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.

The Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the Vice President and Members of the Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as a committee to escort our distinguished guest to the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as a committee to escort the Secretary of State into the Chamber the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the members of the President's Cabinet, who entered the Chamber and took the seats reserved for them.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, it gives me great pleasure to welcome

back to this Chamber one of its most distinguished ex-members. It was here he began a career that has led to world-wide fame. By his great work at Moscow, in my humble opinion, he has interpreted the inarticulate longings of millions here and of millions over there who, through fear today, cannot speak for themselves. It is my great pleasure, and my high privilege to present to you the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull.

Mr. SECRETARY HULL. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, I am immensely gratified to be back in these Legislative Halls and again meet numerous friends, old and new, and especially former colleagues in the two Houses, for each of whom I have long entertained sentiments of great respect and genuine affection. I appreciate deeply the high compliment of being invited to meet with you today. But I appreciate even more the fact that, by your invitation, you have emphasized your profound interest in the principles and policies for which the Moscow Conference stood, and in the progress made by the participating governments in carrying them forward.

In the minds of all of us here present, and of the millions of Americans all over the country, and at battle stations across the seas, there is and there can be, at this moment, but one consuming thought—to defeat the enemy as speedily as possible. We have reached a stage in the war in which the United Nations are on the offensive in every part of the world. Our enemies are suffering defeat after defeat. The time will come when their desperate movement to destroy the world will be utterly crushed. But there are in store for us still enormous hardships and vast sacrifices. The attainment of victory will be hastened only in proportion as all of us, in this country and in all of the United Nations, continue to exert all possible effort to press home our advantage without the slightest relaxation or deviation.

The glorious successes which have already attended our arms and the confidence which we all feel today in assured, though still immensely difficult, victory would have been impossible if this country and Great Britain and the Soviet Union and China and the other victims of aggression had not each risen as a unit in defense of its liberty and independence. They would have been equally impossible if all these nations had not come together in a brotherhood of self-preservation.

While we are thus engaged in the task of winning the war, all of us are acutely conscious of the fact that the fruits of our victory can easily be lost unless there is among us wholehearted acceptance of those basic principles and policies which will render impossible a repetition of our present tragedy, and unless there is promptly created machinery of action necessary to carry out these principles and policies. The Moscow Conference is believed to have been an important step in the direction both of shortening the war and of making provision for the future.

The convocation of the conference was the result of a profound conviction on the part of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin that, at this state of the war, frank and friendly exchanges of views between responsible representatives of their three Governments on problems of post-war, as well as war, collaboration were a matter of great urgency. Up to that time such exchanges of views had taken place on several occasions between our Government and that of Great Britain. But the exigencies of war had been obstacles to the participation of the Soviet Government in similar exchanges to the same extent. With the acceleration of the tempo of war against Germany, the necessity became daily more and more apparent for more far-reaching discussions and decisions by the three Governments than had occurred theretofore.

I went to Moscow, by direction of President Roosevelt, to discuss with the representatives of Great Britain and the Soviet Union some basic problems of international relations in the light of principles to which our country, under the President's leadership, has come to give widespread adherence. It has never been my fortune to attend an international conference at which there was greater determination on the part of all the participants to move forward in a spirit of mutual understanding and confidence.

The conference met against the background of a rapidly changing military situation. From the east and from the south, the Nazi armies were being steadily hammered back into narrower and narrower confines. From the west, the Allied air forces were relentlessly and systematically destroying the nerve centers of German industrial and military power.

Formidable as the war task still is, it has been increasingly clear that the time is nearing when more and more of the territory held by the enemy will be wrested from his grasp, and when Germany and its remaining satellites will have to go the way of Fascist Italy. In these circumstances, new problems arise which require concerted action by the Allies—to hasten the end of the war, to plan for its immediate aftermath, and to lay the foundation for the post-war world. Our discussions in Moscow were concerned with many of these problems. Important agreements were reached; but there were no secret agreements, and none was suggested.

Of the military discussions which took place it can be stated that they were in the direction of facilitating closer cooperation between the three countries in the prosecution of the war against the common enemy. I am glad to say that there is now in Moscow a highly competent United States Military Mission, headed by Maj. Gen. John R. Deane.

The attention of the conference was centered upon the task of making sure that the nations, upon whose armed forces and civilian efforts rests the main responsibility for defeating the enemy, will, along with other peacefully minded nations, continue to perform their full part in solving the numerous and vexatious problems of the future. From the outset, the dominant thought at the conference was that, after the attainment of victory, cooperation among peace-loving nations in support of certain paramount mutual interests will be almost as compelling in importance and necessity as it is today in support of the war effort.

At the end of the war, each of the United Nations and each of the nations associated with them, will have the same common interest in national security, in world order under law, in peace, in the full promotion of the political, economic, and social welfare of their respective peoples—in the principles and spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the declaration by United Nations. The future of these indispensable common interests depends absolutely upon international cooperation. Hence, each nation's own primary interest requires it to cooperate with the others.

These considerations led the Moscow Conference to adopt the four-nation declaration, with which you are all familiar. I should like to comment briefly on its main provisions.

In that document it was jointly declared by the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China "that their united action, pledged for the prosecution of the war against their common enemies, will be continued for the organization and maintenance of peace and security."

To this end, the four governments declared that they "recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small." I should like to lay particular stress on this provision of the declaration. The principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a future system of general security will be the foundation stone upon which the future international organization will be constructed.

The adoption of this principle was particularly welcome to us. Nowhere has the conception of sovereign equality been applied more widely in recent years than in the American family of nations, whose contribution to the common effort in wartime will now be followed by representation in building the institutions of peace.

The four governments further agreed that, pending the inauguration in this manner of a permanent system of general security, "they will consult with one another and as occasion requires with other members of the United Nations with a view to joint action on behalf of the community of nations" whenever such action may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Finally, as an important self-denying ordinance, they declared "that after the termination of hostilities they will not employ their forces within the territories of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation."

Through this declaration, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States, and China have laid the foundation for

cooperative effort in the post-war world toward enabling all peace-loving nations, large and small, to live in peace and security, to preserve the liberties and rights of civilized existence, and to enjoy expanded opportunities and facilities for economic, social, and spiritual progress. No other important nations anywhere have more in common in the present war or in the peace that is to follow victory over the Axis Powers. No one, no two of them can be most effective without the others, in war or in peace.

Each of them had, in the past, relied in varying degrees upon policies of detachment and aloofness. In Moscow, their four governments pledged themselves to carry forward to its fullest development a broad and progressive program of international cooperation. This action was of world-wide importance.

As the provisions of the four-nation declaration are carried into effect, there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or to promote their interests.

The conference faced many political problems growing out of the military activities in Europe. It was foreseen that problems of common interest to our three governments will continue to arise as our joint military efforts hasten the defeat of the enemy. It is impracticable for several governments to come to complete and rapid understanding on such matters through the ordinary channels of diplomatic communication. The conference accordingly decided to set up a European Advisory Commission with its seat in London. This Commission will not of itself have executive powers. Its sole function will be to advise the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. It is to deal with nonmilitary problems relating to enemy territories and with such other problems as may be referred to it by the participating governments. It will provide a useful instrument for continuing study and formulation of recommendations concerning questions connected with the termination of hostilities.

For the purpose of dealing with problems arising from the execution of the terms of surrender of Italy and with related matters growing out of the developing situation in that country, the conference established an advisory council for Italy. This council will consist of representatives of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, of the French Committee of National Liberation, and of the Governments of Yugoslavia and Greece, as early as practicable. The members of the council will advise the Allied commander in chief and will make recommendations to the respective governments and to the French committee concerning nonmilitary problems relating to Italy.

It was clearly understood that the setting up of these two agencies was not intended to supersede the usual diplomatic channels of communication between the three Governments. On the contrary, arrangements were made for expeditious and effective handling of questions of concern to the three Governments through tripartite diplomatic conversations in any one of the three capitals.

In a declaration on Italy, the conference set forth a number of principles on the basis of which democratic restoration of that country's internal political structure should take place. These principles—including freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of assembly, and the right of the people ultimately to choose their own form of government—are among the most basic human rights in civilized society.

In a declaration on Austria, the forcible annexation of that unhappy country was pronounced null and void. It was further declared that Austria is to be given an opportunity to become reestablished as a free and independent state, although the Austrians were put on notice that in final analysis the treatment to be accorded them will depend upon the contribution which they will make toward the defeat of Germany and the liberation of their country.

The Conference also served as an occasion for a solemn public declaration by the heads of the three governments with regard to the perpetrators of the bestial and abominable crimes committed by the Nazi leaders against the harassed and persecuted inhabitants of occupied territories—against people of all races and religions, among whom Hitler has reserved for the Jews his most brutal wrath. Due punishment will be administered for all these crimes.

Finally, the Conference gave preliminary attention to a number of other specific problems relating to the eventual transition from war to peace. A fruitful exchange of views took place on such questions as the treatment of Germany and its satellites, the various phases of economic relations, the promotion of social welfare, and the assurance of general security and peace.

These were among the outstanding developments at the Moscow Conference. The intensive discussion, lasting 2 weeks, did not and was not intended to bring about the solution of all the problems that are before us. Much less could we anticipate the problems that are bound to arise from day to day and from year to year. There were other problems, such, for example, as questions relating to boundaries, which must, by their very nature, be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities. This is in accordance with the position maintained for some time by our Government.

Of supreme importance is the fact that at the Conference, the whole spirit of international cooperation, now and after the war, was revitalized and given practical expression. The Conference thus launched a forward movement which, I am firmly convinced, will steadily extend in scope and effectiveness. Within the framework of that movement, in the atmosphere of mutual understanding and confidence which made possible its beginning in Moscow, many of the problems which are difficult today will, as time goes on, undoubtedly become more possible of satisfactory solution through frank and friendly discussion.

I am happy on this occasion to pay personal tribute to those with whom it was my privilege to confer in Moscow. Mr. Molotov arranged for the business of the conference in a most efficient manner. Both as chairman and participant, he manifested throughout the highest order of ability and a profound grasp of international affairs. Mr. Eden, with his exceptional wisdom and experience, exhibited the finest qualities of statesmanship. I found in Marshal Stalin a remarkable personality, one of the great statesmen and leaders of this age.

I was deeply impressed by the people of Russia and by the epic quality of their patriotic fervor. A people who will fight against ruthless aggression, in utter contempt of death, as the men and women of the Soviet Union are fighting, merit the admiration and good will of the peoples of all countries.

We of today shall be judged in the future by the manner in which we meet the unprecedented responsibilities that rest upon us—not alone in winning the war, but also in making certain that the opportunities for future peace and security shall not be lost. As an American, I am proud of the breadth and height of the vision and statesmanship which has moved you, ladies and gentlemen, in each House of the Congress, to adopt, by overwhelming nonpartisan majorities, resolutions in favor of our country's participation with other sovereign nations in an effective system of international cooperation for the maintenance of peace and security.

Only by carrying forward such a program with common determination and united national support, can we expect, in the long range of the future, to avoid becoming victims of destructive forces of international anarchy which in the absence of organized international relations will rule the world. By the procedure of cooperation with other nations likewise intent upon security, we can and will remain masters of our own fate.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.

PROCEEDINGS DURING THE RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings occurring during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts from an article by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Vice President Osmeña, of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech on John Hanson made by a constituent residing in my home county.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the new pay schedule. And I am also inserting a table which gives the amount of money paid to the dependents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Sons of Italy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Toledo Times in regard to aviation, under date of November 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] may extend his remarks and include a copy of an Executive order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two speeches that I made in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(1) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferment under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (e) of this section existing at the date of enactment of this subsection shall within thirty days after such date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within ten days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this Act; and the determination of the President shall be final.

"'(m) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b), under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, on the basis of the best inventory information available to him at the time of allocating calls, without affecting the usual regular and orderly flow of the Nation's manpower into the armed forces as required for service therein, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this Act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this Act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term "child" as used in this section means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild, adopted child, foster child, or a person who is in the relationship of child to the registrant, who became such prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than 18 years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions, except pursuant to a requisition by the land or naval forces for persons in needed medical professional and specialist categories.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 (a) (2) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) to create and establish a Selective Service System, and shall provide for the classification of registrants and of persons who volunteer for induction under this Act on the basis of availability for training and service, and shall establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. There shall be created one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President, from recommendations made by the respective Governors or comparable executive officials. No member of any such local board shall be a member of the land or naval forces of the United States, but each member of any such local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction under rules and regulations prescribed by the President. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this Act of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President as provided in the last sentence of section 5 (1) of this Act. No person who is an officer, member, agent, or employee of the Selective Service System, or of any such local or appeal board or other agency, shall be excepted from registration, or deferred from training and service, as provided for in this Act, by reason of his status as such officer, member, agent, or employee;'".

"(b) Section 10 (a) (3) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and fix the compensation of at a rate not in excess of $10,000 per annum, a Director of Selective Service who shall be directly responsible to him and to appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or of any reserve component thereof or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this Act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (a) (2)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States: *Provided further*, That any person so appointed, assigned, or detailed to a position the compensation in respect of which is at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum shall be appointed, assigned, or detailed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That the President may appoint necessary clerical and stenographic employees for local boards and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;'".

"SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service only, any authority vested in him under this Act (except section 9). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this Act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.'"

"SEC. 4. Section 10 of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President is authorized and directed forthwith to appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom one only shall be an Army officer and one only a Navy officer, and the three remaining members shall be qualified civilian physicians not employed by the Federal Government, who shall examine the physical, mental, and moral qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men, including those previously discharged from the armed services because of physical disability, who may qualify under any new standards established.'"

"SEC. 5. Any registrant within the categories herein defined when it appears that his induction will shortly occur shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of Selective Service, to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination, subject to reexaminations.

"The commanding officer of such induction station where such physical examination is conducted under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and this examination shall be accepted by the local board, subject to periodic reexamination. Those registrants who are classified as I–A at the time of such physical examination and who are found physically qualified for military service as a result thereof, shall remain so classified and report for induction in regular order.

"SEC. 6. The Director of Selective Service shall obtain full and complete information from the various agencies, departments, and branches of the Federal Government, and from other sources, concerning requests for deferment, deferments, exemptions, rejections, discharges, inductions, enlistments, replacement schedules, and other matters with respect to registrants, whether or not they are members of the armed forces, or whether or not they are Government or private employees; and he shall report that information, together with the manner in which the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are being administered, to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs monthly or at such intervals as the Committees may designate from time to time.

"SEC. 7. Except as provided in this Act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this Act shall be in force."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
FOREST A. HARNESS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the Senate bill and the first section of the House amendment add several new subsections to section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The first of these subsections in the Senate bill (subsection (m)) contains a prohibition against the employment by, or retaining in the employment of, the Federal Government any registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 who is deferred on occupational grounds, unless such registrant is a father or his services in his Federal position have been duly certified to be indispenable. This subsection also contained a prohibition against the deferment on occupational grounds of any registrant between the ages of 18 and 38 who is employed by any employer other than the Federal Government, unless such registrant is a father or his services in the position in which he is employed have been certified by his employer to be indispensable. The House amendment did not contain any provisions comparable to this subsection, and no such provisions are contained in the conference agreement.

Subsection (n) in the Senate bill related to registrants whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area of his local board, and provided for the review of occupational deferments of such registrants by the appeal board having jurisdiction over the area where the registrant's principal place of employment is located. The decision of such appeal board was to be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The subsection also provided that the Director should have power to determine all questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under the act. Subsection (l) in the House amendment contained similar provisions, but required that the decisions of the appeal boards in cases referred to above should be made public. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect and modifies the subsection so as to vest in the President the power to modify or change such decisions of the appeal boards and to determine claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service. The powers so vested in the President will be subject to delegation by him to the Director of Selective Service in accordance with the provisions of section 10 (b), which are discussed later in this report.

Subsection (o) in the Senate bill contained provisions comparable to subsection (m) in the House amendment. The purpose of the provisions in the Senate bill was to provide that to the fullest extent practicable the induction of registrants who are fathers should be postponed until after the induction of registrants who are not fathers and are not otherwise deferred. The Senate bill also contained a definition of the term child to be used for the purpose of determining who should be considered fathers for the purposes of this section. The comparable provisions in the House amendment contained a number of changes in the Senate language designed to require stricter compliance with the policy stated in the subsection, and made a clarifying change in the definition of the term "child." Subsection (m) in the conference agreement contains the House language with certain modifying changes. The first of these changes is for the purpose of making it clear that this subsection, to the extent that it is inconsistent with the quota provisions contained in section 4 (b) of the act, supersedes such quota provisions. The subsection as contained in the conference agreement provides that under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, and on the basis of the best inventory information available to him, without affecting the usual regular and orderly flow of manpower into the armed forces as required for service therein, and in accordance with the requisitions of such forces and with the other provisions of the act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation, and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces.

The House amendment added at the end of this subsection a provision not contained in the Senate bill, which provided that no individuals should be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted, because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions. This provision will do away with the so-called nondeferable orders which distinguish between persons in the same status with respect to dependents merely because of differences in occupations. It does not abolish class II occupational deferments and the distinctions resulting from such deferments, but it does prevent registrants in a given occupation from being inducted in advance of the time they would otherwise be inducted, merely because of their occupation. The conference agreement retains this provision with an exception which will make it inapplicable in the case of a requisition by the land or naval forces for persons in needed medical professional and specialist categories, such as physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, medical technicians, and other professional persons or specialists in medical fields.

Section 2 of the House amendment contained provisions not contained in the Senate bill, which amended paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 10 (a) of the act for the purpose of clarifying existing law with respect to the eligibility of persons other than civilians for service connected with agencies of appeal, other than appeal boards. The conference agreement follows the House amendment in this respect.

Section 2 of the Senate bill amended section 10 (b) of the Act so as to authorize the President to delegate to the Director of Selective Service any authority vested in the President under the Act, except section 9, and to authorize the Director to delegate or provide for the delegation of authority vested

in him to other officers, agents, or persons. The corresponding provision of the House amendment (sec. 3) was the same as the Senate provision except that it authorized and directed the President to delegate to the Director all authority vested in the President under the Act, except section 9 or section 10 (a) (3). The conference agreement authorizes the President to delegate to the Director of Selective Service only any authority vested in the President under the Act (except sec. 9). This provision (together with sec. 7 of the conference agreement, which suspends laws in conflict with the provisions of this Act to the extent of such conflict) means that all authority vested in the President under the Selective Training and Service Act (except sec. 9) will, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, after the date of this amendatory Act, be exercised by the President personally, or by the Director of Selective Service under delegation from the President subject to further delegation by the Director.

Section 3 of the Senate bill added a new subsection to section 10 of the Act. This subsection provided for the appointment of a commission of qualified physicians to examine the physical qualification requirements for admission to the armed forces and recommend to the President changes which they believe should be made in such standards. The subsection also provided for the reexamination of men who might qualify under any new standards. Section 4 of the House amendment contained similar provision but provided that only one member of the commission should be an Army officer and only one a Navy officer, and the other civilian physicians not employed by the Federal Government. The conference agreement (sec. 4) is the same as section 4 of the House amendment, except for a clarifying change to indicate that the commission shall examine mental and moral, as well as physical, qualification requirements.

Section 4 of the Senate bill provided for preinduction physical examinations at induction centers for registrants when it appeared that their induction would shortly occur. The House amendment (sec. 5) contained similar provisions with certain changes of an administrative and clarifying nature. Section 5 of the conference agreement follows the language of the House amendment, with further clarifying changes. Under the conference agreement the preinduction physical examinations will be given at regularly established induction stations, in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of Selective Service. The results of such examinations are to be accepted by the local boards for the purpose of determining whether or not registrants are physically qualified for service, but any registrant who has been given such an examination will be subject to reexamination, from time to time, and the determination as to his physical qualification or lack thereof may be changed as the result of any such reexamination. Registrants who are in class I-A when they take the preinduction physical examination, and who are found physically qualified for military service as a result thereof, will remain so classified and report for induction in regular order.

Section 6 of the House amendment contained provisions, not in the Senate bill, directing the Director of Selective Service to obtain information from the various governmental agencies concerning requests for deferments, exemptions, rejections, and replacement schedules, of registrants employed by the Federal Government, and to report thereon to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs. This section is retained in the conference agreement with some modifying and clarifying changes. It is contemplated that these reports will be made informally and personally by the Director or one of his representatives, and will be oral or written according to the desires of the respective committees.

Section 7 of the House amendment provided that all provisions of law in conflict with the provisions of this act should be suspended to the extent of such conflict. This section is retained in the conference agreement.

Sections 5 to 16, inclusive, of the Senate bill amended the existing law relating to servicemen's dependents allowances. There were no comparable provisions in the House amendment. The subject matter to which these sections related has been dealt with in the bill (S. 1279) which has been enacted into law since the present bill passed the Senate. Consequently, these provisions are omitted from the conference agreement.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
FOREST A. HARNESS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the conference report follows generally the provisions of the bill as it was passed by the House.

The changes made are not in many instances very substantial, although there are a number of changes in the bill. I believe it would be well to state the principal things which will be accomplished by the bill.

It will carry into effect the provisions for the deferment of fathers until nonfathers have been drafted, practically in accordance with my bill which was passed by the House last spring; the principal difference being that this will relate only to so-called pre-Pearl Harbor fathers rather than create the categories which were contained in that bill.

It will mean that when the Director of Selective Service levies his calls upon the States he will consult the inventory of available men in each State and where that inventory indicates an available supply of non-pre-Pearl Harbor fathers he must allocate his calls to those States in such manner as to draw off those non-pre-Pearl Harbor fathers before he levies calls for fathers; in other words he would go over the Nation levying the call for non-pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. When those are exhausted he could go back over the Nation and levy his call so as to get the balance of the requisition of the armed forces even though it was required to draft pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

The same system would apply within the States: The State director in levying his call would consult his inventory of local boards and levy it so as to draw off first the non-pre-Pearl Harbor fathers before he levied calls which would require the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am anxious to know whether or not a State which has contributed a great many men beyond its proper share would be taxed even further under this arrangement simply because it happened to have non-pre-Pearl Harbor fathers?

Mr. KILDAY. I doubt if that would result to any substantial extent in view of the present inventories on the subject. Existing law as to quotas among the States is amended to the extent that these calls can be levied on the basis of available manpower.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Inasmuch as boys are becoming 18 years of age every day there will naturally be a small supply of single registrants. Would the provisions of this bill require that boys who have recently become 18 be called before they began to call pre-Pearl Harbor fathers?

Mr. KILDAY. All the evidence relating to the size of the armed forces at the end of this calendar year indicates that 446,000 fathers will be necessary to meet the size of the armed forces determined by the high command. The further assumption is that after the first of the year replacements will be practically the draft's levy for the Army. In other words, insofar as you reduce the number taken to make up this 446,000, you reduce them for the extent of the program. Inasmuch as almost a hundred thousand enter the draft pool every month and from this approximately 65,000 members of the armed forces are obtained—approximately 45,000 entering through selective service and 20,000 voluntarily—it is assumed under the present program that this, with the reclassification of the IV-F's which we hope to acquire under this bill, will be sufficient to meet the replacement schedules unless there might be some necessity for revising the present plans of the high command. In addition, it must be remembered that the Navy is now also making requisitions on the Selective Service System.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wish to ask the gentleman a question with reference to the first section of the bill. This proposes to transfer appeals from the local board where a man is registered to the appeal board where a man may be employed on the question of his deferment. Is the gentleman satisfied with this provision? It would seem to me this might result in a double draft on those communities where the boys have gone away to work in industries and that the appeal board there will be more impressed by the need of the man for industry than the local appeal board, which would be more impressed by the local manpower problem.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe that from our experience the opposite has been found to be true; in other words we found in Government employ many men holding occupational deferments for whom such deferments had not been asked under the Lodge-Maybank bill; in other words we found the local board more impressed by the man's statement for the need for his deferment and the character of his work than would have been the local board in the place where the man was

employed and which knew the nature of his employment. Many times the deferment had been granted on the mere statement of the deferred man himself. We must remember that this is going to go from the board of the man's residence to the appeal board of his place of employment.

That appeal board is dealing day in and day out with the men registered within its own State and within its own appeal board area; so that when it comes to stressing the importance of the industry with it, you are going to find the opposite to be true, because the members of the appeal board have constantly been forcing their own registrants into the service. If this man from out of the appeal-board area is in a nonessential position I think that board will be quicker to send him into the service, because for every one they unnecessarily defer occupationally they are going to send one of their own men into the armed services.

Mr. CASE. That may be, except if this man is charged against the quota of a local board the appeal board where the industry is located would have no relation to the dislocation or demand for the dislocation in the other area.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension as to the provisions of the bill. The provision does not transfer the case to the appeal board where the man is employed. When the occupational deferment is granted by the board where the man is registered but not employed, there is an automatic appeal to the appeal board of the area in which he is employed. If the appeal board rejects the occupational deferment, then the case goes back to the local board of the registrant's residence and he will be inducted in accordance with the call of the local board where he is registered. He cannot be used to fill the quota of the area in which he is working. He would be a credit on the quota of the local board where he resides.

Mr. CASE. If he is deferred what district would supply the man to take his place?

Mr. KILDAY. It would be a question of the adjustment of the quotas. It is just exactly the same as if he were working in the district where he is registered. It makes no difference at all. The board of his residence must first defer him for occupational reasons before this provision ever goes into effect.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand there have been hundreds of thousands of men discharged for the convenience of the Government largely because of physical deficiencies and that these men are immediately placed back on the draft rolls. Many of them have been reinducted after having been once discharged. Can the gentleman explain to us how it comes that these men are reinducted after having been discharged for reasons best known to the Army?

Mr. KILDAY. There may be isolated cases. I doubt very much if there are many such cases and I am not able to explain to the gentleman how those isolated cases may have occurred.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why, are they not permanently out when they have been discharged by the Army and the Army has nothing further to do with them?

Mr. KILDAY. They should be; and if they are not, there is an error some place.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot help but feel that the fathers who are not taken into the service must be grateful to the WAC's and WAVES. These women have released men from the service so that the fathers may not be taken. One of the WAC's in Africa was given a soldier's medal for bravery because with her bare hands she put out a fire and saved a soldier's life.

Mr. KILDAY. The WAVES and WAC's have replaced men, and are doing an admirable job. The military program is an over-all program. For every WAC and WAVE that goes into the service it becomes unnecessary to draft a man who would otherwise be necessary.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Getting back to the hypothetical case that the gentleman from South Dakota raised in reference to a man working away from his residence and where he is registered. Suppose the local board refuses to defer him, where does he appeal, if he takes one?

Mr. KILDAY. It goes to the regular appeal set-up as at present and the appeal could go to either appeal board. It is just the same as at the present time and the bill makes no change.

Mr. CURTIS. The request for an appeal does not go to the place where he is working?

Mr. KILDAY. It might go to either board as at present under the administrative procedure of the selective-service system.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report, I believe, will result in a more orderly induction of men into the service than prevails at the present time. It will also eliminate a great deal of the confusion which has existed for some time particularly with respect to the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Moreover, it will result in transferring back to the Selective Service Director, where Congress always intended it should be, full power and authority to administer the Selective Service Act. I refer in particular to that part of the bill passed by this House, which completely divests the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission of authority to administer any part of the Selective Service Act.

You will recall that the President some time ago by Executive order transferred Selective Service to the War Manpower Commission. Since that time we have witnessed a great deal of confusion, for it was shortly after that transfer that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission set up nondeferrable lists. In so doing he listed certain types of business and occupations as being essential while others were denominated as nonessential, the men in the nonessential groups, regardless of their dependents, being required to transfer to the essential occupations or be inducted into the service. Some of us have contended that such action was without authority of law. However, since it actually happened, our only way now to correct it is by legislation. So we have adopted as a part of this bill an amendment which I originally offered to the Kilday bill. This amendment, which appears at the end of section 5 (m), completely forbids the induction of men by occupations or by occupational groups, the only exception being persons in needed medical, professional, and specialist categories. This amendment now having been agreed to, the practice of setting up nondeferrable lists will be terminated, as a result of which men will hereafter be inducted as was originally provided for in the Selective Service Act, namely, according to the status of the individual regardless of his occupation. You will note that we have now provided that the President shall have authority to transfer Selective Service functions to a Selective Service Director only. This will prevent the transfer of such functions to the War Manpower Commission or any other executive agency of the Government.

In this bill provision is made for an appeal to an appeal board in the jurisdiction in which men are engaging in essential work. This will take care of the case, for example, where men have been able to obtain deferments through their local boards simply by saying they are employed in a governmental agency. An appeal board in Washington would be in a better position than the local or appeal boards back home to judge whether such men are engaged in occupations essential to the war effort. We believe this process will take from the Government pay roll and from some industries many men who have heretofore been labeled as essential, thus lessening the demand for men with families.

Bear in mind that this bill does not provide against the induction of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. I have been asked by a number of Members whether or not it affects men already in the service. It does not. It affects only those men who will hereafter be called. While categories are not listed as they were in the Kilday bill, all nonfathers will be called first if this bill should become a law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on H. R. 3637, the tax bill introduced by me today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight, Saturday, to file a supplementary report on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 356, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has passed legislation—in operation now—recognizing the danger of inflation to ourselves and the war effort, and in that act known as the Price Control Act has directed the President to keep prices at the September 15, 1942, level.

The President has courageously done his duty. He has held the line better than most persons thought he could do. Mistakes have been made, yes, but decent-thinking persons expect that. As we look over the whole picture, he has done a remarkable job in holding the line against the break-through of inflation.

One thing is certain, when inflation comes, as it is bound to if this bill becomes law, the fault will rest with those Members of Congress who voted for this bill and not with the President. We might just as well be willing to accept our responsibility. If this bill passes, the responsibility for inflation, if it comes, as it will, in my opinion, will rest with Congress. We should be game enough to take our responsibility for our own acts.

If this bill passes, our people might just as well know now as later that inflation is here. The passage of this bill means wide-open competition among the purchasing public for available food and goods. With existing purchasing power, with the demand far greater than the supply, the result is inevitable.

Mr. Bowles, the O. P. A. Administrator, has stated that the increase in the cost of living by next January will be 4 percent if the bill passes. I consider that a conservative estimate. In any event, even if confined to an over-all 4-percent increase in the cost of living, that will be only the starting point. It will be then that the general public, sleeping or slumbering now, reading of impending inflation, but failing to recognize its significance, will wake up, and then their voices of resentment will be heard and felt.

The amazing and disappointing thing to me is the lack of interest taken by the consumer public in the meaning of price control in wartime, in failing to let their feelings and voices be heard before it is too late, before the damage is done to them.

It seems as though most of us wait until we are sick and in pain before we pause in our everyday life to give thought to the cause or causes that bring sickness and pain to us. It seems to be the same with the general public.

We have the spectacle in this fight of Congress saying to the President, "Hold the price level as of September 15, 1942; we direct you to do so, but we are going to take away from you the power to do it." We might just as well say to any one of our generals in command of a battle area that the enemy is attacking, "We direct you to hold the line," and then in the next breath say that we order all of his troops to retire.

If we expect effective price control during this war, we must give the President the means to accomplish it. If the combination of political and pressure groups is strong enough to bring about inflation, why do they not do the honorable thing and repeal the Price Control Act? Why adopt the inconsistent and insincere position that we are in today, of directing the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, and at the same time take away all means by which it can be done? I am practical enough, having been subjected to it myself on many occasions, to appreciate the significance of a strong pressure interest from a district. On most of the legislation before Pearl Harbor I voted contrary to the views of well organized groups in my district. On the question of pressure, one thing is certain, that anyone representing mainly or on the whole a consumers' district, that Member, whether Republican or Democrat, is not subjected to that situation, to that pressure. That being so, another thing is certain, that any such Member voting for inflation will be voting against the direct best interests of the people of his district. In this connection it will be interesting to note how my Republican colleagues who represent consumers' districts will vote on the question of inflation—how many will vote for it and how few against it.

The American public may not fully appreciate the meaning of what is attempted by this bill, but if inflation comes, they will. One thing is certain. When public opinion is aroused, it is a voice and a power that will tolerate no subtle excuses.

I suggest to my colleagues that they go back to the last World War when there was uncontrolled and unrestricted inflation. Consider the conditions which existed at that time and the properly aroused clamor and demand emanating

from the housewives of America who protested vigorously against the intolerable price conditions. We do not have that spectacle today.

By the Price Control Act we declared war against inflation, instructing the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942. By this bill we still direct the President to wage the war against inflation, but we take away from him the ways and the means to do so. The issue today is not one of partial administration subject to criticism or of unsound judgment. Those matters are subject to constructive criticism, and later correction. The basic issue raised by this bill is price control versus inflation. We have heard all kinds of fanciful arguments made on this question of subsidies in recent weeks. Some Republican Members have even condemned the payment of subsidies to the farmers in the dark years of the Hoover depression, when the supply of farm products was much greater than the demand, and when the cost of transportation to the market was more than the farmer could get for his product.

Time passes quickly, and when conditions improve, it seems to be a human trait for people to forget past pains and sufferings. But the people generally are not ungrateful, certainly not intentionally so.

Even while time passes quickly and with better conditions, the pains of the past become dim. I doubt if all of our people and if all of our farmers have forgotten the pain and the suffering of the unpleasant and dark era known as the Hoover depression. When these Members talk about the conservation program of President Roosevelt, and this Democratic administration, with the payment of subsidies, with the problem of a glutted market, with corn, wheat, cotton, and other farm products selling at the lowest price in history, with a necessity for governmental action that would bring about a more equal operation of the law of supply and demand, such an argument is an insult to the intelligence and the gratitude of the farming population of our country. Yes, I can remember, during the dark era known as the Hoover depression, of foreclosures of farms by the tens of thousands, and in some cases fine men in their desperation resisting such foreclosures. I sat here during that period, and I witnessed the do-nothing policy, and I saw the results—economic distress everywhere—inaction, letting nature take its course, which meant the complete destruction of agriculture. And it was very close to that when President Roosevelt took office in 1933. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt the whole country came out of its economic nose dive. Yes, subsidies were paid to the farmers, and what would have happened if they had not been paid? Subsidies were paid as a part of a broader problem of bringing about a normal operation of the law of supply and demand, thereby bringing to the farmer conditions under which he could get a fair price for his product. One thing is certain. He did not continue to get the destructively low prices of the Hoover depression.

When any Member, upon the premise that the farmer has forgotten those days, attacks what was done to help the farmer then, he proceeds upon one of two theories, that the farmer cannot remember back 10 years or that, remembering, he forgets the leadership of the man who employed all of the powers of Government to constructively assist him in his extreme distress. I brand as intellectually dishonest, as a partisan political appeal, for any Member to compare the conditions of 1933 with the conditions of today. Then the supply was greater than the demand. The result was lower and lower prices until general bankruptcy faced agriculture and industry. The conflict that President Roosevelt waged after his inauguration in 1933 was the war against deflation. Today, due to the demands of war, the picture is the opposite. The demand is far greater than the supply. Unless controlled in some way, prices will spiral upward and uncontrolled inflation will result. Distress will exist, and prices will become so prohibitive that the poor will suffer keenly. Economic group feelings will develop, and everyone will ultimately suffer, as we are all in some way consumers. The cost of conducting the war will be sharply increased. The purchasing value of the dollar for all will rapidly be decreased. Internal division will increase and the morale of our people will be affected with a harmful result upon our whole war effort. In 1933 we were fighting a war against deflation. In 1943 we are fighting the war against inflation.

While I have no doubt as to the outcome of this global war and our ultimate success, it is my strong opinion that if inflation comes it will tend to prolong rather than shorten the war. To any Member who in his conscience stands for inflation and honestly feels inflation would be for our best interests, in sharp disagreement with him, I respect his right to entertain his views, although I do not agree with his opinion.

However, to any Members who are opposed to inflation and who recognize that some kind of price control is necessary to prevent inflation, I say that in barring the use of subsidies to control prices you have a duty and obligation to offer a substitute to the existing law, a substitute that either by congressional act will prevent inflation or by congressional direction to the President will enable him to establish some effective machinery other than the use of subsidies.

In conclusion, expressing my views on the basic question of control of prices, I cannot see how we can control prices with the tremendous purchasing power, the tremendous demand that exists, far greater, and in some cases many times greater, than the supply, and this artificial situation which exists under war conditions which we must meet, how we can control prices unless something of a practical nature is done. I am not approving of all of the things that are done. But those are the things subject to constructive criticism and correction. I have heard many speeches; I have agreed with Members on both sides making constructive criticism that should be welcomed and that under no condition or by remote inference do I criticize, and it is not subject to criticism. I have acted upon suggestions made by Members here. I think it is healthy to seek constructive criticism. It produces corrections and better results. But today we are faced with a basic question whether or not we are going to have inflation, and in order to prevent inflation we have got to have price control and you cannot have it by congressional flat. We can prescribe it, as we have, by the words we have used in existing law, but we cannot accomplish it nor can anyone else unless machinery is provided some place, either established by Congress or given to the President, to control the prices and thereby prevent inflation.

To those who feel such conditions are not satisfactory so far as the operation of law is concerned, for example, the O. P. A., criticize constructively those things you think are subject to criticism, but I ask you, by all means, do not let your feelings or criticism of those actions operate by reaction in a manner that you will vote for a bill that will prevent the control of prices and bring about inflation. Personally, I have no doubts as to the outcome. I had hoped that some kind of compromise would be brought about. Personally I do not think the line can be held hard and fast. There must be a little flexibility. I made that statement when the original O. P. A. act was up. All we can do is hold the line as much as we can. When the pressure is great we must give a little, just like armies attacked and then when they must retreat they do not wait until they are destroyed, but they retreat and form a new line to hold the enemy back. Frankly that has always been my opinion. The best way to administer it would be with a little flexibility where the feeling of arbitrary action would be eliminated or reduced to a minimum. Those have been my personal feelings. But on the basic question involved in this bill today, the question of inflation or no inflation, I have no hesitancy in taking my position in support of the President. And I will support any substitute that will bring about price control and prevent inflation during this war period.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to enter upon a discussion of this controversial and technical bill. Suffice it to say that the distinguished majority leader has taken the floor and has presented from a manuscript a very comprehensive discussion of the matter from the viewpoint of those who favor consumer subsidies. I dare say that when the debate shall have finished there will be no point raised in favor of subsidies that has not been covered by the distinguished majority leader. We are not debating the merits of the bill now but the provisions of the rule. I have just a word about the rule. I have been asked a number of times whether the commentator over the radio was correct when he said that this bill would be considered under a gag or a closed rule. That statement was incorrect. All this

rule does is to bring this bill before the House for consideration by the House under the general rules of the House. The bill will be open to all germane amendments offered by any Member during the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us all enter upon the discussion of this important matter, not in a partisan, not in a selfish manner, not because one is majority leader, or because one is minority leader. There should be no political whiplashing upon the backs or the consciences of the Members when they are conscientiously considering a matter which is and should be entirely nonpartisan. I hope that we will approach this vital measure in that attitude and in that frame of mind. I hope to discuss the merits of the bill later in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for this rule when it was before the Rules Committee. I expect to vote for the rule here today and also to vote for the bill, including section 3 thereof, which undertakes to prohibit the payment of general consumer subsidies.

Certain Members appeared before the Rules Committee to urge the adoption of a special rule which would provide for a separate vote on section 3. That suggestion was not followed by the Rules Committee. Of course, an amendment to strike section 3 from the bill can be made during the consideration of the bill. If a majority favors such action, the amendment will prevail. If the amendment does not prevail, then those favoring the payment of consumer subsidies will have to choose between voting for the prohibition or against the extension of commodity credit. But that is a situation which very frequently confronts us in passing finally on legislation. To attempt in each case to suit certain individual desires would involve us in endless difficulties. After all, under the general rules of the House, the majority can work its will.

It was also suggested that we make in order by special rule a substitute proposal which is embodied in a bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. While there is undoubtedly much to recommend something along the line of his suggestion, his bill has not had committee consideration nor that detailed study which generally precedes floor consideration of such a far-reaching proposal. Therefore, it seemed to the majority of the Rules Committee that such a special rule should not be granted.

The only and real issue involved in this legislation is whether the Congress shall prohibit the payment out of Federal funds of general consumer subsidies.

It is my considered judgment that this matter of subsidies would not now be before us if the administration had grappled courageously, honestly, and realistically with the problems of price control. And further, even today, there is no need to resort to such subsidies in our efforts for price control and to prevent runaway inflation.

Let no one tell you that those of us who oppose these subsidies are in favor of inflation. For myself, I voted for the various price-control laws. I do not stand for their repeal today. My only regret is that the demands of some of us for an over-all, effective and complete price control from the very beginning were not heeded by the administration. It is the failure to adopt such a plan and the further failure to properly administer the various statutes which have been enacted that has resulted in the price squeezes and the increases in the cost of living which are now sought to be alleviated by the payment of consumer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I refer to consumer subsidies. In considering this question, we must remember that the prohibition contained in section 3 does not go to production subsidies to be paid to submarginal or high-cost producers in order to keep up production. The prohibition goes only to consumer subsidies which apply to rich and poor alike by relieving them of a part of the cost of certain commodities which they buy at the expense of the Federal Treasury. Consumer subsidies are taxation in reverse. We take out of the Federal Treasury the money to pay part of the living cost of all people who buy certain commodities. The war profiteer, big or small, is thus permitted to keep more of his profits.

Subsidies must be paid out of borrowed money. They increase the Federal debt, a debt which is now growing to such proportions as to be almost terrifying. Untold generations to come will be struggling to pay the debt now being created. We certainly should not expect them to pay for the bills which we ourselves should now be paying.

Consumer subsidies are now being sought as a matter of political expediency. They are more of appeasement than good, common sense. They represent a resort to the path of least resistance. They are an extension of the old illusion that if we pay something out of the Federal Treasury, it does not cost anybody anything. That illusion so long held by so many millions of our people must now be about shattered as they march up to pay the tax collector.

It seems rather strange to me that a large part of the clamor for the payment of consumer subsidies comes from those who, in respect to the comparative amount of pay they are presently receiving, have profited the most from the extraordinary expenditures of the war effort. Their demands leave me cold. There are undoubtedly many consumers who are being badly squeezed by reason of having level incomes which do not compensate for increased living costs and increased taxation. But I seriously doubt whether any considerable number of that group want relief through the payment of general, over-all consumer subsidies which are in issue in this bill.

It has been suggested that the expenditure of a few millions in subsidies will save billions in the cost of living and inflation. Such a contention is completely absurd. It should be obvious to everyone that if we pay out of the Federal Treasury a part of the cost of certain consumer goods, the purchaser will profit only in the amount paid, less the expense of administering the fund made available. In plain words, if the Government pays 5 cents of the cost of a pound of butter which I buy, I have profited to the tune of 5 cents, and no more.

Much has been said about the so-called farm bloc and its position in this controversy. I have been accused of belonging to that bloc, although many times my farmer friends have thought right bitterly of me because they said I did not belong to the bloc. So I do not know whether I belong or not. Let us not forget, however, that the present law authorized the administration to put a ceiling on farm prices at parity. That is the figure which is supposed to represent a fair return to the farmer. It is a figure which the administration has sought for years to reach. If prices of farm products are not ceilinged at parity, then I assume the administrators in charge of the program have reasons therefor.

Assuming that the farmer is getting no more than a fair price for his product, and assuming that subsequent processors and distributors are getting no more than a fair return for the service they perform, then the resulting price to the consumer is fair and reasonable and is not inflationary. Consumers should not resent paying such a price.

In conclusion, the majority leader said that the Congress had directed the President to "hold the line," to stabilize prices, that if we insist on this position against consumer subsidies that all of his authority in that regard, or I take it the larger part of his authority in that regard, will be nullified.

The plain fact of the matter is that a long time ago the Congress of the United States said to the President of the United States: "Stabilize prices and control the threat of inflation." The plain fact also is that in spite of the mandate of the Congress and the authority the Congress vested in the President the line has not been held, inflation or moves in the direction of inflation have not been controlled. That is not the responsibility of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the responsibility of the administration which is presently demanding that we continue to pay in ever-increasing amounts the consumer subsidies. If we view the past record in the matter of holding the line whatever may happen about consumer subsidies in this bill may not materially affect prices and price control. No one can definitely know what we may expect as to the future, but as far as I am concerned I am convinced that these consumer subsidies that have been paid and that they want to pay now will not be a drop in the bucket in the matter of controlling inflation. What we need is a

complete turn-about and an effective and good-faith determination on the part of those in charge of administering the statutes we have enacted to prevent inflation as an over-all proposition.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understood the majority leader to say that if this bill is passed in the form in which it is brought to the floor that it will be in the nature of a directive to the President to take off all price ceilings. Does the gentleman think that?

Mr. HALLECK. No such conclusion, of course, could be reached. There is nothing in the action that is here proposed that could be said to indicate anything like that at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the rule and I shall support this bill as it is here presented. If the committee offers certain amendments which have been talked about, I expect to support those.

What I wish to direct my remarks toward at this particular moment is the reasoning which was used in the statement presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] because with his general thesis, I disagree. He took the position that if this bill becomes law it will put into operation great inflationary forces in our economy. I deny that general approach for these reasons: I have in my hand a circulating statement of United States money as of September 30, 1943, showing $18,844,000,000 in circulation.

I have here a statement issued on October 30 by the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, showing that there was to the credit of individuals, corporations, and partnerships as of June 30, 1943, a little over $82,000,000,000 in deposits, and that our people had to their credit $8,163,000,000 in Government postal and savings deposits, or, in round figures, a little over $90,000,000,000 spending or buying power to the credit of our people and on the books of the banks of this country.

I have a bulletin from the Federal Reserve Bank which shows that we have in excess of $22,000,000,000 of gold.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the deposits to the credit of our people, plus the currencies which they have in their hands and in their lock boxes, plus our gold stocks, primarily constitute the economic forces with which we shall create inflation in this country, if inflation is to come. I again deny that the provisions of this bill will bring inflation to our people.

Let me point it out in this way, Mr. Speaker: At the present time we have over four times what we had in September 1926 and in September 1929 in the form of money in circulation. We have over three and one-third times what we had in 1920, when our wholesale price index level was 167 percent of 1926 as against a price level in September of only 103 percent of the 1926 level. Our gold stocks are five times what they were in 1929 and about eight times what they were in 1920. Our total time and demand deposits are about 60 percent greater than in December 1929, and they are almost two and four-tenths times as great as they were in May 1920.

Our expansions in deposits, in gold, in currency in circulation, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, are the forces which will precipitate inflation in this country, when, as, and if we, the people, start turning those factors over and bringing into operation what the economists call the velocity of spending. For instance, in 1929 the velocity of demand deposits in banks in 101 of the reporting cities was 67 times per year. That is, $1,000,000,000 demand deposits were moving along and energizing $67,000,000,000 worth of business in this country. I am informed that last September our velocity was less than 20 times turn-over. When the American people begin turning over their present demand deposits and their currency and utilizing our gold in connection with the expansion of commercial credits through the banks, and turn them over at 30, 40, or 67 times per year, it is then you will feel the inflationary forces destroying our people, and then we shall be setting the stage for another great financial debacle, and far worse than that one of 1929. But this little bill such as we are considering here today, if it goes into effect, will not bring inflation. I will challenge any man on this floor during the debate, in the next 3 or 4 days, to show me a statement from any recognized leading economist in this country which does not support the thesis I am here advancing with reference to the 2-dimensional characteristics of these 3 elements—demand deposits, gold, and money in circulation—as related to their velocity.

What are we doing in this country today? What are you doing with the money that is to your credit in the bank? I am talking about your demand deposits. What are you doing with the money that stands to your favor in your lockbox and in other places where you have it? Is its velocity high or low? Are you using it? How fast do you propose to turn it over in the coming months or years, at which time you may desire to run away from the ownership of credits and currency into the ownership of things, of land, of farms, of real estate as city property, of commodities, of equities in corporations represented by debentures, bonds, and stocks? When you decide to run away from the ownership of credits, currency, and gold into the ownership of these other things and begin to whip up that velocity three or four times as fast as at present, that is when you will feel the economic effect of the inflationary forces to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] referred.

But this bill will not bring inflation to our people. I am prepared to take any consequences that may come to me from a political standpoint in my support of this proposal. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this country are entitled to a market where they can go and sell their goods without depending on the whims, the caprices, and at times the prima donna attitudes, and the political phases that operate in appropriation committees and in legislative bodies as to whether or not farmers are to have a decent, fair, and equitable return for their labor in the form of their products which they place on the market. I do not propose to be a party now or at any subsequent date to making the farmers of this country dependent upon our appropriations with respect to subsidy money, whether through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other Government-owned or controlled agency. I insist that the farmers of this country, insofar as it is possible under war conditions, be permitted to put their produce on the open market, that they be permitted to have the O. P. A., for instance, announce the prices which will cover their cost of production plus a reasonable return, just as we buy goods from the manufacturing interests of this country through the contracts which we negotiate with them, later on renegotiate, and later on tax. The farmers in their particular branch of industry are entitled to as fair treatment in peace and in wartimes as we give to our manufacturing concerns and this bill moves in the direction of doing that very thing.

I trust that this House will back up the provisions of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, obviously I cannot discuss the merits of this bill in 5 minutes. I insist that the reason there is so much opposition to subsidies now is because adequate consideration has not been given the subject and I do not think adequate consideration will be given in the general debate on this bill. I mean by a substantial majority of the Members of the House. Consent has already been obtained that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourns until Monday next. This rule provides for 2 days general debate—that is, today and tomorrow. That is an invitation. Of course it was not so intended to anybody who wants to leave until Monday, now is a good time to go, and most of the Members will go and will not be giving this bill much consideration. That is, a majority of the Members will not.

NO ALTERNATIVE FOR SUBSIDIES EXCEPT HIGHER PRICES

There is no alternative but subsidies if you want to keep down the cost of living and if you want to pay the producers an adequate price to encourage production. There is absolutely no alternative.

HIGH PRICES AND INFLATION

A vote for this bill in the form in which it is written now is a vote to further increase the high cost of living. This is a high cost of living bill. Furthermore, a vote for this bill will promote and encourage inflation, a vote for this bill is an inflationary vote which is not the only

inflationary vote the Members of this House have cast. This is an inflationary Congress.

INFLATIONARY CONGRESS

We have done everything within our power to force inflation in this country. In the first place we need a lot of money for taxes to pay on the national debt. Instead of taxing $12,000,000,000 we gave back in the Republican Ruml plan tax bill 7½ billion dollars.

Now these is a movement on foot not to place any substantial tax bill upon the statute books, so we are going in the wrong direction. We are not taxing enough to pay the cost of the war and we are encouraging an increase in prices, which, of course, is inflationary as well as increasing the high cost of living.

Of course, no one can oppose the rule if he is in favor of the Commodity Credit Corporation. When the rule is adopted, the question will come up, and I expect to offer an amendment, if someone else does not, to strike out section 3. When that is done, if the Republicans vote solidly together, as they claim they will, that means we do not have a chance to get it adopted. When we do not get it adopted, we have no record vote on it. It is not possible to get any record vote on that question at all if the Republicans resist it. So in a way, whether or not it was intended, we are not getting adequate consideration to the extent that a Member will go on record on passing on this fundamental question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I have only 5 minutes. Of course, if the gentleman insists I will yield to him.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman should yield to me on this occasion.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, I will yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman made a statement about how some Members might not be here to listen to the debates, that some of them might even be home. Does not the gentleman agree with me that even though frequently by reason of committee assignments or other things we have to do we cannot be present on the floor, we do have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contains all of the debates and the speeches of gentlemen like the gentleman from Texas who are informed about the subject, and we have a chance to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what has been said?

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right; I thank the gentleman, but I have only 5 minutes.

Of course, the political vote on this thing is to vote for section 3, vote for the whole bill as it is, and then when it is vetoed just pray that the veto will not be overridden. Then you have satisfied all groups, you have not lost any support, you have gained lots of support; but you would be ruined if it were actually put into effect; that would absolutely ruin you, and I do not believe the minority party wants that done.

I think if they are looking at it from the political standpoint, as I think a great many of them are, they will vote for this bill as it is in the hope that they will gain some favor with the farmers of this country, and then pray that it will not be overridden, with the knowledge if it is not overridden that the consumers will not hold it against them. So that is a fine political vote for them to cast, for that reason, and it can be exploded only if the veto is overridden.

As I was going to say when our good friend from Indiana interrupted me, this Congress is an inflationary Congress. Everything we have done has been in that direction. It is true that we voted for a good bill to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries, and we not only asked the President but we directed him to hold that line. I do not believe it is possible to hold the line absolutely 100 percent, and you do not either. A lot of things have been done that should not have been done, but we should not say, "We will just let the country go to the dogs because certain things have happened that we do not like."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The major question is stopping inflation and keeping down the high cost of living. Here is where we are inflationary. We tell the President to hold the line. What does it take? It takes an O. P. A. with plenty of money. This Congress cut down the annual appropriation for O. P. A. $25,000,000 so as to make it impossible for them to hold that line. The O. W. I. was doing a fine job of teaching the people the dangers of inflation, and this Congress voted to cut out their entire appropriation for that purpose, which absolutely nullified their efforts to teach the people of this country how the dangers of inflation might be combated. So this is a high-cost-of-living bill and an inflationary bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who to my personal knowledge has made the same speech—which fact can be established by reading the RECORD—a number of times in the last 2 weeks, finds fault because some of the Members do not feel inclined to sit on the floor when he speaks and hear him reiterate the same things he has repeated so many times. I respect his views, and maybe he is right, but he should not criticize those who do not remain at all times to hear the repetition.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take any more time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss the merits of the bill here today. I do want to explain the rule which brings it up for consideration.

I had not heard that there was any question about this being a closed or gag rule until the gentleman from Michigan spoke of it. The contrary is the fact. It is an open rule, about as liberal a rule as we could grant without violating all of the rules of the House. As a matter of fact, neither the proponents nor the opponents of the bill ever asked for a closed rule.

This rule does just two things. It fixes the time for debate and brings the bill to the floor for consideration. That is all the rule does. When it gets here it is governed by the general rules of the House.

The only controversial thing in the bill is section 3, relating to subsidies. Those who oppose that section when they appeared before the Committee on Rules asked for a special rule that would give an opportunity to have a roll-call vote on that separate question. It is true that that question is perhaps somewhat unrelated to the rest of the bill. Some of us thought there was some merit in that contention, and the Committee on Rules did give it very careful consideration, but we reached the conclusion that the rule gives the right to a motion to recommit, and the minority or those who lose on the motion to strike out section 3 will have control of the motion to recommit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman stating that correctly? I know he intends to, but suppose the motion loses, would not one on the majority side have the right to make that motion to recommit, not one in the minority on the question to be decided? In other words, one on the minority side would be entitled to first recognition and could just make a regular motion to recommit—anything to dodge the issue—and we would not have a chance.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the minority is entitled to the motion to recommit, but that is the only question in dispute on the bill, and I am not going to assume that the minority will not act in good faith. Of course, if the motion to strike out section 3 prevails, then under the general rules of the House there can be a separate roll-call vote on the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that if the rule is adopted I shall have the control of the time on this side of the aisle. Although I do not know that I have on my list as yet anyone who wants to speak against the bill, if there are any on this side who want to speak against the bill, if they will notify me I shall be very glad to give them time.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. There are gentlemen on this side of the aisle who will want to speak against the bill. I would take this exception to the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia about the controversy on the bill, that there are certainly some of us left who feel that whether or not this corporation ought to be continued at all is a controversial issue. If there is going to be a division of time on the basis of being for or against the bill, we

should like to have some assurance that we shall have time to speak.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, the Committee on Rules has nothing to do with the division of time under this rule. The gentleman will have to take that up with the Committee on Banking and Currency. As far as our committee was advised, there was no controversy relative to the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It was not brought to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 514) entitled "An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate of the United States, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senate having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

ESTATE OF KATE E. HAMILTON (H. DOC. NO. 359)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 514, entitled "an act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton."

This bill authorizes and directs the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury to Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of $7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from November 23, 1939, until the date of payment by the Secretary in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid.

Mrs. Kate E. Hamilton died intestate in Memphis, Tenn., on December 1, 1930. On December 31, 1931, Mrs. Blanche H. Karsch paid an estate tax with interest of $26,017.15, and on January 24, 1933, paid an additional tax, with interest, amounting to $1,400.40. Litigation involving the estate was not complete until 1939.

Mrs. Karsch filed a claim for refund on November 25, 1939, which was rejected on December 15, 1939, by virtue of section 319 (b) of title III—estate tax—of the Revenue Act of 1926 which provides as follows:

All claims for the refunding of the tax imposed by this title alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected must be presented to the Commissioner within 3 years next after the payment of such tax.

It appears that the court proceedings were instituted prior to the expiration of the date for filing claims for refund and that a timely claim to protect the interest of the estate could properly have been filed.

Congress has determined that it is sound policy to include in all the revenue acts statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a certain period of time, it becomes impossible for the Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to obtain a refund of an overpayment of taxes. This bill selects a single taxpayer for special treatment by excepting her from this policy. The whole body of Federal taxpayers is thus discriminated against, and a precedent is established, opening the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 514 to the long-continued policy of Congress, and do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to file claims within the period fixed by law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 28, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread upon the Journal.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the President's message be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3477, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on the matter of procedure, not on the bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. There are at least 10 or 11 Democrats on the committee who are against section 3 of the bill and we understand that some Republicans are against it. Since there are 2 days of debate under the rule, and the House is to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock, will the gentleman allow us who are against section 3 some definite time for debate today?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. There are also about eight Democrats on the committee who are in favor of the bill, and we will want some time also.

Mr. STEAGALL. I think that the casting up of the vote on this bill at this time is rather immature. I am not in a position to say how people are going to vote.

Mr. PATMAN. If we are going to get any time, we would like to know now, and if we are not, we would like to know it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, the gentleman will get time. Let me say this. The rule provides for 2 days of general debate, and incidentally I will say that I requested that much time be allowed. I did so in deference to the wishes of the minority members of the committee, and I speak of the minority with reference to the matter in controversy in this legislation. It is not my thought that such an amount of time is necessary, but I was glad to meet the wishes of my friend from Texas. The rule provides for 2 days of debate as I say. I do not know under the language of the rule how either myself or the gentleman could at this moment undertake to divide this time on the basis of hours, because I do not know whether the debate will end tomorrow under the rule or whether further time will be allowed on Monday. I say this to the gentleman, that I have not yet allocated any time, but of course I expect to give the gentleman from Texas ample time.

Mr. PATMAN. Assuming that we will have debate for 3 hours——

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman means today?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. At least the gentleman could give us 1 hour or 1 hour and a half today.

Mr. STEAGALL. Very well. I want to be just a little more considerate of the minority in this matter than I am of the majority, and I shall now yield 1 hour to be used by—shall we say—the gentleman's side of this controversy this afternoon.

Mr. PATMAN. If the debate goes that long—3 hours.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know how long the committee will run, but the gentleman will get his hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to know when the gentleman is going to give the gentleman from Texas time. We would like to know so that we may be present here to hear him. I am making that request so that I might be here when he speaks. I do not want that to be misunderstood.

Mr. STEAGALL. I appreciate the facetious remark of the gentleman from Michigan. Of course we are all delighted to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] whenever we have a chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from Alabama state how much time he desires to consume?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall use 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been discussed so frequently and so fully and on so many occasions that it is difficult to discuss it if one desires to avoid repetition. So I do not intend to tax the patience of the House very long. First, that section 1 of the bill was supported by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It has interdepartmental approval and, so far as I know, there is no objection whatever to it. It simply makes a minor change in the manner of making up the annual appraisal and accounting of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It seems more appropriate for the appraisal to be made on June 30 each year, since that is the closing date of the fiscal year. The new basis for appraisal provided by this section is cost at the time of appraisal, or the average market prices during the last month of the fiscal year, whichever is lower, rather than cost plus a year's carrying charges, or the average market price for 12 months, whichever is the lower.

Section 2 of the bill would establish a method of accounting of the activities of the Corporation, to be conducted by the General Accounting Office, and extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the Government to June 30, 1945. This provision, as in the case of section 1, was not controversial in the committee and, so far as I know, has incurred no opposition anywhere.

Section 4 of the bill, as far as the Committee on Banking and Currency is concerned, is unopposed and the report as to that provision of the bill was unanimous. So that we have only one matter in controversy in this measure. It will be remembered that Congress was asked in 1941 to pass a price-control bill, which we were told was necessary to prevent a run-away inflation during the period of the war. Let me remind the Members of the House that the first proposal submitted to us would have given unlimited authority to the Price Administrator provided for in the bill to fix prices upon all commodities in the United States at his own sweet will. I will say that under that proposal he would have been given the power to fix the price of cotton at 5 cents a pound, of wheat at 25 cents, or corn at 30 cents, if he had seen fit. Meantime the bill embodied a specific provision exempting wages and salaries from its operation.

I notified the Administrator at that time that I would not support or sponsor any such proposal. We were then handed a bill placing a limitation upon his power to control prices of agricultural commodities to the effect that no ceiling might be imposed at less than parity. I made known, as I think everybody understands who has the slightest grasp of the matter, that if we were to fix a price at parity it could not be sustained at that figure for the reason that all transactions, speculations on the board, and what not would have to be conducted inside that limit, and, therefore, you could not sustain such a price. I further insisted—and do not think I did not have to insist—that I would not sponsor the bill without a further safeguarding provision to the effect that no ceiling might be established on any article processed from any agricultural commodity that would not protect the price reflected to the producer. And do not think it was not bitterly opposed. I had to talk plainly with the young lawyer who represented the O. P. A. at that time and who has since entered the service of his country. I had to tell him that he would never be able to blindfold any member of our committee by simply offering a parity provision without the addition of a safeguard covering articles processed from agricultural commodities. I wrote with my own hand what I thought was a common-sense provision that would assure something approaching fair treatment to agriculture, because it was evident, when once the Administrator and his lawyer brought to us a bill to confer unlimited power for control of the prices of farm commodities containing a specific exemption of wages and salaries, nobody could ever have been misled as to what was in their minds or what their real intentions were. So I wrote in a provision that no ceiling on agricultural commodity or on any article processed from any agricultural commodity could be imposed at less than 110 percent of parity.

Of course, that provision would not have afforded fair comparative treatment for agriculture, but it was at least a step in that direction. I was assured that the provision would be accepted. It seems this was forgotten a little later when the matter was taken to the Senate committee and where a contrary insistence was made. This provision was adopted by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, by the Senate, and finally incorporated in the act. The Members of the House are familiar with what later happened with respect to the 110-percent-parity provision of that act. It is enough to say that Congress was notified that that provision had to be repealed by legislative act or that it would be done otherwise, else our national economy would be disrupted and the war program imperiled if that provision of the act were not repealed. Well, like good soldiers, we went along and repealed that provision of the original Price Control Act. And what happened? We gave the power to fix controls at parity on any agricultural commodity produced in the country. What happened? According to the last account I had of it a few days ago, the average price of farm commodities in this country was nearing 20 percent above the parity level which they were authorized to establish under the provisions of the last so-called Price Control Act. Yet, the Republic still lives, thank God, and we have not lost the war.

But, of course, Congress is to blame for anything that goes wrong. When they handed us the second bill, which we had been told was to be another price-control bill, to strike out the 110-percent parity limitation, we were presented with a different measure entirely, giving blanket authority carrying the power of life and death over our national economy. And the word "inflation" was not in the bill, and it is not in the law now, except where I wrote it into the title with my own hand.

After all, I wonder how many people in this country who talk and read about inflation every day have the slightest understanding of what they are talking about, or what they are reading. If there is any word in the English language that has been overworked in recent days it is that word.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman recalls that Leon Henderson and Mrs. Roosevelt and the rest of them took the radio and told the people that if the bill were passed putting a ceiling on wages, it would be against the Constitution and would be human bondage, and then they came in and asked for a bill to put on an amendment of the same nature.

Mr. STEAGALL. Well, that is getting a little ahead of me, but I will say to the lady from Illinois that the RECORD justifies her statement of facts.

This matter of inflation has been talked about a great deal here. Do you know who were the pioneers in this country in the matter of stabilization legislation? I want to tell you. In 1932 this House passed a stabilization bill. It had the support of the leading economists of the country. It passed the House with only 60 votes against it, as I remember. My good friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I were in that fight. I want to tell you that the farm organizations of the United States were the pioneers whose support brought about the passage of that bill in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The leading farm organizations of the United States supported the first price control bill. I do not think I would be in error if I said we could not have passed it without their support. They are not for inflation. We did not have inflation then and we do not have any inflation now that need disturb anybody.

We all agree that the 1926 price level was a fair basis upon which to stabilize. That is what we provided in the bill that passed this House in 1932. It directed the Secretary of the Treasury and the

Federal Reserve System to use all their vast powers to restore the 1926 price level and stabilize there. The price level only a few days ago reached the 1926 level, and it is now only a point or two above it, as I recall.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] stated that the bill did not carry any funds for the further operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman explain why it does not?

Mr. STEAGALL. I will. I do not remember that there was any proposal in the committee to increase it. Of course, those of us who are concerned about preserving the Commodity Credit Corporation and keeping it in the channel for which it was intended and to render the service for which it was established are at least as much concerned as anybody else about its successful operation. We would, of course, have provided additional funds if it had been necessary. The only reason we did not provide additional funds was that there was no showing to justify it. We provided $350,000,000 additional in the bill which was passed just after the veto when we extended the Commodity Credit Corporation until the 1st of January, 1944, and it was not insisted that it was needed. The truth is Dr. Hutson did not insist that they needed any more money and, of course, if they had we would have given it to them. I notice the Senate bill has provided for $250,000,000 additional money. If they show any need for it, of course we would all agree, but that is not a matter in controversy. The minute they show a need for money to carry out any legitimate function it will be immediately authorized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think for those who are not members of the committee the RECORD should further show that Dr. Hutson told the committee that, due to the Commodity Credit Corporation's having liquidated some of its inventories, they did not need any additional funds at this time.

Mr. STEAGALL. I was not aware that he made the statement to the committee, and I hesitated to quote him, because I do remember that he made that statement to me in private conversation. In view of the gentleman's statement, I do not hesitate to quote what he said in a private conversation. There is no trouble about money. But why give them more than they need?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman spoke about inflation. Does the gentleman think there is anything inflationary about a price of $1.59 for wheat in Chicago and 90 cents for corn in Chicago, bearing in mind the distance corn has to be shipped from west coast States, Montana, or even the east coast, to the city of Chicago?

Mr. STEAGALL. I have already indicated what I think about the situation with respect to inflation. Now, about this matter of subsidies, it is a long story, and I am not going to talk at great length. It is as simple as first arithmetic in a graded school that if you pay a part of a man's debt or pay a part of his living expenses, no matter what it is, you have put into your money supply that additional sum, no matter where it comes from; and, of course, any sum added to the billions that now exist with their inflationary pressure upon prices is in its nature inherently inflationary. There can be no denial of that proposition.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. If we could be assured that if prices went up wages would remain stationary I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman, but I think any person with a realistic approach at the present time realizes that growing pressure for an increase in wages results in an increase in prices and that an increase in prices necessarily will cause an increase in wages and there you have inflation that much more.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman does not mean to say that we have not had increases in wages already, does he?

Mr. WRIGHT. To a certain extent we have.

Mr. STEAGALL. He does not mean to say we have not had an increase in wages under the law as it exists while we are paying subsidies.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. To a certain extent we have had increases in wages.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is what I am asking the gentleman, if we have not had increases in wages? And let me say to the gentleman that when we wrote the Little Steel formula into the second act there were many—I do not have the number—but many instances where labor was receiving a wage below the Little Steel formula. Is not that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that is correct.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct. Could we have justified establishing the Little Steel formula and have limited it to a portion of labor and denied others the benefit of it? Would it have been fair to have picked out some of those who by strikes or other means forced increases and left the others out? At the time we wrote that Little Steel formula into law we invited everybody below it to demand increases to equal the Little Steel formula, and it was inflationary in the amount of many millions. The Little Steel formula was highly inflationary, and it cannot be denied.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is true, is it not, that under our present economic set-up of wages and prices there cannot be an increase in price without an increase in wages?

Mr. STEAGALL. No; I deny that entirely.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is not the Little Steel formula conditioned upon the fact that there had been a 15-percent increase in the cost of living as of September last year? Now we have an increase above it and wages have lagged behind prices.

Mr. STEAGALL. We adopted the Little Steel formula arbitrarily. I have some figures that will show how they are hooked together.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is mistaken. The Little Steel formula was not written into law; that was a Labor Board decision, was it not?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is the standard we set up in the law.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a part of the War Labor Board's decision, I think the gentleman will find.

Mr. STEAGALL. I have something here that will be interesting right in that connection. The fact is there is not anything more ridiculous than to charge the farmer with responsibility for inflation when he receives less than one-tenth of the national income, an enormous national income that will run to perhaps $150,000,000,000 during the present year. Let me say to my friend from Texas that since the passage of the Stabilization Act wages of industrial workers have increased 15 percent, while the cost of living has increased only 4 percent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the gentleman, who is now speaking correctly, a few moments ago, he gave us facts to the effect that for several years we have spent many billions of dollars in an effort to reflate prices back to the 1926 level.

Mr. STEAGALL. The President in a speech soon after he was inaugurated said that he was not going to stop until we reached the 1926 price level, but we did not reach it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When we came along with the 1941 proposal and the 15 percent that has been referred to, we go far back into the period before we reached the 1926 level?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has pointed out to us very recently that we have reached the 1926 level. What sense would there be, for instance, in our going back below the price level of 1926 after spending billions of dollars in an effort to reflate to that point?

Mr. STEAGALL. We have had a leadership in financial circles in this country who have been lying awake at night and disturbing their souls over the danger of inflation year in and year out and they have been filling the press and speaking over the radio trying to alarm the public about it when 10,000,000 people were walking the streets of the country unable to find employment and farmers by the thousands were being turned out of their homes under

bankruptcy foreclosure. Prices were at destructive levels and the country was in a condition of danger that we do not like to speak of even at this late date.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the price of farm products before they leave the farm is scarcely more than the cost of production and if there is inflation with reference to farm products it happens after they get into the hands of the distributor?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, yes. I would like to talk a long time about that. We tried to include the cost of labor into the last act, but they have never followed it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is not the statement I made true that if inflation occurs with reference to farm products it occurs after they leave the farmer's place?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is what I am going to show you right now in reply to my good friend from Pennsylvania. Let me show you what has happened. You talk about farm prices and wages being yoked together. I will put these figures in the RECORD and some more. I cannot use them all this afternoon. But here is what the figures show:

Using the 1939 figures, beginning January 1940 at 100, the retail food prices were 95, in relation to 100, labor cost per unit of industrial production 97.5, factory pay rolls for employed workers 110. Mind you, this is in 1940, and do not forget that during the time between the passage of the first act and the last act wages had been rising by leaps and bounds during all those months without real interference.

Here they are on the 1st of January 1940, with the cost of living at 100: Factory pay rolls 110.2.

I will not give you all these figures. Let us come on down to December 1940. Cost of living 101, retail food prices 97, labor cost per unit of industrial production 103.6—from 97.5.

Coming on down to January 1941, cost of living 101, retail food prices 98, labor cost per unit of industrial production 105. I am not giving all of these. I will put them in the RECORD.

In December 1941, cost of living 110, retail food prices 113, labor cost per unit of industrial production 124.6.

In January 1942, cost of living 112, retail prices 116, labor cost per unit of industrial production 125.1. They cannot catch up.

December 1942, cost of living 120, retail food prices 133, labor cost per unit of industrial production 155.3.

January 1943, cost of living 121, retail food prices 133, labor cost per unit of industrial production 155.9.

August 1943, cost of living 123, retail food prices 137, labor costs per unit of industrial production 165. The figures show they have never been yoked together. What is the fact? The fact is your increase in the cost of living and the increase in the price of farm products follow increases in wages, they trail the increases of wages all the time, and they have never caught up.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency telling us how he arrived at the labor cost per unit of industrial production.

Mr. STEAGALL. These are figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor and are certainly as authentic and as carefully prepared and as worthy of consideration as any that were submitted to our committee in connection with this legislation and I may say they were submitted by one of the best informed men who has ever appeared before our committee. You can answer this in any way you see fit, because you will have it in the RECORD in the morning. Right here I wish to insert tables supplied by another witness who appeared before the committee who was also most informative, to which I invite attention and which I wish to give opportunity to refute or explain:

Percentage increase in average weekly earnings of workers in all manufacturing industries and in the cost of living since September 1942 [1]

Year and month	Weekly earnings	Cost of living
1942:		
September	0	0
October	2.9	1.0
November	5.2	1.7
December	6.5	2.2
1943:		
January	7.5	2.5
February	8.8	2.7
March	10.4	4.2
April	12.4	5.3
May	14.0	6.2
June	14.7	5.9
July	13.1	5.1
August	14.9	4.6

[1] Calculated from data compiled by the U. S. Department of Labor, and published in the October 1943 issue of the Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce

The "hold the line" order was intended to stabilize the cost of living and wages as of September 15, 1942. Between September 1942 and August 1943, the average weekly earnings of factory workers in manufacturing industries increased 14.9 percent. During this same period, the cost of living increased 4.6 percent.

Percentage increase in average weekly earnings of industrial workers and in the cost of living since January 1941 [1]

Month	1941		1942		1943	
	Weekly earnings	Cost of living	Weekly earnings	Cost of living	Weekly earnings	Cost of living
January	0	0	22.4	11.1	42.3	19.7
February	2.6	0	22.6	12.0	43.3	20.0
March	3.9	0.4	24.6	13.4	44.7	21.8
April	4.2	1.4	26.4	14.2	47.1	23.1
May	8.2	2.1	27.4	15.1	50.0	24.1
June	11.9	3.8	29.1	15.5	50.8	23.8
July	10.1	4.5	30.0	16.1	50.6	22.8
August	11.4	5.4	33.5	16.6	----	22.2
September	14.7	7.2	36.5	16.9	----	----
October	16.5	8.4	37.5	18.1	----	----
November	16.8	9.3	38.8	18.8	----	----
December	17.9	9.6	40.4	19.4	----	----

[1] Calculated from data compiled by the Industrial Conference Board, and published in the Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce.

The Little Steel formula allowed for an increase in wages of 15 percent in order to take care of the rise in the cost of living between January 1, 1941, and September 15, 1942. Actually, during this period the average weekly earnings of industrial workers increased nearly 37 percent, compared with an increase of about 17 percent in the cost of living. In July 1943, weekly earnings of industrial workers were 51 percent above the January 1941 level, compared with a 23-percent increase in the cost of living.

Comparison of the real wages of industrial workers with the pre-war average

[1935-39=100]

Year and month	Wage income per employed industrial worker	Cost of living	Real wages
1935-39 average	100.0	100.0	100.0
1941: January	118.7	100.8	117.8
1942:			
January	145.6	112.0	130.0
September	167.3	117.8	142.0
1943:			
January	173.4	120.7	143.7
February	177.2	121.0	146.4
March	181.1	122.8	147.5
April	184.1	124.1	148.3
May	186.2	125.1	148.8
June	185.5	124.8	148.6
July	186.8	123.8	150.9
August [1]	190.8	123.2	154.9

[1] Preliminary.

Data compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Cost of living index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Real wages" is wage income divided by the cost of living and represents the purchasing power of wages.

In August 1943 the wage income per employed industrial worker was nearly 91 percent above the pre-war (1935-39) average. The cost of living was about 23 percent higher, making an increase in real wages of 55 percent.

The data following take into account the fact that many consumers are buying more and better quality foods, eating at restaurants more frequently, and the like, than they did when their incomes were lower.

Expenditures of consumers for food expressed as a percent of total income, 1929-43

Year and food expenditures as a percent of total income:

1929	23
1930	24
1931	24
1932	25
1933	25
1934	24
1935	23
1936	21
1937	21
1938	22
1939	21
1940	21
1941	20
1942	21
1943 [1]	20

[1] Data for July 1943.

Source: United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Marketing and Transportation Situation, August 1943, page 12; May-June 1943, page 3.

Expenditures for food in relation to consumer's income are lower today than they were before the war. In July 1943, only 20 percent of the average consumer's income was required to purchase food, compared with 21 to 22 percent in the pre-war years and 25 percent during the depression of 1932-33. If consumers were now buying the same quantity of food as they did during the pre-war years of 1935-39, their expenditures for food would amount to only 16 percent of their incomes.

The data following are based upon the assumption that consumers had not changed

their buying habits and were purchasing the same quantities of food as they did during the pre-war period of 1935–39.

Percent of total consumer income required to purchase the same quantity of food as consumed in the pre-war period of 1935 to 1939

Year and percent cost of fixed quantities of food is of total income:

1913	28
1914	30
1915	26
1916	24
1917	31
1918	31
1919	33
1920	32
1921	28
1922	26
1923	24
1924	23
1925	24
1926	24
1927	23
1928	23
1929	22
1930	23
1931	22
1932	24
1933	25
1934	25
1935	25
1936	22
1937	21
1938	21
1939	20
1940	18
1941	17
1942	17
1943 [1]	16

[1] Data for July 1943.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Marketing and Transportation Situation, August 1943, p. 12; May–June 1943, p. 3.

Food in terms of consumer incomes and pre-war consumption habits is cheaper today than any time in the last 30 years. If consumers purchased the same quantities of food today as they did during 1935–39, only 16 percent of their income would be required for food expenditures, compared with 20 percent in 1939, 25 percent in 1933, and 33 percent in 1919. Actually, higher incomes have resulted in many consumers buying more and better food, eating more meals at restaurants, and the like, than in pre-war years. Consequently consumers are now spending around 20 percent of their income for food.

Increase in average weekly earnings of industrial workers compared with the increase in food cost for a family of 4, January 1941 to July 1943 (based upon the assumption that there is only 1 wage earner in a family of 4)

	Average weekly earnings of industrial workers [1]	Estimated food expenditures per week for a family of 4 [2]	
		Total amount spent for food, including meals at restaurants and the like	Assuming the same quantity of food was purchased as in the pre-war years 1935–39
January 1941	$30.61	$10.08	$8.76
September 1942	41.79	13.68	11.16
July 1943	46.10	16.32	12.60
Increase January 1941 to July 1943	15.49	[3] .24	3.84

[1] Compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board and published in the Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce.
[2] Estimated from data published in the Marketing and Transportation Situation, September–October 1943, table 6, p. 21. The figures for January 1941 were estimated on the basis of the data reported for 1940 and 1941.

The average weekly earnings of industrial workers increased $15.49 between January 1941 and July 1943. During this same period a very liberal estimate placed the increase in the weekly food expenditure for a family of four at $6.24. Assuming that there is only one wage earner in a family of four, the increase in earnings has been much greater than the increase in food expenditures. If the worker purchased the same quantity of food as in the pre-war years, food cost for a family of four would have advanced $3.84 per week, compared with an increase of $15.49 in weekly earnings. Part of the increase in food costs has been due to many families purchasing more and better quality food than when incomes were lower.

Estimated effect of subsidies upon the daily food costs for a family of 4 persons

Product	Amount of subsidy per unit [1]	Estimated annual civilian consumption per capita for 1943 [2]	Effect on daily food cost for a family of 4 [3]
			Cents per day
Butter	5 cents per pound.	13.0 pounds	0.71
Cheese	4 cents per pound.	4.9 pounds	.22
Milk	1 cent per quart.	180.5 quarts	1.98
Meat	3 cents per pound.	124 pounds	4.08
Bread	1 cent per loaf.	92.5 loaves	1.01
Sugar	1 cent per pound.	75 pounds	.82
Vegetables	3.5 cents per No. 2 can.	19.2 No. 2 cans.	.74
Potatoes	1 cent per pound.	131 pounds	1.44
Amount per day for a family of 4			11.00
Amount per day per individual			2.75

[1] Based upon or calculated from information released by the Office of Economic Stabilization.
[2] Based upon data published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[3] Calculated by multiplying the amount of the subsidy by the annual per capita consumption, then multiplying by 4 and dividing by 365.

The food subsidy program as now being applied by the Government amounts to about 11 cents per day for a family of four persons, or 2¾ cents per day per individual. Butter subsidies of 5 cents a pound amount to about 65 cents per year per person. A bread subsidy of 1 cent per loaf would amount to less than $1 per year per person. The present consumer subsidy program amounts to around $10 per year per person.

Disposition of income payments to individuals in the United States, 1939–44

[Millions of dollars]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943 [1]	1944 [1]
Income payments to individuals	70.8	76.5	92.2	115.5	142	157
Less: Personal taxes and nontax payments	3.1	3.3	4.0	6.6	16	20
Amount left for consumers to spend	67.7	73.2	88.2	108.9	126	137
Consumer expenditures	61.7	65.7	74.6	82.0	90	90
Unspent funds or savings of individuals and inflationary gap	6.0	7.5	13.6	26.9	36	47

[1] Last half of 1943 estimated. The 1944 figures taken from a speech by Judge Vinson before the Investment Bankers Association, Chicago, Ill., November 1943.

Source: Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Total income payments to individuals in 1943 were estimated at $142,000,000,000, compared with $71,000,000,000 in 1939. After allowance is made for taxes and the greatly increased consumer expenditures, $36,000,000,000 of the 1943 income will remain in the hands of consumers as unspent funds or savings, compared with only $6,000,000,000 in 1939. A national income of $157,000,000,000 is estimated for 1944, with $47,000,000,000 remaining in the hands of consumers as unspent funds or savings. Herein lies the inflationary gap—more money to spend for less goods. This gap has been widening each year since the beginning of the war and has a cumulative effect from year to year that becomes a more important inflationary factor each day the war progresses. This excess buying power is showing up in many ways. The sale of furs in 1943 was 104 percent above the corresponding period of 1942. The sale of coats and suits increased 65 percent, and the sale of flowers was 30 percent above a year earlier.

Cost of the war program to the U. S. Government (cumulative totals) [1]

[Billions of dollars]

Year and month	Program [2]	Commitments [2]	Cash expenditures [2]
1940:			
July	9.4	4.0	0.2
December	21.4	14.5	1.9
1941:			
June	38.1	29.2	6.7
December	77.7	52.8	15.8
1942:			
June	175.6	133.9	34.9
December	237.9	183.8	68.2
1943:			
June	275.8	223.5	110.0
July	339.9	230.3	116.8
August	339.7	----------	124.3

[1] Survey of Current Business, June 1943, p. 29, and October 1943, p. 8–18 U. S. Department of Commerce.
[2] The war program includes the money appropriated by Congress. Commitments include contracts awarded and the like. Cash expenditures are the amount of disbursements by the United States Treasury.

World War No. 1 cost the United States around $32,000,000,000. By August 1943 the Congress of the United States had appropriated nearly $340,000,000,000 for the prosecution of World War No. 2. Commitments, which are made up largely of contracts awarded and the like, totaled around $230,000,000,000. The actual cash paid out by the United States Treasury for war purposes amounted to over $124,000,000,000.

Per capita share of the national debt, World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 as of Oct. 31, 1943

	Total national debt	National debt per capita
	Billions of dollars	*Dollars*
World War No. 1:		
Pre-World War No. 1 debt (Mar. 31, 1917)	1.3	12
Highest World War No. 1 debt (Aug. 31, 1919)	26.6	250
Lowest Post-World War No. 1 debt (Dec. 31, 1930)	16.0	130
World War No. 2:		
Pre-World War No. 2 debt (Nov. 30, 1941)	55.0	412
World War No. 2 debt 1 year ago (Oct. 31, 1942)	92.9	686
World War No. 2 debt 1 month ago (Sept. 30, 1943)	158.3	1,156
Present World War No. 2 debt (Oct. 31, 1943)	[1]165.0	1,204

[1] Does not include guaranteed obligations of the Government agencies, which amounted to 4.1 billion dollars.

Source: The Chicago Journal of Commerce, Nov. 4, 1943.

The national debt per capita on October 31, 1943, amounted to nearly $1,204, or an average of $4,816 for a family of four. During the month of October 1943 the per capita national debt increased approximately $48, while the increase for the year ending October 31, 1943, amounted to about $517. The highest peak the national debt reached during World War No. 1 was about $250 per capita, or $954 less than the present debt burden.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I was interested in the statement regarding the price of hogs. In spite of a floor being placed under the price of hogs, guaranteed to the farmer, the price went below that recently because of the large supply. The natural law of supply and demand does have something to do with prices, does it?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know about that. I cannot answer the gentleman as to the specific item. My head is swimming these days. But at last accounts the law of supply and demand was still doing business at the same old stand. Of course, a child knows when you want to get increased production, the more you pay for it the more you get and the easier it is to get. Let no one say that the farmer is undertaking to raise prices and turn on a flood of wild inflation to imperil the war program. Nobody favors anything like that. The farmer only asks a fair deal and a price that no one denies is fair and just. The truth is this unnecessary interference with the law of supply and demand, this meddlesome and impractical method of administering the law has confused the people of the country. They do not know where they are. They encounter so many regulations, so many senseless rules, and so many indefensible methods of enforcement, that we face a storm of complaint and criticism to the extent that no Member of Congress can read his mail or keep track of all that is going on.

Let me say this. I had some responsibility in the passage of the Price Control Act. I thought it was necessary. I think some good has been done and I think they have rendered a good service to a certain extent. But I cannot say that I endorse the methods employed in the administration of the act, and, to be perfectly frank about it, I do not for a moment endorse the viewpoint or the philosophy of the controlling minds directing the administration of the O. P. A. Act.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not want to take much more time. I would like to yield, but I am anxious to conclude.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I just want to get a clarifying statement from the gentleman.

Mr. STEAGALL. I have taken more time than I should have, anyway.

I do not like to have to differ with my good friends, I do not like to have to differ from some of those who are advisors of our administration in these matters, but boys I have been back home. Please do not understand that I have reached the age where I should be giving counsel so much. The Bible says old men for counsel. I do not want to be classed in that category, but if I were going to advise, I would advise some of my friends to steal away for a few days and go home and talk with their neighbors and friends and discuss these things. Or if you will just come over to my office and read a lot of the mail I cannot find time to read, I think it would be informative, and it might not serve a bad purpose in 1944. Of course, as for myself, I am innocent of politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Back in the days when there were great farm surpluses and the farmer could not get any price for his product, did not the gentleman from Alabama, when he voted for parity payments, vote against the law of supply and demand?

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me ask the gentleman something.

Mr. BARRY. Answer me first; do not ask me a question.

Mr. STEAGALL. I want to ask the gentleman a question. If there was a law ever passed by the Congress to guarantee farmers a parity price, I would like to find it.

Mr. BARRY. They guarantee 85 percent of the parity price.

Mr. STEAGALL. No.

Mr. BARRY. And they guarantee a support price right now.

Mr. STEAGALL. No; but the gentleman said parity. We went along here for years with farmers by the thousands thrown into bankruptcy. Agriculture became a national problem. We knew the dangers of those days, we were alarmed, and as a relief measure we passed an act providing for loans up to a certain percent of parity. The farmers of my own section of the country got only 60 percent of parity for years on those loans.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that with all of the laws we have passed up to date to aid the farmer he is still not guaranteed the cost of production of the products he produces?

Mr. STEAGALL. Not only is he not guaranteed the cost but they refuse to obey a law which provides that increases in prices shall be made to cover cost of production. That is in the second Price Control Act. We put some things in that bill, you know, as we went along in the interest of agriculture. We had to do it by sleight of hand or with a sledge hammer, but we were not asleep all the time! Let me show you what we wrote into that law. This law, which saved the country from the destructive effects of the 110-percent parity provision of the first act by conferring further blanket authority under which the general price level has been permitted to rise to nearly 120 percent of parity:

Provided further, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs: *Provided further*, That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing: *Provided further*, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor.

Let somebody tell me when that law has been obeyed or when the slightest attention has been paid to it, and it is as plain as language can make it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman mentioned the Little Steel formula in his talk. I should like to get the gentleman's position on this. Does the gentleman believe in the retention of the Little Steel formula and at the same time permitting unbridled spiraling of prices? We have to face that condition today or tomorrow. Let us have the gentleman's position on it.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. I hope he may make one, but not now. Of course, all this will be fully discussed before we get through. I shall put some more pertinent figures in the RECORD so that Members may have an opportunity to answer them before we vote on this bill.

Let me say something to our farmer friends in this House, and I speak especially for my own section of the country. I do not believe there is anybody in this House who knows me who thinks there is any sectionalism or bitterness in my soul. I do not believe those who know me credit me with selfish partisan purposes in my views respecting this or any other economic legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. STEAGALL. I shall take 5 minutes more. I am speaking more particularly of the people of the section of the country with whom I am best acquainted. I do not say this in bitterness, but we have been penalized by Government subsidies to railroads which did not carry by railroad rate discrimination any of the benefits to our people. The same is true of tariff, of patent beneficiaries and other things that siphoned away from our people and which if retained and utilized under the leadership which our section has always afforded would make our sec-

tion the garden spot of this land. For many years we contributed our part for the support of the surviving soldiers of the North. We did it cheerfully. We did it when we were not able to do any decent measure of justice to the glorious heroes of the Confederacy. We were required to pay, but we did not participate in the benefits. These things contribute some of the reasons why our land down yonder—blessed as it was of God, and no man will deny that we have had able and worthy leadership in all the years of our history—has been called the Nation's economic problem No. 1. I ask Members here what benefit our people will get from food subsidies paid out of the Treasury of the United States and that, too, at a time when the Government needs the support of every citizen as never before since our flag was first lifted in triumph on the shores of this Western World, and when the citizen has the least need for Government largess.

What benefits are our people going to receive? We are going to be required to pay out of our taxes our proportionate part of this subsidy program that will end, only God knows where. Talk about a little bit of inflation being hard to stop. Let a man get his hand into the Treasury of the United States and don't ask me to find a way to get it out. Our people and it is true with the farmers of the Nation, have been laboring under hardships, and unjust burdens, and discriminations, for more than half a century. They have been forced, in violation of sound economic laws, to abandon the production of things the world needs, which we are best adapted to produce and have been compelled to return to primitive methods and to produce our own food and live at home. What good is a food subsidy going to do to the farmers of Sand Mountain in Alabama? What good will it do to the farmers of Georgia who are forced to raise their own food? We are going to be taxed again to pay the bill but we will not be allowed to participate in the benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes. I do not think there has ever been a more fundamental question before the Congress since the War between the States than this question, the so-called question of subsidies. It presents a fundamental problem which must be solved by the Congress as representatives of patriotic American people. I think the basic problem before this Congress in connection with the subsidization of consumer prices is the perpetuity of the American form of Government.

The fundamental objection to consumer subsidies is that they socialize agriculture. Now, that is a theme which has been discussed in connection with this bill by some who are really and sincerely concerned about the trend in this country toward socialism. I merely make that opening statement so that as I talk along here, rambling, as I probably will, you may have in mind that behind my remarks there is a full realization that unless we solve this problem correctly we can expect, perhaps, a socialization of agriculture. I think anyone will agree that would be more or less disastrous and might result in the destruction of the American form of Government.

I have been burdened with my thoughts about this bill, and I do not think there is any Member of Congress but who has given a great deal of study to it, and I know so far as we, who oppose consumer subsidies are concerned, there is no ill feeling. I wish it were just an academic question which we are discussing, so that we really could get "het up" about it without doing the country any harm. But we do not charge that when a proponent of consumer subsidies makes an exaggerated statement he is less patriotic than we; that he is less sincere; that he is more partisan. In the discussion of this bill in the committee in May, in June, and in the debates on the floor in July, in the discussions of the committee in respect to this particular bill over the radio and in these Halls, there has been a minimum of politics injected into this measure. I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this is too big a question to be discussed in the light of partisan politics. It is too important a problem to be solved along partisan lines. There must be unanimity of purpose in this committee today, and tomorrow, and until we dispose of this question if we are to perpetuate the American form of government.

Why are we opposed to the payment of consumer subsidies? Is it from selfish motives? The argument has been made here repeatedly, the farmer gets no more and no less. He gets no more and no less whether we adopt this bill or not. I do not see how those who are in favor of subsidies can argue that way and then argue that those of us who oppose subsidies are selfish and partisan, and that there are political questions involved. It just so happens that there are many farmers and many working people, many professional people, and many business people, on both sides of this question, just as there are many Republicans and many Democrats on both sides of the question. I hope that from now on in these discussions no attempt will be made to label this a political bill, but one in which each individual Member of the Congress exercises his own judgment in the manner in which he does his duty under his oath, under his promise to his constituency, to preserve, protect, and defend the American way of life. Those are broad charges, I am sure, and should be justified. Now, the reason why, I presume, the farmer is opposed to the payment of subsidies, that is, consumer subsidies, is because it is the first step to regimentation and control, the first step, which eventuates in that farmer finding himself under the yoke of bureaucracy where free enterprise on the farm is destroyed, where the Government, through its several bureaus, tells the farmer when and what to sow, when and how much he shall reap; tells the processor what he shall process and how he shall process it; and tells the distributor how, where, and when, and to whom, he shall distribute the products of our farms.

In other words, consumer subsidies beget control and encourage an expansion of the program. What have we seen in the last few months? We started out very moderately to roll back the prices of butter and meat. The charge was made at that time, if you will recall, the most exaggerated claim, that because the price of butter and meat had been rolled back a few cents, the price of living had been rolled back 10 percent. That is where the trouble started in respect to this question, the exaggerated claims of those who would pay roll-back subsidies to cover up the mistakes of administration, and the making of exaggerated statements that, because they had rolled back the price of butter 5 cents a pound and the price of meat less than 3 cents a pound, they had ipso facto rolled back the price of living 10 percent. Anybody who was not a fit inmate for a lunacy asylum could have seen there was something more behind the payment of consumer subsidies than an endeavor to hold any line which had been established. Behind it is the lust for power.

Subsidies beget subsidies, and if we encourage the expansion of the present program and if we do not stop the program where it is, what have they told you is going to be the next step? It is going to be, first, the purchase of the entire citrus fruit crop. Then the purchase of the entire bean crop. Then the ultimate control from producer to consumer, of all dairy products, and finally the control of the production, processing, and distribution of all foodstuffs.

Mr. Chairman, in August I came to Washington to see what was going on. We had been told in conference when the other bill was before us that there would be no expansion of the roll-back subsidy program. I found when I arrived here that they were not going to have any more roll-backs as such, but that it was their purpose, and plans had already been made, to buy the entire crop of several agricultural products at a so-called support price, and sell it back to the consuming public for a parity price or ceiling price. Of course, that would have been as effectual a way to roll back prices, as to do it directly. That was the payment of a consumer subsidy by subterfuge. While one of the departments of the Government was denying to me that that was their program, they were advising my bean men that same day they were to be the agencies through which the entire bean crop of the United States would be bought at the so-called support price and sold back to the consuming public at a lower price.

So in this bill we have provided against the consumer subsidies by subterfuge, and we have provided that all of these support price programs and subsidy programs shall stop as of December 31 of this year.

Now, it has been said on this floor repeatedly by those who have read no further, or perhaps reading further found language which did not support their

views, that we were destroying the support price program and we were destroying the loan program. Then if they were fair enough to have told you the facts about it, they would have called your attention to the fact that in that same paragraph, after we have stopped the existing programs, so that they could not pay subsidies by subterfuge, so that they could not effectuate consumer subsidies by manipulation of the support-price program, they would have told you that there is a directive, a mandate in this bill to continue to support prices; to continue to make loans under and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the law.

Therefore, in the discussion of this bill, in the solution of this problem, we have got to distinguish and have clearly in mind the distinction between producer subsidies, which are not interfered with in this bill, nothing to the contrary notwithstanding, and consumer subsidies, which we prohibit.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, not now.

Mr. BARRY. For a short question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would rather go on a little further. I know what the gentleman is going to ask.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for information at that point?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would prefer not to yield right now.

If members of the committee will refer to the report on page 5, I will read you some language to substantiate that.

The courts, in interpreting law, interpreting the legislative intent, always consider the committee report. For that reason, the committee report has made it very clear that it is not intended to in any manner interfere with existing law whereby support prices may be announced and loans may be made to support the floor under agricultural commodities.

About halfway down in the discussion of section 3, the majority report says:

> Therefore this section prohibits new consumer-subsidy programs from being announced and prohibits payments on existing consumer-subsidy programs subsequent to December 31, 1943.

You will note the term "consumer subsidies" is always used to differentiate between producer subsidies.

Then the report goes on to say:

> This section does not prohibit nor interfere with any operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government with respect to producer subsidies or loans authorized under existing law, including the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended and supplemented by Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved October 2, 1942, and it does not prohibit or interfere with support prices or the use of Commodity Credit funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation by existing law, including section 4 of Public Law 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended.

Now, let us be fair about this situation. Although we direct the War Food Administrator, the Department of Agriculture, or whoever happens to be administering this particular part of the law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, to continue to support prices and to continue to maintain floors in accordance with the so-called Steagall amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, we do say that if it is necessary to put a support price above a parity price for the purpose of encouraging the maximum amount of production so that we will have adequate food, then and then only will the price have to be increased to absorb that particular price, because the law expressly says that the President or the Administrator of O. P. A. may set a ceiling on any agricultural commodity at parity. So he cannot set a price less than parity. We say that the price must be increased if the support price is above parity so they will no longer be able to manipulate the support price program to effectuate consumer prices and therefore we assure the farmer, we assure the producer or the processor or wherever the additional expense may be that he is to get the benefit of the support price as we really intended he should for the purpose of encouraging him to increase the production of his product. In other words we make sure that if a support price is put on a product to encourage production it is going to have its effect, the farmer is going to get it, because it was for the farmer that it was put up; it was not for the consumer.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I prefer not to yield just now.

Mr. Chairman, the payment of consumer subsidies begets subsidies. If we must adopt a new philosophy of government whereby the Treasury of the United States must pay the food bill of any part or of all of our population—I will put it that way—why do they stop there?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not at that point. I will advise the gentleman when I care to yield.

Mr. Chairman, the price of clothing is going up. Have I not as much right to have a subsidy on a suit of clothes that I buy as I have on the food I eat? It is an element of the cost of living. If we succumb, if we do not answer strongly this threat to inflation by certain so-called leaders, then we must assume that if we bend the knee to them now in this particular bill, in a month or 2 months they will want a subsidy on rent; they will want a subsidy on clothing; they will want a subsidy on shoes; they will want a subsidy on luxuries; they will want a subsidy on all of the things which, in their opinion, are necessities of life; otherwise they are going to continue to hold a bludgeon over this Congress and say:

"If you do not pay our bills for us then we are going to strike, we are going to tie up the production of war machinery, we are going to stop this war for you if you do not pay our grocery bill, if you do not pay part of our cost of living"—and this, my friends, when according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture the total cost to consumers of fixed quantities of food making up the typical consumer food basket was smaller in relation to average consumer income in recent months than at any other time on record. If the people of the United States cannot afford to pay the cost of living at the present time with family income higher than it ever has been in the history of this Nation when in God's name can they do it? Are you going to continue this policy following this war? Adopt it today and you will continue it as a permanent philosophy of Federal Government for generations and maybe centuries to come to the prejudice of the American standard of living.

Is it inflationary? First, let me say again that consumer subsidies beget consumer subsidies. A little of it is splendid, you will like it, you will love it, you will save yourself 5 cents a pound on butter. "Ha! ha! The Government is going to pay 5 cents of my butter bill. That is splendid! That is easy money! So why should we not continue this? Why should we not expand it? Why should not the Government pay a little of my meat bill? Fine! Why should not the Government pay my bread bill? Why should not the Government pay my bean bill? Why should it not pay my milk bill, my cheese bill, my shoe bill, my rent bill, my clothing bill?"

The President can say that inflation is like a drug—you get a little dose of it and you want another. I do not know, but I have been told that that is the way it operates. It seems to me that if there is a greater danger in the country today of the drugging of the population who are gullible enough to think they are getting something for nothing, greater than in the drug which the President called inflation, it is in subsidies. Let me repeat my question: Is the payment of consumer subsidies inflationary? Will they increase the national debt? To begin with, if you subsidize the consumer's grocery bill or his clothing bill by two billions you compel him to pay—collectively, of course—back into the Federal Treasury over four billions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are all in agreement on that. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who, although he has made some very much exaggerated statements on this question, seems to be in perfect accord with us on the proposition that every time we raise the national debt a billion dollars we have to pay it over several times. I will repeat what he said about that yesterday. He said:

> In the first place, if we pay a dollar now, that is equivalent to saving two or three dollars in the future—

I say only an additional dollar; he says three; I do not know; it is somewhere in between—

because, if you have to borrow that dollar, and you pay interest on the dollar, the interest on a long-time bond, the history is that by the time you pay back the dollar on that bond you will have to pay two or three times the amount of it in interest, in addition to the $1 that was borrowed. So that for every dollar we pay now we save these returning soldier boys, if you please, the obligation of not only paying the $1 but of paying two or three times the amount of it in interest.

Well, our worthy colleague has done himself proud. He has advanced his philosophy of this bill courageously if not intelligently. If we pay $2,000,000,000 in subsidies today these same boys that he refers to coming back from the front—and I did not intend to mention this until he did yesterday, we did not want to bring the soldiers and sailors into this—will have to pay it. We will refer to my boy. He is not old enough to go to war. For every dollar the Government pays of my grocery bill today, my boy has got to pay $2. For every 5 cents that we save on butter today he and his generation has got to pay 10 cents.

O Mr. Chairman, let me tell you, there is a moral question involved here. Where is the American with blood so thin, may I say so yellow, that he would pass on to posterity, that he would pass on to his sons and daughters, that he would pass on to the men fighting our battles—and I use that only because it was used yesterday—the payment of any part of the grocery bill for the food which you and I are eating today; at a time when the national income and the family income is higher than at any time in the history of the United States? I do not want to hang my head in shame 10 or 15 years from now when my boy might come to me and say: "Dad, these taxes are high. These taxes are high because you did not pay your grocery bill back in 1943. I am paying your grocery bill today. That was a dirty trick you played on me, dad." I do not want my boy to be able to say that.

Are consumer subsidies inflationary? For every dollar you pay in consumer subsidies you increase the purchasing power of the individual by $1 or the purchasing power of the Nation, any way you want to put it. When you increase the purchasing power of the Nation, you are pressing right up against that inflation ceiling.

What causes inflation? We all agree it is spending by the Government. The spending by Government today has caused the depreciation in the value of the currency which is reflected in higher prices and, remember this, which I say parenthetically, an increase in prices seldom if ever induces inflation. The increase in the prices is the result of inflation. Think that over. It is the result of the depreciation of the value of the currency by other causes which the gentleman from Alabama has so ably covered.

Do consumer subsidies cause inflation? Of course they do, and let me reiterate that we increase the volume of purchasing power at a time when there is a constantly decreasing availability of consumer goods.

Do consumer subsidies cause inflation? The worthy gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and his committee have been working for years trying to solve the problem by siphoning off purchasing power so as to diminish the differential between the national income and the dollar value of consumer goods. Anything which tends to widen that breach, anything which tends to enlarge the differential between the value of consumer goods, on the one hand, and the national income on the other, makes further taxes necessary. So you see, you get right back to the point that if you get the subsidy to pay your grocery bill you have got to be taxed for that money.

You are going to hear a great deal during these debates about individual income, about the relatively fixed incomes of the white-collar workers and Government workers, as well as the annuitants, the pensioners, and so forth. There are undoubtedly some of those who will continue to need some help, which is always a problem of Government. I want you, the members of the committee, to just sit down when you have the time, when it is quiet, and think of your friends, your neighbors, your acquaintances, not as individuals but as families and see how many of the families within your acquaintanceship have not had their family income materially increased during this period of war and war expenditures.

Let me cite you what I consider a typical example of a typical American family. I have in mind a man with a family. He has four children. He has the same income today that he had last year. It is not material what the amount is, but he has the same income today that he had last year. Last year at this time he was supporting himself, his wife, and four children. Today, on that same income, he is supporting himself, his wife, and two small sons. One of his boys is in the service, sending money home to dad, for which dad is buying bonds and laying them aside for the boy when he comes home. One other, a girl, has a position down here in the War Department. She is keeping herself. Has not the purchasing power of that man been increased materially? Has not the family income been increased materially? His individual income has a purchasing power today greater by 35 percent than it had last year, and the entire family income has been increased by two of the family being in position to get some return for their employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, think about that and determine for yourself how many families have not had an increase in family income during the last 2 or 3 years.

I want to get to a statement made by Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A. Mr. Bowles in a statement night before last, as he is quoted in the press, says that if we do not authorize the payment of $800,000,000 the cost of living is going up $8,000,000,000. I have been with this subject for the last 2 years and I do not think heretofore anybody has ever made quite such a fantastic claim and I cannot conceive of my good friend, Chester Bowles, on his own initiative, on his own responsibility without somebody having suggested that he should do it because this bill was coming up, making any such absurd statement as that. Needless to say, it is not borne out by any facts. Let us say that instead of increasing the cost of living by $8,000,000,000 it will increase the taxes according to my friend, Mr. PATMAN'S figure, up to $2,400,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a statement which I made when this bill was reported out and when the intent of the committee was fresh in my mind.

The action of the Banking and Currency Committee in reporting a bill which will prevent the payment of consumer subsidies is a decided victory for the majority faction in Congress who are opposed to the socialization of agriculture. The basic problem before Congress in connection with the subsidization of consumer prices is the perpetuation of the American form of government. The fundamental objection to consumer subsidies is that they socialize agriculture. The Congress, as representative of American patriotic thought, must exercise its constitutional prerogative to stop this trend toward socialization.

The bill continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1945, or to such earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive order. It does not provide for any additional funds. The committee felt that if the Commodity Credit Corporation was to be prohibited from paying consumer subsidies, their present borrowing and loaning capacity of $3,000,000,000 was sufficient. It will be recalled that they were given an additional $350,000,000 in July, bringing their total borrowing and loaning capacity to an even $3,000,000,000.

The bill prohibits funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency from being used to make subsidy payments or to pay or absorb losses on agricultural commodities to reduce or maintain or in lieu of increasing maximum prices, except that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits and vegetables owned and controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage.

We made it very clear in that language that the deterioration should not be in value but in quality by qualifying the word "deterioration" by the words "by spoilage." In short, it prevents the payment of consumer subsidies but preserves the policy of paying producer subsidies for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of essential foods.

The bill authorizes the continuation of any subsidy program initiated previous to October 13 but provides that these subsidies cannot be paid after December 31, 1943. In accordance with this provision the present subsidies on butter and

meat would stop on December 31, 1943, but the milk subsidy in all probability would be continued if this subsidy is reflected back to the producer and is necessary to obtain a maximum amount of production.

The bill gives the assurance that the producer of foods will obtain the benefit of any support prices, and support prices cannot be manipulated to defeat their purpose by being used to effectuate consumer subsidies. The bill is an anti-inflation bill, nothing to the contrary notwithstanding. It is a forward step not only to preserve the American form of government but to prevent inflation; it prevents a widening of the gap between national income and the dollar value of consumer goods, thereby obviating the necessity of increasing taxes by at least $2,000,000,000. It siphons off purchasing power at the source, thereby relieving the pressure on the inflation ceiling; it prevents our sons and daughters and the members of our armed forces after they have returned from the battle fronts from having to pay tomorrow a part of our grocery bill for the food which we are eating today.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I am having some difficulty following the gentleman's attempt to distinguish between consumer subsidies and producer subsidies, because before the war broke out there was no shortage of food. My question is, does the gentleman contend that subsidy payments under the Triple-A Act and the Soil Conservation Act which were made to the farmers to keep them from producing were producer subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think payments made under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Commodity Credit Corporation Act to encourage them to expand production were the subsidies I mean in respect to producer subsidies. I think the question may be answered in this way. If the subsidy is primarily for the purpose of establishing a maximum price or maintaining a maximum price or in lieu of increasing the maximum price, then it comes within the prohibitions of this act. I think that kind of subsidy is a consumer subsidy.

Mr. BARRY. That form of subsidy is to maintain purchasing power, to maintain the price, just as this proposition is to give the consumer purchasing power. There was never any shortage in any farm commodity before the war broke out.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We had a surplus before.

Mr. BARRY. Why did you need producer subsidies? There is no difference between a consumer subsidy and a producer subsidy.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman from months of very attentive consideration to the subject in the committee knows what we mean by a consumer subsidy and a producer subsidy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The payments made under soil conservation and parity payments were made to keep production down, restricting acreage. It was a program of scarcity. That program is now out the window. 1944 will be the first time that we shall have free production and full production in the United States. Under the program of scarcity farmers were penalized and assessed heavy penalties if they produced more than they were allowed to produce under the triple A program.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I should like to have the gentleman's opinion on this question. Can a subsidy, even a producer subsidy, be handed to the producer or handed on to the producer, giving him the benefit of it, unless we establish a floor price in company with the subsidy? In other words, do we not have to have a floor price before we can pass on a subsidy, regardless of to whom it is supposed to be paid?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, and the only subsidies in which we are interested in that respect are those subsidies which are payable when support prices are above parity. We have said in the O. P. A. Act that no maximum prices shall be established below parity. So the only ones in which we are interested are those relatively few cases where the floor prices are above parity prices, and they are all listed in the hearings.

Mr. O'CONNOR. My question is, Does the subsidy pass to the producer unless we have a floor price? Is there any assurance that he is going to get it unless we have a floor price?

Mr. WOLCOTT. You have the floor price underneath them anyway. You always have the floor on all these commodities. As a matter of fact, the support price is a floor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But we do not have any floor price; we have support prices but no floor prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman asked a question of every Member of the House. He said, "Look around and see if there are any families whose incomes have not been increased." I think the gentleman is unaware of the hundreds of thousands of white-collar workers, and is also unaware of the hundreds of thousands of pensioners, policemen, firemen, and other civil-service employees who have not had an increase in income. Without debating the general proposition at this time with the gentleman, I say that the increase in the cost of living has brought about a reduction in income on the part of practically every consuming family in the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Did the gentleman vote for the Price Control Act?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I did.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me call the gentleman's attention to that fact, that you wrote a mandate into the Price Control Act to raise the prices. Do you know that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, you do?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman read that section?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, I am going to.

On October 2 we directed the President to stabilize, as far as practicable, on the September 15 level, and we set up certain standards in respect to agricultural prices. Then on page 2, in a proviso which was not hidden, by any means, we provided:

> That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

When you set, as the Administrator did, a price on canned goods, and then the labor costs in the processing industry were increased, thereby increasing the cost of producing those canned goods, there was a distinct mandate to the Price Administrator to raise the price. The gentleman voted for it, as we all did. We have mandated the Office of Price Administration to do exactly what some of you are objecting that they do today. You would have to virtually repeal existing law if you were to do otherwise.

Let me go a little further with this:

> *Provided further,* That in the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing.

You voted for that and you did not quibble at all about it. You said, "He cannot put a price less than is necessary to get the maximum amount of production." That is all we say in this bill. That is everything we say. All we do is to reiterate the policy established in the Price Control Act and make them do what we told them to do on October 2.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Another concrete example is when the Secretary of Agriculture at a time when hogs were at 11 cents, putting a floor of $13.75, Chicago, or between 110 or 115 percent of parity, at the time, and he was following that particular part of the law, and the reason he gave for doing so was to increase the production of pork in connection with the war.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What we want to do is to straighten out some of these bureaus and tell them that Congress is not going

to stand for their constantly flouting the clear intent of the Congress as expressed in the law under which they are operating.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand the statement of the gentleman this money that it is proposed to supply is simply to pay a part of the price of the food which is consumed by us. Is that right?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Or try to prevent the use of money for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I will take 2 minutes more.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Now, then, the Government has not got any money, has it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has to raise it through Congress by imposing taxes or selling bonds.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And the Government has not got a cent, it is nearly busted now. When a man goes out to the store to buy groceries, is it not proposed now, in effect, that the Government will pay a part of that grocery bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is not that what is proposed to be done, if you have this subsidy?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If you defeat this bill, that is what you will do.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But my question is a matter of yes or no.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes what?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes, that it is proposed to have the Government pay a part of the current grocery bills of everybody.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Government is proposing today to pay a part of it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I know that. I am not trying to argue with the gentleman. The Government has not got any money, the Government is broke and here we are, grown men, and we do not propose to pay for what we eat. Who is going to pay that, if the boys who are on the fighting front now and their kids do not pay it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I cannot answer that. It has to be paid.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Oh, the gentleman from Michigan yielded to me. I do not yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARRY. The Government paid the farmer part of his grocery bill, and we are asking the same thing now for the consumer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the spirit with which the House is confronting the decision of this question. I have heard a good deal of talk about inflation. As I understand it inflation comes about when many people with plenty of money to buy, try to buy more than there is to sell. I am sorry to "bust" in on a lot of big speeches, but that is about what it is. As I understand this contribution that we are trying to stop, or the contribution going on now, it is that the Government is paying a part of the grocery bill of the people who buy food. That is it. Now, then, the Government has not got any money. Everybody knows that. Well, who is going to pay it? Are you going to pay it? If we are, why do we not pay it when we get the groceries? There are just two people who can pay it, and they are the folks who are eating the grub, the ones getting the food—or somebody else whom we are delegating to pay our bills for our food—is that not right?

Mr. ANGELL. That is right.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If we would pay that grocery bill when we get there, we would pay it out of our own money. It is not just a few people mooching off of future generations to pay our current eating bills but it is proposed that everybody get in on this while the getting is good. Our young men are fighting for us while we are at home, safe from danger. There is nothing they can do about it. They cannot help themselves. If we put this food bill into bonds those bonds will bear interest. The people who are sitting here in this Chamber are not going to pay them or any part of them, but we are going to eat the food. These soldiers when they come home will find we signed their names to the bill. It will be a bill for our current eating expenses while they were away fighting for us. Is not that a pretty picture for grown people in America to put themselves in? Here we are, grown people in America, and our boys are fighting on the far-flung battlefields of the world, and we have not got sense enough to arrange some sort of a way whereby we can pay our own grocery bill.

If these white-collar fellows need more money, let them get it—help them to get it. They are entitled to more. All these big words and long speeches—it is just a question of whether we will pay our grocery bills or write them into the books and leave them for somebody else to pay. That somebody else is the generation following us in responsibility. The generation which makes up the body of our brave fighting men and the women of comparable age and their children now and to be. It is not only proposed that we saddle off our grocery bill on them, but that grocery bill will bear interest until they can find the money to pay it. Do we not suppose they are going to have to eat? If we cannot pay our own current grocery bill, how do we expect them to pay theirs and ours, too, plus accumulated interest and plus the salaries and cost and interest on the salaries and cost of the necessary addition to the present army of planners and supervisors and interferers with and messers up that have been drawn from the manpower of the country to harass and bedevil the people still engaged in productive effort. I only have 5 minutes and cannot discuss the even more important thing—the far-reaching effect upon the independence of the business of agriculture and the independence of the farmer which would result from this subsidy policy.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman tell me the fundamental difference between the Treasury subsidizing farmers and the Treasury subsidizing consumers?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not want to get too far away, but I want to get to the fundamental question between you paying your own grocery bill and making your grandchildren or somebody else's grandchildren pay for it, plus the interest on the debt.

Mr. BARRY. Was not that same test applied to the farmer?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Maybe so.

Mr. BARRY. Was not that same test applied to the farmer in subsidizing the farmer?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Maybe so.

Mr. BARRY. A good many of the men who are opposed to this bill voted for that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Maybe they did so. Maybe they did so very foolishly or wisely. What has that got to do with the present responsibility?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the statement about whether or not we should pay our grocery bill or whether our grandchildren should, sounds very, very good.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is good.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But the gentleman fails to realize that if we do go into an unbridled spiraling economy, our grandchildren will not have anything with which to pay.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Well, we had better set a good example of paying our own grocery bills as we go along.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman tell us how he proposes to do that?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

SUBSIDIES ONLY ALTERNATIVE FOR HIGHER COST OF LIVING AND INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have had more than 2 hours in opposition to what some of us stand for in the House and I would like to have just a few minutes to present this from the angle of those who are opposed to section 3. There is no personal difference between us in this fight on this proposal at all. There is a difference of opinion and we have different views.

As evidence of the fact that a lot of Members have not studied this proposal and do not thoroughly understand it, I cite as exhibit A, my good friend the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, who has often been pointed to as the sage of the House. Now, he is a wise man. He is one of the wisest men I know and whenever a wise man like Judge SUMNERS will go off on the angle that he did, I know there is bound to be a lot of misunderstanding and confusion in this

House. I want to show you how fallacious that argument is, if you will pardon me. I apologize for differing with you, Judge SUMNERS, because I know you are usually right and I am usually wrong. But in this particular case maybe I have studied it from more angles than you have studied it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in his talk yesterday—I have talked too much on this, I know that, I have spent entirely too much time—but every time I have made a speech I have made this statement, which I made yesterday:

> And again I challenge any Member of this body to get up, and I will yield to him, who will offer any plan that will keep down the cost of living and encourage production and not increase prices without the use of subsidies. Can you name it? Of course, you can not.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said:

> I would not want the gentleman to yield sufficient time for me to answer on that particular question, but if the gentleman and the rest of the House will listen attentively during the debates on this bill, I will answer it.

That is what he said yesterday. I listened most attentively here today and he did not answer it. I want to say there is no Member of this House who can answer it. Nobody can answer it. You have either got to increase prices or take it out of the hide of the farmers—which would discourage production—or pay a subsidy. There is no other way around it at all. And I have often made that challenge and nobody has accepted it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield, because my time is too limited and I hope the gentleman will not insist upon it.

Let me give you an example on canned goods that the gentleman was talking about. Suppose we raise the prices of canned goods all over the United States to take care of high-cost producers. I happen to know something about that. The gentleman read the law there where we were supposed to raise all prices, and this particular bill will force it—absolutely force it. The canneries, a lot of them, say around Baltimore and around Cleveland and a lot of places where they have a high cost of production, produce a large part of the canned goods, at least a substantial part. They cannot produce at the prices that are paid, the maximum prices. They would have to go out of business. Which is better, to allow them a 10 percent or 20 percent increase to take care of them to keep them in business and in production, or to raise prices all over the Nation? That is the question.

In other words, is it better to go into debt $1 than it is $5 or $30? Why, there is only one answer to it. Of course, it is better to go in debt $1 than $5 or $30. I will offer you an example, just a little bit of an example, that has the same principle involved in it, on copper. We needed more copper. The big companies were producing all they could at 12 cents a pound. If you paid them 40 cents they could not produce any more. So we wanted to get these high-cost mines in production. Which was better to do, increase all copper to 25 cents or 30 cents a pound or just give the high-cost producer the extra amount in the form of a subsidy? The answer is it was better to give those high-cost mines a subsidy of 5 or 25 or 30 cents a pound. The result was that we increased the total copper production 10 percent. It was very helpful. We are almost out of the woods on copper, and we were out between $30,000,000 and $50,000,000 on that. We had to borrow that money, we will say. Yes; we borrowed it. Our children and grandchildren will pay it back. But which is better, to pass on a debt of $30,000,000 to our grandchildren or somebody else to pay, or pass on a debt of $1,000,000,000 which it would have cost us without a subsidy?

The answer is obvious. Of course, it is better to pass on the smaller amount. So it is not just as simple as many have suggested here. And as in the case of copper, so in the case of canned goods, and I could name you a dozen other things that will operate in the same way. Sometimes we have to take something bad in order to keep from taking something much worse. So I do not care if you are against subsidies. Is it not better to pay a $10,000,000 subsidy on canned goods in the distressed areas than it is to pay $100,000,000 in increased prices? Now, remember this, that the Government is buying half of what we produce that is subsidized, more than that in most things, in copper especially. If we were to increase the prices of all copper it would have cost us $1,000,000,000 more. The Government would have to pay more than half of that because they bought more than half of it. So there is $500,000,000 increase in that that we saved by being out about $30,000,000 on a subsidy. Who can argue against that? I say now, I have made this challenge on the floor of this House day in and day out; nobody can answer. Nobody can answer it. You will either use subsidies or you will increase the cost of living, or you will retard production. And saying it another way, there is only one way to encourage production and keep down the cost of living and that is through the use of subsidies.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You made the challenge.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but I have done it day in and day out. I am not going to take my 20 minutes now to yield to anyone to answer it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] offered to answer it yesterday. He said he was going to answer it today but he did not, because there is no answer to it. Nobody can answer it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will help me to get some time, I will answer it.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. They would like to have it answered on the Republican side, because they want to know what that answer is. If the gentleman has got an answer he will be making a great contribution to the Republicans.

So, what about these subsidies? Why has the word "subsidy" become so obnoxious? Are we not paying a part of the rent bill down at Dallas, Tex.? Certainly we are. All these rents around the defense plants are subsidies as well as some social living quarters. We could not get people to go to Dallas. As delightful a place as that is to live, one of the finest cities in the Nation, we could not get them to go there and pay the rent they would have to pay if they paid an economic rent. Therefore, the Government has built houses and made it possible for those people to pay $20 rent when $50 would be an economic rent. You are subsidizing them to the extent of $30 a month. That is going on all over the country. Is that so bad? No. That is the way it should be. You must have production and you must have people to do the work, and you cannot have them unless you give them a decent place to live. So, it is all right. So that is paying a part of the rent bill.

In New England we had to get them fuel. They could not get the fuel by water because of the submarine menace, and we had to ship it by rail. That greatly increased their cost. Was it right for them to pay that increased cost? They could not do it. It would absolutely cause a lot of families to suffer. So the Government subsidized the transportation cost to the New England fuel users. There is a case where we are paying a part of the fuel bill for a large segment of our population. If it is not so wrong to pay the fuel bill and the rent bill, and to pay tariff duties up to $4,000,000,000 a year, which is a subsidy—if those things are not wrong, then is it wrong to save our people $5 or $25 or $30 on every dollar that we have to borrow, or that we use as a subsidy payment?

I hope the Members of this House will study this proposition. In all seriousness and earnestness, I tell you that if you do, without reference to any political consideration, without reference to what will happen to you or to me in politics or anything else, but, solely with the desire to help the country in wartime, you will come to one conclusion and that is the conclusion that I have stated here day after day, that no one yet has been able to answer successfully.

I want to say to my friend from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] if anybody could answer it, he could, because he is better informed on this legislation than any other one Member of Congress. When he said yesterday he was going to answer it today, I said, "I wonder what kind of answer that is going to be"; but he did not touch it, side, edge, nor bottom. The reason is evident, because there is no answer. It is just logical that there is no answer. How are you going to keep the price of living just like it is when the farmers cannot produce and sell at a price that will permit the cost of living to remain there unless you give a subsidy to make up for that difference? It is just as plain as the nose on your face. There is no other remedy. So when you vote for this bill you are voting to increase

the cost of living and you are voting for inflation.

When did the word "subsidy" become so obnoxious? As I have often said, the tariff which is as old as the Government, is a subsidy. The railroads were subsidized. The merchant marine, the inland waterways were subsidized. The postal rates are a subsidy for newspapers and magazines up to almost $100,000,000 a year. I am not opposed to it. I am in favor of it.

George Washington started it. George Washington was right. He said:

> Let us disseminate knowledge and information by making it easy for people to get newspapers at a low rate.

George Washington was exactly right; and since that time we have subsidized the newspapers and magazines. Today a paper published in Dallas County or any other county can be deposited in the post office there and the publishers pay absolutely no postage at all for distribution through the mails in Dallas County or the county of publication. They can send out 5,000, or 10,000, or 100,000, or 1,000,000 copies, and they pay no postage whatsoever under that policy. It is the same way in every county in the United States. If they ship them outside of the county they pay such a low postage rate that the Government in the end loses almost a hundred million dollars every year on those low postage rates. Now there is a case where it is a fine thing—a subsidy is. Nobody opposes that; I think we all favor it. I am just giving that as an example of cases where there is no opposition to subsidies.

I would not be in favor of subsidizing everything: it would be absolutely wrong. There are certain things that it works on and there are certain things that it would not work on. The point I make is that Congress is in no position to determine which of these commodities they will use a subsidy on and which they will not use a subsidy on.

The committee bill is not against subsidies. If you will read the bill you will find down at the end that although the bill denounces subsidies and everything connected therewith, it states:

> *Provided, however,* That none of the provisions of this act shall apply to domestic fats and oils and oilseeds.

In other words if you help pay anybody's butter bill with a subsidy, that is a subsidy, and very bad; but if they will buy margarine that is all right. You gentlemen over here on the Republican side, you say it is all right to subsidize oleomargarine; you are for it in this bill. It permits it, it specifically exempts—specifically exempts oleomargarine. You say that is all right, that is a good thing. Furthermore you say it is all right to subsidize Crisco, or anything else that is made from vegetable oils and fats and oil seeds, domestic. You say that is fine, the principle is not violated there, but if you want to subsidize butter, or hog lard, or something like that, why, it is bribery. It is bribery! It is wrong, somebody ought to go to the penientiary for it. Do you not think it is just a little bit inconsistent? Why, of course it is very, very inconsistent. The fact is that subsidies are just as old as our Government. They have always been with us and will continue to be with us.

POST-WAR FARM PROGRAM

We can have no farm program that is lasting and permanent without subsidies, and this effort to get the farmers to go against subsidies is an effort to make the farmers fight their own interests. Why did we 10 years ago fight the group that is now so vigorously opposing subsidies to the farmers in this case, force the use of subsidies for farmers? There was an excellent reason for that, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the Members study it. For a hundred years the farmers have been at a great disadvantage. They have been compelled to buy in a protected market, buy things over the high tariff wall that was built up to help infant industry and other industry in our country. When they want to sell what they had worked so hard to produce they had to sell it in the competitive markets of the world in competition with the cheapest forms of labor on earth. There was a distinct and decided disadvantage to the farmers of this Nation and for the first time in the history of our Government the Congress more than 10 years ago said: "We are going in a measure to remove that discrimination; we are going to give the farmers a subsidy to help make up for it; we are going to give them some money." Congress even went to the extent of setting aside a part of the actual tariff duties collected to give the farmers a part of that subsidy; yet here we are now trying to teach the farmers that it is wrong to have a subsidy, it is absolutely wrong. Do you know what we are doing if we succeed in doing that? We are leading them up a blind alley to destruction; we are leading them up a blind alley; that is what we are doing.

FARMERS PROTECTED IF THEY DO NOT GIVE IT UP

When this war is over and we have a permanent farm program can we have one without the use of subsidies? Of course we cannot and we have written into the Commodity Credit Corporation Act a provision that for 2 years after the declaration of peace the farmers of this country shall be guaranteed a loan value equal to 90 percent of parity. That will protect the farmers from what happened after the other war. This gives them adequate protection, it gives them a floor under their prices and protects them. All right; that is what they want. No other class or group in America has that protection; no, they do not have it. It is likely to last several years after the war. You will notice that law reads that it shall continue 2 years after the declaration of peace. It is always 2 or 3 years after a war ceases before there is an official declaration of peace, so we are safe in assuming that for 4 or 5 years after this war is over the farmers are going to be protected to the extent of 90-percent-parity loans. Now if you teach the farmers to oppose subsidies, to fight subsidies on the ground that they are wrong, the administration in power, if it happens to be our friends over here, I am afraid will laugh at them and say: "No, no; you fellows are against subsidies; you do not want them; we will have to repeal or not carry out that law." The subsidy will only be needed if prices go down and naturally they will go down after inflation; they always do. So this campaign to teach the farmers to fight subsidies is teaching them to fight their own good interests and best interests and, I repeat, destructive to them when this war is over. I hope that those who are attempting to do it will not succeed. The subsidy question is one that obviously I cannot answer in full in this limited time, but I repeat in conclusion what I have often said. I do not want to take up all the time that has been allotted me. I want other members of the committee to use it.

ANOTHER CHALLENGE

Nobody can answer this question. It has been challenged here every day. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] who has spoken, promised to answer it yesterday but did not answer it. There is only one reason for that. If there is any answer on earth the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] could give it because he knows all the answers available. The answer is, it is either high cost of living and inflation or the use of subsidies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist on that. They have had 2 hours here and we have only had 20 minutes. Why cannot our side go on?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to have that in the RECORD because I was not trying to pull anything. The gentleman in charge of the time over there indicated to me I should yield some time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What time has been consumed by either side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] has consumed 1 hour and 10 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], has consumed 1 hour and 2 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman want to use some time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. PATMAN. May I plead with you gentlemen? You have used 2 hours and 12 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are only 8 minutes' difference.

Mr. PATMAN. Cannot you give us an even break on the time?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I expect to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and to the other gentlemen time before we close this evening. I am giving the gentleman more time than he is entitled to, and I am doing it because he asked me to.

Mr. PATMAN. I object to that. I have used 20 minutes out of 2 hours.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will yield the gentleman more time.

Mr. PATMAN. Then give it to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] or somebody on my side.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will give the gentleman all the time I think he is entitled to. He has no right to ask for all the time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentlemen from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PATMAN. The parliamentary is, I think our folks should come on now. You see, they have not gone on as yet.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, is that a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer it. Under the rule adopted by the House, the time is under the control of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I invite your attention to the fact the chairman yielded me an hour. Now, then, I want to use that hour. I have used only 20 minutes. I expect to yield that time to these other gentlemen to use who are waiting here.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency yielded the gentleman from Texas 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. The chairman well knows that in his opening discussion the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency yielded me 1 hour definitely for today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observed that the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency did promise the gentleman an hour, but the Chair cannot control the keeping of promises.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I expect to carry out the promises of the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. He yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and those who are taking the same position he is taking 1 hour this afternoon. I will yield 40 more minutes to them this afternoon before we close.

Mr. PATMAN. As a matter of good faith, I know the gentleman is fair and wants to be fair——

Mr. ROLPH. Is this taken out of my time?

Mr. PATMAN. Since each side has taken an hour, why should we not use our hour now? You have 2 hours against us.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to yield?

FOOD FOR THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, price control is an emergency measure. No sensible person advocates price control as a scheme for changing our way of life. Not as a means of permanently regimenting our national economy. Leon Henderson sold us on price control purely and simply as a means of combating inflation. Nothing more; nothing less.

The American people support price control because of bitter experiences following World War No. 1. They know runaway prices may well be followed by an aftermath of hesitation, bankruptcy, and chaos. Following the Armistice of 1918, and in the early twenties, innumerable firms went under because of tumbling commodity values. Not because of speculation. Not because of careless management. Not because of inefficiency or neglect. Troubles were caused by head-over-heels falling of prices and no buyers. Heavy inventories and no customers. Therefore, thoughtful people accept price control as a means of self-protection. Sort of an insurance policy. Reliance on an old axiom "once bit, twice shy."

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think our people desire to embark on a sea of unlimited subsidies. During the summer recess we had occasion to discuss this issue with the citizens back home. While certain groups honestly feel the measure is a step in the right direction, others strenuously oppose. Before the recess, I voted against giving the Commodity Credit Corporation a blank check. After visiting San Francisco and talking to my constituents and after listening attentively to the witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee, I have not changed my ideas. I am still opposed to unlimited subsidies. Why should the Federal Government be asked to pay part of the individual's living expenses? Why should the boys and girls now in the armed forces undertake huge tax bills for paying a portion of the living expenses of those who remain at home? Why should our children and our children' children pay any of our bills?

There is a wide gulf between unlimited subsidies and a policy of support prices of foods necessary for war purposes. The policy now in force.

In the latter field, Commodity Credit Corporation is doing an excellent job. The corporation should be continued. In my opinion it is a mistake to even consider abolishing the Commodity Credit Corporation. It has encouraged increased production of food products for the armed forces and for lease-lend. Among the food products supported for the war effort by C. C. C. are vegetable oils, canned vegetables, peanuts, dried peas, prunes, sugar—beet and cane, domestic and foreign—wheat for animal feed, cheese, milk, dried beans, raisins, coffee.

No doubt each of these commodities will be discussed at length several times during the debate. I intend to speak of but three, sugar beets, prunes, and raisins. California leads in production of all three. Each is of paramount importance in the present emergency.

Therefore, let us carefully examine sugar. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been pressing for announcement of support price on sugar beets. On December 31, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture estimated various quotas for 1942 as follows:

	Tons
Domestic beet	1,862,811
Mainland cane	504,995
Hawaii	1,127,420
Puerto Rico	959,088
Virgin Islands	10,716
Philippine Islands	1,237,764
Cuba	2,297,533
Foreign countries	31,747
Total	8,032,074

By proclamation of the President as of April 13, 1942, all sugar quotas were removed.

We counted on about 15 percent of our supply as coming from the Philippines. The attack on Pearl Harbor stopped all shipments from the Far East. Cuba is down for about 30 percent, the largest single contributor to our needs. The United States, through Commodity Credit Corporation, has been purchasing the Cuban crop for the past 3 years. C. C. C. likewise purchased sugar for import from Puerto Rico and other sources. In May, when the earlier C. C. C. bill was before the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Hutson reported on the workings of his Bureau. Referring to page 263 of committee hearings, under the caption of sugar, we read:

As one of its major activities in the foreign field, Commodity Credit Corporation has bought the 1943 Cuban sugar crop and is negotiating for purchases in Puerto Rico, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. Imported raw sugar is allocated to refiners and sold to them at a price which permits them to operate under existing price ceilings. In addition, the Corporation will buy the 1943 sugar-beet crop at a price which will increase returns to farmers, and will resell the crop to processors at a price which will permit them to refine sugar and dispose of it within the price ceilings. The Corporation may absorb some of the excess freight charges in transporting beet sugar outside of the area in which it is normally sold.

The beet sugar planters in the United States were urged by the Federal Government to increase production. Growing beets for sugar is in competition with other commodities, such as lettuce, beans, and similar products. Unless the farmer knows in sufficient time what price he will get for beets, he most likely will plant other crops. The gentleman from Michigan, Representative FRED CRAWFORD, stated the case clearly, as shown on page 80 of committee hearings:

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Hutson, I would like to make this comment, in reply to your question. In the growing areas—and I say this after many years' experience right out in the field of contracting—before the planting season begins, the interested farmers attempt to map out the acreage planned that they propose to follow with respect to all crops, including sugar beets. Now, the competitive conditions with respect to substitute crops, plus all of this planning that all of us are involved in, has an effect upon the individual farmer, in such a manner that it tends to reduce the acreage which goes into sugar beets, so long as the individual farmer does not know exactly what his acreage plan must be as related to this specific crop—sugar beets. So I would say that in

any area where planting has actually begun, every hour the final announcement is delayed will operate against the acreage which will ultimately be planted to sugar beets.

By referring further to page 82 of committee hearings, we find complete text of letter written September 24, 1943, to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones by California Congressional Sugar Committee. The letter sets forth the urgency of naming the support price on sugar beets.

Pressing further for the price on sugar beets, I wrote under date of October 7, 1943, to Mr. Jones and Mr. Hutson jointly requesting action. Mr. Hutson replied on October 16, 1943, stating the acreage question could be settled but that the Government hesitated to name sugar support price pending action of Congress on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

On October 26, 1943, the Agricultural Council of California wrote me, in part, as follows:

We are greatly concerned over the continuing delay in the announcement of a definite sugar-beet program for 1944. Every day's delay means so many more acres taken out of beets and planted in other crops. More and more growers are every day writing beets off their list and contracting for the production of other crops—solely because they have no assurance as to a future beet program.

On page 5 of Committee Report 846, covering bill under debate, we find this language concerning section 3:

This section does not prohibit nor interfere with any operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government with respect to producer subsidies or loans authorized under existing law, including the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented by Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved October 2, 1942, and it does not prohibit or interfere with support prices or the use of Commodity Credit funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation by existing law, including section 4 of Public Law 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended.

This section provides that support prices shall continue to be announced for any such agricultural commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and further provides that loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942. The section provides, however, that maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below prices specified in section 3 of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942.

The language is clear and explicit. The support price of sugar should be announced and is in no way connected with unlimited subsidies. For 3 years past the Federal Government has purchased Cuba's sugar. About 44 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States ordinarily comes from foreign sources. The domestic beet crop is in normal times close to 23 percent of our total requirements, including lend-lease.

I repeat, the question of unlimited subsidies does not, in my opinion, enter into the sugar picture. It is manifestly unfair and prejudicial to our national interests tying sugar in with unlimited subsidies.

Now with reference to dried fruit. Practically the same situation exists as in sugar, except dried fruits are domestically produced whereas a large percentage of the Nation's sugar requirements are imported.

I have obtained copies of Commodity Credit Corporation forms used in connection with raisins, also prunes. Agreements are dated as of August 15, 1943. These contracts are here for perusal by the members of the Committee of the Whole. First paragraph of raisin contract reads, and I quote:

Whereas in order to assure an adequate supply of standard quality processed raisins of the 1943 crop, during the existing war emergency, for the needs of Government agencies and for civilian consumption and to assure the proper and orderly marketing thereof, Commodity desires to purchase certain processed raisins of said crop and to make certain disposition of the raisins purchased, all in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter specified.

Section No. 1 of raisin contract is quoted in full:

Section 1. Support prices to producers: In respect of all of its purchases of 1943 raisins in natural condition, whether such raisins are purchased by packer for processing or sale pursuant to this agreement or otherwise, packer shall pay all producers for 1943 raisins so purchased (other than raisins received from its producer-members by a packer which is a bona fide marketing cooperative) the applicable producer support prices. Such producer support prices shall be the maximum prices in effect as of the effective date of Maximum Price Regulation 461, as issued by the Office of Price Administration on August 28, 1943, in respect of all such 1943 raisins.

And so forth. Prune contracts are almost identical. In my opinion these contracts will fully qualify under terms of the bill as written. The dried fruit industry was encouraged to increase production. The industry responded wholeheartedly, sincerely, and loyally. The dried-fruit industry is making an outstanding contribution to the War effort and is cooperating 100 percent with all Federal agencies involved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Today I have been informed by the War Production Board and the Defense Plant Corporation that we have a great shortage of commercial alcohol, as well as blackstrap molasses out of which to produce commercial alcohol. Does the gentleman know any better way to alleviate that situation than for the Food Administration to announce to the gentleman's sugar-beet growers in California that they may proceed to plant and grow sugar beets, out of which we can make sugar, so that in the offshore areas invert sugar can there be made, to be converted into alcohol?

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very sincerely for that observation. I agree with him 100 percent. As the gentleman knows, the planting of sugar beets began in California in September. The planting starts in our State earlier than in any other section of the country. Due to the late announcement of the price last season, the price not being announced until March, there was a shrinkage of some 100,000 acres in the planting of sugar beets. In other words, instead of 170,000 acres being planted, as in the campaign before, only 70,000 acres were planted in the last campaign. The observation of the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG].

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the vote to be cast by this House on the bill under consideration will be properly weighed by each and every Member who is fully aware of its importance. The vote to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation will reflect the issue of "subsidies," or "no subsidies," as their use pertains to the field of agriculture and commodities processed from that field. All arguments to date presented on this floor have clearly drawn the line of "subsidies" or "no subsidies" and nothing has been said that would indicate that a compromise or a twilight zone between does exist.

I object to the sweeping and all-inclusive language of the antisubsidy provision in this bill. I refer to subsection 3. I believe that there is a danger in completely tying the hands of the executive agencies and corporations by this sweeping prohibition. I have repeatedly said to my colleagues that subsidies may, at times, be the only practical method to achieve maximum production of food, on the one hand, and, on the other, to maintain to the consumer a supply of food at a price which is reasonable and consistent with his income.

When this body considered the Commodity Credit Corporation bill shortly before our recess in July of this year, experiences in connection with food production clearly indicated that manpower shortage with a wholly inadequate supply of farm machinery, increased risks and costs of food production. The farmer could not be expected to increase his production without being relieved of some of the risks and additional costs. Increase in retail food prices which would result in passing on to the ultimate consumer the increased cost of production, would certainly result in demands for increases in wages and salaries. Knowing human nature, we could not permit the cost of living to rise without expecting a wage increase.

I think it must be conceded that the costs of providing farm commodities to the American consumer cannot be completely controlled. Therefore, costs which cannot be absorbed by the farmer can only be absorbed by the use of subsidies if price and wage ceilings are to be maintained. Thus, the payment of subsidies has been an essential part of price control. Price control as a factor in stabilizing labor costs, cannot be overemphasized and it follows that wage

ceilings cannot be held, or even justified, unless the cost of living is stabilized.

The administration is making a desperate attempt to hold the line, even though subjected to continuous pressure from special interests. It is evident that the prior control and subsidy program has been administered partly with a view to preventing increases in the cost-of-living index. Labor has criticized the cost-of-living index as a true measure of cost of living and has protested the administration of the Little Steel formula, demanding increases in wage rates. If we are to accept the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, as accurately reflecting price increases, we can understand the reaction to the information by the average wage earner. To illustrate: The United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, reported on September 30, 1943, that food prices in August were 40.3 percent above January 1941, base date of the Little Steel formula. The entire cost of living was 4.9 percent above August 1942, and 22.2 percent above January 1941. Representatives of the various farm bureaus in the country charged the administration with failure to keep wages within the Little Steel formula. Unfortunately, statistics on the trend in rates since the establishment of the ceiling are not available. Statistics in weekly earnings per capita in 32 selected industries are available, and although there has been an increase in weekly earnings, it is due mainly to longer hours, overtime with higher rates of pay, increased production at incentive rates, upgrading, and other factors.

The recent increase in pay granted to the miners of this country and the present railway wage dispute certainly places the whole stabilization program in a precarious position.

If Congress passes the bill in its present form, it must assume the responsibility for its actions. It has been said that the executive branch of the Government has repeatedly told Congress that if Congress will suggest another way to hold down the cost of living without subsidies, and at the same time give the farmer a fair price and a sufficient price to encourage production of needed food, they would gladly accept an alternative that would get the job done. To date, no one on the Banking and Currency Committee—and, to my knowledge, no Member of the House—has presented a substitute plan.

It is, therefore, apparent that if Congress legislates that no subsidies may be used, Congress repudiates the administration's plan and assumes the responsibility itself.

I have never been in favor of roll-back subsidies, and many of the subsidies which are direct consumer subsidies. I do feel, however, that Congress could limit the total amount to be spent by the Government for subsidies, or support prices, and that Congress should lay down some standards as to how the money is to be spent.

In other words, subsidies should be restricted in their use. May I say that I am not alone in my views on this matter. The very farm group which is urging the passage of this bill realizes that the sweeping subsidy ban proposed by subsection 3 might cause costly disruption and loss.

On Friday, May 28, 1943, Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and, among other things, made the following recommendation:

> No funds shall be used to make loans on or to purchase any commodity for the purpose of supporting the price thereon if, at the time of purchase, any maximum price is maintained on such commodity lower than such support price, or if, at the time of purchase, it is contemplated to sell the commodity at less than the purchase price, except as shall be specifically authorized by Congress as to each individual commodity for which exception is made; provided, that in the case of any commodity which is used for more than one purpose the price may be so adjusted with respect to the different uses for which such commodity is sold that the total rates shall be not less than such support price.
>
> Except as normal market conditions justify, no maximum price shall be placed on any commodity below the support price so long as the Commodity Credit Corporation shall hold any such commodity, either under loan or through purchase, it being the intent and purpose to avoid the use of public funds to prevent agricultural commodity prices from seeking a level necessary to secure adequate production for war purposes.
>
> No direct or indirect subsidy shall be paid to any producer, processor, or distributor of any agricultural commodity upon which any maximum price is in effect, except as may be expressly authorized by Congress.

It is interesting to note that subsection 3 of this bill contains the prohibition requested by Mr. Goss, even to the extent that an exception has been made, as he suggested, for a specific commodity, namely, competitive vegetable oils.

Mr. Goss continues:

> It is recognized that commitments may have been made and purchase or marketing plans may now be in operation which cannot be immediately adjusted to such a program without causing costly disruption and loss. It is, therefore, suggested that an exception be granted, as follows: Exclusive of losses on commodities in respect to which mandatory loans are applicable, the War Food Administrator may enter into such commitments not in violation of the purpose of subsection 3 as in his judgment are necessary to secure production of needed commodities for war purposes, provided that the total estimated losses under such commitments shall not exceed $100,000,000. A detailed report on all transactions under this subsection shall be made to the Congress semiannually. Admittedly, the $100,000,000 named above is a random shot. We believe the committee should find out the extent of the need and adjust the amount accordingly.

When Chester C. Davis was War Food Administrator, he made the plea, and I quote:

> I hope the committee and the Congress won't divide itself into two hostile camps; one saying, "I am for incentive payments," and the other saying, "I am against incentive payments"; one saying, "I am for subsidies," and the other saying, "I am against subsidies."

Let us get the philosophy established for a coordinated program on inflation, of which this is a part, and then give us a chance to use some reasonable common sense in their administration.

The present War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, suggested the use of the Commodity Credit Corporation funds for a definite support price and expressed a perfect willingness on his part that Congress establish safeguards around the Commodity Credit Corporation's power.

If our price-control program was as flexible as that used in Canada, it would seem entirely proper to suggest that the cost of living index be tied to the wage ceilings; that if the index rises 1 percent or more that labor receive a bonus sufficient to absorb this increased cost of living.

However, the administration of a "hold the line" order in a country of 130,000,000, as compared to a country of 10,000,000, naturally presents many unforeseen ramifications. As I see it, the problem is not one of simply eliminating subsidies, but, rather, is one wherein Congress cannot consider subsidies alone but a long-range program of stabilization must include wage stabilization, an adequate tax program, and subsidies.

If the use of subsidies in a price-control program fails to stabilize wages, it contributes nothing to the general attempt to hold down inflation, and, as a matter of fact would contribute to inflation.

Lost in the shuffle, so to speak, is the average worker who has not shared in the pay gains among workers generally. This unorganized group has no representation to voice its woes, except through their elected Members in the House and Senate, and I venture to say that there is not a Member in this House who does not have in his constituency such a group. Estimates range from 15,000,000 to 33,000,000 in number. This is not a mythical group, but a bloc of hard-working Americans who have every right to expect a just and due consideration of their lot. Their plight, at present, is one of desperation. I give you the concern of the group as voiced by a constituent of mine, whom I shall call Mrs. X. I quote from a letter recently received from her:

> I am getting constantly more and more concerned with the news all through the press of taking the lid off of prices and having inflation soar. We in the League of Women Voters have been striving very hard, as you know what it means to each and every individual in the country if we allow such a thing to happen, and yet, as we learn to understand the consequences, Congress allows pressure groups to work, John L. Lewis gets his licks in with Government, the hue and cry is for rising wages. It is all too horrible. Can't you do something? Can't you start more of a campaign in the House of Representatives to stop this inflation? We of the fixed income group—and there are millions of us—are caught between the higher and lower income groups. Our wages are frozen, with prices rising, and before long we won't be able to do our part by paying the rightfully higher taxes we now have and which we know should be higher. We are for a heavy tax bill, as much and more as we can stand, but what good does control of prices do if it is allowed to work alone without the

taxes to sift off the loose money floating around? It all seems so obvious back here in a small town and why we have to suffer the lack of good sense by most of those in Washington is more than I can hope to understand.

Yes, Mrs. X, I appreciate your predicament. So do many other Representatives. Evidence of this fact is now before this body in the form of proposed legislation offering a stamp plan to the low income group. But, to me, this is not a solution to your problem, for the cost of this plan would nearly equal the $800,000,000 proposed to be spent for subsidies, with rising prices and wages depleting the buying power of every dollar you earn. I firmly believe that we can help your group if we continue to use all subsidies with definite restrictions prescribed by Congress.

It is my hope that the Members of the House will have an opportunity to record their votes on subsection 3 of this bill, if this section remains in the bill unamended. For, regardless of what this House decides is best for the Nation as it votes on the subsidy question, most of us are in agreement that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be extended. My views as expressed here represent my firm convictions and what I believe is best for the Nation as a whole as we continue in this all-out war.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My distinguished colleague from Wisconsin has used the figure of $800,000,000. Does the gentleman believe that would be a sufficient amount to finance the proposed subsidies, or can we look forward to a much larger sum being asked for? My point is this: It would take the whole $800,000,000 to subsidize this last subsidy on dairy products, if it were spread across the board to give every dairyman in the country the same subsidy that some of them enjoy.

Mr. DILWEG. My answer is that I am not concerned as to how much they might need or how much they think they need. If we put on this safeguard and limit the amount of money to be used for the purpose, that will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Limit the amount of producer subsidies and limit the number of consumer subsidies?

Mr. DILWEG. Subsidies of all kinds, and if necessary put restraints on the use of the money besides restraints on the amounts of the subsidies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill now pending before the House involves a proposal, upon the correct solution of which may depend, not alone our fortunes in the war, but our internal progress and prosperity in the peace to come. The war may be unnecessarily prolonged, with its daily burden of blood, sweat, and tears, and the recovery of the domestic economy may be so dislocated as to doom this country to another reconstruction era of dismal history.

The bill, ostensibly designed to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Act, which by virtue of previous legislation was doomed to expire absolutely December 31, 1943, has had a string attached to it so that, while its life is to be extended to June 30, 1945, by reason of amendment in committee, the practice of providing subsidies for the support of prices or to stop loss was prohibited.

The amendment was adopted by a vote of 16 to 10. The controversy is one involving the eternal conflict of ideas between producers and consumers. Eleven Republicans, one Progressive, and four Democrats voted against subsidies in committee. Ten Democrats voted for subsidies and against inflation. For some reason as yet unexplained, vegetable fats, oils, and oilseeds were allowed a continuance of subsidies, and the corporation was permitted to sell perishable fruits and vegetables, absorbing loss. Except for these subsidies, support prices and loss absorptions were prohibited.

The action and recommendation of the committee is plainly provocative of inflation. The pressure of surplus spending money against limited supplies of commodities in the absence of encouragement to produce as much as possible, can have no other effect than to break down all control over prices and open the door to competitive bidding with constant, ever-increasing prices. The cost of living must advance and the wage earner living on real rather than nominal wages will constantly demand that his nominal wages be increased to meet the constant increase in prices in the market place.

If the Congress should adopt the committee report it will mean that it has repudiated its order enacted into law requiring the Executive to fix and maintain ceiling prices on both wages and commodities in a heroic defense against inflation. The second Price Control Act, effective October 2, 1942, directed the President to stabilize prices and wages substantially as of September 15, 1942, with due provision for relief in cases of gross inequalities and inequities. The line thus set up was held with substantial integrity and has been held thus for a year. So long as price levels have been held, wage levels have been held, but it is now proposed that both be scrapped and that the only logical method of relief by way of subsidies to maintain and encourage production while saving loss in extreme cases of inequity will be terminated. Both the O. P. A. and the W. F. A., executive agencies set up to control prices on the one hand and to maintain production in the face of frozen prices, on the other, will be rendered helpless by the proposed amendment and the Price Control Act of 1942 may as well be wiped off the statute books.

Those who favor this proposed and revolutionary change in policy in the midst of emergency must be prepared to defend inflation—and inflation has always had the character of a run-away—and at the same time condemn subsidies. Both courses are logically involved and both attempts are inevitably doomed to failure. Inflation is indefensible. Subsidies are the only bulwark of price control. A doctrine of artificial scarcity of commodities, coupled with a doctrine of artificial expansion of the media circulating as money, points only to famine in the end. This is a time when food must be produced "to the uttermost" and compensation for that product must be stable and not a fraud that fails in its rewards for toil. In cases where the producer and consumer are the same man a fictitious price and a fictitious wage or return become both a sham and a mockery.

Those who compose the American public occupy two situations, one as breadwinners and another as taxpayers. In the latter capacity the costs of Government and the prosecution of the war impinge directly upon all and when the country is the main factor in the market for goods, services, and commodities the individual must concern himself not alone on his immediate prosperity and sacrifice in the daily affairs of life, but on his ultimate and secondary prosperity and well-being. The time has gone when any class of people can profit at the expense of any other class or by reason of national misfortune such as war. Sacrifice is demanded of all and in the allocation of sacrifice, whether in comfort or in fortune, must reach all. No one was born in this country and generation in order to live his life as usual, untouched by the universal needs and misfortunes. I should hate to consider that this country is so unstable or lacking in sturdy character that on the coming on of an emergency it should divide into blocs and pressure groups for the sole purpose of each saving themselves or aggrandizing themselves.

There are those who maintain that because the burdens of price and wage regulations come home to them, that the agencies of control are at fault. The fact is they complain not so much over their share of the burden, but that they have any burden at all. In the World War copper commanded a price of 35 cents a pound as against the present price of 12 cents; steel plate, $180 as against $42 per ton. If we had the absence of control prevailing in the last war instead of the control exercised by the O. P. A., the costs of living and of the war up to this date would have been greater by $89,000,000,000. Real wages are substantially the same in a majority of cases. Only 18,500,000 workers out of a total of 43,500,000 are in a better relative position today than in August 1939. The farmer's net income is 75 percent higher. Corporate profits after taxes are 90 percent greater. Producers, however, insist in a short-sighted view of self-interest that they be allowed increases in wages and returns for crops and commodities. If there is any merit in their claims, then increases should go to all and then there would be no special privilege or advantage to any. What they mean to have is preferential treatment in some form or another so that while they are better off, or escape sacrifice, the remainder of the Nation shall continue to share the worser lot and to shoulder the greater proportionate burdens. Often they profess to see escape by saddling greater costs on the Government, forgetting that they must respond

in the end by way of increased taxes. And even here some classes look with expectation to the prospect of escaping taxes while other classes take up the added burden.

It needs no argument to demonstrate that inflation is indefensible. Inflation is always followed by deflation and when we have to pay back in dollars earned by greater labor, those loans obtained when labor commanded higher return in dollars, hardship and bankruptcies will result.

On the other hand, subsidies have historically been used to provide for the general welfare. The protective tariff is a classic example of subsidies which operate to enable manufacturers and producers to raise prices to a point not to be met by foreign competition laboring under tariffs on imports. The mail subsidies for ocean mails, not to speak of the practice of doing business at a loss in carrying second-class mail in order to assist in the dissemination of intelligence, is another instance. The whole history of the homestead laws, the railroad grants and reclamation and river and harbor improvements has been the history of taxation of all for the immediate benefit of a few designed to be reflected, however, in the increased prosperity and progress of all.

The Nation's total wage bill is $100,000,000,000 a year. A 10-percent increase in the cost of living will increase this national wage by $10,000,000,000. The Government itself, being the largest consumer of war goods, would pay 55 percent of this total bill or about $5,500,000,000. The price increase could not be resricted to those goods upon which subsidies are now paid. Once the line is broken a general increase in food prices would result. The farmer, the worker, and industry exert tremendous pressure against the stabilization program. If a break-through occurs at any one point, all controls are threatened.

If this proposed amendment goes into effect, we shall see after December 31 of this year a large increase in the cost of living. This will be followed by a demand for raises in wages and the pernicious spiral in prices and wages will begin, with no end in sight. If we do not hold the line now under this tremendous assault, we shall never again have the opportunity to do so.

If this was a time of peace, I should not be disposed to interfere with the operation of the law of supply and demand, but with the war effort making demands on supply equivalent to the former pre-war demand, the added costs of inflation must be raised by taxation that reaches every consumer in the land, even the consumers who are also producers. In addition, there will be a tremendous tax by raising the market prices in dollars that must be later met when the dollars shrink to normal in volume of circulation.

As illustrative of the attitude of one section of the agricultural population of this country, I desire to insert at this time an abstract from the transcript of the hearings on this bill containing the testimony of Russell Smith, representing the National Farmers' Union, as follows:

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, the National Farmers Union favors the adoption without amendment of the proposal that Mr. Jones, War Food Administrator, has made.

I take it there are three principal points involved in his proposal. First, the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. On that we think that a year and a half is a reasonable time.

Second, on the half-billion-dollar borrowing authority, we think that that is a minimum requirement in a war situation, and we hope it will be included.

Third, on the authority to sell perishables below parity, when they are in danger of deterioration, we feel is only reasonable administrative leeway. We think the potato situation this year illustrated the very high desirability of that provision.

Now, there has been one amendment proposed during the hearings as to which the National Farmers Union would like to go on record as being opposed. That is the proposed amendment which would not permit the fixing of a price ceiling below a support price for a commodity. We think that is unworkable administratively.

Second, we think it would lead us right back into another inflationary spiral. On every commodity that was involved, we feel the Administrator would be faced with an almost impossible decision, namely, whether to break the price ceiling or whether to pay the support price. The net result probably would be that there probably would not be very many actions of any kind taken. So that what you would come out with from the farmer's standpoint would probably be a reduction in farm income. From the consumer's standpoint, you would probably come out with higher prices.

I would like to read to the committee one paragraph pointing out that administrative difficulty:

"The provision would not only immediately increase the cost of living but it would make it impossible for us to adopt support programs needed to increase production without causing a still further rise in the cost of living. Undoubtedly if we must in each case weigh the advantages of a support program against the disadvantages of an increase in the cost of living, many support programs which might otherwise be adopted will be rejected, and other support programs, although finally adopted, will inevitably be delayed."

That is from the President's veto message of last July, when such a provision was incorporated in the Commodity Credit Act of that month.

Now on the general question of subsidies, support prices, and so forth, we feel that right now for the first time in the war situation most of the economic factors involved are beginning to level off. Nonfood prices are leveling off, farm prices are leveling off, so that if the line can be held we think it would be for the public good.

We would like to point out, too, that there is a factor in the leveling off of farm prices which is unpredictable. Right now there is a considerable seasonal element in the stability of farm prices. In other words, if all the other factors were the same and this were 3 months later in the year, it is not at all certain that we would have as good a record on food prices as we have now.

We feel that looking at this situation purely from the farmer's standpoint he has everything to lose by a general breaking of ceilings, which we feel is very likely to follow if the precedent is set by this committee in the consideration of this legislation.

The farmer always loses first going up, and he always loses first coming down.

Second, on the purely income value of the subsidy, as opposed to the rise in prices, we believe that ordinarily a subsidy channels money directly to the producer, and ordinarily any price rise is diluted. By the time the farmer gets his cut from the increased price, it is usually less than he would get if the subsidy would come directly into the farm.

Finally, as a taxpayer, we believe the farmer better off.

The Congress, I believe last spring, passed a military bill of $69,000,000,000, approximately. Now in 1941 the wholesale commodity index stood at about 127. At the time that bill was passed it stood at 152. In other words, that was just about a 20-percent increase. If the $69,000,000,000 bill had been passed in 1941, and assuming that labor and other factors were roughly in that same range, 20 percent, then obviously the National Government would save $13,800,000,000, which now has been added to the national debt. That comes out of farmers, as taxpayers, just the same as it comes out of any other taxpayer.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

There you have the views of a farm organization as to the advantages of subsidies.

In conclusion, in my opinion, there is but one issue here. Do we want inflation or do we fear and repel it? Congress has already ordered prices stabilized. Is there enough heat in certain sections of this country to defrost prices and send the mercury in the economic thermometer up to the point where it will break the top?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time today to present an informal committee report to the House. The time is opportune, since we shall soon become engaged in the consideration of another tax measure, and, consequently, Federal finances generally.

The need for the forthcoming tax measure grows out of the war in which we are now engaged. The cost of its prosecution is daily mounting and no one at this time can even approximate the ultimate total.

The Committee on Appropriations, and more particularly the military subcommittee thereof, of which I have the honor to be chairman, have been the agents of the House in determining the amount of public funds that should be made available to the Army for the prosecution of the war; and, in that capacity, have had a large responsibility in the size of the debt the war has entailed, and, therefore, in creating the need to provide ways and means for its liquidation.

We recognize that responsibility and have conscientiously endeavored to discharge it; with the best interests of the country as a whole ever foremost in mind and deed. Whether or not we have done our job well, I shall leave to the judgment of others. It would seem appropriate, however, to call attention to the fact that every regular annual military appropriation bill we have presented to the House since Pearl Harbor, has had the unanimous support of the House, as evidenced by recorded votes, except that there was one vote cast against the bill for the fiscal year 1942.

In writing the wartime military appropriation bills, Mr. Chairman, we have not proposed to the House an appropriation for a single project which had not been justified to us by our military leadership as being essential to the war effort.

The aggregate of military appropriations has been large. Tersely, that is because of global warfare and modern military implementation. For the period July 1, 1940, to date, the total, roundly, is $127,000,000,000.

The current fiscal year's portion of that aggregate is $59,034,839,673. That amount astounded us as much as it astounded you. We spent many days going over the details with Army chieftains. My subcommittee does not take anything for granted. The Chief of the Army Service Forces, General Somervell, told us, referring to the total of the appropriations requested for the current fiscal year, that such amount, and I use his own words, "can and will be obligated in full by June 30, 1944."

At that time the Allied armies had just ridden north Africa of Axis forces. The drive across the Mediterranean had not begun. Our Air Forces in Britain and north Africa had not then approached their present magnitude or striking power; we had not progressed much beyond Guadalcanal in the Solomons, and the German submarine continued to be a serious menace to the expansion and supply of our own forces across the Atlantic and in getting aid to our allies. We were then, I might say, as it has since developed, just at the threshold of the events which in recent months have inspired us all.

In such circumstances, my colleagues, is it conceivable that any red-blooded American would have denied a dime in the face of assertions of need by the best military minds we had? We did not, except in a few instances where there was no demurral on the part of the War Department, and you, with one voice, endorsed our course.

Happily, much has transpired since that time, Mr. Chairman. The American Army today is really on the march. With our British allies it is striking at the German citadel from the air in ever-increasing volume and effect, and jointly with our British allies, it is steadily advancing up through Italy on the ground. North Africa has been turned from a battleground to an operating base. The submarine has been checkmated, sea lanes have been shortened, and water transport now moves with comparative safety. In the south or southwest Pacific, Allied forces have been advancing up through the chain of islands lying north and northeast of Australia, and judging by latest dispatches, the time is not far distant when the Japanese will be dispossessed of all important holdings and strategic bases from Guadalcanal on the east, to the western tip of New Guinea on the west. The record of successive accomplishments is a grand tribute to American arms.

Today therefore, Mr. Chairman, were we writing the current Military Appropriation Act, we would be able to capitalize on these changes that have so greatly altered the situation obtaining but a few short months ago. We are going to capitalize now, however, in another way, as I shall explain in a moment.

General Marshall, Chief of the War Department General Staff, in his biennial report covering the period July 1, 1941 to June 30, 1943, paved the way for some very substantial economies. Let me read two or three passages from that very splendid and comprehensive document:

> It is difficult to keep in mind the constant changes in the international situation and in the development of trained troops and munitions which dictated the succession of decisions and actions. For example, in the light of the situation today, the summer of 1943, we are not justified in maintaining large air and ground installations in the Caribbean from Trinidad north to Cuba and even in the Panama Canal Zone itself so far as mobile ground forces are concerned.

Here is another:

> Our deployments were made in the light of limited resources in troops and equipment at the time and a continuing lack of sufficient ocean tonnage or landing craft, or both, and were influenced also by the length of turn-around required of ocean shipping and the limited docking facilities in many ports. As these conditions changed our strategical approach to the war was altered accordingly. The recent opening of the Mediterranean to convoys, for instance, has profoundly affected the logistical possibilities in this world-wide war.

And lastly, still quoting from General Marshall's report:

> Another factor is now operating to our advantage. We are reaching the end of the expansion; already it has been possible to reduce many training installations to a purely maintenance basis to furnish replacements for the present strength of the Army.

Largely in consequence of the foregoing, immediately following our recent recess, the chairman of our naval subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and I, as chairman of the military subcommittee, after counseling with the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, put our heads together and determined that each of us would review the appropriations earlier made available for the current fiscal year. Accordingly my colleague called on the Secretary of the Navy and I called on the Secretary of War to have a restudy made of fiscal needs in consequence of changes in the war situation with view to a formal inquiry by our respective subcommittees. The Navy study is still in process, I am advised, although an advance report did make it possible, in writing the deficiency bill just passed a few days ago, to use $750,000,000 of funds appropriated for Navy ordnance to increase the capital of the naval stock fund, instead of doing so by way of a new or additional appropriation.

As a result of the study made by the War Department, the Secretary of War transmitted to me on November 3, 1943, a statement of currently available military appropriations which it had been found practicable to transfer to the Bureau of the Budget reserve. Such transfers aggregated $10,943,519,449.

Commencing last Monday morning the military subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations convened to examine the statement and to ascertain whether or not it would be practicable to place additional amounts in such reserve. We had before us the deputy chief of the War Department General Staff, Lieutenant General McNarney, Under Secretary of War Patterson, and a host of other officers of the War Department, including several branch chiefs. In consequence of our inquiry, which extended over 3 days, the Department has consented to add an additional amount of $2,220,000,000 to the Bureau of the Budget reserve, making a grand total of $13,163,519,000.

The contributing factors are:

First, reduction in military personnel strength. We appropriated for a force of, roundly, 8,200,000 officers and men. By reason of subsequent war developments, a reduction of 548,000 has been determined upon by the War Department high command. That means a saving in pay, travel, subsistence, clothing, and so forth of $1,946,039,000.

Second, curtailment of the armament and equipment programs, $8,262,759,000.

Third, reduction in facilities, including maintenance, $780,447,000.

Fourth, modification and possible permanent deferment of the airplane program, $2,086,069,000.

Fifth, micellaneous projects, $88,205,000.

The total, as I stated before, is $13,163,519,000.

Now, what do these reductions mean, Mr. Chairman? They mean that unless some unforeseeable situation should arise, all of the 13 billions-plus will revert to the Treasury on next July 1, and that our ultimate debt will be diminished by a corresponding amount, and hence our tax levies over the years will be to that extent lightened.

We were assured that in the light of conditions presently obtaining, this vast amount can be given up without in the least impairing the war effort of ourselves or of our allies; without in the least impeding the expeditious and vigorous prosecution of the war.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that this will be welcome news to all who are disturbed over the mounting public debt, and all of us should be so disturbed. It has no immediate bearing upon the need to raise additional revenue, but it means that some day there will be that much less debt to be liquidated and, consequently, a lesser amount of taxes to be paid ultimately.

The amount is equivalent, approximately to 33 percent of the estimated Treasury receipts from all sources during the current fiscal year, according to a statement issued by the President on July 27 last. It exceeds by $6,086,091,333 the total amount actually received through direct taxes on individuals during the fiscal year 1943.

Perhaps I should explain before concluding that a Bureau of the Budget reserve means the removal of funds from control of the agency for which appropriated. No part of amounts so reserved

can be obligated without release by the Bureau of the Budget. In this instance, however, there will be an additional step, because the Department has signified that it will not seek the release of funds of any magnitude should subsequent events make such course necessary, without conferring with the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I wish to say to the House that the War Department has not been coerced into giving up this money. The War Department itself, took the initiative and has established a procedure whereby additional amounts will be placed in the Budget Bureau reserve from time to time as and when circumstances may be justify. The Department has an exceptionally capable official in Brig. Gen. George J. Richards, Budget officer of the War Department General Staff. The committee feels that, working with and under the direction of the General Staff, General Richards may be relied upon to handle the purse strings as economically as may be consistent and practicable under war conditions.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I happen to be quite well acquainted with the gentleman and know he is a conscientious follower of the principles of Thomas Jefferson. I believe the gentleman is going to speak in defense of the subsidy program. Would he, with his beliefs, consider that the subsidy program involves this country in State socialism, as has been charged?

Mr. FOLGER. My answer to that would be, that if I thought that, I do not think I would be here speaking as I propose to.

Mr. Chairman, the observation has been made during the debate on section 3 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill that it was not desired to talk about the war. We have to think about the war. I doubt if I would find myself able to go along to any extent on the position I am about to take in reference to this section if we were not in war. But we are in war, and war is costing this country vast amounts of money. While we know what will be the end, that we shall accomplish a glorious victory, we do not know when that end will be. It is, therefore, quite apparent to all of us that many more billions of dollars will have to be spent in the prosecution of this war. Therefore, it becomes highly important to all America to consider that we are in war when we talk about this bill which would continue the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the percentage is 35 or 40 or 50 or 60, but it is true and acknowledged that the Government, itself, at this time—and it will continue to be, particularly so long as this war lasts—is a great purchaser of goods of every sort. Do we propose to sit still and allow prices to soar to the point where foods will cost three times as much as they do, where clothing will cost three to four times as much as it does, where tanks and guns and planes and munitions of war will soar to where we shall have to pay four or five times as much as we are now having to pay?

These things will come to pass if we allow unbridled inflation to grip this country in this time of peril. Mr. Chairman, the war, therefore, does make it highly important that we give attention to the question of inflation, which so definitely threatens us. It has been put to you in another way, but I have thought of it in this way: We will either have to abolish the Office of Price Administration and let prices soar as they may, or make production or incentive, or, if you want to call it that, subsidy payments, on some articles of food, in order to get production, unless we take it out of the hides of the farmers of this country. As sure as you live today, this section 3, which is written into this Commodity Credit Corporation bill, will actually prohibit support and incentive payments which we have to have to get production, unless we pauperize the farmers of the country in the name of patriotism. What are you going to do? Are you going to allow prices to soar and the Government have to pay two or three or four times as much for goods and materials as it now pays, as well as the people themselves, or are you going to make a subsidy payment, if you want to call it that, here and there, in order to control the over-all rise in prices to prevent inflation, or are you going to say to the farmer that in the name of patriotism he may go ahead and produce but that we will take it out of his hide and will not give any production or incentive payment or consideration to him? We have to do one of these things.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to express on my part a little confidence in the honor and integrity of the men who appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and testified to us that there is no proposal, there is no program, no thought of a program to indulge in unrestrained subsidy support or incentive payments which are pictured as very highly detrimental to the economy of this country, and probably so. When I heard Fred Vinson before that committee testify it was not the purpose of this administration or himself or any other man connected with it to indulge in unrestrained subsidy payments I believed him. He requested and begged and pleaded with us to trust him, as well as Mr. Byrnes, and Marvin Jones, and even, if you please, the Director of the Office of Price Administration, Director Bowles, all of whom I believe to be honest and fair and true to the American people in this situation, in their desire to control the threatened danger of inflation, and the spiral in wages which will submerge the economy of this country, and make us unable to carry on the war. I do not believe that these men were trying to deceive the members of the Banking and Currency Committee when they promised us that they not only would be careful, but exceedingly careful in using any payments that were called subsidy payments.

We are not talking about consumers' subsidies all the time. We are talking about these payments. Remember that there are a great many of our people who are our brothers, who are entitled to our consideration, so we are the power that holds the destiny of them in our hands, as well as others. It is said that there are from fourteen to seventeen million of these people who have received no substantial increase in their income—whom we refer to as the white-collar men—who have not had increases in wages, and who are destined to be pressed to the stage of pauperism unless we do something about the rising prices that are threatened. The very greatest importance attaches to this program which Mr. Vinson and Mr. Jones and others have asked us to allow them to deal in with care, so that it will have the effect of preventing inflation, and not be taking it out of the hides of the farmers but a small payment on this commodity and that, here and there, made to prevent a general rise in prices in everything.

When it starts it is like a judge in my State, talking about the statute of limitations—and I mean it politely; I do not like to deal in anything bordering on profanity—said, "When it starts, all hell cannot stop it." We are all working to the same end. We are all hoping that this economic disaster may not overtake us. You have got to do one of three things. You must take the price ceilings off and let it rise, or you must take it out of the hides of the farmers, or you must provide a means in between the two where neither will be done; and we can go along in a reasonable way in view of the war that we are in and we will have to continue to provide for our farmers and keep down inflation and let our people live.

And when inflation comes, if we allow it, the farmer will be the first man to bear its evils. As he may receive a rise of 10 percent in what he sells, he will pay double, or more likely four times more, for what he has to buy—machinery, clothing, shoes, hats, dress goods, everything his family must have to live on and his dollar is worth 25 cents instead of a hundred.

And all along the line it will affect us all; and that effect will be disastrous. Let us, in this as in all things, apply the rule of reason and reasonableness.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, if we visualize the stabilization line as the starting gate of a horse race we will have an appropriate picture to describe the national scene at the present time. Every analogy limps, of course, but the sight of various forces, tensed and excitable as thoroughbred horses straining at the leash, leads to the inevitable conclusion that if one of these forces breaks the others will rush in pursuit. This figure does not clearly signify the inflationary spiral which will ensue if present controls are broken, but it may serve to

remind us that various groups of our Nation are vieing in competition with one another, having abandoned mutual accord and self-sacrifice. And it is pertinent to point out too that the income of our people is absolutely, inexorably tied up in this contest, and the Federal Government is dually involved, not only as the protector of the private dollar but also as the greatest investor. But the tragedy in this contest will occur only if the starting flag is waved.

One of the dangers of the heightening of this competitive drive is that the significance and meaning of the entire problem is lost in the jockeying and maneuvering that has arisen. The fight against inflation has become, or at the very least gives ominous threat of becoming, a battle royal which bruises all and benefits none. And I am gravely fearful that the ban on subsidies on food, which represents the objective of one or more of the vying forces, will act in the same way as the stone which Jason threw among the armed soldiers which led to a thoroughly effective mutual self-slaughtering. But there are other Jasons and there are other stones poised. This then is a crisis.

I say we have lost a comprehensive picture of the whole situation; we have lost sight of the objective for all, namely the control of the inflationary spiral. For instance, we are forgetting that subsidies are but one aspect of the common struggle. We are also forgetting that subsidies are an important integral part of that struggle. To ban subsidies is to throw down the flag that signifies the start of the self-defeating struggle.

It would be a sufficient argument against banning subsidies to recognize the manifest truth that the precarious balance which we have been holding in maintaining the stabilization line would be broken down completely if the forces for inflation achieve their purpose. Examples recent and ancient testify to the exactness of the figure contained in the phrase "inflationary spiral." Costs, wages, and prices chase one another in an ever-increasing ascent when restraint is broken until the exhaustion of the effort succumbs to a break in confidence and all involved in the grim circular ascent realize painfully the futility of their chase. Then the accumulated possessions which they have picked up in the pursuit are not sufficient to purchase a drink of water to quench their thirst.

This is highly figurative language, and it fails to reveal the reality of privation forced particularly on those who are left behind. Our attention must be drawn now to those who have already been outstripped. A ban on subsidies would give wings to food prices and would ultimately make of the Little Steel formula an abandoned bastion which had been sacked before being overrun. But there are fourteen millions of our people for whom the Little Steel formula has had no personal application as a fort in which they could take shelter. Our aged people, our pensioned people, our people with anchored incomes constitute not a small segment of that group. The pension is either a sinecure against privation as a minimum reward for long years of faithful service or an acknowledgment by all the people of their debt to veterans of former wars and their families. To ban subsidies, and thus to give free rein to mounting costs would be to place an inhumane heel on the shoulder of the tied victim of a minimum income in our selfish effort to jockey for an inside position in the panicky race.

But there are many others who are tied to the ground during these days. They include the great majority of what we term the middle class, although this phrase is gratuitous during these days. In plain terms they are the families who are dependent on allowances and allotments because the principal wage earner is in the service. They include the public servant whose duties are multiplied during these days, whose sacrifices have already been great and who is asked now not for further sacrifice, but for surrender. To ban all subsidies is to use a whip in the double role of driving the leader ahead and lashing the victim behind in the runaway. Not only does the wheel that does the grinding get the grease, but the wheel that has stopped grinding because it has stopped running is thrown into the discard. But we are dealing with humans, which thought may bring the comparison into some focus. It should be emphasized too that organization has demonstrated its ability to do some artificially created grinding. We have had evidence of that during the debate on the present bill. And, the grinding has certainly not been harmonious.

The efficacy of subsidies has been demonstrated repeatedly on the floor by many of my more learned colleagues. But I would emphasize the necessity of subsidizing, at the barest minimum, specified and unquestionably essential foods. The opponents of this absolute necessity present many arguments to support their contentions that subsidies are dangerous impositions or needless remedies. I direct their attention to the most manifest and most significant factor that we have reached an alternative between subsidies or chaos. Whatever figure we employ to describe the situation, the spiral, the race, the panic, all signify the clear conclusion that to break the line means to invite chaos. This is the consideration above all others which must be borne in mind. We have fought inflation and its consequences with patchwork methods and have suffered hardships at home; we have been forced, some of us, to accept inequities. But we have kept some balance. But there can be no balance on a spiral. Only a small percentage strike it rich in a gold rush. The deliberate choice for chaos involves a responsibility which I would certainly hesitate to assume, and I urge the Members of the House not to invite it either.

Even if the crisis were not so grave and the alternatives not so clear, I would support a subsidy program designed to prevent inflation. But small question can be raised that this is not a serious crisis and that the issues are not clear. Consequently, all other arguments which do not take this basic alternative into consideration are more or less irrelevant They are skirmishes, skillful perhaps and capable, but they have not joined in the crucial battle and are inconsequential to its outcome.

The prudent, discriminate, and effective use of subsidies is an important part of our fight against inflation, to be employed together with increased taxation, price control, rationing, and the sale of Government bonds to minimize the threatening gap between supply and demand, between the limited quantity of available goods and the increased income to purchase those goods. All these controlling forces have been assailed again and again; of late the assaults have been more determined, more threatening, more insistent. We have reached the critical stage where a breakthrough at one point would force a break all along the line. I can see little possibility of an ordered retreat to another strong line of defense. There are no natural barriers to fall back on nor any prepared line of defense ready to withstand the assault, particularly when it has gained impetus. The forces which threaten the line have deliberately whetted their appetites; in fact, they remind us of Shakespeare's phrase, "As if increase of appetite grew by what it fed on."

It may be vain to point out the alternative. It may be that the opponents of subsidies have realized the consequences which will result. It may be that they anticipate a break in the stabilization line and are determined to be in the front if the break occurs, "Let the devil take the hindmost." I greatly fear that he will, for he can appear in many different guises. But the alternative remains clear in my mind. Not that I would resign myself to chaos if this line is broken. We fight with all our resources against disorder and breakdown. But the fight is dangerously close to being futile once the race is begun.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, next year's program of drilling wells, as drawn up by the Petroleum Administration for War, is 24,000 wells. This was stated recently by the Director of Production of P. A. W.

The division as to kinds of wells is 5,000 wildcats and 19,000 development wells in fields already found.

That is the program. I believe it will fall far short of being carried out unless there is an improvement in the price of oil great enough to justify the increased drilling. It is a considerable increase that is called for. It is about 7,000 more than will be drilled this year and, as to the 5,000 wildcats on the program, it is about 1,600 more than will be completed this year. The Petroleum Administrator early in 1943 made a plea for at least 4,500 wildcats and the number that actually will have been drilled when the year closes will be about 3,400.

So, the projected program of drilling for next year is on order. It is a program that reflects the necessity of the case, but the essential thing that would

make it possible is being ignored. Manpower, materials and equipment, they assure us, will be available—everything except money. The oil producers want to drill and to supply the Nation's oil needs. They know the places to drill and they know how to make old wells produce more, but merely knowing how will not add a barrel to the supply. It takes money to put the knowledge into operation. The oil producer does not have the money.

This was recognized by the Director of Economic Stabilization in turning down the general price advance repeatedly recommended by the Petroleum Administrator, numerous committees of this Congress, all elements of the oil industry, and the State officials who deal with oil problems every day of their lives. The Director of Economic Stabilization made one decision, that no price increase was needed, then admitted that the industry is not getting in enough money to increase its efforts when he told the Petroleum Administrator to invent some kind of a subsidy program for wildcatting and for the preservation of the stripper wells.

There is no plan, no authority, and no money for any such scheme. The Petroleum Administrator, who has previously condemned such subterfuges and evasions of a simple issue, said in a Chicago speech on November 11:

> Obviously, an attempt to invent such plan or program is the next step.

Note the words, "attempt" and "invent." That sounds as though he does not believe in the scheme any more than he did last summer when he wrote to Prentiss Brown on the subject.

He will attempt to invent a plan. There is no plan and nobody has even a foggy notion of how to make one. The oilmen and all those others I have mentioned have a plan. It is simple and self-executing. Raise the price. That has always worked. That is how they found the oil for the other World War. Nobody was around then proposing any game of trading financial moonbeans for oil rainbows. The producer was allowed a price that would let him pay for the extra drilling he was asked to do.

Who knows what this vague scheme of incentives would cost? Nobody knows They have kept on yelling over at the O. P. A. and at the Office of Economic Stabilization that a price increase of 35 cents a barrel for crude oil would cost the Nation a half billion dollars. Still, they blandly propose something that could not cost any less. Last year, again quoting the Director of Production of the P. A. W., it cost $308,000,000 in discovery costs alone. For next year's program, it is recommended that 2,000 more wildcats be drilled than in 1942, so add two-thirds on the discovery bill, for the 1942 program was 3,000 wildcat wells. Already, you cross the half-billion dollar mark. If this money is to come out of the Federal Treasury, where is the economy to the consumer who gets the bill in taxes? True, some part of the program would be paid by industry itself, but there probably would be enough of it added to the debt, plus the relief for stripper wells, to match the figure they assume the Nation would pay by direct price increase.

The important thing about a price increase is that it would work and get results, and a subsidy would bog down in the same swamp of bureaucratic delays, red tape, and vacillations as the rest of their programs already have. Look at their performances in other lines and judge whether you want them to bungle around any longer with this vital question of oil supply.

Last Tuesday, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the distinguished Member from Texas, spoke at some length in support of subsidies. In the discussion which attended his remarks, the Honorable GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, asked this question:

> Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies on oil?

To which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] replied:

> I am in favor of subsidies on anything that will encourage production without increasing the cost of living. You see, we have to have some kind of standard or guide to go by. I ask the gentleman now, and I ask any person present here, if he can name any way on earth that you can hold down the cost of living and encourage production without the use of a subsidy. I yield to any person who says he has a plan.

He thus gave his approval to subsidies in the oil industry. Yet, in an interim report of the Committee on Small Business, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman, under date of May 10, 1942, the following conclusion was stated:

> That subsidies and bonuses are untried in the oil industry and unworkable and undesirable for the general purposes now needed.

I do not know which of the gentleman's views to accept as being his firm opinion. I know what the men of experience, the doers, and not the theorists think of subsidies. They are in entire agreement with the expression of the Small Business Committee, which I have quoted.

We will not drill the number of wells which the Petroleum Administrator recommends in 1944 under the present price, nor will we maintain the small wells of the Nation in production. These wells produce 15 percent of today's supply of oil in this country. They are dying every day, and thousands have been sold to the salvage dealers this year. Each one that goes takes away some quantity of oil from the Nation's supply. The production from a single well which produces but 1 barrel a day supplies the gasoline for 50 A-card consumers in the East, besides the other products which come from oil.

The need is for more oil. It must come from fields yet to be discovered and from those now producing. Supply can be increased from both sources, but not under this price or through some weird and complicated system of subsidies or bonuses.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3477, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two separate subjects and to include therein letters written by me and letters addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Lea aviation bill, H. R. 3420, I desire to extend my remarks and include a telegram, a letter, and an editorial from the Chicago Daily News entitled "The Lea Bill."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JOHNSON, of Indiana, for November 19, 1943, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'LEARY, of New York (at the request of Mr. DICKSTEIN) indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m), the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 19, 1943, at 11 o'clock, a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will begin public hearings on Friday, November 19, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3687. A bill to provide revenues, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3270. A bill to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business; with amendment (Rept. No. 873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3687. A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 3688. A bill to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 3689. A bill to provide 6 months' pay to all honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 3690. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3691. A bill to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 3692. A bill to provide for National Guard and Reserve officers, who have served in two wars and have reached the age of retirement while in active service, the same pay and allowances as are applicable to officers of the Regular Army upon retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3693. A bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on the bill 3687, Revenue Act of 1943; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 358. Resolution to establish an Office of Fiscal Investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3694. A bill for the relief of Charles Myers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 3695. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas Shea, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3616. By Mr. Schiffler: Petition of Jiosep Consalvo and other citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3617. By Mr. Case: Petition of J. M. Tucker and 50 other residents of Edgemont, S. Dak., urging prohibition for the duration of the war, or at least a rationing of liquor to avoid the use of essential food and materials in liquor manufacture and distribution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3618. Also, petition of Mrs. Wayne Morrison and 117 other residents of Sturgis, S. Dak., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3619. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Charles H. Foe and 17 other citizens of Polk, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3620. Also, petition of Mabel Stevens and 34 other citizens of Polk, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3621. Also, petition of Arthur W. Larson and 19 other citizens of Polk, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3622. Also, petition of Josephine R. Lindburg and 36 other citizens of Polk, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3623. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of the Boyd Memorial Sunday School and Randolph Street Advent Sunday School members, Charleston, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3624. Also, petition of Mrs. C. A. Sinnett and other citizens of North Charleston, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3625. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Licking Township, Muskingum County, Ohio, supporting Senate bill 860 which would give legal protection from the traffic in all alcoholic beverages and from commercialized prostitution in and around Army training camps and all military and naval centers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3626. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of George Boswell and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3627. Also, petition of Victor Marino and 35 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3628. Also, petition of C. S. Lawton and 22 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3629. Also, petition of the Krey Packing Co. and signed by 95 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3630. Also, petition of the Mayfair Hotel and signed by 60 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3631. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Guyan Mills, Inc., Valley Falls, R. I., and employees, protesting against the statutory increases in rate of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance tax effective January 1, 1944, and requesting the Congress to freeze this rate at 1 percent for the duration of the emergency, because various and sundry taxes are already extremely burdensome, and this particular tax will double the income from this source, which is already ample for the purpose intended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3632. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Mrs. Hiram Crow and 67 other members of Townsend Club, No. 1, of Lemmon, S. Dak., urging support of House bill 1649, the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3633. Also, petition of Mamie B. Long and 11 other members of the Townsend Club of Martin, S. Dak., urging support of the Townsend plan and House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3634. Also, petition of Harry C. Burntrager, adjutant, Captain Jack Foster Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of South Dakota, at Hot Springs, S. Dak., and other citizens of Hot Springs, requesting favorable consideration by the House of Representatives on House bill 2350, the Buckley bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

3635. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petitions signed by 443 persons of Clermont, Brown, Scioto, Adams, and Highland Counties, Ohio, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3636. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Prosser, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic-beverage industry for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father Almighty, heaven and earth are filled with Thy glory and praise becometh the upright in heart. So often, dear Lord, strange fears and anxious hopes mingle in our breasts and then we would draw nearer to Thee and understand. For the joys of human experience do Thou make us tremendously ambitious, lifting us above the leaden things of life, shaping our souls mysteriously into the divine image.

O God, make us strong to bear the burden of and the heat of the day, dominated, enthralled by the spirit of justice; we plead for national deliverance from all social and political ills which undermine the domestic peace of our citizens. O let the spirit of our Master fall upon us like a garment until we deeply realize the sanctity of our heritage for the hope and advancement of mankind. Each day we pray that we may carry with us that patriotic devotion unabated, possessing the kingship of understanding and unity, inspired by the conquering supremacies of life. O lead us with strong wills and might of soul to believe that we are a part of a great purpose that shall carry with it the rapture of moral victory and spiritual progress for the sake of the appealing masses of this sad earth. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may read to the House an address delivered by Abraham Lincoln 80 years ago today.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the Chair is justified in recognizing the gentleman on this request. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, fourscore years ago today, standing on an open platform in the chilly atmosphere at Gettysburg, Pa., Abraham Lincoln delivered an address that ranks as the greatest classic in our secular literature. As long as character is recognized and virtue is extolled that address will be known in every land and praised in every tongue. In memory of the man whom the united Nation honors and reveres and in recognition of this special anniversary, I have asked for this time in order that I may read the Gettysburg Address:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place of those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio talk by Mr. Chester Bowles. I am informed by the Public Printer that the speech will take one and one-quarter pages of the RECORD at a cost of $56.25.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE HOG MARKET IN MONTANA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I received this telegram this morning from Bozeman, Mont.:

BOZEMAN, MONT., *November 19, 1943.*
Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
Montana Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

Hogs have been flooding the markets. Packinghouses cannot kill the livestock received. Railroads are overrun. This congested, stagnant condition exists every place. If this condition continues, breeding livestock for the future will be depleted and it will seriously curtail our food-for-victory supply in the future. This could be greatly relieved if the O. P. A. would put pork on the free list, point free, at least for 2 months until the people could get their winter supply of meat. We are wiring Price Administrator Chester Bowles, asking them to do this. Montana people will greatly appreciate your assisting them in bringing this about.

J. H. HEALY,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Everson, secretary of agriculture of the State of South Dakota, given when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture this week on the matter of subsidies. Mr. Everson was for 4 years the national president of the Farmers Union. I think the Members will be interested in his point of view on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem from the pen of James Patrick McGovern.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Scott Ellis, farmer of Dallas Center, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Government periodicals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of H. R. 3420.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a letter just received from Mr. Cleveland Gilcreast, manager, New Hampshire Egg Producers Cooperative, which gives a fair statement of the critical situation which exists in New Hampshire today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item on milk spoilage in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE HOG SITUATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the hog market right now. Yesterday I received from Mr. Jones, War Food Administrator, a leaflet with some recommendations contained therein. The first recommendation contained in this leaflet is that farmers will be authorized for a period of 90 days to slaughter on their farm any hogs owned by them and deliver the meat derived therefrom without obtaining a license or permit for such slaughter or delivery.

I called Mr. Jones' office and asked who the farmers could deliver them to. It so

happens that a lot of thrifty people in small towns up in Pennsylvania and all over the East like to buy two or three hogs in the fall and a quarter of beef, and butcher, cure, and can the meat for the year. This is an established practice. None of them have sufficient points to do this. He says I may slaughter my hogs, but he does not say to whom I may deliver them. There is no one to buy them. If the O. P. A. would permit these people to buy hogs and butcher it would remove perhaps 1,000,000 hogs from the market and give them much cheaper meat for the year and relieve a serious food situation. I wonder whether Mr. Jones thinks the consumers and the farmers are all a bunch of suckers. Until the administration realizes that the farmer must have a green light to produce, then he will produce with all his might, and until they make it possible for the consumers to buy those products, the entire food situation will go from bad to worse.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by our colleague from Washington [Mr. HORAN] last night over the radio, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some resolutions adopted by the Ohio Republicans in Congress endorsing the candidacy of John W. Bricker for the Presidency of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3477, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a moment of recapitulation. On yesterday the leader of the majority side took the floor. He began the debate, and I assume as in former days he will want the floor to close debate. I admire him greatly. He has been a friend of mine for many, many long years. He gives me credit, I am sure—I have heard him say it—for being intellectually honest, and he is just that. But I want to complain of his viewpoint.

My friend, Dr. George B. Galloway, of the American Political Science Association, recently furnished me with many criticisms of the Congress and many suggestions for reform in our procedure. I quote from one of his articles: "In recent years, moreover, majority party leaders have tended to become managers for the President rather than spokesmen for the Congress." Many times have I bewailed this fact. It is greatly in evidence in this debate. This condition must be changed. I will repeat this indictment as often as appears necessary. Let the leader of the majority tell the White House what the people here whom he leads think and will do about legislative matters. But when the lights are turned on at the White House, it seems to show the way to the leaders, who yield to that personal charm of which we often hear. They then attempt not to lead you, but to drive you. Your leader well knows today how the great majority of this House feels, and probably the majority of his own party. To drive a mule successfully it is better to find out how the mule wants to go, then go with him.

Further, our respected leader on yesterday harked back, as he often does, to those dark days of 1933. He finds himself today in a very hard position. He will not even support the chairman of this committee, which is very unusual. But he harks back, as so many others do, to 1933. I give him this poem for his edification. Some of you may wish to use it.

There was a dachshund,
Once so long he hadn't any notion
How long it took to tell his tail of his emotion.
So when his little eyes were filled with sadness
His little tail went wagging on because of previous gladness.

Just read the RECORD of yesterday and the answer of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. It devastates our leader's argument about inflation. It was highly informative. There now seems to be nothing left but a political inference. The inflation bogey in this instance now fails to affright the House.

I have here, I think, all of the speeches of recent days made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It is very tedious to go through them. He is a great friend of mine, really. We differ, but I am sure we respect each other. I admire him greatly for his stubbornness of opinion. It is sometimes good to be stubborn. I was pleased yesterday when he told his colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] that he [Mr. SUMNERS] was generally right, and he [Mr. PATMAN] was generally wrong. Well, I fear that he is generally wrong. But that does not discourage him. I have tried to read through most of these speeches, but, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said on yesterday, they reiterate much. If we keep repeating a philosophy, we are bound to get some to agree with us, but we will have many more who find it so tiresome that they disagree. Too much heat in a discussion rouses suspicion that we simply whistle to keep up our courage. A letter reached his desk yesterday from one of my constituents, who wrote him that he had listened to Fulton Lewis and had almost been convinced, and now, after listening to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], he was thoroughly convinced Mr. Lewis was right. As I said a day or two ago, keep it up. Attack JOE MARTIN all you want. It is so extremely helpful to us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Indeed, I desire to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman has always been consistent.

Mr. GIFFORD. No. Consistency? What a word. "Consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, of little statesmen, philosophers, and divines."

Mr. McCORMACK. I recall once that a distinguished Member of this body whom I admire very, very much, a dear friend of mine, made a speech against the wage-and-hour law, and in the next day or two he flopped over and made a speech for it.

Mr. GIFFORD. It could not have been I, for I supported that from the first. But that person need only say to you "I am wiser today than I was yesterday."

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say it was the gentleman from Massachusetts, but perhaps the gentleman has a guilty conscience.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no. Consistency? I have not too much love for it. Hide behind that theory? I would not hide behind that for a minute. If I thought I ought to change my mind—since the gentleman talks about intellectual honesty—I would change it, yes. We stray very often. We cannot always be consistent, as many judge us. Each problem has its different conditions to consider.

We have heard much about the hold-the-line order and the courage of the President. I visualize John L. Lewis, with merry, squinting eyes, indulging in a horse laugh at that suggestion. Do not tell John L. Lewis the President had the courage to hold the line. Do not tell me that, either.

The gentleman from Texas begs the gentleman from Michigan to tell him what program he would suggest, and he denies that he replied to him. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] on yesterday read the law that Congress passed. He suggested that there be no more subterfuge but to act according to the law of Congress. The answer and the remedy was and is "Follow the law." Now about this hold-the-line order——

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I certainly will.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman says it was answered perfectly. I ask the gentleman if he can answer it or if the gentleman did answer it perfectly. The challenge was to suggest any way, without increasing prices, to encourage production without a subsidy.

Mr. GIFFORD. You have had your answer. Have a fair, proper price and hold the line there. A producer's subsidy is often necessary. Again, hold your arguments to consumer's subsidy.

Mr. PATMAN. A subsidy is the only way. The gentleman cannot suggest another way.

Mr. GIFFORD. You have the answer. We are now attempting to see to it that subterfuges are abandoned. The gentleman keeps saying over the radio and here, that in this bill we do away with the support prices. He has said that over and over again. The report accompanying this bill distinctly assures us that we do not interfere with support prices, but rather demand their continuance.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman from Michigan showed that. The gentleman should not misrepresent things like that.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is misrepresenting it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Not at all.

Mr. PATMAN. In that provision you require the maximum price to be the same as the support price. Why not try it? It will not work. Marvin Jones says that it will not work.

Mr. GIFFORD. The support prices could not be below the parity prices. What is the use of arguing. This was all clearly stated yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. The gentleman from Texas can read that speech. Even he will be convinced. The gentleman from Texas states and reiterates that this bill is politics. His policy that he is defending definitely is politics. When did anything emanate during the last 10 years from the White House that was not carefully considered as to its political value or injury? He is now seemingly catering to the only class whose votes he still hopes to retain.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DILWEG. I believe that the gentleman does not want to misquote the law, but I think he said that the support price could not be below the parity price. Where in this law is there any such provision?

Mr. GIFFORD. The law is right there. The gentleman from Michigan has it, and he read it. The gentleman should read that speech. I trust I am not in error.

Mr. DILWEG. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. GIFFORD. I say it is there because the gentleman from Michigan said it was there. That gentleman knows. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] knows more than anybody else about this matter. He certainly does in my estimation also.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DILWEG. I believe that what the gentleman intends to say is that the support price would not be below the ceiling price, and not parity.

Mr. GIFFORD. Parity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I think the gentleman is vastly mistaken. I believe he means to say 90 percent of parity, rather than parity.

Mr. GIFFORD. Very well. In matters of the complex parity question make any claim or statement you may desire. But do not put another tree of detail before me so that I cannot see the forest of what I am trying to describe. The law has been sufficiently set out. All can read the law. I am trying to look at the general picture, especially the results now obtained. Subsidies? Of course, I believe in subsidies. Is that being inconsistent? Subsidy means simply a grant from the Federal Government to private industry when it is supposed to be beneficial to the public. We have always had subsidies, and we always will. But there are many animals that I like and many that I do not like. But they are all animals, skunks among the rest. Who does not believe in subsidies when reasonable and desirable? They are indeed necessary at times of haste in preparation for defense. You talk about subsidies in New England. When the Government suddenly takes all of the shipping away from New England, so that we cannot get coal or oil, then the Government should see to it that other compensatory methods are employed for their delivery—quite a different reason for quite a different subsidy. This bill does not have anything to do with that kind of subsidy. This is limited to food subsidies. The gentleman from Texas even talks about the League of Nations and the Republican conspiracy of many years ago to bulwark his argument on subsidies. He went so far afield that it discloses the weakness of his contentions. He says something about fats and oils having special treatment in this bill. These products, like aluminum, were and are needed to make the ammunition for war, and we had to get them no matter what prices or subsidies were paid for them. That is a highly different class of subsidy than these consumer class of subsidies under discussion.

We are objecting to the subterfuges indulged in by the administration to bypass this body. We have become tired of being bypassed. Should I get the ax for what the administration is doing against the full intent of laws passed by Congress? Our constituents blame us for these things. These bureaucrats thirst for power as a leech thirsts for blood. Their itch for power and the continuation of this administration is overwhelming them. Their success thus far in bypassing Congress in wartime has whetted their appetite. The President must look upon us with disgust and disdain in that he so easily outgeneraled us. How cowardly we have been in letting him do it. He does many things and then simply reports, "fait accompli." It is done and we must approve it, to save the face of the United States Government. Now, he thought he could bypass us in the consumer-subsidy matter. But the farmers all over this land of ours are aroused and enraged. They have had their medicine. They have had snoopers enough. They have had questionnaires enough. They know that if they want this bounty, they will have to keep their books, and swear to the answers to all of the questions the investigator wants to ask, even to the degree of their stomach ache, maybe. They fear all this. All we want is the green light and the red light, but keep your snooping agents away from us, asking questions that are none of their business. We do not belong to a government of people who want to be regimented that way. The farmer well knows this is another attempt to regiment and socialize him; also that a subsidy will not suffice to cure his condition. "Hold the line." Make a rule and hide behind it. Keep it rigid. How foolish, when, of course, it could not be done without all sorts of exceptions. Hold the line as best and reasonably as you can is far different. But John L. Lewis broke the line and made a very large hole in it, large enough for the labor army to enter. Hold the line, rigid, just when the adjustments of many things were in process and vitally necessary. Just because some need to be checked, all must suffer, even to the point of collapse of their businesses.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A few years ago the gentleman was fighting for a subsidy for the fishing interests in his district.

Mr. GIFFORD. Was I?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not recall that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You do not recall that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It involved a couple of million dollars that you wanted to help out the fishing interests up there and you took the floor here and made a speech for it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps the gentleman may be mistaken. Anyway, I am sometimes like you fellows; sometimes I have a convenient memory.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, no.

Mr. GIFFORD. No.

Mr. GIFFORD. Perhaps I ought not to recall it. So seldom do our fishing boys get anything.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was very much interested, and you and other delegations, both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. GIFFORD. Did we get it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes; you got part of it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes. I introduced a bill and we got an appropriation first of $1,000,000, and then we got more.

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, that is right. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] takes all the credit. But I told you I liked some subsidies, did I not? I am glad to be reminded of that. I can now really have something to remind my fishermen of next year and can claim a part of Mr. MCCORMACK's share of the credit. Fishermen have had a hard time. They are an independent group. They are and will be up against harder times under O. P. A. treatment. When the O. P. A. held a meeting with the fishermen in my city they soon learned how the fishermen regarded

them. They walked out of the hall, saying, "to hell with the O. P. A." You cannot regiment my fishermen. Do not try it. The farmers are now awake and joined up.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I am interested in subsidies, too. We grow beets. I ask you because I know nothing about it whatever, but was not that fishery appropriation a producer subsidy?

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course.

Mr. HILL. I am asking you.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thought it wise not to enlarge upon it at the moment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I remember quite distinctly, when we made provision that the fishing industry would be exempt, the argument was made on both sides of this Chamber that the fishing boats would not go out from Gloucester or anywhere else to catch fish to feed the people unless we paid a subsidy. So, it is very obviously, a producer subsidy, to obtain the maximum amount of production.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman. I am rescued. It was not wise for me to prolong discussion of that matter.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the future Senator.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. This bill does not carry any subsidy, does it? The provision in controversy simply denies the President the right to use any of the funds appropriated by this bill or others, to use a subsidy, if he decides to do so?

Mr. GIFFORD. Contrary to law. It is a producer subsidy that we are willing to have; and not a consumer subsidy.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What is the good of inserting this if the law does not now permit him to use subsidies when he thinks it is wise?

Mr. GIFFORD. Just to call his attention to the fact that he has not properly interpreted the law and the intent of Congress.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And that is the only purpose, I would judge, of the bill, to try to make the President behave himself?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, yes; put it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman. I desire to make a better ending. I have much material here yet for discussion. Must we pass many laws, designed to curb the President in his own interpretation of them? Small wonder that the bureaus are assuming to themselves power that we did not have any notion of granting them, noting the success of the administration in multiplying personnel and activities.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is that not a matter for the Department of Justice to deal with, instead of a legislative body?

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot imagine the Department of Justice arresting the present chauffeur. Only the people can arrest him. The judges are appointed by the Executive.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does the gentleman think the courts of the United States are creatures of this great President that is so disturbing him?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, he has appointed most of them.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. To the courts?

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to be careful what I say about that. I cannot allow you to bait me further along that line.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I would.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have great respect for judges, but not always for their opinions.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What I am trying to get clear is this, that this is a negative act, controlling the will of the President, under what is claimed to be the law, and prevents his using any of the money appropriated to any agency for the purpose of giving a subsidy to keep down prices, or any other purpose?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, put it that way, if you desire. But, keep in mind that this is a consumer subsidy problem. We are not preventing floor prices, support prices, or even producer subsidies, even if the line of demarcation is sometimes a little confusing.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. That is the same thing. That is the only purpose of this controverted provision.

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, its purpose is to tell the President which road he shall travel, and not travel the road of subterfuge. Again Congress is asserting its right. It will take a two-thirds vote to recover this right. This is a lesson that we be cautious in our grants to the Executive in the future. When the R. F. C. is called upon to spend millions and millions of dollars to roll back prices, we hesitate to believe that to be a proper interpretation of any law yet passed by Congress. Think of the billions that could be available to the whim of the Executive. Shall we stop it or not?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I love the gentleman so much that when he looks at me like he did then, I feel like sitting down and quitting.

Mr. GIFFORD. Once before I had to explain, "My face, I don't mind it, for I am behind it! It is you out in front that I jar." I do look ugly at times and greatly deplore it.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What I am driving at is this: You say they are to follow the law. I do not think they are. That is a difference of opinion, but the purpose of this controverted provision in this act is to deny the President, or any agency of this Government the right to use appropriations heretofore made, and appropriations made by this bill, as subsidies to control consumer prices?

Mr. GIFFORD. We will try to make it strong enough this time. Our leaders said on yesterday that we would vote for this bill and then would pray that the veto would not be overridden. In that way we would be saved from ourselves. Well, the President vetoed the antistrike bill. I have thought that he prayed diligently that we would override his veto.

Mr. FORD rose.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. GIFFORD. Just a moment; the gentleman from California is ahead of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I beg his pardon.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman says he is violating the law. The gentleman voted for the adoption of the price-control bill in 1942, did he not?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FORD. And most of the gentleman's colleagues did.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FORD. It carried overwhelmingly.

Mr. GIFFORD. We took 3 months considering it and the officials knew right well how the committee interpreted it.

Mr. FORD. All right; let me ask the gentleman this question: Did we not direct the President in that bill to stabilize prices, to hold prices?

Mr. GIFFORD. Only as best he could. We said nothing about "holding the line, hell or high water." The gentleman knows the terms of the law as well as I do.

Mr. FORD. Of course I do.

Mr. GIFFORD. If farmers need a cent a quart more on milk to meet cost of production, give it to them. That does not mean a 10 percent rise in the cost of living, nor does it mean, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said, a 10-times increase. We hold the line at the new prices determined as necessary for production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman think that if the President believes a law should be vetoed, under his oath of office and under the Constitution of the United States it becomes the President's duty to veto it?

Mr. GIFFORD. But there are cases where perhaps he might feel pleased if it passed after he vetoed it. He may satisfy his conscience and feel that his duty ended there. But this President has "Dutch" in him and he will persevere. I may say that I think our President has a political mind and that he weighs the political results of all these policies and measures. He seems to know where the

votes left to him are and is catering to them. This is my own opinion. It seems to me that this is why he wants a consumer subsidy. Does it matter to him what the great majority of the people and their elected Representatives may desire? It seems not, and this attitude will be proven if this act receives his veto. The people are terribly tired of his attitude of "Mother knows best."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, following the debate that has so far taken place on this bill I can come to no other conclusion than while this has been called an antisubsidy bill it looks to me as though it were developing into a piece of rotten class legislation; rotten because it picks out a certain class, the farmer, and says that he shall have subsidies, he shall have support prices, he shall have incentive prices, he shall have any other kind of price up to a certain amount of parity or more, but no consumer regardless of where the prices go shall be permitted to have a subsidy that might enable him to live. Take the 15,000,000 white-collar people down below who have not had any raises and let them start paying 90 cents a pound for butter, 90 cents a pound for beef, 60 cents a pound for pork, 25 cents a quart for milk, and 25 cents a loaf for bread and some of you boys will hunt for the fox holes when it comes next election time; I will tell you that.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Or $5 for a chicken as we paid during the last war. Do you remember that?

Mr. FORD. Probably; yes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Five dollars for one chicken.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to confine my remarks to section 3 of the pending bill.

This section purports to abolish all subsidies in the following brave words:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof.

Mr. Chairman, the language there is clear to barring subsidies and I never saw anything more direct than that.

Of course there is a reprieve of the subsidy principle to December 31, 1943. Then follows a lot of verbiage about maximum prices not being established below support prices, said support prices not being subsidies only because they are not called subsidies.

But, after all these brave words about abolishing subsidies, on page 5, line 23, we read these weasel words:

Provided further, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed.

Of course, soybeans, peanuts, and cottonseed, at least, the last two products, are important crops in Alabama and other adjacent States.

So, my friends, we have a bill that abolishes subsidies for the consumer, but continues subsidies for the farmer. Of course what the farmer is to get is not called a subsidy. It bears various camouflage names. Sometimes it takes the form of a loan, at other times parity payment. Or it may be called soil conservation, support-price payment or incentive payments.

But all these payments have one common characteristic. They are all paid out of the Treasury of the United States. So we have the $64 question, "When is a subsidy not a subsidy?" It is not a subsidy when Congress in its wisdom calls it, for political expediency, something else.

So we have section 3 of this bill masquerading as a section to abolish subsidies. To me it is a back-scratching, log-rolling piece of political chicanery, in other words a legislative fraud, which by trick and device purports to abolish subsidies on the one hand while establishing them on the other.

I am just wondering what farmers or farm representatives are thinking about when they get into a stew about subsidies.

Let us just take a look-see. Since 1933, the cotton farmers alone have received in subsidies $1,350,000,000. Other farmers have received since 1933 approximately $6,000,000,000 under the name, not of subsidies, but as parity payments, crop-allotment and soil-practice payments. Every dollar of the money came from the Treasury.

When we read this record of subsidies in one form or another, amounting in the aggregate to so many billions of dollars, is it any wonder if we nonfarmers fail to understand this new-born rugged individualism of the farmer, who, for 10 years, has been the recipient of the Treasury's bounty.

I would also like to call your attention to the fact that those who oppose consumer subsidies point out that these subsidies will be paid out of borrowed money and that, therefore, the next generation will be paying the present generation's grocery bill.

Since, however, the money that is still to be paid in subsidies under section 3, under the guise of support prices and incentive payments and all the other camouflaged subsidies that will still remain in force, all comes from the Public Treasury and is, therefore, borrowed money, these sums will also be paid by the next generation.

If this vicious section 3 becomes a law, and the inflation floodgates are opened, as they will be, the billion or two spent for consumer subsidies will not amount to a drop in the bucket. But the misery and disaster that will result will damn this Congress forever.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, so far as the farmer is concerned, the term "subsidy" is a misnomer. It is an undercover attempt to pay the farmer only a part of what he is justly entitled to. The name "subsidy," however, suggests to the general public a means of giving the farmer something in the nature of a special privilege. The farmer is held up to the public mind as one who will not do his fair share in this war effort unless he is paid well for it.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The farmer is not yet getting cost of production. He is selling his normal output at a loss, and this subsidy is an attempt, and probably the only attempt that can be made in this Congress, to even up the loss.

Surely, no one here seriously thinks it would work to let the law of supply and demand set the prices on farm products. With all the idle money lying around, this would mean run-away inflation, and the farmer would be a victim along with all others. So, the objection to subsidies must be an objection to giving the farmer enough additional money to provide him a fair return for his efforts. That, I think, is what the trouble is about. It's the old story about refusing to give the farmer a square deal.

Had this body years ago, 6 years ago, 4 years ago, 2 years ago, or even now, established a cost-of-production program, we wouldn't have all this fuss over giving the farmer a part of what he is justly entitled to. But this body for the last 20 years has failed to adopt such a program. Such a program never became a law. The Congress passed such a measure twice and it was twice vetoed. During the last 9 years, Congress has absolutely ignored any cost-of-production program, and hence we are having all this trouble over many phases of agriculture.

Just to show you how the makeshift price to be given the farmer is arrived at, let me illustrate how the plan affects wheat, hogs, and beef.

WHEAT

First, the average annual production per county is determined, and if the average is 8 bushels per acre, that fact is used in connection with other facts.

The second fact to be discovered is what has been the historic acreage in wheat on that farm. If that has been 150 acres, we have another fact to use in our formula.

Third, we say to the farmer, cut your acreage 5 percent. On a basis of 150 acres, therefore, the farmer would plant 117½ acres.

Fourth, we say to the farmer, if you do cut your acreage, we will pay you 13 cents per bushel for the average yield on the 32½ acres which you did not plant.

Fifth, the computation now reads that the farmer gets 13 cents per bushel on the 32½ acres at 8 bushels per acre, or $42.25.

Result—over the same period, the farmer sells 940 bushels at a loss of 20 cents per bushel—a net loss of $188. Ap-

plying the so-called subsidy payment of $42.25, total net loss, $145.75.

When, therefore, any move is made to pay the farmer a small part of what he is entitled to, the public flays the farmer from coast to coast for being a grabber and a recipient of special privilege.

Had we adopted the cost-of-production program, all this mathematical and philosophical formula could have been avoided and the farmer's proceeds would be on a par with those in other lines of production.

But Congress has curious mental processes. It refuses the farmer a living price, and right now, during the war, we decide to take away from the farmer what little adjustment we have heretofore made.

This remands me of a quotation that reads something like this:

> For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. (St. Matthew, xxv: 29.)

In the case of beef, every time a housewife pays 55 cents for steak she condemns the cattle growers. The subsidy on beef cattle only affects slaughter beef. The top price is set at 16 cents per pound, and a subsidy is supposed to take care of the processor. This does not affect 95 percent of the beef cattle in North Dakota, for the reason that we have feeder cattle instead of finished cattle. At the present time cattle breeders in North Dakota are selling cattle at much less than the cost of production. When cattle arrive at south St. Paul or Chicago from the western area, they are not classed as butcher cattle and the 16 cents limit does not apply. Our growers have to sell their cattle for what they can get, and right now feeder cattle are selling as low as 6½ to 7 cents per pound. There cannot be much logic in the assertion that the subsidy on butcher cattle affects our feeders. A 3-cent spread in price, together with the poundage put on by the feeder is considered a safe transaction. If that held true, feeder cattle should be bringing at least 10 to 13 cents per pound. The trouble lies, rather, with the price of feed—corn and barley. Feeders are reluctant to buy because they cannot see their way clear to put high-priced feed into unfinished cattle.

What applies to cattle applies to hogs. It takes about 12 bushels of barley to make 100 pounds of pork, and with the price of barley where it is and the price of corn, no one can afford to feed out hogs. The result is that you can buy in North Dakota a trainload of hogs for 4 cents per pound or less.

All the ills of every conceivable nature are charged to the subsidy, but if the subsidy were removed the price to the consumers would instantly rise, without helping the producer of livestock which are not fed out for the markets.

If all this is true—that the farmers who are stockmen are selling for less than the cost of production—how does it come that the farmers of the great Middle West are floating around in money? The fact is that they are not wallowing in wealth. They have debts and mountains of debts accumulated during the 9 years of the Dust Bowl havoc, and to their credit it can be said that they are paying their obligations. Remember another thing—that we have had 3 unprecedented crop years—years where the production was immense. It was no man's fault that we had dry years, and it is to no man's credit that we have had three bounteous crops. That is due entirely to the will of the Almighty.

We will have short crops again, just as we have always had, and where will the farmer be then? Under present farm prices and with the average run of fair and poor crops there would be no farmers, in North Dakota, at least, emerging into independence, but we would have more clients for the Farm Security Administration with no funds voted by Congress to sustain the program.

I want the consuming public to know the truth about the farmers. I want them to know that any subsidy that finds its way back into the pockets of the farmers is a return to them, in part only, of the loss suffered in the sale of agricultural products.

I am of the opinion that all these underhanded payments ought to be cut out but until this Congress provides a law to give the farmer cost of production, how can anyone from the Middle West take away what little the farmer is able to scrape up from the various Government payments?

Some say the farmer is regimented, but one glance at the fields in North Dakota and the kind of farming now practiced cannot help but convince that out of the whole agricultural program has come a better farming system, and better land each year is left for the next year's crop. Through this planned system of farming, the devastating effect of dry years can be checked and in the end the farmer himself and the Nation will be benefited by the program of the Department of Agriculture.

Finally, I cannot agree to take any benefit which the farmer is now getting away from him during the present deadly conflict. I have made the statement on the floor of this House so often that I have become a bore to some, that food will win this war. We want more production—more and more food: Even if we did intend to cut out all benefits, is this the time to do it? A great many people in this country think this war will soon end, but my judgment is that we are going to have a long and costly war. Many people are already to say what the peace should be when we are a long time away from peace. The farther Germany is driven back to her own territory, the more war will increase in intensity. The Russians are demonstrating what it means to be fighting for their homeland; the Germans will also demonstrate what it means to be fighting for the life of the actual Germany. In my judgment, the side that has the last loaf of bread will win this war. Should we, therefore, in the name of economy, or in the name of anything else, take away from the farmer what few dribbles he gets from the Government while we sit here bluntly refusing the farmer's program of cost of production.

This present Congress will also refuse any adequate appropriation to continue the Farm Security Administration, where thousands of farm families are being resuscitated and then actually paying their way. No more short-sighted policy could be adopted during a time when we need experienced farmers to bring about the success of our men in arms.

It is my considered opinion that if the so-called subsidies are abolished now, the small farmers of the Nation will receive no benefits and at the same time the consuming public will be aroused and wages will automatically have to go on up to meet the cost of living, and a period of general confusion and unrest will ensue at just the time when we should be all working together for a common purpose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, it is almost universally recognized even by those who are opposed to the present bill that when we install the principle of consumer subsidies we are stepping on dangerous ground. If Congress once records itself in favor of this principle at this time of the country's greatest income, the demand for more and more subsidies will be almost impossible to refuse in times of depression, when incomes are small and people are having real difficulty in meeting their food bills.

If we approve of them now, subsidies will become the demagogue's paradise in future years. "Vote for me and let the Government pay your food bill" will be the cry. Someone must pay the bill ultimately, yes; but hidden taxes are not difficult to levy. There is reminiscent thought in this demand for food subsidies which goes back to the Roman Empire. "Bread and circuses" for the multitude kept the people quiet and kept the Emperor in power.

There has been no denial here that consumer subsidies are inflationary in the long run, and as has been said many times on the floor in the last 2 days, it is the utmost selfishness to ask our sons not only to fight the war, but as the future taxpayers of our Nation, to pay our present grocery bills, plus the expenses of administration of the program and interest and carrying charges on the debt incurred to pay these subsidies.

That subsidies are evil there can be no question; but what we must decide today is whether these evils are overbalanced by the immediate benefits which might result. It is true that subsidies paid directly to the producer will save the consumer slightly more than the amount paid out, as the ultimate consumer pays a price which is loaded by mark-ups through various handlers.

It has been argued that if we can prevent rises in certain basic items, it will prevent a rise in all other items, and fantastic figures have been produced by certain people showing what this may amount to. I am frank to say I cannot see any justification for this claim. What has a subsidy on milk to do with the price of, say, oranges?

It is also true that there is an element of the population who have received no benefit from the war and to whom the high cost of living is causing real hardship. How large this group is is problematical.

When you consider total family take-home pay, I do not think that the group is as large as some think; but however small, they deserve real consideration, and it was for their protection that I urged before the Rules Committee that real consideration should be given to the Herter food-stamp plan. If aid is necessary for these people, it should be given to those who need it, not spread over everyone, be he rich or poor. You and I, and an overwhelming majority of the American people, can and should pay our own grocery bills now.

The argument has been made that, if we do not continue subsidies, labor will be justified in demanding the breaking of the Little Steel formula; that wages will go up; then prices; then wages; and the spiral of inflation will be in full force.

Now, I am one of those who saw the dangers of inflation long ago and have been fighting to prevent it, long before the administration was willing to come to grips with the question.

Two years ago, I supported the theories of Mr. Baruch, as embodied in legislation proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for an over-all ceiling; but at that time, as you remember, the President succumbed to pressure groups, ordered his followers to oppose this legislation, and it was defeated on the floor. Much of the trouble now before us might have been avoided if we had faced facts realistically at that time.

Leaving out the question if the Little Steel formula has not already been broken; leaving out any question if this rigid formula is the best one; let us ask ourselves whether the proposed subsidies would, in the light of wages which are being paid, justify our adding these sums to the real wages received by the workingman.

The subsidy program will amount to about a cent and a half per person per day, if we take the figures presented to the Banking and Currency Committee of what is planned, or perhaps 3 cents a day if the billion and a half subsidies are put in, as suggested in Mr. Bowles' radio speech a couple of nights ago.

In chart No. 15, placed in the hearings by Mr. Gilbert of the O. P. A., figures supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show a rise in weekly earnings in all manufacturing industry groups of over 35 percent from January 1941, the basic date set to calculate the Little Steel formula, to May 1943.

There are no figures available showing what further rise may have occurred in the past 6 months.

It is true that there are certain elements of our working population who, up to May 1943, had not had as great a rise as that of the cost of living. Municipal workers, school teachers, railroad, and public-utility employees are examples of these classes; but the over-all rise on the average has not been only the 15 percent provided by the Little Steel formula, or even the 23 percent represented by the increase in the cost of living; but has been 35 percent.

Perhaps here and there further wage rises are justified, but with these figures before us, the passage of the present bill certainly would not justify the collapse of the entire present wage scale.

The weight of evidence seems heavy against a subsidy program, and I will vote for this bill gladly and with good conscience.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What provision of this bill directs or authorizes a subsidy?

Mr. KEAN. None.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. This is an effort indirectly to interpret and control legislation heretofore enacted or which the President claims has been enacted.

Mr. KEAN. What bill that has been passed provides for subsidies?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I did not mean to go into that, but that is the contention. There is one authorizing him by public proclamation, in reference to strategic materials or necessary materials, to go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and get money to pay for subsidies for various things.

Mr. KEAN. The intent of the Banking and Currency Committee when that legislation passed certainly did not include consumer subsidies.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Then there would not be any law, as the gentleman contends, of course, for them to do what they are doing?

Mr. KEAN. No.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. My question is directed to this situation: What law has been enacted or which they claim you have enacted?

Mr. KEAN. If they have misinterpreted the laws which we have passed, the only remedy, which the Congress has, is to specifically forbid it.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Why not do it in a direct act then?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was very much interested in the gentleman's figures as to how much it would amount to per person per day provided they have these subsidies. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how many cents per day it will add to the burden of the average citizen if we authorize subsidies?

Mr. KEAN. Well, the question would arise as to what type of bonds they may sell and how they borrow the money.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How much will the cost of subsidies add to the taxpayers' burden per day,

Mr. KEAN. That all depends on the interest charges on the money borrowed to get the money to pay these subsidies.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does not the gentleman believe they would exceed the amount of savings to the average citizen?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman has given a good factual account of his own ideas of this program. I do not agree with some of the inferences that the gentleman states, but I do believe his work shows a lot of study. Here is something that occurs to me: The people who believe in your interpretation of this act feel that the price of living, the cost of living, may be raised if we abolish all subsidies and you can hold it there. We who disagree with you feel that once the line is abandoned it cannot be held. I think that is the direct issue between us.

Mr. KEAN. I think the gentleman states his proposition well.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I gather from the gentleman's statement he is not fearful of inflation in the event this bill passes?

Mr. KEAN. No.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman does not fear inflation?

Mr. KEAN. No; not if the administration makes use strictly of the powers which it has.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Are you and the other Members of Congress who take your position willing to assume full responsibility in the event that inflation does occur?

Mr. KEAN. I am not assuming any responsibility for this administration.

Mr. SADOWSKI. You will have to assume responsibility for the situation that will follow the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

A SUBSIDY EXACTS A TRIBUTE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, Benjamin Franklin or somebody said, "Virtue is its own reward." Benjamin Franklin should know.

Anyway, for the last 2 or 3 years I have been talking and voting against subsidies, and now we are coming into our own, for we will defeat the administration's proposals, adopt the committee's recommendations, pass the bill now, and again over a threatened veto—or else the will of the people will be thwarted.

Opposition to the conclusions of the committee is senseless. The policies of the administration to the contrary have been wrong since their inception.

I hope I have not reached that age when I cannot listen to reason or put my opinion against the world. In this instance I voice the sentiment of an overwhelming number of millions of Americans.

I am willing to be shown, and there are plenty to defend me when I say I will admit when I am wrong—much as I hate to do it.

I often think of what Emerson said about consistency, which he called "the hobgoblin of little minds adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines." And he went on to say, if you recall, that—

With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. Speak what you think today—

Said he—

in words as hard as cannon balls, and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said today.

I have been the consistent opponent of the administration's doctrine and policy of scarcity which makes it necessary for it to rob Peter to pay Paul as it steals money out of the pocket of one to pay the other while it puts both in debt.

I have talked so many times, here and elsewhere, in opposition to subsidies as proposed by this administration; I have quoted everybody and stacked figures on top of one another so many times in an effort to show the futility of subsidies that I will not presume to say anything more except "I told you so."

We can save this country from New Deal devastation only by defeating its attempts to give the public another hypodermic injection from which the patient, the body politic, if it survives, must recover at great expense of time and money and effort, reduced to taxes which the people shall pay if subsidies are imposed or granted or permitted as a way out.

SCARING THE PEOPLE TO DEATH

The admistration has tried to scare everybody to death with threats of what will happen—which will not. Most people know that if the New Deal will only let the law of supply and demand alone it will work out for them the economic salvation of the masses when it gets back its equilibrium after the jar of the New Deal subsidies. It always has; it always will.

The New Deal monkey wrench thrown into the cogs of rationalized living has done the world a definite damage from which it will take a century to recover.

None of its experiments has been new. Its audience has been new, and inexperienced. Just why a dollar paid as a subsidy will buy the common sense of a people who eventually must pay the bill is a question no philosopher can, will, or should try to answer. But, as Abraham Lincoln said, "You can't fool all the people all the time."

The time has now arrived for the multitude of common people to use the sense God has given them. They know you cannot get something for nothing and that if you are bought you are sold.

Subsidies are an insidious sop to soak up the support of those who never have contributed any real effort toward the uplift of mankind or the benefit of themselves. What you get as a subsidy you pay for tenfold as a tax, and those who have to pay the bills while the bloodsuckers on the body politic grow fat at the expense of the multitude.

Subsidies are wrong ab initio and always—especially so in the instant case. Those who most strongly urge their adoption do it as they would resort to the use of a life preserver, in a last extremity.

Let me tell you if the American Republic as a patient ever recovers from all the experimental doctrination attempted, and/or all the experiments tried out on the body politic during the last 10 years, it will be because God loves America, in spite of and not by reason of anything the New Deal has done to conserve and to preserve the most outstanding example of a government of, for, and by the people the world has ever known.

God save the State.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a good idea that in the peaceful days that will follow the strike of World War No. 2, when the researchers through these distant years begin to look back and find the point at which the breakthrough of inflation of World War No. 2 occurred, they will put their finger on today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I believe they will determine with statistics and logic that there was one agency and one agency alone, the United States Congress, if in possession of the judgment and the courage that the day demanded, that could have stemmed this tide against the disaster of inflation that marked World War No. 2.

POWER POLITICS AT WORK

I believe they will write that powerful groups composed of labor, industry, and a few farm organizations all leveled heavy artillery on Congress and that we faltered and fell back and retreated from a line that was destined to protect all against inflation.

The constant din for higher and better prices, bigger and better wages, is heard on this floor from day to day. I rarely remember when a Member took the floor to argue that some specific price was too high. It is generally the same. This price and that price are always not high enough. Some prices somewhere in this big scheme of things must have been placed at too high a level.

Once in a great while the complaint, of course, is vaguely made that the general cost of living has gone too high, and for that they simplify the thing and say that O. P. A. is to blame. I do not remember many Members of Congress putting our fingers on any of these specific prices and charging the blame up to them. Yesterday it was the same story—the reason the cost of living has increased was claimed that O. P. A. has blundered.

PERFECT JOB IMPOSSIBLE

I do not believe you will ever have perfect price control. You and I and other Members have always said that you could not have the Government running business because you could not collect in Washington any set of brains that could run this complex and confusing economy of ours satisfactorily. Now when we find ourselves in the greatest World War of all times, spending $250,000,000,000, we know we have to have wartime price and ration controls. I do not think we need to argue that point. So is it unusual, is it expecting anything that we did not know before, when we find that the very thing we had always said comes true in this war?

MUST BE TRIAL AND ERROR

It is bound to be a system of trial and error. We are flying in an unknown field in order to try to get through this war without the disaster of inflation ruining our economy. I think it is to the credit of the committees of this Congress that they are active and alert and alive and investigating and turning up the errors that they find. I have been glad to see that many of these errors turned up by these committees have been corrected. In spite of the shortcomings—and there have been thousands and will be thousands more of mistakes—the fact is that the end result we have gotten has been that the cost of living has risen only half as much in World War No. 2 as it did during World War No. 1 in the same period. Bear in mind that World War No. 1 was a $25,000,000,000 war, and World War No. 2 is a $250,000,000,000 war. The stresses and the strains on our economy are ten times as great as they were in the World War No. 1 period.

GOOD POLITICS TO CONDEMN

I have been in politics long enough to know that it is pretty good politics to go before any group and stand up and cuss and damn the O. P. A., and hear the applause ring to the rafters. I know that and you men know that. You can always win a popularity contest back home by making that speech at almost any group and almost any gathering. I know, too, those with something to sell are always going to feel that they have been discriminated against on their one price of the thing they sell, overlooking the fact that they are protected on a thousand prices of the things they have to buy.

Yes; it is good politics to cuss and damn the O. P. A.—it is good politics as long as the price line is held, as long as the dam stands to keep this onrush of devastating inflation from swamping everyone that is caught beneath that dam, and that is the majority of the people in this country. It is the majority of the little people who do not have great enough earning power and only their tiny savings who will be crushed by this tide of inflation.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

Let all the controls be swept away, break down your ceilings, and let prices skyrocket, and the folks back home will sooner or later look up in the RECORD and see who did it.

I think today Congress stands on the very threshold of inflation. We are about to break in disordered retreat from a line that has been held reasonably well for over a year's time. That line was

held fairly well on prices and it has held prétty well on wages. But now because Congress finds less than a dozen prices in the squeeze, and because one buccaneer with a pistol at Uncle Sam's head, John L. Lewis, forced infiltration in the wage line—and I do not deny it—I do not think we ought to surrender and say that all is lost and we must retreat and withdraw.

OUR DUTY TO FIGHT

I think it is Congress' duty to stay here and fight this thing out. I do not think we will be doing our Nation the service we owe it if we say, "Yes; everything is lost. Let us retreat and see if inflation can catch up with us."

Today we are in sight of victory if we had the judgment to perceive it. We need to beat back the counterattack by two powerful forces, one on the price flank and one on the wage flank. We can win this fight. Congress is the only power in this Nation strong enough to do this fighting. If we fail, I hate to think of the consequences.

We need to beat back, first, this attack on the price flank, for if we lose, there we unhinge our line, and must fall back on the wage flank as well. The two are tied together. You cannot retreat on one without retreating on the other.

LIVING COSTS GO UP

It is proposed here by section 3 to withdraw one of the weapons that are helping us to hold the price line. To withdraw and deny the use of subsidies abruptly on December 31 will increase the cost of food by 7 percent and the cost-of-living index by 3 percent. I would be glad to go along with any plan suggested by either side of the aisle if they can give us any plan other than subsidies that will prevent this precipitous and disastrous price raise from taking effect on December 31.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have very limited time, but I will yield for a question or a very short suggestion if the gentleman has one.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If that is the case, does the gentleman think that the approach to the flour or the bread problem can be met by a $100,000,000 subsidy at a time when we have an embargo against any wheat even coming into our country?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly think it can. I am going on now with my talk, because I do not have very much time.

It is true that we can let these prices go up in the market place, and that is what this bill proposes, but when you do you break in disordered retreat from the wage line.

NINE HUNDRED MILLION VERSUS FIVE AND ONE-HALF BILLION

It is true that we can avoid spending $900,000,000 a year in subsidies. We can let butter go up 9 cents a pound, milk a cent a quart, sugar a penny a pound, bread a cent a loaf, and meat from 3 to 5 cents a pound, and so on, but do we actually save this money? By withdrawing the subsidies we do not save, since the wage flank moves forward to cost us, not the $900,000,000, but five and one-half billion by breaking the wage line, the direct governmental cost of this maneuver.

I say now to my friends on the left is anyone so childish as to believe this administration will keep wages frozen at a point 10 percent less than its wage formula?

FORCE UP WAGES TEN BILLION

Be realists and you will admit that all wages will move upward unless Congress holds both flanks. Abandoning this line that has held for more than a year means that you will not soon find another position on which you can hold, for immediately after your wage line is broken by 10 percent, it is already obsolete. Its immediate effect on the cost of living will so skyrocket living costs that another increase and another and another still occur as higher wages bump up the cost of all production. Your war costs, for, after all, the Government is the biggest buyer in the market, will be increased not by a billion, but by ten, twenty, or even one hundred billion before the cycle has run its course.

Bear in mind Uncle Sam is the biggest buyer of food and all production. He is buying 55 percent of production of goods in this country. And when you raise the cost of that wage bill on that 55 percent you surely increase the cost of war first by $5,500,000,000 and on down the line in jumps of $5,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000 as we further retreat before inflation.

MUST LIMIT SUBSIDIES

I am not advocating the unbridled and unlimited use of subsidies. I have listened patiently to all the hearings. I think one element we all have against subsidies is the fear they will be abused and misused. I agree they are dangerous and their widespread use is inflationary. We have here a choice between two evils—inflation or subsidies. I do believe they are one of many weapons necessary to be used if we are going to control inflation. I believe it is the duty of Congress to proscribe and limit the use of these subsidies rather than to oversimplify this complex situation and to bar their use completely. I have tried to devise ways to develop and prohibit unlimited and ill-advised subsidies, and I am going to propose an amendment under the 5-minute rule.

THREE LIMITATIONS

I first propose to limit it as to the amount. I propose to limit it to $750,000,000 to be spent between January 1 and September 30, 1944. That is barely enough to cover the present program at its present level, and to include the pending subsidy on bread and flour which will cost from $65,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year. This is $200,000,000 less than the amount they say they need in order to do this job, but we have practiced economy oftentimes in this Congress by cutting those estimates far below what officers think they need. We find we get better dollars-and-cents value when we do it.

CONTINUED TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1944

As to the program continuing after the war or continuing after the need for subsidies is nonexistent I think we should make the time expire early for the use of any subsidies.

I propose to prohibit their use after September 30, 1944. The reason for that date, and I would like to have them expire earlier to have them come back to Congress sooner so we can check on it, but, gentlemen, we have to get these programs through the crop-growing season and through the canning season. It would be foolish to cut them off on June 30, the date when the Price Control Act expires, because it would leave our whole war-production program in a state of flux and uncertainty. So I believe that when the Congress takes up the Price Control Act on June 30, 1944, we can then determine this issue of subsidies, whether to continue the act or not, in the light of the conditions at that time. But I think we should then taper off our subsidy program so as not to abruptly disrupt and dislocate our vast war-production economy.

MUST HOLD WAGE LINE

One other point I have there in addition to the money limit and in addition to the time limit is, if the general upward adjustment of wages is ordered, if your Little Steel formula is broken, then I do not believe you ought to pay subsidies. There is no need in the world for paying subsidies if you break the line on wages. And my only reason for advocating subsidies today is to help us hold this wage line against this $10,000,000,000 break. That, I know, will destroy our whole economy and will surely occur by this exclusion of subsidies. We help the President hold the line on wages through my amendment, because if this line is broken on the Little Steel formula, then the authority to use subsidies is gone. He can show labor and others who today are demanding the abandonment of our line against inflation, this absolute prohibition against use of subsidies if the wage line is broken. Thus, their gains would be illusory and their relative purchasing power not increased. This amendment, I feel, gentlemen, will work for stabilization and not against stabilization.

DISLIKE UGLY WORD

There are many here, and I also, personally, who dislike the ugly word "subsidies." I hate the sound of it, but I do not hate it enough to make me deny the use of a weapon that I think is highly important in this terrific fight to prevent destruction of the value of savings, insurance, bonds, and the standard of living of Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to thank the acting Chairman [Mr. BROWN] who has been very courteous and kind to the minority Members on this issue, and it is indeed appreciated.

MAY NOT VETO BILL

One other point I would like to make. I am not accusing anybody of playing politics on this thing, because I do not have any such information. But I do believe, however, that if some Members are going to vote against subsidies on the theory that the President will veto the bill anyway, thus saving them from the backfire of skyrocketing living costs, they are playing with fire.

It might be shrewd politics to please both sides, the millions who are strongly against subsidies, and not incur the terrible complaint of crushing advances in living costs, if you were certain that the President would veto the bill.

I am afraid that those who might consider this will be playing with Roman candles in a powder factory. No one can say for certain that the President will veto the bill so you can have your cake and eat it too.

The situation is not the same as it was when the first bill was vetoed in June. Bear in mind, in June there was only one labor leader then who was willing to sacrifice the stabilization program in his demand for higher wages. That was John L. Lewis.

Today you have dozens of powerful leaders of American labor, insisting and clamoring for increases to break the wage formula because of this Lewis raise. The wage formula has never been under such pressure since it was instituted and now stands in grave danger of collapsing.

WAGE FORMULA ENDANGERED

The President, perplexed, worried, and troubled by the most difficult labor situation this administration or a commander in chief has ever faced, is liable to have to break the line. By Congress breaking the line first on prices, by retreating in the fight we almost force a break in the line on wages. So I would not be so sure, if any of you are relying on this Presidential veto, that that will be the thing that will occur. Congress will be leading with its chin if we pass this bill now, while the wage situation is so critical, we pour gasoline on the fire of inflation. We must be prepared to accept the blame and the Nation will so place it.

Today is the day to strengthen his hand by helping him to hold the line, not only on prices, but on wages as well. We can hold the line by not being afraid of the ugly word "subsidies." We can hold the line by opposing powerful groups that are now seeking to make more money out of this war. We can hold the line by being politically unpopular in the fight against inflation. We can save this Nation from the disastrous spiral that inflation will cause.

This insurance will cost us $750,000,000 for the next 10 months. That is less than 1 percent of our Government's annual expenditure. We are insuring against the spiral of inflation by making this investment and if we can underwrite the risk on tens or hundreds of billions of dollars of potential and impending inflation, it is a mighty good investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], has again expired.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the experience of foreign countries seems to demonstrate that our subsidy program is bound to be much more expansive and expensive than you have been led to believe.

Two years ago I opposed both the Henderson and Baruch plans for price control. Before we voted on those plans in the Banking and Currency Committee, I offered a substitute policy of my own which would be less of a strain on the country. It consisted of having the administration set aside a broad field of luxuries which there would be no attempt to control, some of which in fact, Government would actively encourage to rise in price. Under my plan, government would concentrate on the control of food and other necessities required for the war and for keeping the citizens of the country in good health for the duration, these commodities being permitted to rise in price sufficient to get necessary maximum supply. Since only eight members of the committee voted for my plan, I did not offer it on the floor, not wishing to hurt a good cause by premature presentation but since have privately tried to persuade key officials to adopt it since they already have the legislative power to do so if they choose. Luxuries, by this plan, could help pay for the war since luxuries would then become the escape valve for inflationary money.

I learned only recently that England uses a Spartan policy, described hereinafter, which is much like the policy I devised except that it affords less relief to taxpayers.

This summer, when the Commodity Credit bill was before our committee, the committee voted to strike out the provision similar to the one embodied in the present bill linking prices to parity and substitute instead an amendment I offered embodying one feature of my original plan—to the effect that prices of foods be permitted to rise to the extent necessary to secure adequate production. The committee, however, before bringing the bill to the floor, reversed itself on the question in an informal meeting called for the purpose, though I personally still prefer the previously adopted amendment, since it did not extend price increases to less essential commodities simply because of their relation to parity.

I deeply regret that my whole plan has not been adopted, because it would mean less deficits, less taxes, less pressure to sell bonds, fewer shortages, fewer strikes, and fewer economic troubles stored up for the future, though, to be sure, it would also mean that individuals would not buy so many luxuries and would probably buy more bonds instead. The present price-control policy, which uses Government manpower and money to control the prices of such luxuries as imported wines, seems to me to be utterly unfair to the future generations.

The questions hereinbefore referred to, of course, have no bearing on the subsidy issue except that under my plan you would never find the Government paying subsidies for luxuries, as you are likely to do under the present plan, which is like Canada's. In Canada there was such a vigorous public protest that the Government was forced to give up paying subsidies on grapefruit, leather goods, and a long list of articles the public considered luxuries, which means that Canada will gradually have fewer of the luxuries they could just as well have under the British or my plan. The Canadian Minister has publicly stated that is what it will mean.

This time we had before us Dr. Gilbert, Chief Economist of the O. P. A. Although he vociferously favors consumer subsidies and, under present circumstances, I oppose them, I found that we were able to agree upon the principles involved. We agreed, of course, that the large amount of money now in the hands of consumers is a potential threat of runaway prices. The National City Bank, by the way, in its recent bulletin, points out that the so-called inflationary gap is by no means an accurate measure of that threat. A certain psychology—for instance the feeling that money is to become cheap as spinach—might suddenly cause people to cash in their Government bonds and use a much larger sum of money than the estimated inflationary gap and start buying tangible property sending prices into a panic of increases.

We agreed that, given enough money and police power, O. P. A. can maintain the rigid general price ceiling—though I learned later that even Germany with an indomitable Gestapo has not been able to maintain the rigid price ceiling. Even there prices have risen, it is said.

We further agreed on the important and incontrovertible principle that if rigid ceilings are maintained some relief is going to have to be given because costs, due to war strains, are bound to rise in an increasing number of instances. This principle was well stated by the Canadian Minister of Finance, Hon. J. L. Ilsley in April 1942:

> The necessity for subsidies or their equivalent arises from the fact that the costs of providing goods or services to the Canadian consumer cannot be completely controlled or from the fact that in some cases these costs were actually higher at the time the ceiling was imposed than the level of costs that were then being reflected in the prices charged. * * * Insofar as these costs rise beyond the amount which the industry can absorb with fixed prices, we must either do without those goods, or raise the ceiling on their prices, or else pay subsidies or take some equivalent action to meet these increased costs.

Dr. Gilbert agreed that because such cases multiply, regardless of what you might pay for subsidies next year, the following year the amount of the bill for subsidies would probably be greater. If you adopt the consumer subsidies relief policy you have a debt spiral and if you adopt the price increase technique for giving relief, you get a price spiral.

The chief reason, it seems, that Dr. Gilbert advocates using the subsidy technique is that he honestly fears the reaction of organized labor to any price increases. He feels that if prices of such essentials as milk and meat are permitted to rise to the extent required to

give relief from high costs and get adequate supply, it will be a signal for serious strikes in essential industries.

This very same labor argument which induces Dr. Gilbert to favor subsidies is the one which persuades me that we should vote against subsidies and use the price increase relief technique instead. As I see it, the fact that organized labor is capable of exerting such tremendous pressure against increased prices means that if the administration adopts the price instead of the subsidy technique, O. P. A. will be careful to raise prices only sparingly. The administration has always used a cheap food policy even before the war, never encouraging prices to go beyond parity until the war started. With a vigilant labor group pressuring constantly against increased prices, the O. P. A., you may rest assured, would not permit much of a price increase. Even now when they would get a more nearly adequate supply if in a few cases they raised price ceilings slightly, they seem to prefer shortages.

Today, for instance, on the agricultural front, only a few price increases seem to be needed—beef 3 cents, corn around 20 cents, and milk, a cent or two in some areas. In the report of the Gaumnitz Food Advisory Committee, appointed by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard this year, which, for some reason, was suppressed, only the summary on the first page being given to the public, I find that they estimate that an additional 7,000,000 bushels of corn might be made available.

Living on a commercial grain producing farm, I am convinced from personal observation that such a price increase would substantially increase the amount of corn production. I am equally convinced, however, by the Government officials themselves that they will not grant any such increase, preferring apparently to let the country try to survive the so unnecessary shortage though the rather drastic food report of the Gaumnitz Food Advisory Committee says:

> The United Nations have not even been holding their own: Food stocks have declined steadily to the point where there is no more than a small operating reserve in any commodities except sugar and wheat—and wheat reserves will probably be depleted in the next 2 or 3 years at the present consumption rate.

Therefore, I believe that if the price-increase technique for giving relief were voted there would not be much of a price spiral. I believe, on the other hand, that if the administration is given unrestrained power to use the subsidy technique, the debt spiral will be large indeed. Organized labor never has exerted political pressure against Government spending and no other group has exercised effective pressure against it. The administration has always spent lavishly and even wantonly. Dr. Gilbert himself is coauthor of the so-called New Deal bible, entitled "An Economic Program for American Democracy," which advocates unlimited spending. Dr. Gilbert, who has been called the master mind of O. P. A., has such a flexible mind that I feel sure he does not advocate unlimited spending now. Indeed, he said he wanted to spend not more than $1,000,000,000 next year for subsidies. You and I know, however, that with power given them to spend as they please, those higher than Dr. Gilbert would not harken either to him or anybody else who advocated reasonable limits on the subsidy spending.

The way the subsidy program is likely to expand, even if we had the less expensive kind of program England has, may be observed if you study the English program. In England the conditions are almost ideal for using the subsidy technique in a restrained manner. England is small. No citizen there lives far from the capital as our citizens do, therefore, mistakes can be noticed and corrected quickly. Much of the food supply is imported, easily controlled by government from the time it reaches the ports of entry. England receives cheese and several other foods under lend-lease. No subsidy from the British Government in such cases need be used. There is in England, moreover, a traditional civic resistance against Government extravagance. Since, for the duration of the war, there are to be no elections there is no temptation to grant lavish subsidies as a means of winning elections. Since England does not control the prices of luxuries, there is this broad field where there is no reason to grant subsidies. The British Government even stopped giving subsidies on bacon—ham—leaving it to reach the natural price.

England, please note, has no formal "hold the line" order, no rigid general price ceiling, and no artificial wage dam like the Little Steel formula which looks so noninflationary on paper but which, quite obviously, permits inflationary wage increases in numerous cases where unnecessary and refuses wage increases in industries where higher wages would increase needed supply and often might reasonably be absorbed by the industry concerned instead of by consumers.

Price control and other forms of regimentation which eliminate economic freedom are, of course, most easily administered in countries where the people are living in a state of fear as in Russia or Germany. Repeated bombings give British citizens, presumably, something of that state of fear which enables officials to control prices effectively and refuse unnecessary subsidy requests.

Operating on the theory that the rich can afford to pay their own living expenses but taking care that the poor do not suffer for lack of money to pay for essential goods, England stopped trying to control the price of milk. The price of milk, it should be noted, however, did not rise very high when price ceilings were released. Instead of using a subsidy which would help pay the milk bill of every citizen as our Price Administration wants to do, England has subsidized only milk for children under 5 and for nursing and expectant mothers, issuing these groups coupons permitting them to buy specified amounts. Children at school get one-third pint of milk a day. In all 3,000,000 persons have been benefited. England, by the way, also has canteens supplying food for defense workers.

Britain has used the kind of policy which I have always advocated, letting luxuries rise in price so that those who buy luxuries help pay for the war. She has readily permitted wage and price increases where deemed advisable. She has concentrated her efforts on getting an adequate supply of nutrients, giving Government aid only to those who need it. In England, as in Germany, some subsidies are not paid with Government money but are paid out of a pool made up by levying a charge against those who buy low-cost materials for the benefit of those who have to buy high-cost marginal materials. England, like Canada, has used some ingenuity, removing tariff duties so as to eliminate the need of price increases, instead of actively causing inflationary cost increases as our Government does, an example being the way our administration imposes a 3-percent transportation tax on all commodities—4 cents in the case of coal.

Since the British use a policy which is more sensible than that used by ouf administration, they have much less need or temptation to expand subsidies under their plan than our Government. Even under these almost ideal laboratory conditions, however, their subsidy system has grown in a manner which should completely disillusion us of the hope that in America the use of subsidies will not spread. In England the subsidy system has expanded to this extent:

First. At present 90 percent by weight, of the foods in the cost-of-living index are subsidized.

Second. Subsidies have been extended not only to farmers but also to middlemen, factories and retailers. There is even a subsidy for fish which enables citizens who live in middle England to get fish as cheaply as the next-door neighhors to the fishermen.

Third. Wages are subsidized—the largest wage subsidies going for agricultural and mining wages. They pay, for instance, $80 per acre for flower gardens turned to vegetable gardens. Cost of "plow-up" subsidies not included in cost figures given below.

Fourth. They have found it necessary to have renegotiation of subsidy contracts—essential, they feel, to prevent rank injustice to British taxpayers. Recalling the amount of protest against renegotiation of contracts here in America when relatively few contracts were affected, you know ahead of time what pressure there will be against economizing by means of renegotiation.

Fifth. In England, where officials never loot their own taxpayers—the cost of subsidies for that relatively small country has been enormous: $232,000,000 in 1940, $320,000,000 in 1941, $510,000,000 in 1942, and $600,000,000 in 1943.

Now, after comparing the two countries and their policies, how much chance do you think there is of holding down subsidies in America to any $1,000,000,000 a year for next year? $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 more likely. Frankly, I am afraid to trust this administration with a subsidy relief policy. I would

not, on the other hand, trust a Coolidge or Hoover administration with a price-increase relief policy. Only the President can alter personnel. Where, as here, it is consistent with good principles, Congress can and should fix the policies to fit the personnel.

At the time our committee first held hearings on price control I requested an historical survey and was jovially laughed off with the remark that Hammurabi started it. We need a historical survey. In his book showing the way the political experiences of today duplicate those in old Rome, Helperin gives you a glimpse of how human nature works under a consumer subsidy. It seems that Gaius Gracchus won popularity by subsidizing the price of wheat. A classic joke of the period referred to the way rich people stood in a queue getting their share of the cheap wheat the same as the poor people. Subsidized wheat, though occasionally withdrawn by economy-minded officials, became so popular that political candidates promising cheaper and cheaper wheat tried to outbid one another in order to try to win elections. Soon the government was giving free wheat. Finally subsidized wheat became hereditary and permanent.

Today, to be sure, taxes hurt more people and bond sales are deducted from pay rolls. In some areas, chiefly the rural ones, citizens, grown tired of taxes and Government bond salesmen who threaten to paint their barns yellow and threaten to reveal the amounts of bonds purchased, are mutely irate against Government extravagance. It may be some time before the feeling against Government spending becomes general and even longer before Washington officials realize that the feeling is general since nowadays people prefer to muffle their objections.

Probably the Government will not waste on this program anything like the amount it wastes in foreign countries, but the subsidy waste will be here in America where American citizens can find out about it, with their own eyes and ears and, as soon as they have the opportunity, reveal their sentiments behind the curtains of the polling booths.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all grateful for the erudite and informed discourse of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], who preceded me. I am sure also she will not mind if I do not agree with her conclusions. I do feel that from her illuminating study of the British situation you can draw this conclusion; which is, whenever the Government steps in and tries to regulate the national economy, there are bound to be a multitude of headaches. They have their own headaches in England; their own comparative successes and their own failures in part. That is the way we should approach the program that we have here.

We have achieved relative success in our stabilization program in that our prices have not spiraled nearly as fast as they did in the last war. We have partially failed to achieve success insofar as certain individual food programs have not worked out as well as we would like to have had them work out. I do not think we can avoid this imperfection. It is just one of the headaches that are incident, as my colleague from Oklahoma has said, to this $250,000,000,000 war. We are in the middle of an all-out war and what we have to try to do is to honestly see the best way out of it.

I agree with some of the reasoning the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have given. They have spent a great deal of time on this problem. Where we leave each other—and I think this is the fundamental issue between those who believe that subsidies should be continued with limitations and those who believe they should be entirely abolished—is that we who are convinced it would be dangerous to discontinue subsidies at the present time, do not think that the rise in living cost can be stemmed immediately if the preliminary breach is made. Regardless of justification or regardless of all our hope to the contrary, wages will go up, as well as all prices. Not merely the price of those commodities which are now being subsidized will go up, but because of the tremendous pressure by industry, farm, and labor, that once the line is broken, once this Maginot line is broken, or the Dnieper line, or whatever line you may wish to call it is broken, we may not find another secure place at which we may be able to hold it.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. This law does not authorize or direct the payment of a subsidy, does it?

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say in answer to my distinguished friend that it does forbid the use of the funds of this Corporation or of any other Government corporation for the payment of subsidies, with the exception of certain subsidies which are still permitted to continue.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. But they are not in controversy.

Mr. WRIGHT. They are not in controversy.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Then I ask if there is any law that anybody claims goes any further than to authorize the President, through the agencies of our Government, when he thinks it strategically necessary, to use these subsidies; there is no directive law or imperative law requiring anybody to pay them, is there?

Mr. WRIGHT. Oh, no; and there is a difference of opinion as to whether the present law even permits the use of them. I personally feel that a fair legal interpretation of the existing law permits subsidies, but there are some arguments that can be put up on the other side. We had that dispute in the committee.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I surmise that many people may be like me. I am perfectly willing to authorize the payments of subsidies and the use of subsidies when it is strategically necessary, but I am not willing to vote to directly appropriate one, of my own knowledge, on the subject involved.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not think any one of us wants to do that at the present time. I believe the President has now, under the laws we have passed, the primary responsibility of stabilizing our economy. You gentlemen who feel that if we do forbid subsidies we shall be able to hold some line which will be a brake against inflation, I believe, will have to admit that by adopting this bill as it is now written we ourselves assume the responsibility that this line can be held at some other point. The best advice that I can get is that the use of subsidies at the present time is necessary in order to keep our economy stabilized. There is a possibility that those who are opposed to subsidies are right and I am wrong. I never am so conceited about my own reasoning processes as to preclude the possibility that those who disagree with me may be right. But I frankly am not willing to take the chance—I am not willing to take the chance of plunging this country into an inflationary spiral which I am afraid will result if we adopt this bill as it is now written.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Does it not seem inconsistent to the gentleman that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee who are opposed to subsidies now have supported a provision of the Commodity Credit bill to continue subsidies 2 years after the war to guarantee farmers 90-percent-parity loans?

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say in response to the gentleman's inquiry that there may be an inconsistency there. I would not want to explore this thought except to say I am in favor of stabilizing postwar conditions for the farmers, and I want them to extend the same concern to those who are not farmers. There are more than 30,000,000 people who still are not as well able to meet the cost of living from day to day as they were 4 years ago, and to take this weapon of subsidies out of the hands of the President is after all to take away the only means whereby those who need this help very badly may obtain it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Can the gentleman explain how this program could be held to $800,000,000? Is that the increase in the total cost of living or the cost of food?

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean would that result if subsidies were withdrawn?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No; if we were to allow subsidies and spend $800,000,000; or, to put it the other way around, if we withdraw that right to spend $800,000,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think I understand the gentleman's question. The best figures I have been able to obtain show that a prohibition against subsidies would

cause an increase of something over 7 percent in the food index or a little over 3 percent in the cost-of-living index.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am at a loss to see how $800,000,000 could account for 3 percent of the cost of living.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not an expert at figures. I see my statistician, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] here. I shall be pleased to yield to him to answer the question. I may say to him that the gentleman from Connecticut has asked me how the expenditure of $800,000,000 could result in a saving of 3 percent in the cost-of-living index. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer if he cares to.

Mr. MONRONEY. You get one-half of 1 percent decrease in the cost-of-living index for the investment of a limited amount in your butter subsidy, for example, which at the present time is running at $82,000,000. That expenditure decreases your cost-of-living index by one-half of 1 percent. Your cost-of-living index is based on in some cases what we in merchandising call loss leaders—those are the meat, butter, bacon, and beans items that are highly rated in everybody's individual diet. By working on those specific things which are absolutely essential you do get a terrific influence on your cost-of-living index.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does the gentleman know that the butter and meat subsidies now account for 3 percent?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. I will be glad to give a list to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would say on the butter proposition that the saving is more than the subsidy because a lot of people cannot buy butter, so they save the entire purchase price of butter.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is assuming that the subsidy program constitutes a handicap to agriculture, and although we had witnesses before the committee who said that, when they were asked to develop the thought, I was not able to get any convincing answer as to why subsidies would interfere with production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that the subsidy plus other restrictions put on by different agencies have resulted in a decrease in the production of butter and a scarcity of it in the market.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman may be correct. I know he has a good bit of experience in those things which I do not pretend to have. Somebody did say something that appealed to me, and that is it does not make any difference to the cow who pays for the milk. In other words, the question is merely who is going to pay for the product, whether the Government is going to pay a portion of it or the consumer is going to be asked to pay the entire amount. Subsidies have nothing to do with production. They enter only into the payment for goods which are produced.

I have one more thought I would like to develop before I conclude. I do not believe you can hold the price increase to those goods on which subsidies are now paid. Once the line is broken I am certain a general increase in food prices will result. More than that, at the present time you have your wages and your food prices geared together. I do not think any person who has any sense of realism can say today that if we have an increase in living costs which will bring the cost of living up 10 percent above the 15 percent contemplated by the Little Steel formula you are not going to have irresistible demands for increased wages. Furthermore, if you do not grant these increases in wages, you are going to impair the production of necessary war material.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I may say to the gentleman in reference to the production of butter that the most important thing is whether or not we get production. If the farmer will not milk the cow, we are not going to get the butter, and the farmers seem to be pretty generally against the program.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think there is a good bit of sentiment by the farmers against the program, but I do not think it necessarily goes to the question of production. I feel that the farmer does not want to see the people who are living in the cities get what they consider an unfair benefit and I am trying to point out that I do not consider it an unfair benefit.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the hearings a great number of leading dairy representatives were questioned on this point, and it all came down to the proposition that they were psychologically against it, they did not like the idea of paying subsidies, but in no case could they say where subsidies decreased or detracted from our milk production to make up for a price rise in the market.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that is right.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Did I understand someone to say that the farmers are on a strike?

Mr. BUFFETT. I would like to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to proceed. As I say, the primary responsibility now is on the President. If we pass this bill we assume the responsibility of saying that in doing so we will not precipitate inflation. Maybe it will not, but that is a chance that we are taking, and from the advice that I have obtained from people who I am sure know more about it than I do, I do not want to vote for this bill as it is now written and take that chance. I do not want to be responsible for the War bonds that are being bought by our people being paid for in depreciated dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, in my first participation in general debate in this Congress I would not want to make a partisan speech. There is every reason why this debate should not be partisan.

I shall discuss only one phase of the pending bill: The effect of section 3, prohibiting subsidies, upon farm income and farm interests, and I wish to emphasize the long-range view rather than the consideration of immediate advantages in supporting some amendments to this measure.

We have proceeded a little more intelligently in the debate today as we have shaken off some of the enslavement of words. I am aware that the feeling against the word "subsidies" is strong, but I hope that those who supported the committee report will give us of the committee minority credit for being entirely honest and fair and seeking to add a degree of clarity to this debate by accepting the handicap that we have in defending food subsidies.

You may even use the words "consumer subsidies" if you like. Uncle Sam, himself, is a tremendous consumer, buying almost $5,000,000,000 worth of food every year. If you object to subsidizing a consumer on the market, you have the other alternative of subsidizing with Uncle Sam's money the profits that are made by certain distributors and processors who are going to ride upon the inflation wave that you are setting in force. One of the clearest demonstrations of the fact this has not been weighed carefully by the committee is the windfall profits that are here for some of the sugar producers, a windfall profit that they are not entitled to. It is a subsidy pure and simple, and is but one illustration of the fact that we are going to authorize some unnecessary price rises if we do not change this bill.

I wish to make these points in support of my opposition to the sweeping ban on subsidies: First, section 3 limits the power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to fix support prices without reference to price ceilings by abandoning farm production as the moving consideration in the price-support policy and tying the program to consumer price ceilings. Second, it will work against the farmer by causing an immediate and conceivably a very damaging increase in the price of everything he buys. Third, it will further encourage an inflation in land prices which is already threatening to parallel the disastrous experience of 1920–21.

Now let us examine the section dealing with the relation of support and ceiling prices. The nature of the bill is very clear. It does provide that ceiling prices shall not be below the support prices but there are certain administrative implications that must be very clear. We have no right to assume that the administrators will act arbitrarily. The Price Administrator must operate under the mandate of the stabilization laws. We have

said to him, "Hold the line," and surely other agencies of the Government would recognize that the primary responsibility in that program is his. Undoubtedly, the time will come when it will be desirable in the case of certain commodities to provide an increase in the support price. Under present arrangements, the mechanics of the price support program are responsive to the Food Administrator's orders in that respect. Potential losses to the Government in ordering mandatory loans will not deter him, and at the same time there is no abridgement of the authority of the Price Administrator. If, however, section 3 stands as reported and becomes law and in the future there should arise a need for increasing mandatory loans, then the War Food Administrator will either set the price up regardless of its effect upon the price program, and thus aggravate the problem on the price front, or he will make concessions at the farmers' expense that ought not to be made. We are creating very painful dilemmas for the War Food Administration.

If this Congress intends to divide responsibility in the price program to that extent, we might meet demands for the same authority from the Petroleum Administrator, from the War Labor Board, and from other agencies that must wrestle with problems arising from the price-control program. If we expect arbitrary action by the War Food Administrator we are saying to Mr. Bowles, "Hold the line, but expect a bulge when food is involved." I say that we cannot expect him to hold the line if we permit the bulges.

We are not going to say to the leader on the Italian front, Gen. Mark Clark, that he shall have control except so far as the left flank is concerned, but that he cannot be sure his orders there will be respected. We have to fix authority and we have to stand our ground on the inflation front.

The second objection from the standpoint of the farmers is that if you remove all subsidies you will impose an immediate penalty on the farmer in the rise in cost of the food he buys. Do you realize that the farmers of America buy on the food markets $2,500,000,000 worth of food each year? If you have a 7 percent increase in that—and I believe it figures out at $175,000,000—that is a penalty on him, with no commensurate advantages for him. We must weigh that effect.

Finally, and this is tremendously vital, and so little has been said about it that I shall devote the rest of my time to it, you are going to find abnormal increases in food prices immediately reflected in the land values of this country. The farmers of America have not forgotten the disaster that came to them 20 years ago. Do not fail to note the fact that it is threatening to happen again. The Secretary of Agriculture spoke yesterday of his personal observation of a farm of which the owner said, "This farm is worth $125 because I have tended it and cared for it, and it produces to that amount." But next door to that farm, just last week a sale was made at what rate? Not $125, but $225 an acre. You gentlemen as practical men who know the farmer's language and his problems know that that was inflationary, that it represents a speculative profit for somebody and that nobody but the farmer suffers when it happens.

We have not forgotten in the South, where three-fourths of all the land transactions in some States in the course of 20 years have resulted in foreclosures and loss of the land to the farmer, that that brings ruin in its wake. So I plead with you to think about the effect of the abnormal increases in land prices which will follow a break in commodity prices.

Farm real estate values so far in this war are increasing at approximately the same rate as during the last war. Furthermore, this increase in real estate values is closely associated with the increase in prices of farm commodities.

The following table in an official release of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows comparative figures on the rises in both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

[1910–14 base=100]

Year	Prices received by farmers	Real estate values
1914	98	103
1915	103	103
1916	146	108
1917	192	117
1918	206	129
1919	228	140
1920	157	170
1939	93	84
1940	98	84
1941	122	85
1942	149	91
Mar. 1, 1943	182	99
Nov. 1, 1943	193	107

It will be noted that although the real-estate values have not advanced to the same height as they did during the last war, the proportionate rise from 1939 to November 1943 was 27 percent compared to the proportionate rise from 1914 to 1918 of 25 percent. Further study of the indexes of prices and land values show, over almost all periods studied, a very close correspondence between the two.

Also associated with the increased prices and the bidding up of land values in both wars was a large increase in the voluntary transfers of ownership between farmers. The number of such transfers was 35 percent greater in 1919 than in 1918 and 75 percent greater than in 1914. The volume of sales during the second quarter of 1943 was 75 percent above the second quarter of 1942. There are indications, therefore, that much of the increased land values are due to speculative purchases and sales rather than to a careful appraisal of future income. Further indications that a considerable portion of the rise in land values is speculative are found in the fact that much of the buying of farm land is being done by city people instead of bona fide farm operators.

So far in this war increased values have not been accompanied by increases in mortgaged indebtedness. But if the increases continue to the peak indicated by the present rise, we may expect a repetition sooner or later of what occurred during the latter part of the last war when farm-mortgage debt had increased by 72 percent from 1914 to 1920, leaving the farmer with a tremendous indebtedness to pay off at the moment when farm incomes began to tumble rapidly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman believe that if those costs rise a little bit a lot of those farmers whom the gentleman is pitying so would get to raising their own food on their own land. They do it in Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAYS. Please let me go on with the land-inflation matter. I am talking about the long-range view, not immediate prospects. But it is a snare and a delusion to think the farmer will gain by a price break. Look at the record.

I have made the point that, in the last war, prices rose rapidly, but when prices were high to the farmer land values were just a little behind them. Two years after farm prices collapsed land values were still high. Prices topple first, and then foreclosures come.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. May I suggest to the gentleman that the value of the land does not change, it is the value of the currency with which he buys that land that is depreciated.

Mr. HAYS. Exactly.

Mr. BUFFETT. That currency depreciates just in proportion as the national debt goes up and the deficit increases.

Mr. HAYS. That is the reason we do not want to give him a devalued dollar. We want him to have a good dollar for the price he is getting for his product.

Let me stick to this inflation in land values that has taken place. That is important, the gentleman will agree.

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes, but the thing that makes the price of land go up is the depreciation in the money that is brought about every time you add to the debt or add to the unbalance of national finances.

Mr. HAYS. Does the gentleman think he can add to farm prices without finding that reflected in land values?

Mr. BUFFETT. Prices go up as the money depreciates. It is debasement of the money that is causing our trouble. Every large-scale inflation in history has arisen out of the debasement of currency, and the debasement of currency comes about through deficit financing. We are adding to that every day.

Mr. HAYS. There is not time here to discuss the causes of depreciation. I am sure the gentleman does not think I can take on that question now.

Mr. BUFFETT. Let me make this point, that the very subsidy itself adds to that depreciation.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. If the administrative officer working out this whole thing for the protection of the people has the power to raise prices and also the power to use a subsidy, we are not

justified, are we, in presuming that he will use the subsidy all the time? He will use whichever in his judgment will best promote the welfare of the people, if he is an honest man.

Mr. HAYS. Thank you. And do not we have to leave some discretion with our administrators?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. That is the point exactly. If we are fighting a lion and a tiger let us use a shogtun and a sword both, if we need to.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. As I understand the gentleman he assumes there is going to be a tremendous increase in farm prices if we do not provide subsidies?

Mr. HAYS. I had two assumptions. One is the assumption of those who are fighting subsidies that there is going to be no increase. That is one assumption. One group have advanced the idea that there will be no increase in prices, that it will be merely a replacement in the market price of the subsidy increment. In that case I have shown that the farmer will be penalized in the cost of the food he buys to the extent of $175,000,000.

Mr. POAGE. I was referring to the first part of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. HAYS. The other alternative is, and this, I think, is the real one, may I say to the gentleman, they do expect a price rise. I am saying when those prices start to rise there is no possible hope of anchoring them to the real and permanent value of land.

Mr. POAGE. And the gentleman's contention that land is going up is based on the assumption that farm prices are going to rise?

Mr. HAYS. If we do not use every device we have those prices will be abnormally high and the farmers will lose their farms again.

Mr. KEAN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

CONSUMERS' SUBSIDIES

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, the issue in the current debate is a fundamental one. It is grounded in the philosophies to which men adhere. On the one side stands the idealist who has unbounded faith in his ability to change human nature. He believes in centralization of Government and minute regulation of men's everyday lives. That government is best which governs most, says he. His bottom principle is economic control.

On the other side stands the realist. He knows our world is imperfect because human nature is imperfect. He agrees with Shakespeare that it is not in our stars but in ourselves that troubles lie. To him freedom is paramount. That government is best which governs least, says he. His bottom principle is economic freedom.

This explains why economists take opposite sides on issues. Their basic philosophies are opposites. The cat is made to jump one way or the other, according as the philosopher's cane prods him.

Basically, therefore, the two forces which meet in the current debate on consumers' subsidies are: economic control versus economic freedom. That the New Deal fraternity insist on paying consumers' subsidies is not surprising. Indeed it would be most surprising if they did not, for the paying of consumers' subsidies fits beautifully into the New Deal concept of economics and politics.

It is my contention that the so-called New Deal is the oldest deal in history. The only thing new about it is its location. As New Deal economists state in their book, An Economic Program for a Democracy, one era in our history ended on March 4, 1933, and another era began. Since then freedom has been curtailed and regulation expanded. Even the concept of freedom, which has been thought of as indivisible for more than 150 years in our country, is now divided into four parts, and freedom of enterprise is not one of them.

The cynic says the only lesson history teaches is that men do not learn lessons from history. In spite of that, I propose to take a broad look at the past, keeping in mind the two opposing principles which have sought recognition—economic control versus economic freedom:

First. The ancient peoples of the Orient did not enjoy economic freedom. The moral codes prescribed by priestly lawgivers embraced minute regulation of men's everyday lives. From the cradle to the grave their conduct was subject to government by men, or by a single individual.

Second. The guardians, or philosophers, of Greece were the brain trust of Hellenic days and the head of the Roman household was the only one in it who had full rights as a person. Economic control was in the saddle in the ancient Occident as well as Orient.

Third. Life in the Middle Ages was controlled by custom and the accepted practices of the feudal and manorial systems. For a thousand years after the fall of Rome, economic control still held sway.

Fourth. From 1500 to 1800 mercantilism in England, with its counterparts, Colbertism in France and cameralism in Germany, maintained rigorous control of men's affairs. This was the period of state building, and the means employed in the building were economic forces controlled by kings and their henchmen. It was to escape the tyranny of one of these kings that the Pilgrims set sail for a new and unknown world which we proudly acclaim as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The clock struck a significant hour in 1776. Adam Smith came upon the scene to preach economic freedom at a time when government regulations had become so top-heavy that the structure was about to topple of its own weight. Thomas Jefferson came upon the scene simultaneously to preach the doctrine that men are endowed with certain inalienable rights with special emphasis on life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Custom and status gave way to freedom in both economics and politics. The individual who had cried out for self-expression down through the corridors of time came into his own. Up to that hour he had been something less than a man.

Having taken these giant strides through the pages of history, what do we find? Principally, that economic control and not economic freedom has been the prevailing principle in human history. Freedom, then, is a relatively new thing in human experience. And it was no doubt that bleak and somber fact which made the poet-philosopher remark, "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn," for if the aspirations of mankind were graded in importance, certainly freedom would stand on the topmost rung of the ladder.

What does this survey have to do with the issue before us, you ask? I repeat, the proposal to pay consumers' subsidies is strictly in line with the thinking of him who believes in economic control. He argues that such payments must be made to stop inflation. But that argument is merely surface appeal. Whether he knows it or not, the basic reason is his New Deal approach to economics and politics. He believes in government by men; not government by law.

I contend that the payment of consumers' subsidies leads to inflation. Why? Because the money in people's pockets available for spending is increased by the amount of the subsidies paid. The Treasury says there are forty-five billion "dangerous dollars" dodging around doing damage. The proposal to pay consumers' subsidies would add to that amount. Since inflation is already here and has been with us for quite some time, the proposal made is like fanning the flames of the fire.

As I stated when hearings were held on this bill, Uncle Sam does not have a dollar. He must, therefore, borrow the money with which to carry on. If in addition to his colossal outlay for war purposes, he must also find money for paying citizens' household expenses, he must borrow more than he is borrowing now. And it costs money to borrow money:

First. It costs money to issue and sell bonds.

Second. It costs money to pay interest on bonds.

Third. It costs money to refund bonds not paid at maturity.

Fourth. It costs money to raise taxes to pay interest and principal.

Fifth. It costs money to administer subsidies.

Most of the bonds already issued have been bought, and most of those yet to be issued in all probability will be bought, by banks. Banks manufacture credit. In our banking system as a whole, a hundred-dollar bond in a bank becomes the basis for several hundred dollars in means of payment. Means of payment, called checks, have the same effect on prices as the currency in men's pockets. In addition to these means of payment arising out of bonds and bank deposits, our currency is being increased at the rate of about $5,000,000,000 per year, or about $100,000,000 per week. The backing for this currency is also Government bonds. Does anyone believe that inflation can be stopped by such procedure? If he does, let him examine what happened to the Austrian crown, the Russian ruble, the French franc, and the German

mark during and after World War No. 1. It was the inflation of Germany that made Hitler.

When I confronted the chief O. P. A. economist with this argument, he agreed that I was right but countered with the statement that the choice is not between good and evil but between two evils. The admission was, therefore, made that the payment of subsidies to consumers is an evil.

Finally, let me say that, once started, consumers' subsidies are not easily shaken off. Like some other institutions which have come into being during the past decade, they harbor within themselves a spark of life which seeks not only survival but expansion as well. Allow them to be paid now and who shall stay their course?

Fundamentally, the issue rests on the philosophies of men, and as once so well spoken, " 'Tis with our judgments as with our watches; none go just alike, yet each believes his own."

In my opinion, those who vote for the current bill will register their approval of economic freedom. Those who vote against the current bill will register their approval of economic control. The former is in line with traditional Americanism; the latter with traditional Old World-ism, going back as far as recorded history.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TALLE. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. By "economic freedom" and "free enterprise"—you use the phrase "economic freedom"—you mean freedom from what? Does the gentleman mean freedom from the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States—freedom from reasonable control by the Government?

Mr. TALLE. I know the very able and amiable gentleman from North Carolina knows that I do not subscribe to that definition of economic freedom.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I did not think so.

Mr. TALLE. I assure him he and I will sit down together and smoke some excellent North Carolina tobacco and talk this question over.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. You are just opposed to the fellows doing it rather than to the law which controls the unbridled will of men.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished member of the committee for the scholarly presentation he has made, with which I agree. Secondly, I should like to ask him a question with reference to the matter of increased prices of farm lands in the Central West. I think the gentleman will remember when Secretary Wickard came before the Banking and Currency Committee in support of the first price-control bill I interrogated him with respect to what he thought would happen as to the prices of farm lands, when we drove investors out of other fields, and he answered to the effect that he had not surveyed that. Now we find the prices of farm lands going up. We find the man who works in the city on the war industries' pay roll, sharing in the flow of billions of war dollars, going out and buying these lands and paying cash for them at the advanced prices. I want to ask the gentleman if that is not a natural consequence of what has gone before?

Mr. TALLE. That is true; a wholly natural consequence.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield that time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say that in my opinion the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] has given us the most scholarly analysis of the two conflicting economic philosophies that come to a head in this subsidy bill that this House has heard. It was a treat to hear such a scholarly analysis.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, food is fast becoming the world's greatest problem. We have heard a lot of fine-sounding speeches about America being the larder for the democracies and a lot of irresponsible promises have been made that we stood ready to feed the world. For more than 25 years prior to the present war United States food production did not keep pace with the population. For the 4-year period between 1935 and 1938—just prior to the present war—the per capita production of all food was 8 percent lower than during the corresponding period just prior to World War No. 1. In no single year during the thirties did the per capita production get up to the 1926–30 level. The public was told that we had enormous food surpluses, but the real trouble was the inability of the consumers to buy rather than overproduction. Today the situation is reversed. The citizens of our Nation are receiving their highest national income. Price is not the problem. The supply of food is the No. 1 problem. Food, in terms of consumer incomes and pre-war consumption habits, is cheaper today than any time in the last 30 years. If consumers purchased the same quantities of food today as they did during 1935–39, only 16 percent of their income would be required for food expenditures, compared with 20 percent in 1939, 25 percent in 1933, and 33 percent in 1919. Actually, higher incomes have resulted in many consumers buying more and better food, eating more meals at restaurants, and the like, than in pre-war years; consequently, consumers are now spending around 20 percent of their income for food.

The data following are based upon the assumption that consumers had not changed their buying habits and were purchasing the same quantities of food as they did during the pre-war period of 1935–39:

Percent of total consumer income required to purchase the same quantity of food as consumed in the pre-war period of 1935–39

Year and percent cost of fixed quantities of food is of total income:

1913	28
1914	30
1915	26
1916	24
1917	31
1918	31
1919	33
1920	32
1921	28
1922	26
1923	24
1924	23
1925	24
1926	24
1927	23
1928	23
1929	22
1930	23
1931	22
1932	24
1933	25
1934	25
1935	25
1936	22
1937	21
1938	21
1939	20
1940	18
1941	17
1942	17
1943 [1]	16

[1] Data for July 1943.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Marketing and Transportation Situation, August 1943, p. 12; May-June 1943, p. 3.

The present chaotic food situation is the result of bungling on the part of the O. P. A. and other administrative agencies dealing with price control as the principal means of controlling inflation. The greatly increased income paid to individuals in defense industries has brought about a change of diet. In 1942 the civilians ate substantially less than in 1935–39 of the cheaper foods, such as potatoes, sweetpotatoes, and dry beans, and considerably more of the higher priced foods, such as meat, poultry, eggs, milk, and cream. This increase in wages had brought a drastic pressure on the limited agricultural output of these items. The efforts to prevent inflation by the use of rigid price controls on many scarce foods has tended to increase their consumption and to induce evasion or black markets. Everyone must agree that inflation is caused by excess purchasing power with regard to the available goods and services. While there is no cure-all for inflation, the most effective way to reduce excess purchasing power is to increase the supply of goods and services available. This can be done effectively by increasing the supply of food through maximum production and by reducing the spending power through a vigorous tax and spending program. The present policy of the O. P. A. with its regulations is curtailing the supply and therefore increasing the inflationary gap.

If Congress approves consumers' subsidies as prohibited in this bill it will further expand the inflationary gap by permitting the consumer to have additional

money to spend for food commodities. It makes additional pressure on the inflationary gap instead of removing it. Inflation is here and is going to continue to mount and you will never stop it by roll-back in farm prices, which is to be made up by subsidies. A 10-percent roll-back in the price of farm products would not affect the living costs to the extent of 2 percent. The costs of administration, the interest on the money borrowed, the many items that will be reflected in the cost of paying this subsidy will be many times the benefit reflected to the consumer in his living costs. Think of the vast army of men and women that will be required to administrate and enforce over-all roll-back and subsidy-payment programs. At a time when we must conserve manpower certainly we should not adopt a program of this type. A subsidy paid with borrowed money is like taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another, having a good share of it dribble away while in the process of being transferred. The subsidy program will not stop inflation, but if subsidies are voted as a means of lowering living costs when our family income for the American citizen is greater than in its history we will bring on not only the wildest kind of inflation but the disaster of food scarcity.

The food-subsidy program as now being applied by the Government amounts to about 11 cents per day for a family of four persons, or 2¾ cents per day per individual. Butter subsidies of 5 cents a pound amount to about 65 cents per year per person. A bread subsidy of 1 cent per loaf would amount to less than $1 per year per person. The present consumer-subsidy program amounts to around $10 per year per person.

Estimated effect of subsidies upon the daily food costs for a family of 4 persons

Product	Amount of subsidy per unit [1]	Estimated annual civilian consumption per capita for 1943 [2]	Effect on daily food cost for a family of 4 [3]
			Cents per day
Butter	5 cents per pound.	13.0 pounds.	0.71
Cheese	4 cents per pound.	4.9 pounds	22
Milk	1 cent per quart.	180.5 quarts.	1.98
Meat	3 cents per pound.	124.0 pounds.	4.08
Bread	1 cent per loaf.	92.5 loaves	1.01
Sugar	1 cent per pound.	75.0 pounds.	.82
Vegetables	3.5 cents per No. 2 can.	19.2 No. 2 cans.	.74
Potatoes	1 cent per pound.	131.0 pounds.	1.44
Amount per day for a family of 4.			11.00
Amount per day per individual.			2.75

[1] Based upon or calculated from information released by the Office of Economic Stabilization.
[2] Based upon data published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[3] Calculated by multiplying the amount of the subsidy by the annual per capita consumption, then multiplying by 4 and dividing by 365.

I want to dicuss briefly the flour subsidy program which is about to be placed into effect. The price of bread today is lower than the average price for the past 30 years. Generally speaking, there has been no increase in the price of bread for 20 years. Yet, the O. P. A. placed a flour ceiling price of 85 percent of wheat parity and the millers must have either this subsidy or an increase in the price ceiling. The officials in charge of this program would rather pay a $100,000,000 subsidy than allow the price of bread to go up 1 cent a loaf. The saving for individuals would be less than $1 per person per year. The farmers do not want the flour subsidy, the millers are opposed to it, and I believe I am safe in saying that Congress is opposed to it, yet we are threatened with immediate approval of the flour subsidy. Personally, I believe the O. P. A. violated not only the original Price Control Act but the intent of Congress when they set the price ceilings on flour at 85 percent of parity.

The farmers of our Nation have been accused of being greedy and profiteering. What are the facts? Despite these unfair statements and criticism the farmer has done his best and will continue to do so in spite of unfair criticism and innumerable handicaps. They have been harassed with regulations, regimentation, restrictions and red tape. They have operated at full capacity with practically no new machinery and a greatly reduced labor force. The farmers' wives and daughters have had to take the place of hired help on practically every farm in the Nation. They have worked not 40 hours a week, but 80 or 90 hours a week. They have done this without grumbling. All the farmer asks is a fair price for his products in the market place. Certainly no one would contend that he and his family should have less.

It is estimated that the subsidy program proposed in this bill would require an expenditure of $800,000,000. I think it is impossible to place a figure of $800,000,000 or several billion dollars on the cost of this program, once it is started. The time to stop it is now and it should be done immediately by congressional action. The people of our Nation do not want the Federal Government to pay for a part of their grocery bills while their own sons are fighting our Nation's battles on foreign soil, nor do they want to transfer their everyday living costs to their sons and grandsons when they return home. It is an unwise and illogical program.

I am opposed to subsidies because they will not work, and want to present for your consideration the following reasons why I believe they will not work.

First. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished.

Second. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to post-war chaos.

Third. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear.

Fourth. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the state to support its people.

Fifth. Subsidies lead to political control and when once used they are politically almost impossible to get rid of.

Food will be the No. 1 issue in 1944. It is my opinion that it will be much scarcer than the average person can comprehend at the present time. The demand will be much greater than our citizens anticipate if we are to feed our own Nation and our allies, as present plans indicate. Prompt action must be taken which will give the farmers the farm machinery and equipment needed, the labor necessary for production, and the elimination of all the useless and unnecessary restrictions which are now hampering production.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is, of course, ample room for argument on both sides of the subsidy issue and I respect the right of any of my colleagues to take whatever position he or she believes is the correct one. I must confess, however, that it is difficult for me to reconcile the arguments advanced by many Members from agricultural districts against the subsidies, in view of their voting record in the past. During the past 12 years about $7,000,000,000 have been paid out of the Federal Treasury to farmers in various forms of subsidies such as parity payments, soil-conservation payments, price-support payments, incentive payments, and so forth. When some Members are reminded of their past record, in view of various agricultural subsidies, they try to justify their present position on the ground that those subsidies were for producers and not for consumers. In the first place, it has not been satisfactorily explained to me why producers should be a preferred class to consumers. Producers and consumers are absolutely dependent upon each other. There is no sound reason for subsidizing, as many of you have done, one group, and then refusing to subsidize the other group if it is in distress, later on.

In the second place, the argument that there is a fundamental difference in the type of farm subsidy given out in the past and so-called consumer subsidies, which we are discussing today, is wholly unsound. When the parity formula was adopted and parity payments were guaranteed to farmers, was it their purpose to increase production? Of course not. There was surplus production everywhere. Their purpose was to give the farmer purchasing power, so that he could buy the necessaries of life, and the purpose of the so-called consumer subsidy is to allow the consumer, especially the low-paid consumer, enough money so that he can purchase the necessaries of life. Both subsidies were and are designed to affect the same thing, the purchasing power. An attempt to distinguish them is wholly subterfuge.

The RECORD will bear me out when I say that Members from city or consumer districts, almost without exception, supported farm subsidies when the farmers were in distress. I feel that it is only just reciprocity for the Members from the farming areas who voted for subsidies for the farmers to now support subsidies for the great white collar, middle class of America, and many others who are now in distress. Those people contributed their share to the Treasury payments that went to the farmers and kept the prices up so that the farmer could live decently, and they and their children, and perhaps their children's children, will have to pay, through taxation, their share of the $7,000,000,000 that have been paid out to the farmers since 1930.

Is it unreasonable for them to expect the farmers to contribute their share to some subsidy to benefit them when they cannot afford to pay the food prices that have risen over 40 percent since January of 1941? Farm prices today average 117 percent of parity. There has been an increase of more than 32 percent since 1941. I say more than 32 percent, because Marvin Jones, who is the friend of the farmer, testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency that the average price of farm commodities was 85 percent of parity in January of 1941, and that today it is 17 percent above parity. That makes 32 percent. But in view of the change in the method of calculating the parity formula, you farmers know that the rise has been considerably above 32 percent.

Millions of Americans have had no increase in their income since 1941. Millions of others have had only a slight increase compared to that enjoyed by the farmers. I personally do not like any kind of subsidy, but I voted for farm subsidies when there seemed to be no other way out. I am in favor of subsidies to benefit the consumers now, because I see no other way out. If we do not keep food prices down, we will inevitably—and do not mistake it—bring about ruinous inflation. Attempts by any group to profit out of this war are not only unpatriotic but a sad illusion.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], who spoke just before the gentleman from New York. He spoke about economic freedom. Can the gentleman comprehend how anyone can get up on the floor of this House and talk about the preservation of economic freedom at this time? When the war broke out the United States Government came to the city of Detroit and told Henry Ford, the Chrysler Corporation, and the General Motors Corporation, "You cannot manufacture automobiles any more, you have got to manufacture guns." How can anyone arise on this floor and say that anybody expects economic freedom in time of war? How can the gentleman agree with him?

Mr. BARRY. The statement is absurd. A majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have voted on this bill, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, anticipating what might happen after the war, and they say they are against subsidies, and they have voted to guarantee the farmers 90 percent of parity, because they realize that in the transition period prices will fall down.

The position is utterly selfish. When the market will sustain the farmer's price they want to pay him a subsidy; when farm prices go above parity—and that is what they had been striving for—they desire to keep the prices going up. Their position is utterly selfish.

Mr. SADOWSKI. May I ask further how any man can reconcile giving one group in time of war advantages that are not given to all?

Mr. BARRY. I should like to ask the gentleman if he wants the economy of the country to go back to the law of supply and demand when this war ends? Of course, he does.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I have heard much said about the distress of the so-called white-collar class and I share the gentleman's concern about them, but I am wondering if this subsidy should become operative and the consumer who is in, let us say, the industries of this country should have their wages increased so to speak to the extent of these subsidy payments, thereby in effect giving them more money——

Mr. BARRY. That is not the way it works.

Mr. NORRELL. Thereby giving them more money to compete upon the open market for the short or scarce goods, would make competition a little keener for the white-collar man on his salary to get those goods. Then the farmer gets, we will say, additional money. This gives the farmer an opportunity to be in keener competition with the white-collar man. These two groups have more money, but the white-collar man, without any supplemental money, has got to compete with these groups in order to get his share of these commodities. Since he does not benefit in any way in these increases of income I am wondering if it is quite fair to the white-collar man to make him pay his part of the tax load for the payment of subsidies to the farmers and to the industrial workers? I am concerned about the white-collar man.

Mr. BARRY. That is a fairly involved question. Your white-collar man is in the position where his income has gone up but slightly if any at all; yet this is the class which has been paying taxes right along and will continue to pay taxes when the war ends and that unfortunate transition period comes. Are they going to have any money with which to pay taxes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, usually I have a great deal of respect for statistics gotten out by any governmental bureau. It just happens that a few moments ago I was looking at this chart out here in the hall. I am a great believer in statistics ordinarily but sometimes my belief must waiver when the statistics are contrary to facts which are matters of common knowledge, known to be true. This graph out here in the hall indicates that the farmer today is getting a much larger net income than he did in the last war, in the First World War. It just happens that I had something to do with farming in the First World War and have something to do with it today. I know that in the First World War hogs out in Missouri were selling for $24.50 a hundred; I know that today hogs are selling for less than $15 a hundred. I know that cattle in the last war were bringing $26 a hundred and I know that the farmers today are selling their cattle for $12.25 a hundred. I know that almost every product that is produced on the farms in the Middle West is bringing not more than 60 percent of what it brought in the last war. The Members from the Middle West know that this is true. Just take one look at this graph out here in the hall and you will know that there is not one atom of truth in it. It is highly deceiving. I am astonished that a Government department would put out a graph of that sort that is so far from the plain and unvarnished truth that millions of Americans know and understand too well.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going into the theoretical features of this bill; those things have been gone into, but I do want to cite to the membership today just a few facts that I know to be true. I know that at the beginning of 1942 there were 273 men engaged in the dairy business in the eastern part of Jackson County, Mo., where I live, men who had been making their living as dairy farmers all their lives—273 dairy herds in Jackson County at the beginning of 1942. Then the O. P. A. comes in and begins to make some rather unwise price ceilings and at the end of 1942 a lone 75 out of the original 273 had survived the blitz. Talk about sabotage of our war effort! If we still believe that food is necessary to the winning of the war we have some blundering and unwitting saboteurs in this country who have done untold damage to our war effort. The same thing has happened with respect to the production of beef. Twenty million pounds of beef which was needed by our soldiers across the sea was sabotaged by unwise bureaucratic regulations. The other day I received a letter from a farmer who is now living in another county but who for many years lived in Jackson County, Mo. I have known him for 30 years and highly respect him. I want to say to you gentlemen over here who are my Democratic brethren that for 30 years I have known him as an active, unfailing worker in the Democratic Party.

He moved to another county a couple of years ago and he decided to buy a

little farm over there. The Government had urged the production of butter and butterfat. He invested in a herd of milk cattle, the best milk cows he could buy, and he started in the dairy business because he believed he could help his country by so doing. I received a letter from him the other day, and, while I do not usually like to read letters, I am going to read a paragraph from the letter of this gentleman. First, he outlines the fact that he invested in his dairy herd, then he tells some of his experiences and how he was forced by the O. P. A. to go out of business and sell his herd.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, he states:

And now a word about subsidy.

To encourage the farmers to keep their herds the creamery raised the price of butterfat from 48 to 50 cents per pound, and then came the subsidy.

You know, they have been paying subsidies, although we have not authorized them.

The Government last month paid them $900 and they lowered the price of butterfat to 48 cents per pound. Now, when it is becoming necessary to feed heavier, I talked to the manager today. He is very bitter against the administration and told me this subsidy was robbing the taxpayers. We also have here a black market. I also talked to the manager today. He told me he drew $180 subsidy last month and he said he thought it was terrible, but everyone was getting easy money, and so was he. He has always been a Democrat, but not next time. He also told me that Mr. ———, of ———, who only kills pork and makes sausage, told him yesterday he was getting $2,000 per week subsidy.

Now, I know that little town, I know this man's little packing house out about 3 miles from that little town.

He goes on further:

The mill here is the same way. The manager told me and a group of other men Thursday he had been a lifelong Democrat but is very bitter and expresses it so: "My God, if the people getting this easy money feel that way what do you expect of the people paying the bill?"

I read that paragraph from this letter just to give you, and particularly my friends over here on the Democratic side of the House, a picture of how this thing is going over in the grass-roots country. They are paying subsidies presumably for the benefit of the farmer, but the farmer is not getting one red cent of that subsidy. The little packer over near this country town is getting $2,000 a week. The man at the creamery is getting $150 a week, but not one red cent of it goes into the pocket of a single farmer in the Middle West. I repeat, not one red cent of it is going into the hands of the farmer. A farmer said to me the last time I was home something that is very significant. He has been on a farm for many years, he was a tenant on the farm in the last war. He said, "You remember, in the last war I was a tenant on this farm. There are 160 acres of it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, the question before this House is one that goes far beyond the merit or lack of merit in the proposed food subsidy; it jars the foundation of our democracy, it is sowing the pasture for another dictatorial bureau and its many parasites to forage and grow fat upon, at the expense of an overburdened taxpaying public. I am deeply concerned over the concerted efforts that are being exercised toward useless regimentation of our people under the shadow of a purported necessity during this emergency, which has been and is being deliberately taken advantage of to fasten the yoke stronger on a helpless people.

If one will only analyze the abuse of power by the Office of Price Administration it can well be seen why the people are demanding that the Congress retake the reins of government, that the rights guaranteed by our Constitution may be preserved for our posterity. There was an actual necessity for such an organization as the Office of Price Administration, and with the powers given it by Congress it had the opportunity to render a great service to our people; instead it has set up a reign of terror and despotism heretofore unknown to a free people. It gloats in the glory of confiscating private property and running enterprising and honorable American businessmen out of business, all in the name of saving the people from themselves. I could quote many specific instances where their conduct has been such as to make a true patriot wonder to what shores the old ship of state is headed, and in what port she will anchor. Time will not permit my going into more than one of these instances. I can give you proof where on an alleged violation of some edict a patriotic businessman, Mr. M. M. Monroe, of Waycross, Ga., was sued for approximately $5,000 in a court 1,300 miles from his home and place of business and the place where the alleged infraction of regulations was committed. This party, knowing that he had committed no wrong and that he did not owe his Government anything, prepared to defend himself in said action. One of the army of lawyers paid from the tax money of the people, Mr. Levenson, of Boston, Mass., in conference with this defendant and his counsel advised the defendant if he defended himself in this case and did not settle it he was preparing to bring many more such actions against him in different sections of the country and would keep on until he broke him, all in the name of democracy. This party paid up and stated he was going out of business for the duration. His business was essential to our war effort, but he was literally run out of business by one mad with power and drunk with the desire to regiment, yes, hurdle, pen up, push around, and abuse people. The conduct of this bunch is enough to make the colors run from the flag that stands for justice and equality of mankind. They are running rampant over the country and have the people bewildered with orders, directives, rules, and regulations that they themselves do not understand. The country is working alive with their regimentators from border to border and from coast to coast.

I wish the people of the Nation, and especially of my district, could come to Washington and look through the offices from end to end of long corridors and see the thousands upon thousands of employees of the Office of Price Administration waxing fat off their tax moneys, who are responsible for the reign of terror that they have brought down on an already burdened populace. While on the question of food, let me say that if the thousands on top of thousands of their emissaries in the field work throughout the United States and the thousands on top of thousands on the public pay rolls here were put to work producing food, we would be faced with a surplus.

My time will not permit going into statistics to argue the fallacy of this subsidy program. The subject is so elementary, however, that it requires only sober thought of a reasonably intelligent person to shoot any argument for a producer subsidy full of holes. It is no complicated question. It has been amazing to me to notice how the Reds, radicals, and crack-pots here who sponsor such programs attempt to accomplish their wild aims. They take a subject as simple and as unsupported by merit and fact as this subsidy question and first shroud it in a cloak of purity and then parade it in the shadows of deep mystery in the hope of confusing and bewildering the Congress, if possible, to such degree that they will in hopeless despair support it, and if Congress does not support it that they may so mesmerize the thinking public that their confusion will cause them to condemn the Congress for not accepting the yoke and bowing to the demands of these star gazers here in Washington who are determined to chart and direct the course of the American people.

I ask the membership of this House to come from under the haze of the smoke screen created by Philip Murray, the administration leadership, and the Communist press who have formed and sponsored this damnable piece of legislation.

It is unthinkable to know that this legislation has been sponsored by the radical element of this country who have been responsible for the exorbitant wages being paid industrial workers who are now drawing twelve and fifteen dollars per day. They demand higher wages one day and are granted it, as in the case of the coal miners, and the next day call on the taxpayers of America to pay their grocery bills; and yet we have Members on the floor of this House who will use every means at their command to saddle that expense on a helpless, taxpaying public. You have not heard one cry from the millions of wage earners who have not received any increase in wages through all of this spiral trend calling for subsidies; it

comes from those who are responsible for the heavy taxes we are paying today.

There is one reference I would like to make that is fundamentally sound in analyzing the merits and demerits of this legislation. It will be found in the Holy Writ that you can judge a tree by the fruit it bears. I call upon the membership of this House and the people of this Nation to judge the Office of Price Administration by the fruit it has borne.

A few months ago, the great saviors of the American people put forth a roll-back program, which they were given the privilege to try. I could give you many instances of its ill and destructive effects, but will only call attention to the fact that it has caused the slaughter of hundreds of herds of milk cows throughout the United States right at a time that we face a milk famine. It has prevented thousands upon thousands of beef cattle from being fed and thereby providing millions of pounds of extra beef for the consuming public, which also applies to hogs. I can cite you one instance where Dennis Adams, an enterprising, thrifty, and hard-working small farmer in my home county, bought on the livestock market in my home town of Douglas, Ga., on August 17, 1943, six feeders of the total weight of 1,385 pounds for the sum of $173.17. On the 12th day of October 1943, after approximately 2 months of careful feeding, he sold the same six cows on the same market, and they weighed 1,665 pounds, a gain of 280 pounds; besides the fact that they were bought thin and sold fat, they brought him only $144.86, a net loss, besides the worth of his feed and time hauling and taking care of said cattle, of $28.31. It could safely be said that he lost at least $75 in his patriotic effort to help produce food. I ask some Members of this House to tell me who got this money, to whom did this advantage go?

How are you going to justify this kind of regimentation and confiscation of property? If any of you have the temerity to claim that anyone profited by this confiscation of this man's property except the middleman, you would have to say it was some of John Lewis' or Philip Murray's legion who are shutting down war industries and living off the fat of the land while they walk in idleness about the streets of the communities in which they enjoy the freedom of a democracy being protected by the blood of the youth of this Nation. The fact is that no one but the middleman profited. I have a family and it is necessary to make weekly purchases of their food and we have not enjoyed one-tenth of 1 percent reduction in any meat prices, nor has anyone else. This in the face of the fact that millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been used to set up another bureau with its many parasites to prey on the working people of this country.

The sponsors of this measure are so inconsistent that it all but causes us to lose confidence in human beings and human reasoning. I had one sponsor of subsidies tell me that a plain example of the merits of the subsidy program is that we produce about 20 percent of our sugar, and by the use of subsidies that only our producers would benefit, but if we permitted an increase in consumer prices then the foreign countries who produce 80 percent would then profit likewise. I reminded him that "this is your argument on this measure, in the next breath you will be calling on the Congress to appropriate billions for lend-lease from which you will send these very countries, that you do not want to enjoy the increase in prices, millions of dollars of lend-lease goods such as silk hose, lipstick, rouge, and other weapons of war of this nature. I ask you to remember who said: 'Consistency, thou art a jewel.'"

It is so childish, so ridiculous and so destructive to think of the real effect of this purported legislation that I am caused to tremble in fear of what lies ahead for this Nation unless those in charge of its destiny revert to more sober thinking. We had the Treasury Department to call on us to saddle onto the tax-paying public an additional ten and one-half billion dollars in taxes, based on the argument that there is so much surplus money that it is necessary to levy such an excessive tax to siphon off the surplus money in the consumers' pockets to prevent inflation. In the next breath we are urged by the same source to vote millions of dollars that this same bunch may pay the grocery bills of the consuming public because prices are beyond their means to meet. It will take someone with a mind like a jig-saw puzzle to convince any sober-minded human being of any consistency between the two positions. At this point I would like to ask when God in His infinite powers will bring sober thinking back to the directing powers in Washington. The purpose seems to be to, by any means, get control of the entire income of the American public that it may be wasted, spent, and scrambled for any purposes that this wild bunch may conceive in their dreams and imagination of that realm of utopia in which they yet seem to think that the American people are going to live under their plan.

The effect of their over-all proposal would be to take in taxes from a man with a net income of, we will say, $5,000, an extra sum of approximately $1,000, and I know and you know that he would not be saved, under the most liberal construction of the result of the program, more than one or two hundred dollars in the course of a year on his purchases. This is about as consistent, however, as the general financing of the Government's business has been over the past few years.

I want to say to you Members who brand yourselves as liberals that you with other powers at work in this country may break down the system of government we and our forefathers have enjoyed. You may destroy at home the very thing that the youth of this Nation are dying on foreign battlefields to preserve, and in their absence, but let me take this opportunity to thank God Almighty, from whom all wisdom and justice comes, that when it is done the pages of the procedure of the National Congress will never show my name as being one who joined hands with the Communists, radicals, and other crackpots of this country in its destruction. I accept as the greatest privilege that a kind providence has given me to know that in the pages of history yet to be written my children will never be able to point to the fact that their father helped to destroy the America that the patriots of old gave their property and lives to build.

I sometimes wonder how you can face the fathers and mothers who have given from their bosom their first love to go abroad and fight for you and for me when you know that you are saddling onto them a national debt of destruction for them to try to pay by their labor when they return from the blood-stained and smoke-colored battlefields of terror where they have left so many of their comrades to sleep through the years under a tomb resting on foreign soil and kissed at night by a foreign moon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks just submitted to the Committee by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]. I wish a great many more Members could have been on the floor and heard that speech. It impressed me, as I am sure it impressed every other Member, because of the fact that he gave to us the truth and the whole truth about the situation in which the American farmer finds himself.

INFLATION A DANGEROUS OPIATE

Mr. Chairman, inflation is like a drug. It gives you an immediate lift and leaves you with a bad headache. It is also like a drug because if you become an addict you crave stronger and stronger doses in order to keep up the effect. The end of the drug addict, and of the nation resorting to inflation as a permanent policy, is the same. The end is collapse and destruction.

During the 10 long years of the present administration the American economic system has persistently been injected with doses of inflation. The dose has been designated by more innocently appearing labels, like "reflation" or "deficit financing," but the more polite name does not alter the evil effects of that deadly dangerous economic drug, properly called inflation.

Tens of millions of Americans today receive their wages and salaries in fresh new dollar bills, or through checks on new Government bank deposits. These salaries and wages mean purchasing power. They represent the means of paying rent, of buying food, of getting a pair of new shoes, or a hat, or a movie ticket. Now, where did that purchasing power come from? From the Government, you probably will answer. But I ask you again, from whence did the Government get that purchasing power to hand to you on pay day? Some of it the Government got from your taxes. Some of it came from your bonds. Some

of it is simply fictitious; and this fictitious part of the purchasing power dispensed by the Government creates the process we call inflation. When the Government wants your work, the products of your farms, the goods you manufacture, and has not the economically sound means of paying you, it nevertheless gets what it wants by a very simple device. It is indeed unfortunate for humanity that this device is so simple that the temptation to resort to it has rarely been resisted by those wanting more than they can get by legitimate means. That process is the simple one of issuing Treasury bills or similar obligations, and then discounting them at the central banks, thereby creating deposits against which Government checks may be drawn. Of course, the result of such a policy is an ever-increasing public debt. On October 15 the total gross public debt and guaranteed obligations of this country amounted to over $168,000,000,000. At this time each man, woman, and child in this Nation is responsible for a public debt of some thirteen hundred dollars. Last year at this time the individual responsibility was only $700. Ten years ago, when this administration took over and began the mishandling of the affairs of this country, the per capita debt of each individual was a mere $190.

Every month the Government pays out about two and one-half billion dollars more than the Government has available for payment. In so doing, it goes deeper and deeper into debt, and two and a half billion dollars of inflationary money goes into circulation. Now more money would be quite all right, provided at the same time a proportionate increase in consumers' goods available for purchase were created. In that case, we should all be better off. We would be able to buy more of the things we want than we ever could before. But, as you all know, such is not the case. All we civilians can buy with our money is the left-overs after the demands of our armed forces have been supplied, and after more than a billion dollars worth of goods a month have been shipped overseas as gifts to our British and Russian allies, and to other nations to which we play Santa Claus under the terms of lend-lease. The reduced supply of consumers' goods certainly shows no tendency to grow.

With evermore billions of dollars distributed in wages and salaries, it is no wonder the supply of money and the supply of goods available get out of balance. An unbalanced condition as between purchasing power in the hands of the people and the purchasable amount of goods and services arises. That, in popular language, is called an inflationary gap. In reality, of course, there is no such inflationary gap. Every dollar will either be spent, saved, or taken away in taxes. If the supply of consumers' goods and services were fixed, and the amount of money were doubled, the same transactions of purchase and sale would take place as before, but the level of prices would double to the benefit of nobody. That is the way in which inflation, engendered by excessive Government spending, exercises an upward pressure on prices.

Of course, the Government can put ceilings on prices, but it cannot force people to produce if their production costs rise to a point where the ceiling prices do not permit a profit. If we try to fix prices under such circumstances, the goods simply will disappear, because the Government's price policy restrains production. I do not know whether or not you noticed the other day that even the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, was liquidating his herd of fancy dairy cattle, because the cost of milk production was greater than the price he received. If you cannot stop costs from rising—and you can do that only to a certain extent—you have the choice of letting prices rise or of going without the goods. Of course, there is a third escape, called the black market, but that is a most undesirable and illegal expedient.

In the early stages of our wartime crisis, many people seemed to be rather impressed with the benefits of inflation. They thought the vastly increased Government spending would make it possible practically to eliminate the curse of unemployment, to create jobs for women and young people who had not theretofore been gainfully employed; that wages would rise, temporarily, even faster than the cost of living. Many believed prices on farm products would finally reach the so-called parity with prices on industrial commodities. So, as I say, inflation is like a drug. At first it has a very pleasant effect. We have now reached the point when the ill effects—the suffering—begins, and to most of us that is anything but pleasant. Unrest is spreading all over the country; in the coal mines, on the railroads, in the factories, and even on the farms. People are beginning to listen when demands are being made in Congress for economy in Government spending. It is being pretty generally realized that the over-sized administrative machinery is far from efficient; that we are paying the salaries of hundreds of thousands of Government employees whose services could be ended without any loss to society, any loss of efficiency, or any let-down in the war effort.

A demand is growing for economy even in military expenditures. Many sins can be covered by the cloak of so-called military necessity, as was shown on November 4 when the House of Representatives reduced the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill by 82 percent below the Budget estimates. This was a reduction of nearly $1,000,000,000 in this bill alone.

In recent weeks, particular attention has been drawn to the tremendous volume of goods of all kinds, and services of all kinds, which have been and are being given away to foreign countries. It is true that, comparatively speaking, this country is a rich country, or perhaps I should say, this country has been a rich country. Whether we can afford to continue to distribute gifts at a rate of over a billion dollars a month is another matter, inasmuch as we have to go into debt in order to make those gifts. We all know that Mr. Stalin thinks of Russia first.

We are increasingly aware that Mr. Churchill's first concern is for Great Britain and the Empire. It is high time that we in this country place America first, and put some brakes on the wild schemes to supply the whole wide world with the goods our own people must go without. The day has come, and it is not here for a day, but for the rest of our lifetime and perhaps the whole of the lifetime of our children and our grandchildren, that we will suffer under a crushing tax burden. Later we will have to struggle to pay the interest on the loans our Government made in order to give away the products of this country to the peoples of other nations. It is inexcusable that no definite arrangements have been made whereby those people, who now receive all kinds of goods and services free from this Nation, shall some time, in some way, help lighten the economic burden of our people, a burden very largely incurred to help them in their days of trial.

In the meantime, the Government goes on with its inflationary policy. Every month, two or three billion dollars are added to the sea of economic morass in which we are sinking deeper and deeper. Instead of going to the roots of the disease, and curtailing expenditures, the Administration would resort to all kinds of subterfuges to postpone the day of reckoning with the American people. One of these devices is represented by Governmental subsidies under a wide variety of forms. To conceal the fact that costs rise, and that prices consequently must rise if production is to continue, the Administration proposes to pay subsidies to producers and processors. Instead of admitting that production would cease if the price of milk is not raised, the Administration prefers to fool the public by suggesting that prices shall be kept down and that the Government will pay the difference between the real price and the sales price. I do not believe that those who think this problem through will be fooled by such a proposal. They will know that the subsidies will be put on their tax bill, together with the staggering costs of administering the subsidies. They will see that the subsidies will have to be increased continuously in line with the growth of inflation. Subsidies do not prevent inflation when they retard the rise in sales prices. Subsidies add to inflation by pouring more purchasing power into the economic stream and by forcing the Government deeper and deeper into debt. It is high time that we all sober up and reject an economic policy that has brought this rich and prosperous Nation to the very verge of bankruptcy.

Insofar as tax money is money earned through production of goods and services, no inflation results in the economic system but a distribution of purchasing power does result. This is not, as some people fondly believe, a share-the-wealth operation. It is a share-the-poverty operation inasmuch as it compels the taxpayers to pay part of the cost and profit of the production of goods and services

which, normally, would be recovered in prices at the retail counter.

But where these subsidies are paid, as this administration wants them to be paid, out of governmental deficits, which give rise to fictitious purchasing power, then these subsidies become, not only a share-the-poverty operation, but they become dangerously inflationary as well.

When the Government undertakes to bestow subsidies through money created by deficit financing which does not represent goods and services produced, the administration is knowingly and secretly administering the drug of inflation to the American economy. If we travel very far along this road, we will end up in the abyss of ruin and economic chaos.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege this morning to review the last of the two measures known as the anti-inflation bills enacted by the Congress. Both these measures contain the exact provisions insisted upon by the President of the United States. He assured the Congress and the country that if given these bills he could and would throw every protection around our economy, and that inflation would not take place. No one questions his authority under the act as amended to do exactly as he then promised to do. It must be perfectly apparent to everyone, however, that a rather large measure of inflation has occurred since these powers were given to the President. His failure to control the same was not through lack of legal powers to do so, but rather his neglect to exercise those powers. I think anyone familiar with all the facts will agree that if inflation has occurred—and it has—the responsibility therefor can be placed directly upon the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have reached the conclusion that the administration program of rolling back prices, of paying subsidies, of still further increasing our national indebtedness, and still further expanding the bureaucracy which at every hand stifles and irritates the people of the country, will, for the reasons I have set forth, induce inflation rather than curtail it. Notwithstanding the provisions of the bill before us, the President can, even though the measure were enacted into law, stop inflation exactly where it now is. If the President up to date, with all the powers he has under the law, has not curbed inflation, certainly he cannot now do so through the medium of rollback of prices and subsidizing of activities, which in my judgment is in itself dangerously inflationary.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts relative thereto.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INFLATION NO. 1 PROBLEM ON HOME FRONT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the real key to all of the problems on the home front is in the fight against inflation. From the lessons learned as a result of studying the movement of prices during World War No. 1 it is perfectly evident that a completely uncontrolled economy in wartime results in disastrous dislocations and unequal distribution of hardships. This fact is obvious from the figures which I presented here in this House on November 1, wherein the figures showed specifically that the farmer's position was worse in World War No. 1 than it is now.

EVILS OF UNCONTROLLED INFLATION

From the lessons which we all must have learned as we watched the actual operation of uncontrolled inflation after the last war in various foreign countries, we can easily envision two definite results: The first result is an almost complete destruction of the values of those things which we, all of us, have learned from infancy represent the true worth of our country, and of our business structure, and of each individual; second, we know that with uncontrolled inflation the dollar cost of a global war such as we are involved in now would become so huge that we would be led into the ultimate of absurdity in our fiscal system and the very real necessity of abrogating debts which no conceivable plan of taxation could ever hope to pay.

STABILIZATION DESIRED

It has also become perfectly apparent that all of our people desire during this wartime period to prevent inflation and to stabilize the economy insofar as it is humanly possible. Further, the people of this country, no matter whether they express it in these words, understand that to win any fight against inflation it is impossible to divide the country into classes or groups and to stabilize in one direction and not in another. It is impossible either by legislation, directive, or regulation to attain the goal of stabilization by favoring any one group because that can only be done at the expense of all others. If this sort of thing is tried the very human demand will arise from all the other groups that they too be favored, and thus there will be generated the step-by-step movement of inflation which will end no one knows where.

LEGISLATION AND ADMINISTRATION NECESSARY

The main principle of controls established to prevent inflation and to stabilize the economy lies in legislation and administration which does the job equitably insofar as that is humanly possible. This stabilization must be done upon a firm foundation of a knowledge of the facts and not upon the shifting sands of wishful thinking or political pressures. When I say these things, I am not becoming a member of any group of fanatical dreamers, reformers, or idealistic doctors of economy. I am a member of the huge majority of the people and the businessmen of this country, who have always, and still do, state unequivocably that they do not want inflation.

HISTORY OF PRICE CONTROL AND STABILIZATION

Because of the very peculiar reactions of certain Members of the Congress, I think it is necessary at this time to retrace the history of price control and stabilization. Before the first legislation was had, an agency set up under the President's war powers did some very fine work in bucking the tide of inflation on a purely voluntary basis. The agency people realized that this voluntary situation could not continue. With huge amounts of money in the hands of many people; which they wanted to spend for goods and services, it was evident that a voluntary system would break down under the pressure of buying power, particularly as both goods and services became scarce as the war continued.

FIRST PRICE-CONTROL ACT

The first piece of legislation, therefore, resulted in the establishment of an Office of Price Administration. This bill was introduced as H. R. 5990 and was passed in January 1942, it being shortly thereafter signed by the President and thus becoming law. This legislation was carefully considered by all the Members of Congress. Numerous hearings commencing in August 1941 were held, and every phase, yes, in fact, every word, given careful scrutiny and analysis.

There, of course, were many differences of opinion, but the final vote here in this House showed that the majority believed that the country wanted and needed the legislation. The vote resulted as follows:

Against:	
Democrats	64
Republicans	93
Total	157
For:	
Democrats	167
Republicans	56
Total	223

The administration, and particularly the Office of Price Administration, did not immediately thereafter rush into violent action, but in April of 1942 did put out an all-embracing order known as the General Maximum Price Regulation, which froze the prices of most of the important goods and services as of the March level. This action was taken because by that time it had become completely apparent that inflation was definitely on the way. Of course, such a method as an over-all freeze was bound to catch some people at a disadvantage in their position. Therefore, immediately after the establishment of G. M. P. R., O. P. A. started on a job of tailoring a regulation for every industry on an individual basis. During the time when G. M. P. R. was in effect, and when the individual regulations were being developed and written, complaints about price control began to develop. Sometimes the complaints were due to purely selfish interests of industries or groups; sometimes they were due to honest differences of opinion between business and O. P. A.; sometimes the complaints were due to mistakes which O. P. A. made. But with all of these complaints during this period no one suggested that price

control be eliminated. Everyone recognized that the attempt to hold inflationary tendencies under control by the method of price control had to be for the benefit of everyone, and would probably at some point or other hurt practically everyone.

NO INFLATION CONTROL WITHOUT INEQUALITIES

It is unrealistic thinking to say that you can have inflation control without hurting anyone just as it is unrealistic to say that you can win a battle without casualties.

CRY OF "GET RID OF PROFESSORS"

Price control was new to our people and there was not very much known about the science of doing the job by anyone in this country. In particular the businessmen of the country, never having envisioned such a control in our economy, did not know much about it. Gradually, therefore, there grew up a feeling that all of the Government agency people were professors, lawyers, or long-haired reformers. The cry was "Get rid of the professors and get businessmen."

UNDER COVER PLAN TO KILL PRICE CONTROL

Not so loudly in public, but nevertheless definitely, a small group of our bigger businessmen developed the idea that all controls were wrong and that we would be better off if controls of any kind would be eliminated. Considerable work was started under cover to kill the whole idea of price control and stabilization.

SECOND PRICE CONTROL ACT OR STABILIZATION ACT

During the summer of 1942 it became apparent to the Members of the Congress, or at least to a large majority, that there was some strengthening needed, so that the President and the administrative agencies could really cover all elements of the inflationary movement. So then on October 2, 1942, there was passed what is popularly known as the Stabilization Act.

The Democratic Members of this House who voted for that measure honestly believed in its necessity. Did the Republican Members of this House also believe in its necessity or did they see a chance to vote for a measure which in effect they hoped would be the dropping of a hot potato into the hands of the President? Did they hope that it would burn and embarrass him? Let us look at the votes for this measure:

For:	
Democrats	155
Republicans	128
Total	283
Against:	
Democrats	70
Republicans	25
Total	95

I would like to call your attention to the fact that this vote showed a larger majority of all votes in the House for the Stabilization Act than for the original Price Control Act. I would also like to call your attention to the fact that while 56 of our honorable opposition of the Republican party voted for the Price Control Act, that 128 voted for the Stabilization Act. Why did 72 more of our honorable opposition vote for the Stabilization Act? I trust that they did so out of the very real desire to insure that our country would not face a terrible inflation.

APPROPRIATION FOR O. P. A. INSUFFICIENT FOR ADEQUATE ENFORCEMENT

Shortly after the passage of the Stabilization Act, under which the Administration immediately went to work trying to carry out the mandate of the Congress, the problem of an appropriation for the Office of Price Administration came up. The net of the history in this particular action was that thirty millions were eliminated from the appropriation even after many hearings developed the fact that to do a good job the agency really needed the money, especially to do a good job on enforcement. The elimination of this thirty millions was done right in the middle of the very serious and unpatriotic wave of black-market development and of racketeering to evade price and rationing regulations. It would seem to me that once the Congress had decided upon a course in respect to inflation and stabilization and had then by legislation directed the President and certain Government agencies to do a job and had given them the power to do the job, that the least the Congress can be charged with is a most peculiar line of reasoning to have so limited appropriations as to have hampered the very work that Congress had decided formerly was necessary. How did this vote come out?

Votes for reduction:	
Democrats	26
Republicans	156
Total	182
Votes against reduction:	
Democrats	135
Republicans	11
Total	146

It appears that almost the total number of our honorable Republican opposition who voted on the measure actually voted to hamstring price control and stabilization in this matter of necessary appropriation. Does this mean that our honorable opposition saw an opportunity to make the Democratic administration continue to handle a difficult problem without the necessary funds? Did this give our honorable opposition a chance to say, "Go thou and do thus-and-so," but "there will not be allowed you the means to do thus-and-so"? Did they expect the Government to make bricks without straw? Did this action on the O. P. A. appropriation come from the same astonishing minds of our honorable opposition as the action on the O. W. I. appropriation? The O. W. I. was doing a good job combating inflation, and practically the same Members who voted to cripple O. P. A. also voted to eliminate the appropriation for O. W. I. that was used to fight inflation—another Republican vote for inflation.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

Let it go into the record that to the eternal credit of the administration of the Government agencies, particularly O. P. A., and of the businessmen of this country that cooperatively they all tried to stop black markets and racketeering as best they could without the manpower needed to do the job. But these rotten things still exist, and you can charge their continued life to the vote of those Members who cut the appropriations.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Now we come to the middle of the summer of this year in which the bill was introduced to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill was finally passed in such a form that the President found it necessary to veto it. I do not believe I need to rehearse all this very recent history, but I do think I should ask whether or not that first Commodity Credit Corporation bill as passed was not part and parcel of a design to destroy stabilization. I would probably not ask such a question if anyone, anywhere, of any political party in this House, had ever suggested any other method to establish stabilization than that of subsidy, properly used.

PEOPLE COMPLAIN ABOUT MISTAKES

After the President vetoed this bill another was brought out which continued the Commodity Credit Corporation for a temporary period. Evidently our honorable opposition felt that this was the proper and safe thing to do because they felt sure that during the recess which came shortly thereafter, all Members of Congress would go home to find the country rising up en masse asking for the destruction of price control and stabilization. But the people did not rise up en masse asking for this destruction. They did complain; they did criticize; they did argue, but they never said to anyone that they didn't want any more control and that they would welcome inflation. I am talking about the vast majority of the American public and not the selfish few who think that they can ride out inflation to their own personal advantage. I am talking about the small businessman, about the professional people, about labor; yes, and the vast majority of farmers and all those people—over 14,000,000 of them—living on stable incomes which have not risen during this war. I am talking about the soldiers, the sailors, and marines and their families who don't want inflation, and who have unmistakably in vast majority said so not only to Democrats but to Republicans.

MORE EXPERIENCED MEN USED BY O. P. A.

During all this period since the first price-control legislation the President, Mr. Jimmie Byrnes, Mr. Fred Vinson, and all of the Government agencies and bureaus involved have worked very hard to obey the congressional directive to stabilize. During this period the various agencies have brought in more and more practical and experienced businessmen. I really believe that there has been an improvement in the methods of price control and stabilization. I believe that the regulations are generally clearer and are more simple. No one can really criticize the good work which has been done in rent control and rationing and the food-production program. There are only a relatively few of the price regulations out of over 400 which O. P. A. has put out

which caused the most complaints and wherein there were the most mistakes made. These regulations either have been or are in the process of being revised. The work of revision is being done in conjunction with a system of industry advisory committees which have been extended to every possible industry and many parts of industry. The whole approach so far as I can determine is more realistic and more one of partnership between Government and industry.

OTHER AGENCIES DOING A BETTER JOB

I think that this is true of all agencies of the Government. W. P. B. has done the same kind of a job. The War Food Administration is doing it also, using many committees made up of producers, processors, retailers, and consumers. So far as I can determine the people of the United States and the war agencies are actually cooperating efficiently and learning now to do the job that this Congress directed the President and the war agencies to do. Business, labor, many farmers, and Government agencies are all working together because they believe in the absolute necessity of keeping inflation out of our system. It seems that only the Congress is not a member of the partnership. It almost seems to me on the record of votes we can say to our honorable Republican opposition, that they are the principal ones who are not members of this partnership which is now working to get the job done. I should judge that they would not hold out from being partners on any other basis than one of honest differences of opinion. I should judge that in this time we certainly could not charge them with playing politics, could we?

O. P. A. NOT THE CAUSE OF ALL MISTAKES

There has grown up a habit here in Congress of blaming our own creation, the Office of Price Administration, for any and all mistakes of any of the Government agencies. We make O. P. A. the whipping boy and yet it is the one important war agency which was created by an act of Congress. Are we falling into the error of whipping ourselves? Why do the selfish, the disgruntled, the opposition constantly pick on the child which the Congress gave life to? Why is it that those who are trying to do what Congress, representing the people of this country, wanted done, control inflation and stabilize our economical life—why is it that those very people and agencies are the receivers of the blows of objection and political attack upon the operation of the home front? Why is it that the opposition frequently does not even stick to the facts? Why is it they do not get the facts, or they do not get all of the facts?

ARE SUBSIDIES ONLY FOR THE FEW AND SELFISH?

The opposition cries out against subsidies. Is it just because the President and the agency we created want to use subsidy because there is no other logical method? It seems to me that the use of subsidies as represented in Republican tariff after Republican tariff should now be so completely acceptable to the honorable opposition that there would be no question of the use of an internal subsidy which the facts show benefits everyone. Do our honorable opposition believe in subsidies only for the few and selfish; do our honorable opposition think that by attacking the subsidy program to hold down the price of food as being un-American, that they themselves are being logical or politically sound? Do they believe that they can sustain this remarkable inconsistency by calling upon the name of the farmers?

SUMMARY

What does this all add up to?

First. Realizing that the country wants inflation control and wants the economic position stabilized, the majority of both Democratic and Republican Members of this House voted overwhelmingly for the Stabilization Act which followed and buttressed the first price act;

Second. I do not want to doubt that this vote was an honest one and reflected the desires of the vast majority of our constituents, and if this is true, the opposition is on record, just as our party is on record.

Third. Because mistakes were made by human beings who worked long hours trying to do the right thing on your assigned problems and because of selfish pressures from some well-known spots there seems to me to be by the record of votes a move by our Republican friends to constantly and consistently undermine their own work in every possible direction. Surely it cannot be that our opposition Members are saying that they are doing all this for the sake of the farmer, when actually they know that they are doing it all for the sake of a small minority who want inflation, or for the sake of just hampering the administration in the middle of a difficult wartime situation. After all, Republicans must be just as patriotic as Democrats.

Fourth. Is this all the evidence of an old political trick where you appear to help your opponents when your voters at home tell you you have to and then you try to crucify your opponent on every move thereafter? Surely none of us can be so short-sighted as to crucify the Commodity Credit Corporation, and thus destroy support prices for the farmer simply because there is some kind of a political point to be gained.

CONSTANT BICKERINGS AT HOME

Fifth. Frankly, I cannot conceive that this constant evidence of disunity amongst us in the Congress is entirely a matter of honest division of opinion. Yet all of us know that we continue to weaken our position at home. All of us know that these constant bickerings sicken the man in uniform and we know that he will not forget. Some day he will put his memory to practical use, and when that day comes he probably will make a clean sweep of all of us who fail now to back him up. I, for one, say he should make a clean sweep.

What is it that is necessary to be done? It is very simple; we want all the food production we can get; we want a decent living standard for every man, woman, and child in this country; we want to stabilize our economy so that no class or group is favored beyond any other; we want to strive mightily to preserve ourselves intact.

Now surely the path this Congress is going down at present is a piece-meal killing of any and all opportunity to stabilize the national policy of this country in respect to the home front, thus doing what the voter wants and our own good sense tells us is needed. That is not sound politics for either Democrats or Republicans, that is just stupidity on our part. If you do not like subsidy, show us something better. I do not like war, but I cannot show any method of exterminating the evils of dictatorship and aggression except by war.

CHILDREN'S PARTY

Are not we being a little bit like the "Children's Party" which the very famous author by the name of Ruskin wrote about? You will remember that the children came, dressed in their best, to a beautiful house and a beautiful garden to play, with all the toys in the world at their command. But one selfish little fellow decided that the most valuable thing to him were the brass tacks that studded the furniture in the house. So he started to pull out brass tacks, and he convinced all the other children of the value of brass tacks. Thus the party ended in the destruction of furniture, fights amongst the children, and the elevation of useless brass tacks to a position of first importance. I am sorry to say that the recent gyrations here in the House remind me of this story. I am sorry to say that the selfish little boy after the brass tacks reminds me of some of the honorable opposition. If the opposition wants to "get down to brass tacks" why do you not just abolish all controls. Then the wrecking of our house and garden will be an honest job.

PRESENT BILL, IF ENACTED, WILL PRACTICALLY DESTROY SUPPORT-PRICE PROGRAM

Some of our Republican friends, and especially the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], on page 9695, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have contended that H. R. 3477, as reported out by the solid Republican vote, would not destroy the farmers' support-price program. Insofar as the support-price program involves the Government in a risk of loss, this Republican view is plainly erroneous. As to this, we do not need to speculate. On October 21, 1943, Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, who must administer every support-price program, wrote a letter to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] opposing this Republican bill.

Marvin Jones stated in his letter of October 21:

> If section 3, in its present form, is included in the bill, it will practically destroy the support-price program. Carrying forward the support-price program will involve some losses. This, however, would apply only to the commodities where the support price must be above the level of ceiling prices if we are to secure the necessary in food production.

The support-price program for this year has involved the loss of only about $350,000,000. It has resulted in tremendous production. We will need even greater production in the coming year. The adoption of the bill would force a complete change, embark us on a course of great uncertainty, and jeopardize, beyond measure, our prospective 1944 production, which is vital to the war effort. This program has not only enabled us to realize these goals but to secure production in excess of the goals that were established.

I do not see how any statement could be plainer than that. Those who would enact this bill into law are driving a knife into the farmer's heart by destroying the support-price program and are threatening to impair the production of vital foods for our armed forces, our allies, and our civilian population.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House has to do with the question of continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, of which of course we are all in favor, and for other purposes. In the ramifications of this bill, naturally the O. P. A. becomes involved. Also, there are questions involved dealing with whether or not we are going to continue subsidizing certain food products and other commodities. To a great extent we have already adopted the use of subsidies in connection with our war program.

I do not believe there is a Member of this House who would want to wipe out our price-control program. However, neither do I believe there are very many Members who are not disgusted with the manner in which the price-control law has been administered. It has been condemned throughout the country for its inefficiency, confusion, and incompetency. That it has saved the Government and the people tremendous sums of money many doubt. However, I believe from the information we have that it has saved money. The O. P. A. claims that a saving of $67,000,000,000 in the purchase of war materials alone has been effected which would not have been saved had the prices of these materials gone uncontrolled. The same agency of the Government claims that the consumers have been saved $22,000,000,000 because of the generally lower cost of living in this war. Maybe these figures are inaccurate and maybe not, but the fact is that a responsible agency of the Government has officially put them out and until their inaccuracy is shown, it seems fair to accept them.

Do not think for a moment that I take the position that this saving is due in any considerable degree to the use of subsidies—far from it. However, I do not become excited over the use of subsidies. We have seen them used directly and indirectly since the first tariff act was passed approximately 150 years ago. Alexander Hamilton said at that time that if industries are to be protected by a tariff the farmers of the Nation should be paid something not by way of a bonus, gift, or subsidy, but by way of restitution to put them on a basis of equality with industry. In addition, we have seen railroads, newspapers, other means of transportation, of both persons and property, and mail subsidized. We have seen commodities of nearly all kinds, including some of the farmers' products, subsidized for years and years, and nobody raised much of a howl. So much for subsidies at the present moment.

I want to make it clear that the present program is entirely unsatisfactory, and the use of subsidies thus far has not been productive of any particular benefit to any person other than the processors. This Congress by the act of October 2, 1942, not only empowered the President of the United States to fix all prices, wages, and salaries and items that go into the cost of living on the basis of prices existing on September 15, 1942, but directed him so to do, giving him discretion in correcting gross inequities, and so forth. Congress did its part.

If prices have gone beyond those prices of the dates mentioned in the act, the fault lies with the administration of the act and not with the Congress. The President should have pegged the prices right then as he was directed to do by the Congress. The Congress cannot administer its acts. If we are to believe the economists of the two leading labor unions, it would appear that the cost of living has gone up an additional 7 percent, beyond the 15 percent under the so-called Little Steel formula, since the passage of the act. Canada in 1941 fixed prices, wages, and so forth, and supplemented that program with a restricted use of subsidies and it is claimed that living costs have advanced only 3 percent.

In the over-all picture we must not lose sight of 15,000,000 unorganized workers in America who are now very near the end of their economic rope. Their living costs and taxes have gone up, but their incomes are what they were before the war. We must keep an eye to their interest as well as to the interest of the farmer, stockman, and union laborer. If this group of people are benefited by the subsidy program, it is worthy of serious thought before scrapping this program in its entirety.

I find plenty of fault with the subsidy program so far as the producer is concerned. He is not benefited by it. We can take for instance the cattleman and sheepman—I have first-hand knowledge of the fact that, this fall, through manipulations of the packers, the packers were able to push down the price of sheep from 4 to 5 cents per pound—getting the carcass almost for nothing, in this way, the packer is paid a subsidy of 95 cents per 100 pounds ($1.10 in the case of beef, and $1.30 in the case of pork). This subsidy was supposed to take care of the roll-back in prices under the act of October 2, 1942. On top of that the packer was paid, although I am informed that this practice has stopped, from $2 to $4 by the Government for each sheep pelt. These pelts were being used for aviator's vests. I understand from five to seven million pelts were bought for that purpose, but, in any event, the packer gets the wool from the sheep in addition to the subsidies as well as the offal of the sheep for fertilizer purposes. You will see from these figures that a sheep weighing around 110 to 112 pounds as it goes to the packer and for which he pays 4 or 5 cents per pound, is almost clear to the packer with the carcass nearly all profit. Sixty percent of the carcass is meat that is sold by the packer at 16½ cents per pound. Now that means the packer is making about $8.48 on that sheep. The cost of slaughtering and distribution is estimated—by the packer—at $1.42, so when we come down to brass tacks, the packer is the boy making the money. I am informed that they are making more money today than ever before. The subsidy is not working at all to the benefit of the grower of either cattle or sheep or to the consumer.

It is interesting for us to know just what these profits are. The O. P. A. revealed last week, after a careful study, that the profits of the packers had jumped to over four times the average of 3 pre-war years, 1936–39. This study, which covered 53 companies handling 85 percent of the Nation's meat production, showed the aggregate profits of the packers in peacetime to be $24,971,000 a year, but that now this figure has jumped to $108,613,000 for 1942. The top group, which does 70 percent of the total business, rolled up 336 percent more profits, from $23,476,000 to $102,322,000. The medium firms rose even more, by 638 percent, from $717,000 to $5,293,000.

These huge profits are coming out of the hides of the producers as well as from the consumers, and the producer, being a consumer also, gets hit twice. I always contended the liquor dealers and the saloon men, owing to the roughshod manner in which they carried on their business, were the cause of prohibition. You will also remember the policy of railroads that "the public be damned"—until Government ownership loomed. Then they commenced to realize that the public was not impotent to act. Let the packers beware and stop, look, and listen before they proceed during this wartime to rob both the consumer and the producer through their monopolistic practices. Let us not be too harsh in our criticisms of men going into the bowels of the earth and of those engaged in other industries for their daily wage, when they see these exorbitant profits that are being made and as a result feel they should get something additional.

The use of subsidies will never be passed on to the producers or the consumers by the packers under the present system. They are simply adding to the huge profits of the processors. I have contended on the floor of this House ever since we were threatened with war that the best way to maintain and increase production was by guaranteeing at least cost of production, and the only means by which that can be accomplished is by placing a floor under the prices which may be paid for the live animals, and if we are to use subsidies they can only be passed to the producers in that way. The placing of a floor under the price of live animals is absolutely necessary regard-

less of whether or not subsidies are paid to the packer. The ceiling is not the answer to increased production. Ceilings guarantee nothing.

Livestock men must have more assurance of what they are to receive for their product. Otherwise production is going to lag. The wage earner knows what he is going to get when he goes to work. The industrialists know what they are going to receive when they build a ship, and so forth, but the farmer and stockman do not know today whether or not they are going to be paid a reasonable price for their product when it is raised and sold. They are taking the chance, and they are the ones who are producing the food for the Army and Navy, the civilian population of this country, and our allies. You cannot throw them out of the door. Food is vital in winning this war.

Here let me also say that I think the policy of the O. P. A. in figuring the point values on beef as high as they have is no less than asinine—in fact, that might be said of the points for all meat. I was glad to see a recognition of this fact by the Office of Price Administration as reported in this morning's papers that, effective at midnight, a reduction of two points per pound in the ration cost of all pork cuts was to occur. We have the largest cattle population in the United States we have ever had. People want those points lowered consistent with the needs of the Army, Navy, and lease-lend requirements. There is beef everywhere but it cannot be used. The miners, loggers, and other workers of my State who perform heavy, back-breaking work have repeatedly told us that they will have to have more meat to keep up their strength and in turn keep up production.

Prices for farm products and livestock products have been so uncertain that I am afraid we will have a shrinkage in beef products in the coming year. In years gone by we in Montana would have feeder lamb buyers and calf buyers come to our ranches to buy our lambs and calves. None came this year to speak of. Why? Because we had no program to insure feeders against actual losses, much less paying them for their time and feed. The result is that there will be a shortage of fed lambs and fed yearling cattle this coming year. I do not need to tell you that a calf may be brought to weighing 700 or 800 pounds in a short time by proper feeding—producing the choicest and most beef in the shortest of time. The Government must wake up to the fact that we have got to promulgate a program that is going to at least insure our producers and feeders their cost of production. Up to date we have not done this.

We talk a lot about inflation. The present price of wheat is only $1.59 per bushel in Chicago, the present price of corn is 90 cents, and potatoes were sold in my State for $1.50 to $2 a hundred, scarcely the cost of the production. Where is the inflation? The inflation occurs after it leaves the farmer and producer. One of the best answers to inflation is increased production. The more there is of a commodity, the less it is apt to sell for. We can increase production if we guarantee a man he is not going to lose his shirt in the process, and we are not going to have increased production until we do that. Increased production is also a fairly good answer to the rising cost of living; it will lower the price. It is production that we must have. So, getting back, if we are going to use subsidies, let us use a floor price and use subsidies to supplement the floor price. Now the Congress has done its part. It gave the President full power, and not only that, but directed him to fix these prices. What more could the Congress do?

In conclusion, let us all, Democrats and Republicans, and all others, throw politics and political schemes out of the window and think only of the boys who are dying, maimed in mind and body and blinded and destroyed in mind by the thousands on the 55 battle fronts of the world, and of the winning of this war. It is not won yet by long odds. It is going to take work. It is going to take unity. It is going to take sacrifices. It is discouraging to me to see these political contentions which certainly are furnishing fuel for our enemies. If mistakes have been made, in the failure to fix prices, wages, and so forth, and if subsidies have to be used to correct those mistakes, if they will enable us to win the war more quickly and bring our boys back home, let us use them or use any means that will accomplish that end.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman is making a very fine statement, especially on the sheep situation. This morning I received an official Department of Agriculture report on the lamb-feed situation in my district. As a result of the confused policy that has been followed in respect to feeding livestock, the feeder lambs are less than 50 percent of normal.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, the gentleman is right.

As I have said you can pay all the subsidies you want to, but they never go into the hands of the man who produces. You have to get them into the hands of the man who produces if you want increased production, and increased production is a good answer to inflation. Put three suits of clothes where there is only one, three bushels of wheat where there is only one, three calves or steers where there is only one, and you increase the amount to be bid for and the price comes down. It is a fairly good answer to the rising cost of living, also.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not also true that the lack of buyers of calves and the lack of buyers of lambs goes right back to the grazing lands in the gentleman's State and in Colorado and Utah, and causes a reduction in the propagation of sheep on the grazing lands in that area?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why, of course. I want to say this to the gentleman. Many sheepmen have closed out as a result of just what you say. Many cattlemen are also liquidating. There is no guaranteed price for these producers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the costs of herders has advanced 200 and 250 percent?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; that is another vital point. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up. We are paying $125 and $150 a month today for sheep herders whom we used to pay $50 a month. We are paying $150 and $165 a month for an ordinary common fencer whom we used to get for $50 a month. Then costs of operation on farms have gone up easily 200 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3477, is one of the most important measures that has come before the House since the war clouds first gathered over the country. Although its greatest impact will be felt on the home front, this bill ranks in importance with the military and naval bills which have passed this House.

Therefore, I would ask those who are in favor of this bill in its present form and without provision for food subsidies to carefully weigh the disastrous effect this bill will have both on the home front and on the fighting fronts, if food subsidies are excluded from this bill. I believe that all the Members of this House are deeply patriotic. I have a profound conviction that no Member of this distinguished body would knowingly prejudice the early and successful termination of the war, which has already taken a heavy toll among the youth of our country and has brought tears and sorrow to many American firesides. It is to that sense of patriotism that I appeal today in urging you, my colleagues, not to pass this bill without provision for food subsidies.

This is not only a war of men and arms, guns, ships, and planes. It is an economic war as well. The President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, has ordered our Army and Navy to advance and strike the enemy, and today our forces are advancing victoriously on all fronts. As Commander in Chief the President has ordered that the line of prices be held against inflation, the deadliest enemy on the home front. Do we at home lack the sacrificial spirit of our armed forces? Will we follow the orders of the Commander in Chief to hold the line against inflation, or shall greed for profit break the home front, while tanks and guns and bombers could not break the fighting

front. Pass this bill in its present form and upon this House will rest the terrible responsibility for the break in the price line against inflation, which will come as surely as the British broke the line at El Alamein or the Russians on the Dnieper, or our own brave troops are doing at the moment in Italy. That we, as Members of the historic House of Representatives, would do aught to aid and comfort the enemy abroad is unthinkable; that we should do aught to aid our deadliest enemy at home—inflation—chills me at the very thought.

I have the highest regard for the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and for my colleagues who are serving under him. I had the pleasure and good fortune to have served under him for 2 years on that committee. I do not question the motives or the sincerity of those who approved the majority report of that committee, but I could not let this opportunity pass without paying a tribute to the courage, forthrightness, and genuine statesmanship of our colleagues who signed the minority report.

An analysis of controversial section 3 makes it clear that the effect of this bill will be to help the farmer and bleed the consumer. It continues the power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support farm prices, which is for the benefit of the farmer, but it abolishes the power of the corporation to use any of its funds for making any subsidy or other payment or to absorb losses on any agricultural commodity or commodity processed or manufactured therefrom, for the purpose of reducing, maintaining or in lieu of increasing maximum prices, which, of course, would be an aid to the consumer. All aid to the farmer—no aid to the consumer. Guarantee the farmer against loss, but no protection for the consumer against higher prices. It may be said that the O. P. A. will protect the consumer. If this bill passes in its present form it will mark the beginning of the end of O. P. A., and make no mistake. Without subsidies and without the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to absorb losses incurred in reducing, maintaining, or in lieu of increasing maximum prices, the O. P. A. will soon become a thing of the past and the consumer public will be left to the ravages of the wolves.

To the agricultural bloc it seems perfectly fair and just that the farmer should receive all the protection and the consumer none. Thank God we have a President of all the United States, and not a President of just the agricultural States—a man who has the vision to see the difficulties of all the people, not only the difficulties of some of the people, and a man to whom, no matter how this Congress acts, the consumer public can still look with confidence, knowing he will see that they, and all other segments of our population, will not be taken advantage of in these times of war.

I call your attention to the fact that there are millions of people in this country who, being in the white-collar class, have not benefited in the wage scale even to the limited extent of the Little Steel formula. I cite for you as examples the school teachers, policemen, firemen, and other employees of the States, cities, and municipalities. The report submitted by a minority of the committee truly states the undeniable fact that there are 33,000,000 of our people, many with sons and husbands in the service, who are today less able to meet their ordinary living expenses than they were 4 years ago. Pass the bill in its present form and the total food index will rise 7.294 percent. Can the consumer stand that increase with wages frozen? May I urge those who are in favor of this bill to "Stop! Look! and Listen!" You are heading this country to disaster, for if ever this bill becomes law, labor will demand wage increases to meet the higher cost of living that will be imposed upon it, and the vicious spiral of inflation of higher prices will be followed by ever-increasing demands for higher wages.

It has been said that as a result of the settlement of the miners' wage controversy wages in general will rise. The miners represent only a small percent of the wage earners of the country. The wages of the balance of the workers, organized and unorganized, have been frozen, and in some instances unmercifully frozen. Yet the great wage-earning class has unselfishly accepted the burden that has been placed upon them as part of their patriotic duty and as a contribution to the great objective—an early and triumphant peace. I doubt whether they can be reasonably expected to continue their sacrifices when the agricultural bloc of this House tells them that the sacrifices of their sons and husbands are not enough, that their children must now go without milk, bread, and foodstuffs, so that the farmers of the country, who are receiving the highest prices in 20 years, may squeeze out the last cent of profit from the consuming public. They cannot reasonably be expected to sit quietly by and continue the sacrifices they have been making with the price of milk increasing under this bill a cent a quart, pork chops 4.6 cents per pound, butter 9.9 cents per pound, cheese 7.8 cents per pound, roundsteak 5.2 cents per pound, and so on down the long line of foodstuffs.

The farmers of this country rightly expect the Government to keep its pledge to support the floor under hogs at $13.75 per hundredweight. Labor, with no less justification, expects the Government to keep its pledge to maintain farm commodity prices at the September 15, 1942, level. Are we Members of the Congress going to tell the farmers of the country, by the passage of this bill, that we will keep the pledge that was made to them, and at the same time tell the consumer public that we will not keep the pledge that was made to them?

My colleagues, I give you this solemn warning which I trust will be heeded. The ten and one-half million people in New York City cannot continue at their present wage schedules if prices are not reduced. Their rents have increased, their food prices have risen, but in large part their wages and salaries are static and in addition the Government is withholding 20 percent of their wages and salaries, less their income-tax deductions. Are we so blind that we cannot see we are heading for strikes and food riots? And of what benefit will it be to the farmer? His dollar will be as inflationary as the dollar of the city resident. Inflation is not the enemy of the city resident alone—it is the enemy of the whole country.

A few days ago we increased the allotments to the dependents of men in the service and likewise increased the pensions of veterans of World War No. 1. Now this bill comes along, supported by the agricultural lobby, and the corporation farmers and if passed in its present form, the condition of the veteran and the serviceman's family will be worse than it was before. The increase in allotments and pensions will be an empty hypocritical gesture. Do not try to fool the soldier, sailor, and marine who is serving his country today.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain tables at the appropriate points.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. POAGE. On yesterday afternoon, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from the First District of Texas, who is leading the fight to have Government relieve each of us of a part of our present grocery bill and to require our returning soldiers to ultimately pay this bill for us together with interest and handling charges, challenged the Members of this House to tell us how we can keep down the cost of living and encourage production without the use of subsidies.

Mr. PATMAN. Without increasing prices, that is.

Mr. POAGE. What?

Mr. PATMAN. Without increasing prices.

Mr. POAGE. I said, "Keep down the cost of living." That would mean without an inflationary increase in prices. As a matter of fact the gentleman said:

> I challenge any Member of this body to get up, and I will yield to him, who will offer any plan—

But when a number of us rose, he refused to yield. I do not know whether he wants that question answered or not, but since the whole philosophy of the subsidy people rests on this assumption that this cowardly and selfish policy of requiring our soldiers to do both the fighting and the paying in this war is necessary, I want to answer the question.

In the first place, how will we encourage production? By assuring the farmer that he will receive parity for his products—the kind of parity that the President of the United States described in his message to Congress on September 7, 1942 when he said:

> Parity is a fair relationship between the prices of the things farmers sell and the things they buy. Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor. As a result, parity prices may shift every time wage rates shift.

That is what the President told the Congress, the farmers, and the Nation in order to get us to lower the figure at which ceiling prices could be placed on agricultural products. Relying on

the justice of this statement, farmers and farm representatives agreed to allow ceilings on farm products to be reduced from 110 percent of parity to parity or the highest obtained price between January 1, and September 15, 1942. This, my friends, is the famous "line" of September 15, 1942, to which the subsidy advocates so often refer. All I ask is that you hold that line, but the advocates of subsidy are not willing to carry out the agreement written into law on October 2, 1942. They do not simply want to hold the line. They want to roll it back. That line fixes the price of wheat at $1.47 per bushel on the farm. Wheat has been going up rapidly, but the latest figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that it is approximately 17 cents below that line—yet we are told today that the Government is going to subsidize flour—subsidize flour when wheat is less than one-half of the price it reached in the First World War. The September 1942 line fixes the minimum ceiling on medium beef cattle at $13.38 per hundredweight. On November 9, 1943, the average price of such animals was $12.14—$1.24 below the line. Hogs are substantially below the line. Cotton is almost 2 cents per pound below the line. Are these facts in keeping with the claims of the proponents of subsidies who say they only want to hold the line?

Farmers are just as patriotic as any group. They ask no special privileges, but they do appreciate a square deal. Give them that square deal and they will produce. It is most interesting to find that almost every man in the House who opposed the Pace bill to require the Department of Agriculture to include in its calculation of parity the cost of labor are today supporting subsidies. This House has passed, but the administration has opposed and has refused to carry out, the plain statement in the President's message that "calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including labor costs." Why not quit chiseling the farmers? That might help production.

Why not quit blaming the farmer for starting the spiral of inflation when the spiral has already been pushed far above his reach by other hands? Why not tell the truth, that the Government has by its surrender to organized groups almost at the point of a gun already approved the very shifts that the President said must result in a shift of parity? Why not face the facts? Why continue to say that if farm prices go up wages must go up? Wages have already gone up. Why try to ignore the coal-mine settlement? Why try to say that it is not inflationary? Why try to say that the other wage increases that are about to follow are not inflationary? Why not be fair with the farmer? He would appreciate it. Oh, yes, my friends, the line has been broken all too often, but not by the farmer. So I answer the part of the question about getting production by saying: Give the farmer what we promised him. Give him the price fixed as the ceiling by the 1942 line.

The answer to the first part of the question is similar. The gentleman wants to know how we can keep down the cost of living without subsidies. I refer the gentleman to his own O. P. A. Let this agency, which the gentleman has so often praised, simply apply the ceiling prices that it is authorized to apply. Let it apply these ceilings to all alike. Let the other agencies of Government exercise a little backbone while dealing with Mr. John L. Lewis. Let the people who have the duty and the power to enforce ceilings enforce them at the levels fixed by law rather than trying to effect all roll-backs at the expense of the farmer. Let them concentrate their efforts on the really important necessities of life and let luxuries go up. Why bother with the price of mushrooms? Let people pay any price they will for these items. The more they spend this way the less pressure there will be on the price of necessities. In short, let every Government agency follow the law. The act of October 2, 1942, pointed out the way to hold the line. Let us follow it.

Of course, it would help in our fight against inflation if we would meet the tax issue squarely and collect a much larger part of the cost of this war in current taxes from those who are now making the money. Why not an excess-profits tax all the way down the line on individuals? This is the only way we will ever remove the great accumulation of inflationary buying power now in the hands of those who are receiving the unreasonable wages of the shipyards and the airplane factories—all paid by the Government—and at the same time not work an injustice on those who have had no increase in salary. I favor such a forthright tax policy, but I do not believe that we should allow our failure to meet the tax issue squarely to serve as an excuse for us to avoid our plain duty to pay for our groceries as we eat them.

As a Nation, we are in a better position to pay for the food we eat today than ever before. Expenditures for food in relation to consumer's income are lower today than they were before the war. In July 1943 only 20 percent of the average consumer's income was required to purchase food, compared with 21 to 22 percent in the pre-war years and 25 percent during the depression of 1932–33. If consumers were now buying the same quantity of food as they did during the pre-war years of 1935–39, their expenditures for food would amount to only 16 percent of their incomes.

The data in the following table take into account the fact that many consumers are buying more and better quality foods, eating at restaurants more frequently, and the like, than they did when their incomes were lower:

Expenditures of consumers for food expressed as a percent of total income, 1929–43

Year and food expenditures as a percent of total income:	
1929	23
1930	24
1931	21
1932	25
1933	25
1934	24
1935	23
1936	21
1937	21
1938	22
1939	21
1940	21
1941	20
1942	21
1943 [1]	20

[1] Data for July 1943.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Marketing and Transportation Situation, August 1943, p. 12; May–June 1943, p. 3.

Food in terms of consumer incomes and pre-war consumption habits is cheaper today than any time in the last 30 years. If consumers purchased the same quantities of food today as they did during 1935–39, only 16 percent of their income would be required for food expenditures, compared with 20 percent in 1939, 25 percent in 1933, and 33 percent in 1919. Actually, higher incomes have resulted in many consumers buying more and better food, eating more meals at restaurants and the like, than in pre-war years; consequently, consumers are now spending around 20 percent of their income for food.

The data in the following table is based upon the assumption that consumers had not changed their buying habits and were purchasing the same quantities of food as they did during the pre-war period of 1935–39:

Percent of total consumer income required to purchase the same quantity of food as consumed in the pre-war period of 1935 to 1939

Year and percent cost of fixed quantities of food is of total income:	
1913	28
1914	30
1915	26
1916	24
1917	31
1918	31
1919	33
1920	32
1921	28
1922	26
1923	24
1924	23
1925	24
1926	24
1927	23
1928	23
1929	22
1930	23
1931	22
1932	24
1933	25
1934	25
1935	25
1936	22
1937	21
1938	21
1939	20
1940	18
1941	17
1942	17
1943 [1]	16

[1] Data for July 1943.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Marketing and Transportation Situation, August 1943, p. 12; May–June 1943, p. 3.

Following this thought a little further, we find:

The average weekly earnings of industrial workers increased $15.49 between January 1941 and July 1943. During this same period a very liberal estimate placed the increase in the weekly food expenditure for a family of four at $6.24. Assuming that there is only one

wage earner in a family of four, the increase in earnings has been much greater than the increase in food expenditures. If the worker purchased the same quantity of food as in the pre-war years, food costs for a family of four would have advanced $3.84 per week, compared with an increase of $15.49 in weekly earnings. Part of the increase in food costs has been due to many families purchasing more and better-quality food than when incomes were lower.

Increase in average weekly earnings of industrial workers compared with the increase in food cost for a family of 4, January 1941 to July 1943 (based upon the assumption that there is only 1 wage earner in a family of 4)

	Average weekly earnings of industrial workers [1]	Estimated food expenditures per week for a family of 4 [2]	
		Total amount spent for food, including meals at restaurants and the like	Assuming the same quantity of food was purchased as in the pre-war years 1935–39
January 1941	$30.61	$10.08	$8.76
September 1942	41.79	13.68	11.16
July 1943	46.10	16.32	12.60
Increase, January 1941 to July 1943	15.49	6.24	3.84

[1] Compiled by the National Industrial Conference Board and published in the Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce.

[2] Estimated from data published in the Marketing and Transportation Situation, September–October 1943, table 6, p. 21. The figures for January 1941 were estimated on the basis of the data reported for 1940 and 1941.

The food-subsidy program as now being applied by the Government amounts to about 11 cents per day for a family of four persons, or 2¾ cents per day per individual. Butter subsidies of 5 cents a pound amount to about 65 cents per year per person. A bread subsidy of 1 cent per loaf would amount to less than $1 per year per person. The present consumer-subsidy program amounts to around $10 per year per person.

Estimated effect of subsidies upon the daily food costs for a family of 4 persons

Product	Amount of subsidy per unit [1]	Estimated annual civilian consumption per capita for 1943 [2]	Effect on daily food cost for a family of four [3]
			Cents per day
Butter	5 cents per pound.	13.0 pounds	0.71
Cheese	4 cents per pound.	4.9 pounds	.22
Milk	1 cent per quart.	180.5 quarts	1.98
Meat	3 cents per pound.	124.0 pounds	4.08
Bread	1 cent per loaf.	92.5 loaves	1.01
Sugar	1 cent per pound.	75.0 pounds	.82
Vegetables	3.5 cents, No. 2 can.	19.2 No. 2 cans.	.74
Potatoes	1 cent per pound.	131.0 pounds	1.44
Amount per day for a family of 4.			11.00
Amount per day per individual.			2.75

[1] Based upon or calculated from information released by the Office of Economic Stabilization.

[2] Based upon data published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

[3] Calculated by multiplying the amount of the subsidy by the annual per capita consumption, then multiplying by 4 and dividing by 365.

Now let us see just what has happened to the earnings of industrial workers. The "hold the line" order was intended to stabilize the cost of living and wages as of September 15, 1942. Between September 1942 and August 1943, the average weekly earnings of factory workers in manufacturing industries increased 14.9 percent. During this same period, the cost of living increased 4.6 percent.

Percentage increase in average weekly earnings of workers in all manufacturing industries and in the cost of living since Sept. 1942 [1]

Year and month	Weekly earnings	Cost of living
1942:		
September	0	0
October	2.9	1.0
November	5.2	1.7
December	6.5	2.2
1943:		
January	7.5	2.5
February	8.8	2.7
March	10.4	4.2
April	12.4	5.3
May	14.0	6.2
June	14.7	5.9
July	13.1	5.1
August	14.9	4.6

[1] Calculated from data compiled by the U. S. Department of Labor, and published in the October 1943 issue of the Survey of Current Business, United States Department of Commerce.

The Little Steel formula allowed for an increase in wages of 15 percent in order to take care of the rise in the cost of living between January 1, 1941, and September 15, 1942. Actually, during this period the average weekly earnings of industrial workers increased nearly 37 percent, compared with an increase of about 17 percent in the cost of living. In July 1943, weekly earnings of industrial workers were 51 percent above the January 1941 level, compared with a 23-percent increase in the cost of living.

Percentage increase in average weekly earnings of industrial workers and in the cost of living since January 1941 [1]

Month	1941		1942		1943	
	Weekly earnings	Cost of living	Weekly earnings	Cost of living	Weekly earnings	Cost of living
January	0	0	22.4	11.1	42.3	19.7
February	2.6	0	22.6	12.0	43.3	20.0
March	3.9	0.4	24.6	13.4	44.7	21.8
April	4.2	1.4	26.4	14.2	47.1	23.1
May	8.2	2.1	27.4	15.1	50.0	24.1
June	11.9	3.8	29.1	15.5	50.8	23.8
July	10.1	4.5	30.0	16.1	50.6	22.8
August	11.4	5.4	33.5	16.6	.....	22.2
September	14.7	7.2	36.5	16.9	.....	.....
October	16.5	8.4	37.5	18.1	.....	.....
November	16.8	9.3	38.8	18.8	.....	.....
December	17.9	9.6	40.4	19.4	.....	.....

[1] Calculated from data compiled by the Industrial Conference Board, and published in the Survey of Current Business, U. S. Department of Commerce.

In August 1943, the wage income per employed industrial worker was nearly 91 percent above the pre-war (1935–39) average. The cost of living was about 23 percent higher, making an increase in real wages of 55 percent.

Comparison of the real wages of industrial workers with the pre-war average

[1935–39=100]

Year and month	Wage income per employed industrial worker	Cost of living	Real wages
1935–39 average	100.0	100.0	100.0
1941: January	118.7	100.8	117.8
1942:			
January	145.6	112.0	130.0
September	167.3	117.8	142.0
1943:			
January	173.4	120.7	143.7
February	177.2	121.0	146.4
March	181.1	122.8	147.5
April	184.1	124.1	148.3
May	186.2	125.1	148.8
June	185.5	124.8	148.6
July	186.8	123.8	150.9
August [1]	190.8	123.2	154.9

[1] Preliminary.

Data compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Cost-of-living index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Real wages" is wage income divided by the cost of living and represents the purchasing power of wages.

At the present time, farm income is 197 percent of what it was during the base period. Industrial workers' weekly income is 457 percent of what it was during the same period. Does it seem fair to reduce farmers' prices in order to aid industrial workers? Possibly those of you who say that this subsidy is not intended for the benefit of industrial workers did not read the letter you received this morning from President Philip Murray, of the C. I. O.

The leader of the subsidy forces has repeatedly referred to the subsidy which was paid to certain marginal copper mines. He says it saved the Nation considerable money. I think it did. But the people who are now supporting general food subsidies have never told you that the copper program has not the slightest resemblance to the food program. What happened in connection with copper was simply this. There are certain mines where copper could be produced in small quantities at a high cost. These mines were not being worked and could not be worked at the established price of copper. The Government agreed that it would pay more for the copper produced by these mines than it would for the copper coming from the mines that were already operating at a profit at existing prices. This enabled the high cost mines to produce, and the Nation got some extra copper that way. As to food, what is now proposed is that all shall be subsidized alike. The low-cost producers will be paid the same as the high-cost producers. The very essence of the copper program, its selectivity, will be thrown away. More than that, most of these food subsidies are to be paid not to the producer, but to the processor, which impels me to ask if any Member of this House knows the name and address of one single cattleman who was helped by the roll-back subsidy on beef cattle last June? If such there be, I want to get in touch with him. I had some cows and calves, and I lost, not gained, about 3 cents per pound as a result of that subsidy. Thousands of others had the same experience. I do

not believe that that subsidy is going to encourage many stockmen or farmers to increase production next year.

And what did the consumer get from this subsidy? My distinguished colleague from the First District of Texas has stated on numerous occasions that the consumer saved from $5 to $30 for each dollar spent on subsidies. I have, however, yet to hear him explain just how this saving is to be calculated. My wife reports that she was unable to notice any reduction at all in the retail price of beef as a result of the roll-back subsidy, but I have consulted the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. They could hardly be accused of being prejudiced against subsidies, but they tell me that their figures show that the consumer gets a reduction of 8.9 percent as a result of a 10-percent subsidy. This would indicate that the Nation lost 11 cents out of each dollar spent on subsidies as it was spent and that no man knows how much interest and administrative expense will be incurred before that dollar is repaid by taxes levied on some future generation at some distant date.

Of course, I recognize that in spite of the great increase in the national income, in spite of the great increase in the average income of the average worker, there are many people whose incomes are fixed, people who have had no increase at all. If we are to use the subsidy principle at all, why not take the best parts of the plan that the gentleman from Texas described in regard to copper? Why not use a selective system? Why not help those who need help—those who have not had an increase in income? Why not issue food stamps to that small portion of our people who have had no increase in their income and who need an increase to meet the increased cost of living? Why do you suppose the advocates of these consumers' subsidies want to subsidize Henry Ford and Alfred P. Sloan in order to reach Widow Smith and Professor Jones? Would it not be more reasonable to pay the subsidy only to those who need it? I think that we should recognize the difficult position of our white-collar workers, of our teachers, preachers, pensioners, and so forth. I am willing to aid them, but just because I would be willing to split some wood to help keep some dear old lady warm in a box house does not indicate that I am knowingly going to chop the winter firewood for a family of able-bodied men in brick mansions.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman but I do not want 1 but I would appreciate 2 additional minutes. It is evident that my colleague from Texas is going to take 1 minute to ask me a question. I will need 1 minute at least to answer him.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. I said that no Member could suggest a plan that would increase production and not increase the cost of living, without subsidies. Now, if the gentleman has a plan he will be the first one who has accepted the challenge and I hope he will explain what the plan is.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman evidently did not listen to me in the first place. I pointed out that if the gentleman would carry out the law as it is now written, let the farmer get what the law says he can get for his products, he can get production. I would suggest further that if the gentleman wants to keep prices to consumers lower, that he might establish, and I will vote for it, an excess income tax, touching all groups, clear down to the bottom, so as to siphon off the excess purchasing power in the hands of the people. I would suggest to the gentleman that if the O. P. A., which he has supported so many times, will but follow the law that gave it the power to establish ceiling prices at parity or at the highest attained prices, he can hold the line, if it is only the line he is interested in holding. But if he wants to roll back prices, of course, that is a different matter. If that is what he wants to do he has got to charge that off to future generations. We cannot roll back present prices without piling up a tremendous debt. That will involve charging the boys who are overseas fighting today for the groceries we are now eating. The advocates of consumer subsidies would make those boys fight the war and pay for the war too. If the gentleman wants to maintain prices where the law fixed them in 1942, he can do it by applying the law as it is written.

Mr. PATMAN. I am still anxious to know the plan.

Mr. POAGE. I have given you the plan. In plain language, follow the law. There is no need to complicate it. My friends, food subsidies have been tried since the days of ancient Rome. Their only lasting result has been the destruction of economic and political institutions. It is easy to inaugurate but very difficult to abandon a subsidy. Any demagogue can promise a gullible public and a job-hungry bureaucracy that it will in some mysterious way relieve consumers of a part or even all of the cost of living. Once fastened on the country, no political party will have the nerve or the power to remove it. It is worse than the drug habit. It passes today's costs on to our returning soldiers. I think those of us who stay home should at least pay our own grocery bill. It will cost less to pay now. To postpone the payment will involve not only exorbitant administrative expense but also billions of dollars in interest. General subsidies themselves are certainly no less inflationary than wage increases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has again expired.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I enter this discussion of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill this afternoon. I am the last one in this Congress to stand here and advocate anything that would bring about inflation or disturb any stabilization program of our Nation. I have a great stake in this war, as most of you Members of Congress have. We have more than our own political futures at stake in this decision we are making. I would be very reluctant to vote for this bill if there was any other way of stabilizing prices and controlling inflation, but when the Congress created the O. P. A. it gave to that agency all the power in the world to stabilize prices at a fair and equitable level.

It is only because they have not established those prices at fair and equitable levels and handled it in an efficient manner that they come here today and ask the Congress to give a subsidy to cover up the mistakes they have made. I say that advisedly. In answer to my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] when he asks someone to give him a formula to eliminate subsidies without raising prices, I cannot give him a direct formula, but certainly he was in the committee hearings and there were enough illustrations brought out at those hearings to prove to me, and certainly to him, that had the O. P. A. handled price regulations with a sense of efficiency or with any practical knowledge of the problems they were handling, a great many of the requests for subsidies today would not have been made.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman has voiced the sentiment of a great many Members when he intimates that one of the reasons these subsidies are so distasteful is because of the operation of O. P. A. I hold in my hand a market bulletin from my State, South Carolina, in which a farmer advertises 400 bushels of sweetpotatoes for sale at $1 per bushel, showing that he has no local market in which to dispose of his potatoes or else he would not be advertising them for sale. On my way to the office this morning I stopped at a grocery store and inquired the price of sweetpotatoes. The groceryman said, "Ten cents a pound," which amounts to $6 per bushel.

Much has been said in the discussion of this bill about support prices, but I am unable to see where the support price for the farmer or the subsidy price for the consumer has been of any benefit to either because if support prices were of any benefit this farmer would be getting more than a dollar per bushel for his potatoes and if the consumer had been protected or benefited in any way he would not be required to pay $6 a bushel for them. If this illustration is representative it forces me to the conclusion that the

price-control program has failed in its purpose and is disappointing to both the producer and the consumer. I do not know whether the illustration is representative or not but I do know this paper I hold in my hand was issued just 1 week ago by the commissioner of agriculture in my State and that sweetpotatoes are selling for 10 cents per pound in the District of Columbia today. A farmer offering to sell 400 bushels of sweetpotatoes for $400 in South Carolina, yet consumers here, and I assume elsewhere, are obliged to pay at the rate of $2,400 for a corresponding amount, a difference of $2,000. The support-price subsidy or the consumers subsidy do not seem to have benefited either. There seems to be something wrong somewhere and it does not appear that a subsidy has been able to correct or improve the situation.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman is entirely correct. That is just one of many illustrations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement, not for a speech?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say that according to labor statistics the cost-of-living index for potatoes has advanced 59.4 percent since September 15 of last year.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I just want to give one illustration since the gentleman from South Carolina used the sweetpotato example. I wish to refer to some testimony which came out before our committee and with which you are familiar if you read the hearings. That is the case of canned spinach. Baltimore is one of the spinach-canning centers of the country. During the last spring season when Maryland spinach was at its height, the O. P. A. set a price of $1.89 per bushel wholesale on spinach sold to the market trade. At the same time they put a ceiling of 48 cents on spinach to the canner. They expected the canner of spinach to buy it at 48 cents, competing against a market trade offering of $1.89. The testimony before our committee was that as a result of that legislation instead of 1,000,000 cases of spinach being packed by the Baltimore canning industry last spring they packed only 200,000 cases. In other words there was a loss of 800,000 cases as a result of which the points on spinach were raised and the Members know how hard it is to get canned spinach. These are some of the illustrations of the way the administration of the O. P. A. has been handled and which makes the request for these subsidies necessary. If we needed a subsidy to stabilize our war economy I would be for it. I would not, as I said a moment ago, do anything to break up our stabilization program; but I am not willing to stand here and provide money to an agency to cover up their mistakes and inefficiencies and the lack of knowledge of those handling the food program of this country. In my opinion that is the way the O. P. A. has administered this program.

There are just one or two basic things I want to talk about for a minute. It has been charged in quite widespread manner that this is a bill of the farm bloc, of the farmers of this country. Why is this a bill of the farmers of this country? The farmers are taken care of under the subsidy program. Why would it not be much easier for the farmers to get what they want when we can borrow that money from the United States Treasury than by an increase of prices? Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the country are conservative people. They are the people who know how hard it is to make a dollar. They do not believe in spending money just to throw it away; they are not in favor of issuing bonds to get money to pay the consumer's food bill when the consumer can afford to pay it better today than at any other time in his life. That is why the farmers of the country are against food subsidies, because they are a conservative people and do not believe in that kind of political philosophy.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They are for a producer subsidy, however.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. There is a sound basis for producer subsidy in the case of essential commodities. The producer subsidy is an incentive subsidy to get increased production. When the Government directs farmers to produce beyond the reasonable limits they have a legitimate obligation to those producers. That is entirely different from the obligation to pay the food bill of the consumers at a time when the consumers are better able to pay it than they ever have been before in the history of our country.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. In connection with this producers' subsidy is not the Government now paying a producer subsidy to every laboring man who works in an airplane plant or a shipyard or any of those plants where the Government raised the wages far beyond the regular level in order to get the workers in there? Is not that a producer subsidy?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Yes; and they are paying a subsidy on housing, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. We have heard a lot of complaints about dairymen and the cost of the production of milk. If you will read the hearings before our committee a little further, you will find that the fixing of prices on feed by the O. P. A. has had a great deal to do with the request of the dairymen for a milk subsidy or an increased price. Every Member of this House who is familiar with the dairy industry knows that the dairy farmer produces his roughage and produces his basic grain to make up his feed mixture for his cattle; but when O. P. A. comes in and sets a price on dairy feed that prevents a farmer from buying a ton of protein dairy feed, he then is thrown on the mercy of the feed dealer.

The result has been that instead of being able to buy protein feeds to mix with his own home-grown feeds and making a cheap, efficient, highly desirable dairy feed, he has had to go to the feed dealer and buy a mixed feed at about 50 percent of an increased cost over what the basic ingredients of those three feeds sell for individually. Any feed dealer in the country is protected with a ceiling price by O. P. A. on his protein feed, yet he can mix the three or four together and charge 50 percent more without anything happening to him. They then ask the Congress to appropriate a subsidy to cover up that kind of handling of the dairy feed question.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many phases to the way the O. P. A. has handled this food question that could be gone into that I could take much more time than I have to go into them this afternoon. On the radio the other night, and I think I should say this in fairness, our distinguished colleague from Texas said that this was a political bill reported out of the committee in a conspiracy with the Democrats. I am a Democrat, Mr. Chairman, my people have been Democrats for years gone by and I am still a Democrat. Nobody has approached me with any idea of entering into a conspiracy to report this or any other bill for political reasons. And I may say further that whatever stand I take on legislation in this House will be based on my honest, sincere, and considered judgment on the particular subject. I am in favor of this bill whether all the Democrats are for it or none of them are for it but myself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman will remember that while the hearings were conducted, I interrogated Mr. Hutchins, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with respect to proteins in the form of cottonseed cake and meal. May I say that within the last 10 days I have direct information, by letter, from ranchers in the Southwest that they are paying open and above board a black market premium running from $10 to $17 per ton on cottonseed cake produced in central Texas. I think our friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], should bear facts like that in mind because they so closely relate to his district and that great State.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, last week a great number of livestock feeders and representatives of livestock feeders' organizations from most every section of the Nation came to Washington by invitation from the Senate Agriculture Committee. The committee held hearings for several days, taking testimony from these men who came directly from their farms to tell the Congress exactly what they

thought of the O. P. A. regulations and subsidies to the meat producers. They are anxious to produce to the limit for the war effort, but are now being hindered in their efforts because of the bungling theorists here in Washington.

It was my great privilege to attend one of the sessions and to hear among others a farmer and stock feeder from my own district, a man who knows his business from long years of experience and who is quick to recognize when a monkey wrench has been thrown into the machinery. He is Mr. Wayland Hopley, of Atlantic, Iowa, who in partnership with his brother Harry, operates one of the most successful stock farms in Iowa. Mr. Hopley is president of the Iowa Beef Producers' Association and as such he came here last week and made a most convincing argument against subsidies and bureaucratic control of the beef industry, which he proved by facts and figures has decreased the production of beef.

Here is Mr. Hopley's testimony. It should convince the O. P. A. that they should change their course.

I am Wayland Hopley, of Atlantic, Iowa, a farmer, cattle feeder and breeder, and president of the Iowa Beef Producers Association. My farms are located in southwestern Iowa and I have been engaged in the livestock business all my lifetime. On our combined farm we will feed out annually about 3,000 cattle, as well as lambs and hogs. At the present time, my mind is in such a state of chaos and confusion that I am afraid to go into our normal and annual beef production. As a result, we have in our yards today and in our pastures and stock fields about 650 head of cattle. This is merely the picture of my feed yards as they exist today, which is also typical of the majority of my farmer friends and neighbors who are engaged in the same industry. I have taken occasion to make a survey of the cattle feeders here assembled, for whom I am privileged to speak, and I find this is a true picture as it applies to their respective territories. To more emphatically illustrate the point as to what is happening to the cattle-feeding industry in the State of Iowa, I wish to present the figures obtained from the secretary of agriculture's office in the State of Iowa relative to the shipments of feeder cattle coming into the State of Iowa for the months of August, September, October, and the first few days of November, for the year 1942, as against the year 1943. To date, our shipments of feeder cattle have been 579,137 against 710,247 for 1942, which would show a reduction of feeder cattle for those months of 131,110. The period of 1942 was considerably less than the period of 1941.

I quote from the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

"Shipments of stocker and feeder cattle into the Corn Belt States in October were smaller this year than last and the second smallest for the month in 5 years. The decrease from October last year was largely in the direct movement. Records for 8 Corn Belt States show that while the total in shipments in October this year were 32,000 head below last year, the number coming in from public stockyards was about 10,000 head larger.

"For the 4 months, July through October, the movement of stockers and feeders into the Corn Belt was also the second smallest in 5 years. The total into the 11 Corn Belt States this year, inspected through public stockyards, was 9 percent below last year but larger than in 1941. The total into 8 States, both from markets and direct, of 1,170,000 head was about 107,000 head, or about 8 percent below last year, but was about 60,000 head larger than in 1941.

"Reports from States outside the Corn Belt are that cattle-feeding operations in nearly all of these States will be below last year, and the smallest in the last 5 years at least. Because of the reduced production of sugar-beet feeds, and the smaller number of sugar factories operating this season, the total number of cattle fed by or at these factories will be substantially smaller than last year.

"In October, as in preceding months, the preference of cattle feeders was for heavier weights of feeders, and prices of these were high relative to yearlings or calves. Slaughter records indicate that a relatively large number of calves, that in recent years would have been taken for stockers or for feeding, went to slaughterers in October."

The remarks I might make to explain to you gentlemen my reactions and feelings to this chaotic condition we find ourselves in could be much more easily said if I were at home in my feed yards and in the surroundings which would be more adaptable to my means of expression. It is high time that Congress recognizes the situation that is confronting the Nation regarding its feed supply and the future production of beef. Unless Congress asserts itself and takes steps to stop the bureaucratic directives that are being issued by various bureaus in Washington to the food producers of this country, we are headed for a real shortage of beef. The cattle feeders find themselves in a state of chaos and confusion and are more confounded each time a directive comes from Washington concerning the meat problem. The markets are now at times completely demoralized, and no feeder or farmer wants to raise or feed cattle, hogs, or lambs when he, by experience over the past year and a half, knows that a group of theorists are more than likely to put into effect a new regulation that will upset his whole feeding operation, to say nothing of the financial loss thereby sustained.

The beef production is going to depend entirely on the way it is handled in Washington. If they will allow prices that justify a profit to the producer, they will get plenty; if not, the farmers will undoubtedly spend part time on their farms and in their feed yards and part time in defense plants and other jobs, where the compensation is greater; as a result, probably small production in all places. Ceilings and subsidies are two terms that are exceedingly obnoxious to cattle feeders and farmers. True, we cattle feeders are opposed to runaway price or inflation, but the arbitrary way the ceilings have been imposed upon us, not having been consulted, has not met with our approval. We feel controls and management are quite necessary, but these controls should be directed at demand and supply—not at price pegging. We are unalterably opposed to any and all subsidies. They propose to give cheap food and prevent inflation, but we farmers feel that if the Government spends money for a subsidy that it must borrow the money, pay interest, and pay men for administering these funds, so the same subsidized foods will, in the long run, cost the consumer more than they would if they paid a fair price when they bought it. It has always been accepted as a fact that Government borrowing was in itself inflationary, so that we feel subsidies are very much an illusion, or bait hung out to the consuming public to supposedly cheapen their living costs, which it does not do.

Our regulators or dictators are very slow to learn anything by the old, tried method of experience. It seems to us producers that the whole beef-cattle program has been very badly handled by the powers in Washington. They say: "Food will win the war and write the peace," and that it is just as essential to the war effort as are arms, tanks, airplanes, or ammunition, but they have one way of getting food and another for the equipment of the Army, Navy and Air Force. The cry goes out to get equipment for the armed forces at any price—not inflationary—but when food production is wanted, it must be cheap or the price low to prevent inflation.

We are proud of the production we are getting from some of our defense plants. We farmers have sons in the United States forces and we want them well-equipped that they may meet their adversaries on at least an equal basis, and are for this all-out war effort, but we also want them well-fed and well-clothed, and that is our part in the war effort. We farmers have only one desire, and that is to produce an abundance of food and fiber, but the sooner we recognize the limiting factors about this food production, the better it will be for all of our economy.

The farmer needs machinery and labor in order to produce the maximum amount of food. Unfortunately, we cannot get all the farm machinery we need. Then, for that reason, we need more labor; but prices received for farm products will not justify a farmer in going into the labor market to expand his farming business. This last year, when feed grain was so badly needed, we did not grow as many acres of corn as we did in 1920 but yielded more corn. We cannot produce or live on regulations out of Washington, and until we get agricultural business on comparable basis with industry and labor, recognize there is no substitute for price when you want production, we will not be able to sustain our fighting forces, civilian population, and our lend-lease effort as we should.

There is a subsidy on beef today, but is the American public buying their beef any cheaper? I checked my local retail market, both before and after the subsidy program was made effective, and found that price quotations had not been changed, let alone revised down. This being a fact, the consuming public is paying the same for its beef as it was prior to the announced subsidy program. Therefore, it must not be accomplishing its supposed purpose of lowering the cost of living.

It is reasonable to assume that with a fair and equitable price, the necessary beef requirements for the armed forces, civilian population and lease-lend could and would be produced and might even be increased if the need were necessary. If this subsidy program is carried out to its fullest extent, it is purely inflationary, and the thing no cattle feeder wants. The feeders of cattle know that there will be a shortage of beef as soon as the present marketing of range cattle is completed, but not a shortage of cattle. This is due to the fact that feeders have not placed and are not placing their usual quota of cattle on feed because these feeders have been kept confused and alarmed by constant threats of additional regulations and restrictions, such as live ceilings, Government buying, allocations and subsidy programs, causing constant price roll-backs.

Any policies which tend to put the cattle feeder in such a frame of mind that he is cutting down our meat production, I believe would be decidedly unwise from the standpoint of our Nation's health. Leaders of our armed forces have been quick to recognize the value of meat in the diets of men on our fighting lines. Army officers tell us that meat is the No. 1 item in Army needs and, according to quotations from officers of the Quartermaster Corps, they say that meat is eaten every day by the American soldier, and all Army meals are planned around a meat dish.

The food problem is not so confused that it could not be solved. Every segment of the livestock industry has cooperated in working

out a program known as the meat-management program, which I feel if it were allowed to work, would result in the stabilization of the industry and the production of ample meat to supply the armed forces, civilian population and lease-lend.

I wish to reiterate that I am unalterably opposed to the subsidy, due to the fact that we are better prepared to pay for our groceries as we go along today, with our present high rate of consumer income, than we ever have been in the history of our country. I feel that it is wrong and unjust to increase our national debt to pay for something which could easily be paid for at the present time, so that our boys who are now on the far-flung battle lines will not have this increased tax burden to pay off when they return. I am opposed to the subsidy, for the fear of what will happen to our industry after the war is over, and we will be compelled to go back to a normal field of production.

Cattle feeders do not want inflationary prices, but we do want a price at the market place which will get production. Abundant production will keep down consumer prices and I feel that we have not as yet come anywhere near our peak production if proper management was instituted. We must get away from the idea of Government support and let our industry stand on its own here at home and in this way back up our boys who are on their own in the battlefields of Europe and the South Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and to include a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the statement the gentleman's own statement?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure permission to do that when the House is not in Committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to my remarks appearing in the RECORD today in reference to the attempt on the part of the economic stabilizer to have the oil-petroleum industry accept the subsidies. I want to refer particularly to one part of my remarks of yesterday and restate it here today so that the Members will understand the position of our distinguished friend from Texas in the early part of the year.

Last Tuesday, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the distinguished Member from Texas, spoke at some length in support of subsidies. In the discussion which attended his remarks, the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. GERALD W. LANDIS, asked this question:

> Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies on oil?

To which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] replied:

> I am in favor of subsidies on anything that will encourage production without increasing the cost of living. You see, we have to have some kind of standard or guide to go by. I ask the gentleman now, and I ask any person present here, if he can name any way on earth that you can hold down the cost of living and encourage production without the use of a subsidy. I yield to any person who says he has a plan.

He thus gave his approval to subsidies to the oil industry. Yet, in an interim report of the Committee on Small Business, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman, under date of May 10, 1943, the following conclusion was stated:

> That subsidies and bonuses are untried in the oil industry and unworkable and undesirable for the general purposes now needed.

I do not know which of the gentleman's views to accept as being his firm conviction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the bill presented to the House and shall support it.

I do not believe there is a Member of this body who, whether he is for or against subsidies, believes in inflation. I do not want inflation and my support of the bill before us is based upon my opinion that it will aid in preventing inflation. The great threat to inflation in this country is the ever-mounting national debt.

Congress discharged its duty to the people in passing the Stabilizing Act under which the Office of Price Administration was created. The purpose of that law was to stabilize prices. If it has not been done, it is because of the failure of the Office of Price Administration to do its duty as directed by Congress. If the taxpayers and the consumers were different persons, there might be some argument to justify consumer or food subsidies. Unfortunately they are one and the same person and as such must foot the bill.

Advocating subsidies of this nature contains the dangerous doctrine that the state should support the people rather than the people support the state. I desire to point out, and especially to the people for whom I speak in this body, that living costs, if consumer subsidies are established, will be more than saved now at the grocery counter. There will be deducted from the laboring man's check and all others $2 for every dollar saved now to pay back the money that must be borrowed, with interest on the bonds and the increased cost of administration through the building up of the ever expanding bureauracy in Washington. If the Government must pay the grocery bill of the people now when the wage scales and the national income are the highest in our history, when will they be able to pay? Under a consumer-subsidy program we will be paying to the Government in heavier and more burdensome taxes any increase in the cost of living instead of paying it to the storekeeper now.

Those who advocate food subsidies and request the Government to pay for what is placed on the table are asking succeeding generations, including the men who now fight the Nation's battles, to pay our board bill.

The Nation's farmers have been called upon to produce more food. They are as patriotic as any other segment of our people. They are willing to do it but they are opposed to accepting Government bribery to do so. What reason can any Member of this House advance for not paying those who till the soil and produce the food we eat a reasonable price for their produce in the open market place? No one has answered that question. Behind this philosophy of consumer subsidies is vicious political control and regimentation of the farmer and he knows it. Food subsidies mean discouraging food production. They are a demagogue's paradise providing him with the instrument to promise higher prices to the producer and lower cost to the consumer.

In the 12,000 word message sent to this House by the President advocating food and consumer subsidies, there was one very glaring omission, namely the President failed to point out to the people that whatever the Government paid now on their living costs would be collected with interest and expenses in heavier taxes demanded by the Government later.

If food subsidies are adopted what does it mean to the average individual? If he uses 5 quarts of milk weekly and the Government pays 1 cent a quart subsidy, the average person would save $2.60 for the year. Under the present rationing system each individual is entitled to 12 pounds of butter a year. With the Government paying 5 cents a pound, the total saving is 60 cents annually; and if the individual can buy 2 pounds of meat weekly there would be a saving of 6 cents a pound or an annual saving of $3.12. The total saving per person per year on these three essential items is $6.32.

The Government will be compelled to borrow to pay the subsidies on these three items the sum of $200,000,000. No one will seriously contend that our enormous debt, which may reach $300,000,000,000 before the end of this war, can or will be paid within 50 years. The interest alone on the $200,000,000 spread over a period of 50 years at the rate paid on War Savings bonds will amount to $1,160,000,000 or two and a half times the original subsidy paid. This means that for $6.32 now saved to the consumer he will pay $19 in taxes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, subsidies are economically unsound and vicious. They lead to political control and regimentation. The roll-back program means three things to every American citizen: more bureaucrats, more taxes, and more power in Washington.

These subsidies are unfair, because they are paid from the borrowings at the expense of our fighting forces and future generations. They lead to greater inflation, because they increase available purchasing power, increase Federal expenditures, and contribute to a loss of confidence in the financial stability of the Government.

Farm organizations, producers, the farmers, food processors, distributors, Congress, and every American citizen who expects to pay his own grocery bill are opposed to subsidies. The administration has been strangely silent on the fact that to pay these subsidies it must sell more War bonds, collect more

taxes, or borrow more money from the banks.

Just why are the New Dealers urging the adoption of the subsidy program? I will tell you the answer. First, to bait the American producers and consumers for fourth-term votes; and, second, to place more New Dealers on the Federal pay roll to administer this new program. We already have more than 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll. But every thinking American knows that the subsidy program is to put $1 in one pocket and take $2 out of the other pocket. The roll-back program is a complete admission on the part of the O. P. A. that it will not be able to control prices and must resort to hidden inflation rather than orderly wartime price adjustments.

If the subsidy program is abolished, the New Dealers will make an effort to place the blame on the Republican Party for creating inflation. Nevertheless, inflation is already here, but most of the Federal officials will not admit it. The American people know that their dollar will not purchase as much as it formerly did. Inflation is here through black markets, the cut in the size of packages, and a lower quality of merchandise.

This administration has tried to confuse the people about subsidies and price control. They claim subsidies are holding down the cost of living, when, in fact, price control is doing the job of keeping down prices to the degree that prevails.

The roll-back of food prices will not effectively stimulate food production. On the contrary, it will have the opposite effect. The subsidy program is just another method the New Dealers have in promoting their philosophy of scarcity.

An example of the failure of the subsidy program was illustrated when the canners came to Washington.

THE CANNERS CAME TO WASHINGTON

Mr. Speaker, yes, the canners came to Washington just like thousands of other businessmen to help out in the war effort and take part in the battle for a united home front. They were, of course, given the run-around by the alphabetical agencies. It was too bad they had to spend so much of their valuable time away from their business. Many of them spent days and even weeks here trying to get something done. Some of these canners were here in December of 1942, some came back in the early months of 1943. At the start of the year, canners had sought definite information on raw-material costs, price ceilings, and wages. But by the middle of June, with the packing season under way, none of these problems were solved. As a result, the 1943 pack of seasonal vegetables and fruits are 27,000,000 cases under the 1942 pack, according to the canners of America. This loss is due to delays and bungling by Federal officials and the adoption of the subsidy program. The 1943 pack was finally subsidized by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If the Government had accepted the canners' program and allowed them an increase of 1 cent per can, we would have a full 1943 pack today at a smaller cost to the consumer. Our civilian population would find more canned fruits and vegetables on the shelves in the food stores this winter.

I hope the New Dealers will begin to see the light. I hope the canners will not have to go through the red tape and delays they had to contend with last year. They started the year with the purpose to produce the largest pack possible under wartime conditions. The four most important factors facing them in 1943 were: First, the amount and price of raw products; second, amount of labor available and the wage rate they would have to pay; third, maximum prices that would be established for sales both to the Government and civilian trade; fourth, amount of equipment and containers available.

The canners were forced to deal with several Federal agencies, such as the War Labor Board, the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, the War Food Administration, and the O. P. A. No wonder there was delay and bungling. A single food administrator with complete authority would have helped considerably in solving this important problem of getting out a full 1943 pack.

Mr. Speaker, subsidies have failed to increase the production of canned goods. The canners did a splendid job, notwithstanding the New Deal restrictions placed upon them. The canning industry is ready and willing to go to the limit to do a job next year, but it cannot accept the responsibility for failure to do the job desired in 1944 if it is compelled to operate under either delayed or impracticable policies and regulations.

Let us remove the shackles from the canning industry and give them an opportunity to process the food to win the war.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in the midst of this discussion involving subsidies, according to an announcement which has just come to hand, the National Lawyers' Guild is tendering a testimonial dinner and reception at the Mayflower Hotel to the Honorable James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and Chairman of the Board of War Communications, on November 19, 1943.

The announcement describes Mr. Fly as having been "an ardent champion of the greatest freedom of all groups to secure time on the air and of the widest possible extension of radio service to all listeners." The notice of this jamboree is signed "District of Columbia Chapter, National Lawyers' Guild," and it recites that Mr. Fly "has done an outstanding job of preserving the integrity of the administrative process"—and I emphasize the phrase "administrative process"—"by his courageous stand against the Dies and Kerr committees and by his steadfast opposition to the Cox committee; and he has been a tireless worker in attempting to gear the all-important communications industry to the war effort." A full copy of this announcement reads:

NATIONAL LAWYERS' GUILD,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAPTER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: On Friday evening, November 19, the National Lawyers Guild is tendering a testimonial dinner and reception at the Mayflower Hotel to the Honorable James Lawrence Fly. As Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and the Board of War Communications, Mr. Fly has been an ardent champion of the greatest freedom of all groups to secure time on the air and of the widest possible extension of radio service to all listeners; he has done an outstanding job of preserving the integrity of the administrative process by his courageous stand against the Dies and Kerr committees and by his steadfast opposition to the Cox committee; and he has been a tireless worker in attempting to gear the all-important communications industry to the war effort. Mr. Fly will deliver an address on the importance of freedom of communications, both in the domestic and international field.

A distinguished group of Government officials and members of the bar are joining in the tribute to Chairman Fly. Vice President Wallace; Leon Henderson; and Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, have kindly consented to address the gathering. Robert Kenny, attorney general of California and national president of the guild, will act as toastmaster. We believe that this dinner is one of the outstanding events that this chapter has sponsored.

All members of the bar and friends of Mr. Fly are cordially invited to attend this dinner. The subscription is $4.50 per plate. The number of tickets available is strictly limited, and we therefore urge you to make your reservations promptly at the guild office. Checks should be made payable to District of Columbia Chapter, National Lawyers' Guild. Reservations may be made for groups at tables accommodating 10 persons.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAPTER,
NATIONAL LAWYERS' GUILD.

It is obvious therefore that this feast of honor is being tendered the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission for the contempt he has shown Congress, congressional committees and individual members of the National Legislature. It is unique in the history of America for a so-called organization of lawyers to thus honor one so contemptuous of the Nation's law-making body, but it is thoroughly in keeping with the communistic performances of the National Lawyers' Guild.

Mr. Fly is to deliver an address on the importance of freedom of communications both in the domestic and international field.

Mr. Chairman, with those proclaimed reasons for rejoicing and for praising Mr. Fly as Chairman of the Communications Commission and as Chairman of the Board of War Communications, a good time should be had by all. But there are still other hopes held out for a joyous occasion. "A distinguished group of Government officials and members of the bar are joining in the tribute to Chairman Fly." The Federal Government is to be represented on that festive occasion by none other than Vice President Wallace, Leon Henderson, erstwhile but hapless head of the O. P. A., and Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, who "have kindly consented to address the gathering." All members of the bar and Mr. Fly's friends

"are cordially invited to attend this dinner" at a cost of only $4.50 per plate.

Mr. Chairman, we readily recall another occasion when an assembled multitude was reminded that it had foregathered for a purpose other than to praise a noted character of history; but times, circumstances, organizations, and "isms" have undergone many changes. It now seems to be the style to combine praise of the living with propaganda for a continuance, even a redoubling, of their accomplishments along the lines advocated by the intelligentsia. The coming praise of Mr. Fly seems remote from a praise limited merely to past accomplishments—it portends other things that doubtless will be expected of him; and the testimonial dinner is probably meant as a spur to greater accomplishments along the lines of things sponsored and advocated by the guild.

For the benefit of the uninitiated, if there are any such at this late date, the National Lawyers' Guild is one of the most outspoken and rankest of communistic-front organizations of this or any other day. Its tenets, objects, and aims have been and are such that Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, former Attorney General; Mr. A. A. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State; New York Supreme Court Justice Ferdinand Pecora; Judge Nathan Margold, of our District of Columbia Municipal Court, and formerly solicitor for the Department of the Interior; New York City Comptroller Joseph D. McGoldrick; and others resigned, with reasons therefor which may be stated, as they were by Mr. Berle, as follows:

> It is obvious that the present management of the guild is not prepared to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line. Under these circumstances, and in company with most progressive lawyers, I have no further interest in it.

Come what may, Mr. Fly still thinks so well of the guild that he is willing to break bread with its members and at a dinner given under its auspices, and that at a time when our people are tightening their belts, foregoing as the President has strongly intimated, adequate diets as a safeguard against greater shortages of good food, and to the end that we may do more than a man's part in feeding, financing, and policing the world as a part of the new world order which is just now taking shape and emerging from the dream state.

Since it has become the fashion among high administrative officials in Washington to classify as Fascists those who dare criticize their divergent views, perhaps I should say no more. But, Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from observing that it seems strange that the expensive dinner to honor Mr. Fly should be held in these days of strenuous rationing, and when many organizations and associations are, at the behest of the Government itself, canceling their meetings, conventions, and banquets in the interest of the war effort. This observation holds, too, in the face of the fact that, in Ottawa, Canada, the people are not worried about a butter shortage or the shortage of any other kind of food—a place where the best filet mignon steak with all desired trimmings, decreases the content of the pocketbook not more than $1.10.

Seriously, whatever the true object of the impending testimonial, and whatever the subjects that will be discussed, let us hope that Mr. Fly will enunciate a fixed and determined plan to safeguard the freedom of the radio; and that any and all other proposals will be left to the countries which have dictators and admit the fact. If Mr. Fly does this, however, he will have to forsake a principle which he has helped to establish, namely, that radio stations may properly be required to sign and file stipulations with the Commission indicative of program content, as conditions precedent to favorable action by the Commission on matters before it.

One other matter, Mr. Chairman, and I shall have finished. A document accompanying the announcement of the Fly testimonial dinner bears the notation "Standard Form No. 64, office memorandum, United States Government," and is signed Harry M. Plotkin—spelled P-l-o-t-k-i-n. That paper indicates that officials and employees of the Federal Communications Commission are probably being solicited to purchase dinner tickets at $4.50 a throw, since Mr. Plotkin happens to be a member of the Commission's legal staff.

In these days of heavy demands upon Government employees for taxes, the purchase of War bonds, subscriptions to the Red Cross—so that persons of high estate may perform world travel—and subscriptions to the Community War Fund, which is an enlargement of the old community chest, and which spends its money, in part, through an ideological organization which busies itself with the rescue and bringing of alien refugees to this country, it seems our Government workers have enough legitimate uses for their surplus change, without being asked to buy dinner tickets at $4.50 each for the purpose of honoring any Government official.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should point out here that we are not, with this bill, writing or establishing a food program. We are merely resisting, with this bill, the establishing of a false foundation upon which to construct a sound food program.

I personally want to compliment the Banking and Currency Committee for the way they have handled this matter. It is a credit to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], the committee's able chairman, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], and to the entire committee.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provisions of this bill. The average citizen is most confused and bewildered by all of this discussion on subsidies, producer subsidies, consumer subsidies, price parities, and so forth. But when you ask him, "Do you want price stabilization, and are you opposed to inflation?" his answer is a most emphatic "Yes." Price stabilization or inflation is the question that is before us here today. There is no doubt about it but that the purpose behind this bill is to increase prices and to open the doors wide to uncontrolled inflation. Those supporting the bill say that it will not create inflation, and yet when I asked the question a few minutes ago of "whether you are willing to assume the responsibility for inflation in the event of the passage of this bill," you answered: "The Roosevelt administration must be responsible for the administration of the bill." It is like tying a man's hands behind his back and shoving him into a boxing bout and saying, "I'm not to blame if you do not lick that fellow."

For my part, I want to make this point clear: I intend to go up and down my district and tell my people that the Republican membership of this House, together with a few Republican-minded Democrats, are responsible for the passage of this bill and the results that will follow.

So far we have done fairly well in holding the line. So far we have not permitted the speculators, food profiteers, gougers, and black marketeers to run wild as they did in the last war—when butter was a dollar a pound, meat a dollar a pound, a small chicken $5, sugar, coffee, bread, shoes, and clothing, in fact, everything was prohibitive and priced beyond the reach of everyone, and as a result everyone suffered except the speculators and profiteers.

"To h—— with the war. We want our profits, too!" This seems to be the theme of the antisubsidy group. I have listened attentively to one after another of the supporters of this bill, and I have heard them say, "Subsidies are socialism," "We want economic freedom," "We want the American way of life," "We want the law of supply and demand," and it makes one stop, think, and shudder. Is our home front going to degenerate into one mad, greedy scramble for money?

When the Japs attacked us we did not think of "economic freedom," "law of supply and demand," "subsidies and socialism." No! We knew we were at war. We went to General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford, and to the other industries, and told them to stop making automobiles, refrigerators, and civilian goods and start making tanks, airplanes, guns, and ammunition. Did they say, "We won't do it! We want economic freedom"? Oh, no! We immediately called millions of boys into the armed services and gave them 10 days' time to leave their civilian occupations. Did they say, "We won't do it! We want our economic freedom! We want the American way of life"?

Let me ask you: What greater service could be rendered to Hitler and Tojo than to open the doors to inflation and cause economic chaos on the home front? Let us first win this war. We still have a long way to go. Let us not do any-

thing which would prolong the war. Wars always cause unnatural economic conditions which call for regulations that are repugnant in peacetime. But we are still very much in the war and our boys over there expect us to hold the line over here.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAPOZZOLI].

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great care to the various arguments advanced in support of this bill which, amongst other things, seeks to do away with subsidies. I have tried to see the justice of the attack made on subsidies. Frankly, I have been unable to do so.

My district is part of the great Lower East Side of Manhattan. It is a consumer district. It is populated by workers, many of whom have had no benefit whatever from the so-called defense work. In fact, in this latter respect, particularly, my district is typical of the other districts in the City of New York.

Little has been gained by the New York City residents from the so-called defense program of our country in comparison to other parts of the country. In fact, it has been estimated by competent authorities that over 400,000 persons are unemployed in my city. We all do know that shipbuilders on the west coast came to my city, gathered unemployed workers, and shipped them west to their shipyards. These workers had to go across the country, leave their families, and, in many cases, live under very unfavorable conditions, in order to earn a livelihood for themselves and their families.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, no one can be so naive as to believe that these family dislocations would have taken place if the defense program had made full use of the City of New York labor market and its industrial capacity. If this labor market was able to furnish the west coast with thousands of workers in shipyards, then why was there not a shipyard, doing shipbuilding, located in New York City, aside from those doing Navy and repair work? This question may not be germane to the issues now before us, but its consideration does shed some light on the necessity of keeping the cost of living from spiraling upwards, especially in the City of New York and other localities which have not benefited by the defense program.

Aside from the unemployed, New York City has thousands and thousands of the so-called white-collar workers and unorganized employees. Many of them reside in my congressional district. They have been subjected to all the disadvantages of a country at war and have not profited in any way from increased earnings. In fact, they have been unable to take advantage of the Little Steel formula. They have had to depend on the voluntary action of their employers for increases in wages. Yet they have had to continue to meet the rise in living costs as everyone else has had to do. Teachers, clerical workers, State, county, and municipal employees, policemen, firemen, librarians, and so forth, have had no benefit of increases in wages, with some exceptions. It is estimated that throughout the country there are 15,000,000 heads of families who have been unable to get a pay rise. They have been, and are now, at a disadvantage. Is the adoption of this bill, with the elimination of subsidies, going to help them? Obviously not. It is going to make their condition ever so more difficult.

It has been authoritatively stated that 4,000,000 wage earners still earn less than 40 cents an hour, with millions of others earning just a little above that. Also that 4,000,000 families have not had an increase of more than 5 percent since the beginning of the war. And what about those who have retired and are unable to work, depending for their support on fixed pensions, such as veterans, railroad and civil-service workers, the purchasing power of whom has gradually gone down? What shall we say to all these persons? Are we helping them by passing this bill in its present form?

The Little Steel formula was originally meant to fill the gap between wages and the cost of living from January 1941 to September 1942, and limited wage increases to 15 percent above prevailing level on January 1, 1941. Even as we debate this bill, the formula is being attacked and not without some justification. It is claimed that it has failed in its avowed purpose of halting living costs. Imagine with what more justification can demands for increased wages be made if food subsidies are banned.

Just what will be the immediate effects of this bill if it is enacted into law? For an answer to this question, let me refer you to what Mr. Chester Bowles has had to say about it. After all, as head of the Office of Price Administration, it is his duty to keep up to date on matters of this kind and, speaking for myself, I am perfectly satisfied that he is doing the best possible under the circumstances. He is entitled to the confidence and support of the American people in his efforts to handle a very perplexing problem.

He says that, without subsidies, the cost of a 5-pound rib roast would increase by 23 cents; 3 pounds of veal cutlet would cost 18 cents more; a 15-pound ham would go up 67 cents; butter by 10 cents a pound; milk by about 1 cent a quart; and cheese 8 cents a pound. Increases will take place in the foods so that the total food index will be increased by over 7 percent.

These increases would immediately result in a demand for higher wages, on a country-wide scale, and, for the life of me, I cannot see how such a demand can be denied, in the light of these increases. The result will be a break-down in the whole price-control structure and we shall be well on our way to inflation.

I yield to no one in my respect and admiration for the American farmer and his patriotism. However, it seems to me that the proper picture has not been made clear to the farmer. I am sure that he knows the meaning of adversity and he has known it from personal experience. We all remember the unfortunate condition which was his before President Roosevelt entered on his first term. The people of the country, by this Congress, and under the leadership of the administration, directed the payment of subsidies to the farmers during that period in order to save many of them from what looked like economic destruction. Congress saw the justice of subsidies then.

It is contended by those who claim to speak for the farmer that he does not want hand-outs or subsidies. Well, no other self-respecting American ordinarily would want them either. It is further said that the payment of food subsidies is not according to the American way of life. Is the mother who stays awake nights, worrying about the safety of her boy at the front, today living according to the American way of life? Is her boy fighting his way through the mud and jungle of a South Pacific island, at the present time enjoying the American way of life? No. Both of them are making sacrifices much greater than what the farmer would have to endure by temporarily accepting the aid of subsidies.

It is important, of course, for the production of food, that the farmer receive an adequate price. In a normal economy an adequate price ordinarily is fixed by the law of supply and demand. But, today, we are not living in a normal economy. If resort is had to the operation of the law of supply and demand then we are going to have trouble, because the demand for food today, considering the needs of the civilian population, military and lend-lease requirements, far exceeds the supply. The results will be disastrous for the consumer here at home. Hence, some Government assistance must be had. That was the reason for the enactment by the Congress of the Price Control Act. But, how can that act be enforced if you take away from the Government a very important weapon needed for its enforcement?

Subsidies are regarded by farmer representatives as something which is so completely alien to our way of life. Yet, it is not so. Often has this country used public money in aid of private enterprise in order to bring about the most good to its citizens. Subsidies have been used to protect manufacturers in the way of discriminatory tariffs; they have been used to assist in the building of railways; to encourage shipbuilding at home and to maintain an American merchant marine in operation and in other ways. No one would question the excellent purposes served by these mentioned subsidies.

Another objection frequently heard to the use of food subsidies is that they result in taxes for the public. Let us consider the soundness of this objection. We all know that the Government is now engaged in expending record sums of money because of the war effort. Is there anyone who would question the building of new battleships, tanks, airplanes, and guns because they result in taxes? Of course not. We accept these expenditures as necessary incidents in the prosecution of a war for survival. What about food? Is it less important

a weapon than any of those already mentioned?

We have been told that the increase in our farm output since Pearl Harbor has been the largest of any similar period in history. Yet, with this record achievement, we have still been short in our food supply. We know that these shortages cannot have been due to the lack of production, but they were due to the demands brought about by the war. Hence, it is a necessary war expenditure. So that if the Government is compelled to pay subsidies to keep the cost of living down for the average person, why should there be any objection to payment of taxes to meet these payments. Today we do not have a normal cost of living, it is abnormal, made so by the demands of the war. Therefore, we should accept the burden of payments of these taxes in the same spirit in which we pay taxes for increased production of other implements of war.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the East Side of New York, in company with their fellow-Americans, have given conclusive evidence of their support of the war effort. Literally thousands of their sons are with the armed forces all over the world. Unfortunately, many of them have already made the supreme sacrifice. These people are Americans to the core. They, too, believe in the American way of life. Yet, they recognize an emergency and, knowing that it is best for the country, they are not too proud to accept the aid of subsidies. While they do so, they pray and hope for an early victory, so that we may again enjoy our American democracy, with its free enterprise and normal economy. Let us not add to the already heavy burdens of the American people by taking away from the Government a formidable weapon with which to combat inflation. Do not do away with subsidies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I propose in this brief 10 minutes to present to you a horseback opinion of a Member of Congress, who came from the tailgate of a chuck wagon in a cow camp in Texas. The opinions of such men have been variously colored by the press, by columnists, and by calumnists for quite a period.

I shall not indulge in any repetitions, I hope, but when one adds up the sum and total of statistics which have come by what might be termed short- and long-wave recordings and remote control, I merely want to say that I am not yet ready to sell my birthright as an individual citizen, as a Representative of the Fourteenth Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor of representing, for any $6.32 of subsidy, which is the sum total of the complete receipts that would come to the so-called consumers of America if the bill presented by the committee is defeated. I am not that cheap and I do not believe you are.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a discussion of subsidies, this is not a discussion of ceilings. The question to be decided here before this august body, in the presence of God Almighty, who had more to do with giving us this country than any and all of the men in this great Nation from George Washington down, is different from what they may have contributed. He who marks the sparrow's fall and who gave us reason, who differentiated us from the beasts of the field and the birds of the air and the fish of the sea, was responsible for this great Nation's being able to accept the incomparable responsibilities of this absolutely unequaled hour. It is not a question of subsidies. It is a question far greater than that upon which the States were divided and the freedom of one particular group or race, and by Constitution we have no conceptions of those kinds of divisions. The law applies equally and uniformly to all citizens, if we have what I deem to be an American concept of our Government.

This proposition, as stated by my distinguished friend of over 40 years, the gentleman from Texas, HATTON SUMNERS, in an address made here several years ago, is best expressed as a final laying down of the gauntlet and glove in a challenge as to whether the people of this Nation are competent and capable of self-government or whether we are going to answer the challenge in this Congress by adopting the plan set out here, An Economic Program for American Democracy, written by a group of distinguished gentlemen, the most interesting of whom out of seven Harvard and Tufts economists is Richard V. Gilbert, of the Office of Price Administration. Are they going to substitute this book not only for the Constitution but for every single thing that our sons and daughters, the flower of American manhood and womanhood, are fighting to preserve on the battle fronts of this—and I mean this—Old World?

You are either going to finance this program following both the arithmetic and the logic which is born in the statistical branch of the O. P. A., which has long ere this evidenced both its disrespect and its unwillingness to adhere to either constitutional or substantive law limitations on its operations, and who are willing not only to substitute government by directives for government by law and reason but who are backed by a group who have less conception of what that flag means to me than Richard V. Gilbert and his group know of the cattle industry, of the cotton industry, and all of the industries which produce the food and clothing upon which this Nation depends in its dire hour and upon which our allies and our friends depend.

As far as I am concerned, the bridle is off this afternoon. I have no limitations except my love for our common God and our country in what I say this afternoon—not one. Would that I were of the age to be on the battle front to meet this situation face to face. I repeat, $6.32, which is the total value that the consumers of this Nation will reap as individuals out of this proposition, is too cheap a price for me to sell out for.

I have three letters here. They are most interesting. A long time ago a cowhand came to the King Ranch for employment. He was barefooted. He had three children and he had never had an opportunity to go to school. He still lives. He still has not been to school. One of his sons served his country. The others all passed on. He spelled "coffee" without using one single letter that fitted into the word as properly spelled. When he ordered 10 pounds of coffee from the storekeeper at the King Ranch he spelled it "k-a-u-g-h-p-h-y."

This is a representative democracy. On my word of honor as a Representative in the Congress of the United States and as an American citizen, I hold in my hand here the only three letters which I have received in support of this infamous proposition to set aside a government of people who know what the flag stands for and substitute therefor government by a group that is represented in print by those whose school of thought belongs to that of Richard V. Gilbert and the seven other economists.

Hesitate, if you will, as Representatives of the American people, to follow my distinguished and able friend from Texas, my colleague, and were he my brother I would still say, though I have only one, "He can go to hell; I still propose to stay in America."

I have three letters here. They come from the same address, 3739 Neptune Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; that is, for two of them. And the name of one is illegible. It is like Wesley Stephens, and the way he spells coffee, "Potemkin." I do not know what you fellows make of it. The other name is from the same address. I am going to insert them in the RECORD. I hope that somebody can decipher the signature; I cannot. It is from the same address. I am going to read you one of them; they are very much the same:

> We want subsidies. We must have subsidies to keep prices down.
>
> In other words, to save $6.32.
>
> We must keep prices down to stop inflation.

I wish I had more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. I appreciate that, sir. I cannot possibly fail to comment that the other letter, the third one, is a copy of a letter addressed to my distinguished friend who made a tolerant and highly American speech, the majority leader, on my side, a Democrat, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK. I hold in my heart no higher place in esteem or friendship than I have for the troubled position of that distinguished American from Massachusetts. But this letter, while it contained the backbone of his speech on yesterday, and you read it, the headline says, "Congress of Industrial Organizations," and it is signed by Philip Murray. And, with permission, I ask to include these three letters in the RECORD.

Now for these three letters. Here they are, including one I just read:

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. KLEBERG: We want subsidies. We must have subsidies to keep prices down. We must keep prices down to stop inflation.

Mrs. S. POTEMKIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *November 11, 1943.*

Representative RICHARD KLEBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As housewife and citizen of the United States, I earnestly request that you exert your influence in establishing food subsidies.

I believe that this measure is of utmost importance in order to combat the present rise in the cost of food.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., November 17, 1943.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have sent today to Majority Leader MCCORMACK on the question of the subsidy issue which comes before the House in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY.

[Enclosure.]

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: The subsidy problem which comes before the House for debate and decision during the course of the next few days constitutes one of the most serious challenges to the efforts of the President to maintain a stable home economy in this critical war period. The consuming public of the Nation looks to you as the responsible leader of the forces of your party in Congress to assure the fullest and most effective support for the President on that issue.

There has been an unfortunate effort from many sources to confuse the crystal-clear issue involved in this subsidy debate. Eight Members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency have pointed out in their report that if we abolish subsidies now the price of more than 24 basic and primary food items will immediately increase from 4 to 20 percent. They have informed the Members of the House that unless subsidies are continued, round steak will be raised 5.2 cents, butter 5 to 9 cents a pound, canned vegetables 1.4 cents, sugar 1 cent. Price Administrator Bowles has added the information that a termination of subsidy payments will mean an increase of 1 cent a quart in the price of milk and 3 cents a pound in the price of cheese.

It has been the very failure of Congress to give full and effective support to control prices up to the present time that has driven labor to seek true stabilization through revision of present wage strictures. Certainly any step which will permit still further price rise redoubles the threat to our Nation's efforts to achieve and maintain a stabilized home front economy.

These threats of runaway prices are threats to the working health and efficiency of American war workers, they are threats to the stability of our entire home economy. The issue in this subsidy fight is whether we shall keep prices within the reach of the men and women and children of America or permit food to be taken off the tables of the American public for the personal profit of special interests. I respectfully urge that no more critical issue has faced you in recent times and that no issue calls more pressingly for the most effective possible action in support of the President's war program.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY.

In the entire time on this question these are the only three communications, as a Representative in the American Congress, that I have received from the people that I represent and, yes, the people that you represent, in support of this infamous proposition that we substitute a government of blackmail for a government for, of, and by the people. Gentlemen, it will not do. Now, as I take this floor this afternoon I want to call to your attention a few things, and I have all the material here. God knows I wish I had the time to talk to you about it. Here are the facts: I am a Democrat. I resent the implication that any American, even though he be a Republican—mark that—should be responsible for this demand to substitute for a government of law and reason a government by blackmail.

An interesting application would be your study of the recent directive as affecting our industry, the one which I represent, as an individual producer of beef cattle, not beef, and follow through the recent directive issued, not only without sanction over the objection of the entire industry, and the conclusions drawn, I repeat, by some columnists, mostly calumnists, that would suggest that those whom I represent are willing to accept a program of laissez faire and accept the opportunity to charge what the traffic would bear, an abominable accusation of profiteering against Americans who happen to constitute that particular group which at Lexington fired the first shot that was heard around this world. There is no consumer from your district, my good friend, Mr. O'BRIEN, or from my district, or any other Member's district, who, in reason and with American inspiration, remembering what that flag stands for and what these two pictures mean, who supports the infamous proposition of a substitution of a government which must be financed out of the Treasury of the United States, mind you, without authorization, or who supports this infamous document in substitution for the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the book which I hold in my hand is the one I just exhibited to the committee. Its title is "An Economic Program for American Democracy." Its flyleaf after the title recites as follows:

By seven Harvard and Tufts economists: Richard V. Gilbert; George H. Hildebrand, Jr.; Arthur W. Stuart; Maxine Yaple Sweezy; Paul M. Sweezy; Lorie Tarshis; and John D. Wilson.

The Vanguard Press, New York. Copyright, 1938, by the Vanguard Press, Inc.

Mr. Chairman, the copyright provision even will be heeded by me, and I will not quote from this amazing opus—which by this mention may receive at least some sales impetus.

This at least should be pay enough for the authors if, as I hope they may need it when they go out in this old world to try to make an honest nonsubsidized living.

Yes; even if the theme of this book is that private business is totally incompetent to manage itself and that the entire fate of the American people and the very existence of the American people lie in the hands of the Federal Government.

It will, too, if the Congress follows the tactics of Federal bureaus like the O. P. A. and others who ignore the Constitution, laws passed by Congress, and the intention of Congress many times expressed.

Who said anything about pressure groups?

Like my beloved and able friend, the gentleman from Alabama, HENRY STEAGALL, chairman of the committee which reported the bill before us and which I shall support, I have been home, yes; and I visited all over my district, and found then as now that my people, like myself, are not ready to sell out.

If any compromise is made on the proposal such as we know will occur—likewise we do not want even a little bit of it—I shall vote against it.

There can be no compromise with either the subsidy proposal or with the group who propose it or presently administer it.

If this Congress does weaken in the interim and fail to override a possible Presidential veto, just know that lots of folks like me in every congressional district will know that right here we have junked all we hold in trust for them.

Just go back and read the facts leading up to the directive on live cattle, and the laws affecting this transaction, and you have a clear-cut case of the virtue and moral integrity of those who will put the subsidy program into effect.

The record is even worse than the proposed subsidy plan or the compromise proposals yet to come, and God knows this is small comfort; they are bad enough.

This is not a plan to finance a ceiling program; it will finance a stealing program. Upon examination—like a rose called any other name—the smell lingers one and the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Did the gentleman from Texas request permission to insert something in the RECORD?

Mr. KLEBERG. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert three letters in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. That permission will have to be obtained in the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that every Member of this House is grateful and deeply appreciates the fine American speech and plea just made by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] to save our way of life and the American concept of government. And like my distinguished friend, it is my considered judgment that what we may properly term the highly

controversial issues involved in this legislation; namely, the payment of consumers' subsidies—which have been so vigorously championed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]—involves one of the most vital and fundamental issues ever to be considered by any Congress during the more than 150 years existence of our Republic. I am not an alarmist, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this new departure and venture on the part of the administration which is sponsored by our friends who brought in the minority report on this bill, and which I believe, if adopted, will mean a full and complete all-out subsidy program, and which will likely cover every commodity produced on the farm, every article which reaches the hands of a processor, and which will mean the complete full and final regimentation of all of the people in this country, and which will involve a complete change of our economic system, as was suggested by my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], this issue is as fundamental, so far as the rights of a free people are concerned and our ability to carry on as a representative democracy, as were the issues which stirred the country into a division in 1850 to 1860 and which finally brought on civil war.

If by commencing with a piece-meal policy of paying a part of the grocery bills of consumers, whether needed or not, through the weapon of taxation—because that is what it means in the long run—who is there to say that after a while we cannot or would not go all the way and just pay all consumer bills?

It involves the same philosophy of those who were telling the people a few years ago that it really did not matter how large the national debt becomes, because, after all, we just owe it to ourselves. Last year I suggested to the collector of internal revenue that I just write my check for income taxes payable to myself, but he did not seem to understand it that way.

It has been argued by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] at least 10 times in the last 30 days that the subsidy paid the producers of copper was analogous and comparable with what he wants to do with this bill. Such comparisons, of course, are ridiculous. It is an argument by analogy—and the analogy is false. We have only a few, a mere handful, of copper producers producing one commodity—copper—which is a highly strategic war material. In order to get copper it was all right, of course, to have the Government step in as a part of the war program and implement the cost of mining this copper.

Let us examine the gentleman's logic a little further. He argues that in the case of copper every dollar paid by the Government to subsidize and increase production has saved the Government $28.

Now, how can the Government give a subsidy of a dollar to a copper producer and thereby save $28? The gentleman is not very clear or very explicit when he makes such a claim, and his explanation of what he means is quite difficult to understand. Presumably what he is trying to say and what he means is this: That we are at present giving subsidies of so much a pound to high-cost copper producers, the amount being the difference between the market price and their cost of production.

Suppose that instead of doing this we had let the market price rise sufficiently to cover this high-cost production? How much larger would our total bill for copper have been? Admittedly, it would have been larger.

The gentleman from Texas says that it would have been larger by an amount equal to 28 times the subsidies we have paid.

What is wrong with such reasoning? Overlooking the fact that most of the difference would have been recovered through the excess-profits tax, we will assume, for the sake of argument, there is nothing much wrong with it, as it applies to copper or to any other highly strategic war material to which we can limit subsidies to high-cost producers. That is the reason, perhaps, that no one has objected particularly to subsidies in these isolated cases; but the fallacy of the gentleman's argument is that in the case of farm production subsidies cannot be so limited.

As I have heretofore suggested, we have only a handful of copper producers. We have more than 6,500,000 farmers. We can allow for the difference in the cost of production between copper producers; we cannot allow for such a difference among farmers. If one farmer gets a subsidy, so must everyone producing the same thing; and since this is true, there can be no multiple saving, such as the gentleman claims.

Incentive payments or consumers' subsidies, roll-backs, or whatever you want to call them, will not increase production. Why do I say that? Because we tried it on butter and the production of butter decreased, and hundreds of dairy farmers sold their dairy herds and quit business. We tried it on cheese, and the cheese supply went down instead of up. The O. P. A. has tried it on beef. Immediately that the roll-back was put into effect, the price of cattle in the producers' hands sharply declined and thousands of producers sold their cattle and quit the business of raising cattle, which, of course, will mean reduced production in beef. The same thing is happening with the hog producers.

You cannot fool the farmers and the ranchers. They know they do not get the benefits of these roll-backs, that they will go to the packers or processors or someone else—and as a result they take the rap and then get out of business, or greatly curtail production because of prices. What the farmers and producers want is not roll-backs or incentive payments—they want a fair, decent price in the market place. That is the only way we will get production, and if we will simply give them a decent price, you need have no fear of inflation, the ample production will take care of that.

Of course, if you do it that way, you will not need the hordes of political regimentators who would go along with the all-out subsidy plan; and there will not be 130,000,000 checks going out to 130,000,000 consumers, or to thousands of merchants between now and election time next year so that political henchmen will be able to constantly remind those who are receiving the checks what a benevolent and generous "Uncle" they have in Washington. Or, as they used to be so bold as to say down in my congressional district a few years ago, "Here's a check from the President. I am sure you will remember who gave you this check when you are about to cast your vote."

Mr. Chairman, the general objections to consumers' subsidies have been so thoroughly discussed in and out of the Congress the past few months that no good purpose could be accomplished by a detailed review of all of them. Some of the witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee summarized these objections somewhat in this fashion:

"Subsidies throw the burden which we are able to bear onto future generations. We cannot find words strong enough to express our disapproval of a policy of transferring this cost to the children of the young men who are fighting our battles for us today in every corner of the world.

"Subsidies increase our national debt—a very potent cause of inflation. Subsidies introduce the dangerous doctrine that the state should support its people rather than the people support the state. Subsidies lead to political control, which is extremely hard to break. Of recent years we have seen candidates for office campaign on the promise of continued subsidies which were provided to meet emergencies now long past.

"Subsidies are a demagogue's paradise. They enable him to promise higher prices for the producer and lower costs to the consumer. This cannot be kept up long.

"Probably the worst danger in subsidies lies in the fact that they lead directly to chaos. If we are to use subsidies to meet the steadily increasing cost of production, we will soon have our price structure badly out of balance, and the longer the war continues the more out of balance it will become. When the war is over and we must return to the necessity of balancing the Budget, it takes no stretch of the imagination to realize that we must cut off all unnecessary expenses, and subsidies will be one of the first items to get the ax. Then what happens? Either farmers must increase their prices to get the cost of production or they will have to quit. If we are unwilling to pay the cost of our food bill during these days of the greatest income in all history, when food is costing us a smaller percent of the income than ever before, what chance would farmers have of raising their prices when the boys come back looking for jobs, and the problem of unemploy-

ment stares us in the face? The answer is, None at all. Agriculture would be thrown into a deflation far worse than that which followed the last war, because that war was not complicated by subsidies."

Mr. Chairman, another regrettable thing that has been going on continuously in and out of Congress the last few months, and by many in high places, is the unwarranted and unfounded charge that the farmers are responsible for the increased living costs and that it is the farmer who has and is about to set off the spark that is threatening to consume the country in a conflagration of inflation. I regard these false statements and this tirade that has been used to inflame the American public against the American farmer as the most ridiculous and insidious propaganda that has ever been practiced against the American public, and particularly the American housewife, who largely does the family buying.

Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, which is one of the great farm organizations, very clearly and concisely gave a complete answer to these ridiculous charges and this propaganda when he appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I quote from his remarks:

> Farmers are just as much afraid of inflation as anyone. In fact our organization issued the first warning against the dangerous path we were pursuing before either labor or industry had apparently given it a thought. Before we can determine the cure, let us get at the cause. In offering the roll-back subsidy proposals we are attacking the problem at the wrong point. We are treating the results rather than the cause. There is no reason whatever why the blame for price rises and inflation dangers should all be charged to agriculture. Of the three groups, labor, industry, and agriculture, farmers are the least to blame. If the blame were confined to abuse we would not be appearing before you. We would go right ahead and work our 80 hours a week, as shown by the last farm-labor report, and devote our whole effort to food production. We have not only been subjected to the most terrific abuse and attacks, but we are being made the victims of roll-backs and in some cases are being forced out of production. The time has come when we feel that action is necessary to put a stop to this movement, which will lead to disaster if pursued much further.

We have prepared a table which reveals very clearly where the trouble lies. Before looking at the figures we would like to point out that there has been a lot of confusion over the labor situation. We have had more work to do, more men have been employed, and the total income has gone up sharply. That is natural. In a peace economy this increased employment would result in more consumer goods. Except as this increased labor income may be a contributing cause of inflation by increasing the spending power, the figures on total labor income are meaningless in studying the economic problem.

There are two figures which really help us to see what is going on. The first is the earnings per employed worker. When this is compared with the cost of living it is the gage by which we can measure whether or not wages are adequate to meet such cost. The second, and most important figure from the standpoint of society as a whole, is how much labor is there in the finished product? This determines the cost of the finished product and is the foundation of our whole price structure. When costs go down prices should go down. When costs go up prices have got to rise or production is stopped. Now, if you will refer to the table, you will see what has been going on.

The table referred to is as follows:

Economic trends—Corporate earnings based on average quarter, 1939; others based 1935–39

Year and month	Cost of living	Retail food prices	Labor cost per unit of industrial production	Factory pay rolls per employed worker	Increase in corporate earnings after taxes	Increase in corporate earnings before taxes
					Percent	*Percent*
1940						
January	100	95	97.5	110.2		
February	100	97	98.3	106.5	−5.7	10.8
March	100	96	98.2	105.4		
April	100	96	97.3	105.8		
May	100	97	95.0	106.0	2.6	21.7
June	100	98	93.4	108.0		
July	100	97	96.0	109.3		
August	100	96	99.0	111.5	14.9	34.9
September	100	97	101.6	115.6		
October	100	96	101.5	116.3		
November	100	96	102.2	117.2	62.4	88.3
December	101	97	103.6	120.2		
1941						
January	101	98	105.0	121.1		
February	101	98	104.2	120.4	29.4	98.6
March	101	98	102.7	119.7		
April	102	101	106.9	121.8		
May	103	102	110.4	128.5	67.4	156.5
June	105	106	113.9	133.5		
July	105	107	118.1	136.5		
August	106	108	119.4	135.9	97.3	200.5
September	108	111	121.1	138.5		
October	109	112	121.3	139.6		
November	110	113	125.6	142.0	117.8	230.4
December	110	113	124.6	144.9		
1942						
January	112	116	125.1	149.4		
February	113	117	129.1	151.2	60.1	221.1
March	114	119	133.1	154.4		
April	115	120	136.4	157.1		
May	116	122	139.7	160.1	74.1	249.3
June	116	123	142.0	162.2		
July	117	125	144.9	165.0		
August	118	126	148.1	171.4	89.2	272.2
September	118	127	149.2	174.2		
October	119	130	150.7	177.9		
November	120	131	152.8	181.9	98.3	288.8
December	120	133	155.3	182.7		
1943						
January	121	133	155.9	181.5		
February	121	134	156.4	184.6	84.2	309.9
March	123	137	160.9	188.4		
April	124	141	162.1	191.7		
May	125	143	164.5	194.5	96.2	332.4
June	125	142	167.3	195.1		
July	124	139	165.5	194.1		
August	123	137				

You will note that except in the column on corporate earnings the base period taken was the 5-year period 1935–39, the 5 years just before the beginning of the World War. During that period, agriculture was not far from an all-time low with an average per capita net income of $172, including Government payments, as compared with nonfarm per capita income of $623. So you can see agriculture had a long way to go before it reached a comparable starting point. Now, let us see what the table reveals. Following the outbreak of the war, industry took a spurt. Wages went up somewhat, but because of the increased volume the cost per unit of output went down. These figures are shown in the fourth and fifth columns. Food prices were below the previous 5-year average, which I pointed out was near an all-time low, and the cost of living remained level until December of 1940, when it went up 1 percent.

Let us look at those 1940 figures a moment and notice what happened. Everything stayed fairly level till midyear with costs of finished products going down because of increased volume. Then both wages and earnings started to rise sharply. It was not the cost of living that sent them up. That remained stationary, with food prices very low. Had labor and industry been content with reasonable levels, and reduced the price of the industrial product as increased volume reduced costs, the result would have been a decreased cost of living, and we would have developed a healthy low-price level, a condition which contributes toward abundance. By the end of the year, labor had increased its per capita income 20 percent, industry had increased its net income 62 percent, the cost of consumers' goods had risen 10 percent in 6 months to an index of 103.6, and the cost of living had started up, but food prices were still very low. Labor and industry had led cut in a sharp upward swing.

Of course, this affected all costs, including farm costs, and unless the upward swing of labor and industry could be halted, farm prices had to rise or farmers would be closed out. The trend continued. By midspring retail food prices had gone up to the 5-year pre-war average and the cost of living had gone up 2 percent. The increase in the cost per unit of production had gone up about 7 percent, and wages approximately 22 percent. By midyear the cost of food had gone up to 6 percent, the cost of living to 5 percent, the labor income per individual had gone up to 33.5 percent—the labor cost of the finished product had gone up 13.9 percent, and corporate earnings had gone up 67.4 percent. About this time we began to start efforts at price control.

The Leon Henderson philosophy entered the picture. He made the position of the administration very clear in a letter to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee in which he argued that nothing

should be done to control wages, and that profits arising from increased volume should go largely to the wage earner, instead of reducing the price to the consumer. The committee will recall how vigorously he fought any control of wages for possibly a year or more, until finally they had gone up 74.2 percent by last September as compared to an increase in living costs of 18 percent, a ratio of more than 4 to 1. Industrial earnings had gone to 89.2 percent, or nearly five times as high as living costs.

Incidentally, the heads of our two great labor unions are the chief proponents of a demand that food costs be rolled back 10 points to the level of last September, while industrial labor income per individual has increased 20 points during this same period and the cost per unit of manufactured production has increased 15 points. Farm costs have gone up far more than the 10 points they are demanding, although I do not have exact figures upon farm cost increase.

But let us return to the table about midyear 1941. From that point on you will note that food prices have increased faster than the cost of living, although at no time have they ever increased anywhere near as fast as the income of individual wage workers or corporate earnings. The increase has been less than half as fast. The reason for the increase is fairly plain. The farmer was being hit from two directions. His cost of living was being forced up the same as that of everybody else, and he had had to contend with the sharpest increase in wages of any domestic industry. In fact, except for ocean transportation where bonuses are paid for entering the war zones, farm wages exceed all others in rate of increase by a wide margin. The following table shows the 10 industries having the highest rate of wage increase since 1941:

	Percent
Water transportation	96.7
Farm labor	81.1
Quarrying and nonmetallic mining	61.5
Anthracite mining	72.0
All manufacturing	59.5
All durable manufacturing	59.2
Bituminous mining	59.2
Shipbuilding	58.7
Textile mill products	53.0
Iron and steel	51.5

But note that farm wages have gone up 81.1 percent, the highest of all. Thus it will be seen that farm costs have been under terrific upward pressure, and this must be reflected in food prices if we are to have food. Let us return to the first table. Three things stand out very clearly.

1. The cost of living did not advance a single point until labor and industry had led out and attained a dizzy pace.

2. Food prices stayed down for some months until the increased cost of living and increased wages forced them up.

3. We have been on a rising spiral ever since labor and industry set the pace, but throughout this whole period labor costs, labor income, and corporate earnings have gone up from two to four times as fast as the increase in living costs.

Labor and industry started the upward swing months ahead of agriculture and before there was an increase in the cost of living, and they have continued to lead the field by a very wide margin to this day. Labor is still going up three or four times as fast as the cost of living, and is threatening strikes if it cannot get increases or a rollback on food prices.

The suprising thing about it all is that while we are having substantial inflation of wages and corporate earnings, food, which is being so severely attacked, is the least to blame. We are still the best fed Nation on earth and we are spending the lowest percent of our income for food. In fact, we are spending a lower percent of our income for food than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, with these daily blasts going out from Members of Congress and others in high places, charging the farmer and his friends in Congress with being responsible for food shortages, excessive prices, and a hundred other things, is it any wonder that the farmers generally, throughout the country, are bewildered?

While farmers generally recognize that to win the war, food is as necessary as guns, and while they are determined to produce foods to the limit of their physical and financial ability, they are now so bewildered that they cannot intelligently plan for the future; and this, in my humble judgment, is because of the fact that there have been so many conflicting and shifting policies established and so many conflicting statements made by the Washington officials.

To obtain maximum production of food in 1944 it is necessary for farmers to know that, except as affected by drouths, floods, pests, and other uncontrollable forces, the prices they receive will be sufficient at least to cover production costs.

Mr. Chairman, I suggested at the outset that in my humble judgment this so-called consumer subsidy program strikes at the very vitals and fundamentals necessary to the preservation of our form of Government. There can be no compromise. This Congress must act, and act now, firmly and decisively, on this fundamental issue. We will either stand steadfast for the free enterprise system, or we will surrender to a system of planned economy and one based on national socialism. There can be no halfway compromise; and I am not willing to surrender to this totalitarian scheme at the rate of $900,000,000 a year, as has been suggested by my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Few people realize how far we have traveled in this country during the last decade—we have been following a rough and rocky path, step by step, which one after another of the European nations have trod; and in my opinion such a course can only lead to the same destination that it has led them over there, and that is to bankruptcy and ruin.

We have allowed our Government to expand its activities into every branch of free enterprise, and to expand its domination over every activity of the private citizen. We have allowed the administration that promised to reduce by 25 percent the cost of Government in peacetimes to double and triple our cost of Government and our taxes. We have furnished the money for an overexpanding bureaucracy until there are hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats and gestapos at our elbows day and night, telling us what we can and cannot do, until we are no longer able to conduct business on a competitive basis as was intended under our system.

If we continue to adopt such totalitarian philosophy, we will not only destroy our own Government, but we will also destroy our ability to help the peoples in the other countries to establish for themselves a government that will contribute to their progress. If we cannot help the Europeans by an example of honest constitutional government, we certainly cannot help them by adopting their own failing, totalitarian philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, during my limited service in the House, I have never seen nor heard a bill discussed as fully, as well, or as intelligently as the one that has been under discussion for the past 2 days. Though I cannot agree with the conclusions reached by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in my opinion he has done a good job in marshaling as best he can the facts and circumstances that might be built up for subsidies. Likewise, and by the same token, I have never heard a better prepared address nor a more scholarly one than was delivered this morning by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Not only in the case of these gentlemen but so far as the other advocates of the subsidy program are concerned, I ascribe good motives to their proposition and to the position they have taken; furthermore, I concede the proposition that they may be correct in their position, but in conceding that there may be valid reasons that could be given in support of their position, for they may be right, and we who oppose the subsidies may be wrong—we come in the last analysis to the proposition that all we can do in this body is to sit in the position of a jury, listen to the evidence in the committee and to the arguments in this Chamber, then make up our mind as to where we are.

Personally I think there is a lot of underbrush that can and should be swept aside on both sides of this argument. There are arguments that have been advanced by both sides which are totally fallacious. For instance, I heard some of the opponents of the subsidy program, with whom I line up in this fight, make the statement that the subsidy program robs the farmer of his independence. I cannot see that there is very much weight in that argument because it is a matter of common knowledge that in years gone by the farmers were quick to take the A. A. A. payments, the corn-hog money and any other benefits that a subsidy provided. Consequently, the argument is totally erroneous. On the other hand, it seems to me that the argument of the Treasury is very far afield when the administration speaks on the one hand about dangerous money, four-fifths of which they say is in the hands of persons earning less than four or five thousand dollars a year, and should be siphoned off, while at the same time it advocates subsidies to decrease the cost of living of this same group. I say the administration may be correct on either proposition, but not on both, for these two positions are as far apart as the poles

and are as inconsistent as any two positions can be.

In the last analysis the true reason and the true argument that can and should be advanced against subsidies and which, in my humble judgment, will stand up against any attack, involves two propositions: First, any subsidy that could conceivably be borne by the Federal Treasury would be futile. It has been estimated a subsidy of $485,000,000, a half-billion dollars, would reduce the cost of living of a family of four just 30 cents a week, which is a negligible amount, of course. Even if the amount were broadened to the extent of a billion dollars, it would mean about 60 cents a week for a family of four. But over and above that, there is a principle that goes far deeper and which, in my judgment, is far more dangerous.

It has been argued here by the proponents of subsidies that this country has always had subsidies. Perhaps that is true. They have pointed out that the railroads were subsidized; they pointed out that various other groups have received the benefits of subsidies, but they overlook one important proposition. Let us take the railroads, for instance; the railroads which were receiving the subsidy were receiving it from the great majority of people who were paying it and were not on the receiving end, consequently there was of necessity always a watchdog or a potential watchdog in reserve to stop that subsidy and to check it. The day we start to give subsidies to every man, woman, and child in this country, we set up the greatest lobby that has ever been conceived, a lobby whose strength and power exceed all imagination and which will in time swallow up and bankrupt this entire Government. It takes a lot less courage today, I submit, to turn down this proposal when times are good and everyone employed than it will when six or seven million people are unemployed. If we take this step now, we are just scratching the surface and opening the doors, and when this war is over and when the inevitable reaction sets in, we will be faced with a situation that, in my judgment, will swallow up the national solvency of this country.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain tables prepared by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, the vote on this matter for a person who operates a farm and who, therefore, may be regarded as having a selfish interest is not a particularly easy one. I only wish to say in explanation of my position that I am one of those Members of the House who originally voted for the so-called Gore bill to control all prices. I believed then and I believe now that it was the best bill that has been before this House. I was one of 68 who went down in slaughter when that bill came to the floor of the House.

I voted against the first price-control bill because I thought it was not a good bill. It involved no firm control of either labor or farm prices, as I saw it, and I felt it would not work. I voted subsequently to sustain the President's veto of a commodity credit bill because I felt we had a right to experiment with the problem of subsidies and see whether or not they would work while there was a serious effort being made by the War Labor Board to hold the line. It has only been when I have seen that effort to hold the line completely fail, when I have observed that wages were continuing to go on up beyond the figures of the War Labor Board, that I concluded it was my responsibility as a Member of the House to vote for this bill which the Banking and Currency Committee has brought out.

I have a number of telegrams and a number of messages. I shall not try to read them all. I have a telegram here from the president of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association, E. G. Hayward, pleading with me to go along with the western groups of livestock men. It reads in part:

> Sincerely hope you will go along with New Mexico livestock and farming interests in opposing farm subsidies. It is a noteworthy fact that at the Senate Agricultural Committee hearing all farm and livestock groups of the entire United States are of one opinion in their opposition to farm subsidies. The uncertainties and lack of confidence in the minds of the feeder buyers caused by O. P. A. regulations of live price ceilings, rollbacks, and the subsidy program have caused stagnation in the cattle sales in New Mexico. We are faced with 3- to 5-cent drop in price of feeder calves and no sales or no demand even at these reduced prices.
>
> E. G. HAYWARD,
> *President,*
> *New Mexico Cattle Growers Association.*

I found during the time I was at home this summer that the farmers seemed to have some things bothering them, and during that time I went to several farm-bureau meetings to meet with the farmers and to find out what those problems were. Every time the farmers asked me to vote against subsidies, and every time I stood up and argued with them that I had voted for subsidies to hold prices down and control inflation, and that as the matter was then being conducted, I was going to continue to vote for subsidies. But I based that on one thing, a proviso that the line be strictly held and there be no increases in wages or other prices. I do not have to tell this group that it did not take me all summer to find out that this line had not been strictly held.

I received on the 6th day of August a quotation on alfalfa seed of 28 cents a pound. I received on the 26th of August a quotation of 40 cents a pound. I saw the price of cottonseed cake go completely out of sight, and I knew in the terms of my own dairy that my farm was in difficulty.

I have here a bulletin on the dairy situation published by the United States Department of Agriculture for November 1943. This is not an antiquated nor a completely obsolete document. It is one that just now, within the last 24 or 48 hours, has come in the mails. The very first paragraph of it reads:

> Total milk production on farms in September was 2.5 percent below production a year earlier. Larger amounts of evaporated milk and dried whole milk were produced. Nearly all the remaining dairy products showed more than seasonal decline and were produced in smaller amounts than a year ago.

I could read you a great deal more from that document to evidence that the situation in the dairy business was not too good.

I went back to my farm from these farmer meetings and tried to find out in terms of my own experience what was wrong. I hope that my operation is large enough so I have a chance to get a cross section. I was at that time milking between 150 and 200 cows, 173 at the period when I made the closest check, and I think that is sufficiently large that it gave a chance to get a typical experience. My dairy was about an average one. It produced an average of 8,614 pounds of milk per cow last year, whereas the national average was 4,576. It produced 312 pounds of butterfat per cow. Therefore, I felt that I had a right to regard it as a normal operation. What has happened on my place? I have prepared a table which I intend to insert at this point in the RECORD. It is based upon a new formula for my dairy, a 16-percent protein-grain mixture, which I am feeding the cows. Formerly we used some corn, but not now. It shows, based on sales slips from stores selling feed, not imaginary figures, that the cost per ton of my feed mixture has changed from October 1941 from $39.47 to $48.29 in 1942, and $66.60 in 1943. Here is the table:

TABLE A.—*Feed and labor costs by years, using 16 percent protein grain mixture*

	Pounds	October 1941		October 1942		October 1943	
		Price	Cost	Price	Cost	Price	Cost
		Per cwt.		*Per cwt.*		*Per cwt.*	
Ground barley	750	$1.95	$14.62	$2.30	$17.25	$3.50	$26.25
Ground oats	750	1.90	14.25	2.60	19.50	3.50	26.25
Wheat bran	200	1.85	3.70	2.25	4.50	2.41	4.82
Cottonseed meal	280	2.40	6.72	2.45	6.86	3.25	9.10
Salt	20	.90	.18	.90	.18	.90	.18
Total (ton cost)	2,000		39.47		48.29		66.60
Costs per hundredweight			1.97		2.41		3.33
Grain cost per cow per day (6 pounds)			.118		.144		.199
Hay costs per ton			8.00		18.00		30.00
Hay cost per cow per day (24 pounds)			.096		.216		.36

Labor costs per day per cow

	Cents
October 1941	7
October 1942	9
October 1943	12½

Let me say to you that these figures are kept by a trained accountant who is in charge of that farm but who went to that farm from an accounting office. Accurate books are necessary to produce reliable figures of this nature.

Therefore, the cost of grain per day per cow has gone from 11 cents to 20 cents in that period. The cost of hay per day per cow has gone from 9.6 cents to 36 cents.

You may say, "Where do you get the basic figures?" To you people who do not keep cows and dairies, may I explain that we feed a cow 2 pounds of alfalfa per day for each 100 pounds of weight, and a 1,200-pound cow would take 24 pounds of alfalfa daily on that basis.

To get sufficient protein we have to feed that cow 6 pounds of grain per day. These figures, then, are based upon accurate studies and based also upon the best known methods of feeding in a dairy.

My labor costs have been easy to compute. In 1941 I paid milkers 7 cents per day per cow. In 1942 I paid 9 cents per day per cow. Sensing a labor shortage, I put in milking machines in the early part of that year. This year my costs have gone to 12½ cents per day per cow. I give you those figures because I think it may interest you to see what the problem has been.

What does the daily production cost become? I find that my daily production cost—and here again I will insert the table in the RECORD at this point—for producing eighty-five one-hundredths of a pound of butterfat was 30 cents in 1941 for feed and grain, 47 cents in October of 1942, and 71 cents in 1943—from 30 cents to 71 cents. This is the table:

Daily production costs

	October		
	1941	1942	1943
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
Alfalfa hay, 24 pounds	9.6	21.6	36.0
16 percent grain, 6 pounds	11.8	14.4	19.9
Labor	7.0	9.0	12.5
Miscellaneous	1.7	2.0	3.0
Cost of producing 0.85½ pound of butterfat	30.1	47.0	71.4
October price per pound of butterfat, 1941, 62 cents; 1942, 80 cents; 1943, 92 cents.			
Price received for 0.85½ pound of butterfat	53.01	68.4	78.66
Margin per day per cow	22.91	21.4	[1] 7.26
Feed and labor cost of producing 1 pound butterfat in October 1943	------	------	84.0
Price received	------	------	92.0

[1] Out of margin farmer must pay insurance, taxes, interest on investment, water, gas, lights, fence upkeep, milking machine upkeep, delivery expense, keeping of the bulls and calves, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Here, then, is our problem: The 7.26-cent margin per cow per day plus 85.5 percent of an 11-cent subsidy—this being the amount of subsidy per pound of butterfat when the subsidy is 40 cents per hundred pounds of fluid milk—still leaves us behind our gross profit for the years 1941 and 1942. A ½-cent increase per quart, or approximately 8 cents per pound of butterfat, would mean an increase in the daily income per cow of 85.5 percent of 8 cents, or 6.84 cents. This figure added to the 7.26-cent margin plus the 9.4-cent subsidy would produce a total margin of 23.50 cents per day, which is approximately the 1941 margin of 22.91 cents. Since this margin must take care of the keep of bulls, calves, the upkeep of machinery, the expense of delivery, the cost of gas, light, and water, an even greater increase on margin would be indicated, and certainly nothing less would bring any degree of parity.

It could be argued that the figures I have given are not typical, or it might be contended that, even though they are based on actual sales slips for milk and on feed bills for which checks have been written, they are not completely accurate.

Fortunately, I have an extremely good check on my calculations. A former Member of this House, the Honorable Albert G. Simms, and Mrs. Simms, the former Ruth Hanna McCormick, also a former Member of this House, are the owners of another Albuquerque dairy. They conduct a businesslike, progressive, well-managed establishment, a model in every way. I wish I could insert all the figures which Mr. Simms has supplied me, but the interesting fact is that they confirm almost to a penny the figures which my own dairy has developed.

The Simms Dairy uses a ration which gives the average milk cow 10 pounds of mixed grain, 25 pounds of alfalfa, and 40 pounds of corn silage each day. The cost of that feed mixture in August 1942, according to the books of the dairy, was 40 cents and in August of 1943 was 87 cents. My corresponding figures were 36 cents in 1942 and 56 cents in 1943, but I use a mixture which does not produce as great a volume of milk, and my feed costs are therefore slightly lower.

On the other hand, labor costs at the Simms Dairy are slightly higher than my costs due to the fact that there are more machine operations and that ensilage is fed to the cattle. The labor cost per cow per day for August 1942 at the Simms Dairy was 12.3 cents and in August 1943 was 19.3 cents. Adding these amounts, the feed and labor costs per cow per day was 52.3 cents in 1942 and $1.063 in 1943.

From these we can calculate the feed and labor cost of a pound of butterfat. The cows at the Simms Dairy produce 35 pounds of milk per day, and in August this milk would contain an average of 3.6 percent butterfat. Therefore, the cost of 100 pounds of fluid milk in 1942 was $1.50 and in 1943 was $3.04. The cost of producing a pound of butterfat in August 1942 was 42 cents and in August 1943 was 84 cents.

To me the interesting part of these figures is the fact that my feed and labor costs for producing 1 pound of butterfat in October 1943 and Mr. Simms' cost records for producing a pound of butterfat in August of 1943 were exactly the same figure, 84 cents.

I did not stop there. I checked with George W. Barte, L. G. Zartman, J. S. Bowers, G. W. Thatcher, and other milk producers at Albuquerque to get the figures. Every dairy operator uses a little different feed mixture, makes available a little more or a little less ensilage, uses a little more or a little less hired labor, and the figures are not completely uniform, but they follow very closely the pattern of the two dairies I have just listed. Their figures show that the total feed and labor costs for 100 pounds of milk were $2.19 in 1941, $2.67 in 1942, and $3.77 in 1943. When you realize that 100 pounds of fluid milk would produce about 4 pounds of butterfat at 92 cents a pound, or $3.68 in 1943 as against a cost of $3.77 for labor and feed alone, you realize what the farmer was up against because to that deficit must be added his costs for power, light, insurance, transportation, the keeping of bulls, and a whole host of other items.

When I saw those figures I began to understand the opposition of farmers to subsidies. The subsidy is used to cure what O. P. A. should have cured by an increase in the price of milk. The difficulties are never the same in every town. The subsidy cannot be evenly spread, and the farmer is always getting just a little bit less than his average costs because of the temptation to keep the subsidy low.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe this is the sort of information the Members of the House are glad to receive. I believe that this is the sort of information that really does us good. I compliment the gentleman from New Mexico on his splendid address.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman, who is a very practical producer, Is he more likely to maintain and produce an increased production of milk and milk products under a marketing mechanism which does not force him to use subsidies, or is he more likely to expand production under a subsidy program such as now proposed by the administration?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I can answer that very quickly. I will say that I would not expand my dairy production under the subsidy program. I had about determined that I was going to have to sell a large portion of my dairy herd, and may have to follow Secretary Morgenthau's example and still do it, because the subsidy is inflexible. It cannot be quickly adapted to changing conditions,

and is generally applied evenly over an entire area, whereas you may have one individual pocket where prices are inadequate that is causing all the trouble. Milk prices in my home town are not sufficient. Milk prices in some other towns in my State seem ample, and in other towns may be more than sufficient. Yet when the subsidy was put on, every town was treated alike. The town where Senator HATCH lives, the town of Clovis, N. Mex., was probably worse hit than any city in the State, but received the same subsidy as did any other city. It is that inflexible part of the subsidy that I do not like. A free commerce will let prices seek the level that local conditions may require.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If that applies to the gentleman it will apply to all other farmers having dairy herds.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not know as to that. I only know how it hit me.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman allowed, as part of the cost, depreciation and the cost of maintenance of his capital structure?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I have not handled it that way exactly, no; but I have tried to figure what a businessman would do if he were trying to calculate the costs, and I have found that the situation has grown progressively worse. Even with the subsidy I am in far worse shape today than I was in 1941, and have plenty of figures to produce the evidence to show that that is correct.

The farmer's great difficulty has been that once the price of milk is fixed, the items entering into the price of milk continue to advance. We were given a price of milk based upon certain developed costs, and then the price of cottonseed cake, of alfalfa, of labor, and of about everything else that has entered into the production of milk was allowed gradually to rise, with the result that what might have been a fair price in January of 1942 became an unfair-price in January of 1943, and that by the time it was corrected in the middle of 1943, prices had already gone up on other products so that it was again completely out of line.

I do not think that the administration could have selected a better man than Judge Marvin Jones to administer the subsidy program and to have assumed responsibility for the production of food. But he cannot work miracles—sympathetic as he is to the problems of the farmer.

When one price gets out of line, other prices have to be adjusted. Because we did not have one over-all and all-powerful regulating agency, we found individual price increases whittling away at the relationship between production costs and selling costs on almost every item that the farmer has produced. The result has been the picture that The Dairy Situation for November 1943 gives us. I quote now from page 4 of the November issue:

> Reflecting the lowest production per cow for October 1 since 1939 and the lowest percentage of cows milked on that date in 15 years, total milk production of farms in September is estimated at 9,255,000,000 pounds. This was a decline of 12.5 percent from August, compared with a normal decline of 10 percent.

On page 5 we find an item with reference to butter production. It reads:

> Butter production in September was 126,485,000 pounds, the lowest for that month since 1931.

That is the story all the way along the line, and it will be the story until prices are allowed to reach the point where the farmer can find it attractive to retain his herds and develop, rather than decrease, his production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the House is a simple one—will subsidies provide a sound and substantial barrier to further inflationary trends? On this issue I find myself in disagreement with the President. He has sent a lengthy message to the Congress urging the adoption of a subsidy program. The President's message is skillfully drawn. It is a perfect specimen of capable craftsmanship—a persuasive campaign document. Certain assertions are made which are so obvious that to take exception to them would be foolhardy. I find it difficult, however, to find the pertinency of some of these statements to the issue before us. The President declares that food is a weapon of war. That is a self-evident fact. I am at a loss, however, to see how the granting of a subsidy will produce more of these weapons of war. I am in agreement with the assertion that the disasters of inflation should be avoided. But that assertion does not answer the question which concerns me: How will subsidies aid in the control of the flood of purchasing power let loose by an ever-increasing wage program in a market of decreasing available goods? Other instances might be cited of immaterial assertions.

The President's message would have been much more convincing had it said in so many words how subsidies would halt the flow of purchasing power, how subsidies would let loose a larger volume of purchasable goods, how subsidies would produce one additional bushel of wheat or corn, how taking funds out of the taxpayer's pocket, administering the funds by a Federal agency with its attendant cost, and then distributing the balance of the fund as a subsidy, amounts to anything other than a financial fallacy. One might imagine that subsidies were like the manna in the wilderness—a providence of God. Make no mistake about it, this is not the case. Subsidies, like all other Federal funds gathered by the taxpayer, are earned in the sweat of every man who labors and of every woman, too.

As I contemplate the concern manifested by the administration over the dangers of inflation, I cannot dismiss from my mind the general loose and easy money policies—inflationary policies—which have characterized the New Deal from the beginning. An easy spending policy is inevitably an inflationary policy.

I realize that many feel it is futile to attempt to change the fixed policy of the administration—the policy which ignores completely the stress and strain imposed on the men and women who pay taxes by every additional dollar of Federal expenditure.

It might be vain in this day of wildcat spending, of political juggling, to urge caution in appropriations, but the time will come when the fallacy of subsidizing our existence will be brought home to the American people with just as much forcefulness as the worthlessness of W. P. A. leaf raking proved to be a few years ago. It may be useless at this time to advocate common sense, but I am convinced the time will come when our people will see all too clearly that a cost-of-living standard which depends on Government grants cannot be substantial.

Gratuities and bounties have always appeared to be the way of life of the New Deal. Today the administration sounds a warning against inflation—a condition which has already been felt by every householder in the land. The condition is a critical one. The President insists that subsidies will provide a remedy for the threatened ills. The suggested remedy is in line with the New Deal's usual policy—spend, give gratuities of one kind or another—to give strength to the impotency of the New Deal.

It is well known that recent policies of the administration in dealing with certain labor demands has resulted in making greater the purchasing power of the people. I find it difficult to grasp the genuineness of concern over inflation in the light of what appears to be a fixed policy in other fields of our economic life. What positive position has the President taken to keep in check the purchasing power growing directly out of the war effort? Are we to assume that one standard applies in one case and an entirely different standard in another. Are we to assume that additional dollars can be pumped into the purchasing stream on one hand, then subsidies provided such as recommended by the President, and the net result will be anti-inflationary? Is this the justification for an additional Treasury raid? How will subsidies give strength to our people in the battle of inflation? Can it be said that it will be encouraging and stimulating to our fighting men, challenged as they are to be courageous, to learn that the drug of subsidies must be resorted to, rather than all-out stand against unwarranted demands of labor leaders? Apparently

offensives are desirable on the fighting fronts while a delaying and retreating action is necessary on the home front.

Try as I will I can find no other excuse for the administration's attitude than the political advantage that may accrue from a "keep everybody happy" program. I am driven to this conclusion as I see the wishy-washy methods used in dealing with every factor entering into our economic problem. Subsidies are no doubt palatable. We cannot dismiss from our minds the assurances given by the President when he urged the adoption of an emergency price-control measure that the wage factor, admittedly a very important factor in the inflation problem, could be left to him. The record can speak for itself as to the outcome of that commitment.

I cannot close without making reference to what I believe to be something more dangerous even than the threat of inflation. As a people we are solely in need of a reestablishment of faith in the integrity of Government. I do not believe subsidies will contribute to the reestablishment of that faith.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. The House has under consideration H. R. 3477, which is a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets and for other purposes.

One of the other purposes is found in section 3, which prohibits the use of funds appropriated to or borrowed by or in custody or control of any governmental agency as a consumer subsidy. This bill does not interfere with any operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation producer subsidies or loans authorized under existing law.

The issue revolves around the question of whether the Federal Treasury shall pay the proposed consumer subsidies and continue to pay those already in operation.

The question here is not one of paying subsidies for production. The question is not whether it is advisable to pay producers to encourage production. The question here is whether the consumer shall be paid a subsidy.

The State of Maine produced, among other things in the year 1943, more than 70,000,000 bushels of white potatoes—enough to feed the armed forces of the United States for a year. The official figures indicate this required 192,000 acres. As a matter of fact the best figures indicate nearer 200,000 acres, a tremendous increase over previous years. The farmers of Maine are an alert, capable, conservative group of men and women who believe in and love our form of government.

These men and women are opposed to consumer subsidies, not for selfish reasons, for whether this bill is passed or not they will not be directly affected. They see in the efforts of certain groups in Washington to roll back prices and make up the difference from the Federal Treasury a step that will inevitably lead to the complete socialization of agriculture in America. This step toward regimentation and control will lead to another, until free enterprise on the farm will be a thing of the past.

So-called consumer subsidies are already in operation to a limited extent. On these articles the farmer receives no more and no less. The price to the consumer is reduced and the Federal Treasury makes up the difference. The consumer subsidy and roll-back advocated would put upon the future taxpayers of this country—the returning soldiers, and others—the obligation to pay from taxes or borrowed money a portion of the grocery bills of this present generation now employed on the home front at regular or higher wages, the while the said soldiers fight at $50 a month to defend free enterprise. It is claimed by spokesmen of the administration that unless the Government is allowed to do this, the forces of inflation will have free rein. Why?

It does not appear why. And I have waited in vain for some sound reason to support that view. This has nothing to do with placing ceilings upon articles. The O. P. A. does that. This has nothing to do with siphoning off purchasing power. The same amount of money will be in circulation if section 3 of this bill is defeated. This has nothing to do with increasing production, because the producer takes nothing whether this bill is passed or not.

It does have something to do with the future of free enterprise in America.

The next avowed purpose of the administration is to purchase some or all of the products of the farm and sell directly to the consumer at a loss.

If this is not socializing America, what is it?

There is no need of extended argument on this question. The ground has been ably covered by the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has completely answered the suggestion that the passage of this bill will have a tendency to increase inflation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to relate to the House this afternoon an incident that determined my own convictions on the matter now pending. Late in September I addressed a letter to Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, pointing out in my rather humble and untutored way, that while I pretended to be no expert in the field of agriculture, I could see when the grasses failed upon the range, range cattle would have to go into market, since the feeders could not afford to buy them and feed them in the Corn Belt. I indicated my best guess was it probably would reach the peak of cattle movement in December and that in connection therewith there would be a heavy hog run so that the packing facilities of the country would be taxed to the limit. That I could sense already, because anyone in looking at the receipts of 27 primary markets could observe nearly 1,000,000 head of hogs were moving in every week. They did not necessarily tax the facilities of the packing plants. The real difficulty was that a plant could accept no more hogs than at the rate at which it could dispose of the pork products. And if there were no outlets manifestly there was no use in buying more hogs than they could slaughter and dispose of. I suggested then to Mr. Jones that they remove all the restrictions from pork, remove all the rationing restrictions for a period of 90 days; let the people enjoy a succulent pork chop for a little while. Let them enjoy some very juicy and toothsome bacon to their heart's content. Let there be a field day in pork, because we had more hogs than at any other time in the record of the agricultural history of the country. Mr. Jones' office acknowledged the letter, and said they were some rather timely and meritorious observations, but they had other plans.

They proposed to develop orderly marketing through committees. I watched, with bated breath, as we moved on into the field of chaos. We are there now, 2 months later. Did you observe Mr. Jones' release on yesterday? There is a glut; there are too many hogs now for our slaughter facilities. Yes, livestock men knew that months ago even if the Government did not know it. So it is proposed now to say to every farmer under the release issued yesterday that he can slaughter hogs on the farm to his heart's content and he will require no license to sell the meat in the market. You observed the headlines yesterday in the Washington newspapers to the effect that the requirements of rationing points on pork have been diminished by 2 points per pound. Mr. Jones did not go far enough, nor did the O. P. A. They should have taken them off entirely, because that is not going to meet the situation. We are moving into the danger zone and with each passing month it gets infinitely worse. If they make that kind of mistake I shall not be a party to providing any more instrumentalities to make any more mistakes.

We cannot afford any more mistakes. There is an element of morale that is involved here. There is an element of balance that is involved. There is an element of confidence on the part of the producers that is involved here and if you disturb it too seriously, I rather fear for the ultimate results so far as production is concerned. Did not the President, after all, in his subsidy message, admit that there was not sufficient food to go around? And then he said there must be enough of the right kind, at the right time, in the right place. And those six words mean what? They mean planned production. And that does not sit with the farmers of the United States of America. To carry that out, he asked for subsidies, and I am opposed for many

reasons. But I give you this illustration of how War Food in my considered judgment erred in meeting the present meat problem. I feel very humble when I let my judgment enter into contest with that of a man so skilled in the field of agriculture as our former beloved colleague, Marvin Jones, yet in all humility I say a great mistake was made. They admit it now. They admitted it in the release that issued from War Food yesterday to the country. So I reiterate, I do not propose to be a party to more mistakes. I would rather err on the other side.

There is one other aspect of this thing that probably has not been discussed too freely. I feel like saying in the manner and language of the Great Teacher of long ago, "Oh, ye of little faith."

Have you been home recently?

I have been home for a week, Senator. I have talked to many people.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I thought you were describing yourself so beautifully with that quotation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been home visiting with people, rubbing shoulders and enjoying that kind of fellowship that you can get only when you go home. Probably several thousand people were in those little groups where I visited. Not one mentioned subsidies and not one asked for subsidies. Not one confessed his defeatism and was willing to go on record to have a son or daughter somewhere far afield fighting for the preservation of this Republic, to come back and be apprised that we were going to depend on them in the days to come to shoulder the grocery bill of the present generation.

No, there is no such defeatism out in the country. You find it only in one place in the United States, that is in the slightly effete atmosphere of the United States Capital. You do not find it anywhere else. Folks are not asking for it.

I examined the remarks of the majority leader with a great deal of interest. That is, the remarks he made at the inception of the debate on yesterday. He said, we should not criticize too freely, too caustically unless we had a program to substitute therefor. I have a program. I will tell you what I will substitute for subsidies. Notwithstanding the fact that the President of the United States said in that 12,000-word message that War Food, the O. P. A. and the Director of Stabilization, and the Department of Agriculture were handling this very nicely, I still would concentrate authority and channelize it in some one experienced head. Bring it all together. It is a jigsaw puzzle today. I can establish it out of such a humble commodity as pulpwood. The men who wield the axes and make them shiny on the butt of a tree were getting $6 a ton for pulpwood in central Illinois.

Somebody in Washington decided that $3.35 a ton would be about enough. What happened? The axes were covered with grease and placed up in the tool sheds not to be used again. Then I was advised by the agency here that there was a mistake in construing and interpreting the regulation that had been gotten out. Just a little confusion; but the mistake has been persisting for weeks and weeks and the program of cutting a tree a day to meet the paper shortage is failing of eventuation at the present time. That is the trouble right now. I saw it and I visited with the head of a timber project only 2 or 3 days ago out home and got the whole story.

Now if we had concentration, so that instead of having a jigsaw puzzle we would have some symmetrical, well-joined program on every food front, how much better it would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does the gentleman think there is an economist or statesman or businessman, even in the Republican Party or anywhere else in the United States, that could stand the assault made upon him by the greed of the country, if he was given all the power you say ought to be consolidated in him?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The party is filled with men of courage and fortitude to do the job, because for the last 12 years they have had to develop that fortitude on the basis of what has been happening in the country. Yes; there are many in Congress. The steam roller used to go over us so frequently that it developed fortitude and determination to preserve the sane, sound American way of doing business in a climate of freedom. So, I think we could find many who could do the job. Certainly we need experienced people who know something about livestock and about butter and about food, who are going to issue these directives. We have made some progress in the O. P. A. I asked Mr. Bowles recently for a report on bringing experienced personnel into O. P. A. I shall not be satisfied until more business experience, more perspective, permeates and impregnates this whole Federal structure.

Secondly, there should be a revision of control on a lot of these items. There are 800 items, as I understand, now under O. P. A. control, but is it not amazing that about 90 percent of all the food sales virtually consist of 20 commodities? And yet we build up a great administrative wilderness here in dealing with this whole food program with all its consequent confusion.

Next, instead of having the cart before the horse as we have been doing for 2 years let us just stop and unhitch that horse and put the horse where it belongs. Nailing down prices at the consumer level while at every step of production from the farm through the cannery, the packing plant, the processor, the broker, the jobber, the distributor, it is not nailed down—how can it be reasonably expected to stop the inflationary process when there is no control over any prices outside of the simple business of pushing food across a retailer's counter?

The majority leader said we must be responsible for inflation if we vote for the pending bill. We have had inflation for the last 2 years. Prices have gone up 33 percent; on green vegetables and fruits they went up 84 percent. If you are going to eliminate the black market, you are going to have to straighten out O. P. A., putting the emphasis on essential things, getting away from a lot of things that ought not to have any emphasis whatever today. Then we can see more clearly ahead and keep this thing in line.

In addition to a centralized food authority, experienced personnel to handle food problems at every level, an over-all simplification of rationing, the management of controls at various levels of food production and processing, there should be some kind of synchronization between rationing and production.

Thus far our thinking on rationing has been but a device to divide as equitably as possible the available supplies. But why not gear it to production? The value of a point will determine where the production emphasis must be placed and that, of course, brings us to the heart of the program for meeting our present problem, namely, production.

The answer to the whole program is production. Say what you like, you cannot meet this inflation problem by any other means except production unless you want to siphon off in the form of taxes all the money that people earn, or immobilize most of their income. But if you siphon off their income who is going to buy $17,000,000,000 of bonds in each War bond drive? Will somebody answer that question? Politically, economically, socially, that does not seem to be the expedient thing. So you go back to the whole question of production all over again and we are not going to solve it until a little more common sense pervades some policies that have been in effect.

I have a letter from a mother. One boy in the Army out in New Guinea; a younger boy helping to run a 200-acre farm. In October they were filling the silo. It collapsed and fell on this youngster and he died right there. A heavy mortgage on the farm. She sent me a note saying:

> Mr. DIRKSEN, can you get my other son out of the service? Who is going to operate this farm?

I tried to get him out. I failed.

I went out to see another farm when I was home. It is 480 acres in extent with perhaps 500 head of livestock. The one who was left on the farm has infantile paralysis to such a degree that his frame is firmly stooped over and his eyes always look at the ground. He said: "Can you not get my one brother out of the service? If you do not," he said, "this farm goes on the block."

And it is on the block right now.

Can we not get some of these farm boys out of the service? Otherwise how can we solve this problem of production? It is in proportion as produce moves into

the market that you are going to deal effectively with inflation and the inflationary prospects that arise from the monetization of a debt of hundreds of billions through the banks of the country. That in my judgment is the only fair, reasonable, durable answer and not this business of reaching into the Federal Treasury for the purpose of paying subsidies upon the food that we eat in this generation.

The argument against subsidies has been thoroughly explored. They but add to the inflationary forces already at work. They create an aggravated problem for the future when removed. If they remain, after the war terminates, it but means that we have a permanent problem on our hands. They apply to only certain commodities and the statistics offered on this whole subject are not too accurate because the black market operations are not revealed. They deal mainly with end results and not with basic causes. They ignore the very basic fact that in a wartime economy production is and must be the primary consideration.

Let us not stray from the basic remedy. It is production and more production and that means a fair price, adequate manpower and ample machinery.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, for me it is well that I shall have at least 2 days to read the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the week end before this bill is read for amendments and the final vote is taken. During the last 2 days I have listened through most of these debates and find myself confused. Therefore I am promising myself that I shall reread tomorrow and Sunday what Members have said here on this bill in general debate. I do feel we have a lot of discussion pro and con available for study, but I shall need it with this highly controversial proposal.

This bill, or at least that part of it in section 3 dealing with subsidies, is very technical as well as highly controversial. I have heard it said many times on the floor of this House through the 7 momentous years during which I have been a Member, "The bill before us is of paramount importance and of more vital concern to the welfare of our country than any other measure we have been called upon to vote for a long time." Well, I think really that such is true of this measure, for I regard it as of great significance and of outstanding importance, even in the midst of those other momentous measures we have been called upon to consider during the last half-dozen fateful years in American history. Why do I think so? Because I believe that our war upon inflation is as meaningful to our country as the military war against the Axis foes.

Mr. Chairman, an intimate knowledge of economics, business, human nature, and the perils of the situation should be had by each one of us before casting this vote. Much as we have discussed it the last 2 days my mind is not made up. I do need more time to sleep on it and to think over it. Where such a life-and-death situation confronts our Nation we ought to bring science and sense rather than politics and prejudice to bear on our thinking. Which will determine our vote?

I had some questions of an elementary kind which I intended to place before you in an extension of remarks 2 days ago, but neglected to do so in time for any to answer during general debate. However, I will insert them in the RECORD tonight with the hope that someone before the vote is taken can enlighten me on the matters involved.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] as he desires.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion on the floor of the House yesterday and today regarding the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I have heard references to producer subsidies and consumer subsidies which I believe are misnomers. The so-called subsidies involved in this legislation are war subsidies and should be referred to as war subsidies. Outside of the fighting front, the greatest problem of this country today is the imminent threat of inflation and a complete wrecking of our entire home economy.

I represent one of the greatest industrial districts in the United States. Thousands of men and women are engaged in factories which are producing steel, airplane parts, tanks, ammunition, and all of the necessities that are essential to the winning of this war. The great majority of these men and women in most instances are applying their daily wage to the feeding, clothing, sheltering and educating of large families. A world war necessarily brings about an abnormal and unusual economic upheaval. It is the duty of every Member of this House to protect the millions of men, women, and children of America who will be thrown into impossible financial hardships if living costs are allowed to increase beyond the present burdens which they are now bearing without complaint.

The President has courageously done his duty in holding the line against the breaking through of inflation. If this Congress permits legislation to be passed that will bring about unreasonable increase in the price of necessities, and as a result thereof, demands for higher wages to meet these increases may eventually bring about strikes and tie-up of war production, the responsibility will rest upon the shoulders of this Congress.

I have heard it mentioned in this discussion that it does not make any difference whether these increased war costs are paid directly by the consumer or indirectly through Government subsidies. That statement is misleading because when increase is made on the price of necessities, pyramiding immediately starts to take effect.

For instance, increasing war costs make it necessary to pay the farmers 10 cents more for a bushel of corn. If this increase is paid directly to the farmer by the Government, that is the end of it. On the other hand, if the farmer is allowed an increase to 10 cents a bushel, that is only the beginning. Ten cents more a bushel for corn means that the hog raiser will have to charge more to the packer; the packer more to the wholesaler; the wholesaler more to the retailer and the retailer more to the housewife—with the cost pyramiding along as each normal profit is added on. This explains the President's statement that only eight hundred million spent for subsidies this year saved the Government and consumers billions of dollars.

Prices and rent ceilings, wage and farm price stabilization, War bond buying, rationing of scarce essentials, are necessary to preserve the economic welfare of our country in a wartime emergency like this. The establishment and continuance of wartime subsidies to keep the price of life's necessities within reason is essential for the rapid winning of the war. The very fact that Congress has refused to increase taxes this fall makes it doubly important to hold the line on all fronts including prices of life's necessities. By paying wartime subsidies to food producers or processors, the Nation can bring out full production without increasing the cost to the consumers. The amount so paid will be but a fraction of the cost of a general price rise which would certainly bring on new wage increases and the spiral of economic ruination would continue to grow.

Regardless of everything that has been said pro and con on this legislation, I believe the above is the simplest and most concise explanation of the necessities of wartime subsidies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I will address myself to people and food, not to sons in the service and many other subjects.

From every walk in life, from every corner of my district, from rich and poor, from professional men and laborers, from housewives, mothers, and school teachers, have I had this same plea—"Hold the line," "Beware and alert to the new enemy on the home front—inflation."

Inflation with its drastic results has, in the course of years, left its scar upon the nations of the world. In the First World War, with a national debt of thirty-two billion, the inflation portion of the debt was $13,500,000,000 and its effects upon the economy of our Nation is written in the history of the recent depression. An inflation of equal proportion in the present war would reach the staggering figure of $70,000,000,000 by the end of 1943. The world knows the effect

that uncontrolled inflation had in Germany after the last war. The story abroad of the violent effect of present uncontrolled prices in China should be sufficient testimony for any thinking individual.

The spiral of inflation in its attempted rush to dizzy heights has been retarded by the operations of O. P. A. and the subsidy program, and the proof of this statement is found in the low level of prices in the present war as compared to World War No. 1. Not even the opponents of the subsidy program can deny this statement.

Many arguments have been advanced against food subsidies which appear convincing until studied. The proponents say subsidies will add $800,000,000 annually to the public debt. This is a staggering sum, but when placed in a relative position to war expenditures, it dwindles to the cost of a 3-day war operation. The Government is the purchaser today of three-fourths of our production. High prices would increase tremendously Uncle Sam's bill. Again, the relationship of the $800,000,000 to the Nation's expenditures for a year is dwarfed to a small sum. With food subsidies out of the picture, the Little Steel formula cannot be maintained. Wage scales would increase and Uncle Sam, being the big purchaser, would pay the bill. Let us remember that Uncle Sam always makes his annual visit during the income-tax period. The public debt would grow by leaps and bounds and would affect drastically our entire economy.

In view of the great volume of mail encouraging me as the Representative of the Fourteenth District of Michigan to do all in my power to support the food-subsidy program, I feel it unnecessary to refute the arguments of those who say "I don't want to leave this subsidy bill for my boy to pay—I'll pay my grocery bill now." The truth of the matter is there are several grocery bills—there is the individual's grocery bill, there is the Army and Navy grocery bill, and there is the lend-lease grocery bill.

Why make the long speech about the smallest of the grocery bills, when Uncle Sam, who is the American taxpayer, will pay all of these grocery bills and especially will we—your boy and mine—pay a grocery bill with a staggering total if we have unbridled inflation. Today, I am justifiably proud of the alertness of the people of my district to the menace of inflation. Surely they must know that the income of many to a number in excess of three million one hundred ten thousand is absolutely fixed regardless of changes in economic conditions. In that group there are the aged, the blind, dependent children, and those on general relief. Employees of local governments, excluding those in the educational system, number almost 2,000,000. There are military allotments to dependents of men in the armed services to the number of 2,000,000 and there are 860,000 in the ranks of the veterans all with fixed incomes and a ruthless inflation would deal harshly with them indeed.

Throughout the country community war chests are being collected under quotas to supply funds for many charitable activities too numerous to be cited at this time. What will happen to these praiseworthy undertakings if the galloping steed of inflation runs rampant and renders impractical the well-intended contributions of those charitably inclined donors to the civic chest? Oh, my friends, it is time to remember. Remember the aftermath of the last depression brought about by a short-sighted policy which resulted in the astounding figure of $13,500,000,000, representing the inflationary portion of the debt of the bill of World War No. 1. Remember the empty smoke stacks of the factories, remember the apple vendors on the corner, remember the days they walked the streets in search of work only to return each night with the same expression—"No luck today." Remember the times that popularized the song Brother, Can You Spare a Dime? Yes, my friends, this is the time to remember. Let us not talk around this subject, let us talk of its real phases—subsidies for food that Uncle Sam's bill may be less and that the spiral of inflation may be halted in its rush to the sky. I will not attempt to advise the farmer nor those who represent the farm districts. Surely they have not forgotten the deflated prices of farm commodities—the sheriff sales—and the abandoned homesteads that dotted the countryside. Yes, my colleagues, this is the time to remember for inflation will bring naught but misery for the greater number and a justifiable finger of scorn from their fellow beings for those who advocate and profit by its parasitical rewards.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in committee, I include at this point correspondence I received from the Maryland Citizens Committee for Democracy, Baltimore League of Women Voters, and a petition from Local 43, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America:

THE MARYLAND CITIZENS
COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY,
Baltimore, Md., November 15, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: The Maryland Citizens Committee for Democracy urges that you vote in favor of food subsidies because:

It is imperative that there be no further inflation and further inflation must result if food prices are permitted to continue to rise. By subsidies production can be maintained and food prices stabilized.

So many other commodities and industries both inside and outside the war effort have been and are subsidized—some of these subsidies dating back to 1789—the argument that food subsidies are un-American and unconstitutional, etc., are not valid. Further we consider the use of such arguments intentionally hypocritical—the flag-waving of the unpatriotic who try to hide their real purpose (inflation in this case) behind the American flag.

We will watch the vote on food subsidies with keen interest.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH HOLT DOWNS
(Mrs. James R. Downs),
Corresponding Secretary.

BALTIMORE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Baltimore, Md., November 16, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: The Baltimore League of Women Voters is very much disturbed by the reported sentiment in Congress against food subsidies. In our opinion the issue is clear.

Our Government has asked farmers as well as industrialists and mine owners to produce more for the war even though it means producing at a higher cost. Increased costs can be met either by higher prices or by Government subsidies. Higher prices must, of course, result in bigger and worse inflation. The farm pressure groups (with the exception of the Farmers Union) have made it quite plain that this is what they want. We as individuals and consumers, and as an organization that has the welfare of our country at heart, are opposed to further increases in food prices. We therefore urge that you vote in favor of food subsidies.

We are mindful of the fact that the subsidizing of food is only one facet of the anti-inflation program, albeit a very important facet. We know, too, that subsidies are slightly inflationary, but so much less so than increase in prices that we strongly urge their use. The line against inflation is being threatened by the big farm pressure groups and their cohorts in Congress. We look to you to hold that line and keep it unbroken. Your vote will tell us on which side you stand.

Sincerely,

BEULAH A. HESS, *President.*

PETITION OF LOCAL NO. 43, INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA

To the Members of the Maryland delegation, the House of Representatives; President Roosevelt, White House; Office of Price Administration; Maritime Commission; National War Labor Board; Department of Labor; Department of Agriculture; Senators Tydings and Radcliffe:

We, the men and women in the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Baltimore, Md., who are building ships to help win the war in the shortest time possible, demand that prices of essential goods, food, clothing, rents, etc., be reduced to meet the wages we receive, or that wages be adjusted upward to meet the tremendous rise in the cost of living.

We believe that prices can be reduced or wages adjusted in the shortest time possible by adopting the proposal of the President that the difference between cost of production of essential foods and the prices farmers get be paid or subsidized by the Government. In this way the rich individuals and corporations will be compelled to pay their share of high prices. If the President's $800,000,000 subsidy program is not passed, we will be in the middle. We will have exorbitant prices and most of the taxes to pay, on the one hand, and a frozen wage scale on the other. Before this heavy burden of prices and taxes as against an inadequate wage scale leads to serious difficulties, we urge you to take a vigorous stand in our behalf. We urge the Members of the Maryland delegation to insert this full petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and fight for the President's program every step of the way.

This petition was signed by thousands of men and women of this organization.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in this bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation and in the question of subsidies. Of course, I am in favor of the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but that is not the element of controversy in the bill. I have read the hearings which were conducted on the bill and I have listened to many speeches. The more I hear and read, the more disturbed I become over so-called consumer subsidies.

To be perfectly frank, I must say that I believe in support prices for agricultural products and any subsidy to agriculture that could be proved necessary to maintain a fair price or increase production. A fair price in the market place is what the farmer desires. He asks no more. But the question of producer subsidies to increase production does not seem to be the question at issue in this bill.

The question in this bill is, Shall we subsidize consumers? That is, shall we help pay the meat, butter, milk, and bread bill of the consumers out of the Federal Treasury, a Federal Treasury which is threatened with bankruptcy? The welfare of the consumer cannot be disregarded. But the more I study the problem the more I question the desirability of consumer subsidies. In the name of helping the consumer, we must not flirt with disaster. We must not take a chance on wrecking the country—destroying agricultural production and bankrupting our Nation. It does not seem quite ethical for the Government to be paying a part of the grocery bill of all the people at the greatest period of prosperity and widespread employment in the Nation's history. If we cannot pay the farmer a fair price for his products now, when will we ever be able to do it? But the matter is more important than that. To win on the battle front, we must win on the production front, on farm and in factory. Production must be stimulated.

But those who favor consumer subsidies lift a finger of warning and say that if the price of bread should go up a penny a loaf, milk a penny a quart, and meat and butter a few cents a pound, making an annual increase in a man's grocery bill of a few dollars, there will have to be a great increase in the wages of industrial workers and that our Nation will be thrown immediately into the throes of uncontrolled inflation and certain disaster. I cannot follow this argument, but if I am in error I should like to know it. The country's welfare is at stake, and we must do whatever is necessary to meet the demands of the hour.

Let me say emphatically that I believe in price control. There may be those who favor uncontrolled inflation, but I am not one of them. Moreover, I believe the people whom I represent in Congress are in favor of price control, price control reasonably administered. They know that uncontrolled inflation would wreck the country. But why would everybody have to have a wage increase if bread went up a penny a loaf, milk a penny a quart, and butter 60 cents a year? My observation has been that the increase in the price of fruits and vegetables has presented the more difficult problem. I will admit that if all Americans were on the ragged edge, working for starvation wages, and if they did not have a penny left over after paying the grocery bill, then a small increase in the price of groceries would have to mean a few less groceries or a higher wage.

But that is not the situation—certainly not in the average family. The national income this year will be about $150,000,000,000. You can buy a lot of groceries with that. Moreover, we spend only about 22 percent of our national income for food. That proportion is not considered unreasonable when compared with past experience. Yes; the national income is to be about $150,000,000,000. It is estimated that after we pay our grocery bills, rent, other expenses, about $40,000,000,000 in taxes, and buy all the goods that are available for purchase, we will have about $40,000,000,000 left over. The experts say that this is the money that creates the inflation threat. This is the money that the President wanted us to partially collect in new taxes, save, and buy bonds with. Would it not be best to use part of this money to pay the necessary price for food? Again I say if the price of milk went up a penny a quart, we would have to raise wages a penny a day if our people were making no more than enough to barely pay their grocery bill. But we are making about $150,000,000,000 annually and we should have about $40,000,000,000 in surplus income at the end of the year—a sum equal to the entire national income in 1932. Unfortunately, this money will not be very equitably distributed among our people. There will be many hardship cases. But why are consumer subsidies out of Federal tax money and borrowed money necessary? And why do we have to have uncontrolled inflation and a lot of unjustified wage increases. Some increases may be necessary, and if they are, they should be made. Surely there are not many who now deserve further increase—certainly not in the war factories of the Nation. Oh, but it is said, "Sure, most people can well afford to pay adequately for their food, but there are certain groups that cannot."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Those who say this make it all very simple. Here it is: A relatively small percentage of the people do not make sufficient income to pay adequately for their butter, milk, and bread, so the Federal Government will help every American pay his grocery bill, taking the money out of the Federal Treasury. The plan is to subsidize all the people, rich and poor alike, those not needing such a subsidy being in the majority. And I am not unsympathetic toward those who have been severely hampered by subnormal income and rising living costs. Most all Americans have had their difficulties and we can hardly expect anything else in wartime.

Moreover, if the Government pays part of each man's grocery bill, from John D. Rockefeller to John Doe, there are going to be a lot of overhead administrative costs, a lot of dreaming, blundering bureaucrats to deal with, and a lot of additional regimentation upon our people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a better way to handle the problem.

Another thing, if Americans have to pay an additional penny for milk and bread, do you not think that most of them can afford to do it? Would it be out of order for Americans on the home front to do a little sacrificing? Our men are fighting in the mud in Italy, on the bloody road to Rome. In the Southwest Pacific the boys are fighting malaria, the jungles, and the Japs. The boys are flying over Germany in the face of deadly peril and they do not all come back to their bases. What would they give for an end of this war and a chance to come home to the country they love? This wrangling over profits and higher wages where higher wages are not due must make our wounded boys in hospitals and all those who bear our colors overseas sick at heart. Let us be Americans who are worthy of our country in this great and tragic hour—Americans willing to make the necessary sacrifices. After all, the ones who are making the real sacrifices in this war are the ones who are hazarding their lives on the fighting fronts—they and their parents, wives, and loved ones.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in the current discussion of subsidies, the Congress and the Nation have been burdened with a mass of statistical information. Most of the statistics have emanated either from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics or the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Proponents and opponents of the subsidy program are quoting statistics designed to support their respective contentions. The result is that certain groups in this country have questioned the authenticity of the statistics given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as to the earnings of workers and the statistics involved in the cost-of-living index. The Secretary of Labor, apparently viewing with alarm this attack upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics, appointed a committee of impartial statistical experts to make a survey of the findings and figures issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That report has been published and substantiates the accuracy of the Bureau's figures.

As this committee pointed out in its report, the difficulty lies in the use and

interpretation of the statistics. Having been confused in my own thinking by the variety of statistics quoted, I have recently secured from the Bureau of Labor Statistics definite figures relating to wage increases and cost-of-living indexes that can be definitely relied upon in connection with the present discussion. The Bureau advises me that between January 1939 and January 1941—the base date of the Little Steel formula—average hourly earnings increased from 63.2 to 68.3 cents, or 8.1 percent.

From January 1941 to October 1942, when Congress passed the Stabilization Act, they advanced to 89.3 cents, or an increase of 30.7 percent. Since then the average has advanced to 96.5 cents by August 1943, or another 8.1 percent. This means that average hourly earnings of wage earners, both part-time and full-time, increased between January 1939 and August 1943, 41.3 percent.

In order to be perfectly fair, however, it should be stated that while this percentage increase does not measure changes in wage rates, it should be pointed out that earnings have increased more rapidly than hourly rates for two reasons, namely: Much more overtime is being worked today at a premium rate, and there has been a greater expansion of employment in high-wage industries. Of the present average of 96.5 cents, representing the average hourly earnings in August 1943, 6.5 cents is due to averaging in payments for overtime. The Bureau estimates that in January 1941 the average earnings at straight-time rates would have been about 66.4 cents per hour. The estimate for August 1943 is 90 cents, or 35.6 percent more than in January 1941.

Thus it is clear that while average hourly earnings have increased 41.3 percent between January 1939 and August 1943, the hourly wage rate has increased only 35.6 percent. It should be noted that average hourly earnings would have risen between 1941 and 1943 even if the hourly rates had remained unchanged, because of the transition of wage earners from low-paid industries, like textiles, into the higher-paid industries working in metals and shipyard construction.

The Bureau advises me that if employment had been distributed among industries in August 1943 in the same proportions as in January 1941, straight-time earnings would be 85 cents per hour rather than 90 cents. Thus it is clear that hourly earnings uninfluenced by overtime or by changes in employment also increased from 66.4 cents in January 1941 to 85 cents in August 1943, a total of 28 percent over January 1941.

The average level of retail prices, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics' cost-of-living index, increased 18.1 percent from January 1941 to August 1942, and further 3.7 percent from October 1942 to August 1943, a total of 22.4 percent since January 1941.

Thus it may be seen that average factory wage rates have advanced 28 percent since January 1941, and the average level of retail prices had only increased 22.4 percent to August 1943. It is fair to state that these are average figures and that many rates have not been changed substantially in this period. The wage increases under the formula of the War Labor Board have been accepted only where rates are low compared to those generally prevailing. While this causes the average to rise, it does not mean that wage increases have been general since October.

It should also be stated that while these figures indicate an increase in average rates of pay since January 1941 amounting to 28 percent while retail prices increased only 22.4 percent, there still may be many workers whose rates have advanced less than retail prices. Many workers have received rate increases of 30 or 40 percent. Many have received increases no greater than are permitted under the Little Steel formula—15 percent. In some communities, retail prices have advanced much more than 22.4. For example, Savannah, Ga., where the increase is more than 30 percent. There will, therefore, obviously be many jobs of which it may be said that rates of hourly pay have advanced less than the retail prices, even though the average indicates that there are more factory jobs of which the reverse is true.

Measured in terms of the ability of the average worker to meet his expenses, it would seem to me that we should in all fairness consider what increase in the average hourly earnings of the worker has been since January 1941. The figures heretofore referred to indicate that as to actual earnings, the increase has been 41.3 percent. Comparing this with the average level of retail prices which shows a total increase of 22.4 percent during the same period of time, it should be clear that, uninfluenced by other considerations, the average worker today as a result of an increase in average rates plus longer hours, actually earns 41.3 percent more than he did in January 1941, while his cost of living has increased only 22.4 percent. The worker, however, is generally interested in what he actually takes home. An examination of the average figures discloses that in January 1941 the gross average weekly earnings was $26.64, which after deduction of social-security taxes left $26.38 for the worker to take home. His gross weekly earnings in August 1943 was $43.43. We find, however, that the average worker is permitting a deduction from his wages for the purchase of bonds and, in addition to social-security taxes, further withholdings for tax purposes have reduced the amount of his take-home wages. Computation of these figures indicates that a married man with no children whose gross weekly earnings in August 1943 was $43.43 a week, actually took home after the bond deductions and tax, $33.85; a married man with one child, $35.13; and a married man with two children, $36.41.

To be perfectly fair, we should further explore and compute the difference between the take-home wages in January 1941 and those in August 1943. As I have already indicated, the take-home average earnings of the worker in January 1941 was $26.38. A married man with no children in 1943 took home $33.85. Adjusting the cost-of-living index to these take-home wages, we find that in August 1943, the average wage earner would have to spend $32.39 to obtain goods and services which cost $26.38 in January 1941. These figures indicate that after payment of taxes and after saving 10 percent of his wages in the form of bond deductions, the married man with no children in August 1943 would be able to buy the same amount of goods and services he bought in January 1941 and have $1.56 left. The married man with one child would have $2.84 left, and the married man with two children would have $4.04 left.

Thus we see that by the cold, naked figures, the average wage earner in America is enjoying a "take home" wage, after providing for his taxes and bond savings, considerably in excess of the rise in the cost of living.

If no consideration is given to the payment of taxes or bond savings, the average worker is still better off according to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. However, this does not necessarily mean that the worker in all cases is better off, because he might have had to move to a new town. He may have to eat more restaurant meals because of his longer hours, and it may be, that as a result of quality depreciation, he does not live as well in 1943 as in 1941 with a given amount of money. With all these qualifications, however, it is certain that the average factory earner today certainly has the same command over goods and services as the average wage earner had in 1941, as measured by his "take home" wages. No one can successfully contend, in the face of these figures, that the average worker is worse off at the present time.

I believe it is only fair to state, that in as much as all figures used in these discussions are average, there will be many workers who are much better off today in their ability to purchase consumer goods than they were in 1941, and there may be some who, because of changed location, quality deterioration, longer hours, and so forth, are not in a much better position than they were in 1941 with respect to their present ability to purchase goods and services. When consideration is given, however, to the over-all picture and we credit the average worker with the payment of his taxes, building up a reserve for retirement under social security plus savings in the form of bond purchases, there can be little doubt that a fair appraisal of the accurate figures clearly demonstrates that the average increase in the cost of living to the average worker in America is far under the increase in wages which the average worker now enjoys.

I am submitting these figures for the RECORD for what they may be worth in connection with some of the arguments made in favor of the extension of subsidies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has emphasized repeatedly that it opposes consumer subsidies. Every time this issue has been considered both Houses have opposed the payment of Government funds for the purpose of selling foods to the consumers of the country below support prices which the farmer obtains for his commodities. Congress has taken this view because it sees the necessity of meeting the costs of producing food in order to increase production for war and civilian needs. In the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, the following provision was contained:

Provided, That modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Under this provision it was mandatory on the President to modify maximum prices for agricultural commodities where the same were necessary to increase the production of such commodity for the needs of war, as well as to make modifications of the ceilings by allowing for increased farm-labor costs to the producers. Do you think that the mandate of Congress was complied with? Let me tell you what happened. Within only a few days after the enactment of the act, subsidies were being paid on milk instead of carrying out the expressed provision of an act of Congress.

If consumer subsidies are permitted, it means the establishment of additional Federal control and regulation. A specific provision written in the bill prohibiting and outlawing the payment of food subsidies is the only logical method to stop these payments. In a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States the rights of the Government to "regulate that which it subsidizes" was recognized. There is justification in having certain Government controls in wartime. There can be no justification in setting up any new Government control over the citizens of the Nation for the purpose of rolling back living costs on those items only which amount to but a small fraction of the total costs of living. What is needed in this country is less Government control instead of imposing new ones. What we need is fewer Government employees instead of increasing the number on the rolls. The people are clamoring for retrenchment in the operation of governmental affairs and they oppose the continuation of policies, of long standing, of increasing the powers of the central Government. A subsidy means control of the recipients of such payment. Our people have a right to expect of their Representatives that we put an early end to the socialistic trends which have swept America for the past several years. The adoption of Section 3 as written into this bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency will be a step in the right direction in doing just that. To strike Section 3 from the bill would leave the executive branch of the Government free to pay consumer subsidies, a concoction to further regiment America at a cost so alarming that even we opponents of such a plan would not attempt to estimate. The $800,000,000 asked of this Congress would be only a start if the green signal is given. The subsidy plan means a substitution of a policy of the Government supporting the people rather than the people supporting the Government. Should such a plan be adopted, it would be establishing a system of Government which our armed forces are fighting against on all the battle fronts of the world.

The wage earners of America are paying the smallest amount from their earnings for the food they consume than ever before in the history of this country. Only 21 percent of the total cost of living goes into the purchase of food. When the original Price Control Act was before Congress, the Baruch plan was considered. It provided for across-the-board stabilization of price, profits, and wages. Leon Henderson argued for at least a year that wages should not be controlled. He favored strict stabilization in the price of agricultural products. I strongly supported the Baruch over-all plan, and should it have been put into effect at that time, our economy would not be threatened with inflation as it is today with an inflationary gap of $63,000,000,000 competing for consumer goods. Let us see what the facts are. Up to September 1943 wages have advanced 74.2 percent in comparison with an increase of 18 percent in the cost of living, or more than four times the cost of living. At the same time industrial earnings have gone up 89.2 percent or nearly five times as much as living costs. The cost of living of the farmer has advanced along with that of everyone else and in addition he has had to contend with the greatest increase in wages of any domestic industry. Since 1941 farm wages have advanced by 81.1 percent. The cost of living today is 1.6 percent above the 1929 level; the per capita income in America is 59 percent above the 1929 income, with practically everyone in the family working. In 1929 the price of butter was 45 cents a pound and no one complained. Butter was selling for 46 cents a pound when the roll-back went into effect which paid the middleman a subsidy of 5 cents a pound—the consumer paying today 41 cents a pound which is 4 cents below the 1929 price. That is the reason that we have been complaining about the scarcity of butter.

It just does not make sense to charge that the farmer is the cause of all of our economic ills. He only asks fair prices for his products in the open and free market. Twenty-one percent of the total cost of living should not be singled out as the sole and exclusive cause of any inflationary ills that may come to the country. Industrial labor is demanding that the prices of foods be rolled back to the September 15 level or to an extent of a saving of 10 percent to the consumers. This means that they are asking an additional 10 percent in wages. With the $63,000,000,000 inflationary gap, according to the figures of Secretary Morgenthau, it would be highly inflationary for Congress to support a roll-back on the price of foods. Common, ordinary horse sense tells us that when we desire to increase production and decrease consumption the thing we do is to increase the price. If we desire to decrease production and increase consumption, we decrease the price. Our trouble is that we have too much spending power and too few goods to purchase, yet the proponents of subsidies are asking Congress to reduce prices. What kind of reasoning and logic is that? Let us face this problem realistically. I trust that the bill as recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee will be speedily enacted.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, our friends over on the left, I think, are pretty hard on my party. For some time I have heard your criticisms. I have been anxious not to provoke political controversy here in these wartimes, and the few opportunities I have had should not provoke any reply, but I want you to good-naturedly let me quarrel just a little bit with you about that. You do not even want to let us have our party name. You want to change the name of the grand old Democratic Party, the oldest party dealing with governmental affairs in all the world today. You say we are a New Deal Party. One thing a Republican is very careful to do is never to mention the Democratic Party. It is a ghost of righteousness that he is afraid even to name. New Deal Party? Why, there is no such thing as a New Deal Party. The New Deal was the program, the hand dealt, figuratively speaking, to rescue this country from the debacle into which the Republican Party had thrown it from Harding to Hoover. It was a program to restore a constitutional democratic American Government in the United States, which you had well-nigh destroyed in your long tenure of office and your misguided concept of duty to the American people.

They talk about saving the country. The country would have been gone if it had not been for Franklin D. Roosevelt and the great millions of American people who inaugurated him President of the United States in 1932 and took this country's government back from the few great selfish groups to which you had allowed it to go in greed and grasping plunder of the American people. That is what I think about the record of your party, and yet I hate to say anything about it here. You really provoke a good-natured man and an old man by your almost constant assaults upon

everybody connected with this great Democratic administration.

This subsidy is a part of a program—not a whole program but a part of a program—which this great administration asked for, to carry us on successfully through the great conflict in which we are now engaged. Oh, if we can keep at it for a few more months, victory, victory, glorious and complete, will come to the standards of democracy and liberty everywhere. For God's sake, do not let us wreck it and tear it down with a little bit of small, old-fashioned Republican politics. Let us not do that.

Today we are doing well. Last spring you prophesied wreck and destruction, but we had not been wrecked up to then and we have not been wrecked now. If we are wrecked, you will wreck us, because if you uphold the hands of this greatest of the earth's champions of democracy and of constitutional government in all time, we will win and we will win triumphantly.

I know it is hard for you not to hate him because he beat you once, he beat you twice, he beat you three times, and by the eternal God it is the hope of humanity that he will beat you the fourth time at the next election.

Yes; I am in favor of free enterprise. Even the brilliant young Governor of New York, one of the beacon lights of Republicanism, the other night said the great duty on us was to restore fre enterprise in the United States, free commerce, economic freedom. Freedom from what? Freedom from the law. You want to tear down all restraints. You are promising selfish business groups all over this country a destruction of control, freedom.

Yes, you are going to suspend the Constitution of the United States, you are going to quit controlling commerce, you are going to adopt instead the old Rob Roy plan, the simple plan of "Let him take who has the power, let him keep who can." We tried that sort of freedom in the United States from Harding to Hoover, and by the eternal God, if it had not been for Roosevelt and the grand old Democratic Party, not the New Deal Party, that rescued us from you, we would have been in a poor fix to have met this world conflict. Suppose we had gone into this mighty conflict under the form of government we had and with the degree of prosperity of business we had when Roosevelt was inaugurated President. Where would we have been? We were well-nigh destroyed without the assault of Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, the devil, and the rest of them. If they had assaulted us before Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, yes; God bless its name, not the New Deal Party but the Democratic Party, rescued this Government and stood it up and increased its productivity, and restored prosperity and opportunity, we would probably today be under the heel of Hitler and the damnable gangs around him.

All of this talk about somebody wanting to act the rascal, and tyrants, bureaucrats, and destroyers of government—you know there is not a word of truth in it. What are you talking about? Why do you regale the country with that sort of stuff? I always did say in every campaign where I was ever challenged about it that there was no reason why a Republican was not just as patriotic as a Democrat, but I have asserted that we have more sense than they had about government. That is the only superiority I claim.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman tell us whatever happened to the Democratic Party?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. What happened to it? Why, my dear friend, what happened to it is that we have written in the last 10 years into the history of this country the most glorious chapters that adorn its whole history. We rescued this Government from the plundering groups to which your free economy and your unbridled business leadership had thrown it.

And we put it back into the Constitution of the country and gave the Government back to the people. And neither Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, the devil, and the rest of them can whip the United States under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party. If we had to go into it, why, do you know the income of this country, we are talking about spending money, the income of this country could pay for the whole expense of the war this year, the whole $100,000,000,000, and we could have more income left than we had under Herbert Hoover when he was President of the United States the year he went out. Now, let us discuss this thing hereafter like we were all Americans and all patriots. Why, you talk about ex-Senator Byrnes, ex-Senator Brown, ex-Congressman Jones, the country's greatest business people, Republicans and Democrats, and your own great leaders like Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of War, and the great, and I admire him very much, Mr. Knox, Secretary of the Navy, as if they were enemies of America trying to submerge its liberties. Why, when you get off by yourselves I know you are ashamed about any such unbrotherly and unpatriotic nonsense. Let us get under the flag.

What about the subsidies? Let me come to that. It is a part of one glorious whole. Listen, gentlemen, bear with me for a minute, because this is quite important. I would not undertake to legislate on an appropriation specifically for any subsidies here. We are not competent to do it in a legislative body. We are simply standing for a program that will give the President, the leader of our Armies and our Navies, our constitutional leader, more power in a crisis than any branch of Congress, giving him the power to use subsidies as well as price control to protect the people of this country from hunger and want and misery and wretchedness. I stand for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And we want him to have that power. I hope he will have to use it very sparingly. One of my brilliant young friends here talked about paying the board bill and the grocery bill of their people, that it will never be used except for a few items. I hope it won't be necessary, and maybe only a short while then. But let him have the power. When we are going to whip our enemies on the battlefields, we must have all the instrumentalities to destroy the minions of hell that we can invent and manufacture in fighting this other specter of hunger and want, and starvation and misery. Let us clothe our great leader with price control, with some money for subsidies, and everything that will enable him to keep us from becoming demoralized. Let us keep him strong, and let us be united under the flag. And never fear, it will be done in honesty and cleanliness, because whatever you may say, you may challenge the judgment of this administration, but nobody has yet challenged its honesty. There has been greater cleanliness in the Democratic Party. Why, the Republican Party in 12 months after you came in, back yonder under Harding, I will swear you stole more than the Democrats have stolen under Roosevelt during his whole 10 years in office, to such an extent that, what happened to the glorious Republicans of the United States, that great party of honesty? The people turned on your own party and smote it hip and thigh until you did not carry but one little State, I believe, in the whole Union. Now, that is the record.

Now let us discuss this thing hereafter with some respect for each other, and as if we were all Americans whose sons and nephews and sons-in-law are dying under the flag wherever manhood is being tried. I love a Republican. I like him better than anybody else that God ever made except a Democrat. I cannot love him quite that well. I want you to love me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] 10 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the senatorial campaign of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has gotten off to a flying start. We are all for him on the Republican side and wish him well in the primary. But if the gentleman from North Carolina is interested in the pending legislation he does not need to seek converts among the Republicans. If he can just get the full support of his own side of the aisle he will have all the votes he needs.

There has been a lot said in the course of this debate about the danger of inflation, and what is going to happen if we do not permit subsidies to be paid. But I contend that up until this good hour at least there has been no real effort on the part of this administration to carry out

a program against inflation in this country. Now, it is true we have had price-control legislation. We passed a bill in this House back in the fall of 1941 which became a law in January 1942, which was called a price-control bill and which failed, as we all know, to stop price increases. The situation became so bad that the President sent a message to us in September 1942, insisting that Congress pass further legislation with reference to price control. We did pass a bill at that time.

The reason that the first price-control bill was ineffective was because it did not touch wages, the primary cause of inflation, or increased prices. The administration insisted that we not go into the subject of wages. There was an amendment offered here when that bill was under consideration, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], which I supported, by the way, which would have put into effect control of wages, as well as control of prices. That amendment, with the administration opposing it as vigorously as it possibly could, was voted down and we passed an ineffective bill. When the President sent us a message a year ago last September, he still did not ask us to do anything about wages. He said, "I will take care of wages. You control prices, particularly agricultural prices." He said the farmer was responsible for inflation and for high prices. You will recall that we did pass a bill and we directed the President to control prices as of the level that they were on September 15, 1942. But we went further than that. We went further than he asked us to go, because we also directed the President to fix wages and salaries based upon the level existing on September 15, 1942.

Now, what has happened since that time? Has the President carried out the direction that Congress gave him in that legislation? We know that he has not. We know that prices have gone up to some extent. We know that wages have gone up to a considerably greater extent than prices since that time. The figures have already been put into the record. You know what they are, I think, but just to refresh your recollection, let me call your attention to the fact that since September 1942 full-time hourly earnings in manufacturing industries have increased 8 percent.

The take-home pay—that is what counts when you are talking about inflation—has increased 11 percent. Total manufacturing pay rolls, including both salaries and wages, have increased 21 percent.

During the same period of time, the cost of living has advanced between 4 and 5 percent. So that there is nothing to the argument that we have heard here today and yesterday to the effect that it is necessary, if we do not pay subsidies and reduce food prices, to have an increase in wages. The big argument that was made by the President in his food message to Congress and that has been made by the proponents of subsidies on this floor has been that unless we reduce food prices we are going to have labor trouble and strikes and therefore that it is necessary for us to reduce and roll back food prices.

I submit that anything we may do here in the way of subsidies is not going to have the least effect upon labor leaders when it comes to asking for increased wages. We know what happened in connection with the coal miners. We rolled back the butter price and the price of meat. We paid a milk subsidy. We are now paying subsidies at the rate of $800,000,000 a year. Yet that has not prevented John L. Lewis from getting practically everything that he asked for. It is not going to prevent Phil Murray from getting an increase in wages which he says he is going to get for the steel workers and others in the C. I. O.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that Mr. Murray and Mr. Green have been trying to "hold the line" and they have been discouraging strikes and they have been advocating that the unions stay where they are on wages, and it has only been recently because of the increase in the price of living that they are asking for more wages?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Murray announced the other day that they were out to break the Little Steel formula.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. HOPE. The only excuse for it is that the cost of living has gone up between 4 and 5 percent since a year ago last September, while total earnings have gone up 21 percent.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am not going to yield to have the gentleman quote some other figures.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did not intend to quote any other figures, but I would like to know the basis of your figures; where you received those figures.

Mr. HOPE. From the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Those figures you quoted, I understand, represent manufacturing, which is 15,000,000 out of a total employed force of 44,800,000.

Mr. HOPE. These are figures for the manufacturing industries, whose workers are represented by Mr. Murray. They are the only wages on which statistics are available.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And not for the whole of labor?

Mr. HOPE. But the total income of this country has increased during this same time tremendously. Since 1939 it has doubled, and for 1943 it will be at least $23,000,000 over 1942. That confirms what we all know from observation that almost everyone has shared in the increased income, and certainly there are few families in the country today whose income is not considerably greater than a year ago. Even where the head of the family has not had an increase, more members of the family are working and at better wages than ever before.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. And if almost everybody has had an increase—although there may be a few throughout the country who have not had an increase—would it not be sound policy, following the suggestion that was made by the advocates of subsidy, simply to subsidize those who have had no increase rather than to subsidize everybody over the Nation in order to raise all prices?

Mr. HOPE. Certainly; I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 6 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that from September 15, 1942, to September 15, 1943, a good many of the food prices have gone down while on the other hand the increase in the index of the cost of living as submitted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that permanent waves, for instance, for women have increased 32 percent; that the cost of living has increased 15 percent and that the largest increase has been in items which they do not propose to subsidize.

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. While food costs have gone down except in fruits and vegetables.

Mr. HOPE. That is very true, food costs have declined in recent months. Now getting back to the question of what the administration has done during this time to "hold the line" and carry out the instructions that Congress gave to the President a year ago last September, let me point out that we have not only had the great increase given to coal miners; we have not only had the increases in manufacturing wages to which I have called attention, but the President himself has signed an order which has done more to bring about inflation than anything else—that was the order setting up the 48-hour week with time and a half for all time over 40 hours. That automatically gave a 30-percent increase in income to every working person in the country who had been working 40 hours or less prior to that time.

Mr. Chairman, I have too much confidence in their patriotism and the desire of the fine working people of this country to do their part toward winning the war to believe that we are going to have strikes and labor troubles because we are not going to pay consumer subsidies. I do not have so low an opinion

of the fine patriotic working people of this country as to think that anything of that kind is going to happen, and I do not believe they will follow labor leadership in a program of that kind. I submit that if they will, that if they are of that mind, that a little subsidy program, which does not now mean more than $6 or $7 per capita to every man, woman, and child in the country, is not going to prevent strikes and labor troubles. We are not going to be able to head it off that easily.

Of course, if we go ahead with the subsidy program it does not mean that we are going to get off with a little program which would give $6 or $7 to each individual in the country. This program is going to expand, it is going to get bigger and bigger because when you start on a program of this kind you cannot stop on this commodity or that commodity, you have to continually expand it.

The announcement came out a day or so ago that we were going to subsidize flour in order to keep down the price of bread. The price of bread has not gone up one-tenth of a cent in the last year; it is the cheapest food we have today. It is selling at less than the average price for the last 25 years. Wheat producers have never yet during this entire war period received parity for their wheat, and yet we are told that there must be a subsidy paid on flour in order to keep down the price of bread. Bread is selling for the same price today that it did in 1928; it is selling for less than it did in 1925, 1926, and 1927, and yet it is said that we must have a subsidy on flour in order to prevent inflation.

Mr. Chairman, the people I represent, I do not care whether they are farmers, working people, housewives, white-collar workers, or what, do not want subsidies. The people generally do not want them. The only ones urging them are certain labor leaders, who at the same time are announcing a new drive for higher wages. These labor leaders are out to get everything they can. They want cheaper food and higher wages. The sky is the limit with them, war or no war. The unconditional surrender of the President of the United States to the president of the United Mine Workers has put other labor leaders on the spot. They have got to show that they are just as good as John L. Lewis. If we have a bad break in the line as far as inflation is concerned it will come from the shameful surrender of the administration in the mine strike and not from any action which may be taken on subsidies. Let us not mislead ourselves on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, the proposal of the administration to continue the payment of consumers' subsidies should be decisively defeated. It raises a fundamental issue which should be resolved on the side of economy and good government. Of course, we do not object to the payment of a subsidy or incentive payment where necessary to increase production and where it can be demonstrated that it will have that effect.

The subsidies sought to be continued by the administration do not fall within that classification. They are purely payments made from the Federal Treasury for the purpose of reducing the cost of living to the consumer. They are uneconomical, unfair, unproductive, and detrimental to the best interests of the people.

The cost of the proposed program on a few chosen commodities is given at $800,000,000. However, that would be only the beginning. To carry out the complete program as envisioned by some administration officials would require billions.

In spite of the large aggregate cost, the saving to any particular consumer would be small. For a person using 1 pound of butter a month, the amount of this subsidy would be 60 cents a year. A big subsidy program would be very expensive to operate. It would require another vast horde of Government employees who might be better employed winning the war.

A general consumer subsidy would be unfair to the future taxpayers. The money paid in subsidies would be borrowed. It would become a part of the dangerously increasing national debt. Many people now have an income larger than before the war. There is no reason why their grocery bill should be passed on to future generations, many of whom may sometime have difficulty finding any kind of a job. It is true a certain percentage of the people have not had an increase in their annual income. The earnings of others have been actually reduced. If it is desired to aid this group, it could be done more equitably and economically by putting into operation a food-stamp plan.

One way to combat inflation to which the administration has not given sufficient consideration is to maintain production at a high level. Large crops have been raised this year. That, however, is due to the skill and energy of the Nation's producers, rather than to any constructive policy adopted by the Government. It should be remembered too that for the most part weather conditions in 1943 were favorable.

For some time the Members of Congress from the agricultural States have been urging that a single administrator of actual experience be put in charge of the entire job of producing, distributing, and rationing food. In that connection I wish to call attention to the importance of the State of Iowa in the food program. In 1942 Iowa sold livestock products of a total value of $1,011,392,000, being the first State in the Union in that regard. The second State was Illinois, selling livestock products of a value of $626,499,000. Although ranking sixteenth in population and twenty-third in the area of land, Iowa ranks first in value of corn, oats, hogs, horses, and poultry; first in value of farm lands and buildings; first in combined value of livestock; first in total value of farm property; first in farm land improved—95.6 percent; first in value of farm machinery.

Twenty-five percent of all grade 1 farm land in the United States is within the State of Iowa. One-tenth of the food products in the United States comes from the State of Iowa. Her grain products for 1942 totaled 863,353,000 bushels. This amount divided by Iowa's number of square miles—55,586—gives an average of 15,555 bushels per square mile. No other State begins to equal these figures.

I call attention to these figures only for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that if the necessary food is produced a lot of it must come from Iowa.

It is interesting to note what the farmers of Iowa think about this subsidy and roll-back program. In a poll taken recently in Hardin County 93 percent were opposed to the program. In Mitchell County 96 farmers opposed it and 19 favored it. When the question of parity price in the market place against part of parity price plus a subsidy was voted on, the Mitchell County farmers favored a fair price in the market place and no subsidy by a vote of 103 to 9. On the question, "What are the greatest obstacles to food production?" the answers ranked as follows:

First. Government price policy too uncertain.

Second. Farm labor shortage.

Third. Shortage of farm machinery and equipment.

Fourth. Shortage of grain and other feeds.

Fifth. Farm prices too low.

I repeat, the greatest thing the Government can do to increase food production and to prevent inflation would be to appoint an experienced administrator with complete authority, and the greatest thing such an administrator could do would be to appoint on his staff several farmers from Iowa to whom the production of food is not merely a theory in a book.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who I know has given much study to this question. In view of the fact that I have received a communication from Mr. Jones, addressed to the chairman of the committee, in which he states that the adoption of this legislation would probably result in jeopardizing the entire support program to producers while, on the other hand, the majority report states that producers subsidies will not be affected, would the gentleman care to make an explanation of that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the War Food Administrator has said that he could not announce a sugar program during the pendency of this legislation because of the ambiguity of the legislation. I have seen a letter which

he has written to a Member of Congress so stating. May I say that there is nothing in this pending legislation whatsoever that justifies the War Food Administrator in taking that attitude. As is stated in the majority report, "This section does not prohibit nor interfere with any operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government with respect to producer subsidies, or loans authorized under existing law, including the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and supplemented by Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved October 2, 1942, and it does not prohibit or interfere with support prices or use of Commodity Credit funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation by existing law, including section 4, Public Law 147, approved on July 1, 1941, as amended."

Assuming for the sake of argument that certain gentlemen are correct in their interpretation that this does interfere with the payment of producer subsidies, which, of course, is denied, this does not in any manner interfere with the operation of subsection (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to complete my answer.

Mr. Chairman, subsection (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 provides that—

Whenever the Administrator—

Meaning, of course, the Price Control Administrator—

determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereon.

That gives the Price Control Administrator the authority to pay subsidies to marginal high cost producers of any commodity to obtain the maximum amount of production. I cannot at the moment refer to the particular passage in the law but I believe there is a passage in the Price Control Act which says that the Price Control Act may be administered through any other agency than the Price Administrator upon a directive of the President assigning these duties to that other agency.

So, assuming that there is an ambiguity in this act, which I do not admit, the President could under the terms of the Price Control Act vest in the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of the Government the power which now vests in the Price Control Administrator to pay subsidies to high cost domestic producers without interfering in any way whatsoever with the general price scale.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. In the opinion of the gentleman, then, the adoption of this legislation will in no way jeopardize the announced program for sugarcane and sugar beets for 1943 and 1944?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The only way it could possibly interfere with the sugar program would be in the manner in which the money is raised with which to encourage the expansion of production. That applies as well to the sugar cane program as to sugar beets.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I respect the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan always, but the gentleman who will enforce this law, the War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has given consideration to section 3 and he states that section 3 in its present form, if included in the bill, will practically destroy the support price program. Carrying forward the support price program will involve some losses.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, it is perfectly absurd for the War Food Administrator to take that attitude or for his attorneys to give an opinion to that effect in view of the expressed mandate of section 3.

Mr. PATMAN. He is a mighty good lawyer himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains four sections. Section 1 provides that an appraisal of the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made annually on the 30th day of June instead of on the 1st day of January as heretofore, the 30th day of June being the last day of the fiscal year. The basis for the appraisal is cost at time of appraisal, or the average market price during the last month of the fiscal year, whichever is lower.

Section 2 extends the life of the Corporation to the 30th day of June 1945. Section 2 also provides for an audit of the capital-fund operations of the Corporation by the General Accounting Office annually.

Section 3 deals with subsidies, and is quite controversial. I shall refer to this later on.

Section 4 gives the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to sell perishable fruits and vegetables owned and controlled by it below cost when there is a likelihood of deterioration.

Sections 1, 2, and 4 are not controversial and are desirable to everyone.

Mr. Chairman, the vast sums of money provided the Army and Navy in the past few years have given us the best fed, the best clothed, and the best trained armed forces in the world. We are on the offensive in every theater and on all fronts. Our loyal, patriotic, and alert leaders and fighting forces are thinking of but one thing, and that is to win this war and win it as quickly as possible.

Our war front is almost perfect. No one dares to criticize our great leaders and our fighting boys. They have been so successful and their mistakes are so few that even the enemy is withdrawing and shortening its lines in every theater.

The home front is not what we desire. The American people generally are against regimentation, but we must realize that we cannot have the same freedom in business in time of war that we have in peacetime. We must realize that we will suffer hardships and will have to be denied many things that are essential to the war effort. We must be brought to the realization that security comes before prosperity.

The O. P. A. and W. P. B. have irritated a lot of people of this country by so much "red tape" and unnecessary regulations and ceilings, but no one desires inflation. The American people do not desire to see the purchasing power of their dollar reduced in value to 25 cents, as it was following World War No. 1.

While the home front is not what it should be, let us take a look at the home front 10 years ago, when our merchants were going into bankruptcy all over the country, banks were breaking everywhere, industry was paralyzed, and farmers were piling up surplus after surplus and headed for financial ruin. Bread lines formed in every town and city of this great country, with thousands and thousands of men in the lines begging for bread. You know what is in the heart and mind of a father when he knows that his helpless wife and starving child are suffering for something to eat. Something had to be done and done then to save America. Do you know of anybody suffering for something to eat or something to wear today?

When Congress met in 1933 in this Chamber it was necessary, in order to save America, to pass some legislation to benefit all groups in every section of this great country. It is very difficult sometimes to pass a general law to foster the interests of certain sections of this country without crippling the struggling energies of other sections, so it was necessary to pass a series of laws to benefit all and save the country. Some of them worked well and some did not. Two of the most outstanding achievements ever passed by an American Congress were the law guaranteeing bank deposits and the law creating the Commodity Credit Corporation. The first law helped everybody. The banking law has restored the confidence of our people in the local lending institutions. That saved the

people. Not a depositor has lost a dime in the banks of America since the year 1933.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized to stabilize the prices of agricultural products. It came to the rescue of the American farmer at a time when he had no avenue of escape. In this fashion, it loaned to him money so that he could hold his surplus crops off the market and sell them in an orderly way. It has saved thousands and thousands of farms of this country.

The American farmer is appreciative of his Government coming to his rescue when he was helpless. He has shown his gratitude by paying in full these loans plus the interest. He has shown further appreciation when the great Government called upon him to produce, produce, and produce more crops to feed our armed forces and the civilian population by responding to this request wholeheartedly.

A few days ago the United States Department of Agriculture issued another chapter in the amazing war record of American farmers. It showed that despite the greatest difficulties—shortages of man and machine power, floods in the spring and drought in midsummer—despite these the farmers have produced this year another wartime record volume of crops and livestock—more than 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn and 1,500,000,000 bushels of other feed grains, more than 835,000,000 bushels of wheat, more than 200,000,000 bushels of soybeans, more than 2,600,000,000 pounds of peanuts. The farmers produced this year more than 118,000,000,000 pounds of milk, more than 4,500,000,000 dozens of eggs, more than 125,000,000 hogs, and they marketed the largest number of cattle in the Nation's history.

This record production of food surpasses that of last year, which itself was a record. The basis for this war production lies, to some extent, in nearly 10 years of agricultural adjustment programs designed to bring order out of chaos which had previously existed in our agricultural economy.

Commodity Credit Corporation has been in the forefront of these developments and achievements during the last 10 years. This corporation was organized in 1933, at a time when the national economy was burdened with great surpluses of farm products. The prices the farmers were getting for their crops and livestock were at bankruptcy levels. The gross farm income in 1932 was less than $6,000,000,000. This was the smallest for which the Department of Agriculture has any records running back to 1910. In the following year—in 1933—the gross farm income increased to nearly $7,000,000,000; but by 1937 the gross income had increased to more than $11,000,000,000. Last year it was more than $18,000,000,000.

During all of this period of economic improvement, the Commodity Credit Corporation was actively engaged in making loans to farmers on their surplus crops of cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco—helping to support the prices of these commodities by lessening the burden of supplies upon the markets. The large quantity of corn—nearly 300,000,000 bushels—put under loan in 1933–34 was an invaluable reservoir of supplies needed during the drought years of 1934 and 1936. In 1933 and 1934 more than 6,500,000 bales of cotton were put under loan—action which importantly relieved the markets of the heavy weight of cotton surpluses. Large quantities of dark tobacco were also put under loan during this period.

These loan programs were really the beginning of our modern ever-normal granary designed to accumulate surpluses of food, feed, and fibers during years of excess production for use in later years when weather and other conditions should reduce the production below current needs.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to make loans on all agricultural commodities, but the Corporation was specifically directed to offer loans on wheat, corn, and cotton to producers cooperating in adjustment and conservation programs when supplies of these commodities should rise above or prices fall below specified levels, the rate of loan to be between 52 and 75 percent of the parity price of the product.

In 1941 the Secretary of Agriculture was directed by Congress to make loans on 1941 crops of the five basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice—at 85 percent of parity to producers. Peanuts were later added as a basic commodity, and the authority to make loans at 85 percent of parity was extended through the crop year 1946. As for nonbasic crops, the Secretary was directed in separate legislation to support a price of not less than 85 percent of parity or a comparable price—whenever the Secretary of Agriculture should announce the need to increase the production of such commodities during the existing war emergency.

In October last year Congress increased the loan rates to 90 percent of parity unless the President should determine that loans on basic crops at rates previously fixed were necessary to prevent an increase in the cost of feed for livestock and poultry and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. Loan rates on cotton, tobacco, and rice were raised to 90 percent of parity and rates on corn and wheat were maintained at 85 percent of parity. The same law also provided for the making of loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation on basic crops for a period of 2 years after the war.

From 1933 through 1941 the Corporation had made approximately $2,000,000,000 of loans to farmers on a long list of commodities which included feed grains, naval stores, bread grains, cotton, wool, peanuts and other products. Its realized losses through March 31, 1942, on this volume of business totaled a little more than $21,000,000, or approximately 1 percent. As I have indicated, the gross farm income had been less than $6,000,000,000 in 1932, the gross income in 1942 was more than $18,000,000,000.

Until 2 years ago the Commodity Credit Corporation was engaged almost exclusively in making loans to farmers. But just as it has been necessary to convert our industrial plant to the making of munitions, it has been necessary to convert our agricultural plant to the production of commodities in quantity and in kind needed for the war against the Axis. As a part of the program to increase the production of feed, food, and fibers during this war period, the Department of Agriculture made a commitment to farmers that the prices of specified commodities would be supported by means of loans and purchases. The principal objective was to increase the production of vegetable oils, dairy products, poultry products, and meats.

Stimulated by the imperative war need for increased farm production and aided by exceptionally favorable weather for planting, cultivating and harvesting crops, our farmers produced and marketed in 1942 the greatest volume of agricultural products in the Nation's history. This large volume of production met the increasing military requirements here and abroad and made possible for civilians at home to have adequate nutrition. Loans to farmers totaled a little more than $800,000,000 during 1942–43 fiscal year, as compared with $626,000,000 in 1941–42. Loans to farmers during the past year were larger, principally because of the larger quantities of wheat and cotton put under loan, and because of an increase in loan rates. Loans on corn were smaller than in 1942 since market prices were higher than the loan values. Other commodities on which the Corporation made loans during the last fiscal year included barley, fiber flax, flaxseed, grain sorghums, linseed oil, olive oil, rosin, soybeans, and turpentine.

In addition, the purchases of commodities by the Corporation totaled approximately $2,700,000,000 as contrasted with less than $1,000,000,000 the preceding year. About $1,500,000,000 of these purchases were for lend-lease account, as compared with $900,000,000 on this account in 1941–42. The remainder of purchases consisted principally of oil crops, tobacco, naval stores, cotton linters, wool, sugar, and other commodities. Large quantities of foreign-produced agricultural commodities were bought to supplement domestic supplies for civilians and war uses. These included coffee, sugar, tea, cocoa, flax, fats and oils, and other commodities to be brought into the United States or held in foreign countries under wartime control programs.

Corporation sales of commodities during 1942–43 totaled $2,800,000,000 as compared with $1,000,000,000 the preceding year. These sales included both domestic and foreign commodities which had been purchased for lend-lease account and for civilian and military uses. Large quantities of tobacco were sold in

connection with a program designed to maintain the foreign market for United States tobacco. Considerable cotton the Corporation had acquired under nonrecourse provisions of loans to farmers during preceding years was sold without loss for lend-lease account. A large tonnage of wheat and corn similarly acquired was sold below cost to stimulate the wartime production of meats, milk, and eggs. Substantial quantities of wheat and corn were sold for the manufacture of industrial alcohol for war uses.

I have addressed the Congress upon several occasions in the past regarding the detailed operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the part it has played in helping to improve the economic situation of our farmers; of the stabilizing effect of the loan programs on cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and other commodities; and of the resultant benefits to producers. Since 1933, the Corporation has lent farmers more than $3,500,000,000. Most of this sum has been repaid with interest, the remainder being represented by commodities turned over to the Corporation in satisfaction of loans.

The loans to cotton growers alone during this period have totaled nearly $1,500,000,000, of which only $230,000,000 was outstanding on June 30 last. The loans to the wheat growers totaled more than $1,000,000,000, of which only one hundred and sixty-one million was outstanding on June 30. The loans to producers of corn totaled $668,000,000, of which only sixty-seven million was outstanding on June 30, and practically all of which has been paid off by now. Of the total of more than $3,500,000,000 for all commodities, only four hundred and eighty million was outstanding on June 30, but, of course, this sum will now increase as the 1943 crops go under loan at the 85 and 90 percent of parity as prescribed by Congress.

Several years ago when we had up a bill in this Chamber to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, quite an attack was made on loans to the cotton farmer. At that time the Corporation had a loss of nearly $200,000,000 on cotton, and no loss then on corn or wheat. I remember then making the statement on this floor that cotton did not deteriorate, that in the course of a few years the Government, instead of losing on cotton, would make a profit. Since then on Government-owned cotton sold by the Corporation, the Corporation realized a profit of $50,000,000; and, at the present price, on the 3,200,000 bales of cotton to which the Government has title, the Commodity Credit Corporation now has a profit of approximately $30 a bale or $96,000,000 if the cotton were sold today. The total profit on the cotton sold by the Corporation and on the present Government-owned cotton amounts to approximately $146,000,000. The Government has lost on corn and wheat in the last couple of years.

The Corporation is buying and selling a large part of the soybean crop, and all of the record crop of peanuts produced this year. Part of the peanut crop is being sold at a loss to the processors of vegetable oils, and part at a profit to the sellers of peanuts used in the manufacture of other edible products. The Corporation is buying this season more than 300,000,000 pounds of tobacco for sale to Great Britain, a continuance of the program to maintain the foreign market for United States tobacco. It has bought a large part of the 1943 wool clip—more than 200,000,000 pounds—for sale at prices designed to maintain the production of wool.

Since July 1 of this year the Corporation has sold more than 160,000,000 bushels of feed wheat at prices designed to maintain the production of dairy and poultry products at high wartime levels. It is importing feed grains from Canada and Argentina to supplement the diminished feed supply for livestock feeding. It is importing both vegetable and animal high-protein byproduct feed for livestock production. It is importing fats and oils to supplement our own production of these commodities and to make possible increased exports to our allies.

In 1942 the gross farm income for all agricultural products totaled $18,628,000,000, as contrasted with thirteen billion eight hundred and forty-eight million in 1941. But this year—largely because of the price-support programs of the War Food Administration—the gross will be approximately $22,000,000,000.

Last Thursday the Nation celebrated Armistice Day by working in the munitions plants, the shipyards, and the airplane factories turning out the implements needed to end this war and produce another Armistice Day later on. It was altogether fitting, I believe, that the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, should also announce on Armistice Day the production goals which farmers reported they would strive to reach in 1944. These goals add up to 380,000,000 acres of crops, as contrasted with 364,000,000 acres in 1943 and with 354,000,000 in 1942. Increases were indicated in acreages of food and feed grains above the acreages planted this year, in oil and fiber crops, in sugar crops, in vegetables, and in other crops such as dried beans, dried peas, and tobacco.

On top of the splendid record they have made this year, our farmers are eager to produce in 1944 a still larger volume of food, feed, and fibers. I believe it unfortunate, therefore, that the War Food Administrator has been unable to announce the price levels at which the various agricultural products will be supported in 1944. Of course, the loan programs are mandatory, but there are necessities beyond the loan programs if the 1944 production goals are to be achieved.

These necessities include the financing and handling of the commodities for which price supports must be established at higher levels than in 1943 in order to offset the increased cost of farm production. Farmers look to the Commodity Credit Corporation for this protection, as they have come to respect and depend upon that agency through the years of recovery from the depression of the early 1930's, and as they do now in this time of war emergency. The uncertainty that now surrounds the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation already is having a hampering effect upon our war-food production program. It is incumbent upon us to remove that uncertainty—to assure farmers that they will have the fullest measure of physical and economic assistance from both the legislative and administrative branches of the Government. With this assurance, and if they can get more labor and the machine power and other physical equipment needed to do the job, our farmers will set a new high mark of achievement in 1944.

Mr. Chairman, it is both necessary and desirable to continue support prices to aid the farmer so that he can obtain sufficient production to feed our great armed forces and our civilian people. Subsidies to roll back prices are uneconomical, and somewhat inflationary. Such subsidies do not bring about more production. Abundant production with reasonable prices is anti-inflationary in character.

This bill does away with such types of subsidies but it gives the right to extend the support prices so the farmer can produce to save America and the Allies. It also does not interfere with the loan features under existing law.

I shall support this bill. Section 3 is the only controversial section in the bill, but regardless of what becomes of section 3 I want the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation extended beyond December 31 of this year. To do away with the only vehicle which came to the rescue of the great farming class of this country would be detrimental to three-fourths of our farmers who feed us all.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the exceptions that have been made in the case of domestic vegetable oils in section 3. I have this to say. It is necessary to have price supports on oilseeds in order to obtain the necessary production. In the case of peanuts, for example, this was an edible crop before the war. The sudden shortage of fats and oils made it necessary to expand the peanut crop for oil purposes. This commodity is an extremely high-cost source of oil. Consequently, it could not compete with other fats and oils without a type of subsidy. It is contended that the only alternative was to permit competing oils to advance to the peanut-cost level which would have entailed a much greater cost than the subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the American people to be misled by how much this type of subsidy will benefit the consumer. When you know that each

consumer will be benefited by approximately 83 cents per month, it is very little aid.

Mr. Bowles, the O. P. A. Administrator, announced that if this bill passed milk would go up 1 cent a quart. Now, how much would that cost the consumers? Based on the estimate that an individual uses only 15 quarts of milk per month, this cost would be 15 cents a month to a consumer. Is that a heavy burden on anyone? Now, the main thing at issue, and let us be frank about it, is whether the consumers shall pay the entire cost of their food bill out of their current incomes in the form of slightly higher prices amounting to 83 cents monthly per capita for some commodities, or whether part of the food bill is to be paid for with borrowed money and added to the public debt to be paid by our returning soldiers and their children. The issue is simple. The subsidies to the consumer so far amount to so little, 83 cents a month, and if Mr. Bowles has to increase the ceiling 1 cent a quart on milk, on 15 quarts, the average amount consumed by the average consumer per month, then his milk bill will be increased by only 15 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WRIGHT. I wish to commend the gentleman who acted as Chairman in charge of the bill on this side for his extreme fairness in yielding and giving time to those who disagree with him to some extent on the subsidy question. I think the RECORD should show his kindness and consideration in that respect.

Mr. PATMAN. I desire to make the same statement and agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. The gentleman in charge of the bill has been very fair and it is appreciated very much.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In view of the statements made by the gentleman from Louisiana, the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from Michigan, as to the provisions in this bill to continue support prices for the production of food, it seems to me that that vital question ought to be fully discussed before we vote on this bill, because if we pass any legislation here, Mr. Chairman, that will prevent the War Food Administrator from producing the necessary food that this Nation is going to need, the American people will never forgive us and we will be held responsible. Therefore, I hope that this provision of the bill will be discussed and explained so that there will not be a question or doubt in the mind of any Member of the House. To me that is one of the most serious things that we have to consider, and so little has been said about it in this debate.

The bill is so written that you have to go back and refer to other provisions in other measures in order to find out just what powers the War Food Administrator has, and I say, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a lot of discussion has gone on here about matters that are not of grave consequence. But I say the production of food and the authority to produce it is something that the American people will hold the Members of this body responsible for if we make a mistake.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield myself 1 minute, Mr. Chairman.

I do not think there is any question about section 3 permitting the support prices to be carried on. I do not think any lawyer who reads that section carefully can doubt it. If there is any doubt we will correct it. Certainly we intended to continue support prices. I made the statement, and many members of the committee made the same statement, that section 3 of the bill continues support prices. Now, if there is any doubt in your mind, read the majority report on this section. It is as clear as it can be to me. If it does not carry out the theory of extending support prices for farmers to produce war crops, it must do so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I observe further in that respect that it might be a coincidence, but it just so happens that although we do not claim and nobody claims at the present moment, because the program has not proceeded far enough, perhaps, the payment of subsidies has caused a curtailment in the production of those commodities upon which consumer subsidies have been paid, it is self-evident from all of the information which has been presented to us that it has in no manner increased the production of those commodities upon which consumer subsidies are paid.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. This is so important that I think a lot of the Members, like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN], are also honestly trying to find out what the situation is. I think we can take the language of section 3 itself and very quickly discover. I concede in the first part of section 3 it says, "no losses shall be absorbed except on programs that are announced before October 13, 1943," and lots of programs were announced before that time. But it specifically says where they are even announced before October 13, that they shall expire December 31, 1943. Now, this other proviso which I think the gentleman refers to has this limitation on it. It is a major limitation, that the support price cannot be any higher than the maximum price; or I will say it in another way, in the way that the bill says, "that the maximum price must be as high as the support price." Now, does that mean in order for the Administrator to have proper support prices he has got to go and see the Office of Price Administration and get them to agree to raise the maximum prices, or will it automatically force the War Food Administrator to raise all prices in order to have a support price, say, in one section where it is a high-cost area? I think it is a very material and important point and I hope that time is given to clear it up.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The reason I am raising the point at this time is I have great respect for the legal ability and the splendid judgment of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. Likewise, I have high respect for the legal ability and for the judgment of the War Food Administrator, Judge Jones, who is known to this body. When gentlemen with the learning and ability of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and Judge Jones differ on this very important and vital subject, it seems to me that we should proceed cautiously until we settle, if possible, this highly important issue.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] be willing to accept an amendment that will make plain what he said on the floor in regard to this question, in plain language, without reference to any laws?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would want to see the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I mean, it will make it clearer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have been offered by the War Food Administrator a so-called clarifying amendment, which would nullify the clear intent of Congress with respect to section 3. So the gentleman will pardon me if I do not accept any pigs in pokes.

Mr. PATMAN. No. I am asking the gentleman to write the amendment like his speech reads. In other words, take a part of his speech.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the language of the amendment is just about as clear as it can be made. I have no objection whatsoever and I do not think anyone else on the committee or in this House should have any objection to any amendment which will clarify any ambiguities in the bill. I have had this sugar proposition put up to me, as well as several others. I think the sugar men are very well satisfied now that there is no prohibition in here against any sugar program. When you start clarifying more or less general statements to meet specific problems, then the gentleman knows as well as I do what happens. We are legislating policies, not particular, specific questions. We are trying to lay out a wise policy, and we have to rely upon judicious and courageous administration of these laws. We cannot administer them, of course.

Judge Jones is a good lawyer, a splendid gentleman, an honest, patriotic citizen, and public servant. He knows, as a lawyer and a judge, that he can readily determine the intent of Congress by reading what all courts read when they are confronted with a question of legislative intent, namely, the committee report. If Judge Jones will read the committee report, it perhaps is made more

definite in the committee report than it is in the language itself, that we intend in no manner whatsoever to interfere with any of the legitimate programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation or of the other agencies of the Government which have to do with the production, processing, and distribution of food.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is a good lawyer and I know it and I do not believe he will contend that the interpretation placed upon this bill by the committee or any of the members of the committee will be used as a basis for the decision of a court, if it contradicts the plain, unmistakable language in the amendment or section.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that unless there is specific contradictory language in the act itself, the courts are bound to accept the interpretation of the committee report. I say that the language of the bill, although in general terms, establishing a general policy, is not contradictory to that. In fact, the committee report substantiates the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this subject yesterday and today. Last night I listened to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] on the radio. He made a fine, statesmanlike speech, and I want to commend him for it. I also listened to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] today in his able presentation. Like Agrippa said, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

The charge has been made that subsidies are un-American. That charge has been fully and completely answered by numerous speakers. Subsidies are part and parcel of our American economic history. Every tariff law passed has been for the subsidization of some segment of American business. Every land grant or franchise to an individual or corporation by the Government has been in effect a subsidy. Every crop or farm loan at lower than customary private interest rate has been a subsidy at the taxpayer's expense.

Every Defense Plant Corporation loan to American business for the purpose of plant expansion which included rapid amortization clauses or lower-than-usual interest rate is a subsidy. And when the war is over, every readjustment of contract or plant indebtedness will be a further subsidy to private business at the expense of the American taxpayer. So the charge that subsidies are un-American is fallacious, the charge is untrue.

The charge is made for the purpose of dragging the red herring across the trail and confusing the American people. Those who make this charge may succeed in confusing the people now, but when the price of living advances 10, 15, or even 25 percent during 1944, they will not face a confused people. They will face an enraged people.

If the price of living goes up 10 percent in 1944 it will cost the people of the United States $15,000,000,000. Is there a man in this Congress who will deny that we face a 10 percent rise in the cost of living if price control is sabotaged? You cannot have price control without subsidies for below-cost producers and you cannot keep the price of living down without price control. The expense of $800,000,000 in subsidies will provide the farmer a fair price for his products.

No one will deny that farm income has risen 196 percent since 1939. In comparison nonfarm income has risen 90 percent. The wartime rise in net income of farmers is not confined to any one type of farmer, but extends to all types as a careful study by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows. In 1939 the farmers received $4,668,000,000 for their products, and it is estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that they will receive over $12,000,000,000 this year. These prices are stable in comparison with the price of wages. If we destroy stabilization and lay the groundwork for a severe inflation, the farmers will be the chief ones to suffer as they were in 1921 and 1922. The mortgage companies will recapture the land and we will again burn corn and wheat for fuel instead of coal. Who is it then that opposes the use of subsidies?

There are two groups in this Congress who oppose subsidies. The first and smaller group is composed of those who are yielding to the pressure of professional farm organization leaders who claim to represent the best interests of the rank and file of American farmers. I do not believe they properly represent the best interests of the rank and file of the American farmers, because an attack on stabilization will in the long run hurt the farmers the most. An attack on subsidies now will be used in the post-war era as a precedent to deny the farmer fair prices. The argument today is to return to the law of supply and demand. Obviously this argument is based on the extraordinary demand for farm products during this war emergency. If you eliminate price control during these times for agricultural commodities, how can you depart from the law of supply and demand when these same commodities become surpluses in the post-war era?

The second group who oppose subsidies, I am convinced, are opposing them strictly from a political standpoint. The fact that the Republican Party is voting as a bloc on this issue is ample proof that this is a partisan stand. Let us Democrats be realistic about this matter. What does the Republican Party stand to gain by this attack upon price control?

A rise in the cost of living throughout our country will create great confusion and resentment in the minds of the average consumer, many of whom have not received an increase in their earning power. An increase in the cost of living will disrupt the present comparatively peaceful labor situation. The wage earners of this country will be forced to demand additional wages. Opposition to this demand will involve the workers in strikes. This will create confusion throughout the Nation and in the ensuing confusion the blame will be placed by the newspapers and radios, which are controlled by the Republican philosophy, on the Democratic Party.

I want to make it very plain that many of us realize the value politically to the Republican Party in their furtherance of this part of their plan to capture political control of the Nation, but I do want to appeal to my fellow Democrats to support the subsidy price control stabilization plan. It is the only way to prevent inflation. Remember this subsidy plan is not a plan advanced by theorists or economists. Insofar as it has been properly applied, it has worked in the past few months to arrest the heretofore rapidly rising cost of living. Congress has directed the Price Administrator, Chester Bowles, to replace the professors and economists with businessmen. This he has done. Thirty-eight out of the top forty-four executives in the O. P. A. have been drawn from the most representative businesses in America—men whose experience has been with nationally-known firms such as Armour & Co., great department stores such as Macy's and Wanamakers, men who have had years of food experience with General Foods, Inc., and so forth. These men all agree that subsidies are necessary to control the price of living. They look upon this method as the only way to stabilize the fact-yielding line. When you vote against subsidies you are not voting against theorists. You are voting against the cold analytical conclusions of representative businessmen from the largest business firms in America. An investment of $800,000,000 is a good businessman's bargain, as Chester Bowles recently said. It will prevent at this time a 10 percent rise in the cost of living which will cost the American people $15,000,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG].

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the gentleman from Michigan answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] when he asked him whether or not the support price paid to a part of a general field would affect the maximum price of the entire field?

Mr. WOLCOTT. With respect to sugar?

Mr. DILWEG. Yes; I think that is a good example.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All right; let us take sugar. I do not want to get into a confusion of figures, but I understand that the sugar produced domestically in continental United States amounts to 29 percent of the sugar we consume and that

this is divided 26 percent beet sugar and 3 percent cane sugar.

Under the O. P. A. Act, even if all of these other acts were negatived by this law, the O. P. A. Administrator could pay the domestic producers of sugar, whether it be cane or beet, the half cent or the cent which might be considered necessary to get the maximum amount of production without having to pay that half cent or cent to the 71 percent of off-shore sugar; so we have not seen fit to answer specifically the gentleman from Texas in the exaggerated claim he made of the millions and millions it would cost in the sugar bill of the Nation. It could not cost any more than a half cent or cent a pound on the amount of sugar produced domestically.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. DILWEG. Is not that a matter of interpretation of law? Is that the gentleman's interpretation of that law?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. DILWEG. Then how does the gentleman account for the fact that the law does propose this: That support prices shall continue to be announced and so forth—and states:

> Any maximum prices heretofore or hereunder established for such commodity shall not be below the support price therefor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman believe that this bill repeals the Price Control Act?

Mr. DILWEG. I am asking the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not believe this bill repeals the Price Control Act. I believe that if the domestic producers of sugar are actually high-cost marginal producers, then the O. P. A. has the authority to subsidize them just as they have the authority to subsidize high-cost marginal domestic producers of copper or any other material.

Mr. DILWEG. But in the main that becomes a consumer subsidy, does it not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not in any part.

Mr. DILWEG. I claim that it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; it is a subsidy for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production which we have set up in at least two different laws.

Mr. DILWEG. And it does not increase the cost of the article to the consumer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; it does not because you keep your general price down. It is the same as when you pay a subsidy of 4 or 7 cents a pound on copper to open up the high cost marginal producer mines; the subsidy is paid for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production of copper; and sugar in this particular case is in the same position as copper under the Price Control Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have been over this before, have we not?

Mr. MONRONEY. I was going to ask about another item, that is all.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that the principle involved in this legislation is the most fundamental involved in any legislation we have considered for a great many years. I expect to vote for H. R. 3477, as approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee, but I want the RECORD to show just why I am voting against consumer subsidies.

When this proposal was before the House last June, I voted against the subsidy provision and later voted to sustain the President's veto. I may have misinterpreted the subsidy section but I concluded, at that time, that in view of the circumstances that then existed, the prohibition against consumer subsidies went too far. I had previously and, in fact, on several occasions expressed my opposition to consumer subsidies. However, at that time it was generally known that Congress was about to recess for 2 months. I did not feel then that I wanted to bar all consumer subsidies inasmuch as Congress was not going to be in session for some time.

Today the situation is different. The President has known for months that an overwhelming majority of Members of the House and Senate are opposed to the payment of consumer subsidies. No one can deny that we have the right—in fact, we have the duty to prohibit consumer subsidies. During the summer I spent 6 weeks at home talking to from 50 to 80 people each day. With the exception of C. I. O. delegations, no one with whom I talked urged consumer subsidies. Time after time, committees representing various locals of the C. I. O. would urge me to vote for consumer subsidies but many, many times, after a discussion of the question, they would admit that personally they did not approve of the program but they were carrying out instructions from their national headquarters.

I have spent more time reading, studying, and listening to speeches on this subject than any other subject considered by Congress since I have been here. Every one of us knows that there is nothing new in this consumer subsidy program. It has been tried time and time again. The Caesars experimented with consumer subsidies and, in spite of the strength of the Roman Empire, it was a subsidy program that, in a large way, wrecked that great empire.

I am absolutely convinced that the adoption of this legislation, thereby preventing the payment of consumer subsidy, is not a departure from the Price Control Act. It is true we ordered the President to hold prices at the September 1942 level. It has not been done, even with subsidies. Congress knew when it adopted the Price Control Act that there would have to be adjustments, both up and down, in the prices existing in September 1942. No effort had been made to determine whether or not the September 1942 prices were economically sound. As proof of that fact, Congress recognized the necessity of flexibility, and I quote a brief provision from the Emergency Price Control Act:

> *Provided further*, That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Prices can even now be adjusted downward in some cases without the payment of subsidies. If you doubt this, I call your attention to Mr. Vinson's order, which appeared in last night's Washington paper, ordering a reduction of 25 percent in the price of citrus fruits. Our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has referred to every farm-relief payment as a subsidy. Certainly roll-back consumer subsidies are not being proposed as a relief measure. Not when a millionaire can get 5 cents out of the Federal Treasury for every pound of sirloin steak he buys—if he can find the sirloin. How can anyone argue that it is not inflationary to take a maximum of $800,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury and use it to pay part of the grocery bill of every consumer in the United States?

It has been said that the adoption of this bill means uncontrolled inflation, upward spiraling prices, and so forth. I ask in all seriousness, How come? Do those who advance that argument mean to imply that this administration will take a dog-in-the-manger attitude, and take off all price control, thereby permitting prices to soar, simply because Congress, in its wisdom, decided to forbid the payment of consumer subsidies? Will anyone contend that the announced consumer subsidy of a few cents a pound on meat and butter means the difference between stabilization and uncontrolled inflation? I do not think so. This Government spent millions of dollars over a short period of years, trying to increase the price of farm commodities, by even more than the few cents involved in this legislation, and no one feared uncontrolled inflation at that time.

I realize there are many people living on fixed incomes or working for salaries in nonwar industries who have had no increase in income since 1939. It is our duty to consider their situation, especially when we take up the tax bill next week. But they are not the ones who are clamoring for consumer subsidies. The ones I hear from, who want part of their grocery bill paid from the Federal Treasury, are those who are making more money than they have made since 1918. How are the Members of this House who vote for consumer subsidies going to look the returning soldier and sailor in the

eye, after these servicemen have found out that you and I, with our $10,000-a-year salary, have voted to take $6.32 out of the Federal Treasury for each member of our family and left these returning servicemen with a debt of $19 that they must pay over a period of years for each $6.32 we have voted ourselves? How will the man now working on the production line of this Nation look his son, brother, or friend in the eye, under such circumstances? In closing, I submit that consumer subsidies are un-American, inflationary, and a threat to the future security of this Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to thank the Republicans and I am not going to thank the Democrats for the confused and miserable situation in which this Nation finds itself. If I had to thank anyone I would have to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and his party, because they are in the majority. The administration is in their hands and the responsibility, be that good or bad, is theirs primarily.

I repeat, however, that after we are elected as Members of Congress we should forget that we are either Republicans or Democrats. Just plain citizens cooperating and working together for the best interests of our Nation. We have made blunders enough. Let us not make more. We have permitted a few alphabetical set-ups to all but wreck the Nation's food supply. To correct these blunders is our duty and our responsibility not as Democrats and not as Republicans but as Members of Congress—citizens of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

We are traveling a dangerous road—the road of subsidies. Subsidies mean national decay. When the Roman Empire was on its last leg, its rulers gave subsidies to prolong their reckless rule. Is it possible that the bureaucracy is also on its last leg? Is it attempting to continue its inglorious rule of waste by giving subsidies? Subsidies are a fraud and a deception. They would put millions on the public teat that has already been sucked dry to the extent of over $150,000,000,000—the public debt.

Subsidies are based upon the theory that you can tax yourselves into cheaper living. Only the unthinking believe that they can pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. Subsidies are a delusion because if we pay them out of present taxation, then, for every 50 cents we receive we will have to tax ourselves $1. The other 50 cents will go to the pay-rollers—the pie counter brigade—that dish them out to us.

Since we are already over $150,000,000,000 in debt, subsidies will have to be paid out of additional borrowed money. They will have to be paid in addition to the expense of distribution together with interest. They will have to be paid out of taxes collected during the war and when the war is over.

They will have to be collected from those of us who live on a subsistent wage or income. We will have to draw in our belts a few notches further than the 20 percent withholding tax. We are being taxed all we can stand. Why should we be foolish enough to collect additional millions for the pie counter brigade that ride on our backs. These parasites must be eliminated. We must use drastic measures to remove them—lysol if need be.

But since we cannot pay these subsidies out of present taxation then when our sons return from the victorious battlefields they will be compelled to help pay our board bill. I appeal to every father and mother who has a son in the armed forces, to every brother and sister of the boys in uniform to register a protest to such a cowardly, dishonorable, and contemptible attempt on the part of the stayers at home—an attempt to fasten their board bill not only on the soldiers when they return but on the unborn millions.

The farmer cannot be fooled. He knows that when the subsidy went into force on butter he was rolled back 4 cents a pound. Again when the subsidy went into effect on beef the rancher was rolled back 4 cents a pound. He lost $56 on every steer. Who got the subsidies—let the O. P. A. answer. Most of it went to the pie-counter brigade—to the immature from New York in the O. P. A. The consumer and the producer were rolled back. The pay-roller and the processor got most of the subsidies.

If we grant the major premise of those who argue in favor of subsidies then they have a logical argument. But their major premise is false. It is untrue. The fact is we are not going to have inflation. We have inflation. Let that sink deep into your conscience. There is no honesty in saying that subsidies will prevent inflation. How can they? You already have the disease.

Subsidies have nothing to do with inflation. Inflation has been caused by printing four times as much money as we ever had in circulation before. This money was given to the big concerns—the cost-plus contractors—and now we are trying to siphon it back from the little fellow via 20 percent withholding tax—via high cost of living. Thus with one hand we would hand the wage earners subsidies and with the other hand we would siphon them away. Ridiculous but tragic.

I repeat that inflation was brought about by the cost-plus contracts, brought about by contracts where Uncle Sam prints and furnishes all the money and materials and the contractors get the 10 percent plus. Of course, the bigger the cost the bigger the plus. In order to supply these cost-plus contractors with sufficient money, Uncle Sam just opened the printing presses. He printed about $19,247,059,969 where before there never was over $5,700,000,000. This additional $14,000,000,000 was not equally distributed. It was distributed to a few and now we want to siphon it back from the many.

Why talk about inflation? We have inflation. It has been brought about by the Federal Reserve banks opening the printing presses for the big boys—not for the farmers and the wage earners. The high cost of living is the result of inflation, not the cause. The cause of inflation is the cheapness of money, not the scarcity of commodities. Let us do some straight thinking and not deceive ourselves with dumbness. Scarcity of articles does not cause inflation. When there are crop failures there is not inflation. Even in famine countries there is no inflation. Inflation is caused by the Government printing too much money.

Some of those who today argued for subsidies, just a few days ago told us that the people had too much purchasing power. They were alarmed lest wages would increase and the workingmen be given more purchasing power. Yet today those same Members argue that there is not sufficient purchasing power, that you have to give the consumer subsidies. That argument is contradictory unless we assume that most of the consumers here under consideration are drones and not wage earners or workers.

The only way to stop inflation is for the President and the Federal Reserve banking system to stop printing money for the cost-plus contractors. Let them call in some of the surplus money they have issued. Some of the money subsidies they have given to the big boys. There is where inflation must be halted if you are going to halt it. Why should we cowardly argue all around the thing that needs correction and that needs watching? Inflation means just one thing. More money in circulation than is healthy for the people. Remember this money, however, has reached only a few. The rest of us are being deflated, not inflated.

Another factor in inflation is the $150,000,000,000 of debts. Even the servicemen ask us whether Uncle Sam's bonds are safe. Whether they had not better buy something in place of saving the bonds. The people are getting suspicious of our ability to finance the whole world. The people are getting suspicious of our ability to lend-lease indefinitely. The time has come for an American program as well as a foreign policy. Charity still begins at home.

We have been challenged by the gentleman from Texas not only once but many times to offer a substitute for subsidies in order to bring about full agricultural production. I will give him a substitute. Pass H. R. 2475, the cost-of-production bill. Give to the farmer what it costs him to produce, and it will not be necessary to subsidize anybody.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I know the gentleman comes from a great farming State. Does he not think if they would take the shackles off the American farmer, eliminate these restrictions and regulations that are strangling him to death, and give him a fair price for his products, he would produce all the necessary food not only for civilian purposes, but for war purposes as well?

Does not the gentleman believe that price control has degenerated into profit control? The new philosophy of bureaucracy is production for use and not for profit. They have planned for months a plan of producer to consumer to eliminate the farmer, middle man, small businessman, and small producer. Do you not believe they intend to regiment the entire agricultural life of the Nation?

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman is correct, and I am coming to that in a moment.

We have no business to expect the farmer to produce for less than it costs, and the farmer is on to the hypocritical scheme of subsidizing and regimenting him. He is through with that ignorance. He who can read ought to read the signs of the times. We have just had an election. That should be an eye-opener even to those who believe in subsidies—in pulling themselves up by their own boot straps.

I want to say to my Republican friends that the recent election was not a signal to them to go back to the dark ages, but was a signal to get rid of government by and through bureaucracy.

Again, I will offer another substitute. Abolish the O. P. A. and all the other alphabetical set-ups that are needlessly wasting manpower and energy, that are putting unnecessary hardships on the American people. Congress made a serious mistake when it surrendered that power to the executive department. Congress, if it had its eyes open, should have put a ceiling and floor on every commodity the day after Pearl Harbor. That ceiling and floor should have been the price that things were selling at on December 7.

Then, it should have appointed one committee, one alphabetical set-up in place of all the rest, to adjust any differentials that were necessary. Of course, Congress should have men of ability and experience on it, not a lot of immature boys from New York and other large cities. That would have solved that problem and we would not find ourselves in the ridiculous situation we are in today. It may not be too late yet to do that.

I will give you an example of how the O. P. A. increased prices. It put a ceiling on raspberries. A large part of our raspberries are raised in Minnesota. The grower could not pick and get them harvested at the ceiling they put on them as one farmer testified before the Members of Congress that met in Minneapolis.

He had 18 acres of raspberries. When the O. P. A. fixed the ceiling of 18 cents a quart he plowed them under—the only thing he could do; and then the price went up to 90 cents a quart and you could not get them even at that.

Another case of O. P. A. bungling was in the case of potatoes. My farmers sold their potatoes at 80 cents a hundred early in the fall of 1942 and when the O. P. A. put a ceiling on them we paid $10 a hundred here in Washington. This for potatoes that were not fit to eat. These are just two instances out of hundreds in which the ignorance of the bureaucracy in these various alphabetical set-ups has all but wrecked agriculture and the Nation's food supply. Let us have the courage and the determination—not as Democrats and Republicans but just as plain citizens of the United States in Congress—to cooperate and correct the blunders. If this Nation is to live as a democracy we must do it. If we fail, ours will be the responsibility not as Republicans and Democrats but as the representatives of the people of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I do not want to indulge in a lot of repetition, but I do want to point out several things that have not been mentioned. Subsidies have been tried out in Britain and in Canada for some years. Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] stated that subsidies beget subsidies. How true that has been in Britain. They started out in 1940 with a program over there of £55,000,000 a year on subsidies. This year it is up to £185,000,000 and still rising. Yet Britain's economy is managed much better than ours.

Let us take the case of Canada. Canada has been, in my judgment, very successful in administering this subsidy program. If you will look at the October 30, 1943, issue of the Foreign Commerce Weekly, which has a very informative article on this subject, you will find that in Canada only $29,000,000 a year are used for subsidies on food, but their law is entirely different from that of Britain and the United States. Britain, as you know, has a Ministry of Food that has complete charge of all matters relating to food. We tried to get that in the United States, but we were not successful. Our law is the most haphazard of all these countries.

Canada takes both wage control and food control, puts them under the same head, interlocks them, and settles both at the same time.

That brings me back to the first price-control bill against which I voted, and I am proud of that vote today. I followed the lead of Mr. Bernard Baruch, who knew more about price control than anyone else in the United States. Mr. Baruch said that that price-control bill was no good and would not work, and his statement in that respect has certainly been verified by what has developed since then. Constant changes are being made, and statements are being made as to what is to be done to prevent inflation.

A lot has been said about inflation. I want to point out one thing that has not been stated. Let us say that we would take $800,000,000 for consumer subsidies. It would be borrowed money, as has been pointed out. Let us say that we paid it in 50 years. I think that is a violent assumption because in my opinion the national debt will not be paid in 50 years or a hundred years. But even conceding that it is paid in 50 years, at 2 percent that would mean that the taxpayer would have to pay $1,600,000,000.

The thing I want to point out in addition to that is this: We sell our bonds usually to mature in let us say 10 years. That is quite a long stretch, but I will take that as an example. We sell this $800,000,000 worth of bonds and what happens? If we follow exactly the same formula that has been followed in the past on bond sales, the banks will purchase 50 or 51 percent and they will put them up as collateral, currency will be issued against them, thus increasing the amount of currency in circulation.

In 10 years you will find that these banks, if they are still in existence, will buy 50 or 51 percent and again put it up as collateral and issue currency against it. So that in the course of 50 years you not only have to pay this $800,000,000 twice but you will have issued $3,200,000,000 of currency against it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] pointed out yesterday some interesting facts in regard to the two dimensions of currency, namely, volume and velocity. I want to add a little to what he said, and I agree with every statement he made.

I want to point out that while, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] stated, you had a turn-over of 67 times on the dollar back in 1929, we are in the position today that our deposit turn-over is 25 percent of normal. What does that mean?

It means that private money has gone into hiding, and the money that is in circulation is Government money or printing press money, because you cannot call it anything else. It is currency that is issued against the bonds that are being sold. So that there is this additional danger that the more Government money you put into the bloodstream of commerce the greater is the dilution of that bloodstream and the fewer red corpuscles you get in it. In other words, the more Government money that is put into circulation the less private money is in circulation.

If you advocate Government ownership, Government socialization, then I have no argument, but if you believe as I do in the ownership of private property and that private initiative is the greatest motive force back of progress, then you will agree with me that what we should do is take some of this money out of circulation and not put more in.

In that connection, may I add this. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] made a very interesting speech on the floor of this House. There is much of it with which I agree. It was my unfortunate experience this summer in going through my district, where there are many cheese factories—we have 1,800 of them, or did have before the O. P. A. started working on them in the State of Wisconsin. As a result of O. P. A. regulations, slowly but surely these independents are being liquidated. They are forced to sell to either Borden's or National Dairy, or else lease their plants to

the same monopolies. As a result of this interference, we are finding in my State that these independent cheese makers are forced to turn over their plants and create a monopoly which will put them out of business eventually, and they know it.

We have the same difficulty with the canners. There are 35 canners in my district. They came down here in October 1942, and they came down here again and again and again. Many times I sat in with them, and we tried to get O. P. A. to set a price. Up to 3 weeks before they had to begin the pack this summer, O. P. A. refused to give them any price so they would know where they were at. The boys said to me, "What are we going to do?" I said to them, "To h—— with the O. P. A.; turn out the food. We are going to need it." So they went out and turned out the food.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. I should like to add to what my distinguished friend has said that on the day before yesterday I received a telegram from the canners that can 50 percent of the grapefruit and citrus products of this Nation. They still have not gotten the price which they have asked for during the entire period.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

It was my experience only recently to have down here for 1 month the president and manager of a large cooperative that deals in milk and milk products. They handle 60,000 pounds of milk a day. This plant was being tied up, a plant where $30,000 worth of critical materials have been granted by the War Department so they can turn out additional cheese. They were being stopped because some young squirt that was not even dry behind the ears and had never tried a lawsuit in his life sat in the legal department and gave an interpretation to the regulation that no one agreed with and that, after 4 weeks of effort, the head of the department was simply forced to override.

To paraphrase a popular song of the present day, if some of the "pencil-packin' papas" would just lay their pencils down and let our folks go ahead and produce, we will get the food out, because our producers mean to get the food out, and they want to get it out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In support of what the gentleman has said about promoting subsidies, I should like to read a few lines from a booklet entitled "British Wartime Price Restraining Subsidies":

> Since the first payment of subsidies in December 1939 there have been five Budget messages, in each of which the Government could have announced their discontinuance. Far from discontinuing them, however, the Government has several times expressed satisfaction with their operation, and, in fact, in April 1941 expressly elevated them to a principal instrument of Government policy.

This booklet was put out by the Division of Research, Office of Price Administration. As the gentleman has said, it shows that when you first promulgate a policy of this kind it grows and spreads and sinks its tentacles into the economy of the people.

Let me support the gentleman's statement further with this from the Comptroller of the Currency, dated October 30, 1943. On June 30, 1942, the 14,661 banks of this country owned $30,000,000,000 worth of Government issues, while on June 30, 1943, the ownership had moved up to $57,963,000,000, or six and one-half times the total capital accounts of all the banks in this country.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate what he has added and contributed to this discussion. Let me add this, that I received a letter from the Department of Agriculture and Markets of Wisconsin only a few days ago saying something will have to be done about O. P. A. regulations on milk and dairy products, because it is a serious danger of wiping out independence in that field and the creation of monopolies which our State has been fighting for some 40 years, to my knowledge. I have not wanted to take up so much time at this late hour, but these are matters that affect our economy and affect it seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 2 more minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. If we do this, create a board that will establish a parity between wages and farm products I will vote for it. But as long as we have this insincere and superficial effort being made to regulate the prices I cannot go along with it. You will recall that back in June 1943 I introduced an amendment calling on the departments not to put any roll-back or pay any subsidies on any food products until they had reached parity. That law, which went through this House by a vote of 229 to 106, has been utterly ignored and no attention paid to it. How long are we going to endure the creation of Executive directives and the taking from the properly constituted legislative body its right to function as a legislature? How long are we going to sit quietly by and permit somebody, whom we do not even know and cannot find, to tell us what the interpretation is of the laws that we have written?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it was stated on the floor of the House yesterday that "there must be a little flexibility and that the line could not be held hard and fast."

I do not know of any person desiring inflation in the sense that we are led to believe it may soon exist. I do know many who feel substandard situations should be adjusted wherever these substandard conditions may arise, whether labor, business, or agriculture is affected.

The yardstick used and the fatal period of our troubles, if we would believe our friends, dates from the period following the First World War.

On that basis, agriculture's position in opposing consumers' subsidies in which they do not participate is readily explainable. Their position is justified.

Following the other war corn sold in Illinois for $2.10 per bushel. Today the ceiling does not exceed $1.07. Just 50 percent of the so-called inflation. Do you blame the farmer for opposing consumers' subsidies on this basis?

Following the other war the floor price on wheat was $2.20 per bushel and today wheat is selling for $1.40. Does this constitute inflation? Do you blame the farmer on the price he gets for this crop today?

During the same period, cattle reached a peak of about $23 per hundred and today they are $15.75. Does this constitute inflation? I think not. The farmer evidently, from his protests, thinks the same.

It also seems permissible to remind the Members of this body that in 1937 or 1938 cattle reached the price of almost $20 per hundred when we were not at war and no one was mentioning inflation. It could possibly have been caused by the American recognized theory of supply and demand causing this situation.

During the same period following the First World War hogs reached the price of $21 or $22 and today the War Food Administrator sent all Representatives in Congress a bulletin stating that every governmental power would be used to maintain the support price of $13.75, Chicago basis. Does this differential even approach inflation on the very basis we are led to believe? Does this situation approach inflation in view of increased farm costs?

Do not blame the farmer because he is wiser and has had more actual experience than the planners.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I want to compliment the gentleman for his very interesting statement. The gentleman comes from a farming district and several speakers in this debate have stated a large segment of the farming population of this country is in favor of subsidies. Have you found any such condition in your district?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Not a one.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. The proposed railroad wage scale, the wage raise, will not increase the cost of living——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order and also to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will make the point of order first and then make the parliamentary inquiry. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking on the bill. And I propound the parliamentary inquiry: Does the gentleman intend to talk on this bill in this Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair is unable to advise the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG] expects to talk on.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say that I understood the gentleman had some time under special orders.

The CHAIRMAN. All the Chair knows is that the gentleman in charge of the time on the majority side yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Of course, I did not know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG] had time under a special order. I do not think the gentleman wants to speak at this time if he has time under a special order.

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, I will abide by whatever you say.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes. Of course, under the rule, debate must be confined to the bill under consideration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask the further parliamentary inquiry, Has the gentleman been granted a request to speak under special orders this evening?

Mr. FURLONG. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman does not intend to speak on the bill under consideration, it would probably be more appropriate for him to take his special order.

Mr. FURLONG. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule providing for the consideration of the pending bill provides that debate shall be confined to the bill.

Mr. FURLONG. Well, it concerned the bill, but not entirely so. It will concern what you are debating about today. I shall abide, however, by whatever you gentlemen decide.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want the gentleman to understand I am not trying to take him off his feet. There were others who had special orders, and they asked me how the gentleman happened to be addressing the Committee at this time. I am sure the gentleman will appreciate the situation.

Mr. FURLONG. Whatever you decide to do, I will abide by it. What is your decision, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to wait for his special order?

Mr. FURLONG. Yes; whatever your decision is, thank you.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term "31st of March" where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term "30th of June," and by deleting from the second sentence thereof "on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower." The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and Mr. RAMSPECK, having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3477, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I have made today and include therein certain statements and excerpts relating thereto, including extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have four requests to submit.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] may have permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee today, and to include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include three short letters referred to in those remarks and some short excerpts, and the name and authorship of a book, which I request likewise to be made a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon in Committee and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. SPARKMAN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein several editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address delivered before members of the Lehigh Valley Medical Society and in the second instance to include a letter from the Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers' Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some correspondence I received from the Maryland Citizens Committee for Democracy, the Baltimore League of Women Voters, and a petition from Local No. 43, Industrial Union of Maritime and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a report by E. H. Butler on the cost of living.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in six separate instances, and to include therein certain excerpts and extraneous matter pertaining to the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—EIGHTY YEARS AFTER THE ENDURING WORDS OF LINCOLN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, fourscore years ago today Abraham Lincoln, sixteenth President of the United States, stood on a crude platform in the midst of new-made graves at Gettysburg and delivered an address which has not "perished from the earth."

In July 1863 it took 175,000 men in Blue and Gray, at a cost of 10,000 lives, in 3 days of battle, to elevate the little

Pennsylvania town of Gettysburg to historic fame. Four months later it took 1 man 2 minutes in 270 words to make it a spot of double historic interest which the world will always note and long remember. Thereafter it had a second claim to immortality.

Eighty years have passed since Lincoln stood in the crisp air of a November afternoon in response to an invitation to "make a few appropriate remarks" at the dedication of a national cemetery at Gettysburg. It is quite evident that he was not invited because of his ability as an orator, nor for what he might say, but only because he was the President of the United States. He was to be there as a figurehead to draw a crowd. The committee in charge came very near not inviting the President, feeling that he might make a political speech or otherwise mar the dignity of the occasion.

Lincoln did not use that modern, much-abused word "democracy," but he did mention "the Government of the people"; declared that it should not perish from the earth and that it should have a new birth of freedom. He was not sure that it would not perish, but he did ask the people to highly resolve that the dead shall not have died in vain. We are the stewards of that trust.

The beauty and the eloquence of the Gettysburg Address remain undimmed with the passage of time. Rarely, if ever, has any man said so much in so few words. Its brevity, modesty, and simplicity, its charm and power, mark it a masterpiece of the purest English; and it still stands as the oration of the age. The cadence of its words makes it as beautiful as a Psalm.

The address, however, was not regarded highly when it was new. Bitterness clouded reason and true appreciation of an address, wholly devoid of bitterness. While there were those who heard the address and appreciated it, there were also those who criticized it. Lincoln himself told his friend, Ward Lamon, on the platform after he concluded, "That speech won't scour," and the President was depressed. One newspaper characterized the speech as the President's "silly remarks." The Chicago Times referred to it as a "silly, flat, and dishwatery utterance," while the London Times commented by saying, "Anything more dull and commonplace would not be easy to produce."

The heartaches and grief, the hopes and prayers, the aspirations and faith of a liberty-loving people were expressed by this Uncommon Commoner in 20 lines. Simple words they were, but packed with so much meaning as to become engraved in the minds of men for all time. They reflected the simplicity of the man who uttered them.

We might well contemplate Lincoln as we wage a Second World War and, at home, face problems of a magnitude which he knew. It should profit our current leaders, it should curb any reckless ambitions which they may have, to realize that Lincoln's greatness came in retrospect and therefore is enduring. This man neither sought nor experienced the acclaim of the multitude while he lived. His strength lay in the knowledge of his limitations; it lay in his humility before his God.

It was his genuineness that has stood the test of time, not an effort for a fleeting fame which so many seem to make. He was not thought of as a man of stature in his day. It never occurred to him that he was the only one capable of serving in the high office which was his. Instead, his was a deep sense of obligation to a people who so honored him.

He sought not after false prophets for wisdom. He drew it from the people whom he served. He was the composite greatness of a people, not a man who either thought he could or who sought to set the world agog.

In our high places today we need men of his homely virtue, we need his simple philosophy throughout our national life. Only in this way will we successfully meet the grave problems facing us.

Lincoln dedicated himself to the great task before him, not to the advancement of his ambitions. Let us all, here and now, rededicate ourselves to the things for which he stood and which he expressed so eloquently. As a nation we have wandered far away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a press release from the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PROPOSED RAILROAD WAGE WILL NOT INCREASE THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, through the enactment of the so-called Stabilization Act approved October 2, 1942, Congress provided:

> That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war the President is authorized and directed on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages and salaries affecting the cost of living.

On the following day, October 3, the President issued his Executive Order No. 9250, establishing the Office of Economic Stabilization. In paragraph 3, of this Executive order, the President directed that:

> The Director, with the approval of the President, shall formulate and develop a comprehensive national economic policy relating to the control of civilian purchasing power, prices, rents, wages, salaries, profits, rationing subsidies and all related matters—all for the purpose of preventing avoidable increases in the cost of living.

The President's Executive order, in section 4, provided further that:

> The guiding policy of the Director and of all departments and agencies of the Government shall be to stabilize the cost of living in accordance with the acts of October 2, 1942.

I call attention to these basic objectives of the stabilization program for the purpose of relating them to the present railroad wage dispute which has now reached the point where it has produced the threat of a Nation-wide railroad strike.

The only way in which the 8-cent hourly increase recommended by the President's Emergency Board for railway workers can contribute to an increase in the cost of living would be as a result of increase thereby necessitated in freight or passenger rates.

It is common knowledge that the railroads today are rolling in wealth and wallowing in war profits as a result of the record business handled in the past 2 or 3 years. Consequently, there is no necessity for raising freight or passenger rates following the granting of the 8-cent hourly railroad wage raise recommended for these highly efficient workers by an emergency board after 44 days of public hearings and investigation.

The fact that no freight-rate increases are necessary was clearly reflected in the position taken a few days ago by the Stabilization Director before the Interstate Commerce Commission. In appearing before the Commission last week Mr. Vinson and others urged the further suspension of the freight-rate increases that were ordered by the Commission in April 1942. He urged an indefinite suspension and on Saturday, October 30, the railroads themselves agreed to a further suspension of 6 months beyond the end of this year. The railroads took this action after having signed an agreement with the employees on August 7 providing for an 8-cent hourly increase in wages which the Stabilization Director has not, as yet, approved.

During 1941 there was a very substantial increase in railroad business and railroad operating revenues as compared with 1940. In fact the 1941 operating revenues of the class I railroads, which amounted to $5,377,000,000, were well over a billion dollars in excess of the 1940 revenues, when the roads took in $4,297,000,000.

But in 1942 the railroads' operating revenues climbed to new high peaks, never before even remotely approached, when they soared to $7,466,000,000. This was the first time in railroad history that operating revenues ever reached the seven-billion figure, the nearest previous approach being in our earlier pre-war business peak of 1929, when they climbed to $6,279,000,000, or approximately 1¼ billion less than the figure reached in 1942.

However, during the present year the fantastic figures of 1942 are being left far behind. During the first 8 months of 1943 the railroad revenues increased a fraction of 28 percent above the amazing high peaks set in 1942. Incidentally, this meant an increase of about 75 percent over the prosperous year of 1941.

After deduction for operating expenses, the net revenues for the first 8 months of this year were about 41 per-

cent over 1942. It will be noted that while total revenues went up 28 percent, the net revenue climbed 41 percent, which means that during the first 8 months of this year railroad revenue increased more rapidly than did railroad expenses. In fact, for the first 8 months of this year their net income after taxes went up 30 percent notwithstanding the fact that they are paying a greater amount of taxes than ever before in the history of the industry.

I merely mention a fact well known to all informed persons and not denied by the railroads or by the Interstate Commerce Commission when I say that the 8-cent hourly increase for railroad workers, as recommended last May by the President's Emergency Board, can be applied by the railroad industry without increasing freight or passenger rates and, therefore, without increasing the cost of living.

Consequently, this important basic factor underlying the Stabilization Act and the President's Executive Order 9250 did not justify nor warrant the Stabilization Director in his unexpected and arbitrary cancelation of the railroad wage increase.

Since his action was not required for the accomplishment of the purpose of the Stabilization Act, since it could not even be justified on these grounds, and since the result of his arbitrary act has seriously impaired, rather than aided, the effective prosecution of the war, it seems to me that it is now essential to the national welfare for Congress to take such action as may be necessary to correct this situation at the earliest possible date, and to restore the labor stability that prevailed in the railroad industry prior to the time that the Stabilization Director stepped in with his unstable action.

The subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, to whom was referred Senate Joint Resolution 91, recommends that it be reported out favorably. At public hearings on the resolution, representatives of railroad management and labor presented their views with considerable documentary evidence. All of this was submitted to Judge Vinson, Director, Economic Stabilization, and his comment thereon was solicited and received.

We find it necessary to point out that, contrary to the statement of Judge Vinson, the passage of this resolution will not disturb the Little Steel formula nor will it express directly or indirectly congressional disapproval of that formula. The subcommittee favors the stabilization of wages as required by the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and subsequent Presidential orders authorized by that act.

The gross misinterpretation of this act has caused so much confusion that congressional clarification seems necessary. That is all Senate Joint Resolution 91 attempts to do.

There should be no unsettled dispute with reference to the wage increase here involved since this was the product of a Presidential emergency board recommendation which was accepted in an agreement between the carriers and their employees on August 7, 1943. Administrative approval of the agreement should not have been withheld.

Out of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, came the "hold the line" order (No. 9328). The Little Steel formula was only one of the bases laid down by the President upon which wage increases were to be permitted. The railway wage agreement and the Board's report were justified not under the Little Steel formula but under other principles specifically written into the Stabilization Act and maintained by the President. Approval of the wage increase agreement of August 7, 1943, therefore in no way violates or even modifies the Little Steel formula.

Director Vinson, apparently realizing that nonoperating railway employees are underpaid, has suggested a sliding-scale wage increase of from 4 to 10 cents per hour. If 8 cents does violence to Little Steel, what does 4 to 10 cents do to it? The pay roll under Judge Vinson's proposal would differ by less than 1 percent from the pay roll if the wage agreement which he disapproves were made effective. Obviously the railroad industry wage agreement is not inflationary since Judge Vinson maintains that his substitute is not inflationary.

The unsettling effect of Judge Vinson's proposal is plain to all practical railroad men. The arbitrary sliding scale proposed by Judge Vinson would destroy existing wage differentials, and would be contrary to sound industrial practice and in violation of the directive of Justice Byrnes on which Judge Vinson claims to rely. The folly of creating new inequities, by introducing this sliding scale is evident.

The President's Emergency Board in recommending the 8-cent wage increase followed the principle and requirement written into the Stabilization Act that wage adjustments should be made when necessary to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

The subcommittee finds that this is the fundamental principle involved in this dispute between Judge Vinson on the one hand and other Government officials plus the railroad industry on the other.

Advice from every competent and informed source assures us that approval of the wage agreement is necessary to remove gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. Such approval will not weaken but will fortify the hold-the-line policy of the President.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*
HARRY S. TRUMAN.
ROBERT F. WAGNER.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.
CLYDE M. REED.

Senator REED concurs in the action of the subcommittee in reporting Senate Joint Resolution 91 favorably. He will submit his individual views in a separate statement.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, November 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Monday, November 22, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear Mr. Boeschenstein and Mr. Bittner to bring the committee up to date on W. P. B. activities on newsprint.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 23, 1943, for consideration of H. R. 3140 et al.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume consideration on Tuesday, November 23, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

921. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

922. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint notaries public; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

923. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting corrected copies of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the second quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

924. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

925. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting in accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, a report on Federal ownership of real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

926. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting in accordance with the requirement contained in the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1253), report of agreement between the Navy Department and Standard Oil Co. of California, dated November 20, 1942, and agreement between the Navy Department and Standard Oil Co. of California, dated September 8, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt; without amendment (Rept. No. 874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club; without amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae

Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney; without amendment (Rept. No. 876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 213. A bill for the relief of Edward H. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 3696. A bill to authorize the seizure of certain property which is being used, or which is about to be used, to aid any nation at war with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 3697. A bill to amend sections 1400 and 1410 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, as amended, so as to continue, during the calendar year 1944, the present rate of tax on employees and employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEWSOME:

H. R. 3698. A bill to permit increases in certain salaries without prior approval by any officer or agency of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 3699. A bill to provide that credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be allowed for certain service with the city of Manila, P. I.; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 359. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," and the accompanying report thereon; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3700. A bill to vest jurisdiction in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma in the case of Benjamin E. Cook, administrator of the estate of Cam C. Boyd, deceased, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 3702 (by request). A bill granting a pension to Marjorie Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3637. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Jiosep DiPietro and other citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3638. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Ottie B. Glasgow and 61 citizens of Freeport, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3639. Also, petition of 15 members of the First Baptist Church of Versailles, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3640. Also, petition of 400 members of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, Knoxville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3641. Also, petition of 150 citizens of Kimbolton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3642. Also, petition of Jeanette Wickersham and 45 other citizens of Edison, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3643. Also, petition of 44 citizens of Gallipolis, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3644. Also, petition of Isabelle K. Huntley and 30 other citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3645. Also, petition of Rev. A. Lindvig and 30 members of the Second Congregational Church, Colorado Springs, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3646. Also, petition of Harold S. Lawrence and 40 other citizens of Canon City, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3647. Also, petition of Jewel Dale and 28 members of the Church of God, Grand Junction, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3648. Also, petition of 73 members of the First Baptist Church of Grand Junction, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3649. Also, petition of Charles Olson and 22 other citizens of Pocahontas, Iowa, uring enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3650. Also, petition of Rev. T. Garland Smith and 48 members of the University Methodist Church, Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3651. Also, petition of Mary B. Jones and 68 citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3652. Also, petition of Mrs. S. R. Estes and 15 citizens of Muskogee, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3653. Also, petition of A. S. Allred and 191 other citizens of route No. 2, Mount Airy, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3654. Also, petition of Louise M. Petersen and 15 other citizens of Jerome, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3655. Also, petition of Cora G. Hanlon and 109 other citizens of Sterling, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3656. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of Mrs. Jessie McEwan and others,

with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3657. Also, petition of Ida May Samuelsen and others, with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3658. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by Mary Ann Harwood and other residents in Westchester County, N. Y., opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3659. Also (by request), petition signed by Harold Werner and other residents in Westchester County, N. Y., opposing the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3660. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of Rev. Milton W. Dills, minister, Columbia Church of Christ, Cincinnati, Ohio, and 58 members and friends of his congregation, urging support of House bill 2082, providing for the prohibition of intoxicating liquors for the duration of the war and the period of demobilization thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3661. By Mr. McLEAN: Resolution of the Federation of Churches of Rahway, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States, through its Senators and Representatives, to set up legislative machinery to study the problems of a just and lasting peace based on the Christian principle that all men everywhere are the children of a Divine Father, who desires that they live in love and charity with one another; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3662. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of members of the Pratt Memorial Methodist Church of Rockland, Maine, realizing the menace of alcoholic beverages to the safety and efficiency of our armed forces and defense workers, urge that action be taken in line with Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic liquors in and around these areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3663. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, the national board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to prevent inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3664. Also, petition of the president, the American Institute of Consulting Engineers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to inadvisability of the gradual extension of engineering duties by various governmental agencies into the field that has been, in the past, normally covered by private practicing engineers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

3665. Also, petition of the president, the American Institute of Consulting Engineers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the passage of Senate bill 702 and House bill 2100; to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend William J. McDonald, Ph. D., of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Come, O Holy Spirit, inspire the Members of this august body with Thy heavenly wisdom; guide and direct them so that their deliberations may be fruitful unto good for all our people. Send forth Thy light, illumine their minds to see our problems in proper perspective, thus faithfully discharging their grave responsibility to the Nation and to Thee.

Thou, O Spirit of Love, inflame our hearts with the fire of divine charity so sadly needed in these days of stress and of crisis. Strengthen our wills, make us clearly to realize that every just enactment is but the reflection of Thy eternal law, having its binding force not from any mere human will alone but from a moral authority above and beyond all the powers of earth. In this recognition shall our beloved country prove worthy of her great destiny as a true leader amongst peoples for,

"* * * it is our high duty
To teach the world the might of moral beauty
And to stamp God's image truly
On the struggling soul."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of calendar day Thursday, November 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

FREEZING OF SOCIAL SECURITY PAY ROLL TAXES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on Friday I made a short statement to the press regarding my attitude toward pay-roll taxes for old-age and survivors' benefits, which, under the existing statute, will increase 100 percent on New Years. I have again presented in the statement my reasons for believing that the pay-roll taxes should be frozen at the present level. I ask that my statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall again move, by amendment to the revenue bill, to freeze social-security pay-roll taxes for old-age and survivors' benefits at existing rates (1 percent on employers and 1 percent on employees) instead of permitting them to increase 100 percent next New Years, as the existing statute would otherwise require. On my initiative Congress has twice taken this annual action in previous years. I have withheld my conclusions for 1944 until all possible information could be explored. There may be reasons unrelated to old-age benefits which recommend the 100-percent pay-roll-tax increase next January, such as a flank movement against inflationary trends. But I am unable to find any reason, related to the maintenance of adequate reserves for existing old-age benefits, for doubling these pay-roll taxes on workers and employers next January; and, no matter how important other purposes may be, I shall always be unwilling to use social-security taxes for anything but social-security benefits. We are not entitled to use social-security taxes to finance any part of the war.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, we collected $1,130,000,000 in these particular pay-roll taxes. We paid out $149,000,000 in benefits and $27,000,000 in administrative expenses. The balance of $954,000,000 went into reserve. This brought the reserve last June 30 to $4,300,000,000. It is obviously vital that this contingent reserve should always be wholly adequate. Congress indicated in 1939 what it considers to be adequate, namely, a reserve 3 times greater than the heaviest annual costs in 5 subsequent years. That rule has been endorsed by Secretary Morgenthau. This heaviest annual cost from 1943 to 1948 is estimated by the Social Security Board from a low of $415,000,000 to a high of $813,000,000. The present reserve is about 11 (instead of 3) times the low and better than 5 times the high. Chairman Altmeyer, of the Social Security Board, concedes that if no employer or employee contributions were collected at all in 1944 the reserve assets on December 31, 1944, would amount to about $4,600,000,000, which is more than 3 times the estimated expenditures 5 years later in 1949. Under such mathematical circumstances, I am unable to justify a 100-percent increase in these pay-roll taxes on both workers and employers next year.

It should be noted in this connection that the receipts of this fund and its balances are far greater than contemplated in its original set-up—and presumably it was initiated on firm foundations. The formal report of the Senate Finance Committee in 1939 estimated the reserve at the end of 1943 at $2,651,000,000. Actually it will be nearer $4,843,000,000. We shall collect more in 1944 pay-roll taxes at the existing 1 percent rates on employers and 1 percent on employees than it was expected we would collect at the contemplated rate of 2 percent on each. Therefore, it seems to me that Congress should again freeze the rate where it is.

It should be clearly understood that this question has nothing to do with the expansion of social-security benefits or coverage. There is decided need for reasonable action in both directions. Congress will meet this issue later. We are concerned at the moment solely with the problem of financing existing benefits and coverage. New rates will, of course, have to be arranged to meet new obligations. But I cannot escape the conviction that present rates are adequate for present obligations for 1 more year, and, I repeat, I am unable to consent that social-security pay-roll taxes should be used for any except social-security purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Reynolds
Andrews	Gurney	Robertson
Austin	Hatch	Russell
Bailey	Hawkes	Scrugham
Ball	Hayden	Shipstead
Barkley	Holman	Smith
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Lucas	Tobey
Bushfield	McClellan	Truman
Butler	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murray	Wheeler
Downey	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Willis
George	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	
Green	Revercomb	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is conducting hearings in Western States for the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent, visiting with his son who is in the military service.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT AND OFFICES

Letters from the Secretary of War, the Acting Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, and the Secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective Department and offices for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; also a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, submitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements under the Veterans' Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

LANDS WITHIN NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 1, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, agreements entered into under authority of the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1253) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EIGHTH BIMONTHLY REPORT, SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report submitted by Brig. Gen. Robert W. Johnson, Chairman of the Board of Smaller War Plants Corporation and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, covering the period from August 1 through September 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy (2), Agriculture (4), Agriculture (War Food Administration), and Labor; War Manpower Commission, Federal Security Agency (3), Civil Service Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL REPORT ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL (S. DOC. NO. 131)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee relating to Federal personnel, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I ask that the report just laid before the Senate and ordered printed, also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL

(Report to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.)

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL INCREASES (PAID EMPLOYEES)

Last spring the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, alarmed by the ever-swelling number of persons employed by the Federal Government, issued a report (S. Doc. 66, 78th Cong.) which described in detail the overgrowth of the executive branch of the Federal Government and recommended that 300,000 civilian employees be eliminated from pay rolls. Senators BYRD and LANGER introduced an amendment to the Overtime Pay Acts which gave the Director of the Bureau of the Budget authority to order reductions in establishments subject to the overtime pay laws.

Since June 1943 some progress has been made in reducing Federal civilian employment. The following table, showing Federal employment, indicates the necessity for continued reductions:

TABLE I.—*Federal employment increase (paid employees in executive branch)*

	Personnel	Monthly pay roll
Nov. 11, 1918	917,760	(1)
August 1939	933,386	$141,733,064
August 1940	1,039,451	159,260,975
August 1941	1,444,985	217,772,054
August 1942	2,450,759	391,502,171
March 1943	2,978,824	638,926,265
April	3,003,539	634,324,484
May	3,039,412	610,675,661
June	3,095,463	657,791,453
July	3,093,495	(1)
August	3,020,814	(1)
September	2,964,405	(1)

[1] No figures available.

Despite the fact that the first Overtime Pay Act, which increased the working hours of the Government employee applied to at least 2,180,000 Federal civilian employees, or over 70 percent of the Federal employees of the Bureau of the Budget issued reduction orders only to agencies or parts of agencies representing an aggregate of 735,338 employees, or only one-fourth of the Federal civilian employees. Also, when viewed in terms of total Federal civilian employment the reduction orders issued by the Bureau of the Budget have been ineffective. As many Federal civilian employees have been eliminated through recent congressional actions as have been eliminated through the operation of ceiling orders placed upon the number of civilian employees by the Bureau of the Budget under authority contained in the overtime-pay laws. During the period the reduction orders of the Bureau of the Budget were being executed under the first Overtime Pay Act, Federal employment rose from 2,810,871 to 3,005,812, or by 194,941 employees. In other words, while less than one-fourth of Federal employment was being reduced by 16,535 employees, the remainder of the Government service was being increased by 211,476, resulting in a net increase of 194,941 employees.

Figures for September 1943 show that there are now 2,964,405 Federal civilian employees. Some agencies have curtailed recruiting, and a few substantial reductions have been consummated. The committee is of the opinion that despite achievements its recommendations have been disregarded in many instances. Moreover, the First Overtime Pay Act had little salutary effect.

It is because of this failure of the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the various departments and agencies to effect recommended reductions that the committee deems it necessary to issue this second personnel report on Federal employment. Should this second request be disregarded, the committee will believe it necessary to recommend legislation to the Congress of the United States which will make reductions in Federal civilian employment mandatory.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS PARTIALLY FOLLOWED—131,058 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ELIMINATED FROM FEDERAL SERVICE SINCE JUNE 1943

In June 1943, when the committee issued its first personnel report the all-time peak in Federal employment had been reached. There were then 3,095,463 paid Federal civilian employees. Latest figures which are for September 1943, show that there are 2,964,405 Federal workers, or a reduction of 131,058 employees since June. Table II (page 3) shows Federal civilian employment by department and agency for the months April through September 1943, and increases and decreases in the number of personnel be-

tween June and September, by department and agency.

Committee figures used in table II and throughout this report do not include employees of the White House, employees of the Federal Reserve System, who are not paid with Federal funds, and employees of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government. Nor do they include 40,000 Federal Works Agency project employees in Puerto Rico, 8,375 Farm Security Administration committeemen, over 100,000 Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen, 64,000 members of War Price and Ration Boards of the Office of Price Administration, 160,000 voluntary selective-service workers, 9,000 physicians paid on a fee basis and employed intermittently by the Veterans' Administration, 9,000 volunteer workers of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, 7,000 maritime service enrollees, nor the employees of the quasi-Federal corporations.

Recently, the Civil Service Commission has revised its personnel reporting procedure to include over 300,000 voluntary and unpaid workers, which have never before been considered as Federal employees in the strict sense of the word. Everyone recognizes that there will be great changes in the number of these unpaid workers from month to month, and from season to season. Any attempt to show decreases, or even increases, in Federal employment by the use of figures which include volunteer and unpaid Federal workers tends to confuse the American people. For example, between June and July 1943 the Commission reports that several agencies have deceased employment; whereas, over the same period of time and in the same agencies committee figures show an increase in the number of paid employees.

TABLE II.—*Federal civilian employment, by department and agency, for months of April through September 1943, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees*

	April 1943	May 1943	June 1943	July 1943	August 1943	September 1943	Increase, June to September	Decrease, June to September
Office of the President [1]	847	854	829	795	622	577		252
State Department	8,234	8,249	8,426	8,433	8,595	8,567	141	
Treasury Department	77,651	79,625	81,187	84,016	82,659	84,064	2,877	
War Department	1,356,774	1,380,693	1,397,956	1,382,542	1,308,812	1,257,988		139,968
Justice Department	30,616	30,650	31,088	31,376	31,025	30,445		643
Post Office Department	319,847	313,630	325,105	330,913	333,025	[2] 333,025	7,920	
Navy Department [3]	633,206	637,154	669,114	679,475	684,252	[2] 684,428	15,314	
Interior Department	37,805	38,060	41,839	43,218	41,973	[2] 42,700	861	
Agriculture Department [4]	79,176	85,011	80,297	78,685	80,710	77,747		2,550
Commerce Department [5]	32,836	32,210	32,538	32,982	32,955	34,963	2,425	
Labor Department	6,285	6,455	6,202	6,318	6,304	6,120		82
National war agencies:								
Office for Emergency Management: Liaison Office	18	16	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	0	0
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	(7)	(7)	3	44	68	92	89	
Division of Central Administrative Services	6,006	5,660	5,191	5,036	4,909	4,767		424
National War Labor Board	2,362	1,966	2,362	2,419	2,522	2,784	422	
Office of Alien Property Custodian	1,108	1,092	1,084	1,082	1,068	1,052		32
Office of Civilian Defense	1,418	1,319	1,229	1,053	979	959		270
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,282	1,352	1,406	1,400	1,385	1,340		66
Office of Defense Transportation	4,073	4,246	4,543	4,705	4,556	4,524		19
Office of Economic Stabilization	10	10	5	8	9	8	3	
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	610	658	717	728	723	720	3	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,221	1,299	1,335	1,388	1,237	1,260		75
Office of War Information	3,737	3,828	3,775	3,424	3,435	[8] 4,456	681	
Office of War Mobilization	(7)	(7)	9	14	14	13	4	
War Production Board [9]	21,032	20,260	20,372	20,241	19,411	19,098		1,354
War Manpower Commission [10]	38,284	38,141	38,235	30,983	29,060	26,304		11,931
Selective Service System	26,003	25,462	25,174	24,666	24,978	24,514		660
War Relocation Authority	2,139	2,033	1,926	1,699	1,637	1,836		90
War Shipping Administration	2,840	2,985	3,341	3,615	3,720	3,970	629	
Office of Economic Warfare	4,007	4,453	4,447	4,925	4,986	5,048	601	
Office of Censorship	12,270	12,061	12,119	12,259	12,381	12,147	28	
Office of Price Administration	53,788	54,595	56,049	56,389	55,799	55,282		767
Office of Strategic Services	1,484	1,481	1,537	1,576	1,573	1,556	19	
Petroleum Administrator for War	1,277	1,341	1,407	1,408	1,441	1,468	61	
Independent establishments:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	4	4	3	2	2	2		1
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel	41	39	39	35	34	(6)		39
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	170	169	157	123	110	91		66
Civil Aeronautics Board	303	305	297	307	304	308	11	
Civil Service Commission	7,142	6,356	7,063	6,568	6,380	6,297		766
Employees' Compensation Commission	525	524	543	538	536	540		3
Export-Import Bank	53	55	55	58	59	60	5	
Federal Communications Commission	2,296	2,273	2,181	2,104	2,192	2,195	14	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,185	1,168	1,153	1,141	1,131	1,116		37
Federal Power Commission	677	680	687	694	690	686		1
Federal Security Agency	32,435	31,455	32,301	32,230	31,657	31,159		1,145
Federal Trade Commission	505	488	484	479	470	466		18
Federal Works Agency [11]	23,839	23,050	22,334	22,397	22,064	22,506	172	
General Accounting Office	8,251	8,534	8,734	9,086	9,224	9,621	887	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,338	2,298	2,268	2,256	2,201	2,178		90
Maritime Commission	8,046	8,284	8,487	8,717	8,740	8,986	499	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	3,502	3,767	3,955	3,940	4,000	4,373	418	
National Archives	383	368	350	347	344	344		6
National Capital Housing Authority	241	246	253	264	270	262	9	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	19	20	21	18	19		1
National Gallery of Art	248	247	252	251	250	248		4
National Housing Agency	18,458	18,625	19,303	19,789	20,061	20,304	1,001	
National Labor Relations Board	847	816	809	806	773	795		14
National Mediation Board	100	104	94	92	87	96	2	
Panama Canal	37,958	47,566	37,874	38,538	37,685	34,326		3,548
Railroad Retirement Board	1,603	1,632	1,678	1,645	1,613	1,572		106
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,148	8,210	8,311	8,472	8,478	8,349	38	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,328	1,319	1,314	1,308	1,299	1,263		51
Smithsonian Institution	415	408	403	401	405	405	2	
Tariff Commission	321	310	307	300	304	301		6
Tax Court of the United States	125	128	127	126	126	127	0	0
Tennessee Valley Authority	29,197	28,888	28,421	28,355	28,284	27,075		1,346
Veterans' Administration	44,589	44,228	44,356	44,220	44,200	44,593	237	
Total	3,003,539	3,039,412	3,095,463	3,093,495	3,020,814	2,964,405	35,373	166,431

[1] Includes only Bureau of the Budget and National Resources Planning Board.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Includes 10,324 employees of stations in the hands of the enemy.
[4] Farm Security Agency committeemen not included.
[5] Includes about 2,900 part-time weather observers of the Weather Bureau.
[6] Abolished.
[7] Established by Executive order, May 27, 1943.
[8] Includes 1,050 employees abroad not previously reported.
[9] Includes Smaller War Plants Corporation.
[10] Includes training within industry and U. S. Employment Service. Also includes the National Youth Administration which was ordered liquidated by Dec. 31, 1943. Does not include the Selective Service System.
[11] Does not include Work Projects Administration project workers.

Table II indicates that between June and September 1943 the majority of the executive departments and agencies have either reduced the number of their paid employees or curtailed the recruiting of new employees. During this period 35 departments and agencies eliminated 166,431 personnel. Substantial reductions in the number of personnel were accomplished by the following departments and agencies: War Department, 139,968 employees; War Manpower Commission, 11,931; Panama Canal, 3,548; Agricultural Department, 2,550; War Production Board, 1,354; Tennessee Valley Authority, 1,346; and the Federal Security Agency, 1,145.

However, between June and September 30, departments and agencies increased the number of their personnel by 35,373 employees. Greatest increases were made by the following departments and agencies: Navy Department, 15,314 employees; Post Office Department, 7,920; Treasury Department, 2,877; Commerce Department, 2,425; and the National Housing Agency, 1,001.

At the hearings before the committee on October 8, 1942, the War Department announced a net reduction of 145,564 civilian employees between June and August 1943. On the other hand, committee figures show that between June and September there has been a reduction of only 139,968 employees in the War Department. The discrepancy between War Department figures and committee figures arises because of the following: (1) The committee figures cover a longer period of time, and (2) War Department totals for June and August do not include all of the employees on the War Department pay rolls for those months to whom compensation was paid for services rendered. Neither the figures of the War Department nor those of the committee include civilian employees outside continental United States; therefore, with present information it is difficult to determine exactly how many employees have been eliminated from the War Department pay rolls.

Congressional action was responsible for reducing Federal employment by 15,000 employees during the period between June and September 1943 through the reduction of appropriations for, or the elimination of, some of the following agencies: Farm Security Administration, Office of War Information, Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, National Resources Planning Board, Board of Legal Examiners, National Youth Administration, Work Projects Administration, and Civilian Conservation Corps.

In recommending the elimination of 300,000 Federal employees the committee believed that there were 3,008,519 paid Federal workers. However, actually there were 3,095,463 Government employees in June. Therefore, the committee should have recommended the elimination of 390,000 Federal employees from the June total.

The committee is encouraged by the fact that 131,058 Federal employees have been eliminated since June, and wishes to commend those 35 departments and agencies which are responsible for the net decrease in Federal employment. However, the trend is indicative rather than conclusive, because many decreases were offset by increases in 30 departments and agencies. Further, it should be pointed out that according to latest available statistics from the Civil Service Commission various departments and agencies have requested that 180,000 additional employees be furnished them.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL INCREASES 260,649 IN THE NUMBER OF PAID EMPLOYEES DURING THE PAST 11 MONTHS

Taking the longer view—that is, from October 1942 to September 1943—the committee found the trend less satisfactory. Federal employment totaled 2,703,756 in October 1942. By September 1943 the number of employees had risen to 2,964,405, or a net increase of 260,649 in 11 months.

Those establishments employing large numbers of persons almost universally increased employment. All 10 departments except the Interior Department showed increases, some alarming. The Navy Department topped the entire Federal service with 154,593 additions; the War Department was next, with 68,155 increases; and Post Office and Treasury showed substantial gains of 16,723 and 14,842, respectively.

Among the war agencies, the Office of Price Administration increased 19,562, a 55-percent gain. The National War Labor Board increased from 282 to 2,784, a gain of 2,502 or about 890 percent. War Shipping Administration employment increased 167 percent. The Office of Economic Warfare (formerly Board of Economic Warfare), the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Office of Defense Transportation, all increased substantially.

Of the remaining agencies, attention is directed to the General Accounting Office, the Maritime Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Housing Agency, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—each of which showed substantial gains. Three new agencies were created during that time, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, the Office of War Mobilization, the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War, the latter of which already has 1,468 employees.

Substantial reductions were made in the following: Federal Security Agency, Federal Works Agency, Selective Service System, the Civil Service Commission, and Veterans' Administration. During this period the Tennessee Valley Authority eliminated 14,021 employees, most of whom were project workers. The National Youth Administration was ordered liquidated, and by September 1943 had reduced to 1,370 employees.

FIFTY-TWO PERCENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES NOT IN DIRECT WAR PRODUCTION

In the committee's last personnel report it was pointed out that 55 percent of Federal civilian employees were not engaged in direct mechanical war production. Six months later, or at the present time, this percentage has been reduced to 52.2 percent.

Following is a list of the agencies engaged in direct mechanical war production with the number of employees so employed:

War Department (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	800,224
Navy Department (except clerical administrative, and fiscal employees)	559,333
Maritime Commission (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	1,271
Tennessee Valley Authority (except clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees)	23,596
Panama Canal	34,326
Bureau of Standards	2,465
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	4,373
Total	1,425,588

Thus, today there are 1,425,588 Federal civilian employees, or only 47.8 percent of the civilian employees of the Federal Government, who are chiefly engaged in actual direct mechanical war production. This represents an increase of 76,490 employees over April 1943. It is gratifying to observe that the number of employees not engaged in direct mechanical war production has decreased by 130,734, since April 1943. The trend is encouraging, although not to the extent to which the committee desires. There are still more employees in the Federal Government not engaged in direct mechanical war production than there were in the entire Federal service in July 1941, 5 months before Pearl Harbor.

In the next section the committee will point out where reductions in Federal personnel can be effected. It is believed that these reductions should be made almost exclusively in those 1,538,637 Federal employees not engaged in direct mechanical war production.

DESIGN FOR REDUCTION

In the committee's report on Federal personnel issued June 18, 1943, the following recommendation was made:

"That a 300,000 reduction in personnel be promptly carried out by all departments and agencies of the Federal Government. The committee believes that much further reduction can be safely effected without interference with the war effort, by a firm determination in all branches of the Government to eliminate all unnecessary personnel. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget can effect much of this reduction through an effective use and execution of the authority and power contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment in the Overtime Pay Act (sec. 11, Public Law 49, 78th Cong., approved May 7, 1943). This power applies to all employees in the classified service comprising over one-half of the total Federal civilian personnel. In the remaining half the proper officials in charge shall take the necessary steps to effect all possible reductions of personnel. It is of course realized that this reduction cannot be made on a uniform basis as some agencies can afford a greater reduction than others."

The committee did not designate where the reductions were to occur, because it believed that those decisions should be made by the various departments and agencies in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. However, at this time the committee desires to point out with particularity where some of the personnel could be eliminated without injury to the war program. This would release vital manpower for war work and increase over-all efficiency.

Liquidation of the following five agencies have either been ordered by the Congress or recommended by the committee, and should result in the reduction of large numbers of Federal personnel:

Work Projects Administration: The committee recommended the liquidation of this agency in December 1941. The President ordered its liquidation on December 4, 1942. At the time the committee issued its first personnel report latest statistics, which were for March 1943 showed that the Work Projects Administration had on its pay rolls 2,665 administrative employees. Latest figures which are for September 1943, show that there are now 181 administrative employees, engaged in liquidating the Work Projects Administration.

National Youth Administration: In December 1941 and again in May 1943, the committee recommended the abolition of this agency. In the Labor-Federal Security Appropriations Act for 1944 the National Youth Administration was ordered to liquidate. At the time the committee issued its first personnel report latest statistics, which were for March 1943 showed that the National Youth Administration had 10,588 employees. By June the employees of the National Youth Administration numbered 12,604. However, by September the National Youth Administration had 1,370 employees.

Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation: On March 11, 1943, the committee recommended the abolition of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Testimony pre-

sented to the committee on February 19, 1943, indicated that the services of about 3,000 employees were required for this program.

Farm Security Administration: In December 1941, the committee recommended the abolition of the Farm Security Administration. At the time the committee issued its first personnel report latest statistics, which were for May 1943, showed that the Farm Security Administration had 17,090 employees, excluding committeemen. Because of a reduction in its appropriation for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, the Farm Security Administration has eliminated 5,029 employees.

Civilian Conservation Corps: In December 1941 the committee recommended the abolition of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Labor-Federal Security Appropriations Act of 1943 provided for the liquitation of this agency. At the time the committee issued its first personnel report latest statistics, which were for March 1943, showed that the Civilian Conservation Corps had 618 employees. Latest information shows that the Civilian Conservation Corps had five employees on its pay roll in September 1943.

Thus, since the committee's first personnel report 33,961 employees should have been eliminated from the Federal pay rolls through the liquidation of the above agencies. Actually, only 17,344 of these employees have been eliminated.

In considering appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 the activities of the following agencies were either curtailed or entirely eliminated by the Congress: Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, National Resources Planning Board, Board of Legal Examiners, and the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information. This congressional action should have further reduced the number of Federal personnel by about 2,000 employees.

War and Navy Departments: In its first personnel report the committee furnished statistics which showed the number of civilian personnel in the War and Navy Departments in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service (hereinafter referred to as the clerical category). These figures show that in the Navy Department there is 1 civilian employee in this category for every 5 other civilian employees (mechanical, professional, etc., engaged in direct mechanical war production). However, in the War Department the ratio between civilian employees in the clerical category and those civilian employees in other categories is 1 to 2. The committee believes that from the standpoint of sound personnel management the differences between the War and Navy Department in this respect are too great. There are not sufficient extenuating circumstances to warrant the War Department's having one-third of its civilian employees in the clerical category. The committee wishes to point out that in this discussion military and naval personnel doing this type of clerical, administrative, and fiscal work have not been included. Making due allowances for the relative sizes of the two branches of the armed forces, and considering the large number of military personnel assigned to clerical, administrative, and fiscal duties, it is not unreasonable to require the War Department to decrease the ratio of civilian clerical employees to those civilian employees actually directly engaged in war work, so that there is only one clerical civilian employee for every other three civilian employees engaged in direct mechanical war production. This means that the War Department should reduce the number of its civilian employees in the clerical category from 457,764 to 307,764, or a reduction of 150,000 employees.

Up to this point in this report the committee has pointed out with particularity how Federal civilian personnel should have been reduced by 185,961 employees since the date of the first personnel report. At most, these are only minimum reductions. These reductions in personnel have been accomplished in part, but not as completely and promptly as desired by the committee.

The attention of the committee has been directed repeatedly to examples of waste in the utilization of existing personnel in almost every agency of the Federal Government. Reckless and excessive hiring of personnel predicated upon the assumption that sometime in the future work would be provided is the rule rather than the exception.

Overestimation of personnel for existing work needs is still another miscalculation made by Government agencies. There are a few—very few—departments and agencies which have tried to solve their personnel problems by thoroughly investigating their personnel needs to determine if improved methods, reduction of red tape, and eliminating idleness, duplication, and overlapping functions would not reduce the need for personnel. The majority of the agencies recruit inexperienced employees from outside the Federal service to add to the confusion caused by the lack of a systematized and intelligent procedure which is based on fundamental businesslike and economical considerations. If the departments and agencies of the Government had attacked and will now attack the problem of useless and excessive personnel in the manner described, over-all "horizontal" reductions in all of the agencies could have been and can now be effected which will result in the elimination of at least 100,000 to 200,000 more Government employees.

Further reductions might be made were the duplicating activities among the various Federal establishments removed. For example, the committee has long advocated a complete unification of all lending activities of the Department of Agriculture, for there is no logical reason why these duplicating activities should not be eliminated at a tremendous saving in personnel and Federal funds.

There are 7 agencies aside from the Department of Labor dealing with labor problems. If the functions of the Office of Defense Transportation were placed under the Interstate Commerce Commission, an estimated saving of $2,000,000 and thousands of man-hours would be effected annually. The Federal Trade Commission and the Office of Price Administration are in many respects so closely related as to benefit by a single identity. The latest figures on the number of Federal agencies engaged in research work show that no fewer than 134 agencies and bureaus are spending money for this purpose. There are 22 agencies dealing with matters affecting the fishing industry.

An increase of 16,723 Post Office Department employees over the past year to some extent has resulted from increased amounts of nonessential penalty mail originating from the departments and agencies. Better control by the departments and agencies over their penalty mailing privileges would not only reduce Federal expenditures per se, but would result in the elimination of several thousands of Government employees engaged in duties, relating to the preparation and distribution of such unnecessary material.

Functions which formerly would have been placed under the 10 departments of the Federal Government are delegated to a complex multitude of interlocking, yet independent agencies, many of which have their own personnel, including administrative sections, information sections, budgetary divisions, procurement sections, records sections, and statistics sections thereby duplicating one another's functions at every turn.

The national emergency has undoubtedly encouraged this trend. But, on the other hand, there is every reason to fear that many of these so-called emergency agencies will attempt to perpetuate themselves after the war. Were this not the case consolidation of duplicating agencies should have already begun.

In its first personnel report the committee pointed out the manner in which personnel recruiting is duplicated. One of the principal functions of the Civil Service Commission is to investigate and to hire employees for the various Federal establishments. This it does at a cost of $57.95 per employee hired. Yet every department and agency has its own personnel officers and administrators, investigators, and experts, clerks and stenographers, who investigate, classify, and recruit employees—the very work which the Civil Service Commission is supposed to be performing.

In this portion of the report the committee has endeavored to outline specifically methods by which total Federal personnel may be reduced by at least 300,000 employees, using total personnel figures of September 1943 as a base.

These methods are:

1. Reductions in the number of personnel resulting from the liquidation of certain agencies.

2. Reduction in the number of employees in the War Department engaged in clerical duties.

3. Reduction in the number of employees in nonwar agencies.

4. Over-all reductions in personnel throughout the Federal service resulting from more efficient personnel management.

In view of the fact that Federal employment has decreased by 131,058 employees since the first personnel report, the committee observes that its recommendations have not been completely followed, and it is now forced to recommend a reduction of at least 300,000 civilian employees from the total number of employees who are on the Federal pay rolls at this time. Such a reduction would release manpower for vital war work and would also save the taxpayers about $1,000,000,000 annually.

WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that the War and Navy Departments are effecting reductions in personnel by replacing civilian employees who have been and ordinarily would be employed in certain positions by young male enlisted and commissioned personnel who are physically fit for active combat service. This is not a solution to the problem of excessive and unutilized personnel, and should be stopped immediately. Between now and the time the committee issues its next personnel report this practice will be fully investigated and all the facts will be reported to the Congress and the Nation.

The committee has requested of the War and Navy Departments the number of male commissioned and enlisted personnel below the rank of lieutenant colonel or commander between the ages of 18 and 35 years and physically fit for active combat service who are in the United States occupying positions of a clerical, administrative, fiscal, or custodial nature not directly connected with the activities of task forces, combat units, or training units.

Evidence adduced at the hearings on October 8, 1943, at which time the War Department appeared before the committee, showed that a portion of the reduction in personnel was attributable to a transfer of the management and operations of certain ordnance plants and depots, previously operated by the War Department, to private industry. This resulted in a transfer of 8,950 War Department civilian employees to the pay rolls of contractors. Other similar agreements and contracts have been entered into by the War

Department, and at the present time the War Department is assembling this information for the use of the committee so that it may be apprised of the extent to which this practice is used to show over-all reductions in civilian personnel. Since June 1943 the War Department reduced more than twice as many employees engaged in mechanical war production, a it did those engaged in clerical, administrative, and fiscal duties. The committee has never taken the position that the War Department should reduce the number of its employees engaged in actual direct mechanical war production, and it is well aware of the fact that any reduction in the number of these employees should be accompanied by a corresponding greater reduction in the number of War Department clerical, administrative, and fiscal employees.

FEDERAL MANPOWER-UTILIZATION PROGRAM

In the broad sense the success of a Federal manpower-utilization program is dependent first upon the reduction in personnel in those agencies where curtailment of activities is possible; and, second, in the transfer of Federal employees between agencies as opposed to the recruitment of employees from outside the Federal service. Also, a successful manpower-utilization program will result in the savings of millions of dollars, because it will eliminate idleness and insure the maximum utilization of each employee's working time and highest skills.

In maintaining that a cut of 300,000 employees from Federal rolls would be beneficial from the standpoint of efficiency and economy, the committee previously believed that Federal employment would be reduced through the effective execution by the departments and agencies of the First Overtime Pay Act. This has not been done. While it is true that the majority of the departments and agencies have reduced, or at least stabilized, their personnel, many have not. Moreover, the committee is unable to determine the success of the labor-utilization program in connection with the First Overtime Pay Act since the Civil Service Commission has informed the committee of the high expense involved in ascertaining the number of employees actually reduced who could have been utilized in positions filled by new employees.

Obviously it is more satisfactory to transfer employees than to recruit new ones. In addition to aiding morale and releasing idle employees from overstaffed departments and agencies, such a program is far more economical than recruiting new ones. Today the Government is paying $57.95 to place each needless new employee on the Federal pay roll. Without computing the cost of their training or their salaries, since January 1942, this expense has amounted to over $17,000,000, and is rapidly rising. Yet, today, for every employee who has been transferred through the operation of the manpower utilization program there are at least two surplus employees on the Federal pay roll who are either idle or not working more than 50 percent of the day, or whose skills are not completely utilized.

The power to institute a Federal manpower-utilization program has been given the Civil Service Commission by the all-embracing authority of War Manpower Commission Directive No. 10, several Executive orders, and the overtime-pay laws. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission indicated this when he advised the committee as follows:

"In the field of maximum utilization of manpower in the Federal service, I rely upon the United States Civil Service Commission."

Only recently, in fact a year after the issuance of War Manpower Commission Directive No. 10, and subsequent to the committee's first personnel report, has the Commission taken any affirmative action whatever to institute a few labor utilization surveys. Officials of the Civil Service Commission in justifying the inactivity of the Commission regarding this Federal manpower-utilization program, have stated that they must proceed cautiously for fear of offending departments and agencies which might then refuse to cooperate entirely in manpower-utilization surveys. The committee believes that cooperation from departments and agencies should be mandatory when not given voluntarily, and that the Commission should use all the authority at its command to reduce waste of manpower and Federal funds.

For the most part, the Commission has been content to adopt a negative attitude by initiating inquiries and making decisions only when approached by a courageous employee who desired to be of more service. Such an anomalous situation is the more reprehensible when War Manpower Commission officials state that their own manpower-utilizations surveys receive "very high cooperation" from private industry at the very time that the Civil Service Commission, charged by the War Manpower Commission with the responsibility of administering the Federal personnel-utilization program, is found lacking the cooperation of and refusing to exercise authority over the various Federal departments and agencies.

The American people at this time, more than ever before, have a right to expect that their Government will not waste manpower, and that every measure will be adopted to eliminate superfluous personnel. Therefore, the committee believes that the Civil Service Commission should, in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, immediately begin manpower-utilization surveys, whether connected with a request for additional personnel or not, throughout the entire Government service and by February 1, 1944, report their findings to the President and the Congress. The committee calls upon every department and agency of the Government and all Federal employees to extend fullest cooperation.

RATE OF PROMOTIONS

The committee has continued its study of promotion policies in the Federal Government. Within-grade promotions are controlled now by the Mead-Ramspeck Act, Public Law 200, Seventy-seventh Congress, but between-grade promotions are not controlled by statute. Legally there can be no grade promotion unless a vacancy exists to which an employee may be promoted. The operating officials and personnel officers of the Government and the Civil Service Commission are responsible for filling these vacancies in accordance with good personnel practices. However, the committee's investigations reveal that promotion policies in certain agencies are flagrant violations of good personnel-management principles, and are wasting annually hundreds of thousands of dollars of Federal funds.

In a study embracing the 6-month period between December 1, 1942, and May 30, 1943, it was established that of 580,822 classified and per annum employees in the Government, 120,227 received full-grade promotions. This represents a 20.7 percent promotion rate over a 6-month period. (See Appendix II.)

This percentage of pay raises compares favorably to that of the long-standing departments of the Government. These departments, excluding the War and Navy Departments, have promoted 47,768 of 251,240 employees in the past 6 months. This represents a promotion rate of 19 percent in that period:

TABLE III.—*Between-grade promotion rate in departments*

Department	Promotions	Total classified and per annum	Percent
Agriculture Department	10,540	64,751	16
Commerce Department	5,576	22,547	25
Interior Department	2,561	25,598	10
Justice Department	6,450	30,650	21
Labor Department	1,327	6,078	22
Post Office Department	1,235	16,955	7
State Department	2,361	8,043	29
Treasury Department	17,718	76,618	23
Total	47,768	251,240	[1] 19

[1] Average.

One might assume that if the average promotion rate for the entire classified and per annum services was 20.7 percent and that the rate for the 8 departments was 19 percent such might be expected to be true of the entire classified service. This, however, is not the case. Four agencies report grade promotions of over 40 percent of their employees in 6 months. Nine other agencies report grade promotions of between 30 and 40 percent. The list follows:

TABLE IV.—*Agencies with high between-grade promotion rates*

Agency	Promotions	Total classified and per annum employees	Percen
Central Administrative Services, Office for Emergency Management	2,672	5,659	47
Office of Strategic Services	632	1,477	43
Liaison Office, Office for Emergency Management	5	12	42
Railroad Retirement Board	686	1,632	42
National Labor Relations Board	320	816	39
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	240	658	36
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	6	18	33
Office of Scientific Research and Development	177	545	32
Government Printing Office	464	1,446	32
Administrative Office of United States Courts	32	99	32
National War Labor Board	507	1,640	31
Office of War Information	1,111	3,603	31
Office of Censorship	3,650	12,061	30
National Youth Administration	3,157	10,602	29
War Production Board	5,767	20,260	28
War Manpower Commission	995	3,675	27
Office of Civilian Defense	363	1,316	27
Selective Service System	1,109	4,250	26

The use of these percentages is based on the assumption that there are no "repeaters" counted. That is to say, a 20 percent promotion rate would indicate a complete agency-wide grade promotion in 2½ years, a 33 percent rate would indicate a complete agency-wide promotion in 1½ years. From available statistics the committee knows, however, that this frequently is not the case. Some employees are jumped four or more grades over a 2-year period. Others, as well or better qualified, wait many years for a single grade promotion. Obviously such a policy is

detrimental to the morale of the employees, hinders the effective prosecution of the war, and encourages a high rate of turn-over in personnel.

The committee finds from this and previous studies that there is no uniform intergrade promotion policy in the classified service. It believes that such a policy would prove highly beneficial to the morale of the employees in the classified service and would prove economical, in view of the inordinately high promotion rate in many agencies.

The committee further finds that the Civil Service Commission, which is ultimately responsible for approving these promotions within the departmental service, has not exercised sufficient care either in placing employees, in restricting promotions in certain agencies or in educating the operating officials of all departments and agencies into administering a uniform promotion policy, and believes that the Civil Service Commission should do so in the future.

Until very recently in order to expedite personnel actions the Civil Service Commission had in effect delegated its authority over promotions and reassignments to the various departments and agencies by operation of departmental Circular No. 257, revision No. 2, dated April 13, 1943. The standards prescribing length of Federal service required of an employee before promotion were very liberal. A department or agency, without prior approval of the Commission, could promote its employees on the following bases: At least 30 days' service for a promotion of less than $300 per annum, at least 6 months' service for a promotion of between $300 and $599 per annum, and at least 1 year of service for a promotion of $600 or more. However, the Civil Service Commission's order stated that the standards prescribing length of service and qualifications could be waived by the departments and agencies when in the opinion of the operating officials and personnel officers such action was warranted.

From the committee's investigations and analyses it is believed that a promotion rate above $600 per annum for any Federal employee in the same 12 months is extravagant and conducive to poor morale among the rest of the employees. Therefore, the committee believed that no exceptions to the above standards should have been allowed without complete investigations by the Civil Service Commission, and that decisions in connection therewith should have been made after all other promotion actions had been taken by the Commission.

The committee notes with approval that recently the Civil Service Commission has taken certain remedial steps to review promotion requests, and now requires that the Commission make a prior determination in each case. This is a step in the right direction. However, at the same time, the committee observes that the length-of-service and qualifications standards for promotion have been relaxed. The committee opposes such a policy, and believes that the standards pertaining to length of service laid down in the Commission's order of April 13, 1943 (see above), are sufficiently liberal, and that any further relaxation of these standards encourages waste.

NEW PERSONNEL REPORTING SYSTEM TO SAVE OVER $10,000,000

Mention was made in the first personnel report of the necessity of completely overhauling the present antiquated personnel reporting system. Having initiated the procedure for the new reporting system, the committee intends to continue its insistence that such a logical policy be instituted. It believes that the new system, if vigorously carried out by those in position to make it effective, will be of inestimable value in placing personnel and fiscal statistics of the Federal Government on a sound and concise basis for the first time in history. Advantages are obvious. It is estimated that the savings involved will amount to over $10,000,000 a year. In addition many fewer employees will be needed to perform personnel work. Consequently it is hoped that the new system will not be opposed on the grounds that it may involve partial loss of authority over groups of employees no longer needed in personnel statistics.

The committee is pleased to state that according to latest assurances from the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, the new system as advocated by the committee is being evolved and may be in actual operation by the beginning of 1944.

The necessity for a new personnel-reporting system is not difficult to see. Many representatives of the various departments have concurred in the belief that the present system is of little practical value. Representatives of the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the War Manpower Commission, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Members of Congress, needing personnel information, have been forced to make their own investigations. Obviously the present report does not meet the required need.

In attempting to secure definite information on personnel, the committee found no uniform classification system is at present in use in the Federal Government, approximately half of the employees being ungraded, i. e., unclassified. The committee further learned that it was impossible to secure information on employment on a job-title basis, there being no occupational breakdown of employees in the Federal Government. In other words, no one knew how many typists, how many engineers, how many economists, etc., were employed by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, the present system provides no adaptable method of securing information as to where Federal employees are located. When such information is desired manual effort, involving great expense, is the only recourse. The committee believes that such information would be invaluable at the present time of manpower shortage, and envisions a future of Federal civilian employment demobilization when such need will be imperative.

Other difficulties with the present system are evident. The committee found that it does not require an adequate break-down of personnel in the departments and agencies by which study may be made of trends within large employee groups. Again in some cases figures given are only estimates within 5 or 10 percent. In one agency the committee was told that the number of employees is arrived at by dividing pay-roll figures by an average wage. Field offices are dilatory or find it impossible to give figures as of dates requested. Sometimes there is a lag of 6 months before reports from continental United States are accumulated. Some offices have no permanent records at all but can give figures only as of today.

Through this new system, information regarding such personnel statistics as sex, age, occupations, geographic distribution, classification, grade, pay, service record, retirement record—all these will be readily available. As indicated, the proposed system envisages a complete roster of all Federal personnel based on actual occupational classifications in addition to such other information as may be deemed necessary.

By use of a card punch tabulation by a central servicing agency, a complete classification system may be set up based upon the schematic outline formulated by the Civil Service Commission. In this way a truly adequate break-down of jobs will be secured. Although this classification will include thousands of job designations, the tabulating machinery to do this is already in use in Government agencies. Not only will information become available as to present classified employees, but description of industrial positions—skilled and unskilled—will be made available.

The new personnel reporting system must, as far as is humanly possible, meet the present needs and such future needs as may be foreseen for all branches of the Federal Government. Such a report, required monthly by the Civil Service Commission, should contain all personnel information necessary to the various branches of the Government. The agencies themselves should be made aware of this and should be authorized and required to expedite issuance of such reports at stated intervals. The savings in curtailment of duplication of effort offset any expense incurred, any strain upon manpower or time, and any initial confusion always present when a new system is inaugurated.

PERSONNEL REPORTS TO THE COMMITTEE

Until such time as this system becomes effective each department and agency of the Federal Government should make every effort to comply with the request of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to submit monthly personnel and pay-roll reports by the 6th of each succeeding month. Some fail to do this.

Although the committee recognizes difficulties in some instances in securing information from distant field offices, it believes that, after 8 months of operation, the reporting machinery for each Federal establishment should be so adjusted as to meet this demand on time. The committee, therefore, expects each Government establishment to cooperate in securing this information and calls attention to title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Seventy-seventh Congress, which empowers the committee to expect such cooperation.

EFFECT OF OVERTIME PAY LAWS

(Public Law 821, 77th Cong., and Public Law 49, 78th Cong.)

Information was furnished the committee by the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget in the form of progress reports which reflect the true effect of the orders by the Bureau of the Budget in its attempt to reduce Federal civilian personnel, in connection with the first overtime pay law which extended from December 1, 1942, to April 30, 1943. These statistics reveal that the Bureau of the Budget failed to reduce the number of personnel in all departments and agencies who were subject to the provisions of the First Overtime Pay Act.

The committee believes that in the execution of the Second Overtime Pay Act the Bureau of the Budget should place limitations upon all civilian personnel subject to the provisions of the Second Overtime Pay Act in every department and agency.

The committee will more fully discuss the effects of the First and Second Overtime Pay Acts in a future report devoted entirely to that subject.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In June 1943, when the committee issued its first personnel report there were 3,095,463 paid Federal civilian employees, or approximately 90,000 more employees than in April, which was the latest month for which figures were then available. Today, the latest figure, which is for September, shows that there are 2,964,405 paid Federal civilian employees, of which 52.2 percent are not engaged in direct mechanical war production. Therefore, the committee finds that some progress has been made in reducing Federal employment, but not to the extent to which the committee finds is possible. Had it not been for a reduction of 139,968 employees in the War Department between June and September there would have been a net increase in the entire Federal service during that period of 8,910

employees. Further, the fact that the departments and agencies have requested that 180,000 additional employees be furnished them by the Civil Service Commission shows that not all the departments and agencies are attempting to eliminate personnel.

2. Statistics furnished the committee by the Civil Service Commission relative to reductions in the number of Federal personnel which have been effected by the Bureau of the Budget under authority contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment to the First Overtime Pay Act show that while one-fourth of Federal employment was being reduced by 16,535, the other three-fourths of the Government service was being increased by 211,476, resulting in a net increase of 194,941 employees.

3. The committee observes that the Bureau of the Budget did not reduce the number of personnel in many agencies to whose employees the First Overtime Pay Act applied, and also that in those departments and agencies where limitations were placed upon the number of personnel, certain categories of employees subject to the act were excluded.

4. The committee finds that the Government's failure to produce a completely effective manpower utilization and war-transfer program, which is administered by the Civil Service Commission, has resulted from the failure of the departments and agencies to coordinate properly their personnel activities. It costs, on the average, at least $57.95 to recruit, place, classify, and investigate a new Federal employee. This is wasted money when it is seen that thousands of new employees are being constantly recruited to fill positions which could be filled by employees already on the pay roll.

5. Statistics compiled by the committee show that in some agencies there is an unreasonably high between-grade promotion rate. During a 6-month period from December 1942 to May 1943, it was found that in the entire classified service 20.7 percent of the employees received at least one full grade promotion. Eight old line departments showed a similar rate of grade promotions—19.0 percent. However, 4 agencies show a grade-promotion rate above 40 percent, and 13 at or above 30 percent. These studies, plus those in the committee's first personnel report, show that many employees in the upper salary ranges are jumped four or more grades in a 2-year period or less, while other employees, as well qualified, wait many years for a single grade promotion.

6. The committee finds that there is a lack of coordination and cooperation between the various departments and agencies in supplying each other with information relative to new methods adopted to save manpower and Federal funds.

7. The committee finds that one of the reasons why the Civil Service Commission has been unable to execute a more effective manpower utilization program in the Federal Government is that the Commission is proceeding hesitantly since it believes a more authoritative approach would result in a hostile and noncooperative attitude on the part of the departments and agencies.

8. The committee finds that preliminary steps have been taken to institute a more economical and efficient Federal personnel reporting system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The committee still recommends that a reduction of at least 300,000 paid Federal employees be promptly carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and that the following methods be used to effect these personnel reductions:

(a) Immediate elimination of all personnel in those agencies or parts of agencies which have been ordered to liquidate as soon as possible.

(b) A reduction of at least 150,000 employees in the clerical category (clerical, administrative, and fiscal service) now employed by the War Department.

(c) A drastic curtailment in the number of employees in those agencies or parts of agencies engaged in nonwar, duplicating, and overlapping activities.

(d) Over-all reductions in personnel of from 100,000 to 200,000 paid employees throughout the entire Federal service, resulting from more efficient personnel management.

When the committee issued its first personnel report in June it recommended a reduction of 300,000 employees, believing that there were 3,008,519 Federal civilian employees. Later figures showed that there were actually 3,095,463 Federal employees that month. Therefore the recommendation should have been a reduction of at least 390,000 employees. Since June, the all-time peak month for Federal employment, and the month in which the first personnel report was issued, there has been a reduction of 131,058 Federal employees.

The committee is aware that in bringing these wasteful and extravagant personnel practices to the attention of the Congress and the Nation there has resulted a corresponding reaction in the executive branch of the Government. This reaction has taken the form of a slower rate of recruiting new employees, of an actual reduction of 131,058 in the number of Federal personnel.

2. Since the execution of the Byrd-Langer amendment in the First Overtime Pay Act did not result in reducing over-all Federal employment, the committee recommends that the Bureau of the Budget intensify its efforts to effect major reductions in Federal personnel by use of the authority contained in the Byrd-Langer amendment to the Second Overtime Pay Act, which is in addition to the Bureau's power to establish reserves in any department or agency where funds already appropriated by Congress are not needed.

3. The committee recommends that in executing the Second Overtime Pay Act the Bureau of the Budget place definite limitations upon the number of personnel which may be employed in all departments and agencies to whose employees overtime compensation is provided, and that no category of employees be excepted unless excluded from the provisions of the act.

4. The committee recommends that the Civil Service Commission in executing its obligations under the Second Overtime Pay Act make certain that not a single new employee is recruited for a position which could be filled by an employee who is being released.

5. The committee recommends that a more uniform, equitable, and economical between-grade promotion policy be instituted immediately in all the departments and agencies, and that the Civil Service Commission in the future refuse to allow any exceptions to the standards prescribed by it in Departmental Circular No. 257, revision No. 2, dated April 13, 1943.

6. The committee recommends that all new methods and procedures, developed by any department or agency to save manpower and Federal funds, be transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget or to the Civil Service Commission for dissemination, where applicable, throughout the entire Federal Government.

7. The committee recommends that the Civil Service Commission, in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, immediately proceed to institute manpower utilization surveys throughout the entire Federal Government with a view toward reducing and more fully utilizing personnel in all departments and agencies in keeping with the purpose of War Manpower Commission Directive No. 10, and by February 1, 1944, report their findings to the President and to the Congress. To avoid the necessity of adding employees for these investigations, it is recommended that the Investigations Division of the Civil Service Commission be used for this purpose.

8. The committee recommends that measures be adopted to install the new Federal personnel reporting system so that it will be in full operation by January 1944.

(Due to the illness of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., he was unable to join in the presentation of this report, therefore it does not necessarily represent his views.)

NOVEMBER 18, 1943.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 12, in which you request my comments, suggestions, and approval of an additional report on Federal personnel.

As I stated in my letter of June 12, in connection with the committee's first report, I am in accord with the committee's views that the tremendous expansion in Federal personnel is a cause of serious concern, but it is my belief that it is not an opportune time to undertake drastic and far-reaching changes in Government personnel. While there may be some organizations which could make substantial reductions at this time, such reductions should only be made after a careful study rather than in an arbitrary manner.

I do not agree with the general implications in the report that the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget have failed to exercise properly their assigned functions or that they are primarily responsible for many of the unfavorable personnel conditions mentioned in the report.

I am in sympathy with the committee's objectives, and except for the reservations made above, join in the committee's report.

Very truly yours,

H. MORGENTHAU, JR.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1943.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot agree with the basic philosophy of the proposed report on Federal personnel. Reduction of personnel on the basis of an arbitrary quota would necessarily impair services which the Congress, through legislation and appropriations, has declared essential.

The staffing of Government agencies must be related to the specific functions and work load of each agency as established by law or imposed by the exigencies of world-wide war. Personnel needs can be determined only by systematic investigation on the basis of comprehensive and detailed knowledge of each operation and establishment. The Bureau of the Budget endeavors constantly to reduce personnel by suggesting improvements in organization and procedure.

The manpower utilization surveys which you suggest would constitute a fruitful intensification of our present efforts; this is one of the possibilities I had in mind in my recent discussions with the appropriations committees.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

APPENDIX I.—*Between-grade promotions in executive agencies for 6-month period, December 1942 to June 1943, for classified and per annum employees*

Department	Jan. 1, 1943	Feb. 1, 1943	Mar. 1, 1943	Apr. 1, 1943	May 1, 1943	June 1, 1943	Total	Classified and per annum employment	Percent of total employment promoted
Agriculture	[1] 1,866	[1] 1,735	[1] 1,735	[1] 1,735	[1] 1,735	[1] 1,734	10,540	64,751	16
Commerce	866	964	881	909	1,000	956	5,576	22,547	25
Interior	[2] 706	313	379	419	361	383	2,561	25,598	10
Justice	1,340	1,061	1,013	1,144	1,019	873	6,450	30,650	21
Labor	117	108	85	564	202	251	1,327	6,078	22
Navy									
Post Office	342	248	271	165	104	105	1,235	16,955	7
State	256	232	144	550	679	500	2,361	8,043	29
Treasury	5,503	1,729	2,955	5,146	1,298	1,087	17,718	76,618	23
War									
Board of Economic Warfare	[1] 166	110	209	87	108	99	779	3,240	24
Bureau of the Budget	16	5	27	5	9	11	73	546	13
Office of Censorship	855	585	695	669	402	444	3,650	12,061	30
Office of Price Administration	2,277	1,872	1,595	1,528	1,167	1,941	10,680	52,680	20
Office of Strategic Services	169	52	66	115	110	120	632	1,477	43
Selective Service System	143	304	149	168	223	122	1,109	4,250	26
War Shipping Administration	135	152	106	79	99	57	628	2,902	22
National Resources Planning Board	12	19	9	5	8	6	59	280	21
Alien Property Custodian	25	27	20	53	35	49	209	1,080	19
Central Administrative Services	555	523	378	435	411	370	2,672	5,659	47
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	69	50	42	26	43	57	287	1,333	21
Economic Stabilization Board	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	17
Lend-Lease Administration	75	18	52	24	27	24	240	658	36
Liaison Office for Office for Emergency Management	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	42
Office of Civilian Defense	125	70	39	73	28	28	363	1,316	27
Office of Defense Transportation	118	117	124	104	112	80	655	4,246	15
Office of Scientific Research and Development	32	31	32	34	31	17	177	545	32
Office of War Information	296	252	107	197	97	162	1,111	3,603	31
National War Labor Board	107	128	66	89	65	52	507	1,640	31
War Manpower Commission [3]	197	150	115	208	199	126	995	3,675	27
War Production Board	1,799	1,497	1,189	538	277	467	5,767	20,260	28
War Relocation Authority	19	26	38	11	72	38	204	1,697	12
National Youth Administration	761	530	406	410	534	516	3,157	10,602	29
U. S. Employment Service	794	1,405	481	[4] 762	851	281	[5] 4,574	22,025	21
National Capital Housing Authority	12	8	6	9	5	10	50	246	20
American Battle Monuments Commission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel	1	3	0	0	2	2	8	35	23
Civil Aeronautics Board	31	2	9	16	23	6	87	305	28
Commission of Fine Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Board of Investigation and Research	7	5	2	13	0	1	28	169	17
Civil Service Commission	29	482	133	609	200	175	1,718	6,356	27
Employees Compensation Commission	16	20	12	6	1	9	64	524	12
Federal Communications Commission	109	64	118	115	47	71	524	2,151	24
Federal Deposit Insurance Commission	36	35	11	36	6	16	140	1,168	12
Federal Power Commission	29	43	15	25	29	17	158	680	23
Federal Security Agency	1,114	990	972	757	688	536	5,057	29,734	17
Federal Trade Commission	17	11	14	4	12	8	66	488	14
Federal Works Agency	456	341	298	245	231	574	2,145	20,000	11
General Accounting Office	306	549	321	352	296	246	2,160	8,534	25
Government Printing Office	95	61	74	83	74	77	464	1,446	32
Interstate Commerce Commission	39	32	46	59	32	23	231	2,298	10
Library of Congress	53	58	36	55	16	22	240	1,422	17
Maritime Commission	167	388	296	435	388	301	1,975	8,266	24
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	54	1	38	515	370	130	1,108	3,767	29
National Archives	21	25	8	8	14	8	84	368	23
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	18	33
National Gallery of Art	7	3	4	7	2	2	25	240	10
National Housing Agency	[1] 621	711	523	726	677	573	3,831	18,317	21
National Labor Relations Board	133	83	43	28	20	13	320	816	39
National Mediation Board	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	79	3
Panama Canal	388	161	169	249	745	189	1,901	6,164	32
Railroad Retirement Board	[1] 202	27	95	135	151	76	686	1,632	42
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	724	295	311	492	239	117	2,178	8,208	27
Export-Import Bank	1	0	4	0	10	0	15	55	27
Securities and Exchange Commission	59	39	54	50	37	39	278	1,319	21
Smithsonian Institution	4	6	4	7	0	3	24	408	6
Tariff Commission	16	13	16	10	4	1	60	310	19
Tennessee Valley Authority	299	893	355	717	708	367	3,339	12,364	27
U. S. Courts Administration	6	11	2	2	8	3	32	99	32
U. S. Tax Court	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	128	2
Veterans' Administration	1,266	1,476	599	471	374	455	4,641	44,228	10
Petroleum Administration for War	61	58	44	61	34	19	277	1,341	20
Total	26,213	21,269	18,341	22,560	16,845	15,059	120,227	580,822	20.7

[1] Averaged.
[2] Incomplete.
[3] Does not include Selective Service, National Youth Administration, and United States Employment Service.
[4] Average of other months.
[5] Estimated total.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by a meeting at Pendle Hill, Pa., of the National Board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, favoring the enactment of legislation to prevent inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Board of Aeronautics, Lansing, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A petition of sundry citizens of the Territory of Hawaii, praying for the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of members of the student body of Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present petitions for appropriate reference and also to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 514 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

California	40
Connecticut	20
Illinois	69
Iowa	20
Maryland	74

Minnesota	92
Ohio	5
Pennsylvania	150
Texas	3
Wisconsin	41
Total	514

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 5,365 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	175
Illinois	757
Iowa	250
Maine	17
Maryland	103
Massachusetts	1
Michigan	60
Minnesota	1,570
New Jersey	2,039
New York	49
Ohio	79
Pennsylvania	190
South Carolina	73
Texas	2
Total	5,365

GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO—RESOLUTION FAVORING PERMANENT UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution approved by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Puerto Rico, at its extraordinary meeting held November 11, 1943, at San Juan, P. R.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the island of Puerto Rico has been a Territory of the United States for 45 years; and

Whereas persons born in Puerto Rico are American citizens and loyally and cheerfully as citizens of the United States have fought for their country in two major wars and are enthusiastically cooperating with the war effore; and

Whereas the vast majority of the people residing in Puerto Rico cherish and respect their citizenship and would resist any attempt from whatever source forthcoming to change it; and

Whereas the Department of Puerto Rico of the American Legion has gone on record on her insular conventions of 1931, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1943, favoring statehood for Puerto Rico; and

Whereas Puerto Rico occupies a strategic location in any defense plan for our country especially with reference to the defense of the Panama Canal and of the east coast of the continental United States and of north and northeast coast of South America, all of tremendous importance to the national defense of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Puerto Rico:

1. That the national executive committee of the American Legion be urgently requested to go on record as favoring the permanent union of Puerto Rico with the United States, under the American flag.

2. That the national commander of the American Legion be requested to personally convey the above expressed sentiment of the American Legion to the President of the United States of America.

3. That the legislative committee of the American Legion be requested to convey the same sentiment to the Members of the Congress of the United States.

4. That the adjutant of the department of Puerto Rico be instructed to send certified copies of this resolution by air mail to the national commander of the American Legion and to the national executive committee, and that the department commander be requested and instructed to communicate directly with the members of the national executive committee to urge upon them the importance and urgency of this resolution.

PRICE CEILINGS ON CATTLE AND HOGS—SHIPMENT OF OILSEED BYPRODUCTS IN UNMIXED FORMS

Mr. BUTLER presented resolutions adopted by the South Platte (Nebr.) United Chambers of Commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, Washington, D. C.:

1. Whereas recent action by the Office of Economic Stabilization to create live price ceilings on cattle adds to the confusion already created by live price ceilings on hogs and the June roll-back on cattle prices; and

2. Whereas this action will contribute to curtailment of livestock production far below the production goals for 1944, as established by the War Food Administration and will seriously hamper food production for the war effort and be detrimental to the economic welfare of the country; and

3. Whereas livestock producers today are operating under the least favorable relationship between feed costs and livestock prices since the beginning of the present emergency and cannot sensibly plan their operations on a sound basis in the face of continual changes in administration policies which result in confusion; and

4. Whereas there is no justification for ceiling prices on live animals and the resulting use of manpower in the administration of such program with wholesale and retail ceiling prices on beef and pork: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Office of Economic Stabilization be most urgently requested to wholly rescind those parts of its recent order establishing live price ceilings on cattle and hogs, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately by the secretary of this organization to Fred M. Vinson, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Nebraska.

SOUTH PLATTE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
GEO. E. OVERTURF, *Secretary.*

To MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas many Nebraska livestock, dairy, and poultry producers are accustomed to purchasing their protein supplements, such as soybean oil meal, cottonseed meal, and linseed oil meal in unmixed forms, as they prefer to mix these supplements with home-produced feeds rather than to purchase mixed supplements of lower protein content which contain many feeds they produce at home; and

Whereas there is a fair supply of the mixed feeds but an extremely short supply of unmixed protein feeds available in this State; and

Whereas much labor in mixing and transportation could be saved by sending unmixed protein feeds to this State; and

Whereas the producers of meat, milk, and eggs are entitled to receive a percentage of the 1943 oilseed byproducts output in unmixed forms equal to the percentage distributed in unmixed forms prior to 1942: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the War Food Administrator be urged to take immediate action under the powers vested in him, to authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to make shipments of such oilseed byproducts in unmixed forms into this State; and that copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately by the secretary of this organization to Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Nebraska.

SOUTH PLATTE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
GEO. E. OVERTURF, *Secretary.*

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 18, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 1354 An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy"; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim armed services honor day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1540. A bill to amend the act relating to the construction and maintenance of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Nebraska City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1541. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of A. L. Clem against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1542. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States Naval Construction Training Center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BROOKS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRICE SUPPORTS AND SUBSIDIES ON FARM PRODUCTS—STATEMENT BY JAMES G. PATTON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have received from James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, setting forth the position of the Farmers Union with respect to price supports and subsidies on farm products.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In contrast to the intemperate demands of proinflation groups, let me call your attention, in connection with the forthcoming Senate debate on price supports and subsidies, to a reasoned and temperate statement of the problem and its solution offered at Cleveland, Ohio, on October 27 by a round table of the Food for Freedom Conference.

Mr. Murray Lincoln, executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, headed the food production round table that adopted, as part of its report, the following statement:

"Consumers should demand that farmers be assured adequate prices, using selective subsidies when necessary to keep increases from spiraling into inflation through the stages of higher consumer prices, wages, and profits. In addition, consumers should insist that, as a part of a production pattern designed to meet national needs and do our share in meeting international needs, all farmers be enlisted and equipped for maximum production by credit, war risk crop insurance, priorities on seed, feed, fertilizer, machinery and labor, along with a program of technical assistance and education. As consumers press these demands effectively, dangerous gaps of misunderstanding * * * between farmers and city people will be closed."

Mr. Lincoln's group, I submit, is to be commended for a moderate and logical statement of the principal elements of an adequate food program.

The past 2 weeks have witnessed the distressing spectacle of a coalition of packers, distributors, businessmen, cattle kings, and big farmer representatives presuming to speak for the farmers of America. In its campaign to intimidate Congress, this coalition has made it appear that farmers are a selfish, blindly grasping group that puts profit before patriotism.

I know this is not true. Farmers have sent their sons to Bataan, and to Salerno, and into the skies over Nazi Europe. I know that these farmers do not desire to squeeze families already living on meager allowances from other sons, with higher and higher living costs. I don't believe that they want to face their sons, when they return, with dollars that have been cut in half by inflation.

Those who oppose the use of selective subsidies in order to hold the line have offered no alternative. They have been asked repeatedly what they propose in lieu of the price support-subsidy program. They answer that they want "a little inflation." The answer is a contradiction in terms. If price ceilings are broken in the fashion they desire, then the country will have not a little dose of the cocaine of inflation but an overdose. We have seen lately an example of what this could mean to farmers.

In the past few days, we have seen the strange coincidence of the arrival in Washington of a horde of so-called representatives of farmers, heavily salted with middlemen, and simultaneously in the livestock-growing areas a panicky flow of livestock that has swamped the handling capacity of some markets.

This is a sample of what uncertainty, instability, disunity, and inflation can do. Misrepresentation of the Government's guarantee of price supports is primarily responsible for wild marketing, and, in some markets, for the breaks in prices below the support prices. There is no justification whatever for farmers having to sell their stock at below support prices. The Government is still paying support prices for all meat it buys, and civilians are still short of an adequate supply for their own consumption. Farmers should not be misled by scare stories circulating in their regions and in Washington.

It is just this kind of economic and moral disruption and calculated chaos that accompanies inflation. The immediate result this time has been a temporary price break which will cost producers and consumers dearly. Deliberately fomented uncertainty as to future policies and powers with respect to support prices and subsidies made the break possible. Stability can be restored by prompt action renewing the Commodity Credit Corporation without the prohibition against subsidies. Continued delay, or renewal with the subsidy prohibition, will touch off new and greater uncertainties and disruptions that will pitch us into a dizzy whirl of inflation to be followed by worse price breaks and eventual collapse of markets and employment that can bring American agriculture to 30-cent wheat and $3 hogs.

If the Congress forces on the country the inflationary policies that must inevitably result from the prohibition against subsidies now contained in H. R. 3477, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, I am afraid it must bear the responsibility for putting us on the devil's scenic railway of inflation. This is a war issue, not a 1944 political issue.

As a nation, we have temporized with inflation too long. In the present fiscal year, income payments to individuals will total, it is estimated, $152,000,000,000. Available goods and services can absorb only about $89,000,000,000, leaving $63,000,000,000. Personal taxes will reduce this by $21,000,000,000 at the present rate, leaving about $42,000,000,000, from which War bond sales may absorb about $17,000,000,000, leaving a net excess of about $25,000,000,000, very unevenly distributed, to bid up prices.

Faced with this immediate danger, selective subsidies for the double purpose of assuring farmers necessary prices and holding consumer prices stable are the only alternative to inflation. As you have already pointed out, and as President Roosevelt has emphasized, the opponents of subsidies have proposed no alternative to inflation. The conclusion is inescapable: we have the alternative of selective subsidies or inflation.

We, in the National Farmers Union, are convinced that working farmers generally prefer known markets at known fair prices, to gambling for higher and higher prices with a certainty that they will be cleaned out in the end. Such an orderly plan of all-out food production to meet war and post-war needs can be worked out, using war food production agreements equivalent to industrial war production contracts. But, in order to develop this plan or any other sensible and adequate plan, the present menace of inflation must be removed. The Government must have the authority to use subsidies when necessary in order to meet and discharge its dual responsibility for getting maximum war food production and at the same time preventing inflation. The immediate responsibility is upon the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

PROPOSED WAGE INCREASE FOR RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Archie C. Lufkin, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks and Freight Handlers, dealing with the proposed increase in the wages of railway employees by 8 cents an hour.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *November 17, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM R. LANGER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want you to do all you can to secure passage of Senate Joint Resolution 91 so we may have the meager pittance of 8 cents per hour increase that was granted us railroad employees after the long and lingering process of negotiation in compliance with all rules and laws.

I have not been able to keep my current bills paid up for several months. After such a small increase as 8 cents per hour is snatched just as we reached for it to put it into our pockets it is no wonder we "rails" are in no mood to be further kicked around.

Government agencies wink at overtime amounting to $2 to $3 per day in other industries and glibly say that it will help to bridge the gap between basic rates of pay and the increased cost of living. In the next breath they insult the intelligence of the railroad employees by just as glibly saying that our measly 64 cents per day would cause inflation and that the cost of living has only increased about 7 percent since January 1, 1941.

My grocery bill has increased about 90 percent since that date. It was between $30 and $32 per month then and now it averages $58 per month. There has been no change in the size of my family. On the other hand my oldest daughter during the past year has bought most of her noon meals at school.

Yours truly,

ARCHIE C. LUFKIN,
Card 419, Lodge 488, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks and Freight Handlers.

THE WASHINGTON SCENE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Washington Scene," delivered by him November 17, 1943, before the National Founders' Association at their convention held in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND—TELEGRAM FROM SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from him to Hon. John A. Pateracki, president of the General Pulaski Memorial Committee, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Republic of Poland, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS—ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. T. A. TERRY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Maj. Gen. T. A. Terry, commanding the Second Service Command, Governors Island, N. Y., before the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Rochester, N. Y., November 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS—ADDRESS BY JAMES L. FLY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "International Communications," delivered by Hon. James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, before the National Lawyers' Guild in Washington, D. C., on November 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE—ADDRESS BY LOTHROP STODDARD

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Lothrop Stoddard, delivered on November 21, 1943, and having to do with the Moscow Conference, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "American Precedent," written by William Philip Simms and published in the Washington News of November 18, 1943, dealing with post-war international relationships, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR POWER AND AMERICA'S AIR GENERALS

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Air Power and America's Air Generals," a résumé of a special program arranged by the American Academy of Public Affairs and the Los Angeles Breakfast Club, which appears in the Appendix.]

HULL IGNORES OMINOUS SIGN IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Hull Ignores Ominous Sign in Europe," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of November 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN STRATEGY—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republican Strategy," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of November 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIEF OF SINO-KOREAN PEOPLE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, on behalf of the Sino-Korean people, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FUTURE MERCHANT MARINE—EDITORIAL FROM COLUMBIA (S. C.) THE STATE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Future Merchant Marine" published in the Columbia (S. C.) The State, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW FRONTIER: THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST—REPLIES TO ARTICLE IN COLLIER'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Robert A. Hudson, president of Hudson-Duncan & Co., in comment on an article entitled "New Frontier: The Pacific Northwest," published in Collier's, as well as a letter by himself commenting on the same article, which appear in the Appendix.]

SACRIFICES TO COMMUNISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO AMERICAN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sacrifices to Communism," from the Chicago American of November 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR PRACTICAL TREATY OF PEACE—ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Treaty That Works After-War Need," written by Bill Cunningham and published in the Boston Herald of November 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT LANDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government Lands," from the Washington Post of November 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections I desire to make a brief statement with respect to Senate bill 1285, which is now before the Senate. It is unnecessary to make an extended statement, because copies of the bill and of the hearings, as well as the report of the committee, were distributed to all Senators last Wednesday, and I have no doubt that those who are interested in the details of the proposed legislation have familiarized themselves with those documents.

Mr. President, there are millions of our fellow citizens who have entered the armed forces and are engaged throughout the world in the bitter struggle to defend the institution of democracy. Basic to this institution in our own country is the right of qualified voters to participate in the election of their representatives to the Congress of the United States and in the election of the President and Vice President. The men and women who are most intimately engaged in this struggle should have an opportunity to exercise the right to vote which they are fighting to preserve. As individuals they deserve such opportunity. As a group they constitute such a large part of the electorate that any national election in which they did not participate could hardly be called representative.

For that reason, in the last session of the Congress, I introduced a bill in the Senate, and a similar bill was introduced at the same time in the other House, to give those in the active service of the Army and the Navy of the United States the right of absentee voting. The bill passed in spite of objections which had been made in various quarters as to some of its provisions being unconstitutional. These questions were all debated. They were decided affirmatively in the House and in the Senate, and the bill was signed by the President, and is now the law of the land.

Because of the late date when the bill was passed and because of the experience which the War and Navy Departments later had in administering the provisions of the law, which were found to be cumbersome in view of the amount of detailed attention which had to be given in administering its provisions which interfered with military operations, and because of suggestions for improvement of the law which were received from secretaries of state of the several States, it was thought wise to amend the act in a number of particulars in fact, in so many particulars that it was deemed much better to introduce a new bill as a substitute for the existing law than to enumerate a long list of amendments to the law. However, most of the fundamental substantive provisions of existing law are retained in the pending bill, although the machinery for carrying out the provisions has been rearranged so as to lighten the burden placed on the military departments of the Government, and so as to make it easier for those in the field or at sea to vote.

The ballot has been simplified, and the machinery for casting the ballot has also been simplified. In order to lighten the administrative burdens of the War and Navy Departments, it has been thought wise, as a method to accomplish that end, to set up a bipartisan commission which will attend to the administrative work of putting into effect the provisions of the bill. This will lighten the work of the War and Navy Departments greatly.

In order to facilitate the voting by individuals in the service, the ballot has been simplified so that such persons, who cannot be expected to give much time to consideration of political questions while in active service, can fill out the ballot

which they will be given the opportunity to execute, swear to it before an officer, who, under the provisions of the pending bill, may be a noncommissioned officer instead of a commissioned officer, as under the present law, seal the ballot, and have it forwarded by the commanding officer of the unit to which the soldier who executes it belongs, to his superior, and from the superior the ballots in bulk are to be shipped to the commission in Washington, which will distribute the ballots according to the provisions of the law to the various secretaries of state, who will in turn distribute them to those who do the actual counting of the ballots, to be opened on election day, and no ballot may be opened by anyone between the time the soldier executes it in the field and the time it is counted together with the other ballots, as though the individual had cast the ballot at home.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves the discussion of the War Ballot Commission, I wonder if he would be good enough to permit me to ask one or two questions. The Senator has referred to the fact that the proposed commission is to be bipartisan, composed of two Republicans and two Democrats. The Senator made no reference to what would happen if there should be a disagreement among those four partisans. Will the Senator indicate for the RECORD what would happen at that point?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, I shall be glad to do so. Answering the question of the Senator from Michigan I may say that the bill as introduced in the present session provided for a commission of five, to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, at least two of whom should be Republicans and at least two of whom should be Democrats, the fifth undesignated. It was finally thought advisable to omit the name of any political party, and, furthermore, objection having been made to the fact that the President might appoint a majority of his own party, it was thought advisable to provide simply that there should be two of the majority party and two of the minority party, and that in case of a tie, request should be made to the President to ask the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to name one of a group of higher judges to act in the dispute as the fifth member and chairman of the commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate to me why in selecting the judicial arbiter retired justices are eliminated?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I do not know. I did not make the suggestion myself. I suppose the idea was that someone was wanted who was actively engaged on the bench. Some judges retire because of old age, because they do not want to keep in touch with active affairs, because they do not want to be bothered with public duties, and if they were retired rather than active, they would be less apt to understand the point in dispute and less willing to take the responsibility of deciding it. I assume that was the reason.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In view of the possible power which the fifth member of the War Ballot Commission might exercise, particularly under subsection (c) on page 32 of the bill, I am sure the Senator will agree that the designation of a reliable and dependable fifth member of the commission for such purposes is vitally important.

Mr. GREEN. I think its importance can easily be exaggerated. The duties of the commission would be almost purely administrative, to carry out the rather detailed provisions of the bill itself. There would be very small chance, it seems to me, for the commission to exercise any partisan or any political influence. It is possible, of course, for anyone connected with the whole procedure of balloting to be biased in one way or another, but there certainly can be no intimation of partisanship under the provision which the majority of the committee has recommended, because it is well known that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is a Republican. I have entire confidence in him, and I have no objection even though the bill itself provides for his naming an arbiter; that is really what the provision is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I presume the language of the bill which provides that the President shall request the Chief Justice to act is used because we would have no authority to designate him to act; is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in view of the fact that in my opinion the selection of the arbiter goes to the very root, heart, and core of the integrity of the entire bill, as we found out under the electoral problem submitted in the Hayes-Tilden contest once upon a time, it seems to me that it is desperately important that there shall be no doubt about the fifth member of the war ballot commission. The bill as drawn hangs entirely upon the willingness of the Chief Justice to serve.

On Saturday—with some presumption, I confess—I came to the conclusion that this was of such vital concern that there ought not be any doubt, if there was any possibility of resolving the doubt, whether the Chief Justice would thus act. I therefore had the temerity to address an inquiry to him. I shall read to the Senator his reply, addressed to me, dated November 22:

> I have your letter of the 20th instant, inquiring whether the Chief Justice of the United States would be likely to honor a request that he associate himself with the administration of the proposed law for the establishment of the United States ballot commission either as its chairman or by designating its members.
>
> In response I feel free to say, for myself only, that I regard the performance of such a function as incompatible with obligations which I assumed with the office of Chief Justice, and as likely to impair my usefulness in that office. It is enough to say, without more, which might be said, that action taken by the Chief Justice in connection with the administration of the proposed legislation might become subject to review in the Court over which he presides and that it might have political implications and political consequences which should be wholly dissociated from the duties of the judicial office. For that reason and for that only, as at present advised, I should feel obliged to decline such a request if made.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> HARLAN F. STONE.

I submit that to the Senator because it seems to me that obviously the bill must be rewritten at its very heart.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may say that I myself go still further in objecting to the provision, because I doubt very much the constitutionality of any provision limiting the appointive power of the Executive. Certainly, I regard the limitation of the Executive's appointments to any small group as taking away from the President powers which the Constitution gives to him alone.

Since the language under discussion was urged as an alternative to other provisions, and since it seemed to me obviously unpartisan, for my part, I assented to it. I should be very glad to accept any constitutional provision which might be offered which would secure not only the nonpartisan action of the commission but afford assurance to the people of the country that they may have confidence in its nonpartisan action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield further to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In view of the letter from the eminent Chief Justice, it certainly becomes obvious that the language in the pending bill will have to be changed. For the Senator's information, I will suggest to him on my own account that I am prepared to move that the commission be left with four members, two Republicans and two Democratic members, with the provision that any action taken by the commission at any time shall be by a majority of the entire commission. So far as I am concerned that will be a satisfactory check against any possible fear or suspicion of political maladministration, because then in the case of every decision at least one adverse political vote will have to be cast with the majority.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator made the statement that he believed it was unconstitutional to put a limit on the appointive power of the President of the United States. Is the Senator aware that that has been done time and time again by the Congress?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I am aware of it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator also aware that laws making such provision have been enacted and are in force and have stood?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I am aware of that fact.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question about another matter. As I understand, the elections are now held under and

by the State authorities. Is there any reason the Senator knows of why a bill could not be drawn which would leave to the State authorities the performance of the work? My recollection is that there is no Federal law now governing the general elections. I do not believe there has been any complaint about elections for many years, so far as I know, certainly not about Presidential elections in the last quarter century or more. I am merely wondering why we wish at this late day to have the Federal Government take over any part of the elections in our country, even though the persons affected may be soldiers. I think it would be infinitely better to direct that the State authorities be required to perform this service. Does not the Senator think so?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the answer is that the Congress of the United States some 13 months ago passed a law under which the Federal Government made provision for voting by the members of the armed forces in the field. The law provided for the distribution of ballots, and so forth. As I said in my introductory remarks——

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not here at that time, I am sorry to say.

Mr. GREEN. The machinery was so cumbersome and the ballot so complicated that the attempt failed of its purpose. A number of soldiers in various parts of the world did vote under the provisions of that bill; but out of the millions of persons in the service who were disenfranchised by the action of Uncle Sam in drafting them or by accepting their voluntary offer of service, only some 28,000, so far as we can ascertain, voted, instead of the millions entitled to vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been informed—I do not know whether correctly or not, because I have not looked into the question—that all the States of the Union except one have provided for voting by soldiers, and that the one State which has not so provided is likely to enact a law making such provision.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is almost correct. There are two States which have no provision for absentee balloting. However, in most instances the State laws are absolutely ineffective.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I should like to finish the answer to the question raised by the Senator from Tennessee. The laws of the 46 States which have such laws are all different. The machinery is not applicable to wartime. The time consumed by the various methods of securing and casting the ballots is so prolonged that the State laws are ineffective in providing the soldiers with the opportunity to vote.

Take the State of New York as one illustration. A person otherwise entitled to vote must first request an application blank. He must send to the secretary of state a request for an application blank. The secretary of state must send it back to him. Then he must sign the application for a ballot and send it to the secretary of state. The secretary of state must then send the ballot back to him. Then the ballot must be executed and returned to the secretary of state to be counted. That procedure represents five different transactions. In this bill they are reduced to one. Of course, the time varies according to the distance away the man may be and the accessibility of the place. It has been calculated that in the Far East the procedure would require between 80 and 90 days.

Some State laws provide that the forms must be sent out within a shorter period than that. It is absolutely impracticable to conduct the balloting according to the laws of the several States. Furthermore, the heads of the War Department and the Navy Department, although they are willing to afford facilities for voting under a State law, find it almost impossible to keep track of the laws of all the States and the various provisions which must be followed. Every unit in the field must be provided with information as to the laws of all the States. The men in the service are not distributed according to geographical regions. There is no telling where a man who may be entitled to vote according to the laws of his own State may be located. The burden on the administration is just as great as though there were voting citizens from all 48 States in each unit.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on another matter?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The bill provides for commissioners to serve a term not exceeding the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. My question is, did the committee give consideration to the possibility, which has been seriously suggested, of an extended armistice period? Hostilities may cease, but the war may not be terminated. Under this provision the authority of the Commission might be projected into the future, into another election.

Mr. GREEN. I do not know how long the war will last, and I do not know how long any armistice may last; but so long as the war is not terminated, there will be hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of men away from home and unable to vote because of their service in the Army or Navy.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator means termination of the war by a treaty of peace?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. That question has been considered. It seemed only fair that those men should continue to have the right to vote if they were continued in service after the actual fighting had ceased.

I wish to emphasize again—and perhaps I shall have to do so several times in the course of this discussion—that this bill is not an original bill. It is in effect an amendment of the existing law. We have not tried to cure all the existing evils by it; we have not tried to cure all the evils connected with balloting. We have simply tried to make only such changes in the existing law as are necessary, in our opinion, so as to make it workable. We think we have at last a bill which would be workable.

We cannot guarantee that even under this bill all soldiers and sailors and others entitled to vote under it would vote. But even if they should not vote, the bill would remove any reason for charging that legislation was enacted without their consent or the consent of representatives of their choice while they were away from home and prevented from voting by reason of their service. In other words, unless this bill is passed, the charge which was made in connection with the passage of the Volstead Act may be made against all legislation enacted by Congress and signed by the President elected at the next election, or at future elections during the war, in case the war should not end before that time. For the sake of the national morale and the morale of the soldiers and sailors themselves, I hope that the bill may be promptly passed.

As compared with the existing law, the bill would enlarge the number of those who may avail themselves of the privilege of voting. It is not limited, as is the existing law, to members of the Army and Navy of the United States. It seemed unfair not to extend the same privilege to members of the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard or any of their components. Their duties are much the same. Their services have been the same. The dangers to which they are subjected are equal. In fact, I believe figures could be cited to show that the casualties among those branches of the service are as great as in the Army or Navy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator may have covered the subject before I entered the Chamber. If he did, I do not wish to have him go over it again. As a practical legal matter, I have been wondering how, no matter what our desire might be, we could overcome an impediment such as the following: I understand that some States—it is not true of my State—require that a voter exhibit his poll-tax receipt as a qualification for voting. Without for the moment saying whether that is good or bad, I am wondering if the Federal Government can permit a voter from such a State to vote if he has not paid his poll tax.

Mr. GREEN. I think there is no doubt whatever of the power to do so, under the general war powers. Such powers have in fact been exercised. The provision in this bill is not new. That is a provision of the existing law. Furthermore, it is analogous to many other laws which Congress has enacted. Congress has enacted laws interfering with many civil rights. It should be able to enact laws relating to political rights as well. In matters of litigation, one cannot proceed against a soldier in wartime as he can against a civilian. Congress has taken it upon itself to protect the soldier who is absent and cannot get home to protect his civil rights. The States and municipalities cannot collect taxes in the absence of a soldier. His property cannot

be levied upon, and mortgages cannot be foreclosed. Private contracts cannot be terminated. Such provisions are plainly constitutional. Many a decision has been rendered by the Supreme Court upholding such interference with civil rights. Such provisions would be unconstitutional in time of peace, but are constitutional in time of war. It is not that the Constitution is suspended. The Constitution provides for the Congress declaring and waging war to a successful conclusion; and it must do everything it deems necessary to that end.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not made a study of the legal questions involved, and have not looked up the decisions as I am sure the Senator and the committee considering the bill have done. But insofar as it is bottomed on the practical relativity which the Senator used to illustrate what might be done in this case, I do not think the analogy is a sound one.

For example, when a soldier is in the Army the law says that he cannot be proceeded against in a civil court to any extent which would impair his property rights and his personal rights. The liability which he had has been suspended. The law does not give him a right that he did not previously have. I am not saying that perhaps there is not a way around this situation legally, but as a matter of good law I can see a great difference between saying to a soldier, "No one shall take advantage during your absence of such rights as you had at the time you went away" and conferring upon him an extra right which he did not have when he left. It seems to me that the analogy is not a good one. There may be precedents, and cases which would be on all fours with the Senator's position. If so, I have certainly not read them, and I am not in a position to argue them legally. But I can see a great distinction between saying that a case against a soldier shall not be tried because he cannot be present, and conferring upon him a right which the law of the State had not conferred upon him at the time he went into the service. One is a sort of ex post facto proposition, and the other is one in future, so to speak.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. Perhaps I should first answer the question, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado.

I may say that this bill would not create any new interference with State law. The existing law, which was enacted a year ago, interfered with it in only two respects, both of them relating to conditions of voting. One was with reference to registration, and the other was with reference to the payment of a poll-tax. That does not mean that a soldier is relieved of the obligation to pay the tax. It simply means that the fact he has not paid the tax and has not registered shall not be used against him in his exercise of the fundamental citizenship right of voting. The collection of the tax is merely suspended. That is because the United States Government has taken those men and prevented them from doing those very things. The Government does not mean to take away from the man any more than it has to of his right to vote, but it has made it impossible for him to comply with certain conditions which the State laws have made preliminary conditions of his right to vote. So we are not taking away anything. Or, if we have taken anything away we are simply restoring to him a right which he already had. If he had remained at home he would have had that right. Being away, and not being able to comply with the conditions, he should not have the right taken away from him. We should simply waive the conditions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we may carry further the analogy which the Senator has pointed out, there are two things which seem to me to disprove the position he has taken. For example, if the soldier had not gone away he would have had the right to vote provided he had paid his poll tax. If there were no poll tax I can see how the Federal law might come in. But it is somewhat difficult for me to reason out legally how the Federal Government can set aside a legal qualification of the State, such qualification being of itself not a right, but a limitation on a right. There may be a way around it. Merely as a theory I might suggest that the Federal Government pay the poll tax of everyone in the service—$2, $1, or $3 a head, or whatever the tax may be. Then the Federal Government should tax those payments so that it could recover all of it into the Treasury. At least that would put the States in a position in which the law would be complied with, and the State's rights, so-called, or the State's responsibility, or prerogatives would not be set aside or invaded.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

Mr. GREEN. I should like to first answer the Senator from Maryland, and then I shall be glad to yield.

In answer to the Senator from Maryland, there are numerous illustrations which seem to me to be analogous, and I am sure he will find some of them to be so in his opinion. I had prepared—and perhaps I might as well use it now as at any other time—a list of a number of them. In order to get them into the RECORD I should like to state them now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I had no disposition to divert the Senator from the thread of his argument. So far as I am concerned, if he will put his list of citations in the RECORD it will be the equivalent of relating it. I wished only to know what his citations were.

Mr. GREEN. The same question may have arisen in the minds of other Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate and of the Senator from Maryland to section 2 of the existing law, being Public Law 712 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Section 2 reads as follows:

> No person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

That is the law at the present time. It is for the emergency only. I take it that is primarily the reason why only five Senators voted against this provision in August or September, 1942, when it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I think I should answer the Senator's question before we go to other bypaths.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to conduct any debate on the question, but since the Senator from Illinois has read the law on the subject I am more convinced than ever that that law is not good law, even though Congress enacted it. The mere passage of a law by Congress does not make a bad law a good one. If it does not have a legal foundation it is not good. It is void ab initio. I should like to see the imperfections eliminated, but it would be a fallacy to assume that all we have to do in order to eliminate an imperfection is to enact a law.

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I am making is that the question was rather thoroughly debated in September 1942 on the floor of the Senate. Only five Senators voted against this provision at that time. The Senator from Maryland voted for the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may have voted for the bill, Mr. President; but I have voted for many bills, as has every other Senator, without having been on the committee or having had the privilege of hearing all the debate. Many such bills are better drawn than was the one which was passed on the occasion to which the Senator refers. I was willing to give the soldiers the benefit of the doubt on the vote, on the theory that the bill went as far as it could go. My purpose is not to block the proposed legislation if the bill would carry out the purpose which the Senator from Illinois has in mind; but the question is whether we are carrying out that purpose by passing the bill in the shape in which I understand it to be.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may have one further word——

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The poll tax issue is now before the Judiciary Committee. I understand that sooner or later it may be brought to the floor of the Senate. But undoubtedly those who are definitely opposed to the poll-tax measure becoming the fundamental law of the land—as many Members of the Senate are—did

not see fit 2 years ago to take the same position with respect to the poll-tax measure as it related to the soldiers of this war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I am somewhat afraid if the Senator from Maryland continues I shall forget his original question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I desire to ask one more question. I think the poorest argument in the world that can be made for or against anything is to say that 5 years ago such-and-such a proposition was under consideration and one either favored it or opposed it. That is not the question here. The question here is this: Is the vehicle which is now before the Senate sufficiently strong and legally constructed to carry the load which the Senate has in mind, which is to give the soldiers the vote. In my opinion, the vehicle which was provided 2 years ago, as I recall——

Mr. GREEN. One year ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. One year ago, to which the Senator from Illinois refers, was rather in the nature of a repair job, made up of generalities rather than legal precepts carefully engrafted into the law itself. I am not taking issue with the Senator's viewpoint that it would be a desirable thing to let the soldiers vote. Frankly, I should like to see it done; I would even go so far as to say I believe I would favor a constitutional amendment eliminating the poll tax, which is utterly different from a law of Congress proposing to do something which Congress may not have the power to do. That is all my point is.

Mr. GREEN. To continue my own thought, if I may resume the floor, I wish to emphasize the fact that this provision which is now the present law has nothing to do with the constitutionality of the poll tax anywhere. It is perfectly logical for anyone who voted for it a year ago to vote for it now, and still oppose the repeal of the poll tax. This bill has nothing whatever to do with that. The question is simply whether the collection of such a tax from men in the armed services in time of war can be used to prevent their voting; that is all.

Now for the analogies if I may answer the question of the Senator, who asked me for analogous cases. I should not like to put them in the RECORD without reading, for I am afraid the Senator from Maryland might not have time to read the RECORD, and so if he will bear with me with his presence here in the Chamber, although it is almost lunch time, I shall be glad to cite him certain provisions of law which it seems to me to be analogous and to prove that the Congress has a right to legislate on these matters as it sees fit, and, during the war, it is constitutional for the Congress to do so.

I shall not read, but shall put in the RECORD the references to the laws in order to save time and help to clarify the statement.

Among the laws which have been passed by the Congress under its war powers are the following:

First. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940—the act of October 17, 1940, chapter 888, 54 Statute 1178, title 50, U. S. C., section 51, Appendix—provides for the stay of any action or proceeding in any court in which a person in military service is involved either as plaintiff or defendant during the period of military service or within 60 days after military service is completed. Stays may be ordered for as long as the period of military service and 3 months thereafter.

The act also provides for the exclusion of the period of military service in the running of the statute of limitations relating to any action by or against any person in military service whether the cause of action accrued prior to or accrues during the period of military service.

Both those provisions would be unconstitutional in peacetime; they are constitutional in wartime.

The same law forbids eviction or distress in respect of any premises whose rent is less than $80 per month occupied by any dependent of a person in military service except upon leave of court. Unless the ability of the tenant to pay the rent is not materially affected by military service, eviction or distress proceedings must be stayed.

Furthermore, comparable provisions apply to installment contracts for purchase of property and to mortgages upon real or personal property. Sale of property to enforce the collection of taxes or assessments is also forbidden, except upon leave of court.

I think that is closely analogous, and both those provisions, while they would be unconstitutional in peacetime, are constitutional in wartime.

Second. The censorship law (sec 303 of the First War Powers Act, 55 Stat. 840, title 50, U. S. C., sec. 618, appendix), authorizes the President during time of war to cause to be censored under such rules and regulations as he prescribes any communication passing between the United States and any foreign country. That would be unconstitutional in peacetime; it is constitutional in wartime.

Third. The requisition laws (the act of October 16, 1941, 55 Stat. 742, title 50, U. S. C., sec. 721 appendix), authorize the President during time of war under certain conditions to requisition materials needed for the defense of the United States.

Fourth. The Priorities Statute—section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 56 Statutes 177, United States Code, title 50, section 633 appendix—authorizes the President to grant priorities in the delivery of material under Army and Navy contracts over all deliveries for private account or for export.

Those provisions would be unconstitutional in peacetime; they are constitutional in wartime.

Fifth. The law providing for internment of enemy aliens—Revised Statutes, section 4067; 40 Statutes 531, United States Code, title 50, section 21—authorizes the arrest and internment of enemy aliens.

Sixth. Seizure of enemy property—Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 as amended by section 301 of the First War Powers Act—provides for the vesting of any property or interest of any enemy country or national in the United States.

Seventh. Punishment for Violation of Orders of Military Authorities—Public, No. 503, of Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 21, 1942. This act provides criminal penalties for anyone who shall enter, remain in, leave, or commit any act in any military area prescribed, under authority of an Executive order of the President, by the Secretary of War or an authorized military commander contrary to the restrictions applicable to that area or the order of the military commander.

In *Hirabayashi* v. *United States*, October term, 1942, No. 870, the Supreme Court sustained the constitutionality of this statute under the war powers and the validity of a curfew ordered thereunder for persons of Japanese ancestry on the west coast, including American citizens. That goes much further than the instance we were discussing. In discussing the war power Chief Justice Stone said:

> The war power of the National Government is "the power to wage war successfully." (See Charles Evans Hughes, War Powers Under the Constitution, 42 A. B. A. Rep. 232, 238.) It extends to every matter and activity so related to war as substantially to affect its conduct and progress. The power is not restricted to the winning of victories in the field and the repulse of enemy forces.

Eighth. The Wartime Prohibition Act of the First World War. This, I know, will appeal to the Senator from Maryland:

> The act of November 21, 1918 (40 Stat. 1045) (approved 10 days after the armistice with Germany), provided that after a given date and "until the conclusion of the present war and * * * the termination of demobilization * * * for the purpose of conserving the manpower of the Nation, and to increase efficiency in the production of arms, munitions, ships, food, and clothing for the Army and Navy, it shall be unlawful to sell for beverage purposes any distilled spirits, and during said time no distilled spirits held in bond shall be removed therefrom for beverage purposes except for export * * *."
>
> A similar prohibition was applied to the sale for beverage purposes of "beer, wine, or other intoxicating malt or vinous liquor."
>
> By the Volstead Act of October 28, 1919 (enacted over the President's veto—before the effective date of the eighteenth amendment), it was provided that "intoxicating liquor" means "any beverage containing one-half of 1 percent or more of alcohol by volume."
>
> This legislation was sustained by the Supreme Court under the war power—as a war measure (*Hamilton* v. *Kentucky Distilleries Co.*, 251 U. S. 146; *Jacob Ruppert* v. *Caffey*, 251 U. S. 264), though the eighteenth amendment makes clear that constitutional change was needed to authorize such legislation in time of peace.

But in time of war it was constitutional.

> In sustaining the legislation the Supreme Court rested solely on the power of the Congress to "increase war efficiency" and to adopt measures thought to be necessary for the attainment of that end.

If such a measure as the Volstead Act could be sustained as constitutional by the Supreme Court, how about doing away with the collection of a poll tax in the interest of enlisted men who have been taken away and prevented by the war from paying it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I rose to my feet because I thought I understood the Senator to say awhile ago that during wartime the Constitution may be suspended.

Mr. GREEN. No; quite the contrary. I never made any such statement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. GREEN. I am merely saying that it is constitutional to do things in wartime, under the provisions of the Constitution itself, as construed by the Supreme Court, which would not be constitutional in peacetime.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In other words, when we are in war, certain wartime powers expressly stated in the Constitution come into effect.

Mr. GREEN. They are not all expressly stated, but they are expressed or implied in the Constitution of the United States as construed by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator agree with me that if they are implied, they are implied from something which is expressly stated?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So that, after all, we have a constitutional question. In peacetimes we have to look to certain parts of the Constitution which are normal to peacetime. In wartime we have to consider those parts of the Constitution which come into effect in wartime, and there may be a problem of reconciling peacetime provisions with wartime provisions. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. GREEN. I agree with the Senator, with the added statement that under the Supreme Court decisions wartime necessities have priority over peacetime necessities.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should not wish to go all the way along with that. I imagine that there are some provisions of the Constitution which cannot be impaired even in wartime. The Senator has cited a case in which we have restricted the movements of American citizens of Japanese ancestry. But before doing that, we have to set up a war area which in theory is subject to invasion, and in that kind of an area it is conceivable that the rights of an American citizen who might not have Japanese ancestry could be curtailed in manners different from curtailments which would be valid in peacetime.

My point is that there are war powers set forth in the Constitution which do not override peacetime provisions of the Constitution except in certain cases where there are certain foundations for that kind of action.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from Colorado is entirely correct, and the basis for the proposed action is that the Government has practically taken away from the men in the armed services who are fighting for their country overseas or in this country, it does not matter which, the fundamental right of voting, which, so far as it can be consistent with military necessity, should be restored to them. Throughout the bill will be found over and over again the statement that these things must be done, but not if inconsistent with the requirements of the military situation.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator give me information as to what was the reason behind the extension of the voting privilege, with exemption from payment of poll tax and exemption from the necessity of registration, to all officers and employees of the United States who happened to be outside the United States?

Mr. GREEN. That is because their situation seemed to be like that of men in the armed services. The secretary of a legation abroad, wherever he may be in the world is nowadays largely engaged in war work. Other civilians are sent overseas in connection with war work. It does not apply to everyone who is doing voluntary work; it applies to those in the employ of the United States, or whose work is associated with that of the armed forces.

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator will yield further, it applies to those who are attached to or are serving with the armed forces, or any other officers or employees, whether connected with the armed forces or not.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct, because they are doing war work, although they are not connected with the armed forces. In other words, they may not be under the absolute control of the War Department or the Navy Department, or even of the Maritime Commission, but they are engaged in war work. They may be employees of the United States Government overseas, building highways, building docks, doing we cannot tell what.

Mr. GILLETTE. But irrespective of whether they are connected with war work or not, they come under this authority?

Mr. GREEN. There is hardly any employee of the United States who is not now engaged in war work. That is the theory.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. A question has been raised regarding the constitutionality of the poll-tax provision. Of course, there are other grounds upon which it has been held, and there are legal opinions to that effect before the Committee on the Judiciary, that a poll tax may be abolished by act of Congress. What worries me more about this subject than anything else is the question whether there is any power in Congress to deal with the method of choosing Presidential electors. There is nothing in the Constitution, so far as I can find, which authorizes Congress to deal with the selection of Presidential electors. The provision which gives Congress the right to regulate the method of election of Representatives and Senators does not mention Presidential electors, nor does any other provision of the Constitution mention Presidential electors. So that I wonder whether the Senator is claiming the right of Congress to make the proposed enactment from the Constitution, or from the war powers to which he has been referring.

Mr. GREEN. I think that the considerations which sustain the application of the bill to the election of Presidential electors are similar to those in connection with the application of the bill to the election of Senators and Representatives, although the provisions in the Constitution are separate. The provisions relating to Presidential elections are treated in article II, section 1, of the Constitution, and the sections are as follows:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Next:

> The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think that, since one provision says that Congress may choose the time, whereas the other provision says they may determine the time, place, and manner of choosing Representatives and Senators, it is clearly implied that Congress is not given the power to determine in any way the place or the method of choosing presidential electors?

Mr. GREEN. No, I do not think that is a justifiable deduction.

Mr. TAFT. Why not? No express authority of any kind is given anywhere in the Constitution for Congress to deal in any way with the selection of presidential electors. I wonder whether the Senator from Rhode Island is relying solely on the war powers for those provisions or whether he thinks there is something in the Constitution which would authorize the Congress to act.

Mr. GREEN. As I understand the argument of the Senator from Ohio it is that the explicit grant of power to Congress to determine the time of choosing the electors was intended to exclude Federal authority in all other respects.

Mr. TAFT. Clearly the Constitution gives only power which is expressly granted or which can be implied. That is the general principle of the Constitution. We cannot imply simply from the grant of power to Congress to provide the time of choosing electors, any power of providing the method or the place of choosing electors.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Supreme Court has answered the question really in *Burroughs and Cannon* v. *United States* (290 U. S. 534).

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President, I do not think the Supreme Court did anything of the kind in that case. The Court simply held that Congress could punish fraud in elections having some general relation to Congress, as it could punish

fraud in the election of Representatives and Senators, but I do not see anything in Burroughs and Cannon against The United States that would in any way imply power of Congress to pass any Federal election law for the choosing of Presidential electors.

Mr. GREEN. I regret that I must disagree with the learned Senator from Ohio. I admit that there is room for argument on both sides. But the case in question decided that—

> The President is vested with the executive power of the Nation. The importance of his election and the vital character of its relationship to and effect upon the welfare and safety of the whole people cannot be too strongly stated. * * *
>
> Congress, undoubtedly, possesses that power, as it possesses every other power essential to preserve the departments and institutions of the general Government from impairment or destruction, whether threatened by force or by corruption.

Certainly if a Presidential election may be protected from destruction, it may also be protected from distortion which would be caused by the enforced absence of a substantial body of the electorate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I notice in the report of the committee that the Senator also relies on the war power as authorizing the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely. I think that alone would justify it.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to suggest to the Senator that it seems to me the moment we apply the war power to elections we get into very dangerous ground indeed. It seems to me that the moment we say that the Congress may set aside specific provisions of the Constitution relating to elections because of the war powers, we are getting into the field where we may say that Congress can postpone the elections altogether. We are then practically saying that express language of the Constitution, express methods for election provided by the Constitution, may be changed by Congress because of the war. I believe that would be a very dangerous thing. I do not believe we can, because of the war, warp or stretch the Constitution or change its express provisions, without a constitutional amendment.

Mr. GREEN. I think the fundamental theory is that while it may be dangerous to exercise the war powers, yet it is still more dangerous not to fight a successful war against a challenge to the continuance of all our institutions.

Mr. TAFT. I may suggest to the Senator that I cannot think of anything more dangerous to our institutions than to have a serious constitutional doubt with respect to the result of the next Presidential election. If we were to repeat the occurrences of the Hayes-Tilden election and enter upon the election with a serious question which is going to be referred to some court to determine who is President of the United States, it seems to me we could not face a more serious danger. I do not want to present a definite view of my own at the present moment as to the constitutional question, but I think it is vitally essential that whatever we do shall be so constitutional that it will not involve a serious controversy in the courts as to the outcome of the United States Presidential election.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to tell the Senator from Ohio that I thoroughly agree with him. The measure, in my judgment, is unconstitutional and its enactment will certainly cast grave doubt on the validity of the next Presidential election, and upon the election of Senators and Representatives.

The Senator from Ohio mentioned the Hayes-Tilden controversy. That controversy was decided on the ground that the Congress could not go behind the certificate of appointment of Presidential electors by the executive authority of the State. This bill sets up a commission to control the elections of this country and provides that if that commission certifies—regardless of what the State executive certifies—that this act had not been complied with, then Congress claims the authority to refuse to count the electoral votes of that State, which is something that we do not have a right to do.

I think the whole measure is unconstitutional, and that its enactment will throw us into turmoil such as we had in 1876. I think there will be grave doubt with respect to the election, that in a close election many weeks will be consumed in contests to decide who has been elected President of the United States. Furthermore, when we decide that a State has not complied with the provisions of the act, and refuse to count the electoral votes, then by the same token we would be justified in refusing to seat a Senator, or the House of Representatives would be justified in refusing to seat a Member of that body who had been elected by the same ballots.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know whether I should reply to the Senator from Mississippi first, but I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator will be good enough to yield for the purpose I think it might be well to read into the RECORD at this point the pertinent provisions of the Constitution with reference to the manner and time and place of selection of electors. The second paragraph of article II, section 1, of the Constitution, says:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The fourth paragraph of the same article and section says:

> The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

I observe at that point that so far Congress has not been given power to determine the manner of choosing electors and the States have been given such power.

In the twelfth amendment it is provided:

> The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the persons voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.

I simply wish to observe at this point that the proposed act has several very direct violations of those provisions; and I hope the distinguished Senator will reconcile his bill, or will attempt to do so, with those provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Just before the discussion turned to the matter of electors and voters for Representatives and Senators, I was interested in the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, if I may refer to it for a moment. He was referring to section 102, subsection (c), subdivision 2, on page 20, which provides that the bill shall apply to civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

Of course, I am sympathetic with the fundamental purpose of making some provision, during wartimes, so that members of the armed forces shall participate in elections, inasmuch as they have been drafted or, being under orders, have been sent away. I merely wonder how the Senator justifies applying the provisions of the bill to officers or employees of the United States who are not drafted or are not outside the United States under orders, and who, during wartime, and under war conditions, are carrying out precisely the same duties they carry out during peacetimes—for instance, our consular officers in foreign fields and persons similarly employed, who are not compelled to be where they are during wartime any more than they are compelled to be there during peacetime. Let me inquire why the provisions of the bill should appy to them.

Mr. GREEN. I may say in answer to the Senator that most of the officers and employees of the United States now are engaged in war work. There may be some whose duties are the same as they were in peacetime, but the number of such persons is negligible. Most of them—and it is on that theory that the provisions of the bill would be extended to them—are engaged in war work; and even if otherwise some of them could go

home to vote or could comply with the provisions of the absentee ballot law of their State, in case their State had one, yet most of them could not; and they have to move around from place to place, according as they are ordered or are requested to do by the Government. For that reason it seemed that it would be better to make the law applicable to them.

However, the point raised by the Senator from Ohio does not go to the fundamental purpose of the bill. I may say further that some of the other suggestions which have been made do not go to the fundamental purpose of the bill. For example, the suggestion has been made that the Commission should not make a report to Congress of its opinion as to the compliance of an official of a State with the provisions of a certain title of the bill. I am perfectly willing, speaking for the committee, to agree to the omission of that provision. In fact, I have made a note to offer it as a committee amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Let me ask the Senator to what section he is referring, and with respect to which he intends to offer an amendment?

Mr. GREEN. The language on page 32, lines 9 to 11.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Senator expect to offer a committee amendment to strike out that language?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Recurring for a moment to the language on page 20 to which I referred, let me inquire whether it is within the contemplation of the Senator that after the war is over such civilians, staying in the same places and carrying on the same duties, except that they will not relate to duties of war, but to duties of peace, at that time would return to their original status, and would vote by absentee ballot, although they were carrying on precisely the identical duties they were carrying on during the war.

Mr. GREEN. First it is necessary to provide for some arbitrary period following the cessation of hostilities. Usually 6 months is provided as the period during which affairs shall be wound up. Frequently a longer period than that is required for a return to standard conditions, after the war is over; but 6 months seems to be the usual period of time provided.

Mr. BURTON. If the officers or employees of the United States referred to were the only persons affected, the Senator would not be in favor of the bill, would he?

Mr. GREEN. I quite agree; but so long as we are providing for voting by the soldiers and sailors, who may be quartered in precisely the same places as those in which the civilians referred to are quartered, although one group is in wartime service and the other group is in peacetime service, it seems better, when machinery is provided for voting by the soliders and sailors, to extend its operations to the civilians so situated. I do not think it would be proper to provide such machinery solely for such civilians; but since it would be provided for the members of the armed forces, and would be available, it would seem to be better to permit such civilians to vote. However, I do not have any quarrel with Senators who disagree as to that point.

Mr. President, there are several committee amendments which I desire to offer. They may forestall other criticisms.

The first committee amendment is on page 18, lines 13 to 15. It is proposed to strike out the language—

> The Commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act, except that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the Senator offering an amendment?

Mr. GREEN. I was simply going to point out the committee amendments which we are prepared to offer.

Mr. WHITE. If we have reached the amendment stage, I think a quorum should be present.

Mr. GREEN. I am referring to the corrections or changes simply for the information of the Senate. For instance, there have been aimed at the bill some criticisms which perhaps would not have been aimed at it had the proposed amendments been previously stated.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator has reached the point of offering amendments to the bill, I think a quorum should be present.

Mr. GREEN. Very well.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Reynolds
Andrews	Gurney	Robertson
Austin	Hatch	Russell
Bailey	Hawkes	Scrugham
Ball	Hayden	Shipstead
Barkley	Holman	Smith
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Lucas	Tobey
Bushfield	McClellan	Truman
Butler	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murray	Wheeler
Downey	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Willis
George	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	
Green	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, there are a few committee amendments to the committee amendment which I should like to present for consideration of the Senate but not for action at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has already offered the first amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Considering the fact that the quorum call intervened, perhaps I should restate the first amendment for the benefit of Senators who have returned to the Chamber.

The first committee amendment is on page 18, line 13, after the word "administration", to strike out "The Commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act, except that when" and insert the word "If."

At the top of the following page, page 19, a slight change is made necessary by the amendment which I have just read. In line 3, after the word "irregularity", it is proposed to strike out "found pursuant to this section" and insert in lieu thereof the words "indicated by such reports."

On page 32——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Rhode Island suspend for a moment, so that the Senate may act on the amendments as they are presented?

Mr. GREEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 13, in the committee amendment, after the word "administration", it is proposed to strike out "The Commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act, except that when" and insert "If."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as a result of this section, whether amended or not, is there any penalty which attaches if the Commission becomes cognizant of neglect, misconduct, or irregularity?

Mr. GREEN. In case there should be misconduct on the part of anyone in the armed forces, it would be referred to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case might be.

Or, if the reports sent in by the Governor or State officials show any irregularity, that situation is provided for at the top of page 19 of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I was probably responsible for the elimination of this language because in the way it reads, it gives power to the Commission, as I understand, "to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act." That would mean, I believe, or at least it would be possible to construe it to mean, that in the event there were complaint in some congressional district of an irregularity in certain voting methods in a particular county, or precinct, the Commission might have power under such complaint to make investigation.

I will say to the Senator candidly and frankly that I do not want the Commission to have any such power. I do not want any language in the bill which could be interpreted by the Commission as giving it the power to go into any community and make an investigation of that kind. If and when the reports come from the election officials of the precinct to the secretary of state, and on to the ballot commission as provided in the bill, and upon examination of those reports the ballot commission finds an irregularity or something which they should report to Congress, then they have the power to do so. But they should not go out into the field or send investigators to make an investigation relative to the conduct of an election.

As I read that language I was convinced that perhaps such an interpretation might be placed thereon. I insisted that the language be deleted and that was agreed to by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] for the committee to the committee amendment, on page 18, line 13.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 19, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "found pursuant to this section" and insert "indicated by such reports."

Mr. GREEN. That means the reports of the secretaries of state to the Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state the third amendment which he proposes.

Mr. GREEN. The third amendment is on page 32, in line 9, of the committee amendment, after the word "certification" and the comma, to strike out "or if the United States War Ballot Commission certifies that there has not been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title." Objection was made to that language earlier on the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator read the sentence which would remain.

Mr. GREEN. It would read as follows:

> If the executive of the State does not make such certification, the Senate and House of Representatives, acting separately, shall concurrently decide whether the noncompliance so affected the appointment of electors in the State as to require such appointment to be treated as invalid.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why should subsection (c) of Section 114 of the bill be in the bill at all? Governors are not required to certify that there has been substantial compliance with other voting laws.

Mr. GREEN. No; but it is much more specific than that. The bill requires a definite report; not substantial, but definite. The language here is "substantial compliance." It would simply require the Governor to report that he had carried out substantially the provisions of the law in his State.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then under the language which remains, if the Governor should not make such certification—and he might deliberately decline to make it, even for a captious reason—that would immediately invalidate the entire electoral vote of the State, subject to the approval of the House and Senate voting separately. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. That is substantially correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see any reason in the world for threatening the validity of the entire electoral vote of the State merely on the basis of the action or inaction of the Governor in respect to a certification. I do not believe there is any remote justification for attaching a penalty of that substance and implication to the mere failure—perhaps the deliberate failure—of the executive of the State to file a certificate.

Mr. STEWART. On what page is the language to which the Senator refers?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is found on page 32.

Mr. GREEN. It is in connection with the other provisions which the Governor must certify.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by striking out all of subsection (c) on page 32 of the bill, which embraces the language from line 2 to line 15, inclusive.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his motion?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am moving to amend the amendment by striking out all the language of subsection (c) of the bill on page 32, being lines 3 to 15, both inclusive.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know that I am not willing to go along with that amendment; but I should like to have the amendment go over until I can make a little further study of it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then let the committee's amendment go over also.

Mr. GREEN. Very well.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator say with respect to the amendment he is offering for the committee, how he would interpret the words "substantial compliance"? What does he mean by them?

Mr. GREEN. I think use is made of the word "substantial" here, as has been true elsewhere, because exact definition of "compliance" is impossible.

Mr. BRIDGES. I mean it would leave the whole interpretation of compliance with the act to a matter of judgment.

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely. That is always the case where the word "substantial" is used, and it is often used in legislation. It is because exact definition of the word "compliance" is impossible.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator believe that where the future of the country and the Presidency of the United States, and so on, are at stake, we ought to have something definite and specific rather than a word which is susceptible to indefinite interpretation?

Mr. GREEN. I may say that to a great extent I agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The language is not essential to the bill at all. It would not secure to the soldiers the vote. I am perfectly willing to have the whole subsection stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island withdraw his pending motion to amend?

Mr. GREEN. I do not withdraw my pending amendment to strike out the language beginning in line 9, on page 32, as follows:

> Or if the United States War Ballot Commission certifies that there has been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] was to amplify it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island has prior right to any other amendment. If he wishes to postpone action on the amendment, or withdraw it at this time, he may do so.

Mr. GREEN. It seems to me that whoever asked that the amendment go over should do the withdrawing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I simply want to add that it is absolutely unthinkable to me that the election of a President and Vice President of the United States could be thrown into the Congress for determination simply upon the failure of one Governor to file a certificate that some law had been substantially executed in his own State. It would be beyond my comprehension that anything of that sort could be done.

Mr. GREEN. In answer to the Senator from Michigan, as he puts it, it does not seem to me to be the best solution. It was a solution of a contingency which might face the Congress. If we strike the whole thing out the contingency would still face the Congress without any solution for it. This may not possibly be the best solution, but, so far as I know, it is the best solution that has been offered. However, I am perfectly willing to have the whole subsection stricken out and then the contingency will be left without any solution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In the light of what the chairman of the committee has just said, I think the coauthor of the bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] now agrees, and I agree, that that provision of the bill does contain implications which should not exist in the bill. I see no reason why we should not strike it out at this time.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, what is the motion pending? Is it not that of the Senator from Michigan to strike out the entire subsection (c)? I understood the Senator from Michigan to make such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island offered a

perfecting amendment which has precedence. The Chair understands he has now asked for a postponement of that amendment.

Mr. GREEN. I beg pardon of the Chair; I have not asked for a postponement.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked that the amendment go over, but I will withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to subdivision (c) of section 114, proposed to be stricken out by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is not the question on the motion to strike out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island has precedence as a perfecting amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to offer the amendment to strike out all of subsection (c) so that we can clear up the subject now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I move to strike out subsection (c) on page 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. I desire to offer another amendment. On page 37, I move to strike out the whole of line 7 and substitute therefor the words "the United States upon the demand of the Commission".

Mr. BRIDGES. To what page does the Senator refer?

Mr. GREEN. Page 37, line 7, to strike out the words after the word "the" at the beginning of the line, and substitute the words "United States upon the demand of the Commission". That is an amendment suggested this morning by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Before I yield the floor, I wish simply to state, as I stated before, that this bill is not perfect; it does not cure all the ills relating to the participation in elections by men who, by reason of their service, cannot vote at home. It is, however, an earnest attempt to improve the existing law.

The pending bill, Senate bill 1285, has the approval of the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Association of Secretaries of State of the United States, as well as many other bodies and organizations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he sits down?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Was definite approval given the specific bill as reported by the Senator from Rhode Island or for the principles involved in the bill?

Mr. GREEN. The approval was more than of the principles, because different Government agencies have offered a whole series of amendments which have been accepted almost in their entirety and incorporated in the bill. They have helped to improve it. I think one of them is annexed to the report of the committee.

I may say that the National Association of Secretaries of State met recently in St. Louis. They had many objections to the original draft of the bill and they appointed their president to come to Washington to meet with the committee. He did so, and the bill, as amended, met with his approval.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator know anything about how the approval of the individual secretaries of state was obtained? Did a majority of them approve the bill or was it approved only by the president of the association?

Mr. GREEN. The president was directed to represent the association here. Naturally, in the give and take of phraseology, the amended phraseology was not submitted to all the secretaries of state, but the president of the association said it met with his approval.

Mr. BUTLER. The reason for my question was that I have had letters from individual members of the association objecting very strenuously to the whole measure.

Mr. GREEN. It undoubtedly imposes additional work on all the secretaries of state, but so does the existing law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yied on that point?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. With respect to the inquiry made by the Senator from Nebraska, I should like to state to the Senator that I appeared at St. Louis, Mo., before the secretaries of state and delivered an address upon the subject matter of the pending bill. After that address, I appeared before the subcommittee of which Frederick Cook of Massachusetts was the chairman. Five members of that committee were present, acting as a subcommittee for the secretaries of state. They went through this bill carefully. I stayed with them for about 3 hours. They offered a number of constructive amendments to the bill. Mr. Cook came on from Massachusetts and testified for the secretaries of state as chairman of that subcommittee before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and at that time made further suggestions. The secretaries of state, so far as the votes taken indicate, were for the principles of this bill. Mr. Cook even went so far as to recommend the bill as amended when he appeared before the committee. I might also add that he is a good Republican from the State of Massachusetts; he has lived there all his life, and has held the office of secretary of state for 25 years.

There has been much hullaballoo about the form of ballot found in this bill. There will probably be more before we conclude the debate; there has been much "shadowboxing" about this bill from the beginning. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I want it understood now that I have only one thought in mind, and that is to give the soldier, wherever he may be, whether in this country, in Guadalcanal, in Africa, Italy, or elsewhere, an opportunity to vote. I want to do it in a constitutional way, and it can be done in a constitutional way, notwithstanding some of the opinions to the contrary. Under conscription we cannot take an American boy from his home in Illinois and send him to Africa without providing some means to enable him to vote. That simply cannot be done, and no Congress is going to do it, in my humble opinion. Before we get through with this measure, we will have a bill which will be satisfactory to the great majority. I have no pride in the authorship; I want to obtain the passage of a bill that will work. That has been my position from the day the measure was introduced. To say that we want any provision in this bill which will give the Democratic Party a better opportunity than the Republican Party or the Progressive Party or any other party is begging the question insofar as I am concerned.

I am surprised to find some people who claim to know something about this bill, but it is difficult to discover it from what they say. I am not referring to Members of the Senate; I am referring to people on the outside who are writing constantly about the measure. I will cite a sample of what has been going on throughout the country. Mr. Paul Mallon is a very prolific writer. I have great respect for him; he is a fine gentleman. Recently he wrote a column about the Green bill.

The headlines are as follows:

Senator GREEN angles for 10,000,000 votes.

That is the title of the article. Then he calls it a trick bill, and says:

All in very high-toned legal language and fair-sounding words is his trick bill. He would have the voting conducted by five commissioners to be appointed by the President, with senatorial confirmation, saying "at least two shall be Democrats and at least two shall be Republicans." This would simply allow the President to select three New Dealers and two Republicans of, say, the Winant school of New Deal thought, to conduct the election.

Just think of that, "to conduct the election." Mr. President, that goes to the American people as though the ballot commission were going to conduct the election from beginning to end, among our soldiers in this country and in other parts of the world where they are fighting. That is not the worst of it. Listen to this:

To help them in their work, the Green bill would destroy all State rules for qualifications of voters as to age, eligibility—

Just think of that! This writer is supposed to be a brilliant man. Why do men

do this? How can a student who reads the bill reach a conclusion that we are seeking to destroy the qualifications of voters of the States so far as age and eligibility are concerned? It is beyond me to understand. Truly I should like to know the real reason back of the distortion.

Furthermore, this writer talks about registration and poll tax. Of course we claim we have the right to pass such legislation under the Constitution and our wartime powers. However, the poll tax and registration questions were passed on in the act of 1942. We only seek to reenact something already passed by Congress.

I mentioned Frederick Cook a moment ago. He is as fine a gentleman as I ever met in my life. He is a Republican, too. I can find some Republicans about whom I can say pretty good things. We accepted the ballot that was presented by Mr. Cook, Secretary of State of Massachusetts, because it was a simplification of the ballot, and a better one than that prepared originally by the authors of the bill. I mention that in passing, because if there are any more amendments to be offered which will simplify the bill I am for them. I want to get the ballot to the soldier in the quickest possible time, a ballot which gives him the right of secrecy, gives him the right to vote as he chooses and to have the vote counted in the election precinct in which he resides. Anyone who understands this bill must conclude, if he be honest about it, that the ballot we propose is more secret than any absentee ballot that is sent out from the State at the present time. I believe I can explain that more fully when the proper time comes.

Question was raised this morning with respect to the States handling this matter. I wish it could be done through the States. Read the absentee ballot laws of most of the States of the United States as they exist at the present time, with respect to when a man can vote by absentee ballot. It would not be possible to get an absentee ballot from Illinois over to Hawaii and back in 30 days; it would not be possible to get it to England and back. We would be lucky if we could send it to Florida and have it returned in time. The application must be made within 30 days before the election; it must be sent to the county clerk and the county clerk has to send it to the soldier. Perhaps the soldier may be out in the field for 10 days, and then following that he will have to make his application for the ballot, and the ballot will have to come back to him. He will have to mark it and send it in, and it will have to be in the voting precinct some 3 days before the election. How can anyone say that an Illinois soldier serving outside his country can vote under such a provision?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I will conclude in a moment.

All we are attempting to do by the bill is to give a man inside and outside of the country the right to vote. If he is in a position to vote for State and county candidates he can get an absentee ballot through local election officials. Upon such a ballot the names of all the Federal, State, and county candidates are printed. That is the way I hope the soldier, if he can, will cast his vote, because he will thus have an opportunity to vote for a greater number of candidates; but it cannot be done in all cases, and that is the basic reason for the bill.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GREEN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Colorado, but if the Senator from Illinois will not take long, I will yield to him first.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think it will take long to say what I desire to say, and I very much appreciate the Senator yielding.

Mr. President, I desired to ask a question. I was much impressed with the statement of my colleague from Illinois that the boys from Illinois were being drafted but were not being given the right to vote. Last year Congress provided a method by which they could vote, but the pending bill goes much further. The bill provides the same opportunity to members of the merchant marine, who are not subject to military regulations, to whom we have never given the franking privilege, for whom we have never provided bonuses. There are no restrictions on them when they are in port. They are working for larger salaries now than they ever before received in their history, and their own leader, Mr. Joseph Curran, went out of the country to avoid the draft. Yet under the bill he would be given the right of absentee voting, the same as the soldiers.

I think it is time we stopped harnessing other people onto the soldiers. I agree that, since the Senate and the House voted to draft men to fight and face death, we should give them the right to vote; but that should not apply to all the other people we are harnessing to the soldiers. The bill provides for extending the privilege to members of the merchant marine and civilians.

I wish to call attention to paragraph (c), on page 20:

> The following individuals, if otherwise eligible under subsection (b), shall be entitled to vote in accordance with the provisions of this title.

Then subsection 2 provides:

> Civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

How many civilians have been sent overseas? Congress can hardly ascertain how many, or where the employees are being sent all over the world. They do not even have to be attached to the armed services. Are these men who are outside the country, who are not facing death, who are drawing increased pay, to be classified along with the soldiers, for whose benefit we are proposing to legislate?

Do not let anyone misinterpret what I say. I will ever be found fighting for the man who is at the front. I know his problems. I have been with him. I will defend him and fight for him. But those who are taking advantage of a measure such as the one now before the Senate to impose these other classes on the soldiers depart from the effort to provide free elections in the United States, and the provision should be deleted. When the chairman of the committee concludes, I shall offer an amendment to delete the provision.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know how much longer I should postpone my promise to the Senator from Colorado to yield to him.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to have the Senate proceed with the consideration of a conference report, but if the Senator's interruption will be brief, very well.

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I invite the Senator's attention to section 102, which appears on page 19, and to subclause (b), which starts in line 23, at the foot of the page.

As one reads subclause (b), and going over on to the top of page 20, one finds that the authors of the bill have included in lines 2, 3, and 4, on page 20, not only the electors of President and Vice President of the United States, but also the Members of the Congress, United States Senators and Representatives. Therefore I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he will not break down section 102, subclause (b), by dividing it, so that one section shall apply solely to United States Senators and Representatives in Congress, and the other apply solely to electors of President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. GREEN. With exactly the same provision as to each?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall move an amendment to that effect, and submit the language to the Senate. May the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate?

Mr. DANAHER. No; I should like to have it acted on. The amendment will be as follows:

> In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual specified in subsection (c) who is absent from the place of his voting residence but otherwise eligible to register and qualified to vote in any election for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, shall be entitled to vote for such electors in accordance with the provisions of this title.

Mr. President, I move that language as a separate subsection for 102 (b).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 763.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. This is a very important conference report. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Reynolds
Andrews	Gurney	Robertson
Austin	Hatch	Russell
Bailey	Hawkes	Scrugham
Ball	Hayden	Shipstead
Barkley	Holman	Smith
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Lucas	Tobey
Bushfield	McClellan	Truman
Butler	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Caraway	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murray	Wheeler
Downey	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Willis
George	Radcliffe	Wilson
Gillette	Reed	
Green	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(l) In the case of any registrant whose principal place of employment is located outside the appeal board area in which the local board having jurisdiction over the registrant is located, any occupational deferement under subsection (c) (2) or subsection (e) of this section existing at the date of enactment of this subsection shall, within thirty days after such date, and any such occupational deferment made after the date of enactment of this subsection shall within ten days after such deferment is made, be submitted for review and decision to the selective service appeal board having jurisdiction over the area in which is located the principal place of employment of the registrant. Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the President, and such decision shall be made public. The President, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this Act; and the determination of the President shall be final.

"'(m) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (b), under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, on the basis of the best inventory information available to him at the time of allocating calls, without affecting the usual regular and orderly flow of the Nation's manpower into the armed forces as required for service therein, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this Act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under eighteen years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this Act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces. The term "child" as used in this section means a legitimate child born prior to September 15, 1942, a stepchild, adopted child, foster child, or a person who is in the relationship of child to the registrant, who became such prior to December 8, 1941, who is less than eighteen years of age, or who by reason of mental or physical defects is incapable of self-support, who is unmarried, and with whom the registrant has maintained a bona fide family relationship in their home since December 7, 1941, or since the date of birth if such date of birth is later than December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no individuals shall be called for induction, ordered to report to induction stations, or be inducted because of their occupations, or by occupational groups, or by groups in any plant or institutions, except pursuant to a requisition by the land or naval forces for persons in needed medical professional and specialist categories.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 (a) (2) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) to create and establish a Selective Service System, and shall provide for the classification of registrants and of persons who volunteer for induction under this Act on the basis of availability for training and service, and shall establish within the Selective Service System civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and such other agencies, including agencies of appeal, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. There shall be created one or more local boards in each county or political subdivision corresponding thereto of each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia. Each local board shall consist of three or more members to be appointed by the President, from recommendations made by the respective Governors or comparable executive officials. No member of any such local board shall be a member of the land or naval forces of the United States, but each member of any such local board shall be a civilian who is a citizen of the United States residing in the county or political subdivision corresponding thereto in which such local board has jurisdiction under rules and regulations prescribed by the President. Such local boards, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President, shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to hear and determine, subject to the right of appeal to the appeal boards herein authorized all questions or claims with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this Act of all individuals within the jurisdiction of such local boards. The decisions of such local boards shall be final except where an appeal is authorized and is taken in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe. Appeal boards within the Selective Service System shall be composed of civilians who are citizens of the United States. The decision of such appeal boards shall be final in cases before them on appeal unless modified or changed by the President as provided in the last sentence of section 5 (l) of this Act. No person who is an officer, member, agent, or employee of the Selective Service System, or of any such local or appeal board or other agency, shall be excepted from registration, or deferred from training and service, as provided for in this Act, by reason of his status as such officer, member, agent, or employee;'.

"(b) Section 10 (a) (3) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and fix the compensation of at a rate not in excess of $10,000 per annum, a Director of Selective Service who shall be directly responsible to him and to appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers, agents, and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That any officer on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or of any reserve component thereof or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this Act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (a) (2)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States: *Provided further*, That any person so appointed, assigned, or detailed to a position the compensation in respect of which is at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum shall be appointed, assigned, or detailed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That the President may appoint necessary clerical and stenographic employees for local boards and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

"SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service only, any authority vested in him under this Act (except section 9). The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this Act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.'

"SEC. 4. Section 10 of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) In order to assist in the determination of whether or not men should be deferred from training and service because they are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective, and to delay as long as possible the induction of men living with their families, the President is authorized and directed forthwith to appoint a commission of five qualified physicians, of whom one only shall be an Army officer and one only a Navy officer, and the three remaining members shall be qualified civilian physicians not employed by

the Federal Government, who shall examine the physical, mental, and moral qualification requirements for admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and recommend to the President any changes therein which they believe can be made without impairing the efficiency of the armed services. The commission shall especially consider the establishment of special standards for men who will be inducted only for limited service. The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men, including those previously discharged from the armed services because of physical disability, who may qualify under any new standards established.'

"SEC. 5. Any registrant within the categories herein defined when it appears that his induction will shortly occur shall, upon request, be ordered by his local board in accordance with schedules authorized by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of Selective Service, to any regularly established induction station for a preinduction physical examination, subject to reexaminations.

"The commanding officer of such induction station where such physical examination is conducted under this provision shall issue to the registrant a certificate showing his physical fitness or lack thereof, and this examination shall be accepted by the local board, subject to periodic reexamination. Those registrants who are classified as I–A at the time of such physical examination and who are found physically qualified for military service as a result thereof, shall remain so classified and report for induction in regular order.

"SEC. 6. The Director of Selective Service shall obtain full and complete information from the various agencies, departments, and branches of the Federal Government, and from other sources, concerning requests for deferment, deferments, exemptions, rejections, discharges, inductions, enlistments, replacement schedules, and other matters with respect to registrants, whether or not they are members of the armed forces, or whether or not they are Government or private employees; and he shall report that information, together with the manner in which the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are being administered, to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs monthly or at such intervals as the committees may designate from time to time.

"SEC. 7. Except as provided in this Act, all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this Act are hereby suspended to the extent of such conflict for the period in which this Act shall be in force."

And the House agrees to the same.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
FOREST A. HARNESS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Senate bill 763 had a rather peculiar legislative course. It was introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] as a bill to prevent the drafting of fathers. It went to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, was reported by that committee and placed on the calendar, came before the Senate, and while being considered on the floor of the Senate it was completely changed. The provisions of the original Wheeler bill were almost completely stricken out; and some of the provisions of the Bailey amendment, the Clark amendment, the Bushfield amendment, and the Taft amendment were worked into the bill, and it was passed in that form. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] also added an important amendment to the bill.

Then the bill went to the House of Representatives. The House completely changed it. The bill was sent to conference, and the conferees agreed upon a bill substantially in the language and form of the House bill.

So the Senate did not retain the language of the original Wheeler bill or of the Bailey amendment, the Clark amendment, or the Wheeler amendment. The bill does contain the language of the Bushfield amendment, changed in some degree, and at the present time it contains some of the important features of the Taft and Clark amendments.

I desire very briefly to state what the bill would do and what it would not do. The bill would not prohibit the drafting of fathers nor would it defer their drafting either to January 1 or for any other definite period. The bill might possibly delay 2 or 3 months the drafting of some fathers, since the registrants would be inducted on a Nation-wide basis and State-wide basis, with pre-Pearl Harbor fathers inducted last. That is the only way in which the bill would affect fathers. That is to say, a pre-Pearl Harbor father could not be inducted by a local board so long as there remained in the State or in the Nation men who were not pre-Pearl Harbor fathers and who had not been inducted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think this is a good place to bring out what I remember to be a fact, which is that a division of the group of fathers which existed under the orders of the Selective Service System was eliminated, namely, a category of fathers having regard to occupational status. One of the important changes which the bill would make in existing law, as it would apply through the Selective Service System, would be to delete exemptions based on the status of occupation, as set forth in the letter of instructions of the Director of the Selective Service System, dated some time in September last.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, Mr. President. However, I do not know whether that was a provision of law; it was a provision of policy which was decided upon by the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Am I to understand from the explanation the Senator has very ably made of the first point that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers could not be drafted in a State so long as nonfathers subject to the draft were available?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is my understanding of the conference report.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does it go further, and say that pre-Pearl Harbor fathers cannot be drafted by any draft board in the country so long as there are in the country nonfathers eligible for draft?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would put pre-Pearl Harbor fathers last on the list on a Nation-wide basis.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. On a Nation-wide basis?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is in the report a flexibility provision affecting this point. It is to the effect that the rule shall not be an arbitrary one such as would prevent the regular and systematic flow of inductees into the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I should like to read the language of the escape clause, as it is considered. It appears beginning at the bottom of the first page of the conference report in the language in italics, and reads as follows:

> On the basis of the best inventory information available to him at the time of allocating calls, without affecting the usual regular and orderly flow of the Nation's manpower into the armed forces as required for service therein, and in accordance with the requisitions of the land and naval forces and with the other provisions of this act, registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants, regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces.

Of course, outside that exception, the statement I previously made is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. How could there be a Nation-wide basis and at the same time a State-wide basis? In other words, if the Senator's explanation is correct—that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers could be drawn into the service anywhere in

the Nation until the supply of all others was exhausted—what good would be served by a provision that within any State pre-Pearl Harbor fathers could not be drawn into the service until the supply of other persons available in that State had been exhausted? It seems to me the supply of nonfathers would have to be exhausted in all the other States before pre-Pearl Harbor fathers could be drawn into the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that observation is correct, except that at the present time induction is on a local basis, and the desire is to have it clarified that henceforth it would be on a State basis and a national basis rather than on a local basis.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the two terms are utterly contradictory. I do not think there can be two bases.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. First, Mr. President, let me say that the House inserted that provision. I myself think it is somewhat contradictory, but the provision does clarify the matter to a certain extent.

Now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. My understanding of the reason for the two bases is that the purpose was not to have colliding bases, but to make the law feasible, if possible. A State administration of the Selective Service System has certain information with respect to the status and inventories of manpower in the State which is not available to the national headquarters of the Selective Service at the time when a man comes up for induction in California, let us assume.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is a duplication, instead of being contradictory.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is all; it is a duplication, not a contradiction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us see if it is duplication. Suppose in Vermont and in Kentucky the supply of eligible men had been exhausted except the supply of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, but suppose that in California, in Illinois, and in Massachusetts the supplies of nonfathers had not been exhausted, and suppose that the State boards or the local boards attempted to induct men in Kentucky and Vermont, where the supply of nonfathers had been exhausted, but the point was made that, under the act, the supply of nonfathers had not been exhausted as a Nation-wide proposition. Who would decide which one of the provisions would take precedence over the other?

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator were to assume that the transaction occurred in the State of Vermont, and that anyone was interested in raising the point that there were eligible persons in the categories preceding the father class, in Vermont, a judgment could be rendered at once in the State of Vermont on a State-wide basis. But suppose the objection to induction is that somewhere in the Nation there are men in the categories preceding the father class. That would immediately impose a great burden upon the Government and upon the inductee who is trying to establish that fact. It is for feasibility in the operation that both bases are made operative, parallel, and working together. Even that parallel method presents difficulties, both to the Government and to the candidate. That is why the flexible clause was inserted, on the basis of the inventories as they are. Let me read it. I cannot remember all the details. The language is:

> On the basis of the best inventory information available to him at the time of allocating calls.

That language is found at the bottom of page 1 of the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. The language "to him" means to the President.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but the President, of course, operates through the Director General.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Director General of the Selective Service knows, from the records of the Selective Service, whether in any State there are eligibles above the pre-Pearl Harbor class. He knows whether they have been exhausted in any State.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does he? That is the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should think so, if the records are accurate.

Mr. AUSTIN. There will always be that "if," for this reason: Every day men are becoming of eligible age. We can assume that the inventories in the office of the Director cannot be changed every day, and that, therefore, the law must be made flexible enough so that it can operate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the desire for flexibility. I am wondering whether it is realized. It may not make any particular difference; the point which I have raised may be purely technical; but it seems to me that there cannot be simultaneously a Nation-wide basis and a State-wide basis in operation. It is either State-wide or Nation-wide. It cannot be both.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That would perhaps be true if we had not already started with the local board. The local board was the original unit. In order to get away from that, the language about the State was inserted, which makes a larger unit with which to start. This is a little easier way of making that point clear.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have said all I wish to say about it. I am still of the same opinion as I was originally.

Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is no pride of authorship in this language, because Members of the Senate are not the authors of it. In any event, there is no pride of authorship which would bind the Senator from Colorado or myself with respect to this matter. We have learned in our experience that with 96 Members of the Senate, suggestions which would improve legislation are often made on the floor of the Senate. For my part I would welcome any suggestion which the Senator from Kentucky might wish to make.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing I can do about it. We must vote the conference report up or down.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the point is sufficiently important, we can vote it down.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may vote that way; but I doubt if I shall be in the majority if I do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The majority leader has asked a very practical question. I should like to have a direct answer to that question. I do not think the question has as yet been fully answered, as to what would happen if there were no persons eligible for draft in a State except pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, and there were men other than pre-Pearl Harbor fathers eligible in another State. I should like to have that question answered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement. I admit that I did not get a categorical answer to my inquiry. It may be that that is a part of the flexibility of this conference report. [Laughter.]

I venture to express the viewpoint that if the induction is to be on a Nation-wide basis, if in any one State there are still eligible men who are not pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, a serious question may arise in all the other States where that category has been exhausted, as to whether pre-Pearl Harbor fathers can be called until the other eligibles have been exhausted in all the other States. I have very grave doubt about it, if the language means anything at all. If it does not mean anything, it ought not to be in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Which of the two provisions would the Senator from Kentucky delete?

Mr. BARKLEY. If I had my way about it, I would delete the Nation-wide part of it, and put it on a State-wide basis.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I am very strong for exactly the thing which the Senator from Kentucky is opposing. I think it ought to be on a Nation-wide basis. If, for example, there are 100,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers in 20 States, and 100,000 men are needed next month, I think the 100,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers ought to be called first, and all the other States ought to be exempt from further call during that month. I think that is what this report provides. That is what was intended by the Senate bill, but the language was somewhat doubtful. This seems to be much clearer. I see no reason why it should not operate on a Nation-wide basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Ohio as to the desirability of making it Nation-wide. The Senator will notice that the language is:

on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State.

Mr. TAFT. We may find that a State has pre-Pearl Harbor fathers in one section of the State, but not in the other sections; but that would not nullify the Nation-wide basis in any way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I prefer the State-wide basis to the Nation-wide basis, but that is a mere personal preference. If it is to be on a Nation-wide basis, so that we cannot call into the service men who are pre-Pearl Harbor fathers so long as there are any non pre-Pearl Harbor fathers anywhere in the United States, it certainly, in my judgment, eliminates the State-wide basis feature of this report.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is in any way inconsistent with the State-wide basis. The State-wide basis operates after we decide as between various sections of the State; but I do not see why it cannot be on both a Nation-wide and a State-wide basis.

Mr. BARKLEY. The State-wide basis would operate after we had determined that, on a Nation-wide basis, every one had been called except pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as I understood the reply by the able Senator from Colorado to the first question I asked, it is the understanding of the Senator from Colorado, who is submitting the report, that it is upon a Nation-wide basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, with the one exception as to the practicability of working out the machinery for it. That provision is found at the bottom of page 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in regard to another matter, unless he wishes to pursue this question further?

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to pursue it further. I believe the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a point to make.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish I could clear up the question. I think the difficulty is to state it. As I understand, when the armed forces call for a certain number to be inducted—we will assume 300,000—the Selective Service System in Washington allots the call to the States. As I understand, the allotment is made to States which, according to the inventories, have candidates who are ahead of the father class. Thus we see it is necessary to give consideration to both the State group and the National group. That is what makes it possible to operate, and to obtain the quota for the Army. As I understand, if we did not make the allotment on both bases we might have a failure in inducting men into the Army; but on the basis which is written into the conference report, in most cases the necessary number of inductees can be obtained out of the two previous categories before entering the third category.

In fact, I think that as the future unfolds the operation of this proposal there will be a sufficient number of men becoming eligible, and a sufficient number of men ahead of the father class being taken on a Nation-wide basis to answer the requirements of the armed forces. I hope that will be true. But it would not be possible to administer the act if we should fix it arbitrarily on either a State or National basis.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator about another provision, if he is ready to take it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have completed this part. I see the Senator from Iowa on his feet, and the Senator from West Virginia has asked a question of the Senator from South Dakota on this point. Let us first clear that up.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, my question relates to the point under discussion. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont. I understand that when the Director makes a call for men through the Selective Service he contemplates the whole Nation, and if he finds that in some States all eligible men, excepting fathers, have been taken, and in other States there are eligible men who are nonfathers, he makes his call first from those States where there are nonfathers.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under the existing law, the Director might divide the total number of 300,000 necessary for a particular call into equal parts, or into parts based on population, or something of that kind. Under this proposal he would not do that. He would take into account what his inventories showed with respect to the number of available men outside the father class, and whereas he might in one case have called for 8,000 men from the State of Vermont, he would under this case, if they were short of men who were not fathers, make that a much smaller number in order to adapt his call to the condition in the State. That is why we have made available to him both the Nation-wide basis and the State-wide basis.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I think the RECORD should show at this point that representatives of the Selective Service organization told the conferees that they understood this language and that they could operate under it. I think that ought to be shown in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; that was a part of the evidence which we had before us, and it helped to bring us to an agreement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator from Kentucky desires to raise a point.

Mr. WHEELER. I wanted merely to add something on the particular question being discussed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. When the question was first before the Senate, I pointed out what was happening in some of the States before we got into the war, and even before the draft law went into effect. There were a great many young men who left certain States and went into other States. They took employment in war industries and became, temporarily, at least, citizens of the State in which they were being employed. The older men, the married men with families, did not do that, but the younger men did. As a consequence, there are in some of the States many young single men, or even married men without children, whereas other States were completely denuded of such men.

I was glad to have the examination made by the Senator from Colorado, as well as the Senator from Vermont, with reference to the operation of the proposed act, because if it is operated on the basis we have heard described I think it will mean a much fairer operation of the Selective Service than there has been in the past.

But even within the last month or two I have received numerous letters from men and women, particularly women, stating that they had three, five, and as many as nine children, and that their husbands had been taken into the Army under the selective service. I think we have all read such statements in the newspapers. It seems to me that that is a perfectly preposterous action when there are nonfathers and single men in the country who are not being taken.

I do not have present with me, but I have received a letter from an Army officer who is in Canada and has been employed on the Alaskan Highway, who has said that there are any number of single men, nonfathers, working there—in the Government service, I assume—who have not been called, and he said he was very much opposed to it. He had been a member of a selective service board, but had resigned because of disagreement with the policy which had been adopted by the Selective Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Montana, and I am sure his conclusions will prove to be accurate unless the administrative agencies in charge of the operation of the proposed legislation hide too much behind the escape clause which has been put in the bill, and keep away from anything that is practical in the operation of the law.

Mr. WHEELER. Because of the experiences in the past, I am somewhat fearful of the escape clause. I am afraid it will be interpreted by the executive branch as giving them power to do whatever they please regardless of the intent of Congress, or regardless of what has been written into the bill in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly any such action would be contrary to the intent of both Houses of Congress, if I understand the position of the House of Representatives on the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make merely one observation on

that point. I do not care to pursue it, but when we do anything on a Nation-wide basis we amalgamate the whole population of the United States and forget State lines. We take our total population and the total number of people available as if there were no boundaries at all by which to divide the Nation into its various geographical sectors. The difficulty I have is in understanding how simultaneously we can amalgamate the whole population of the country for the purpose of drawing men into the service and at the same time knock it down into 48 different compartments, and say that we are going to do both at the same time. But I hope it will be handled in the best possible way.

I wish to inquire of the Senator regarding section 3 (b), which reads as follows:

(b) The President is authorized to delegate to the Director of Selective Service only, any authority vested in him under this act (except sec. 9).

What is section 9?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Section 9 deals with plant seizure, and, of course, this would not apply to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. The section continues as follows:

The Director of Selective Service may delegate and provide for the delegation of any authority so delegated to him by the President and any other authority vested in him under this act, to such officers, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint for such purpose or as may be designated or appointed for such purpose pursuant to such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

I inquire of the Senator regarding the power of Congress to limit the President by an act of this kind in determining whom he shall designate to enforce a law the execution of which is primarily placed on his shoulders. Under the language which I have read the President would not be able to designate anyone else or delegate anyone else to do this except the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; he would either have to do it himself, or if he delegated anyone else to do it, it would have to be under the one mentioned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; himself or the Director of Selective Service. I presume that under this language the Director of Selective Service can delegate to others such authority as has been delegated to him by the President. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Could the Director of Selective Service delegate any of his authority to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who is unhorsed by this language? I presume that the object of the language is to take all power away from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. There could be no other use for the language unless that was intended, and I am wondering if the Director of Selective Service himself, under his power of delegation, could delegate any of this authority to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My understanding of this bill is that the Director of Selective Service could transfer it to the War Manpower Commission if he wanted to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, notwithstanding the fact that under the President's order of consolidation heretofore made, the Director of Selective Service is subordinate to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and to the War Manpower Commission, the subordinate could, under the terms of this language, delegate some of his powers to his superior who has no authority to act under the President's orders and to whom the President himself could not delegate the same authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From a reading of the text I believe that could be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. That, it appears to me, is an anomaly in legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Because this is a legal question, I should like to hear from the Senator from Vermont, who I see is on his feet.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, when the Congress enacted the Selective Training and Service Act it vested certain powers in a Selective Service System with a Director at its head. That System was made the operating agency of the law by authority of Congress. It was not the President's organization; it was a ministerial organization created by Congress to carry out the will of the people so far as Congress expressed it.

What happened after that? We passed the First War Powers Act, vesting in the President tremendous powers, unprecedented so far as my examination of law goes, and under that authority the President took a vast amount of the operating powers which the Congress had delegated in the law out of the hands of the Director and out of the Selective Service System and gave it all to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. Then we had a hydra-headed operating agency which created the greatest confusion all over this country. If there is any one place where I think Congress should go to work to remedy confusion, it is in the administration of the Selective Training and Service Act; and there is where we come to a difference of opinion. Some legislators think that it is wiser to have the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission operating this act than it is to have the Director of the Selective Service System operating it, while others adhere to the original proposition and belief of Congress that the Director of the Selective Service System should operate this system, according to law. So, when the issue arose in the conference, there is where we stood divided on that point.

It is not a question whether we have authority or not. Of course we have authority. We are the authors of the act; we created whatever powers are to be exercised under it; and it is not subject to the charge that we are trenching upon the appointive power of the President. It is the restoration by an act of legislation to the Congress of the power to legislate with respect to this particular subject which is so close to the hearts of the people. That is what this is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask him a question. I have great respect for his legal ability, as he knows. Of course, when we passed the original Selective Service Act we were not at war. I am not certain that that makes any difference because the Constitution establishes the President as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy whether we are at war or at peace; he is continuously the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. But what effect will this language limiting him to the appointment of a single person under his authority have upon his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy?

Mr. AUSTIN. It will have no effect at all.

Mr. President, this is an act of just as high degree of authority as the War Manpower Commission Act. It is up to the Congress to say whether such powers shall be created or shall not be created and who shall operate them. The Congress chose to place the execution of the law in the hands of a civilian agency, namely, the Selective Service System, with a director at its head, who came out of the body of civilians. Today he wears a uniform, but he is, indeed, a civilian; he was not chosen from the Army. The constitutional authority of the President to appoint is not at all involved. For that I stand just as long as I can see clearly that that question is at stake, and, so far as I am conscious of it, I will not undertake to derogate that power; but when it comes to a question such as this, of legislative policy, I say that if the Congress believes in its original plan of a democratic form of operating agency raised from the people themselves, then we have done exactly what we ought to do in the conference report.

Do not forget, Mr. President, that we inserted the word "only"; we provided that the President, if he did not exercise these powers, should delegate them to the Director of the Selective Service System "only." We discussed that fully, so that there is no disagreement about what the word means to us. We meant to restore this authority to the place where Congress put it originally. Have no doubt, Mr. President, about it whatever. Probably we would not have used the word "only" if the War Manpower Act had not been used to put the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission in command of this operating agency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield, if I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator spoke a moment ago about a division in the conference. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the designation—not exactly in the language that is in the conference report—of the Director of the Selective Service to perform this function was put into the Senate bill by unanimous vote of the Senate, and in the House bill by a substantially unanimous vote?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that when the conferees met they had before them a proposition to which both the

Senate and the House had agreed to practically unanimously?

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Missouri for reminding me of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, just a moment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I insist that we had no moral right, even though the House struck out all after the enacting clause and opened the door, theoretically, to do anything except what we did; morally, I felt we should stand by what both Houses had agreed on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator from Vermont in his concurrence with the statement of the Senator from Missouri, because the Senate never did act upon it. The Senate bill had no language at all on the delegation of authority to the Director of the Selective Service. We did have a clause with respect to appeals. The Director of Selective Service was given final authority in appeal cases, but this goes far beyond anything that was in the Senate bill. It delegates all power and all authority either to the Director of the Selective Service or to be retained by the President.

The Senator from Kentucky asked a constitutional question. I shall not try to answer it, but the Constitution in article I, section 8, reads that—

> The Congress shall have power • • • to raise and support armies.

I presume that the Selective Service is operating under that clause of the Constitution, and that is one of the congressional prerogatives and powers and authorities under the Constitution.

I noticed a few moments ago, when another bill was being discussed, the so-called soldiers' vote bill, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] answered that Congress had no power to take executive powers away from the President, or to limit his executive powers. We do it right along. We delegate powers to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture; we give them executive authority and executive powers; but I doubt whether we would be able to find at any place in any other Federal statute the word "only," where we tell the President he has power, and if he is going to delegate it, he must delegate it "only," and then proceed to let the agency to which he delegates the power delegate it further as it sees fit, with a free hand and without limitation. I doubt whether there can be found any precedent of that kind.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I merely desire to keep the RECORD straight about the language before the conference which had been agreed on by both the House and the Senate. I read from page 8, beginning at line 9, of the text that came to the conferees:

> The President is authorized and directed—

The words "and directed" are in italics, representing an amendment suggested by the House—

> to delegate to the Director of Selective Service all authority vested in him under this act.

Every bit of that, excepting the additional word——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me finish the sentence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator said "all authority." It is "any authority."

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me finish my sentence. The Senator has interrupted the sentence that was going to indicate what was changed.

Mr. President, what the House did to the Senate language was to insert the words in italics, "and directed," and to strike out the word "any" and insert the word "all." That is what the House did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was quite a change, I should say.

Mr. AUSTIN. Far from it. That represented what we really finally did, except for the word "directed." We struck out the word "all" and went back to the word "any," but we added the word "only" in order to make it certain that we meant "all," that if the President delegated any of his authority he should delegate it all to the Director.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator desire to speak on the point we have been discussing?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. I assume that the language adopted meant merely that in order to perform his duties the Director could delegate some of his powers, which he would have to delegate to some subordinate. But there was no intention on the part of the conferees, I assume, that the Director could or would delegate all his powers to the War Manpower Commission or to any other body. It was the usual provision that was inserted, merely because the Director would have to delegate some of his powers to subordinates in order to execute the provisions of the act. To put any other construction on the language would seem to me to be contrary to all legislative policies and all drafting of legislation which has been heretofore enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think there is any question about what the language means. I think it is definite enough.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Rhode Island raised a question with reference to the power of Congress, stating, as I recall, that it was unconstitutional for the Congress to take away from the Executive any powers. Certainly the Congress of the United States has the power to enact any piece of legislation it desires to enact, and it has the power to designate who is to execute the provisions of any act. There cannot be any question about that. We are not taking away from the President his power to appoint. We are merely providing by legislation who is to carry out particular provisions of the law, as we have a perfect right to do under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that in the original act section 9 starts out in this way:

> The President is empowered, through the head of the War Department or the Navy Department of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods—

And so forth. So that there is somewhat of a precedent, except that the language is unusual, having the word "only" in it.

I took the matter of the bill up with Mr. McNutt, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and I have a reply from him, which I received just a few moments ago, which I desire to have appear in the RECORD at this point. It reads as follows:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1943.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: This is in reply to your request for information on S. 763. I will answer first your inquiry with reference to the history of the nondeferrable list. I will then describe the effect of the amendment which would authorize the President to delegate any Selective Service authority to the Director of Selective Service only.

The opposition has been engaged in creating a public impression that the nondeferrable list was imposed on Selective Service by the War Manpower Commission or by me personally. The actual history, and it is one which, I am sure, General Hershey would be very happy to confirm, is quite the contrary. The nondeferrable list was proposed by General Hershey to the War Manpower Commission on October 26, 1942, 6 weeks before the Selective Service System became a part of the War Manpower Commission. General Hershey at that time recommended that these lists take effect on or before November 10, 1942.

The Commission studied the proposals and our staff wrote an analysis which criticized the recommendations adversely. General Hershey renewed his recommendation on November 10, 1942, and it was rejected.

In these earlier proposals made by General Hershey, his proposed nondeferrable list was far broader than that finally adopted. It included such items as banks, printing and publishing, and civilian apparel.

After the transfer of Selective Service to the War Manpower Commission, the matter was discussed further and the curtailed list, which included only unskilled activities and occupations and those bordering on the luxury trades, was developed as a compromise. It was General Hershey, who on January 27 presented the revised proposal to the War Manpower Commission and who on January 29 of this year presented it to the management-labor committee.

One of the basic purposes of the list was to delay the date for the general drafting of fathers by sending increased numbers of fathers from the listed occupations into essential industry where they might be eligible to displace single men.

The proposed amendment of section 10 (b) of the Selective Service Act, which would authorize the President to delegate selective-service authority to the Director of Selective Service only was developed apparently with two objectives in mind: (a) that this action would keep such policies as the nondeferrable list from being "imposed" on the Selective

Service System. The history described above adequately indicates that it was not "imposed;" and (b) with the idea that a divided authority over manpower mobilization would permit a reduced emphasis on occupational deferment and a consequent reduction of the number of fathers to be drafted. It is my belief that such divided responsibility would make it difficult to allocate workers with accuracy and dispatch. To whatever extent that happens, manpower will be wasted and the number of fathers who will be vulnerable to the draft will be increased.

The principle that there should be one responsible administrative authority allocating manpower between military and civilian needs is basic in all well-operated programs. It is worth notice that every congressional committee which has studied the problem has reached that conclusion. The Truman committee, the Tolan committee, the Kilgore committee, have all, in various language, placed emphasis upon the need for a single, responsible, administrative control. The proposed amendment would make it impossible for the President to provide for the integration of selective-service policy with the manpower program as a whole. It would throw all coordination back into the President's hands. It is a sabotage of sound administration. Let us hope that if it is passed, the President's critics will not then attack him on the ground that administrative responsibility is divided.

It was the absence of such a single integrated control and the urgent necessity of coordinating military and civilian recruitment, led the President on December 5 to issue an Executive order transferring the Selective Service System to the War Manpower Commission. In the absence of such coordination, it is inevitable that an agency responsible solely for filling military calls would tend to subordinate the vital needs of war production. The depletion of our manpower pool over the past 2 years and the fact that we are approaching peak schedules of war production make it especially important that the greatest possible selectivity be exercised.

Another important consideration in reviewing the relationship of the United States Employment Service and the Selective Service System lies in the resources and facilities which must be made available in restoring individuals to useful war work as they are discharged from the armed services. Arrangements have been effected and procedures issued for a close working relationship between local selective-service boards and local employment offices to war-useful employment. In many respects this working relationship constitutes the basis for the post-war readjustment of demobilized individuals. It would be extremely unfortunate to impede the efforts now being made to speedily place individuals who have been discharged from the armed forces.

Very real progress has been made during the past year in developing an over-all manpower program designed to recruit manpower for the armed services, the war-production industry, and the civilian economy. These provisions authorizing the President to delegate selective-service authority to the Director of Selective Service only, would tear apart the relationship which has been established, and would seriously weaken the manpower program on the basis of which this recruitment is now being effectively carried on.

These paragraphs will, I hope, serve to state the fundamental issue. It is one which I think the Senate should know before taking final action.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

LXXXIX——618

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but first I merely wish to say that under the language of the bill as it comes from the conference no individual will be inducted because of occupation. Nondeferrable lists set up by the War Manpower Commission have been entirely eliminated, and will be eliminated by the language of the bill that has been agreed upon by the conferees.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has just called my attention to a colloquy which took place on the floor of the Senate when the Bailey-Clark amendment was under consideration, in which I stated:

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from North Carolina, the author of the amendment. I call his attention to the language on page 3, beginning in line 3:

"The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final."

I have no complaint with the paragraph, but the question arises whether that language applies only to subsection (n), or whether it has general application. I assume that the Senator intended that the paragraph should have general application, and did not intend to have it apply only to subsection (n). There is some question in my mind as to whether it applies only to subsection (n), particularly because it is in that subsection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about that. The language is:

"The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, but that applies to appeals, if the Senator will notice.

Mr. WHEELER. Wait a moment. The Senator from North Carolina continued:

The words "this act" refer to the entire act.

That was the question in my mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They do, so far as appeals are concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. No; the language goes further than that, it seems to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know how it can go any further.

Mr. WHEELER. The subsection deals with appeals, I agree. That is the thing of which I was asking the Senator for his interpretation. The Senator from North Carolina said:

The words "this act" refer to the entire act.

Then I stated:

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, allow me to say to my friend that it was not only a question in my mind but it was likewise a question which I raised in the mind of the legislative counsel, Mr. Murphy. There was some question about it, and it was thought that it might possibly be interpreted in that way. I wished to have the explanation of the Senator from North Carolina, which is that the language is not intended to apply merely to this particular subsection but that it is to apply generally to the whole selective-service law.

Mr. BAILEY. If the language had been intended to apply merely to the subsection, it would have read "under this subsection" instead of "under this act." The word "act" is very significant. In my judgment, it refers to the whole act.

So, if it referred to the whole act, then it did not refer to appeals, because the language is:

The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, we had that colloquy before us when the conferees reached their agreement. But regardless of what the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators may have intended to write into the bill, this is what they wrote into the bill—and I read from the bill itself:

Such decision of the appeal board shall be final unless modified or changed by the Director of Selective Service. The Director of Selective Service, upon appeal or upon his own motion, shall have power to determine all claims or questions with respect to inclusion for, or exemption or deferment from, training and service under this act; and the determination of the Director shall be final.

That is still talking about appeals. However, the conferees adopted the language found in the report, so that the President either must exercise the authority and power we have given him under this act itself or, if he delegates it to anyone, he must delegate it to the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In view of the letter of Commissioner McNutt, and also in view of statements contained in letters sent out by some news services to the effect that the provisions both of the Senate and the House bills were intended as some derogation of the respect due to the President, or some attempt to limit the President's authority, or else an attempt to unhorse Mr. McNutt, I should like to say that the provisions referred to in the Bailey-Clark amendment were included in that amendment at my instance and insistence, and were included after consultation with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who was one of the Senators in charge of the bill, and with various other Senators. The language was substantially taken from a provision in the substitute of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

I should like to say that there was no intention on the part of anyone, so far as I know, and I think I attended all the conferences that discussed the matter, of showing any disrespect to the President, or in the slightest degree undertaking to derogate his authority, and there was not even any attempt whatever to unhorse Mr. McNutt. The whole point was that the Senate and the House, in my judgment, were tired of the ring-around-the-rosy game which has been

played in this country for the last several months, which has caused so much confusion and so much dissatisfaction.

It has been the practice that if one went to Hershey with a problem arising in the field, Hershey would say, "You have to go to Appleby," or whatever the name of the executive assistant or director may be, who would say he did not know about it, and that you would have to go to McNutt. McNutt would say you would have to go to somebody else. It was the intention of this provision to fix the authority and the responsibility some place where Congress could get at it, and have someone to hold responsible.

The question then was whom to hold responsible, and it was deemed wise to include a provision looking to holding responsible a statutory officer already in existence, one provided for by statute in connection with setting up the Selective Service. He was the man who was to exercise the responsibility, and to be held responsible.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be an entire muddying of the issue to come forward now and try to create a controversy between the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service. Congress set up the Selective Service. Congress had the right to impose any duties it saw fit on any statutory officer, and that is all it did, and all that was intended to be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the so-called Bushfield amendment respecting preinduction physical examination was somewhat changed, but it still remains in the bill as reported by the conferees. I do not know whether it is improved, but the idea is there, although the House made some changes to which the Senate conferees agreed.

Another feature of the bill, I may say, was the setting up of a board of five physicians. The purpose was to reduce the number of persons classified in IV–F. That point was repeatedly discussed in the Senate, and there seemed to be a desire on the part of the Senate that persons placed in class IV–F should be more carefully scrutinized. So provision was made to create a board of five physicians so as to get more inductees out of the IV–F classification, and the provision was especially directed toward the physical, mental, and moral condition of the prospective inductees.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am glad to yield. The Senator from Montana stressed that point repeatedly.

Mr. WHEELER. Information which has been furnished me by a rather reliable source is to the effect that already more than 500,000 men have been mustered out of the armed services, and that by the end of the year it is estimated that considerably more men will have been mustered out. Some estimates are that as many as a million men will be mustered out. It does not seem possible, to me, that so many men could be mustered out, and that the Army is mustering out of the service at the rate of several hundred thousand a month men who have had the benefit of military training and experience, and a vast majority of whom are perfectly capable of performing limited duty. If the Army could be persuaded to postpone the discharge of such men, and if it would utilize them for the various so-called housekeeping duties, it would become unnecessary to call so many fathers. I do not have the exact figures but I have the figures furnished me some time ago by the Army.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a provision of the conference report bearing on that point. I think the provision referred to would be an improvement of the existing law, because it would open the door, as the Senator suggests, for the employment of officers coming from one group. I read from the third paragraph on page 3 of the conference report:

Provided, That any officer on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or of any reserve component thereof or any officer or employee of any department or agency of the United States who may be assigned or detailed to any office or position to carry out the provisions of this act (except to offices or positions on local boards or appeal boards established or created pursuant to section 10 (a) (2)) may serve in and perform the functions of such office or position without loss of or prejudice to his status as such officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or reserve component thereof, or as such officer or employee in any department or agency of the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. If I may have the indulgence of the Senator from Colorado, I should like to have him point out what the Army is doing. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Army should call pre-Pearl Harbor fathers and at the same time muster out several hundred thousand men who are still qualified for limited service. Some of the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers have one child; some have as many as five children; some have as many as nine children. Mr. President, stop and think what that means in the way of expense to this country, not only in the matter of taking care of the children during the war but in the matter of the burden which will be placed upon the Government after the war, if the fathers of those children are wounded or injured.

I appreciate the fact that anyone who criticizes the Army in the slightest degree because of anything it does during wartime subjects himself to serious animadversions, but I submit there is no reason in the world why the Army should be mustering out every month thousands of men who have had experience and training, and then calling in pre-Pearl Harbor fathers with five, six, eight, or nine children. It is an absurdity upon its face.

In the last few weeks there came to see me a man who happened to be hospitalized for a few weeks, and then was mustered out. Some such men have said they were not physically fit to take the tough training, but that they were doing limited-service work. The man who spoke to me said he was doing office work. He was mustered out, but he said, "I am perfectly able, physically, to do that work." He wanted to stay in the Army, but he was mustered out. Other cases of the same kind and character have come to my attention, and they are occurring all over the United States. Why does the Army muster out such men, on the one hand, after they have had a year or 2 years of training, and then call fathers with children?

When the bill was before the Senate, everyone knows that the sentiment of the Senate was overwhelmingly in favor of the passage of a bill exempting fathers; but in order to prevent having that done, General Marshall and Admiral King were called before the committee. Immediately it was said, of course, "Anything they say you must not question; you must not question anything under the sun that General Marshall or Admiral King says." If any Member of the Senate had stood on this floor and said that the War Department should not have the $13,000,000,000 it is now turning back to the Treasury I can almost hear other Members of the Senate saying to him, "You must not question that; they know what they are about."

The Army is going to turn back $13,000,000,000 which it cannot use. Yet, Mr. President, if any Senator had stood on this floor and suggested a reduction of the appropriations he would have been severely criticized in many of the newspapers, by the Army, by the Navy, and by the administration. I could stand here the remainder of the afternoon and call attention to the fact that factories are now being closed and that copper is now being stock-piled, although a few months ago certain officials of the Government were calling for more copper, were saying not enough copper was being mined, and were urging that more and more copper be mined. Nevertheless, today copper is being stock-piled, and factories are being closed.

In my judgment, the first thing we know we are likely to have some unemployment in the United States. Why do we not wait awhile before we allow to be called into the service fathers who could not possibly be shipped overseas as soon as they were called? Why not use common, ordinary horse sense, and not take fathers with children, and break up homes? Why not wait a few months, to see whether it will be necessary to take fathers into the armed forces and to break up many homes?

Mr. President, I do not think it will be necessary to take fathers. I do not think it is necessary to take them now, and I do not think it has been necessary to take them, any more than it was necessary to give the Army the $13,000,000,000 it could not possibly use, any more than it was necessary for certain officials of the Government to cry for all the copper in the United States, although now it is being stock-piled because more copper than can be used is available, or any more than it was necessary to keep in operation all the factories which are equipped to turn out munitions, although for a long time it was constantly said that the entire output of such factories was necessary, and that it was essential

to employ thousands of persons to work in such factories. However, now they are being closed.

With all due respect to General Arnold, he said that they had to proceed on a business basis. Of course, General Arnold is not responsible for it, because he could not possibly know what was going on in that gigantic undertaking, and I place no blame whatsoever on him, but I do say that there is more inefficiency today in the War Department than in almost any other department of our Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as the Senator from Montana knows, I am in agreement with him on the points which he has raised; but both the Senate and the House have refused to enact that kind of legislation. Every day fathers are being inducted all over the country. If the pending conference report is adopted, it may be of some little help, but Congress refused to enact the legislation which the Senator from Montana favored.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two observations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to make one further point, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I have to say is in connection with what the Senator from Montana has just stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The whole theory of the argument of the Senator from Montana was discussed for weeks and months. It was threshed out when the bill was before the Committee on Military Affairs, when hearings were held. It is true, as was made perfectly plain by General Marshall, General Hershey, and others who testified, that men are being discharged from the Army. They stated that, based upon an Army of 7,700,000 at the end of this year, an average of about 75,000 a month were being discharged for physical reasons. That is an average of about 900,000 a year. It may be true that some of those men might be used somewhere else for limited service; but I do not think that is a question which we can settle here. We do not have intimate knowledge about the condition of those men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the following language in the conference report. It is the last sentence in section 4:

> The Director of Selective Service shall cause to be reexamined those men, including those previously discharged from the armed services because of physical disability, who may qualify under any new standards established.

Mr. BARKLEY. Substantially that provision was in the bill as it passed the Senate. We adopted that amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true; and it is still in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. We instructed the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service, and the departments which were responsible, to reexamine all the men who had been discharged or who were on the verge of discharge for physical reasons, and all those who had been deferred for one reason or another. We instructed that they be reexamined with a fine-tooth comb to see if their services could not be utilized.

The point I am trying to make is that the War Department is not subject to criticism because it has been discharging and is now discharging men at the rate of about 75,000 a month for physical reasons. General Marshall and the other representatives of the War Department testified that as we get further into the war and our casualties increase, the average will be higher than 75,000.

So far as the $13,000,000,000 referred to by the Senator from Montana is concerned, we know, and any fair-minded, reasonable man is bound to concede, that when we got into this war unexpectedly after Pearl Harbor, we had to operate in a hurry. We had to do things on a large scale. We proceeded with the appropriation of money, and the War Department and the Navy Department proceeded in the execution of plans on the theory that it was much better to have more than was needed than to have less than was needed. If on any battlefield or in any program inaugurated by the War Department or the Navy Department, it had developed that less had been provided than we needed, the criticism of those departments would have mounted sky-high, compared with the criticism that they asked for more than they needed. I think it is to the credit of the War Department that it has already announced the return of $13,000,000,000 to the Treasury. The estimate is that the Navy Department will turn back $5,000,000,000, and perhaps more. I have heard estimates as high as $10,000,000,000.

The same thing happened in the last war. It is always impossible to sit down at a table and calculate to the fineness of a bat's eye, just how much is going to be needed everywhere. Congress accepts the theory that we are bound to prepare for the possibility of having more than is needed, rather than to have less than is needed, always provided, of course, that due economy is exercised in the expenditure of the money. I hope the War Department can turn back not only $13,000,000,000, but much more than that when the war is over, and that the Navy Department, in proportion to the amount which it has received, can turn back to the Treasury more billions of dollars than have been suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It restores our confidence in those departments to have them do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does; and it seems to me that they ought not to be criticized for finding out that they asked for more money than they needed, and are turning back the surplus.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the War Department for turning back the money; but when the Senator talks about $13,000,000,000 being what can be put in a bat's eye——

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that I was not talking about putting $13,000,000,000 in a bat's eye. I was talking about Army officers sitting down at a table and working out to the fineness of a bat's eye, everything they needed in the way of supplies and equipment.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was talking about a bat's eye, and I say he was talking about putting $13,000,000,000 in a bat's eye.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is playing on words.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Kentucky was playing on words.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that even the Senator from Montana thinks that $13,000,000,000 can be put in a bat's eye.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was playing on words when he was talking about the $13,000,000,000 which I mentioned. He said that Army officers could not sit down and work it out to the fineness of a bat's eye. I said that $13,000,000,000 could not be put in a bat's eye.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for once the Senator and I agree. Thirteen billion dollars cannot be put in a bat's eye. That is settled. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to have the Senator agree with me once in a while.

I wish to compliment the War Department for turning back $13,000,000,000. I hope the Navy Department will find that it has made mistakes to the extent of $10,000,000,000; and I hope the Maritime Commission will find that it has made mistakes to the extent of $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000. I hope that many of the other departments which are greatly overstaffed will find that they can turn back a few billion dollars of the taxpayers' money into the Treasury of the United States. If they would all do that, they would restore confidence in the Government and in the Democratic Party.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a statement in connection with something which the Senator from Montana has said. He said something about the War Department turning back $13,000,000,000. In a sense, that is true; and in a sense, it is not correct.

The Director of the Budget was before our committee a few days ago. It seems that this money has been turned over to the Director of the Budget, and he holds it until next July, to determine whether he shall reapportion or reassign any of the money. I wish to be frank about it. I told him that I doubted whether he had the authority to reapportion, reallot, or reappropriate money for the Department, and that that function was entirely within the province of the Congress. In some way he holds it and sets up reserves. He is to furnish me with a brief so that we can determine whether or not he has authority to hold the money or to set up reserves with respect to that money or any other money. I do not think he has such authority.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let us put it in the new revenue bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly is not in the law at present.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for the interruption. If the Senator from Colorado will bear with me for a moment further, one of the things which is causing a break-down and lack of confidence in the Government is waste and extravagance, not only in the amount of money which is being squandered by some of the departments but in other respects. I think the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the special committee of which he is chairman have done a magnificent job in showing up some of the waste and extravagance which have occurred in some of the departments and agencies in Washington, for instance, in the War Department, as well as in other departments. I assume that the junior Senator from Missouri and his committee have not much more than scratched the surface in respect to much of the waste and extravagance which is occurring. There is not only waste of money but there is waste of manpower from one end of this country to the other. Let Senators talk to any businessmen or to any officers in the Navy Department and they will be told what I have been told. I have talked to some of the officers in the War Department and to some of the officers in the Navy Department, and they have told me that they can get along with one-third the personnel they have in Washington.

The whole matter ties into the operations of the Selective Service System, because of the waste and extravagance in connection with the use of the Nation's manpower.

I have no fault to find with Mr. McNutt. I do not think the fault is his. So far as I am concerned, I have no criticism in any way whatsoever of Mr. McNutt or of General Hershey. I think the responsibility should be centered in one man, for conflicting statements were constantly coming from those two agencies, some by Mr. McNutt and others by General Hershey.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The conference report does not put the responsibility in only one place. It puts it in two places, one of which is the Selective Service System.

Mr. WHEELER. What I was saying was that I think the Selective Service System was originally intended by Congress to be in one department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what this bill would do.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that is what it would do; and I am in thorough accord with the provisions of the bill, but by voting for it in that respect I do not want my vote or statement to be understood as being in the slightest a criticism of Mr. McNutt. I think it is rather a criticism of placing responsibility for the matter on both General Hershey and Mr. McNutt.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. On the subject of waste in the isolation of manpower, based on physical capacity, I think the RECORD should show that the general policy of the War Department is in full agreement with what the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has just stated. I should like to have the RECORD contain Circular No. 293, dated at Washington, November 11, 1943. That is only about a week or so ago. I will read from it only one sentence and shall request unanimous consent to have the whole of it inserted in the RECORD if the Senator will permit. Will he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. The portion I wish to read is as follows:

> The discharge of an enlisted man for physical reasons because he is incapable of serving in a physically exacting position when he may well render adequate service in a less exacting assignment is a waste of military manpower and is prohibited. Such men will be retained in the service and will be given appropriate assignments even though they do not fulfill the minimum physical standards for induction under MR 1–9.

That is the end of the portion I wish to read. I ask unanimous consent that the entire circular be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the circular was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIRCULAR NO. 293

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 11, 1943.

Enlisted men—Utilization of manpower based on physical capacity.—1. Rescission of previous instructions.—a. Circular No. 395, War Department, 1942, as amended by section II, Circular No. 404, War Department, 1942; section I, Circular No. 39, and section II, Circular No. 101, War Department, 1943; section III, Circular No. 161, War Department, 1943, as amended by section I, Circular No. 176, War Department, 1943; paragraphs 2 and 3, section III, Circular No. 189, War Department, 1943; and Memorandum No. W615–64–43, August 26, 1943, are rescinded.

b. All instructions and directives in conflict with the provisions of this circular are rescinded.

2. General policy: a. It is imperative that each enlisted man be assigned to the position in which he can render the maximum service. Classification, assignment, reassignment, and training are command functions which must be exercised energetically and continuously so that the skill, aptitude, physical qualifications, and capacity for development of the individual are used to the utmost.

b. Some assignments require enlisted men of unusual strength, stamina, and all around physical ability but even in combat units there are many positions which can be filled by men of lesser physical attainments. Conservation and proper use of our manpower require that each enlisted man found in an assignment beyond his physical capacity be reassigned to a job within that capacity. Many enlisted men who are below current physical standards for induction are extremely valuable to the Army because of their training, experience, ability, and demonstrated capacity to render service in a specified assignment. The discharge of an enlisted man for physical reasons because he is incapable of serving in a physically exacting position when he may well render adequate service in a less exacting assignment is a waste of military manpower and is prohibited. Such men will be retained in the service and will be given appropriate assignments even though they do not fulfill the minimum physical standards for induction under MR 1–9.

c. (1) Officers responsible for selection and dispatch of oversea casual replacements will select only those fully qualified physically to perform the duties of their military occupational specialties under field conditions. See paragraph 4a (6).

(2) Men of Table of Organization units dispatched overseas must be considered in the same way. At the time they were assigned to units these men were considered physically qualified to serve therein. Those found definitely not qualified should be removed as early as possible in the training period. As members of units arriving at a port of embarkation these enlisted men have been trained in their jobs, have proved their ability in their assignments, and have become part of the organization team. Though they may not meet the standards for individual replacements, they are considered fully capable of performing adequately in their current assignments unless they have suffered recent marked physical set-back or deterioration. The unnecessary removal of trained enlisted men from units immediately prior to departure for overseas is a flagrant example of wastage of military manpower and training, destructive alike to the morale of the individual and the efficiency of the unit.

d. The existence of a nonprogressive or remedial defect or disease which would disqualify a man for dispatch overseas will not be sufficient reason to return him to the United States from an overseas theater. Men whose defects are such that they can be remedied within the oversea command and those who can serve usefully in any assignment in oversea theaters, despite their defects, will be retained. Malaria alone, without incapacitating residual damage or sequelae, such as marked splenomegaly or cachexia, will not be a reason for return to the United States from overseas.

e. The discharge of men who can render effective service is prohibited. On the other hand, the retention of men unable to perform a reasonable day's work for the Army is wasteful. Therefore, commanders and surgeons will exercise extreme care and judgment in arriving at a decision to discharge an enlisted man on physical grounds. It is essential that commanders exercising discharge authority give this matter their closest personal supervision so as to obtain the maximum benefit from available manpower. Enlisted men who are physically unable to render useful military service in any assignment that can reasonably be made available will be discharged immediately under the provisions of AR 615–360. If overseas they will be returned to the United States for discharge.

f. Enlisted men will be assigned to the most active-type of duty appropriate to their physical qualifications with due consideration to their civilian training and experience, education, intelligence, aptitude, leadership ability, and acquired military occupational qualifications. All commanders and those staff officers concerned with personnel must study this matter continuously, for it never remains static.

g. Each of the three major forces must make the best use of its physically handicapped enlisted men. Enlisted men will not be transferred from one major force to another solely by reason of physical condition without the concurrence of the commanders concerned, except as directed by the War Department. Enlisted men of the Army Ground Forces who cannot be used in any unit or installation thereof by reason of physical handicap, but who are considered capable of rendering useful service elsewhere, will be reported to The Adjutant General for reassignment.

3. Use of term "limited service": The use of the term "limited service" pertaining to enlisted men is discontinued. This term is used only at armed forces induction stations where similar terminology is used by Selective Service and the Navy. Discontinuance of the term "limited service," however, does not mean that men heretofore classified as "limited service" are to be discharged or that the Army will not continue to induct and use men who do not meet the full standards for general service. No man will be discharged for physical disability if he meets the standards for induction for limited service currently prescribed in MR 1-9.

4. Physical standards for dispatch overseas:

a. Enlisted men will not be dispatched overseas who have any of the following defects:

(1) Pronounced psychiatric disorders. Men with other psychiatric disorders, except mild psychoneuroses, transient in character, will not be sent overseas with combat units or as casual replacements.

(2) Hernia, except small incisional or umbilical. Moderate impulse produced by cough at the inguinal ring or at the site of a scar is not necessarily indicative of hernia. Diagnosis of inguinal hernia must be based upon demonstration of a hernial sac.

(3) Class I dental defects, except those individuals whose only defect is the need of prosthetic replacements, provided that, despite the missing teeth, they have been able to follow a gainful occupation in civil life, and histories indicate that restoration of the missing teeth is not essential.

(4) Enucleation of an eye with or without prosthesis.

(5) Individuals who have suffered from tropical diseases causing residual damage or sequelae, or tropical diseases, such as filariasis, which are liable to exacerbation or serious aggravation upon reinfection. This does not include uncomplicated malaria, except that individuals who have or have had a clinical attack of malaria or in whose blood malaria parasites are found will not be sent overseas until 6 months subsequent to the date of recovery from symptoms or of disappearance of parasites from the blood.

(6) Defects below the minimum physical standards for induction as provided in MR 1-9, as amended, except that enlisted members of units who have defects below the minimum standards for induction, other than those listed in (1) through (5) above, and who have been trained in and have performed adequately in their current assignments, or who are believed capable of serving usefully therein, will be retained in their units.

b. Enlisted men not qualified for oversea service as specified in this circular will be removed from units prior to departure from home stations. Examinations of men in units at staging areas will be limited to necessary physical inspections to determine the existence of communicable disease, venereal disease disqualifying under the provisions of e below, and to locate and remove those whose physical condition has undergone a marked and disqualifying deterioration subsequent to the screening at home station. The removal of men from units at staging areas immediately prior to departure overseas must be reduced to a minimum.

c. Enlisted men with physical defects which disqualify them for oversea service will not be reassigned to oversea replacement depots, casual shipments, or tactical units of the field forces which have been alerted for oversea service. They will be reassigned to installations, activities, or units assigned to duty in the continental United States until their defects are remedied. This does not prohibit the appropriate reassignment to new or low priority units of casual replacements disqualified under a (6) above, but who otherwise meet the requirements for oversea shipment as members of units.

d. When disqualifying defects are discovered, appropriate notation will be made on Soldier's Qualification Card under "Remarks" (par. 28, W. D., A. G. O. Form No. 20) and on service records (W. D., A. G. O. Form No. 24) under "Remarks Administrative." Prompt initiation and early completion of action to remedy correctable defects is the responsibility of every commander.

e. (1) When otherwise qualified, enlisted men with venereal diseases are eligible for oversea shipment except for those with the following conditions:

(a) Chancroid or undiagnosed penile ulcers.

(b) Primary and secondary syphilis unless two injections of an arsenical have been administered.

(c) Sulfonamide-resistant gonorrhea as determined by failure to respond to one course of treatment.

(d) Gonorrhea with complications such as epididymitis, arthritis, and severe acute prostatis.

(e) Granuloma inguinale or lymphogranuloma venereum.

(2) When penicillin is available on transports, all individuals with gonorrhea, except those with complications listed in (1) (d) above, may be shipped.

5. Uniform standard and procedures to prevail: Commanders will require officers under their jurisdiction to read this circular within 48 hours of its receipt at the station. They will then conduct the conferences and inspections necessary to insure that all concerned are acquainted with these policies and that a uniform understanding of standards and procedure is achieved.

[A. G. 220.4 (6 Nov. 43).]

By order of the Secretary of War:

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Official:
ROBERT H. DUNLOP,
Brigadier General,
Acting The Adjutant General.

Mr. AUSTIN. In passing, I should like to observe that of course the men and women of this country, other than those already in the military forces, do not come under the authority of the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces until the law with which we are dealing operates, and neither do they come under the general policy of the War Department or the Navy Department until the execution of the law with which we are dealing.

So when we consider the question of whether we will accept or reject the conference report, I wish Senators to take into account the question of whether we have devised well in amending the Selective Training and Service Act so as to get into the armed forces all those eligibles who are in categories ahead of the category of fathers. That is the question. We have tried to accomplish that result in several different ways. One of the ways is by trying to eliminate the waste to which Senators have referred. We did that by doing away with the existing law which retires an officer at a certain age, no matter whether he is at the zenith of his powers or not, and which made it utterly impossible to employ him in any capacity in connection with the operation of the law we are considering. If this proposed legislation should become law, all such men would be available.

Then we have proposed that the law be made operative on a Nation-wide and State-wide basis, and that certainly would open the door very wide to a great number of men who are in classes ahead of the class of fathers.

There are other provisions in the proposed law. I shall not take time to refer to them. But I have not heard the senior Senator from Colorado, who has submitted the report, say anything which would justify the Senate in rejecting the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope I have not said anything that would have that effect.

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Colorado has exhibited great zeal for the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. In the committee I was overruled on some very important points concerning which I feel deeply, and naturally I am not too enthusiastic for some of the provisions contained in the report.

There is just one other point I should like to discuss.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BALL. This morning I received a letter from a businessman in St. Paul who had been working with the War Manpower Commission in promoting the use by industry of manning tables and replacement schedules. Apparently he has the impression that the conference report would provide that fathers would be placed last in the draft list, and that all single men and married men without children, regardless of occupation, would be called before fathers were called; in other words, that all occupational deferments of single men and/or married men without children would be wiped out by the bill.

I call the Senator's attention to the language at the top of page 2 of the House report, in line 7, where provision is made that registrants shall report on a Nation-wide basis and a State-wide basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. BALL. From page 2 of the conference report. The language is as follows:

> Registrants shall, on a Nation-wide basis within the Nation and a State-wide basis within each State, be ordered to report to induction stations in such a manner that registrants—

It is the following language which I assume gave rise to my correspondent's impression of the bill—

> regardless of their occupations or the activities in which they may be engaged, who were married prior to December 8, 1941, who have maintained a bona fide family relationship with their families since that date and who have a child or children under 18 years of age, will be inducted after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability, or postponed from induction under this act or the rules and regulations prescribed thereunder who are available for induction and are acceptable to the land and naval forces.

That would tend to create the impression that we are wiping out all occupational deferments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that is not correct. It is a misinterpretation of the conference report to say that the bill would wipe out all such deferments.

Mr. BALL. I do not understand. There is also in the conference report this language, for instance:

> To report * * * after the induction of other registrants not deferred, exempted, relieved from liability—

And so on. What is the purpose of that language?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to page 6 of the statement on the conference report, in line 5 of the second paragraph. The language to which I refer reads, as follows:

> This provision will do away with the so-called nondeferable orders which distinguished between persons in the same status with respect to dependents merely because of differences in occupations.

That is an explanation of the language. The statement continues, as follows:

> It does not abolish class II occupational deferments and the distinctions resulting from such deferments, but it does prevent registrants in a given occupation from being inducted in advance of the time they would otherwise be inducted, merely because of their occupation.

In other words, the report sets aside the present rule and regulation whereby a bartender, for instance, with five children, would be taken into the service, regardless of the fact that he had dependents simply because his occupation was a nondeferrable one?

Mr. BALL. And classed as nonessential.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. That list was promulgated by the War Manpower Commission, and that list is wiped out and eliminated by the conference report.

Mr. BALL. The Senator means that as between a bartender with five children and a single man employed in a food industry, the single man in the food industry would come first unless specific deferment had been obtained for him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bartender and all other fathers would be in the same pool; they would all be at the end of the list.

Mr. BALL. What I am getting at is that the conference report wipes out the occupational deferment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No.

Mr. BALL. What is being wiped out, then, is the War Manpower Commission's classification of deferrable and nondeferrable or essential and nonessential occupations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is still the classification of A–2, which is occupational; then, A–2 is divided.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Colorado has made a good explanation, but I wish to observe, in passing, that this provision to which attention has been called applies only to fathers; it does not apply to any other classes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And to pre-Pearl Harbor fathers at that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only other point I wish to call attention to is a provision which was put into the bill by the House and was not in the Senate bill, that the Director of the Selective Service must gather information from various governmental agencies concerning requests for deferment, deferments, exemptions, rejections, discharges, inductions, enlistments, replacement schedules, and other matters with respect to registrants, whether or not they are members of the armed forces, or whether or not they are Government or private employees. He must report to the House and to the Senate, that is to the respective military committees of the two bodies such information periodically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Henry B. Steagall, late a Representative from the State of Alabama, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. J. William Ditter, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to Senate bill 1285 and request that it be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and the clerk will read the amendment, as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 20, after the word "President", it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That the President by the exercise of this authority shall be deemed to disqualify himself thereby from being a candidate for any office to be affected by the administration of this act; should the President become disqualified from exercising the authority granted to him under this act, then and in that event, the ex-President of the United States who has most recently served as President shall exercise every and all authority which otherwise is granted the President under the language of this act."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that the committee amendment is now open to amendment from the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is pending. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "Electors of President and Vice President of the United States", and on page 20, after line 6, to insert the following:

> (b) 2. In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual specified in subsection (c) who is absent from the place of his voting residence but otherwise eligible to register and qualified to vote in any election for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, shall be entitled to vote for such electors in accordance with the provisions of this title.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understood there was general agreement upon that amendment, and I thought it had been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer for myself, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I ask that the amendment be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and it will be read as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

> That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for members of the armed forces to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, it is recommended that each State cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy an adequate number of postal cards for use by such absentee voters in the armed forces in making application for absentee ballots, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall, wherever practicable, and compatible with military operations, cause such postal cards to be delivered to members of the armed forces located within or without the United States, as expeditiously as possible in order to enable such members of the armed forces to secure, execute, and return said ballots in ample time to be recorded for such election.
>
> SEC. 2. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may

be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including postal cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to follow up and clean up the subject I raised earlier in the afternoon, because I understand the able Senator from Rhode Island is in substantial agreement with the amendment which I shall offer. I, therefore, send the two following amendments to the desk and ask that they be read and be considered together; and, after they are read, I shall indicate what the net result of the adoption of the amendments would be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 17, line 9, beginning with the word "In", it is proposed to strike out through line 20, and on page 17, line 20, in the amendment of the committee, after the period, it is proposed to insert the words "The vote of a majority of all the commissioners shall be necessary to a decision by the commission on any matter."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the net result of the two amendments simply is that the language of the pending bill which presents the Chief Justice of the United States with a requested duty which he has indicated he is not prepared to accept is eliminated, and there is substituted a commission consisting of four commissioners, two Republicans and two Democrats, with three of them necessarily voting upon any decision. My understanding is that the Senator from Rhode Island is of the opinion that that is as available as any formula for dealing with the situation.

Mr. GREEN. In view of the communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, some other alternative should be chosen, and the alternative suggested by the Senator from Michigan seems to be as fair as any, especially as it does away with the possibility of any partisanship on the part of the commission. I may say that I accept the amendment as offered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am not very familiar with the proposal. I regret that I was unable to be present this morning to attend the conference of the minority. I do not know whether this suggestion grows out of that conference or not. It would lend some weight to it with me if I did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It did grow out of the conference this morning.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator. I have just been informed of other facts regarding the matter which also incline me to favor the amendment.

I wish to make some inquiries about the amendment for my own information. Does it change the evenly balanced commission?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does not.

Mr. AUSTIN. It leaves a commission of four?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It does.

Mr. AUSTIN. Two of whom shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the party casting the largest number of votes at the last general election, and two from the party casting the next largest number of votes in that election?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Thereupon, it would be possible, if the amendment were accepted, for the commission to divide equally; would it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. In other words, there could be a stultification of the action of the commission by a tie vote?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There could be a failure. Whether that would be a stultification or a victory for common sense would depend upon the facts involved.

Mr. AUSTIN. I trust the author of the amendment does not regard my inquiries as offensive.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. This is old straw for us. I happen to have served on the subcommittee, and we worked so hard on this proposition that I think we thrashed out that particular element quite fully.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may interrupt the Senator, I should like to give him one further bit of information, as I do not think he was present this morning when I first raised the question; I do not think he had reached the floor. I presented a letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court asserting that under no circumstances could he comply with the request which is contemplated by the language on page 17.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is an additional fact of importance, and it is in line with what I would expect of the Chief Justice. Also I doubt if the Chief Justice would accept an appointment even on an operating commission of the kind suggested.

Mr. VANDENBERG. He so stated that he would neither accept a place himself nor accept the responsibility for designating someone else.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then this is the place where I think it is just as important as in any other discussion of the bill for me to ask some questions of the author of the bill. I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, who, for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and himself, introduced the bill, whether they favor the theory, at least, of the Chief Executive, in making the appointments, giving consideration to a list of names of men furnished by those who are in charge of the Republican organization, a list of names of men furnished by those who are the officials of this great political party, and whether the authors of the bill favor the idea of having the President accept such lists with a view of making the selections from them of the two men who would be nominated from the Republican Party. Will the Senator kindly state his position on that point?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may speak more strongly for my colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] than for myself. I know that he is opposed to any such proposition. I, too, am opposed to it, but perhaps not for the same reasons.

Speaking for my reasons, I regard all such limitations on the power of the President to be contrary to the intent of the Constitution. If a limited list is submitted to the President, he cannot exercise the Executive power of appointment which is given him under the Constitution, although I am quite aware of the fact that that has been done a number of times.

I have stated my principal objection to the suggestion. My colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has just entered the Chamber, and he can state his objection, which is based on somewhat different grounds, but in his objection I concur.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask the Senator another question. Assuming an amendment of the bill should be proposed which would aim at some such procedure, and that it should be rejected by the Senate, leaving the bill as we understand it would be upon acceptance of the Vandenberg amendment, with two and two on the commission, with the possibility of a tie, then would the Senator from Rhode Island join with other Senators in urging the President to give consideration, without any law requiring it, to the names presented by some Republican organization, someone who is regarded by Republicans as official, to select therefrom the two men who would be appointed as Republicans on the commission?

Mr. GREEN. I may say that I would thoroughly approve of that. In fact, I might go further than the Senator from Vermont proposes. If it were understood that the majority and minority leaders were to submit names of members of their respective parties to the President, I would strongly urge him to choose from that list, provided it were not too small a list. My purpose, and I am sure the purpose of all the proponents of the bill, is to make certain that it is an absolutely fair bill. We do not want someone who is only a nominal Democrat or a nominal Republican, but someone who will represent the great body of opinion in the two parties, because it is very important that the commission should have the confidence of the members of both parties in its nonpartisanship. In fact, if apart from any action of the Senate, either the majority leader or minority leader should object to any names sent in by the President, I should be glad to support him in his objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. He has confirmed what I understood to be his position in the subcommittee.

May I now inquire of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the coauthor of the bill, what his position is with respect to this informal method of advising the President of who are considered by the parties, in their organizations, to be representative Republicans and Democrats? I am not so concerned about the Democratic Party. That is up to the Democrats. I would not pretend to enter their sanctum sanctorium, and that is why I limit my question to Republicans.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent from the Senate Chamber when the debate upon the pending measure was resumed. However, I think I understand what the able Senator from

Vermont was discussing. Insofar as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I agreed with the Vandenberg amendment in the full realization that it was almost impossible under the Constitution of the United States to be able to obtain the fifth man unless we wanted to go through with the bill as originally drawn, wherein we provided that the President appoint a commission of five, three of whom were to be Democrats and two of whom were to be Republicans.

Mr. President, I want my position in respect to the War Ballot Commission thoroughly understood. I made the statement before the Committee on Privileges and Elections as a witness and as coauthor of the bill to the effect that all I wanted was an honest, efficient, and expeditious arrangement by the Congress so that soldiers might have a real opportunity to vote. I still stand by that statement. I even went so far as to say that insofar as I was concerned three Republicans could be appointed on the ballot commission and I would not object. Apparently I have more confidence in the high type of men who will render this public service than Republican Senators have with respect to this ballot commission.

Mr. President, much has been said about the ballot commission, and one would think that it is the matter of prime importance in the bill. When the Senate accepted the amendment earlier today which eliminates the provision that the Governor of each State must certify that there has been a substantial compliance with the provisions of this act it eliminated all the trouble which might arise as the result of what the ballot commission might do after the votes have been counted.

I know that the Senator from Vermont agrees with me that whatever the commission may do will be purely administrative or ministerial, and that the commission will have no actual power of making a decision about any question of vital importance. That is particularly true in view of the elimination of the provision in the bill earlier today by adoption of the Vandenberg amendment.

Mr. President, one would think from what has been said in the debate and what has been printed in the newspapers, that the ballot commission is going to take charge of all the ballots; that the commission is going to carry the ballots to the soldiers; that the commission is going to set up the election machinery, and count the ballots after they are cast. Anyone who knows anything about the bill must realize that the ballot commission is established primarily for the purpose of relieving the Army and the Navy of the administrative load.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I did not intend to ask the Senator a question on those points. I do not think I asked my question clearly enough. Will the Senator permit me to restate it?

Mr. LUCAS. I am coming to it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, is the Senator doing so?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I am simply making a preliminary statement.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. I appreciate what the Senator is saying, because it is my opinion that the commission will be an operating commission, and will have nothing to do with legislating, and fixing policy, and that sort of thing.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. And that the commission will merely be the instrumentality of the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. But even such a commission should command the confidence of all Republicans.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. It must do so to be effective.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator; and because there has been so much misinformation with respect to the powers of the ballot commission the Senator from Illinois is willing to go off on the deep end in order to clear up any misunderstanding.

Mr. AUSTIN. How far would the Senator go in cooperating with the Republicans to induce the Chief Executive to make his appointments from a panel submitted by the organization that represents the Republican Party?

Mr. LUCAS. I went a long way earlier today in agreeing to the amendment offered by my good friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. It would seem to me that in view of the letter the Senator read from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan would be satisfactory. In view of the fact that there is nothing the members of the commission should quarrel about; that they can make no decisions of vital importance I submit there will be no trouble unless they disagree in the beginning in choosing an executive director, the one who will probably do most of the detail work for the commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have not yet obtained the answer to my question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret if I am taking too much time of the Senator, but I want to lay down my theory with respect to the ballot commission. I do it because, as I said before, there has been so much misinformation and so much shadow-boxing for some cause or other about the ballot commission. I will now answer the Senator in this way: In view of the fact that I am willing to agree to the Vandenberg amendment, which simply means that three individuals on the commission must agree at any time before a decision can be reached, and in view of the fact that no decisions of any importance will ever be reached, it seems to me that we should leave the appointment of the four commissioners to the President of the United States. This position is supported by the fact that we have kept the constitutional power of confirming these men in the Senate of the United States. In view of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to which the Senator from Illinois agrees, I cannot see any point in submitting a list of names by the chairman of the Democratic Party and the chairman of the Republican Party to the President of the United States. If it were a question involving important delegated powers to the commissioners a different argument might be made; but I am not going to place the President of the United States in the position that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans have any confidence in him with respect to the appointment of commissioners with ministerial powers. That is exactly the position in which he would be placed in the event we were to say that a list of men from the Republican Party and a list of men from the Democratic Party would have to be submitted to the President. I speak only for myself, yet I believe that every Democrat on this side of the Chamber will support the President of the United States upon that proposition in view of the Vandenberg amendment. I am going to stand firm in that position. I cannot through such an amendment say that I have no confidence in the type of men he will send here for confirmation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield, but I should like to pursue this point further.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question in the time of the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Illinois has made a very able statement, but I cannot believe he is as naive as his statement would indicate. I simply want to ask him if he expects all the people of the country, including all the Republicans of the country, to have complete confidence in appointments the President might make, when the President himself may be a candidate in the election in which the War Ballot Commission would supervise the casting of votes by 10,000,000 voters.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, apparently the Senator has no confidence in the Senate of the United States; because the Senate has the power of confirmation of appointments. Let me further say as a matter of good faith what I said as a witness before the committee. In the event the President of the United States does not send to the Senate the nomination of men agreeable to the minority leader in the Senate, I will stand with the minority, and will vote not to confirm. How much further does the Senator from New Hampshire desire me to go? If he wishes to call that being naive, I plead guilty. I am endeavoring to be fair about the matter, but I shall not vote for any amendment which is a reflection upon the integrity and good faith of the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely desire to say that it seems to me to be no reflection on the President of the United States. For instance, in Ohio—and, I suppose, in many other States—the four members of the board of election of a county are selected by the Republican committee of the county and the Democratic committee of the county. That is a recognized method of having a bipartisan board,

equally selected by the two committees. I think it is purely a method of controlling the holding of the election, and has nothing to do with the President of the United States and is no reflection on him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will not place the President of the United States in the same category as that of the chairman of a county board. The Senator from Ohio, however, may do so if he so desires.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that, after all, the control of elections is vested in the localities and the States. If the Senator desires to take the control away from the counties and the States, I do not see why we should not give it to the Federal Government and have the same rule apply.

Mr. LUCAS. In normal times that might be one thing, but the present times are abnormal, as everyone knows. If the Senator desires to take that position, I cannot help it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I desire to ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] a question. Please forgive me. I think the method proposed discloses a situation. I believe the discussion is revealing to the country a method which was before the committee when it considered this novel adventure. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico whether it does not strike him as entirely appropriate for members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to attempt to have the election surrounded with an atmosphere of confidence. The members of the committee have studied this problem with a view to giving the soldiers a real opportunity to vote under auspices which would not only guarantee the purity of the election and the certainty of their having their vote counted, but which would surround the procedure with an atmosphere of confidence. With that in mind, let me inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico would have objection to joining with the Republicans in requesting the President to make his appointments from a list of, let us say, 12 men who would have been named by the political organization of the Republican Party.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I judge from the question the Senator now asks that it is his view such a provision would not be included in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. But, inasmuch as the Senator has asked the chairman of the committee if he would personally make that request of the President, certainly I should be glad to join the chairman of the committee in requesting the President to select the Republican members from a list approved by the Republican organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator consider the queries I am making as a reflection in any way upon the President?

Mr. HATCH. Not the queries the Senator is making, but I am in hearty accord with what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has said about including such a provision as a part of the proposed legislation. I do not think it should be included as a part of the bill, but I am willing to do anything I can, individually, or as a Senator, or as a member of the committee, to request the President of the United States to select representative Republicans, recommended and approved by the Republican organization; and, as the Senator from Illinois has said, in the event that there were sent to the Senate names of nominees whom the Members of the Senate on the Republican side said were not representative of the Republican Party, I would join them in exercising the senatorial right to reject such nominations.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Because so much has been said about the bill, and in view of the fact that I know the Senator from Vermont is an able lawyer and a profound student of the Constitution, I desire to read to him an excerpt from article II of the Constitution, and ask him how the bill could possibly be constitutional in view of this provision:

Each State shall appoint—

Of course, that means each State shall elect—

in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct—

That means the Legislature of Vermont or of Tennessee or of any other State—

a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

With that provision in the Constitution, how can we set up machinery relative to a portion of the voters who are to vote in the election? It seems to me that under present circumstances we are precluded from doing so. Knowing the Senator from Vermont to be an eminent lawyer and particularly a great constitutional lawyer, because I have heard him argue constitutional questions on the floor of the Senate, I should like to have his opinion as to how the application of that constitutional provision could be avoided.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is a diversion from my query. I shall come to that point because I not only desire to be responsive but I should like to answer the question. Before doing so, I wish to make an observation about the proposed commission. It is a curious fact that I receive more complaints about the proposed commission and the possibility of having some prejudicial thing done by means of our legislation creating a commission which would be entirely in the hands of a possible candidate for the Presidency of the United States than I do regarding any other proposal of the bill.

As a member of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction of the bill, I receive more queries and criticisms relating to that point, than to anything else about the bill, even more than relate to the great questions which are signified by the inquiry of the learned senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Therefore, it seems to me we should devise the best possible means of clearing the atmosphere relating to the commission. After much study of the matter, I became persuaded that probably the only bill which was feasible, that is, the only one which would be passed by Congress, be approved by the President of the United States, and become law, would be one which would exclude any provision of control over the appointive power, and that we must resort, therefore, to an informal way of getting to the President our views with respect to who are regarded as Republicans.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is there any particular reason in the Senator's mind why the President of the United States should refuse to sign a bill which provides certain standards with respect to a list of nominees?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I think that as legislators we do not have to pass judgment on the President, or say that the President will veto the bill, as a reason for not doing a thing. That is not what I mean by my allusion to the bill passing the Congress and meeting with the approval of the President.

In my opinion there is quite a difference between the status of an academic question relating to constitutionality, which directly affects the Presidential authority and power, and a question of any other kind. It is a human trait for men, regardless of their office, to fight for their prerogatives and stand by them. When a man gets into office, is there anything more characteristic of him as the occupant of the office than that he should defend his jurisdiction? He would not be worth his salt if he did not defend the jurisdiction of his office and uphold its dignity and power, and fight every time an attack was made upon it. That is why it is very important for us to approach this particular question, which affects the appointive power of the President, with a good deal of caution and with wisdom, if we have it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is aware, of course, that time and again in American history the Congress has placed limitations on the Presidential power of appointment. It is customary for the President to make appointments from a list of nominations submitted by various groups. Such laws have been enacted and we have functioned under them as an American Government, and no President has ever felt insulted by such restrictions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me ask the Senator from New Hampshire, What are some of the laws in which restrictions have been placed on the President of the United States with respect to selection of appointees from a list? I am not familiar with them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under the Transportation Act of 1920, three members of an important board were nominated by the labor groups, three by the carriers, and

three members of the public were chosen by the President.

Under the National Screw Thread Commission Act of 1926, for the standardization of screw threads, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers nominated two members and the Society of Automotive Engineers nominated two.

There are many such instances. It may be said that they are not applicable to this case, but such restrictions have been placed. Such laws have been enacted, and we have functioned under them.

Mr. HATCH. Since the Senator has refreshed my memory, I do recall some of those laws; but I think they are altogether different from the situation with which we are confronted in the pending bill. These suggestions arise because it is said the President of the United States may be a candidate for office; and because he may be a candidate for office, he may select members of the Republican Party——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not yield for that charge to be made. That is not my view, and that is not what I implied, either. What I am trying to do is to lift the cloud and eliminate the possibility of the smell of brimstone. We are not really burning, but we do not want anyone to think that we are.

Mr. HATCH. I understand the position of the Senator from Vermont. What I was saying was in reply to what the Senator from New Hampshire said about the President possibly feeling insulted. As the Senator from Vermont will recall, I stated in the committee, that the only thing the authors of the bill desired was to see that the board was composed of men truly representative of both great political parties, so as to avoid any "smell of brimstone," to use the Senator's words. I should be perfectly willing to include in the bill a provision to make the board consist of a congressional committee composed of the majority leader of the House, the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House, and the minority leader of the Senate. I should be willing to have them appointed as the commissioners. We even discussed that possibility, because we knew that those men would inspire confidence. But I did not wish to write into the bill a restrictive provision—unless the commission were to be made a strictly Congressional commission—which would reflect upon the President of the United States, and incidentally reflect upon both parties. When it is said that the President of the United States might select members from the Republican Party and members from the Democratic Party who would not be truly representative of those parties, what would be the purpose of such selection? If he were to select a Republican who did not represent the organization, he would be a man who might "throw in" with the Democrats to steal an election. I have more confidence in the Republican Party than that. I do not believe that the President of the United States would select any man from any faction of the Republican Party who would be so venal or base as to do a thing of that sort; and I do not believe he would select such a man from the Democratic Party.

I believe that the suggestion not only implies a lack of confidence in the two great parties but a lack of confidence in the President of the United States and in the Senate itself, which, if such selections were made, would be called upon to ratify and confirm them. I think the whole idea implies an entire lack of faith in our political system from top to bottom, including the Senate.

I am perfectly willing to go along with the Senator from Vermont. If names of Republicans are sent to the Senate for confirmation, and the minority says that the nominees are not representative of the Republican Party, I, as a Senator, will vote not to confirm such nominations; and so far as I am concerned the same thing applies to this side of the Chamber.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. The responses from distinguished Senators reveal the spirit which existed in the committee, of fairness and honor, and a disposition to do the things which are necessary in order to afford the soldier the opportunity to cast his vote as he wishes, in secrecy, and to have his ballot delivered at the ballot box, like that of any person who is at home, instead of at the battle front.

The problem of how, by legislation, to control the appointment of the person who should be invested by Presidential appointment with this office was considered from a legal point of view. It was quite a problem. If we were to adhere to the policy of the bill and create an office of such dignity that it would require the advice and consent of the Senate to confirm the appointment of any person to such office, the appointing power would rest solely and exclusively in the President and the Senate. When we get into that area—as we did—if we attempt to restrict the appointment, we shall certainly be confronted by the argument of those who are interested to make it, that such a measure would be unconstitutional. I am not interested in making the argument, either with respect to this or any other impediment which may be found in the Constitution to the opportunity of the soldier to vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says he is not interested in making the constitutional argument. It was for that very reason that the committee finally agreed upon the suggestion which was placed in the bill with respect to the fifth member. We thought it would best serve our purpose to request the President of the United States to ask the Chief Justice of the United States to serve on the commission, just as he recently asked Justice Roberts to go to Hawaii and investigate what happened at Pearl Harbor. Justice Roberts did not have to make that trip. Something may come out of the Hawaiian disaster which will finally come before the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, Justice Roberts accepted the trust and did a good job, of course, as agent of the President in that case. That was discussed before the committee, and as a result of that precedent the committee inserted the provision in the bill with respect to having the President make the request knowing at the time that perhaps it was unconstitutional.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I gave my approval to the report on the pending bill containing that peculiar provision. I want it understood that I did not by so doing undertake to pass on the constitutionality of it. I did not pass on the constitutionality of the provision in the bill under the heading "Payment of poll tax not required" for if there is any one who is firmly persuaded in his mind that that provision is contrary to the command of the Constitution, I am he.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the position of the Senator, because it seems to me that if he admits that a provision in the proposed act is unconstitutional in his opinion, he creates a situation in which the whole validity of the election may be questioned.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very good.

Mr. TAFT. We may be faced with a controversy such as the Hayes-Tilden controversy, which almost produced civil war in the United States, and would have but for the willingness of Mr. Tilden to withdraw. So I cannot understand the Senator's position in stating that, although a certain provision in the bill is unconstitutional, he is willing to support it. It may create a dangerous situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Just a moment, please, and then I shall yield with pleasure.

Mr. President, I am trying to make it clear and unequivocal that my position is not that of passing on the constitutionality of this measure. I approve it without passing upon that question, because today, in time of war, a higher law than the Constitution commands us. In my opinion there is a binding obligation on me to afford to the soldier on the battlefield the opportunity to exercise the vote for which he is giving his blood, and I will do all that legislation requires in order to see that he gets the opportunity to vote. If he is denied that opportunity, and deprived of it by my opinion with respect to the constitutionality of this or that feature of legislation which is designed to do this extraordinary thing, to make possible an election day on the battlefield in a condition of world war, the effect on his morale will be profound.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I agree with the Senator, in terms just as strong as those used by him in regard to the absolute necessity of passing a bill which will permit all soldiers in the field, or wherever they may be, to vote. But I think it ought to be done in a constitutional way. I think it can be done in a constitutional way just as effectively as by

enacting this admittedly unconstitutional measure. I agree with the purpose of the Senator a thousand percent, but I disagree with him with regard to the method. As I look at it, it is our duty to stand by the Constitution. I am speaking only for myself. As I look at it, I think it is our duty to stand by the Constitution in a war as in peace; and I see no difficulty in securing a measure which will be entirely within the Constitution of the United States and will be just as effective as, if not more effective than, the pending bill would be.

I think the Chief Justice of the United States, in writing the letter to my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Michigan had in view that if the Congress is to set up a commission, the question which will undoubtedly be raised may come before the Supreme Court hereafter. The Chief Justice did not want to be handicapped by having been a party to any of it.

That is my view. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that no Senator desires any more ardently than do I that all the soldiers who are fighting for their country shall have the opportunity to vote. But let us give them that privilege in a constitutional way.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is a pious wish which was entertained by every member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Senator may be sure that we canvassed other ways, such as State legislation; that is, by having each State provide its own system; but that was found to be utterly futile. It would be necessary to have a session of the legislature of every State of the Union to enact special legislation, and then to consider reaching all the boys. They are not, as they used to be, gathered together in regiments by States. The famous Vermont regiment of former wars could be easily reached. Anyone in the State of Vermont knew where that regiment was all the time. In the old days ballots could have been delivered to that regiment for marking and casting. It cannot be done now. Our boys are scattered all over the world, in all arms of the service. In the administration of 48 different laws we would have the greatest confusion in the world, and meet with utter futility. As a matter of fact, under the law as it is today—the statute which we ourselves enacted—only 28,000 votes out of millions were collected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I was a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections at the time the pending bill was being considered. I voted against the bill because I was certain that the bill was in violation of the Constitution. I was certain of that for many reasons. I inquired of the committee if there was any question in the minds of its members as to the constitutionality of the bill. I understood them to say that that question had been passed upon and that there was no question about it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did the Senator understand me to say that?

Mr. MOORE. I do not know that the Senator said so, but that was my understanding. I am not attempting to quote anyone in particular.

I scarcely think it necessary in this country today for the motives of anyone to be challenged in the least concerning his attitude toward extending every privilege possible to the soldiers of this country. I am becoming tired of being told that a man who refuses to be in sympathy with a certain method of extending to the soldiers the privilege of voting is not in sympathy with the war and its successful conclusion.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I hope I may never consciously vote for any law for the benefit of any citizen if I have the slightest doubt of its constitutionality. I shall never knowingly cast my vote to violate the Constitution. I want my thoughts to be constantly in reverence of the Constitution, and I want the soldiers to revere the Constitution. I have no fear as to what the judgment of the soldiers will be if we conduct the affairs of this country in such a way as to maintain the Constitution for their benefit after the war shall have been won.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is fine. I approve of every man casting his vote according to the dictates of his own conscience, and I do not feel bound to justify my position on the pending measure, or any other measure, which I consider to be necessary or important for the preservation of the liberties of the people of the United States, for the protection of its territory from invasion, and for the ultimate saving of the Constitution, even to shedding blood.

Senators may argue the Constitution to me all they please—and I have no doubt I would gain much from listening to such arguments—but I shall never allow a debate over a constitutional question to palsy my arm in the defense of my country, and in the backing of my son and the sons of my colleagues, and all the people of this great country, in the gallant fight and great sacrifice they are making.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just referred to the question of the poll-tax provision in connection with the pending bill. It happens that on the poll-tax question the Senator from Vermont and I are again in accord. We both believe it beyond the power of Congress to pass the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, which does been pending before our committee, and now is on the calendar. We both voted the same way in the committee. But we believe the particular measure now pending is to be enacted under the wartime powers, and that they give a measure of constitutionality to the measure which the other bill does not possess. Am I correct in that?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have not even stuck my stakes on that. I say that the importance of the pending measure overshadows the debate on the other question, and that I will not permit it to interfere with my thought, my belief, and my effort to see that, by the wisest effort we can devise, we afford opportunity to the servicemen to cast their ballots. Therefore I do not pass upon that question, any more than the distinguished witness, Charles Warren, did. Does the Senator recall his testimony?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. This very point was raised. Here is a law today, with this section in it. The Senate voted for it, nearly all Senators voted for it, though some voted against it. Mr. Warren was asked, "Do you consider the act under which we are functioning today to be constitutional?" He said, "The war powers of the Congress are so expanded and extended today, by necessity, that I am unwilling to pass upon that question at this moment." I do not feel bound to pass upon it.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I asked my question merely to emphasize the thought which the Senator has just brought out. I may point out also that even as to that particular provision a majority of our committee disagreed with the Senator and me and they think that is constitutional, even in peace times.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, Mr. President; that is true.

Mr. HATCH. What I wish to point out and emphasize is this thought: We talk about the Constitution. Everyone knows that in wartimes there are powers which are exercised by the Congress which would not be tolerated for a single moment in peacetimes. Practically all Senators have voted for legislation which in peacetimes would be clearly unconstitutional, price-fixing measures, O. P. A. bills, all such measures. Does the Senator think they would be constitutional in ordinary, normal peacetimes? Of course not. But, as the Senator ably pointed out, the necessities have brought out a power which comes from the Constitution itself, to defend and protect the country, a higher power than these other matters being discussed today. It is on those grounds that I support the pending measure, and I believe it to be constitutional.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico believes, I think, that there are powers which are superior to those expressed in the Constitution of the United States; does he not?

Mr. HATCH. In the written words, yes; but they are all implied in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are obligations which are not expressed in the Constitution of the United States and are not limited by the Constitution; are there not?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly; the Senator is correct; such as our Selective Service Act, and similar acts, all of them.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am through, Mr. President. I see that the hour of adjournment has arrived. Later I may

wish to discuss the amendment which I understand may be offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation, in view of the extraordinary turn the debate has taken. I would feel I was not discharging my full duty if I did not rise and say, as an humble Member of this body, that in my judgment there is no power in the Constitution, none whatever, to do anything in wartime that cannot be done whenever the conditions demanding the action arise. In other words, war does not suspend the Constitution, and war adds nothing to the American Constitution. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I think the whole argument might well be summarized by a suggestion that we amend the oath we take at the desk by saying that we will support the Constitution except in wartime.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, ask that it be read for the information of the Senate, and be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, viz: At the proper place in the bill add the following as a new section:

"SEC. . The act of August 2, 1939, entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"'SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer, or person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and the Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, general order, Government magazine, Government newspaper, or other literature paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government or any officer, agency, or department thereof, or to make, or cause to be made any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the sending of any letter, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation, or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the person sending the same: *Provided further*, That no such communication, order, magazine, newspaper, or other literature, and no such broadcast, shall be deemed to be in violation of this section if it is first submitted to the United States War Ballot Commission, and found by such Commission not to be in violation of the first paragraph of this section.

"'SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to censor or interfere with any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces for the purpose of removing therefrom political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains military information which may be of value to the enemy.

"'SEC. 24. Any person who violates the provisions of section 22 or section 23 hereof shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I may suggest that I think there is complete agreement on the pending amendment, and I think it can be disposed of instantly if it were put to a vote, and thus we can save hours of time tomorrow by not starting discussion of the amendment over again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to a vote being taken on the amendment if it does not require further debate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think everyone is agreed with respect to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. What does the chairman of the committee say about it?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan state what the amendment deals with?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are two parts to the amendment; first, to strike out the language with respect to action to be taken in the event of a tie vote, and an insertion of language requiring a majority vote of the remaining four members.

Mr. GREEN. I think it is very desirable to have the amendment acted upon and out of the way.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 17, beginning in line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had intended before the Senate recessed to call attention to what I regarded as a very unfair attack on Judge Fred Vinson and one of his assistants made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in remarks which the Senator made last Tuesday. Last Thursday I called the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to what I thought were these unfair remarks by him about Judge Vinson and one of his assistants, and the Senator asked me not to make my statement on that day. He said that if I would not do so he would in the meantime, over the week end, seek to make amends for what he had said by a suitable statement, and would submit it to me before putting it in the RECORD. I agreed to that. Then on Saturday, because he was leaving the city, the Senator asked me to mark the paragraphs of his speech to which I objected, and I did so this morning. Because I marked most of what he said as being objectionable, the Senator decided, I presume, not to say anything about it.

Mr. President, I shall not now take the time of the Senate to discuss the remarks the Senator from North Dakota made, but I wish to state that as soon as I can obtain the floor tomorrow I wish to comment on what I regard as the unfair attack, unworthy of the Senator from North Dakota, upon Judge Vinson, made simply because the Senator did not agree with Judge Vinson's action in regard to certain matters upon which he had taken action since he assumed the position which he now holds.

I have always believed and now believe that it is possible to disagree with a man about anything that involves public policy without casting personal aspersions upon him or attempting to subject him to ridicule. If I had been present on the day the Senator from North Dakota delivered his remarks I would have challenged them at that time, but I had stepped out to lunch at a time when the Senator had offered an amendment, affecting radio, to the Bankhead bill, and under the guise of discussing the radio amendment he made this attack upon Judge Vinson and one of his assistants.

I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I intend tomorrow, if I can obtain the floor for only a few minutes, to reply to what the Senator said in regard to these two citizens of my State—two outstanding public servants. I have no desire now to say more than I have just said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask only that the distinguished majority leader make his statement tomorrow while I am present. I wish to tell him now that I do not retract a single word. I wish to say further that the time has not yet come when upon the Senate floor the majority leader of the Democratic Party can tell me as a Republican from North Dakota, elected by the common people, what I shall say or shall not say, either about a man from the State of Kentucky or any other man in the United States of America.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, neither the Senator from Kentucky, nor anyone else whom I know, either wishes to or has the power to suppress the Senator from North Dakota in regard to anything he may want to say, whether it be fair or unfair, in regard to anybody from any State in the Union.

Mr. President, I thought I was courteous enough to the Senator from North Dakota to go to him personally and tell him that I objected to his remarks, and that I intended to comment upon them, and in response the Senator from North Dakota asked me not to do so until today; that he would have a statement to make which he said would be satisfactory to me, and which he would submit to me. He has not done that, and now I take my own course, but I wish to say that I will make my statement in the presence of the Senator from North Dakota.

REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to consume the time of the Senate for a few brief observations. My subject this evening will be the revival of nationalism. However, before approaching the core of the subject I wish to make a few observations which are in a large sense related to nationalism.

I was one of the five members of the Senate who voted against the adoption of the Connally resolution, which was discussed in the Senate for several days by virtually every Member of the Senate. At this time I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 192 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I call particular attention to this paragraph of the resolution:

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small—

I emphasize the words "large and small"—

for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. President, I opposed that resolution, as I said then, for the reason that I believed, among other things, that it was leading us into international power politics and entangling European alliances about which we know very little.

Mr. President, when I first came to this body in 1932 and served during the last lame-duck Congress under Mr. Hoover as President, when the Vice President was Mr. Curtis, I had as one of my distinguished colleagues the Honorable Cordell Hull, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, and as much love as one man can have for another. I heard him the other day in the Chamber of the House of Representatives speak at a joint session of the Congress when he reported to Congress concerning his trip to Moscow, where he conferred with representatives of several governments. At that time he stated, and I was very happy to hear him do so, that there were no secret agreements, and that none were suggested. I was in high hope that we would hear him say that he had made inquiry of those there present as to whether or not there had been any secret agreements made. Mr. Hull in the body of his address in the House on Thursday stated in part:

In the principles and spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the declaration by United Nations.

I was glad to hear him mention the Atlantic Charter because during the discussion of the Connally resolution I submitted a substitute for the resolution which embodied the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," which was, however, voted down by the Senate.

Mr. Hull proceeded to say in the body of his eloquent address to the Members of Congress the following, among other things:

To this end, the four governments declared that they "recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small."

Mr. President, I lay particular stress on that statement in the declaration. The principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, irrespective of their size and strength, as partners in a future system of general security will be the foundation stone upon which the future international organization will be constructed; and it was concerning the principle contained in that utterance by the able Secretary of State that I sponsored, when the Senate was discussing the Connally resolution, an amendment providing for the freedom and the guaranty of political and territorial integrity of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia, Yugoslavia, and other nations which had been subjugated; but unfortunately this body did not accept the amendments guaranteeing the freedom of those countries.

So, Mr. President, I now come to an article by Mr. Constantine Brown, published on November 20 in the columns of the Washington Evening Star. In the article Mr. Brown states, in discussing the Moscow Conference, the following:

HULL IGNORES OMINOUS SIGN IN EUROPE

(By Constantine Brown)

The warm reception given by the Members of Congress to their former colleague and now the very distinguished Secretary of State Hull was well earned.

For many years Mr. Hull has been battling for a world in which the wolf and the lamb would become bedfellows.

At one time he believed that by breaking down tariff barriers we could help the world toward the path of peace. This failed. In the years preceding the war he attempted to bring about universal peace by reciprocal trade agreements. This scheme also failed.

Now the Secretary believes that the Moscow protocols are the answer to world peace. Being a man who thinks that deceit and old-fashioned diplomacy no longer have a place in a world which has suffered from the ills of the war, Mr. Hull naturally is convinced that world diplomacy now is patterned after his own thoughts—honest and upright—and that a given word is a solemn bond which cannot be broken.

TROUBLE BREWS

So convinced is the Secretary that strife-ridden Europe has turned a new page and for the first time in its hundreds of years of history will become an element of peace and order in the world that he glosses over the ominous indications which already have begun to pour into Washington from across the Atlantic.

To his mind the pacts signed in Moscow have more than a moral value. They are, in his opinion, as binding as a decision of the Supreme Court.

Yet, hardly was the ink on these documents dry that uncomfortable reports began reaching the Capital.

For instance, Izvestia, the Moscow newspaper which is the sounding board of the Soviet Government, says that a confederation of smaller European states would be totally unacceptable to Moscow because it might assume the form of a cordon sanitaire against Russia and be an important tool in the hands of the Nazis. This, of course, could not be contradicted if the Nazis were allowed to remain a strong military power.

It was agreed in Moscow, however, that the Allies would fight until the Germans surrender unconditionally, and steps have been devised to pull all the teeth out of the mouth of the Nazi tiger. Consequently, there is little reason to fear that the small nations which have suffered so heavily at the hands of the Germans would become the dupes of the Reich.

It is recalled that a confederation of the smaller states, particularly by those in central and southeastern Europe, had been advocated by Prime Minister Churchill in one of his important speeches early this year in the House of Commons. When he talked about the future peace conference, he suggested that the smaller states should be represented by one member speaking in the name of one or more groups of these nations. The suggestion was welcomed in official Washington circles, and at that time there was no criticism from Moscow.

While William C. Bullitt was Ambassador in Paris, he gave an address urging the formation of such a confederation. At that time Russia could have interpreted this move as an attempt to establish a cordon sanitaire. She was then on the "suspect list" in Washington, London, and even in Paris.

RUSSIA IS SAVIOR

Today the Europeans look to Russia as their savior. Hence, Moscow's opposition to the formation of a confederation is interpreted in many quarters as an indication that she intends to gobble up territories which should remain independent under the demands of international justice, for which Mr. Hull has been fighting with such a vigor.

There appear to be other "incidents" which are creating an uneasy feeling among Washington observers. For instance, Mr. Hull declared at his first press conference that the Free Germany Committee, which had given Washington and London a severe headache, had been disbanded. It appears that its end had been only an offhand promise not incorporated in written agreement.

According to those who are privileged to read translations of the Russian broadcasts distributed for Russian consumption, the committee will remain as active as heretofore.

Everyone agrees that Mr. Hull's mission to Moscow has been a spectacular success. But, and there always seem to be buts in diplomatic exchange, the agreements have left so much room for personalized interpretation that it is feared that their practical application will not correspond with the spirit of disinterested collaboration which the Secretary found during his 2-week stay in the Soviet capital.

Mr. President, in further reference to matters international—and I am anything but an internationalist—I read a very able editorial which appeared in the columns of a recent issue of the New York Daily News. The editorial is entitled

"Learning Geography the Hard Way" and reads as follows:

LEARNING GEOGRAPHY THE HARD WAY

One thing you've got to say for this war: A lot of us are learning a lot of geography from it, even if we are learning it the hard and costly way.

We heard this week, for instance, for the first time in our lives that there is an island by the name of Lero. It is in the Dodecanese group off southwest Turkey, and it was grabbed by the British and Italians after Mussolini cracked up.

The general impression has been that the Allies now control the air over the Mediterranean. But this week the Germans whistled up enough air power from somewhere to take Lero back from the Allies, along with, according to the Germans, 3,000 British and 5,000 Italian troops.

In recent months, most of us have learned various things about Yugoslavia that few of us ever knew before. Most striking of these is that Yugoslavia is not a natural country, but a creation of the peace conference following World War No. 1. Its people are Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and these groups hate one another.

When the Germans overran Yugoslavia, its young king, Peter II, declared for the Allies, left Yugoslavia, and joined Britain's collection of exiled rulers. King Peter's minister of war, Draja Mikhailovitch, stayed behind to stir up guerrilla war on the Axis.

Mikhailovitch's guerrillas are known as Chetniks. An American woman, Ruth Mitchell (sister of the late Gen. Billy Mitchell), joined this outfit in April 1941, and served for about 4 months as one of its intelligence officers.

Mikhailovitch became quite a hero all over the allied world, but presently we began to hear stories of another Yugoslav guerrilla chief named Josip Broz, but affectionately known as Tito. Tito, according to liberal thinkers, is the McCoy, and Mikhailovitch is secretly an Axis sympathizer. Mikhailovitch shows his love for the Axis by blowing up German troop trains, destroying strategic bridges, raiding Axis-held cities for supplies for his men, and doing various similar things which we should think would make the Germans wonder sometimes.

Tito, it turns out, fought on the Communist side in the Spanish civil war, and his guerrilla bands—Partisans—are made up largely of Communists. The Partisans and the Chetniks fight one another as fiercely as both fight the Germans. Communist and liberal organs here and elsewhere, never miss a chance to smear Mikhailovitch.

Then, too, we are learning things about the South Seas that few of us ever knew before.

SOME LESSONS FROM THE WAR

All kinds of interesting new names of islands keep turning up in the dispatches—Guadalcanal to start with, then New Guinea, New Georgia, New Britain, New Ireland, Choiseul, Bougainville, Vella Lavella, and Rendova. We're even coming to know the names of some of the mid-Pacific islands the League of Nations mandated to Japan after the other war—Jaluit, Truk, Makin, Ponape, Marcus, Wotje, Saipan.

We're learning something of the quaint (to us) habits of some of the natives; cannibalism, for instance.

All this knowledge, as we say, is coming to us the hard way. These geography lessons are being paid for in the blood and sweat of more and more of our best young men, and in the toil and tears of more and more of us at home.

Nobody can say how long we shall continue this course in world-wide geography. Superoptimists hope the German course will be completed by Christmas and the Japanese course by late 1944 or early 1945; the more pessimistic offer longer estimates, ranging all the way into 1949.

Sooner or later we may learn an over-all lesson from these isolated pieces of information we pick up as our boys slog through the poisonous jungles of the South Seas and the malarial boot of Italy, leaving dead pals behind them.

That lesson would be that we are not fitted, by either temperament or experience, to become the boss nation of a world-wide empire. We haven't been able to make the Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, or Virgin Islanders over in our own image in years of trying; we haven't the heart to be hardboiled about colonies and squeeze money out of them. We're different from the Chinese, the Russians, the Fiji Islanders, and Yugoslavs, and vice versa, and no one world-wide system of government would suit all of us.

If we learn this lesson, it may be worth its colossal cost.

Mr. President, I come now to the subject: The revival of nationalism. Several days ago I was delighted, pleased, and enthused when I received at my desk a letter from a friend in the State of New York who had forwarded to me an article by Mr. George E. Sokolsky, who writes a daily column under the heading "These Days." The subject of that day's column was the Revival of Nationalism. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the entire article, but I wish to read one paragraph:

It is curious that many of those who admire the Russians, the Yugoslavs, the French, the Chinese for their nationalism, despise this very quality in our own people. Praising it in others, they denounce it in us.

Mr. President, I ask that at this point in the RECORD the entire article by Mr. Sokolsky be printed, because it relates to American nationalism, and I am interested in that subject, because I state with pride and without the slightest hesitation that I am an American nationalist. I believe in America first. I believe we should give more attention and more time to the matters of vital interest to the American people instead of giving so much time in concerning ourselves with the problems of the peoples of the other parts of the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The new spirit out of Russia that is moving the world, an unwilling world, to perhaps a begrudged admiration is nationalism—love of country. The revival of Russia's ancient heroes, of interest in Russian history, the pride at the recapture of the mother city, Kiev, are the response of a people to the call of their own soil. Yugoslavia has, throughout this war, Chetnik and Partisan, dreamed of freedom for Yugoslavia, for Croat and Slovene and Serb. That is nationalism. The Free French movement is the nationalistic soul of Joan of Arc speaking in twentieth-century accents.

In China, nationalism has been struggling against feudalism for half a century, but never more intensely than today. The Chinese love for China is reasserting itself with overpowering persistence, with a fervor and strength that no disappointment, no disillusionment, no corruption, no internal strife can destroy.

And so the course of the war moves in all countries as victory approaches, nationalistic fervor intensifies. As the day of settlement shines ahead, love of country becomes the most potent, the most assertive of emotions. That will be true in the United States as in all countries.

It is curious that many of those who admire the Russians, the Yugoslavs, the French, the Chinese for their nationalism, despise this very quality in our own people. Praising it in others, they denounce it in us. Honoring patriotism when it appears afar, they hurl humiliations upon it here. It is a phenomenon in confused thinking. It is all right for Russians to love the soil of Russia, but it is all wrong for Americans to love the soil of America. Here this noblest of human virtues is degraded into chauvinism, into a narrow isolationism. Who can understand such logic? Or, is it logic? Is it not rather an unwillingness to accept the reality that patriotism is the only ideal for which men will, in the mass of an army, give their lives—our men as well as those of Russia, Yugoslavia, France, and China?

Of course, there are men and women who accustom themselves to parts of the world other than their native lands, but there is a homing pull, a force of gravity as true in the spirit of man as in the physical world that forces them to remember not only the land of their birth, but the lands of their ancestors. I recall more than a quarter of a century ago listening to Talcott Williams of Columbia's School of Journalism speak on the homing instinct of man. And he knew. His father was a missionary in Syria; his uncle was perhaps the greatest missionary scholar America ever sent to China. Talcott Williams was born in Syria, but his spirit turned ever to the America where his forebears were buried. And yet, whenever he and I spoke of the lands in the East, Syria and Palestine, where he was born and where my philosophy of life originated, there was always an overtone of love for the land of birth as for the land of more distant origin.

No normal person can separate himself from these influences which are not of the mind but of the spirit. And that explains the British power in the American consciousness. It is language, ancestry, religion. These qualities are more sure than politics and the reasoned dialectics by which anything can be proved. A nationalistic American can never misunderstand a nationalistic anyone else. He grasps that what appears to be selfish is really idealistic; that what seems to be narrow egocentricity is patriotism.

I could quarrel with Russia's communism and internationalism, but I cannot quarrel with Russia's nationalism. When the Russian speaks of the greatness of his own land, its thousand years of history, the beauty of its gloomy differentiation, I admire him and match what he says with strong words of the achievements of America over three centuries on this continent, of the glories of personal liberty, of our free institutions, of our high standard of living, of our initiative in material improvements, of our respect for God by respecting all God's children of whatever kind. That is nationalism. It is a force that makes for human ennoblement.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, while speaking of American nationalism, let me say that prior to the time when we became engaged in the present war, I, together with other Senators, voted against the repeal of the arms embargo. We voted against the repeal of the neutrality act. We voted against the lend-lease bill. We voted against those various bills because we believed they were steps toward war, whereas other Senators who did not share our opinion, and who voted for those bills believed they were steps away from war.

We who voted against the repeal of the arms embargo, against the repeal of the

neutrality act, and against the lend-lease bill were smeared by the employment of the word "isolationists." I contend, Mr. President, that there never was any such person as an isolationist. We were simply American nationalists. We are not isolationists. The fact is that there is no such person as an isolationist in this country. We are American nationalists. To the best of anyone's knowledge there is no such person in the United States as an isolationist, for an isolationist would be one who demands the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, the cessation of all commercial intercourse with other countries, and the recall of our entire diplomatic staff. Has anyone heard any reasonable person advocating such a policy? Of course not. All that is recommended is that the United States of America continue to follow the course which during the past 150 years has been the chief factor in its growth from 13 weak colonies into a mighty Nation. Yes; we are American nationalists, and proud of it, which means America for Americans.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY B. STEAGALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 361) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
November 22, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 209) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary comunicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. AIKEN the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE J. WILLIAM DITTER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 362) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
November 22, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I feel that I cannot let this day go by without rising to say a few words on behalf of my esteemed friend the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, who fell to his death last night in a tragic airplane crash in the State of Pennsylvania.

The untimely passing of this man, in the very flower of his life, will be deeply mourned by all those who knew him, for with his passing, the Congress has lost one of its outstanding Members, the people of Pennsylvania have lost a faithful and an earnest Representative, and the Republican Party has lost an ardent and a fearless standard bearer.

Representative DITTER was above all else a straightforward American citizen, a sincere and tireless servant of the American people, in whose cause and whose behalf he was always proud to labor and to serve.

Mr. President, the inspiring example of service and honor which was J. WILLIAM DITTER will long outlive the earthly years of a life which he willingly gave to the public service and to the progress and stability of the America which he loved.

I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. BUSHFIELD the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the two late Members of the House, Messrs. STEAGALL and DITTER, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, as we pause at Thy altar, do Thou hear our prayer. Bless us with minds calmed and fortified by moments of withdrawal and communion. Let our words come from fountains of personal rectitude folding away doubts and difference. Not one wise word ever loses its force, not one pure enthusiasm ever failed, nor one sacrifice ever came to nought.

Increase the power of our faith in orderly government and our trust in the events of Thy providence. Impress us that there is no satisfaction comparable to that of duty wisely performed and no regret like the consciousness of opportunities lost and wasted. Grant that all ills and evils which come from discord and misunderstanding may be subdued and the ways which lead to wisdom and harmony be kept open. Dear Lord, banish all narrowness of vision and every thought of expediency and strengthen us in our deliberations with the sense of proportion, ever guarding us against the consuming weakness of avarice and ambition.

Heavenly Father, how great are Thy mysteries, and Thy ways are past finding out. Thy voice is heard in inscrutable depths of human experience, in solemn warning, and we bless Thee that it is heard in the aspirations which lead to the paradise of the soul. We pause. A double alarm is at our door, and there is no response. Two of our most capable public servants have left us. They had the respect and the admiration and the love of all their colleagues.

"Should swift death this night o'ertake us,
And our couch become our tomb,
May the morn in heaven awake us,
Clad in light and deathless bloom."

In our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 19, 1943, will be considered read and approved.

There was no objection.

TAX BILL

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 360, Rept.

No. 878), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

THE LATE HENRY B. STEAGALL

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad and painful duty to announce to the House the untimely end of one of the greatest and most gallant spirits who has ever served in this body, the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL, of the Third Alabama District. In my brief tenure here, I have learned to love and respect him profoundly for his qualities of heart and soul and for the qualities of leadership and service he has exhibited in this body during the past 30 years. I offer a resolution (H. Res. 361), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral;

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House;

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Alabama is proud of HENRY B. STEAGALL and the stainless reputation he has made in this body. In his passing the State and the Nation have lost an invaluable public servant, one whose heartbeat was attuned to the needs of what he so often tenderly referred to as "the little men and women of America."

He was elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress and has served continuously since that date. He has served in the House of Representatives longer than any other Member of the House from the State of Alabama. He has been chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of this great body longer than any other Member in the history of that committee. The type of his service can best be indicated by a mere recitation of some of the legislation of national import which he has sponsored as a Member of this body and as chairman of that great committee. He was author or joint author of some of the most outstanding pieces of legislation enacted by the American Congress during the past decade, among which were the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, United States Housing Authority, Federal Housing Authority, Office of Price Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation and many others.

A mere recitation of the legislation which he has sponsored indicates his love and his concern for what you and I call the average man. The home life of America, the system of government of America, and the way of life of America he believed in with all his heart and soul. He dedicated his life not only to their preservation, but also to their improvement. Brave in heart, eloquent in voice, and sweet in spirit he has gone forth from these Halls to meet his Maker unafraid. He carries with him a record meriting the approval of his colleagues and of his friends with whom he served so long and so devotedly. Of greater moment, however, he also merits the approval of that just and great Judge who must pass upon the lives and characters of all of us and mete out to us our reward.

Mr. Speaker, I hope at some other date to pay a more appropriate tribute to this great American, this great Alabaman whom all of us loved so dearly and so sincerely. To the members of his family we extend our love and our sympathy.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, November 22, 1943.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have just been advised of the untimely passing of HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

It has been my privilege to appear before Chairman STEAGALL'S committee for legislation affecting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the past 10 years, and for 6 years in connection with legislation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. During this time I have appeared before his committee a great many times, and invariably I have found him courteous, intelligent, considerate, understanding, and helpful.

In my view, no man in Congress has been more faithful to his constituents and to all the people of the United States than HENRY STEAGALL, and in his passing at this critical period in our history, the Congress suffers an irreparable loss.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, all over the world today men are dying heroically. Of that number is HENRY B. STEAGALL. With head unbowed and the smile that we all knew and loved upon his lips, and in his eyes, he walked into the jaws of death here Thursday. None of us knew that the Grim Reaper had already seized the muscles of his heart the day before. None of us knew that he came here knowing what he was doing after taking the medicine his physician prescribed to keep the "old pump" going.

He came here and he spoke in this Well, knowing what he was doing to himself, but like the man he was and is, it made no difference to him if that exertion in fealty to the cause he had espoused meant death. He felt the call of duty and he responded. Of such is the roll of heroes composed. This man in the midst of the fight to which duty called him, as he saw it, went down in the unequal struggle, erect and smiling with the consciousness of duty well done spurring him on to the last drop of the precious lifeblood that went through that vital organ.

So it is that on this black Monday for the House of Representatives two of its distinguished Members are being bemoaned. Two brilliant intellects, two choice spirits, two leaders of men, who followed the gleam, as they saw it, with honor and fidelity to the end. They kept the faith.

Today we are doubly bereaved. Today there is not a man nor a lady in this House who is not bowed with a sense of the weight of their respective griefs, as they knew these men. There is no need to ask the question, with regard to either of them, which has been asked so often since King David first propounded it: "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?" We know. Those of us who have the honor and the privilege of calling Alabama home, know HENRY B. STEAGALL not merely as a rare public servant and statesman, but also as a great lover of humanity. The fox hounds in his kennels whine and mourn today, for he loved them. Everything within the compass of human interest was dear to him. And no man was too poor, nor humble, to be outside the sweep of his affection. He hated none. He was friend of all.

As a public servant there was no better prosecutor than HENRY STEAGALL, to whom in the pristine days of his career his profession looked for leadership at the bar. Yet, there never was a criminal before the bar of justice in the circuit in which he prosecuted who did not pay tribute to his fairness as well as to his ability and vigor as a prosecutor.

Having shuffled off that coil of official duty, he came here, and here he made his mark. Talk about memorials and monuments, could any man claim as a legislator any greater memorial or monument than that act which he passed after 20 years of almost lone effort, providing for the guaranty of small deposits in our banks? For he was the father as well as the sponsor on this floor of the bill guaranteeing bank deposits. He was one of the moving spirits in the creation of the Federal Reserve Banking System. Through this House and from this Well he has championed and piloted probably more of the measures that have meant much to the rank

and file of our citizenry than any other one man.

Therefore, we hail him today, in sadness, out of the depths of our gloom and grief, as a leader, a real statesman, and as a friend! Truly, as my distinguished colleague already has said, Alabama is proud of him.

So in many an humble cottage, in many a marble hall, we are joined today in our profound grief by 130,000,000 sons of Uncle Sam, who realize not only that a worthy statesman has written a glorious obituary in the law of his land, not only that a brilliant Member of Congress has fallen bravely, leading a fight, but also, and more poignantly, that their friend, a friend of man, has walked smiling and unafraid into that which some call a grave, but which others, with more vision, call a door of opportunity for higher service!

We all with one accord pay tribute to such a life. There is not a man nor lady in this body, if one there be in America, who will not wish him Godspeed in the new work he began today at 9:45, for it is inconceivable that the amassed wisdom of his years of ripe experience in leadership should be unavailing in the new career which he has taken up. So one and all of us bow respectfully to the edict of the Supreme Judge of the universe and we say, "So long, HENRY, God bless you. We'll be seeing you."

As he looks back over his shoulder with the smile that we last saw Thursday from this Well he is saying, "Friends, forget me. Close ranks! Forward march!"

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House is always deeply moved and saddened in the passing of any one of our colleagues. Today the House is profoundly moved and saddened in the passing on of two of our beloved and distinguished colleagues, both of whom died in the line of duty.

HENRY STEAGALL, my personal friend, whose memory will always linger with me throughout the remaining days of my journey through life, was a leader in this body for many years. Gentle in his dealings with his colleagues and fellow men, a deep student of political science and of our constitutional system of government, he was a leader among men. Occupying a powerful position in this body, he always exercised the great power that he possessed as a trust. This is a government of laws, not of men. HENRY STEAGALL exemplified in his service in this House a deep reverence for this fundamental basis from a worldly angle on which our Government is erected.

It was only last Thursday, as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] well said, that our late colleague was valiantly performing his duty in the Well of the House and on the floor of the House, engaging in active debate, with the knowledge of his physical condition, and the probable knowledge that the strain of debate might aggravate his condition and precipitate his death. Many important laws now on the statute books are a tribute to his memory, and a great contribution to the progress of our country. Truly he died as he lived, in the performance of his duty.

I know that all of my colleagues join with me in expressing and conveying to the near and dear loved ones that he has left behind our profound feelings of sympathy in their great loss and sorrow, and all of my colleagues join with me in extending to the Alabama delegation our deep sympathy in their bereavement, and the expression of our profound sympathy to the people of the congressional district of our late colleague, and also to the people of the State of Alabama in the loss of this great son of Alabama, this great American.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked to hear of the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. I am glad that this body paid him such a deserved and fine tribute on his last appearance before us on Thursday last. He was courageous, honest, honorable, and one of the outstanding men of his State, and the Nation. The country has lost a most valuable statesman, and the American farmer his best friend.

His life battle has been won in behalf of the little fellow, so to speak, and made it possible for the small depositors of America to have a safe place in which to keep their money.

He had no enemies, was charitable in his dealings with all, and led a life of usefulness in public service.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, he understood all proposed legislation brought to his committee. He had the confidence of and was held in the highest esteem by all the members of the committee.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the delegation from Alabama and the membership of the House in paying tribute to a great statesman, HENRY STEAGALL, whose untimely death occurred this morning. It has been my privilege to have engaged his friendship for 20 years. I know of his outstanding abilities, and the great contributions he has made to the legislation of his country. He was the author of many acts which were of great benefit to the people. Men like HENRY STEAGALL are sadly missed, and we do well to honor the memory of one who served his country and the people so well. His life, his fine personality, and his outstanding character were an inspiration to us and we shall ever remember him with fond memories. I express my personal regret at the untimely loss of this great American and to his family I give my sincere sympathy.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are always humble in the presence of the Grim Reaper. Today, because of this double shock, we are peculiarly humble.

Two great men have been called from this body today, for what reason it is not given us to know. Because of the faith which we have been taught we cannot believe that these great men have been taken from us except for a broader and more important service. HENRY STEAGALL has been chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee for over 10 years. He was one of the most lovable men with whom I have ever come in contact. In 1933 when I first became associated with him on the committee, he was peculiarly tolerant of my mistakes, my lack of knowledge of the legislation which that great committee was constantly called upon to consider. He took me under his wing, and I dare say that I speak for most of the members of that committee when I say that they have truly gone to school, to a great schoolmaster. Character is something that is not always apparent to a casual observer. You cannot always see it. It has been said that character is what a man really is, that reputation is merely what others think he is. HENRY STEAGALL was of great and noble character, and he likewise enjoyed not only in his home State of Alabama, not only in this body, who knew him so well, but throughout the Nation a splendid reputation for honesty, intelligence, and ability.

I recall so well several more important instances in his life. It has been mentioned here that he was the sponsor, the father of a bill which has done more to stabilize banking and currency and credit than any other action which this Congress has ever taken. He told me of the history of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, how when he first came to Congress, I believe, in 1913, or 1914, he came here with a firm determination that if people were to continue to put their little savings into banks, he felt that the greatest service that he could be to them was to assure that they were going to get these hard-earned savings back when they were needed. So for a good many years he dreamed of the day when the banks of this Nation would be safe. This proved to all of us that HENRY B. STEAGALL was a great humanitarian. He was criticized; I have criticized him. We disagreed frequently on issues; we disagreed honorably and honestly. HENRY B. STEAGALL never in the Committee on Banking and Currency and never in his life ever did a small thing. He was a great man. He was a big man, spiritually and intellectually, and this House is going to mourn his loss, but our sadness is going to be softened somewhat by the appreciation of the fact that he has been called to a greater service.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I have journeyed through life it has been my privilege to intimately associate with men much older than I am. This was true with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama whose death we mourn today. As chairman of our committee, I was extremely close to him and I mean

to say by that, that I was closer to Mr. STEAGALL than I am to any other House Member. We found that we had many things in common, not only with respect to legislative matters upon which we agreed or disagreed, but with respect to the social, religious, and economic philosophy in which each of us believed and which plays such a great part in the lives of our people in this free country of the United States. As late as last Friday afternoon I implored him to stay away from this body and to let the other Members of the House finish the debate on the bill that was under consideration and upon which he spoke Thursday afternoon. I had known about his physical failing. Only a few days ago we discussed very intimately some of his future hopes and plans with respect to public life.

In other words, I had confidence in Mr. STEAGALL and he trusted me in connection with matters which came before us. Of course, I shall miss him in the days to come as long as I am a Member of this body and particularly as a member of the committee on which he served as chairman. In the years to come I shall remember his ability, his accomplishments, his constructiveness, his Christian character, and all that he stood for, and in my memory I shall cherish his friendship.

And Mr. Speaker, let me say that I, too, join with my colleagues in their eulogy of that great friend and citizen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose tragic death occurred last evening. We shall miss him as a great Republican, as a statesman of the first order, as chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, as an exceptionally capable lawyer, and as an outstanding Christian gentleman. It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to break bread with Mr. DITTER and his family in their lovely home at Ambler, Pa., to worship at the family altar with our departed friend and his charming wife and his legally trained, captivating daughter, who is an unusual legal-daughter-partner of an extraordinary father. To have had the privilege of being a guest in his Christian home, to walk about his gardens with him, and to visit in his district among his friends and supporters was a method of taking a measure of the man which we cannot exactly do here on the House floor. He, his family to whom he was so greatly devoted, and the atmosphere of his home was an inspiration to any American whose fortune it might have been to have known them.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of life we are in death. Only yesterday a great leader stood in this forum and proclaimed his tenets with a fervor and sincerity that carried conviction to his listeners. And when he yielded the floor at the close of one of the greatest speeches of his notable career, we did not realize that his work was done, that the imprint of immortality was already on his brow. Standing in dazed groups this morning we can only wonder helplessly why with so many about who would not have been missed he should have been called—why he could not have been spared the one more day to witness the culmination of long years of study and fevered months of strenuous work on one of the great problems of our times.

He fell on his shield; in the hour of triumph; and with his face to the front. With all his kindliness he was a man of rarest courage, a courage which could not be stilled or hushed by flattery or sentimental appeal or intimidation. Few can realize the pressure brought to bear upon him these last harried days in the effort to swerve him from the course he felt was right.

It is to be regretted that it could not have been vouchsafed to him to survive this war, as he survived the last war, and to see again as he saw then the universal acquiescence in his program and its successful and beneficent conclusion. In the trying days of 1932, against the determined opposition of financiers and economists, and in contravention of every canon of political expediency, he drove the Federal deposit-insurance bill through the House and through conference to final enactment. Its service to the Nation today is only one of his many contributions to national financial stability. When the history of this war is written, his farsighted sagacity and keenly analytical programs in the drafting and management of measures which stabilized national banking and laid the foundation for the reservoirs of credit from which we have provided the sinews of war, will be recognized as one of the determining factors contributing to Allied victory.

But here, away from the limelight and among ourselves and all those privileged to be intimately associated with him, he will be remembered best for his capacity for friendship. His friendships were not those of a day but of an enduring character which strengthened and flowered with the years. Such men do not die. They pass on, but memory is eternal. And the memory of the life and services of HENRY STEAGALL lives on, hallowed and cherished by the gratitude and affection of the American people whom he so ably served.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, death's messenger is unwelcome, but will not be denied. This double reminder comes to me and it comes to you. We will ask ourselves, "Are we quite ready to receive Him"?

HENRY STEAGALL was my chairman for many years. It can be said he was a true gentleman; he never inflicted pain. His greatest desire, of course, like ours, was to earn and to hold the respect and love of his colleagues and his fellow men. He was assured that he had it. He does not need to read his tombstone when he is dead. Only recently a gathering was held in his office and unusual honors were heaped upon him. His friends saw to it that his likeness was painted and hung in his committee room, so that we who remain and those who follow us may not forget to do him honor.

This double tragedy bears heavily upon us. I greatly admired my chairman, especially during this last week when he made a courageous stand for what he thought was right, although harassed and worried about his physical condition. He proved as he had often before done that he would stand firmly in his belief and would follow his conscience. I am reminded of words I saw only yesterday, "When the ermine of official robe fell on him it touched nothing less spotless than itself."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad day for the Congress of the United States. It has proclaimed to us that in the midst of life we are in death. Two fine upstanding Members have traveled that road which to discover we must travel, too.

HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, was a remarkable man. He had a peculiar knowledge and ability that made him a most useful legislator, who rendered an outstanding service to his country. He had an adroitness and skill in handling the bills of his committee that was seldom matched and never excelled. He was a man of great ability and profound knowledge of the matters that came before the Banking and Currency Committee. He made the best use of his long experience as chairman of that committee and used his wide experience and profound knowledge for the benefit of his constituents and the people of his country. Not only the Fifth District of Alabama, but the State and Nation has sustained a great loss.

After the speech he made on last Thursday he told me he was a sick man and had a fever. He was a casualty of duty performed and of the war. To his devoted family I desire to extend my deepest sympathy.

He fell like the mighty oak falls before the storm in the forest, with apparently many years of useful service before him. Why this should occur we do not know. God moves in a mysterious way.

We only know:

The moving finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all greatly moved and affected by the passing of two of our most distinguished Members. I did not have the privilege of knowing so intimately Hon. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania, but I did know him to be a good, fair, and able fighter; a good debater, and a fine statesman.

I did have the privilege of knowing and being intimately associated with Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama, for 7 of

the last 15 years. During that time we have differed very little.

I presume that more bills and more constructive acts of legislation bear his name than the name of any other one person in either the House or the Senate today. The many acts are too numerous to name. I shall briefly mention a few. I refer to the banking legislation, especially during the dark days of this Republic in 1933, the numerous Glass-Steagall bills, the different pieces of currency legislation, farm legislation, housing, price stabilization, price fixing, and the F. D. I. C. with which his name is connected which has a history that can only now be told. Few people realize the influence he had upon the passage of that legislation, and the persistence and the determination with which he sponsored it. The plain people of this country had a real friend in HENRY STEAGALL, whose every heartbeat and pulse throb was always with them.

As chairman of our Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives he was always kindly, considerate, and sympathetic, and he was always extremely anxious to do exactly what he believed to be right. HENRY STEAGALL was a great statesman; he was one of the finest and best men I ever knew. He was gentle, kind, affable, courageous, always extremely fair, always, under all conditions. This country has suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of our two distinguished fellows who have left us to come no more. They were both able legislators, fine citizens, and men of great ability.

It was recently my privilege to visit the district of my friend and colleague, Mr. STEAGALL, at Napier Field in Dothan, Ala., where I have a son-in-law in the Army Air Forces. I found the people of his district devoted to him, interested in what he was doing, and believing in his ability and faithfulness to his duty here. HENRY STEAGALL was a man of rare ability and adroitness, and he handled the work of his committee in a way few men have been able to equal. We shall certainly miss both these men. The country has suffered a great loss.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with those others who have expressed their very high regard for our esteemed colleague, Mr. STEAGALL, who has today answered the call.

On last Thursday I sat in this Chamber along with the rest of you and heard that hour-long impassioned plea of his. Following that speech he came back behind the rail and talked to two or three of us. At that time he said: "I am a sick man. I have a temperature now. I should have stayed home in bed today as my family tried to get me to do." He knew he was sick, but it was that same loyalty and devotion to duty that characterized his whole life, that drove him here on that day in the performance of his duty. I remember some of the things he said in that speech and I shall quote a couple of sentences from his concluding remarks, for they contain thoughts which I think characterize the man and describe him as the country must know him. He said:

> I do not believe there is anybody in this House who knows me who thinks there is any sectionalism or bitterness in my soul. I do not believe those who know me credit me with selfish partisan purposes in my views respecting this or any other economic legislation.

Those characteristics were true of the man. He was big in every sense of the word; he was a friend always devoted to his friends, helpful at all times. I came here as a new Member and all along as a new and young and inexperienced Member I was pleased to learn from him. I remember the very fine friendship that existed between him and various other Members of the House, Members who had served as long a period of time as he. Many a time I heard him speak of the closeness that existed between him and some of the other Members of long service. Particularly am I thinking just now of the very fine brotherly relationship that existed between him and our late lamented Speaker Bankhead, of Alabama, two Members who had come here from the same State at about the same time and who had worked diligently together in all the years. I remember the zeal and interest with which he worked in behalf of Speaker Bankhead for the Vice Presidency of the United States; and I remember the tribute he paid him, I remember the nominating speech he made at the Chicago convention; and well do I recall the great grief which was his when Speaker Bankhead fell by the side in the performance of his duties.

HENRY STEAGALL was a great friend, a man who loved his fellow men. He was courageous, absolutely unwavering in his convictions as to what he believed was right. Mention has been made time after time of his fight on behalf of the Federal insurance of small deposits in banks. I remember being in a public meeting with him one time when some citizens of our State were passing on certain views to the Alabama delegation. I remember how when Mr. STEAGALL was called upon for some remarks he answered those people in a friendly manner and yet courageously.

I remember the story that he told them about his fight for the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, how the bankers in his own section had passed resolutions condemning him because of his stand for that legislation, but he believed it was right, and in the face of the opposition of some of his best friends he fought for the principle. He told how later those same bankers had come around to his view and begged him for mercy sake to pass that legislation quickly. I am glad that he lived to see the views that he held with reference to much of our fiscal affairs justified. I am glad that he lived to see millions of home owners in this country saved in their homes by reason of the Home Owners Loan Corporation that he helped to establish, and millions of others placed in homes and saved from bankruptcy as the result of legislation that he sponsored and that he pushed through on the floor of this House.

He was a great man. We in Alabama are justly proud of him. Alabama and America have sustained a great loss in his passing. Death is not the end, and out there somewhere today, with the same courage and the same unwavering devotion and loyalty that marked him in life, he carries on his work.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, someone has said, "When sorrows come, they come not single spies, but in battalions."

The Grim Reaper that never tires, and never rests, has been busy at his appointed work. He has knocked upon the doors of two of the ablest and most distinguished Members of this body and called them to "the undiscover'd country from whose bourn no traveler returns."

Socrates contended that no good man should fear death; for, he said that if death is an endless sleep, as his enemies contended, then it was much to be preferred to a life of pain and toil; but he said that if he was correct in his belief in the immortality of the soul, then death was but a transition from this imperfect to that all-perfect, glorious and celestial realm above, over which the Supreme Ruler of the Universe presides.

Shakespeare quotes Julius Caesar as saying that "Cowards die many times before their deaths; the valiant never taste of death but once."

The two distinguished Members of this august body who passed away within the last 24 hours, HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama, and J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania, never tasted death but once. They did not fear to go.

In the passing of Mr. DITTER, the news of whose death reached us first, we all received a most painful shock. I probably crossed swords with him as often as any other man in Congress, for the last few years and in so doing I always experienced—

> The stern joy which warriors feel
> In foemen worthy of their steel.

BILL DITTER was a gentleman, a statesman and a patriot, who placed the welfare of his country above all personal and political concern.

In the passing of HENRY B. STEAGALL, I lost one of the best friends I ever had on this earth. The greatest compliment I ever received from any man came from Mr. STEAGALL with reference to a speech I made in this House on November 1, 1939, when I was appealing to the powers that be to pursue a course which I felt might save the world from the dreadful catastrophe through which we are now passing.

I shall not go into the records of these two distinguished men. They have been ably discussed by other Members who were more closely associated with

them in their daily work; but I will say that today America has sustained an irreparable loss in the passing of two of the most worthy, honorable, conscientious and distinguished Members of this august body.

From lives like these, America's greatness springs,
That makes her loved at home, revered abroad:
Princes and lords are but the breath of kings;
"An honest man's the noblest work of God."

They are gone but not forgotten. Their influences will live as their spirits will live on and on.

We are told of a death-devoted Greek who was about to offer up his life as a sacrifice to fate, when his beautiful companion turned to him and asked, "Shall we meet again?"

To which he replied: "I have asked that dreadful question of the hills that are eternal, of the clear streams that flow forever, of the stars amidst whose azure depths my raised spirits have walked in glory, yet they are dumb. But when I look into thy living, loving face, I see that which, mantling through its rich beauty, tells me it can never die. We shall meet again."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, an All-wise Providence has seen fit to remove from this body one of Alabama's most beloved sons, "Marse" HENRY B. STEAGALL, as he was affectionately known, was serving his fifteenth consecutive term as a Member of this body and as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House he probably sponsored more progressive legislation and more legislation that affected the lives of every person in the United States than any other Member has sponsored in the long history of this body. He was a recognized authority on banking law. He was the champion of the under dog and it may be truthfully said that he died with his boots on fighting for the common man. No Member was more diligent in his effort to secure fair treatment for the people of his district. The farmers of the Nation recognized "Marse" HENRY as their strong and capable advocate. Alabama has lost an illustrious son, the Nation a great statesman.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask unanimous consent at this time that all Members who desire may extend their own remarks in the RECORD concerning the life and character of our late colleague, Mr. STEAGALL.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other Members of the House in mourning the loss of two of our most highly respected and trusted colleagues, Mr. HENRY B. STEAGALL and Mr. J. WILLIAM DITTER, who have just passed on to the Great Beyond.

Mr. STEAGALL was chairman of my committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency. He was always considerate and fair. I shall not forget him for this alone. In his final efforts here on the floor of the House—I refer particularly to the speech he made last Thursday—I think he proved beyond all doubt that he was possessed of the finest integrity.

In my few years of association with Mr. DITTER I learned to honor and respect him. He seemed to be peculiarly sensitive to other people's feelings, taking care always never to hurt them. In the many speeches I heard him make on the floor he was always fair and honest, for which, I am sure, he was admired by all the Members of this body.

The Congress and the country have lost in the passing on of these splendid character, two valuable public servants.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, my sense of loss at the death of HENRY STEAGALL is out of all proportion to the extent of my association with him. He was older than I in years, and far older in service in this body. I was not of his party or of his State; nor was I ever privileged to serve on the committee over which he had so long presided with such great distinction. But it happens that in the last 6 months, I had in a fortuitous way spent some little time in his company, and I had conceived for him an extraordinary respect and admiration. No man whom I have met in this city has more impressed me by his character and convictions and by that blend of highly individual qualities which constitute what we know as personality.

"Mr. Henry," as I heard him affectionately called by his junior colleagues, was a man of mature wisdom. He was a conservative in the best sense, with a nature as humane and compassionate as the wildest radical or the most brilliant demagogue. The reception accorded last Thursday to his last speech in this House attested to the respect in which he was held. When he said, "I do not for a moment endorse the viewpoint or the philosophy of the controlling minds directing the administration of the O. P. A. Act," his hearers knew he meant it, and was not striving for a cheap political effect.

When he said, "Let a man get his hand into the Treasury of the United States, and do not ask me to find a way to get it out," he said nothing brilliant or original, but it was a wholesome farewell message of a man who knew the failings of a Government to which he had given the last full measure of his devotion.

No one who knew Mr. STEAGALL can doubt that he died fighting for his convictions. None of us could ask for life to end more nobly than his, or hope to leave a memory more gracious or more honorable.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME].

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I as a junior Member of this body could add to the eloquent tribute that has been paid to our two departed colleagues, but as the junior Member of the delegation from Alabama, I feel a sense of personal loss in the passing of HENRY B. STEAGALL that is probably as keen as that of anyone in this body. For his kindness, his tolerance, his understanding in my first year of service in this body, I will be eternally grateful. I think it is well that the people of this Nation should know as we know that HENRY STEAGALL died in line of duty in the service of this Republic.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of shock that I heard this morning of the death of two of the outstanding Members of the House, my late friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DITTER, and the genial chairman of the committee on which I am privileged to serve, Mr. STEAGALL.

I think of the many instances of kindness and geniality that have endeared these two gentlemen to me. Indeed, their characters have endeared them to all the Members of the House, regardless of party and regardless of political belief. After our political quarrels and our differences over legislation are forgotten, we remember most of all those little instances of friendship and kindness which I feel bind all the Members here together.

I remember, for instance, that it was only a short time ago that we were felicitating Mr. DITTER on his birthday; only a short time ago that the friends of Mr. STEAGALL had a meeting in his office to express their love and affection for him. I remember, too, the address that was delivered by Mr. STEAGALL on last Thursday. It was a masterful address. Even we who disagreed with some of the conclusions he reached recognized that it was a masterful address and we congratulated him. It was at that time that he told us that he was feeling ill.

I am sure all the Members of the House today share the feeling of profound sorrow that I have.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as Carlyle said of Sir Walter Scott, "When he departed he took a man's life with him," I say of HENRY STEAGALL and BILL DITTER that when they departed each took a man's life with him. Nothing but heaven can cover their high fame, no pyramid offset their memory, nothing but the eternal substance of their greatness.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD], a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a black Monday in the history of this House, to come here and find that two of the outstanding Members of this body have passed to the great beyond. The passing of Mr. DITTER was a sad accident. The passing of Mr. STEAGALL was

the result of overexertion in his labors on the Committee on Banking and Currency at this very critical time.

As has been suggested by numerous other speakers, as chairman of that committee Mr. STEAGALL was adroit, clever, able, and persistent, and when he had a bill to bring out he never quit until he got it on the floor. Whether or not you agreed with him, he was genial, kindly, and forgiving of those who did not altogether go along with him.

Mr. Speaker, Alabama loses a distinguished son. Pennsylvania also loses a distinguished son. This House loses two of its most able and outstanding Members. They go to join that great company of "dead, yet sceptered sovereigns who still rule our spirits from their urns."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in this dark hour of world tragedy the House of Representatives assembles today for the purpose of paying tribute to two of its most distinguished Members. The Grim Reaper has struck this day not one but two deadly blows.

When I came to this House 13 years ago, inexperienced as a legislator, one of the first men to take me under his arm and to advise me wisely was HENRY STEAGALL, of Alabama. I do not want to take more than a few minutes of the time of the House today, but I want to recount a personal experience or two that to me indicated the character of man he was.

I made a trip to Canada with him and other Members of this House 11 years ago to make a study of the Canadian sales tax system. I recall how we traveled together closely with each other as we went to and while we were there. We visited the great cities of that great country, and how we admired their architecture, their development, and their great country. I recall that when we went to the capital of Canada and visited the State buildings we stood in front of them and admired the marble and granite of which they were built, and expressed our deep appreciation of a neighbor like Canada.

When the trip had ended and we returned to Washington, at about 8 o'clock in the evening we detrained at the station and our baggage was taken to our homes, but we walked up the street to our offices. As we approached the Nation's Capitol, I remember how he stopped, took me by the arm, and said in substance. "We have seen a great country, we have had a great trip." Then as the floodlights from the Capitol Grounds cast their brilliance upon the Capitol dome where the Stars and Stripes were floating, he pointed to them and said, "But here is the flag that rules the world, and here is the country that we both love."

I know today that—

On Fame's eternal camping ground
Their silent tents are spread,
And Glory guards, with solemn round,
The bivouac of the dead.

I am sure that when he passed away he had no fear, he had no doubts, and that he was able to say as the great Apostle Paul had said, "I know in whom I have believed and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day."

Mr. Speaker, two great statesmen have passed away. They are gone, but the inspiration of their labors and their lives will through all the years remain with us. I am sure that each of them could have said today, "I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at an early hour this morning when a colleague called and told me of the demise of one of my friends and colleagues, the splendid gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. WILLIAM DITTER. It seems impossible that this tragic accident could happen to a friend with whom I was talking on the floor of the House last Thursday, discussing with him the mission on which the Committee on Navy Appropriations found it necessary to go to Chicago, and I asked him if he would take care of some other matters which are of interest and importance in the investigation. Congressman DITTER told me that he would take care of his portion of the investigation as soon as he got home. My experience with WILLIAM DITTER as a colleague and as a friend during my service in the House has been one of close friendship and cooperation. He was a man of great ability and splendid understanding. It is very difficult for me to pay tribute to my friend under these circumstances, but I feel he will be amply rewarded by the Great Master of all destiny and told to "sit upon My right as your services on earth have been well and faithfully performed."

To his family and the people of the State of Pennsylvania I offer my sympathy for their loss, and to the splendid people of the State of Alabama—my native State—goes my sympathy for the great loss that they have suffered in the passing of a great and splendid statesman, a fine friend, the Honorable HENRY STEAGALL. During the years of my experience as a Member of this body from each of these men I have always received the utmost consideration, friendship, and courtesy. May the Great Master grant to them divine consideration.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I loved HENRY STEAGALL. He has been my friend through many years. In the State of Alabama my district adjoins his. He has never been other than kind. He has always been friendly to the young Members of this body. Someone has said:

I wrote my name upon the sand,
And trusted it would stand for aye;
But soon, alas, the refluent sea
Had washed my feeble lines away.

I carved my name upon the wood,
And after years returned again,
I missed the shadow of the tree
That stretched of old upon the plain.

The solid marble next my name
I gave as a perpetual trust;
An earthquake rent it to its base,
And now it lies o'erlaid with dust.

All these had failed; I was perplexed;
I turned and asked myself, what then?
If I would have my name endure,
I'll write it on the hearts of men.

Mr. Speaker, HENRY STEAGALL has written his name upon the hearts of men. His body will soon lie in the district of his beloved native State of Alabama, but his spirit goes marching on.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, as every other Member of the House, I was shocked to learn today of the deaths of two of our outstanding Members of this body, the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama, and Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER. Both men have served their Nation well and their loss will be sorely felt in this critical hour.

Having served for more than 5 years under Chairman STEAGALL, I have come to appreciate his kindly and loving spirit and his deep and abiding sense of duty. His record in the Congress is filled with great achievement and he leaves the imprint of his character upon this Nation in scores of acts that he has prepared, fought for, and seen take their place as a part of the foundation of our Government.

It is true that I have not always agreed with my chairman on all issues. He understood that and no one could have expected fairer treatment nor more kindly consideration than that which he gave all of his committee, regardless of their divergent views. It was his warmth of human understanding and friendship that marked his every thought for those who were associated with him.

During his service in the Congress he has fathered and secured passage of much of our basic banking law and other acts dealing with the Nation's most important business affairs. Perhaps no achievement in his long record of accomplishment has had greater value to every citizen than his act creating the Federal Depository Insurance Corporation. It was due to his dilligence and careful planning that this outstanding cornerstone of our banking institutions came into being. Not content with that, he has consistently watched its operation through these years to be sure that the agency did the job he had mapped out for it. Through the years he fought to protect the smaller banks and the smaller depositors of these banks from financial disaster.

The wisdom of this act makes it stand as a beacon light of confidence in our financial system.

HENRY STEAGALL will be missed by the millions he served as well as by those faithful friends in his own Alabama district. He will be sorely missed on the Banking and Currency Committee where he was a friendly, kindly leader, and a man of great understanding of his fellowman.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman

from Texas the distinguished Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. After nearly 30 years of close association with HENRY B. STEAGALL, I can say truly that he was a kindly and lovable man. He had character, ability, statesmanship, and patriotism of a high order. With unnumbered thousands I shall miss him always. His friendship was an enriching treasure in the memory of which I shall not be poor.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was shocked and grieved to learn of the passing of that good friend, Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL. I was a member of the committee of which he was chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency. When I knew that my name would be mentioned for membership on this committee I felt it a propriety that I should inquire of the chairman whether my appointment would be acceptable to him or if he had another in mind whom he might prefer. I received a most gracious and courteous reply, assuring me that he had no objection to my appointment and, on the other hand, would be glad to have me as a member. From the time I attended my first meeting I found in him a real friend. He was energetic, devoted to what he believed to be right, strong in his positions, but always tolerant of the views of others. The State of Alabama has been honored by his service in the House, and the Nation has received the contribution of a tireless worker, a thoughtful man, a splendid Member of the Congress, and for a long time a most efficient chairman of a very important committee.

Words fail us when we undertake to express our appreciation of a genuine friendship. We are helpless to extend to the family of the deceased an adequate expression of our deep sympathy in the loss they sustain in having removed from them for a time one so dear as a father and a husband. Certainly, it remains that "we shall not die, but we shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye." That which we call death is but the portal that leads to a larger life.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the membership of the House of Representatives is stunned by the death of two of its most distinguished and useful Members. I refer to the sudden passing of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, of the State of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, of the State of Alabama. Throughout a quarter of a century I have served with Representative STEAGALL, a true son of the South, a man of great ability, and a gentleman of the highest order.

I can well understand why the people of the Third Congressional District of Alabama took pride in returning their able Representative to the United States Congress. Their faith in the man of their choice was well placed. He died after one of many courageous and spectacular speeches made by him in support of what he thought was for the best interests of his district, his State, and his country.

I regret the passing of this great man. I sympathize deeply with the members of his family in this time of their bereavement.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today we grieve the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, of Alabama, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

While I did not know him so intimately during my first term in Congress, I knew of his reputation as a lawyer, legislator, and public servant at that time, and admired him. I became intimately acquainted with him when I joined the membership of the House Banking and Currency Committee. It was my privilege on several occasions to spend some intimate moments with him in discussing the various problems that were before the committee. Only then did I learn to appreciate the depth of HENRY STEAGALL. He was a man of great character, brilliant mind, and wide capacity. As a statesman there were very few his equal. His charming personality kept the committee in a good mood even under the most trying circumstances. His knowledge of banking and currency was vast. Even his opponents who differed with him on issues turned to him for information in times when it could not be obtained from other sources. This he was always ready to impart graciously, honestly, and fully.

As a new member of the committee, I naturally looked to him for advice. I marveled at the patience he possessed in spending much time with members like myself who were not well versed in the background of legislation before our committee. It might be said that during his chairmanship the Banking and Currency Committee was confronted with the most serious economic problems in the history of our country. Thanks to his ability, guidance, and skillful leadership, most of the difficulties were overcome.

I shall ever remember HENRY STEAGALL as one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives with whom it has been my privilege and honor to be associated.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that funeral services for the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL will be held at Gawler's Funeral Home, 1756 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., at 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning, Tuesday, November 23. All Members are invited.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks paid in respect to Mr. STEAGALL today that the proceedings at the unveiling of the portrait of Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama, found in the bound volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, at pages A2237 to A2241, inserted by Senator LISTER HILL, may be made a part of today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Extension of remarks of Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, June 15, 1942]

UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, June 10, 1942, there was a notable gathering of high officials of the Government and distinguished personages in the Banking and Currency Committee room of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama, the able and distinguished chairman of the committee.

The occasion was marked by many fine and deserved tributes paid Mr. STEAGALL and his services to our country. The chairman of the exercises was Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, a Member of the House of Representatives from Texas and one of its ablest and most useful Members. There was a message from the President of the United States, the foremost man of our time, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

There were addresses by Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD 2d, of Alabama, agriculture's great statesman and leader in the Congress; by Representative CLYDE WILLIAMS, of Missouri, the ranking majority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency; by Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency; by Hon. SAM RAYBURN, the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives and the successor to Alabama's great and beloved William B. Bankhead; by Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, father of the Federal Reserve Act and one of the greatest Americans of our time; by Hon. Preston Delano, the Comptroller of the Currency, speaking for himself as well as for the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury, who, much to his regret, could not be present at the exercises; by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency, a man who has held more important positions in the Government at one time than perhaps any other man in the history of our country; by Hon. Marriner S. Eccles, the able Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; by Hon. Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Alien Property Custodian; and by Representative JOE STARNES, of Alabama, an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives.

These addresses were followed by an address by Mr. STEAGALL, who spoke in words of appreciation and of moving eloquence.

The portrait is the work of Mr. Howard Chandler Christy, who immortalized himself with his great masterpiece—the signing of the Constitution of the United States.

The portrait was presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency by the friends of Mr. STEAGALL, in appreciation of him and his memorable services to our country.

During the past 10 historic and momentous years as chairman of the committee, Mr. STEAGALL has understood our time and the need of our people and has had the pure heart to comprehend and the rectified will to choose the right course of action. With devotion and high skill he has fathered and passed measure after measure that have saved and strengthened the hard-earned savings of our people and the financial structure of our Nation.

Mr. STEAGALL's achievements for our country are woven like a golden thread through the mighty fabric of the past decade. Fitting indeed that his portrait should be placed at the scene of his great labors—an inspiration ever to the members of the committee and a reminder to all who pass that way of the example of his service, of the character of his devotion, and of his enduring work for his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the addresses printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PROGRAM OF THE UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAIT OF THE HONORABLE HENRY B. STEAGALL, JUNE 10, 1942, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ROOM OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas (chairman of the committee on arrangements), presiding. Mr. Speaker and distinguished guests, I have been honored by my colleague members of the Banking and Currency Committee by being delegated the delightful duty of acting as chairman of the ceremony honoring our able and distinguished chairman, the Honorable HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, of Alabama.

"Through the years that we have been associated with our chairman all of us have learned to love him. We have respected his fair and impartial administration of the committee. The Banking and Currency Committee is one of the oldest, one of the largest, and one of the most important committees of the House. It handles legislation of great importance, whether it be during a period of depression or during a costly world war.

"During the long and useful existence of the Banking and Currency Committee only 21 men have had the honor to serve as its chairman. In this illustrious group is President James A. Garfield. Chairman STEAGALL has served as chairman of this committee longer than any other person.

"A committee of Chairman STEAGALL'S friends arranged with America's great artist, Howard Chandler Christy, of New York, to paint from life his portrait. Friends and art critics alike have pronounced the portrait a great work of art.

"I am going to call the names and States they are from of the present members of the Banking and Currency Committee, for what we say and what we do here today carries the kindly and personal good wishes of every one of them, regardless of party affiliation.

"The members are Chairman STEAGALL, Alabama; WILLIAMS, Missouri; SPENCE, Kentucky; FORD, California; BROWN, Georgia; PATMAN, Texas; BARRY, New York; SACKS, Pennsylvania; GORE, Tennessee; MILLS, Arkansas; MONRONEY, Oklahoma; LYNCH, New York; KOPPELMANN, Connecticut; BOGGS, Louisiana; HULL, Wisconsin; WOLCOTT, Michigan; GIFFORD, Massachusetts; CRAWFORD, Michigan; GAMBLE, New York; KEAN, New Jersey, SUMNER, Illinois; SMITH, Ohio; KUNKEL, Pennsylvania, ROLPH, California; and DEWEY, Illinois.

"Messages from President Roosevelt

"A number of messages have been received. Time will permit the reading of the messages from only one person. They are as follows:

"Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR HENRY: Since I cannot be present at the unveiling, I send greetings for the momentous occasion. From what I have heard, Howard has done full justice to one of Alabama's favorite sons and to my old friend. I would love to see it. Congratulations.

"Always sincerely,
"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

"Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Please extend my hearty greetings to all who gather with you tomorrow for the unveiling of the portrait of Congressman HENRY B. STEAGALL. He is a faithful and efficient public servant and although I cannot be present in person I am glad to be associated with those who are paying this deserved tribute to him.

"Very sincerely yours,
"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

"Introduction of Senator Bankhead

"'The Stars Fell on Alabama' when the Bankhead family was born. No more illustrious family of statesmen, orators, and patriots has ever represented one State so long and so honorably as the Bankhead family has represented Alabama. They have brought honor and renown to the glorious traditions of Alabama in the Halls of Congress, on the highest judicial benches, as soldiers on the field of battle, as eminent scholars, and as men whose chivalry is as gallant as the old South ever produced. Therefore it is proper that I should introduce the senior Senator of Alabama to present the portrait.

"The late Senator John Hollis Bankhead 1st is the only man in American political history to have two sons—one a United States Senator, the other Speaker of the House of Representatives—and both serving at the same time. The present senior Senator, JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2d is a brother of the late Speaker W. B. Bankhead and the father of Judge W. W. Bankhead, who succeeded his uncle in Congress and served until his appointment to the Federal bench.

"It is my personal pleasure to present the distinguished gentleman and senior Senator from Alabama, JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2d, who will present the portrait to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives. Senator BANKHEAD.

"Senator BANKHEAD. Members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, you have handled a large part of the so-called New Deal legislation involving many explorations into the domain of social, economic, financial, and general security. A brief enumeration of some of the outstanding subjects of legislation of which your committee has had exclusive jurisdiction may elucidate the proposition just stated: The establishment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, revision of the Federal Reserve System to better adjust its operations to serve the needs of business; recodification of the laws governing the national bank system, establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the extension from time to time of its powers, until it has become the largest and best banking institution in the world; the building of houses for urban people at low rental rates for small-income workers, establishment of the Federal Housing Administration, which has built more than a million homes for moderate-income urban residents under a plan which affords insurance of home mortgages covering a long period of payments; establishment of the War Damage Corporation and Smaller War Plants Corporation, and the Price Control Act.

"In my judgment, one of the most important laws that has been enacted during the Roosevelt administration, from the standpoint of economic security and for the general welfare of the people, is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. In the great depression in the early thirties the people lost confidence in our financial institutions. Darker days from a financial outlook never faced our people. HENRY STEAGALL sponsored the bill establishing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In the face of resistance from the strongest official and financial sources, HENRY STEAGALL, with the backing of your great committee, stood as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar against the fierce winds of opposition. That measure was finally passed and approved by the President. Confidence in the banks was immediately restored. Since that time bank failures have almost disappeared, and the depositors in the few defaulting banks have promptly received their money from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. A man who has the vision, courage, and ability to lead our people from a state of discouragement and despair into a confident feeling of protection and security is entitled to have his picture placed where future generations may look with pride upon it.

"From the time a price control bill was presented to him for introduction by a representative of the administration, HENRY STEAGALL fought with force and determination for the adoption of fair price ceilings below which maximum prices could not be fixed on agricultural commodities. This was the outstanding issue involved in that legislation. A majority of your committee, regardless of party affiliations, supported the position of the chairman on that issue. The bill, as reported, contained section 3 which reflected the views of Mr. STEAGALL on agricultural price levels below which prices could not be fixed by law. The House approved that section. The Senate made some amendments but adopted the principle involved. The conference committee had a difficult duty to perform. I had the privilege of serving as one of the Senate conferees. Mr. STEAGALL was chairman of the House conferees. We worked together on that committee with the same motive and fixed purpose—to do the best we could to secure fairness and equality for our millions of farmers and their wives and children. The conference committee adopted section 3 of the House bill with only one amendment. Too much credit or too much praise cannot be bestowed upon HENRY STEAGALL for his services in that and other efforts to better the conditions of rural life.

"At the last Democratic National Convention held in Chicago, friends of my brother, William B. Bankhead, sought his nomination for Vice President. Because of his admiration for and confidence in HENRY STEAGALL, my brother chose him to make the nominating speech. Those who heard that speech agree that it was a masterpiece in the fields of eloquence, logic, and persuasion. It released pent-up emotions and strong convictions, and was the prelude to a spectacular demonstration, which, but for the active interference of dominant forces, might have changed important American history.

"I appreciate the priceless privilege of presenting to the Banking and Currency Committee the portrait by Howard Chandler Christy of my beloved friend and your able chairman, one of the outstanding statesmen of Congress, HENRY B. STEAGALL.

"MR. PATMAN. Since you are now for the first time seeing this wonderful portrait, it is now my privilege to introduce to you the artist, Howard Chandler Christy.

"Mr. CHRISTY. I am both proud and happy to have been commissioned to paint the portrait of this wonderful man.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Christy. I now present the ranking majority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable CLYDE WILLIAMS, of Missouri.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator BANKHEAD, on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, I accept this fine painting of our distinguished chairman and express to the donors our sincere thanks and grateful appreciation. It shall have an appropriate place in this committee room. The presentation of this beautiful portrait is eloquent proof of the high regard and esteem in which he is held by his friends. At this ceremony it is entirely fitting and proper to pay tribute to and proclaim our high admiration and sincere affection for him.

"HENRY STEAGALL, of Ozark, representing the Third District of Alabama, was first elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress and has had continuous service since that time. Only

six Members of the present House of Representatives have had longer service than he. For 26 years he has been a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and for the last 12 years has been its chairman. No one has ever served longer in that position. This is one of the outstanding committees of Congress. To be a member of it is a distinction, and to be a member and chairman of such a committee for these many years is a crowning achievement that has come to few men in our Nation's history. This honor has not come to him by mere accident or chance. It clearly attests his splendid ability, his sterling character, and his real worth as a national legislator.

"There are two things that stand out like mountain peaks in his legislative career. First, he has always stood for the preservation of the many small independent banking institutions and for the protection of bank depositors.

"It was my privilege to know him and to be intimately associated with him when he made the fight for the insurance of bank deposits. That policy was opposed by the big banks of the country. Powerful influences both in the Government and in the private financial world were arrayed against him. The unfortunate experience of some States in this field was cited as conclusive evidence that the plan would fail. It was predicted that the insurance of bank deposits would bankrupt the Government. Undaunted by these arguments and predictions of dire calamities, HENRY STEAGALL continued his fight. At times the outlook was not bright. He did not falter, hesitate, or weaken. His efforts culminated in a victory that brought contentment and the assurance of safety to millions of bank depositors. The passage of this law was among the great legislative accomplishments of the century, and it entitles HENRY STEAGALL to the lasting praise and gratitude, not only of the good people of the Third District of Alabama but of all the people of the entire United States.

"In the second place, his time and devotion have been given to the agricultural interests of the Nation and especially to the Southland which he so dearly loves and of which he is a part. He never lost an opportunity to throw himself with all his great influences, ability, and power into the fight when the rights of the farmers were involved. He has been their stanch friend and able advocate in the long fight to obtain their just share of the national income.

"The inhabitants of Ozark and the people of the Third Alabama District are fortunate and especially blessed in having as their representative in Congress not only one of the leaders during these strenuous times but one who ranks high among the great legislators of our history. We all love him.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you Mr. WILLIAMS. I now present the Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT, the ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

"Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, Chairman STEAGALL, Senator BANKHEAD, and friends, I consider it a signal honor to accept this splendid portrait of our chairman, HENRY B. STEAGALL, on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee; especially do I speak for the minority members of this committee.

"Throughout his career in the Congress of the United States, and especially as chairman of this committee, HENRY STEAGALL has exhibited those qualities of leadership, character, marked ability, and untiring energy which are typical of a true statesman and gentleman. Every one of us recognizes in him a man of unswerving devotion to the fundamentals and ideals of constitutional government. During the years of his service as chairman of this committee he has been helpful, kind, and tolerant. Having been a member of the minority for some years, he has had a sympathetic understanding of the purposes, problems, and objectives of the few of us who now constitute the minority of his committee. When at times most other men would have been impatient with us, he has insisted that each and every member be given an opportunity fully to express himself and to question witnesses. In consequence, the legislation which has been reported from the committee has been the result of thorough investigation and understanding knowledge of the important problems with which we have had to deal. Under HENRY STEAGALL's leadership the Banking and Currency Committee has reported more important legislation during the trying past 10 years than any other committee of Congress—the emergency banking laws, which enabled our banks to open and function normally after the 1933 closing; the laws creating the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration; the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; and the Federal Housing Administration, which have not only saved thousands of homes but has made it possible for hundreds of thousands to own homes who otherwise would not have been able to acquire them; most of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation legislation, through which a great part of our war production is being financed," was introduced, sponsored, and steered through the legislative intricacies and disputes to final enactment by HENRY STEAGALL. But outstanding in his successes have been the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Price Control Act. Insurance against loss by depositors in our banks has been achieved more through his efforts than any other influence in or out of Congress. He is justly called the father of deposit insurance, which has done more to stabilize banking and prevent losses than any other legislation by any other country in the world.

"The price control bill would not have given protection to the policy of parity for our farmers if it had not been for the farsightedness and constant altertness of HENRY STEAGALL in repelling all attempts by those unfriendly to agriculture to undo his work of years that the farmer might receive his just share of national income. The country owes a deep debt of gratitude to HENRY B. STEAGALL, and I am glad that his portrait will hang on the walls of this committee room, here in the Nation's Capitol, as a symbol of unqualified statesmanship and true devotion to duty—a splendid portrait of a great patriot and man.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. WOLCOTT. I now have the pleasure of introducing Texas' first citizen, the able and courageous statesman and patriot, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. STEAGALL, members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and your guests, it is a high privilege, and I deem it a distinct honor to be able to accept upon the part of the House of Representatives this magnificent portrait of this splendid American. After an association of 25 years, usually termed 'a quarter of a century,' with a man, you come to know him. You come to know him really.

"My association with HENRY STEAGALL has been so long, so close, and so intimate that I may speak of him not only as a statesman but as a man. He is a gentleman, as that word is known and used in the part of the country from which he comes. He is a statesman of high order, and I have been rather amused this morning to hear recounted all of the great measures that have passed the Congress under the leadership of Mr. STEAGALL and the dire predictions that were made about some of them, of the destructive forces they would set in motion if they were enacted into law, and none of those dire predictions have been justified.

"When I came to the Congress more than 29 years ago, a distinguished gentleman, who is present here this morning was the chairman of this great committee. I do not know whether it was a great committee before I came here or not, but I know that CARTER GLASS made it a great committee.

"Even in those days of the Federal Reserve System, some made dire predictions as to what it would do to banking and to finance.

"I must not take your time longer because there are others on the program. I want to say this about STEAGALL: He came from the rocks and hills of Alabama; he has not forgotten the rock from which he was weaned. Honors that have come to him have not changed him. He is still the simple man of the plain people.

"Let me repeat, he has grown to be a statesman of high order, but he has not forgotten the people.

"And, Henry, may I wish for you in the years that lay out before you, and I pray that they may be many, that you may enjoy to the fullest measure the rich blessings of health, of prosperity, and of peace, and that your path may lie through green pastures and by still waters. [Applause.]

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. RAYBURN. Our next speaker has probably had influence in framing and passing more financial legislation in Congress than any other person. He was coauthor of the Federal Reserve Act; and the Glass-Steagall bills, which were passed during the depression to help the country, are too numerous to mention. It pleases me to have the honor to present the Honorable CARTER GLASS, United States Senator from Virginia.

"Senator GLASS. Mr. Chairman, members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure to me to be a guest at this appropriate and important meeting in honor of HENRY STEAGALL. I have known him so long that I hesitate to tell you how long it has been.

"He and I have been associated for a number of years in all outstanding measures relating to the banking interests of the United States, and I have always found him amiable, firm, and sensible.

"This is a great picture, by a great artist, of a great representative in Congress. [Applause.] It gives me infinite pleasure to be among the guests here this morning.

"HENRY STEAGALL was a chief factor in the adoption of the insurance of bank deposits. A great many people, including myself, had doubts about what the result would be, but I am glad to know that it has been highly successful, that it has done a tremendous amount of good, that it has lessened, in fact, if it has not obliterated, bank failures in the United States; and in passing I may say that this is largely due to the fact that we put as administrator of this law one of the finest and most sensible men that ever lived, Leo Crowley.

"Administered by a man of less capacity, of inferior character, and oblivious of his responsibilities, the law may have been a disaster instead of a great blessing, but Leo Crowley has administered it as I think no other man could, and I take my hat off to him as well as I do to HENRY STEAGALL. [Applause.].

Also permit me to say that I have known BANKHEAD so long that I am ashamed to say how long. [Applause.]

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Senator GLASS. It is my pleasure to present next the Honorable Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency. Mr. Delano will also represent the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, who was unable to attend this ceremony.

"Mr. DELANO. Mr. Chairman, members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is doubtful if there exists in the entire financial history of these United States a decade of greater significance than that of the last 10 years. During this period the Nation has faced and is still facing problems of deepest gravity. As a result of the unprecedented nature of these problems, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives has been called upon to assume a heavy responsibility. We who are in government well understand how much of this responsibility falls upon the committee chairman during such a period of stress, and we who are in government, and particularly we of the Treasury, know with what earnestness and fidelity this responsibility has been discharged by the very distinguished gentleman whose portrait you have just seen unveiled.

"These last 10 years have seen Congress, with the approval of the President, place upon the statute books a series of acts so important and so far-reaching that they alter completely the financial and banking structure of the country. During this period the whole underlying philosophy of American banking has been fundamentally modified and expanded by the Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935.

"In all of this legislation HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL has played a dominant part. If you will go to the record, you will find there are two outstanding characteristics which have marked Mr. STEAGALL'S career as chairman of this committee. The first has been his earnest and unchanging interest in the welfare of the independent country bank, an interest which I may say is heartily shared by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. He has been, and I know always will be, the closest friend of the crossroads banker.

"The second characteristic of Mr. STEAGALL'S career as chairman of this all-important committee has been the uniform courtesy and dignity with which he has exercised the great power of his office, a courtesy and dignity which is in the best tradition of the chivalrous South from which he comes.

"And so, on behalf of Secretary Morgenthau, for whom I have the honor to speak, and who regrets that he cannot be here today, and for myself as Comptroller of the Currency, may I offer to you, Chairman STEAGALL, the congratulations and good wishes of all of us in the Treasury.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Delano. I now present the able financier, the Secretary of Commerce and Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency, the only man to have ever held two Cabinet-rank positions at the same time, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones.

"Mr. JONES. It is singularly appropriate at this particular time, with the world in its greatest struggle to preserve freedom for mankind and the democratic way of life, that we should pause to pay tribute to HENRY STEAGALL, one of the outstanding leaders in the Congress of the United States.

"HENRY STEAGALL and those associated with him in Congress are called upon to be almost superhuman in both knowledge and action. The Banking and Currency Committee, of which he has long been chairman, is one of the most important committees of Congress. It has been my privilege to appear before his committee many times during the past 10 years, asking for specific legislation, and upon the consideration and recommendation of his committee, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authorized the lending and investing of more than $25,000,000,000. Approximately one-half of this amount was for economic recovery after 1932, and the other half in the war effort.

"We in the administrative branch of Government frequently come to Congress asking for authority to do something which we have taken weeks, and probably months, to think out, and we expect the committee members immediately to grasp and understand the problems and determine the necessity for the law. I have been amazed at the ability of the members of these committees, especially the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, over which HENRY STEAGALL presides and before which I have appeared for all Reconstruction Finance Corporation legislation to get to the heart of the problem. I have been impressed by his patience and his willingness to give those appearing before his committee every possible opportunity to be heard and to explain their problems to their own satisfaction.

"The gentleman from Alabama is one of our most distinguished statesmen. He holds the confidence of his constituents, and he holds the confidence of his fellow Members of Congress.

"Twenty-seven years is a long span for a man to remain in Congress, and you may rest assured, HENRY STEAGALL, that, if you had not looked after the interests of your constituents—the people you represent—you would not be here today. Apparently, in looking after the interests of your own constituents, you are serving the bests interests of Alabama and of the entire United States.

"According to my observation, you go about your responsibilities with that one purpose in mind, and while you have a real understanding of the fiscal and industrial needs of the Nation, you also have a perfect understanding of the people of your State and their welfare.

"Men rise and fall in public favor with passing issues and periodical elections. Fortunately, you have been repeatedly sent back to Congress, and undoubtedly will be as long as you are willing to serve.

"Such is the man we honor today. Your succession, your record in the Congress, bear far greater testimony to your service than could any words said here today. The word 'statesman' has an important meaning, but it is not quite warm enough to sum up HENRY STEAGALL, a warm-hearted, generous, hearty spirit. We are proud of your achievements, and we are proud of the fine things for which you stand.

"I appreciate the opportunity to join with a few of your other friends in paying homage to you in this simple manner.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Jones. The next speaker is the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, of Utah, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

"Mr. ECCLES. It is very gratifying to me to be asked to join in paying homage to my good friend, HENRY STEAGALL, though the 3 minutes allotted to me to review his extended and useful public career and pay tribute to his great human qualities are scarcely adequate. I should at least have as much time as the keynoter at a great national convention.

"Ever since I came to the Federal Reserve Board, HENRY STEAGALL has been chairman of the very powerful Banking and Currency Committee of the House. Time and again I have sat in the well of his august committee room, under his gavel, while his associates have plied me with questions on almost every subject under the sun, some of them touching now and then on matters of banking and currency.

"He has always been gracious and kind to me, as is his nature and habit. I am deeply indebted to him for the patience, wise counsel, and guidance he afforded me at the time of the Banking Act of 1935 and on many subsequent occasions. Even when he has failed to see eye to eye with me during momentary lapses of his usual high statesmanship, he has invariably turned me down so charmingly and gracefully, with such unfailing southern courtesy and consideration, that I have felt no pain—at least not while in his radiant presence.

"The felicitous speeches which have been prepared for this occasion testify to the fact that HENRY STEAGALL is a national figure and a splendid public servant. No portrait of him, however inspired, can, of course, radiate his personality or speak his quiet words of wisdom. Hence I shall continue to consult HENRY in person while I respectfully salute his likeness on canvas. May they both long endure.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Eccles. The next speaker is Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Alien Property Custodian, the Honorable Leo Crowley.

"Mr. CROWLEY. I feel privileged, indeed, to participate today in this ceremony to honor a distinguished American statesman who is also my close personal friend, HENRY B. STEAGALL, Member of Congress from Alabama.

"As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives during the past 10 years, Congressman STEAGALL has handled more legislation vital to the financial well-being of this Nation than was handled during any comparable period in our history. The contributions that he and his associates on the House Banking and Currency Committee made to rebuilding our banking system after the disastrous days of 1932 and 1933, and to reestablishing our whole financial system on a sounder basis, will rank in history, I am sure, among the most valuable and the most workable accomplishments of the Roosevelt administration.

"As Chairman of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the past 8½ years, it has been my privilege to administer what is perhaps the outstanding recent innovation in the financial field. The idea of insuring bank depositors against loss of their funds through bank failures was advocated by Congressman STEAGALL for many years before 1933. Introduction and passage of the measure providing for Federal insurance of bank deposits in the Banking Act of 1933 was largely the product of his vision and of his strong leadership. In view of the powerful forces that gathered in opposition to the measure, its passage is a tribute to the courage and the persistence that his associates know characterize the efforts of HENRY STEAGALL when he knows he is right. And now that Federal deposit insurance is seasoned by nearly 9 years of valuable and constructive experience, now that the desirability and the workability of the plan have been demonstrated beyond question, I think it understatement to say that the people of this Nation owe to HENRY STEAGALL and his committee associates an eternal debt of gratitude, if only for this single contribution to their safety and their peace of mind and to the soundness of our financial system.

"We know that so long as HENRY STEAGALL remains in Congress, Federal deposit insurance will have a good and sympathetic friend. In common with other administrators of financial agencies, I have found him always willing to listen to administrative problems and always eager to sponsor legislation that would improve the soundness and the workability of financial statutes. For standing always with his feet solidly on the ground, for being able always to distinguish between needed changes and visionary proposals, and for lending his support and his leadership only to proposals of unquestionable merit, we and the thousands of American bankers and the millions of American bank depositors are grateful to HENRY B. STEAGALL. And our gratitude extends also to his coworkers on the House Banking and Currency Committee during the past 10 years.

"My own feelings on this occasion go far beyond professional recognition and civic gratitude. Even more than my work with

HENRY STEAGALL has demonstrated his keenness of intellect, his qualities of statesmanship, and his capacity for leadership, the association has meant for me a constantly ripening personal friendship which I value very highly. This friendship has meant much to me since I came to Washington. It is my hope that the fates will permit our association to continue for many years more and that our ties will grow closer with each passing year.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Crowley. I now present the Honorable JOE STARNES, Congressman from the Fifth Alabama District.

"Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, HENRY B. STEAGALL is Alabama's proud gift to the Nation. If, by God's grace, he completes the term to which he has been recently nominated without opposition there will have been only 16 other Members of the House who have served for an equal or longer period than he. No other Member has his name identified with more laws of national and international import. Mr. STEAGALL further has the unusual record of having never lost a bill which has been considered by the House.

"While Mr. STEAGALL is the author or coauthor of more monetary legislation than any other American, the measures which he has authored and sponsored have covered the whole of our economic life. They have touched the hearthstone of every American home. When his party came into control of the House in the final years of President Hoover's administration, he authored the legislation establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Under the able administration of another great American, Jesse Jones, of Texas, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation revived and restored business operations in every State.

"Mr. STEAGALL'S most famous legislative contribution in the monetary field is the act guaranteeing bank deposits. He advocated this legislation for many years prior to 1932 and successfully sponsored the measure through the Congress when his party obtained complete control of the Government. This legislation did more to restore the confidence of our people in their financial institutions and to end bank failures than all other factors combined.

"Among other contributions of our distinguished colleague to the stability and leavening of our social and economic life has been the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, designed to save homes; the Federal Housing Administration, to build and repair homes under which over $5,000,000,000 worth of loans on homes have been insured without net loss to the Government; and the United States Housing Authority, which has abolished many of the slums in our cities, towns, and communities. It is noteworthy that Mr. STEAGALL personally wrote a provision in the United States Housing Authority which inaugurated a slum-clearance program for rural areas.

"Measures to stimulate trade and commerce with other nations and to breathe life into the good-neighbor policy, as well as measures to increase the income and improve the lot of the American farmer have been sponsored by our distinguished colleague.

"It can be truthfully said that as a legislator he has a broad, comprehensive understanding of our national life, with its varied problems; as a leader he is adept, adroit, skillful, always progressive, and uniformly successful; as a man his impulses are attuned to the warm heartbeats of the human family. No man who has served in this distinguished body has ever possessed a keener sense of humor, more common sense, or a greater love for his friends, his country, and his God than HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama. Certainly none has served with more distinction nor constructive usefulness.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. STARNES. At this time it is my privilege and pleasure to present our most distinguished and honored guest upon this occasion, the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, members of the committee, and distinguished guests, we are taught that man acquired the power of speech only after a long period of development. So until this day there are times when no language can give full expression to the emotions of the human heart. You must look beyond my words deep down into my heart to understand how grateful I am to my friends who are responsible for this occasion, and for all the kindly, generous things that have been said. The fact that I recognize my faults and limitations makes it all only more personal, and more appreciated.

"The success that may have marked my service is not due alone to any merit of mine. Credit must be given the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House who have been unfailing in their indulgence and cooperation, and who have contributed so much of what has been accomplished. I speak not only of majority members but of the minority as well. The work of our committee has never been marred by any partisanship inconsistent with public duty.

"In all my years of service in Congress I have never known a committee that possessed a higher average of ability or that reflected more credit upon the House than the Committee on Banking and Currency. In my judgment, the work of this committee is more important to the prosperity and happiness of our people than that of any other committee of the House.

"It was this committee that formulated the great Federal Reserve Act, which enabled the Nation successfully to finance the First World War without serious disturbance to our domestic economy. That measure was enacted under the leadership of the illustrious Senator from Virginia, CARTER GLASS, at the time chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, and Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, who honor us by their presence here today. This committee has played a most conspicuous part in the formation and passage of legislation suited to the stupendous task confronting us at this time of national crisis.

"Through the magnanimity and unfailing kindness of a great and generous constituency, it has been my good fortune to have been chosen as Representative in Congress for a continuous period of 30 years. The record shows that only 11 Members of the House have served longer than this. I have served during the administrations of President Wilson, President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, and now President Roosevelt—the recognized leader of the moral forces of the world. I have served with eight Speakers of the House, beginning with Speaker Clark, Speaker Gillette, Speaker Longworth, Speaker Garner, Speaker Rainey, Speaker Byrnes, brilliant William B. Bankhead of Alabama, and our present able and beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN—great statesmen, all of them, and true Americans. Well worthy of association with these are many contemporaries whose names will forever adorn the history of these times.

"As these names and faces come trooping to memory, I am reminded of the words of the immortal Pericles, who, when approaching the end of his incomparable career embracing the period which history records as the 'Age of Pericles' or the 'Golden Age of Greece,' said that, within his lifetime had, 'Existed the greater part of those who since the origin of the world have been the luminaries of the human race.' No doubt the statement of Pericles was fully justified. I can truly say that these men with whom I have had the honor of association—some of whom honor us by their presence on this occasion—may justly be called the luminaries of another age. I could wish no higher honor than these associations and friendships. They enrich my life. They make the years seem all too brief. I confess I wish they could be longer.

"Throughout all the world, in this hour of darkness, men and women look with tear-stained eyes to the Congress of the United States for light and leadership. We will not fail them. I believe the present representatives of the sovereign people of the United States are worthy of our best traditions and will prove equal to the responsibilities entrusted to them.

"When the present conflict ends—as, please God, it shall end in the triumph of our flag—we will reclaim and hold the powers and prerogatives—vested by the Constitution in the chosen representatives of the people. Of course our orderly processes must be interrupted during this unhappy period of world conflict and our lives adjusted to these temporary conditions. But when peace shall come again, we will resume the normal processes intended by the heroic patriots who established our Government. We will assert anew our uncompromising devotion to those fundamental principles that are essential to the perpetuity of this Republic—and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

"Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. STEAGALL. In conclusion, I desire to express appreciation to the participants of this program. Please accept from the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House our thanks, appreciation, and congratulations."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. WILLIAM DITTER

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and profound sorrow that I announce the death of our colleague the able Representative from the Seventeenth District of the State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER. I offer a resolution (H. Res. 362), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, J. WILLIAM DITTER, familiarly known as "Bill" to all the Members of the House, was one of the outstanding Representatives, a tireless worker, an able debater, a man who was always admired and respected, even by those Members who opposed his views and expressions. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, his keen mind and training were of unquestioned

service to this country. He was an outstanding member of the bar. Bill sacrificed his practice to serve during these critical times in the interests of the Nation. His untimely passing will be a great loss to his district, to his State, and to his Nation.

I think it fitting that I read at this time a letter received by the Speaker this morning:

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 22, 1943.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It was with deep regret this morning that I learned of the tragic death of the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, Representative from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER, during his career in Congress, has been a true friend of the Navy and his loss will be deeply felt by the personnel of the Navy and of the Navy Department.

In all dealings with him we found him to have the best interests of the Nation at heart.

The Nation, the House of Representatives, and the Navy have suffered a keen loss in his passing.

Very truly yours,

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest duties of my career in this body confronts me this morning; that is to speak of the tragic death of our greatly esteemed colleague, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania. About 1 o'clock this morning, I was awakened to receive the shocking news that BILL DITTER had been killed earlier in an airplane crash. It was difficult for me, as I know it is difficult for you, to realize that one so vigorous, so full of energy, so filled with love of life and interest in his work, could pass so quickly from this world.

The tragic death of the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER will shock the Nation. In his untimely passing his country lost a patriotic legislator; the House of Representatives lost a brilliant and able Member; his colleagues lost an associate for whom we all had a deep affection; the Republican Party lost a tireless worker. I know I speak for the whole House in saying that the deep sympathy of this entire body goes out to our dead colleague's bereaved family.

It was my privilege to have enjoyed the close friendship of BILL DITTER since he first came to Congress. His outstanding ability, his splendid gifts as an orator, his brilliant mentality marked him as one who would have gone far in serving his country had he been spared this tragic end.

He served for years as a member of the important Committee on Appropriations, and in this service he acquired a profound knowledge of the Government and its operations. His service on the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs had rendered him an authority on those matters. He had contributed much to the development of the American Navy.

He was three times selected by his associates as chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee.

As a teacher, lawyer, public prosecutor, and legislator, he served well the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation.

We can ill afford, especially in times like these, and with the problems which lie ahead of us to be solved, to lose a great American like BILL DITTER.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER].

Mr. KINZER. My colleagues, a deep sorrow has fallen upon the Pennsylvania congressional delegation in the untimely and sudden death of our colleague which occurred last night at 8:30, about 10 miles from my home while he was on his way from Massachusetts to his home in Ambler. The storm drove them 80 miles west entirely out of their course, and the plane crashed near the town of Columbia, Lancaster County, Pa., at 8:30 last night. WILL DITTER came to this Congress well equipped by education, study, and personality, more than a decade ago and from that time to this he has represented the Seventeenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. He knew his constituents. He understood their problems, their sorrows, their hopes, and their aspirations, and he at all times met them and aided them in every way within his power in the solving of those problems.

WILL DITTER was an able Member of this House worthy of any adversary, with few equals and no superiors in forensic debate. We shall miss him, and I shall miss him as a neighbor and a close personal friend. He has been helpful to all of us; he has been kind to us. In his passing our sympathy goes out to his helpmeet and wife who through the years has aided him in every way, and likewise our sympathy goes out to his son and daughter who have lost the guiding hand of a loving father.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the House bows its head in greatest grief this morning. Two of our distinguished leaders are gone.

J. WILLIAM DITTER came to this House with a wonderful record behind him. Most of the time he has been here he has served with me upon the Committee on Appropriations. All of that time on the committee he has been a member of the Naval Subcommittee, and has had as much to do as any man with the naval preparations that have come in the last few years. But, his service was diversified. He served upon the Committee on the District of Columbia, upon the Interior Department Subcommittee; upon the Treasury and Post Office Department Subcommittee, and in later years upon the Deficiency Committee.

To my mind he was the ablest debater on the floor of this House. He was a great lawyer and an expert accountant. Those qualities made of him one of the very best cross-examiners I have ever seen.

To lose such a man at such a time as this, in the time of our Nation's greatest trial, is a blow to the Republic. Our sympathy goes out in fullest measure to that family of his to whom he was so keenly devoted.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was grievously shocked upon receiving word of the death of our late friend—my genuine friend—BILL DITTER. Our friendship started early in his congressional career, dating back more than 10 years.

His qualities of leadership, his power of speech, his lovable personality quickly brought him to the forefront among our Republican colleagues, and these same qualities endeared him to the entire House.

I can see him now in debate from his position in the third row, and I can see him walking across the House, particularly when there was colloquy or some passage which had taken place between himself and some other Member—and frequently I was that other Member—and how I marveled at his ability, his rapidity of thought, and the difficulty of undermining his position.

BILL DITTER and I often crossed swords on matters involving differences of opinion, and occasionally on matters involving some political color in which we engaged in debate, but always these exchanges were of the most impersonal and friendly nature.

As previously said today in tribute to him, BILL DITTER was "a foeman worthy of any man's steel." He was always fair in debate. Strong advocate though he was, he never resorted to small practices. He was a man of high ideals. He possessed nobility of character. He had the courage of his convictions and never did he hesitate to freely express them.

One emotion BILL DITTER firmly possessed, and that was his love of the House of Representatives.

In his untimely and tragic death this House has lost one of its stalwarts. The Nation has been deprived of a truly great statesman. Throughout his service in the House, BILL DITTER, as I lovingly and fondly refer to him, was ever interested in the United States Navy. He was one of its strongest advocates and supporters. His only boy, I am informed, was just recently commissioned in the Navy; and he was intensely proud of that boy.

I am further advised that there is being completed at the Willow Grove Naval Air Station—which was BILL DITTER's destination last evening when the fatal accident occurred—a chapel which will bear a plaque at the entrance, the inscription for which was chosen by BILL DITTER. That inscription will read:

A house of prayer.

And then these words, from the Psalms:

Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my Strength and my Redeemer.

I have faith that his life has been acceptable to the Redeemer and that his soul is in God's keeping.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the casualty lists from the battle fronts are lengthening. Every morning there is delivered at the door of homes throughout the Nation telegrams which read, "Regret to inform you that your son——"

But all the war casualties are not on the other side, and we have one tragically reported here this morning. Congressman DITTER was as much a participant in the war effort, as much a part of the American forces as any boy who mans a machine gun or pilots a plane across the enemy frontiers today.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations he not only cooperated in the heavy responsibilities of the committee in providing funds for the support of the entire war program, but as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, he gave unstintedly of his time and attention, and of his great talents, to the work of that committee in the development of a two-ocean Navy and of American sea power which has given the United States the greatest Navy ever launched under the flag of any nation in the history of the world—a Navy which has been up to this time, and will continue to be with increasing emphasis, a determining factor in this war of extermination and survival now waged in every quarter of the globe.

WILLIAM DITTER was a man of exceptional ability. He was an outstanding figure in the Congress and in the Nation. He rendered a distinguished service to his State, to the Congress, to his party, and especially to his country.

He died at his post of duty and in line of action, and if he could have sent us a last message I am certain that message would have been, "Carry on." In the words of Saul, as paraphrased by Lord Byron:

Warriors and chiefs! should the shaft or the sword
Pierce me in leading the host of the Lord,
Heed not the corse, though a king's, in your path:
Bury your steel in the bosoms of Gath!

Thou who art bearing my buckler and bow,
Should the soldiers of Saul look away from the foe,
Stretch me that moment in blood at thy feet!
Mine be the doom which they dared not to meet.

Farewell to others, but never we part,
Heir to my royalty, son of my heart!
Bright is the diadem, boundless the sway,
Or kingly the death, which awaits us today!

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to speak of a departed colleague; it is doubly hard this morning when we learn of the loss of two of our very distinguished colleagues. One of them, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, is from Pennsylvania. To stand in this spot where he scored his triumphs and to recall to your minds his value to our country so soon following his departure from us is difficult. Time will impress upon the minds of Americans the worth of BILL DITTER and HENRY STEAGALL to their country. They were called at the zenith of their careers for a higher purpose. Of that I am convinced. That purpose can only be that an all-knowing Father needed them in the furthering of His design. Those of us remaining will do our best to fill their shoes, a most difficult job and one which time will help us do.

To those dear ones remaining with us we pledge our sympathies, we express our regret, and we know that in their remembrance of these departed loved ones they will find a lasting satisfaction.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely death of our able colleague and distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, carries with it a sense of shock and deep personal loss.

For years I have worked closely with BILL DITTER. I have worked closely with him as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as a member of the subcommittee in charge of deficiency appropriations, as a member of the Republican Congressional Committee. In days gone by he has come into my district to speak in my behalf. Only a few days ago, as the Members will recall—in perhaps his last speech on the floor of this House—his friendship was evidenced in striking manner.

No one could work closely with him as I have without having for him both high regard and deep affection. I shall miss him greatly.

BILL DITTER'S death is a great loss to the Nation. His contribution to the Navy and in other fields of outstanding importance is well known to us all. His gift of expression, his capacity in debate, his power of analysis, his knowledge of human nature combined to give him a continually increasing influence on the floor of this House and held for him the prospect of an even brighter and more useful future in the service of his country. The Nation can ill afford, Mr. Speaker, to lose one of his high character and outstanding capacity in these difficult days.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Ditter and to the members of the family who survive him.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are downcast today over the passing of our two colleagues. J. WILLIAM DITTER was sitting by me Friday in a committee hearing. We shall miss him much, for he was an able Member of the House. Besides being penetrating, he was conscientious and forceful. While he occupied a position of leadership in the party, he was a thoroughgoing American and at his zenith in public usefulness. May his memory help us to do our duty better.

It was never my privilege to have served in a committee with Mr. STEAGALL, but I have observed him for nearly eight terms on the floor. I appreciated his high worth. It is very unusual to lose two men in the same 24 hours. It is so rare that they should both be men of such distinguished leadership.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, my long-time and never-to-be-forgotten connection with J. WILLIAM DITTER, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, on which I served with him at his solicitation, was too confidential and too intimate; my personal relations and those of my family with him and his family were and are so close that I do not trust myself to try at this time to pay to his memory so just and rich a tribute as I hope later to be able to pay, somewhat commensurate with his desserts.

Until then and upon this mournful occasion may I say only that so well did I know BILL DITTER, I dare to say that could he have been heard to have spoken as he met the grisly thing called death, he might have been heard to say as he went to the reward of just men made perfect:

Let me live out my years in heat of blood!
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine!
Let me not see this soul-house built of mud
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.
Let me go quickly, like a candle light
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night!
Thus would I go.
And grant that when I face the grisly Thing,
My song may trumpet down the gray Perhaps.
Let me be as a tune-swept fiddle string
That feels the Master Melody—and snaps!

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS].

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, once again the black camel of death has entered our midst, knelt at the threshold of the earthly home of two of our colleagues, and summoned them to go on that long journey to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler e'er returns.

When I received early this morning the information at my hotel that BILL DITTER had been killed in an airplane crash I could not speak; words failed me. It fails me now, it fails all of us, to find words properly to express our regret and our sorrow at his untimely passing. We shall miss his cheery greeting, his ever-readiness to be helpful to us in any way that lay within his power. His place in committee, on the floor, in the councils of his party will be hard to fill. His community, his State, his Nation, has suffered a great loss. To the bereaved family we extend our deepest heartfelt sympathy in this hour of sudden tragedy.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the full scope of our loss today is not realized, I believe, by any one of us. We are too stunned and shocked. We have lost two of the great leaders of the greatest legislative body in the world, the House of Representatives.

Very soon a Member learns to measure the ability, the character, and equipment of his fellow Members. These two gentlemen were well prepared when they came to the House, but they grew steadily year by year in stature and in their ability to get things done for America.

A great writer once said: "It is not life that matters but the courage we bring to it." Both these men always showed rare courage. Both these men had a great belief in God, a firm conviction in the hereafter, and that if you lived properly and courageously you went to that Great Beyond. It is my belief that that is why they were so courageous, why they were leaders, and why their actions in the House will help us to carry on. Their spirit will lead us along the way.

Each man died in the service of his country. The senior Member, HENRY B. STEAGALL, died as a result of an overtaxed heart as the result of war work and a long speech made on the House floor when he was very ill last week. Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER died while carrying out his work for the Navy he loved so well. I believe if he could have chosen the way he was to meet his death, he would have wished to go as he did in a Navy plane while performing a service for the conduct of the war. The Navy wrote a tribute of respect and appreciation of his great contribution in appropriating funds for strengthening of all branches of the Navy. We especially owe this statesman and patriot unfailing gratitude.

Both these men had a great graciousness and a great gentleness. Neither man was ever too busy to sit down and talk things over and talk things out with a fellow Member. The last thing either of them said to me was an encouraging, helpful word. As we grieve, our deepest, most understanding sympathy goes to their families.

There are no party lines when we lose those we love in the House but, of course, the blow falls more heavily upon members of the party to which the departed friend belonged. In the passing of WILLIAM DITTER the Republicans have suffered an irreparable loss. A tireless, effective worker, modest, unassuming, a brilliant debater of great ability, a fine friend, we shall miss him more than we can say.

Both leaders were nationally known. The Nation will pause with us and mourn their loss.

Every Member in the House today realizes that for HENRY STEAGALL and WILLIAM DITTER there is no death.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the silver cord is loosened, the golden bowl is broken. The picture is dashed to pieces. Today those of us who live and move around are conscious of two outstanding men. It has been well said that at the moment we do not realize the loss we have suffered. As the days go on and as time unfolds and the work of this House must be carried on for the benefit of the Nation and the world at large, we shall miss these two men more than we at the moment can imagine.

One day I asked our colleague from Pennsylvania, as he was passing back and forth: "Why is it that you do not go to the Well?" He said, "I consider it a mark of disrespect to the Speaker to turn my back on that Chair and the man who occupies it." I may say, Mr. Speaker, that no man in my acquaintanceship held in higher respect the traditions of this great body than did our brother DITTER.

Many points have been emphasized in the lives and characters of these men, their kindness, their gentleness, their ability, their scholarly attainments, but underneath it all there is something like the Biblical phrase: "Underneath it all are the eternal arms sustaining."

I often think of my friend, and I speak of him now as a friend with the deepest feeling. Frequently he would come to me and ask, "Have you time to look up a little law for me?" or "Will you look up this point for me to make dead sure I am right?" He never entered this Well and never crossed swords with an opponent until he felt he was firmly grounded, that he was established as it were bottomed on the law, and then with that marvelous skill of repartee of the adroit rapier thrust that no man in this House possesses, and I speak from a knowledge of 38 years in the criminal courts of the United States in my State, never have I seen in my time such a cross-examiner, such a debater, such a man of skill as this man, yet with it all kindly, gentle. One day, I recall with distinctness when a Member on the opposition said to me that he felt hurt over something Mr. DITTER had said. I overtook our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, at the door and told him. Like a flash he said he would not hurt a man in this House under any consideration, and, "I will go at once and I will apologize to him, I will strike it from the RECORD," and to his everlasting credit that was done.

That is the measure of a man. Not in the triumph of his success did he wish in any way to hurt his fellow men, but with all kindness, gentleness, and softness, all the time upholding his party and his position, yet through it all having consideration for his fellow man.

If you will pardon another personal reference, may I refer to his daughter who is associated with him in the practice of law. What a remarkable thing it is for a father and daughter to be associated. Frequently we know of fathers and sons being associated together but it is a rare thing indeed that a daughter emulates her father and follows in his course. Then there is his son and what pride he had in that boy and the fact he was entering the Navy. The only time I ever saw him show any emotion was one day when he was speaking to me he said: "You do not know, you will never know the pride of a father, the pride I have in my son entering the Navy and going out to defend our country."

Is it any wonder that we from Pennsylvania are proud of this man, proud of his memory, the marvelous courage he has left us and that we are so glad to pay tribute to him here today? It seems to me that in the days that he taught in the Northeastern High School of Philadelphia, when he taught the subjects of history and economics, that something went through his every fiber and system, for I know of no man in this House who took a greater interest in the history of his country and a greater pride. Living near Valley Forge, passing through Germantown and on the Brandywine day by day passing Independence Hall, the memories of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the Continental United States, the Congress of the Confederacy and all those great heroes and characters, this man had taken something into his very being that meant something for America. He was a genuine American through it all. Now he is gone.

I know of no words more beautiful than the words of George Matheson, the blind English preacher, and if you will indulge me for a moment I would like to read them as a true sentiment of my own feelings toward Mr. DITTER:

O Love that wilt not let me go,
I rest my weary soul in Thee;
I give Thee back the life I owe,
That in Thine ocean depths its flow
May richer, fuller be.

O Light that followest all my way,
I yield my flickering torch to Thee;
My heart restores its borrowed ray
That in Thy sunshine's blaze its day
May brighter, fairer be.

O Joy that seekest me through pain
I cannot close my heart to Thee;
I trace the rainbow through the rain,
And feel the promise is not vain
That morn shall tearless be.

O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from Thee;
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

—*George Matheson.*

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning I learned the news of the death of my colleague from Pennsylvania, WILLIAM DITTER, while at my home in Philadelphia preparing to return to Washington. On my arrival here I was informed of the untimely death also of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. STEAGALL.

Regarding our colleague from Alabama, our distinguished Speaker has well expressed the thought of the House by characterizing him as a kindly and lovable gentleman. To my colleague from Alabama I would say that we all join with them in expressing our sympathy to the family of Mr. STEAGALL and to the citizens of Alabama for the loss their State has suffered. In the years he served in this body he made a contribution not only to the State of Alabama, but to the welfare of the entire Nation.

In common with all of my colleagues from Pennsylvania, I was shocked and stunned by the tragic circumstances surrounding the death of BILL DITTER, to a degree that does not permit expression. He was no less a casualty of the war than are those who have died on the sea, in the air, and on the battlefields in this war. He died in the service of the Navy which he loved and which he had served so well.

This aisle may divide us along party lines but it can never divide us in friendship and in affection. For BILL DITTER, I always felt a sincere and deep affection. I feel I have sustained a personal loss. Our State has lost a man, who, in the service rendered to it, has not been surpassed by anyone, who in our time has been in public life in the State of Pennsylvania.

To his wife and family, I extend my sincere sympathy in this hour of bereavement and I pray that Almighty God will give consolation to them.

Many of us, because of the duties which confront us every day and the new problems that arise engaging our attention, are prone too soon to forget our associates, but they have the right to expect that those of us, who have been so intimately associated with them day by day, shall not forget them. To us they cry, "Have pity, have pity, at least, you my friend, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me."

As we mourn them today, as we recall their memory in the days to come, I would say that it would be well if we would remember the injunction of Holy Scripture, "That it is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead."

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in these troublesome times with our Nation and the world at war, we are constantly in the presence of death, stark and sudden. Almost every day we learn of such a death of someone near and dear to us. But not even the present frequency of these unhappy experiences can alleviate the shock occasioned by the sudden, wholly unexpected and tragic death of one so close to us as was our colleague, J. WILLIAM DITTER. Those of us who have served with him in the Congress of the United States and all of us who knew him are utterly devastated by the sad news conveyed to us this morning.

I find myself at a loss for words to adequately tell of my love and respect for BILL DITTER. Forceful and able, a master of rough and tumble debate, he was yet always kindly and courteous, friendly and fair. A man of his word. A promise made by him was a commitment to be kept. To be helpful to others was one of his greatest desires. Untold scores of us in the Congress and many thousands in the country can bear witness to this plain statement of fact.

Much more might I say of the life and character of my friend, BILL DITTER. For this occasion, suffice it to say that he had the complete respect of his colleagues, and greater than that no man can say. His active service was on the home front, here among his colleagues in the Congress of the United States, but the influence of his earnest and constructive efforts was felt on every front, from the frozen fields of Iceland to the steaming jungles of Guadalcanal. We have lost a friend and the Nation has lost a great and loyal patriot. Truly, a general has fallen.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, all of us mourn the loss of our distinguished colleague, J. WILLIAM DITTER. His untimely death is not only a severe shock to the State of Pennsylvania, but the Nation as well.

It is difficult to understand why one of his character should be taken from us so suddenly. A Divine Providence closed the portals on his life at a time when he was standing on the panel of a notable and brilliant career in the Congress of the United States. Though his voice, which always rang out in the true Christian spirit, is now muted, he will live forever in ou. minds and hearts.

BILL DITTER was a devout Christian. He was the sort of man that one felt free to consult. His wise counsel was so often a blessing to a new Member. He had an army of friends and no enemies. He leaves to his family the priceless heritage of a good name and the record of a life full of devotion to his country, his family, and friends.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning as I walked down the Avenue to my office I noticed that the flags were at half mast on the House Office Building. When I inquired and was told that my friend BILL DITTER had met such a tragic end within a few miles of my home, it stopped me in my path. I reached my office and was recovering from the shock when I was informed of the passing of our friend, Mr. STEAGALL.

It has not been my good fortune to know the gentleman from Alabama intimately, but on last Thursday when he made that marvelous speech here you could get the number of the man by observing him in action then. I shall always think of HENRY STEAGALL as I observed him on this floor last Thursday afternoon, fighting for what I know he believed was for the best interests of the country as a whole.

My good friend DITTER—and when I say "my good friend" I mean that BILL was my friend. I have enjoyed very few personal friendships of this character in my time. We believe in God and when we lose a friend, ofttimes we think about his future. I am not thinking about BILL DITTER's future today. I know that he had religious experiences in his life, that he had a complete knowledge of his creed, and that he enjoyed a strong faith and a lively hope. In that I today find consolation.

I came to the Congress in 1939. I learned to know him during that campaign. He realized that I needed his help, and he always extended it to me. He called me the landsman. He knew I came from the grass roots. Coming from the grass roots, I soon learned to know that while our good friend, BILL DITTER, was a man who had the ability to do big things and did do big things he never overlooked the little things and us little people. In Congress and out of Congress he had one ambition, to further the interests of his country and his party.

While he was big and could have domineered, and while he could have issued orders to us fellows from the grass roots, he never did. He just asked us for our cooperation, if we thought we could go along, and generally we went along because of his strong character and his influence, which was based not on power but on the fine qualities of a Christian gentleman.

I am not concerned today about his future. I am wondering who can take his place.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that misfortunes never come singly. When I arrived at this Chamber at noon I had not heard of the death of HENRY STEAGALL. The passing of two such eminent and outstanding Members of the House within 24 hours is indeed a double tragedy. I had the highest respect and admiration for Mr. STEAGALL, and in his death I mourn the passing of a wise and useful legislator, an exalted patriot, a great and good man. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

It has been a long time since I have had such a shock as I received this morning, when I picked up the paper and read the news of the sudden death of our loved colleague, Mr. DITTER. I wish to join in the tributes of deep and genuine sorrow which our colleagues preceding me have paid to him and which we hear on every hand.

It had been my privilege to enjoy intimate acquaintanceship with Mr. DITTER as a result of many years of association with him on the Committee on Appropriations and on the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, which has jurisdiction over many matters affecting the Nation's vital interests. It seems tragic beyond words that the chair which he occupied at the committee table only last week is vacant today. His death has left an aching void in the hearts of all of the members of our subcommittee, as it has in the hearts of all who knew him.

I do not think I ever met a more lovable man than Mr. DITTER revealed himself to be when you got right next to him and obtained a grasp of his wonderfully kind and ingratiating personality. If in the asperities of debate he by inadvertence said anything that wounded the feelings of an antagonist, he made immediate amends, for he was so warm in his friendship for his fellow men that he would not hurt the sensibilities of any person for anything on earth. I remember once on this floor when he had launched into a criticism of Judge Vinson, I reminded him that the judge had just taken over his office

and could not possibly know about the things he was being criticized for and his reaction was an immediate and abject apology. My reminder had presented the situation in its true light, and he was too great a man, too devoted to principles of justice to want to be unfair to anyone.

He was always considerate and thoughtful of others, and the friendliness which he radiated bound men to him as with hoops of steel. I remember that I once did a small favor for him; it was a very minor circumstance, but he never ceased to be appreciative. He gave the best there was in him to his country and to the service of humanity. We of the committee working circle to which he belonged, who knew him so well and liked him so much, will carry on with sorrow in our hearts and will always think of him as a blessed memory. He was a sweet soul, a loving soul; and as we bid him farewell we might appropriately paraphrase the encomium that Hamlet paid to his father:

He was a man, take him for all in all we shall not see his like again.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, like everyone in this House I came to the floor this morning with sorrow in my heart. That two such strong men should be taken from us from one day to the next is a devastating experience for us all.

It was not my privilege to know the honorable gentleman from Alabama, Mr. STEAGALL, more than slightly though in the years since I have been a Member of this House I have learned to have a sincere regard and warm affection for him. His exquisite gentleness, his chivalry, his kindness to all was outstanding in the House, and for myself I shall miss him.

In the sudden dramatic passing of the beloved Member from Pennsylvania, WILLIAM DITTER, there has gone from our midst a man of strong personality who has made for himself a place we all can envy. His was a strong hand, yet a gentle one. To so many of us he has been a close friend, a kind counselor, never asking anything of us, never expecting anything, and yet because he expected nothing of us often forcing us into something perhaps better than ourselves, even though that something would be in disagreement with his own views. To my mind that is a quality that but few people possess: The ability to clarify a subject without partisanship, without bias, leaving you free to form your own conclusions. To me he always showed that capacity.

We talked together many times of life and of the imminence of death, and of its meaning. One day I said to him, After all, is it not true as the ancients have said that if you would know the meaning of death you must seek it in the very heart of life? After all, life is an eternal thing, an eternal flow, a never-ending adventure.

And we would talk sometimes about the various phases of life, of passing from one stage of existence into another. We spoke of the dragon fly, that emerges from its chrysalis, dries its wings, and then without any knowledge of where it is going, flies off into the sun toward the light and the glory. Though it go far on its first day, it comes back to the place from which it took its wings, and hovers over the water, over the place where it was born.

For myself, I like to think that those who have been with us have not gone far, that they still share with us here in these halls, during these very serious times, perhaps in closer communion than we know, the problems that are ours. Surely a spirit such as Mr. STEAGALL's could not go far from that to which he gave so much, and I know that BILL DITTER's heart was here, in the halls where we struggle to keep our country free, to protect her, to give our dream for her reality. Surely they have not gone far! It is for us to pull aside the veils that lie between, that we may hear the message that they still have to give to us as each day we sit here.

I often think that these chairs that look so empty at times are in reality filled to overflowing! How deeply we should feel our responsibilities to interpret for those who are invisible, yes, but still so very potent. After all, the invisible life is closest to the Infinite. Is it not perhaps true that those that we cannot see are perhaps our strongest hope? I lay upon this desk along with all of the eulogies that we have heard these few words with the hope that because these men have been with us, we in our turn may do more truly the service they died to render.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in common with all of you, I mourn BILL DITTER as a colleague, as a friend, and as a distinguished Member of this body. To me he was somewhat more than that, because he was for so long a time my neighbor. My home is only a few yards from the beginning of BILL DITTER's district. His home is only a short distance from mine. I have known him since his first term in the Congress and when I came to this body as a very new Member I looked to him as an adviser, as a counselor, and, above everything else, as a sincere, trusted friend.

I knew also the very fine young naval officer who, in common with BILL DITTER, this rain-swept evening which has just passed, also reached out and touched the hand of God. I think as truly as Lieutenant Commander Mansure died on active duty in the service of his country, so also it is fitting and it is proper that we take note that BILL DITTER likewise died in the service of his country, and that it may be said of them as it was said of those fallen valiants who have gone before—

They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old;
Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.
At the going down of the sun and in the morning,
We will remember them.

I had occasion when I read the shocking news this morning to look up the last words that our friend and colleague spoke on the floor of this House. They were so typical of him and his great love for this country that I think they ought to be repeated here as a fitting part of his farewell to us who remain for yet a short time. He said, on the 19th of November in this hall:

As a people we are sorely in need of a reestablishment of faith in the integrity of government.

His belief in the integrity of government, of the Nation which he loved, was reflected in that statement, and in all his life and in all his career; in the estimate of his fellowmen he stood for integrity of purpose and of character.

He knew so well that "upon knowledge is an house builded, with wisdom shall its chambers be filled with all beauteous and pleasant riches," for indeed he had a firm grounding of sound knowledge and he knew the riches of wisdom.

It is with heavy hearts that we say to him at journey's end: "Go with God."

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today we record the passing of two great leaders, HENRY B. STEAGALL and J. WILLIAM DITTER. Mr. STEAGALL I did not know so well, but his last address made a profound impression on me.

Of J. WILLIAM DITTER it can be said he was one of Pennsylvania's outstanding Representatives of all time. "Bill," as we all knew him, was a man whose life was enriched and developed not only by early training but by constant self-discipline in early life, which blended in him gifts and graces which when taken alone are very rare. In all his actions he moved with such ease and courtesy that I think it may be said without exaggeration that wherever he moved he seemed to radiate vitality and charm. He was always calm, strong and self-confident. Never lost his self-possession. Never an unwise act, nor a word spoken in haste or ill-considered. Also, he seemed to have that wider and greater gift—the power of understanding and sympathizing with other people, regardless of whom or what their difficulties may have been. He evidenced a love of people, not so much by honeyed phrases but by good counsel, kind deeds, and useful services.

In all things he had charity. Tolerance was of his nature. He respected in others the quality he possessed himself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

With him the inquiry was not what a man believed but did he believe it. His lines of friendship and confidants encircled men in every creed. He had a lengthening list of friends in all elements of our social life.

On all problems he responded with an alacrity of a man who had become the willing servant of public duty—always with the same resourcefulness, the same masterly personality which never failed him in any of the fields of action in

which he had been called upon to play his part.

I cannot attempt to grasp and sum up the aggregate of his service in public life in a short space of time, and it is needless; his life comprised a term of some years and produced a performance which I may say genuinely has been by his toil and stimulated by patriotism for his country, a record that has won for him the hearty commendation of the people of his State and Nation.

His abiding faith in the principles of liberty and of the Government, based on the consent of the people as an instrument of human progress, was not the outcome of any vigorous enthusiasm but the deep-rooted growth of long years. He drew his strength from his experience with men and affairs. In all things it can be said he was an American and his ambition was to hand on to posterity and the generation of tomorrow a greater America than was handed on to him.

He had a broad generosity, and extended to his opponents the same sincerity and honesty that he demanded for himself. No man was better equipped for parliamentary warfare than he, with his commanding presence, sinewy diction, and imperturbable self-control.

His genius in politics was a genius of a leader, his dominance based on strength, iron will, irresistible determination, indomitable courage, tireless toil, amazing intellect, and last but not least those qualities of character which command men's trust and confidence.

Such a life as BILL DITTER needs no moralizing from me. His deep and genuine piety—his adherence to his church, his keeping of his own conscience void of offense before God and man, and his characteristics of a spiritual soldier, to me commends our hearty remembrances, more than any other of his accomplishments.

BILL had a goodness of soul, kindness of heart, devotion to duty, and the highest concepts of citizenship. My friends, we will miss the sound of his voice, the grasp of his hand, his hearty laughter, and that fine companionship which we have enjoyed over the years.

For all he tried to do to help his community, his State and his Nation, and his fellowman he regarded as part of his daily routine to be done and not talked about.

BILL was a humble man who delighted in lifting the burdens of life from the shoulders of others. A man who made the best of life as he found it.

A man who rejoiced mightily when any little act or deed of his added to the lives of the rest of us. A man who brought joy to our daily lives and lightened our daily tasks.

So, today, it is with a feeling of deep sadness that we record his passing, and remember him for the many little acts of kindness that have marked his friendship and the good will toward the membership of this House.

We do him this last great honor and may his soul rest in peace.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH].

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, the shocking news I have received this morning of the tragic death of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, makes this one of the saddest days of my life.

For almost 5 years I have worked with him, and I know that he used every hour to further his ambition that was not personal, but in the interests of the Nation he loved. His great service to all of America, and to his party, was the service of a high-minded, eager, intensely devoted and loyal person. We, on both sides of the aisle in this House, owe him much for having infused such tremendous energy and influence in our work toward a more peaceful intercourse with other countries.

BILL DITTER was still a young man, and though he had ventured far toward his goal of great usefulness to the Nation he honored and revered, he might still have gone on to even more glorious heights. How far, we do not know, for now, as he crashed in what might well be said was the mid-flight of his career, we know only that there remain broken plans and shattered dreams, the last mortal evidence of a distinguished son of Pennsylvania.

Our Republican Party honored this noble friend with positions of importance and trust. He proved, as a Member of this legislative body, to be a student of government and an astute leader of men. The capability, industry, and energy that marked his every day of life brought him distinction as a public figure, and devotion as a trustworthy friend.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, words have not been coined to express at a time like this the emotions of the heart. We are doubly sad in the passing of two distinguished and beloved friends and fellow workers. They have gone, through the guidance of their faith, to the home of the faithful. They have departed from this House to a house not made with hands, where all are of one brotherhood.

At such a time, Mr. Speaker, we realize the vital fact that the basic values of life are spiritual, and as we mourn our loss of these two beloved colleagues, one from each side of the aisle, I can think of no more fitting tribute for us to pay their memory than to carry on together in promoting, personally and governmentally, the teachings of the Master for a better America and for a better world.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to say a word of tribute about BILL DITTER, because of the very many acts of kindness he has shown to me since I came to this body.

On our trip to Chester to see the launching of the ships, I learned to know him and love him and respect him and admire him.

I can express my sentiments in no better way than in the prayer, "Eternal rest grant to him, O Lord, and may perpetual light shine upon him."

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, when the news reached me of the death of BILL DITTER, and sitting here this afternoon and listening to the eulogies paid him, the greatest tribute that has been paid to him by each of our colleagues is that they have referred to him as BILL DITTER. That is the appellation we gave him as a friend. As a colleague you knew him, but I, as a brother member of the bar, knew him in a personal nature. We had been on both sides of the rail, as they say. BILL DITTER was respected and honored and esteemed as an advocate. He went right down the line as one of the most ethical members of the bar of the State of Pennsylvania. I know I speak the sentiment of his friends and brother members of the bar when I say that we join with his family—his widow and his son and daughter—in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON].

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I heard this morning of the death of our very distinguished and able colleague, BILL DITTER.

A few years ago, when I first came to this House, BILL DITTER was a friend of mine, although he was on the other side of the aisle. He gave me counsel which has helped me greatly in this Congress. We, of Pennsylvania, have lost a great statesman. The Nation has lost a great statesman. Most of all, his wife has lost a devoted husband, and his son and daughter have lost a loving father.

Later on I shall extend my remarks more properly to pay my respects to our beloved friend, BILL DITTER.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and tragic death of J. WILLIAM DITTER has withdrawn from this House one of the most outstanding Members who ever served in the Capitol, particularly from Pennsylvania. Mr. DITTER's untimely demise has occurred in one of the most momentous periods of our history when, as never before, we are in need of men who, like BILL DITTER, know only one "ism" and that is Americanism. Yes, BILL DITTER's intense love for America made him a bitter and dangerous foe of all "isms" but Americanism. God grant that this spirit of his will carry on until we have the peace which now is his.

To discuss BILL DITTER's many accomplishments would require a great amount of time and unlimited space. Suffice it to say that may Mr. DITTER's accomplishments in the vineyard of his

Master be as great as his achievements in the Congress where he served so well and with such outstanding distinction. A fearless and fair fighter, he is beloved by friend and foe alike. His memory will live long in the hearts of his fellow man whom he so faithfully served.

Mr. Speaker, I mourn with my colleagues from Alabama the loss of Mr. STEAGALL. He was indeed a fine gentleman and we will all miss him.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, two of our distinguished and illustrious Members, Mr. HENRY B. STEAGALL and Mr. J. WILLIAM DITTER, have gone to eternity; time has ceased for them. They have gone to their reward which they so richly deserved.

In their labors for years for the common man and the interest of the Nation as a whole they worked diligently and there was a selflessness without thought of what the cost might be to them.

I have a feeling of profound grief this morning and a sense of loss sustained by this body. I wish to extend my sincere and deepest sympathy to their families in their loss.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM DITTER, Republican! HENRY STEAGALL, Democrat! Until 3 years ago, when I came to the House, I did not know either of these gentlemen, yet my association with them has become so close that it would seem as though I have known them all my life. I want to pay tribute at this particular time to HENRY STEAGALL, who was the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member. My association with him has always been particularly friendly. Although Mr. STEAGALL was leader of the majority and I a very humble member of the minority, he was always courteous, always helpful, and always patient. As a matter of fact, I had an engagement with HENRY STEAGALL for the latter part of this week, after the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was disposed of, to talk over certain legislation I intend to sponsor.

The Nation will be hard put to secure men to fill the places of these two outstanding Americans. I extend affectionate, heartfelt sympathy to their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to repeat, in memory of these two great colleagues of ours, words penned by a fellow San Franciscan, Anna Newbegin. These lines are captioned "All's well":

ALL'S WELL

Whatever comes is best—'tis the true way
That we should meet the hours in faith and say,
"What's mine no one can keep or take away.
I'll give the best in song, in joy, or pain,
And leave all else without a thought of gain."
When twilight falls, and rest is mine, with care,
My soul can say, "All's well, here, everywhere."

—*Anna Newbegin.*

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I know how feeble and inept are mere words orally spoken on this floor as instruments wherewith adequately to convey a condign tribute to the memory of two of the most distinguished Members of this body.

The House of Representatives has today indeed sustained a telling and a crushing blow in the shocking news transmitted to us of the sudden passing from our midst of these two renowned statesmen. HENRY STEAGALL has many achievements geared to his memory that will remain long alive in the hearts of men, which must be a consolation ever to his family and a source of solace to them when they recall how in these acts he has helped so much the lot of the plain citizen of the United States. Particularly crushing was it to us to sustain this blow when the bill of which he was the chief protagonist, the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, was scheduled to be up for vote today.

For J. WILLIAM DITTER I have conceived the profoundest admiration and the deepest affection having served with him as a colleague on the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with naval appropriations. Day after day I would, figuratively speaking, sit at his feet and listen in the utmost admiration to the words so fluently pouring forth from his lips. BILL DITTER was gift d as are few men endowed with the power of felicitous and extemporaneous expression. He was a great lawyer, a scholar, patriot, and, above all, a humanitarian. His heart was as big as the world, and although often on this floor in sharp debate he would engage in colloquies with Members on the opposite side of the aisle on political discussions, we could always take without asperity from Bill the good-natured criticisms he enjoyed making in respect to Democratic Party policies, because we knew that he had a keen sense of humor and a flashing wit which softened the sting in any argument he might make. His spirit was magnanimous, his soul was big, his interests were all embracing. Yes; we can ill afford to lose these two men from the House of Representatives. I think it very fitting and proper that the Members of the House in such numbers today are moved to go down into the Well and from their hearts let flow a few words that may in some measure mitigate the severity of the blow and the intensity of the grief for the surviving members of the families of these two statesmen who have today gone fror. among us.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, two great statesmen, both dear friends of mine, Hon. HENRY STEAGALL and Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, have within the past few hours been called from our midst. I shall at this time speak only of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER of the State of Pennsylvania. It is difficult when the heart is full to give expression to the affection which one feels for a departed friend. I must confess that seldom has the unexpected passing of a friend inflicted a deeper wound upon my heart than the sudden and tragic death of him whom we all affectionately addressed as "Bill." While we have each lost one of the finest and truest friends, the great State of Pennsylvania has lost an outstanding statesman who has represented one of its congressional districts with marked ability and fidelity. The range of the influence of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER was not only State-wide but Nation-wide. It has been said that no man is worth more than he contributes to the social, civic, and spiritual upbuilding of his community, State, and Nation. Measured by the contributions of our dear friend "BILL" DITTER in these three fields of endeavor he has won the only true worth to which a man of his excellent character would aspire.

I extend my deepest sympathy in this time of their great grief to Mrs. Ditter and to the other members of his family.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today we are saddened by the news that has come to us of the passing away of our esteemed colleague, J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania. There was nothing that more certainly evidenced the friendly feeling of the Members of this House toward him than the custom of each to call him "Bill." It indicated above all else the affectionate regard in which he was held by the membership of this House, Democrats and Republicans, alike. He was a kindly soul, friendly to all and always anxious to be helpful to all.

His memory will linger long and pleasantly with all who have had the privilege of acquaintanceship with him. It was my privilege to know him intimately. We were closely associated. As a result of this intimate friendship I knew the fine qualities of character and mind he possessed. Above all else he had the courage of his convictions, and, yet he could press his point in debate with vigor and strength without offending those with differing views. He was willing to acknowledge to them the same sincerity of purpose that characterized his own actions and words. "BILL" DITTER was a big man in every sense of the word.

He has served his Nation and State faithfully and well. He always thought in terms of the welfare of the Nation and its people. His service in building and strengthening our naval forces will ever be a monument to his love of country and his fidelity to the best interests of national defense and security.

The life that he has lived in our midst can well be an inspiration to each of us, who remain, to serve with equal courage, vision, and singleness of purpose. In the measure that we do so, then, to that extent will we merit similar tribute to that which has been so fittingly expressed today toward our deceased colleague.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the most satisfying reward for service in Congress is in the friendships which are made and in the daily contact with worth-while colleagues.

I have sat with WILLIAM DITTER from 2 to 4 hours a day for months at a time as a Member of the Appropriations Committee. I knew him well from daily observation and under conditions which

bring into the open the true abilities and character of men. We have agreed often, we have battled often.

He had a remarkable facility of expression, a brilliant intellect, great courage and determination, and the capacity for friendship possessed only by men who are true, sincere, and fine in their thinking and living.

To have had such a friend as WILLIAM DITTER is to increase your faith in human nature, and to lose him brings a sorrow and a sense of loss that cannot be expressed.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States was shocked with the news of the untimely death of the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania.

In these trying days when strong men are sought for leadership, the Congress of the United States was most fortunate in having among its numbers a colleague to whom it could look for such leadership. By far the outstanding debater on the floor of the House of Representatives, he always guided his argument within the bounds of ethics. No problem was too difficult for him to deal with to the minutest detail. A keen and thorough analyst he was blessed with such fluency that he was able to make difficult tasks appear simple. Well grounded in the history of our country, he was well equipped to handle any task assigned to him. His sense of humor made the dullest topic interesting. As a political leader he had the affection of those with whom he was associated and commanded the respect of his opponents. While he was a keen contestant, he was always kind to his rival. He was the idol of lovers of debate.

The House of Representatives in the demise of J. WILLIAM DITTER has lost an orator, who will be missed in these trying moments.

I join with all my other colleagues in expressing my deep and sincere feelings and sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay my tribute to one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives who has gone before us, the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER, of Pennsylvania. Last week he was among us, but on yesterday he was snatched away; we mourn his untimely death today.

Our fine colleague, who was strong in character, lovable by nature, dynamic in his presentation of the facts on every issue, pleasing in personality, and loyal in his friendships, was a great statesman and one of the outstanding legislators in this body.

It is tragic, indeed, that life must cease. Life is sweet to every citizen. The end comes all too soon, and the cares and responsibilities which have been assumed must be laid aside to be taken over by another. That is the roadway which all must travel. Yet it is extremely regrettable, at this moment, to have great men suddenly taken away from our midst when the demands are great upon the master minds of our country. We need men today as we have never needed them before. The demands upon those in high legislative positions are greater than ever before. We need their counsel, their wisdom, and their advice.

Mr. Speaker, today we suffer a dual loss in this Chamber. Our colleague, Representative STEAGALL, of Alabama, has answered the summons this morning. My loyal and personal friend, Representative DITTER, of Pennsylvania, suffered death yesterday evening in a most unfortunate airplane crash. The passing of these two outstanding Members of the House is a heavy blow indeed. We can ill-afford to lose any of our Members at this trying period in the history of our country. These two Members were leaders in the House, and it is a sad hour as we reflect that they will be with us no more. They have crossed the bar—their duties on earth have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect upon the suddenness of the departure of our friends we are constrained to value their lifes' work and the result of their efforts. My friend of a few hours ago, WILL DITTER, was a human dynamo of energy; he was constantly working for the best interest of his country; he was both keen and fearless in debate; he was never known to resort to uncompromising tactics as he matched his wits against another; he was kind and considerate, as he was good; he was a genuine friend to all, and his sturdy loyalty was his badge of honor as he walked along the pathways of life. He was a Christian gentleman, husband, and father. During the years he taught in our schools, and in the afteryears when he engaged in the practice of his chosen profession—the law—he carried those ideals into the national legislative halls, where he stood foursquare for his country and the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, thus we behold the life and character of our friend, our friend in his better days, WILL DITTER. His works stand before us. We cannot pronounce any encomium for him—he needs none. His life and his accomplishments stand stalwart and alone; they are his own memorial; they reflect their beauty and their splendor before us.

My humble tribute to him, my friend, I give in the words of a great hero in the days gone by: "This was a man."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sad hearts that we convene today. I came to my office shortly after eight this morning, much depressed because of the untimely death of BILL DITTER of Pennsylvania. Between that time and 10 o'clock, the Death Angel had knocked at our door again. This time it was HENRY STEAGALL, of Alabama. These gentlemen were typical representatives of their people in this great parliamentary body. Each was a leader in his own right. Each wore spurs of his own winning. They were credits to their respective districts, their States, and, yes, they were both national figures, and deservedly so. HENRY STEAGALL was one of my early acquaintances in Congress. I met him first in 1919. He was a typical southern gentleman of the old school, always kind, gentle, and considerate of the other fellow. During all these years I have never heard him utter an unkind, vindictive, or a stinging word on the floor, in the committee room, or in private conversation. This can be said of few men, but this was HENRY STEAGALL.

The laudatory eulogies of those who have preceded me today are not extravagant. They are real. They are genuine. If ever a man died in the harness, working for a cause in which he sincerely believed, that man was HENRY STEAGALL. He was an outstanding Democrat and, as stated in his speech on the floor last Thursday, it was his pleasure, and he considered it his duty, to go along with his political party, if and when he could do so without doing violence to his best judgment and his conscience. Surely it was distasteful for him to take the position which he took in that last memorable speech. Yet again, this is the type of man he was. We need more of HENRY STEAGALL'S sincerity and independence in the Halls of Congress.

While he had but 10 years' service in the House, no Member was better and more favorably known than J. WILLIAM DITTER. He was an exceptional individual in many particulars. He was a statesman of high order. He was an outstanding debater. With a splendid vocabulary, a keen analytical mind, a pleasing personality, he was a factor to be reckoned with in every phase of congressional life.

Yes, BILL DITTER was a politician, and I use this word in its highest connotation. He was a student of the science of government. He was a disciple of American constitutional philosophy. He was a thorough believer in the American way of life, and was loath to be led astray by isms, promises, or what have you. He knew that our form of government was based upon the two-party system and he always responded to the defense of that system. As between the two great parties, he was a Republican by conviction. He believed in a majority rule. He was a political partisan but never permitted that partisanship to interfere with Americanism. He set a splendid example which was most helpful, most inspiring, and most beneficial, especially to the newer Members. The esteem in which he was held is well exemplified by the splendid things that have been said here today.

Mr. Speaker, any additional words of mine would be but repetition, and I conclude by saying that it is a privilege to pay my tribute of honor, love, and respect to the life, character, and memory of my good friend, BILL DITTER.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy and our minds fail to function as they should. We are saddened by the announcement of the death of two distinguished American gentlemen, with long years of service in the House of Representatives.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER or, as he was affectionately known, BILL DITTER, was the first Member of Congress that I called upon after my election, November 1938. I will never forget that first visit with BILL DITTER. As I was leaving his office, he asked, "Where do you want to go from here?", and when I told him that I wanted to call at the

office of the Clerk of the House, he took me over to the Capitol and introduced me to Mr. Trimble. Later I found out that such thoughtfulness was typical of BILL DITTER. I have always felt free to call on him for advice. He was never too busy to talk to a new Member of the House.

In January 1939, it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee. I soon learned to respect and admire the chairman of that committee, the Honorable HENRY STEAGALL. I loved to listen to his homely illustrations. I recall many of the things he said to us in his address to the House on Thursday last. Many of us smiled when he said, "I have been home recently and it is good to go home." He may have been referring to political considerations, but I think he also meant that it is good to go home in another way. He loved Alabama and he loved to go home.

To know both of these distinguished gentlemen has been a privilege. The lives of those who came in contact with them have been enriched. May I extend my deepest sympathy to the bereaved families of our two departed comrades, who meant so much to both of them.

"It is good to go home"—and these colleagues of ours have but gone home.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will later announce the committees to accompany the remains of the late Mr. STEAGALL.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House may I say that funeral services for the Honorable J. WILLIAM DITTER will be held on Wednesday afternoon at 2 p. m. from the Methodist Church in Ambler, Pa.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces as members of the committee to accompany the remains of the late Mr. DITTER the following: Messrs. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania, KINZER, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, RODGERS of Pennsylvania, GRAHAM, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, WALTERS, BRADLEY of Pennsylvania, and CANNON of Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our departed colleagues the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 23, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume consideration on Tuesday, November 23, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Tuesday, November 23, 1943.

Business to be considered: A hearing on the bill, H. R. 2862, "A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 360. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3687, a bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 878). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3703. A bill relating to longevity pay of certain Army personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3704. A bill to provide pay and allowances for temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve during periods of disability resulting from injuries sustained or disease contracted in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3705. A bill to amend the act relating to the construction and maintenance of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Nebraska City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3706. A bill to postpone discharges of members of the military and naval forces for 1 year during which time they shall be in the Reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3707. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the duty on waterleaf paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3708. A bill to provide a national cemetery in every State and such additional national cemeteries as the Secretary of War determines to be needed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3709. A bill for the relief of Harley E. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3710. A bill for the relief of Jacob Wilkes Beasley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3711. A bill to authorize the presentation to James J. Conroy of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

3666. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Alto Brant Cipolletti and other citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3667. Also, petition of C. R. Orton, chairman of the West Virginia State Planning Board, endorsing and urging the location of a pilot plant in West Virginia for the production of oil, gasoline, and other valuable and essential byproducts from bituminous coal; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

3668. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petition of Della Armstrong and 29 other residents of Barnesville, Ohio, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3669. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of John J. Notz and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3670. Also, petition of Carl Mull and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3671. Also, petition of E. J. Smith and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3672. Also, petition of Fred Pillner and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3673. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3674. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Nora J. Borden and 56 other citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3675. Also, petition of 47 members of the Salem Covenant Church, Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3676. Also, petition of Mrs. B. R. Davis and 77 other citizens of Wilkinsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3677. Also, petition of C. F. McBride and 73 other citizens of Struthers, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3678. Also, petition of Rev. Revilo M. Standish and 38 members of Grace Methodist

Church, St. Petersburg, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3679. Also, petition of Mrs. Bailey Hubbard and 44 members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Alba, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3680. Also, petition of Rev. C. R. Heisey and 146 members of the Brethren in Christ Church, Upland, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3681. Also, petition of Rev. S. E. Boyle and 45 citizens of Sterling, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3682. Also, petition of Mamie A. Miller and 88 citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3683. Also, petition of Mrs. C. M. Pickler and 120 other citizens of Memphis, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3684. Also, petition of Rev. C. E. Belew and 106 citizens of Strong City, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3685. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Hollebrands and 93 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3686. Also, petition of Laura R. Ecker and 18 citizens of Pottstown, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3687. Also, petition of Rev. F. D. Walker and 91 members of Church of Christ, Jamestown, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3688. Also, petition of Gertrude Duteil and 21 other citizens of North College Hill, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3689. Also, petition of Mrs. William North and 32 other citizens of Erie, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3690. Also, petition of Mrs. E. T. Koska and 20 other citizens of Arlington Heights, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3691. Also, petition of Grant H. Cole and 26 other citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3692. Also, petition of Rev. Ernest L. Decker and 80 members of the First Presbyterian Church of Canon City, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3693. Also, petition of Rev. J. G. Burt Easton and 50 other citizens of Vestal, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3694. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Zebulon Davis, of Patterson, N. Y., and 30 other residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District, requesting the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3695. Also, petition of the Rogers Liquor Co., Inc., of Albany, N. Y., together with 41 other residents of Fishkill and other towns in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3696. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of A. L. Curtis and 85 other members of the Brig & Fo'c'sle Club of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise, with particular reference to House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3697. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication signed by Agnes Choisser, Percy T. Choisser, Eugene B. Goe, and Ruth Mills, all of Eldorado, Ill., opposing Senate bill 1161; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3698. Also, petition signed by Milton J. Dold and others, of Flora, Ill., opposing section 3 of House bill 3477; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3699. By Mr. COCHRAN: Resolution adopted by the American Hebrew Aid Society of St. Louis, favoring the passage of House bills 49 and 2328; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3700. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Janesville Production Credit Association, Janesville, Wis.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3701. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of the Bowling Operators Association of Seattle, Wash., protesting against the new excise tax planned for bowling alleys and billiard tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3702. Also, petition of Della Krehbiel and 14 other residents of Odessa, Wash., urging the promotion of House bill 2849 and toward getting Senate bill 637 out of committee as it was originally introduced; to the Committee on Education.

3703. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Democratic Women's Club, of Slippery Rock Township, Pa., urging the unimpaired continuance of the agricultural program of the triple A as inaugurated by Congress in 1938 with all the forces necessary to carry on a progressive program in these desperate days of need; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3704. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by members of the Consumers Service Center, of the Bronx, N. Y., opposing the passage of House bill 3744 and favoring the payment of subsidies to prevent price increases or to roll-back prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3705. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of sundry residents of the State of Indiana, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3706. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the acting director, Michigan Board of Aeronautics, protesting against the passage of House bill 3420, affecting air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.